The Role of Leadership in Creating Virtuous and Compassionate Organizations: Narratives of Benevolent Leadership in an Anatolian Tiger

Fahri Karakas · Emine Sarigollu

Abstract This study explores the role and potential of benevolent leadership in creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. A number of small and medium enterprises in Turkey, also called "The Anatolian Tigers", have been experimenting with new ways of incorporating care and compassion at work. The study uses narrative inquiry to explore how benevolent leadership enhances collective performance and wellbeing in Anatolian Tigers. The paper reviews and integrates four streams of research associated with creating common good in organizations: Spirituality, morality, positivity, and community, and links each of these elements to creating virtuous and compassionate organizations through narrative inquiry. The paper proposes that benevolent leadership can contribute to the long-term health and sustainability of organizations through its four elements: spiritual depth, ethical sensitivity, positive engagement, and community responsiveness.

F. Karakas (✉)
Norwich Business School, University of East Anglia, UEA London, 102 Middlesex Street, London E1 7EZ, UK
e-mail: fahrikarakas@gmail.com

E. Sarigollu
McGill University Desautels Faculty of Management, 1001 Sherbrooke Street West, Montreal, QC H3A 1G5, Canada
e-mail: emine.sarigollu@mcgill.ca

As the leaves are falling and the wind is breezing in this central Anatolian city of Kayseri, Nazife Tas, aged 70, is stirring a huge pot of chicken soup. Despite her age, she is working hard to organize the cooking process, while her children and grandchildren help her with the chores. Nazife Tas is the mother of Salih Tas, the owner of a small family company called Bereket operating in the textiles industry. Nazife Tas is cooking "iftar" dinners for all company employees throughout the month of Ramadan. "Ramadan is the month we celebrate compassion in our lives. We love and revere all the creation because of our love for the Creator", she says. She considers herself as the mother of all employees working there and everyone loves and accepts her as their compassionate mother figure. 120 employees and CEO Salih Tas break their fasting together at sunset; praying, eating, chatting, and laughing side by side. This collective spiritual experience enhances members' morale, belonging, and respect for each other. Salih behaves as a benevolent leader as he works together with employees towards organizational goals. As all organizational members feel as part of a big authentic family, they go beyond their contractual obligations to contribute to the greater good of Bereket.

The narrative above comes from field notes within a narrative inquiry study on benevolent leadership in Turkey. To advance scholarship on virtue ethics in business and management, this paper will bring together four streams of organizational research through a higher-order model of benevolent leadership toward creating virtuous and compassionate organizations, and illustrate the elements of this model using narrative inquiry at Bereket.

Bereket (a pseudonym; a Turkish word meaning blessing or abundance) is an exemplar of a compassionate company that exhibits great care for its employees. In addition to iftar dinners in Ramadan, Bereket offers its employees complimentary breakfasts and lunches, free tickets for cultural events and concerts, a library, and a cafe where employees can meet, relax, have fun, and spend time together. More importantly, Bereket supports all educational and developmental needs of its employees so that they can pursue learning based on their passions. Such spaces and opportunities foster positive attitudes in employees, enhance their well-being and belonging, and stimulate their creativity. The company also provides health coverage for employees' family members and educational scholarship for their children. These benefits enhance employees' belonging and job satisfaction at work. Employees take pride in working at Bereket; as expressed in the words of Hasan (35): "This company is my family, my community. I intend to continue contributing to this community until I die. And I want to die among these friends. I would decline a promotion elsewhere. I just want to stay here and contribute."

Employees come from diverse backgrounds, religions, and races. However, they have a shared passion for being part of a valuable community. Bereket is an exception—a hidden gem or a pearl—within the interconnected global economic system which pushes companies to greater levels of competition and velocity. Yet, it represents a model of care and compassion in organizations. A number of small and medium enterprises (SME) in Turkey, such as Bereket, have been experimenting with new ways of incorporating care and compassion at work. These enterprises, often called "The Anatolian Tigers" (Aycan 1999; Demir et al. 2004; Hosgor 2011) have significantly contributed to the dispersal of employment, wealth, production, growth, and local democracy in various Anatolian cities. How can organizations flower the human spirit? How can managers design workplaces to nourish the spirit of fellowship and compassion among all employees? How can leaders create virtuous and compassionate organizations? This paper seeks to address these questions through narrative inquiry conducted in Bereket, focusing on how benevolent leadership enhances collective performance and wellbeing in Anatolian Tigers. In this paper, we explore the role and potential of benevolent leadership in creating virtuous and compassionate organizations.

We define benevolent leadership as the process of creating a virtuous cycle of encouraging and initiating positive change in organizations through: (a) ethical decision making, (b) creating a sense of meaning, (c) inspiring hope and fostering courage for positive action, and (d) leaving a positive impact for the larger community. Benevolent leadership is based on four streams of common good in organizational research: morality, spirituality, positivity, and community. This paper is based on the assumption that these four areas of research can provide leadership scholars and practitioners a theoretically sound basis and a wealth of knowledge to create virtuous and compassionate organizations. Extending on the compassion definitions of Lilius et al. (2008), we consider compassionate organizations as organizations that have the collective action capacities to notice, feel, and respond to the suffering of its members as well as to improve the members' states of wellbeing. We define virtuous organizations as ones that foster virtues and virtuous behaviours as part of their organizational culture and act as active corporate citizens in their day-to-day practices.

This paper aims to bring a new perspective on creating virtuous and compassionate organizations through a benevolent leadership model. Benevolent leaders are those who create observable benefits, actions, or results for the common good. The term "common good" is used in the sense of shared benefits or positive outcomes for all or most members of a community (Bryson and Crosby 1992; Daly and Cobb 1989), and is in keeping with the definition of common good of the firm as the production of goods and services needed for nourishing, in which different members participate through work (Sison and Fontrodona 2011, 2012). Benevolent leaders exemplify whole-hearted and genuine actions at work that benefit people around them. Therefore, they have an inclination to do good, to do kind, or charitable acts due to a felt obligation to use their developmental and intentional attributes of love and charity.

This paper makes two key contributions to the advancement of scholarship on virtue ethics in business and management. First it reviews four large bodies of research associated with nurturing virtues in organizations: spirituality, morality, positivity, and community, and links these elements to creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. The paper discusses and illustrates these links through narrative inquiry at Bereket. Second, the paper proposes a theoretical model of benevolent leadership that directly results from the intersection and combination of these four virtues.

The Quest for Virtuous and Compassionate Organizations

The call to understand and create virtuous and compassionate organizations is timely and relevant for a number of reasons. First, there is a crisis of confidence and trust in business organizations (Jenkins 2003; Shanz 2009; Walker 2005); as demonstrated in the 10 % public trust in large corporations (Zuboff, 2009). Specifically, this crisis of

confidence is manifested in corporate layoffs (Pugh et al. 2003); psychological disengagement of people from their work (Mitroff and Denton 1999; Pech 2009); a sense of betrayal caused by downsizing (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003); organizational bullying and mistreatment (Vickers 2010), and ethical scandals and corruption (Waddock 2004). Unfortunately, we have been witnessing the continuing and routine failure of many organizations and their leaders in responding adequately to these chronic and complex problems. In addition, both the academic and professional literature on management is replete with compelling examples of leaders who abuse power and act selfishly in business organizations (Maccoby 2000). This crisis of confidence in business organizations is also manifested in the recent global financial crisis where the vicious cycle resulted in overextension of credits, bankruptcy of large investment banks, declines in world stock indexes, and increased unemployment and loss of jobs worldwide (Corkery and Hagerty 2008). Recent critics point to the moral problems and ethical roots of the crisis; such as uncontrolled greed, which has resulted in a loss of confidence in the business community (Greenhalgh 2008; Steenland 2008).

In addition to this context of broad disenchantment with business organizations, there is increasing uncertainty and flux in today's workplaces as a result of technology advances, unexpected events ("coconut uncertainty") and increasing global interdependence (Bolman 2008; Makridakis et al. 2010). The waves of change sweeping the business world include interlocking fragility, global interconnectivity, and heightened volatility (Caslione 2009; Kotter 2008). Moreover, increasing complexity and interdependence implies that change is becoming increasingly non-linear and unpredictable (Karakas 2010). The resulting competitive and economic pressures have led to intense cost cutting, massive corporate downsizing, and increasing stress (Neal et al. 1999). In the last decade, four million jobs were cut by Fortune 500 firms, which caused severe emotional damages for affected employees and families (victims), as well as for co-workers and managers (survivors) who remained in their organizations (Cash and Gray 2000; Pugh et al. 2003). Many downsizing and restructuring strategies in the past decades mean that the old psychological contract, which offered job security in return for loyalty, is changing (Cappelli 2008; Kriger and Hanson 1999). Today's leaders are now faced with employees whose attitudes are not of trust and engagement; but of scepticism, fear, and cynicism (O'Bannon 2001; Pelletier and Bligh 2008). Moreover, employees need to deal with toxic decision processes (Maitlis and Ozcelik 2004), necessary evils which cause harm to others (Molinsky and Margolis 2005), and negative emotions as a result of toxic interactions with colleagues or managers (Frost 2003)

throughout their everyday experiences at work. The need for care and compassion is echoing in every organization today as the long term health of organizations is being threatened. There is a deep need for creating virtuous and compassionate organizations where employees feel more empowered and courageous to tackle the unique challenges of the twenty-first century.

Virtues have recently become a significant topic of examination among organizational researchers who are exploring their role in creating more progressive, compassionate, and humane work environments. As organizations which have long been viewed as rational systems are considering making room for emotions, meaning, spirituality, and community (Ashmos and Duchon 2000); researchers have been calling for more theories and research on creating virtuous organizations (Manz et al. 2006; Neubert 2011).

In parallel to this growing interest in virtues, management disciplines have been witnessing an explosion of interest in care and compassion issues. The topic of compassion in organizations has been receiving increased attention in the literature as evidenced by the fact that several well-known journals have covered the topic (e.g., Organizational Dynamics, Academy of Management Review, and, Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences). Organizational researchers have been calling for more theories and research on creating compassionate organizations (Rynes et al. 2010; Tsui 2010). The theme of the 2010 Academy of Management Meeting in Montréal, Canada, was passion and compassion in management practice and research. The title "Dare to care" challenged management theorists and practitioners to focus on passion and compassion in order to enhance the wellbeing of all stakeholders. There have been more than 120 sessions (professional development workshops or academic paper sessions) devoted to care and compassion in the meeting. On the practice side, we have been witnessing a movement toward business organizations with a socially responsive, progressive and humanitarian edge (Esty and Winston 2006; Hollender et al. 2010; Hsieh 2010; Savitz and Weber 2006) as well as new models of social entrepreneurship combining profits, passion, and compassion (Bornstein 2007; Mair and Martí 2006; Yunus 2007). Nonetheless, there is still a gap of theory and research on the process and dynamics of leadership aimed at creating virtuous and compassionate organizations.

To understand how leaders contribute to the world around them, management scholars have borrowed many concepts and theories from other disciplines to advance theories of business ethics (Treviño 1986), spirituality at work (Ashmos and Duchon 2000; Mitroff and Denton 1999), positive organizational scholarship (Cameron et al. 2003), appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider and Whitney

1998), and corporate social responsibility (Carroll 1999). This variation has created a theoretical pluralism that has uncovered novel ways to explain benevolence, care, and compassion in organizations. All of these fields attempt to help leaders to better cope with the ethical, social, emotional, and spiritual challenges of the competitive materialist business landscape, but eclectically integrating these various fields into a broader framework of benevolent leadership has not yet occurred. The confluence and synergy of all these fields through a model of benevolent leadership may enable new perspectives on creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. Although research conducted in these domains address the impact and responsibility of leaders in organizations, they do not go far in illuminating how leaders can create virtuous and compassionate organizations, which will be the central focus of the current paper. This paper first attempts to ''map the territory'' by analyzing the contributions of these streams of research to organizational care and compassion. Then it develops a model of benevolent leadership and illustrates its potential to create virtuous and compassionate organizations through the narrative inquiry study conducted at Bereket.

Conceptual Development

Beneficence is defined as "acts of mercy, kindness, and charity", and it involves all forms of action intended to benefit or promote the good of others (Beauchamp 2008). While beneficence refers to actions done to benefit others, benevolence refers to the morally valuable character virtue of being disposed to act for the benefit of others (Beauchamp 2008). The virtue of benevolence rests on the philosophic belief in the innate goodness of humanity and the corresponding belief that humans have an obligation to use their natural instincts of love and charity to help or do good to others.

This paper introduces a conceptual model of benevolent leadership based on four streams of common good in organizational research:

(1)   Spirituality stream, which is based on spirituality at work and spiritual leadership literatures (the focus is on the inner landscapes and spiritual actions of leaders);

(2)   Morality stream, which is based on business ethics, leadership values and ethics, and ethical decision making literatures (the focus is on leaders' ethics and values);

(3)   Positivity stream, which is based on positive organizational scholarship and strength-based approaches (the focus is on how leaders create positive change in organizations and the world); and,

(4)   Community stream, which is based on corporate social responsibility and corporate citizenship literatures (the focus is on leaders' contribution to society and community service).

We contend that the interplay between these four streams can provide a more comprehensive understanding of how leaders can create care and compassion in organizations and synthesizing them will lead to theoretical and practical insights on creating compassionate and virtuous organizations. We believe such synthesis is useful in several ways. First, it is a step toward a holistic theory generation on virtuous and compassionate organizations. Second, the conceptual framework serves both normative and pragmatic functions. These four streams provide practical guidelines for leaders to enable collective noticing, feeling, and responding to suffering in organizations. Third, the resulting model underlines the importance of taking all four dimensions into account while theorizing or researching on organizational care and compassion.

Wang and Cheng (2009) discuss benevolent leadership as a paternalistic style of leadership in Chinese cultural context where leaders show individualized care and concern for subordinates in both work and nonwork domains. Our conceptualization of benevolent leadership is; however, distinct from this work because: (a) the benevolent leadership construct we propose is not necessarily culture-bound and it is applicable in diverse cultural contexts; (b) benevolent leadership construct presented here does not require paternalism as a key conceptual ingredient, (c) benevolent leadership model we propose brings together four conceptual domains and builds on them to account for positive change in human systems. For more detailed information on conceptualisation and measurement of benevolent leadership that theoretically underpins this paper, readers may refer to (Karakas and Sarigollu 2012).

The benevolent leadership model is conceptually distinct from other positive and values-based leadership models such as ethical, spiritual, authentic, and servant leadership because: (a) it has an explicit focus on creating positive change in human systems; (b) it balances ethical, spiritual, transformational, and social concerns of leaders by encompassing four aspects; (c) it provides leaders guidance on how to create virtuous and compassionate organizations. Table 1 illustrates the conceptual elements of benevolent leadership model by contrasting and differentiating the model from other value-based leadership models.

Next, we review these four streams of organizational research and discuss their implications for creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. We illustrate the linkages and the application of benevolent leadership through

Table 1 Benevolent leadership and related constructs

Relevant core dimensions and leader attributes	Ethical leadership	Spiritual leadership	Authentic leadership	Servant leadership	Benevolent leadership
Ethical sensitivity	√				√
Spiritual depth		√			√
Positive engagement			√		√
Community responsiveness				√	√
Calling		√		√	√
Integrity	√	√	√	√	√
Self-awareness	√	√	√		√
Hope		√	√		√
Stewardship				√	√
Wisdom		√		√	√

the narrative inquiry study conducted at Bereket. Table 2 outlines the essence of these four streams in terms of their related literatures, ideal leadership profiles, main gaps and problems, and leader behaviours.

Spirituality Stream

The spirituality stream of research, or "the spirituality movement", focuses on understanding employees' spiritual needs, inner landscapes, and search for meaning. A large number of employees today often feel psychological isolation and alienation at work (Bolman and Deal 1995); as well as a vacuum and a lack of meaning in their work lives (Dehler and Welsh 1994). Researchers mention that workplace spirituality has the potential to provide leaders a feeling of purpose, a sense of connection and meaning at work (Bolman and Deal 1995; Fry 2003; Fry and Slocum 2008; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003). Ashmos and Duchon (2000) have described the spirituality movement as "a major transformation where organizations which have long been viewed as rational systems are considering making room for the spiritual dimension, a dimension that has less to do with rules and order and more to do with meaning, purpose, and a sense of community" (p. 134). This new spiritual dimension embodies leaders' search for simplicity, meaning at work, more humane workplaces, self-expression, and interconnectedness to something higher (Marques et al. 2007). Management theory has often linked spirituality to compassion; discussing compassion as one of the most important spiritual values and as a path of spirituality (Driver 2007; Kernochan et al. 2007). Both spirituality and compassion are concerned with being deeply interconnected with people and with the whole of life (McCormick 1994). Acts of compassion involve a deep feeling of opening the heart and allowing oneself to feel the suffering in the world. The essential function of spirituality

is also to lead to a path of genuine love of people and a deep concern for others (Kernochan et al. 2007).

Morality Stream

The morality stream of research focuses on understanding the moral values and principles of business leaders (Mayer et al. 2012). Since the 1980s, researchers have focused more attention on the study of ethical attitudes and behaviours of leaders in organizations and a useful body of research has been accumulated (Ciulla 2004; Gini 1997). The call for incorporation of morality, ethics and responsibility in leadership practice has gained momentum in the last 20 years in parallel with increasing ethical concerns in organizational life (Cameron 2011; Ciulla 2004; Gini 1997; Maak 2006; Pless 2007; Pless 2011; Voegtlin et al. 2012). Ethical sensitivity represents leader's process of moral reflection and consideration of what is right and wrong conduct at work. We propose that leaders with higher ethical sensitivity will be more virtuous and compassionate; which in turn will evoke more virtuous and compassionate behaviours in the organization. Organizational theory supports that demonstrating higher ethical sensitivity and enacting ethical principles at work is closely related to practicing care and compassion in organizations (White 1999).

Positivity Stream

The positivity stream is centered on how leaders can create and lead positive change in organizations. The basic fields underlying this stream are appreciative inquiry and positive organizational scholarship. These fields are called "strength-based approaches" in organizational sciences and were developed as a response to the dominant problem

Table 2 Bridging four streams of common good

Anchor/integrative characteristic	Morality stream	Spirituality stream	Positivity stream	Community stream
	Ethical sensitivity	Spiritual depth	Positive engagement	Community responsiveness
Related literatures, models, movements, approaches	Values in management Business ethics Virtuousness Management by values/virtues	Management, spirituality and religion, Reflection, inspiration, Integral philosophy Spirituality at work	Appreciative inquiry Positive organizational scholarship Positive psychology	Corporate social responsibility Organizational citizenship behavior Business as an agent of world benefit
Essential concepts	Morality, integrity, virtues, trust, honesty	Awareness, calling, reflection, wisdom, transcendence	Positive deviance, thriving, vitality, hope	Sustainability, corporate citizenship, contribution
Ideal profile/leadership strength	Virtuousness Modesty Groundedness Honesty	Depth Meaning Sincerity Sensitivity	Hope Morale Courage Healing	Stewardship Service Generosity Sense of community
Main problems/gaps/ necessity	Atrophy: corporate scandals, bad apples, corruption, unethical practices, indifference, cynicism, egoism, erosion of values	Apathy: excessive materialism, positivism, loss of meaning, stress, isolation, fear, barren workplaces	Lethargy: bureaucracy, static, entropy, resistance to change, reductionism, compartmentalization, loss of perspective	Entropy: environmental problems, inequity, social problems, harm to society
Motto	Walk the talk Do what you want to be done unto you	Be self-aware Create meaning	Initiate and catalyze change See the big picture	Serve community Contribute to society

solving approach in organizational sciences. By exploring life-giving capacities in organizations and the world, appreciative inquiry makes deliberately affirmative assumptions about people, organizations, and relationships (Cooperrider and Whitney 1998). By focusing on the best of the human condition, flourishing, and vitality in organizations, positive organizational scholarship utilizes a broad spectrum of theories and concepts to explain and enable top performance and excellence in organizations (Cameron et al. 2003). The common thread in strength-based approaches is to improve the human condition by enabling and empowering the human potential of employees.

There is considerable empirical evidence that positive actions at work lead to tendencies to repeat or replicate these actions and this contagion effect leads to mutually reinforcing cycles and positive spirals in human systems (Fredrickson 2001; Seligman 2002). When employees observe that leaders have positive engagement at work, they become more inclined towards replicating this engagement through spending extra efforts to help colleagues. They will also be more inclined to notice, feel, and respond to their suffering. In turn, these positive spirals lead to collective flourishing and thriving (Cameron et al. 2004), resulting in a more compassionate organizational climate. Therefore, we propose that leaders who are positively engaged will show more commitment to care and compassion at work; which in turn will enable more virtuous and compassionate behaviours in the organization.

Community Stream

The essence of the community stream is that leaders have societal obligations which transcend economic functions of producing and distributing goods and generating profits for their shareholders. The focus in the community stream is on stakeholder interests and societal expectations on issues such as quality of life, societal wellbeing, and community service. The community stream emphasizes the role of corporate leaders in addressing specific social problems relating to education, employment, ecology, civil rights, arts, and sustainability. The concept of corporate social responsibility was invented in 1950s, when academics and practitioners first started to articulate the effects of businesses on society (Carroll 1999). Bowen's (1953) "Social Responsibilities of the Businessman", can be regarded as a milestone in the early formation of the concept of social responsibility of leaders in organizations. The "stakeholder management" concept was developed to address the concerns and expectations of stakeholders who affect companies or who are affected by them (Clarkson 1995). How managers and corporations can successfully address the

competing and diverse demands of various stakeholder groups (customers, shareholders, suppliers, employees, NGOs, activists, community, government, media.) is the central question here (Ogden and Watson 1999). Butcher and Harvey (1999) emphasize that corporate leaders have been re-examining, questioning, and reinventing the very basis of our business organizations as they are challenged by issues of human rights, fair trade, responsible marketing, local economic development, and non-discriminatory employment practices.

We introduce the concept of community responsiveness to describe leaders' roles and responsibilities in solving social problems and contributing to society. Community responsiveness entails leading organizations in ways that benefit the world and creating effective responses to social needs and problems through innovative business solutions. Community responsiveness is also related to actions such as creating caring communities with strong trusting relationships (Russell 2001), acting as agents of world benefit, health, peace, wellbeing, and global sustainability (Cooperrider and Dutton 1998); developing global awareness about world problems and solutions (Gladwin et al. 1995; Neal et al. 1999), supporting synergy and inclusiveness among stakeholders (Ogden and Watson 1999), and building sustainable enterprises that connect industry, society, and the environment (Senge and Carstedt 2001).

Methodology

The investigation of care and compassion in organizations presents a challenge for organizational researchers. This is due to the complex nature of care and compassion as concepts and the contextual elements that influence their perceived meanings. As the literary turn in social sciences has enabled re-discovering the narrative knowledge in organization research (Czarniawska 1998), there is an opportunity to harness the potential of narrative inquiry to discover the emotional and spiritual landscape of organizational members. In particular, the use of stories provides means to make sense of emotional experiences and the narrative method is the most relevant research method to tap into the deep values and spiritualities of organizational members.

This research has used narrative inquiry (Clandinin and Connelly 2000; Daiute and Lightfoot 2004) to analyze stories of employees and leaders at Bereket holistically and to focus on the meanings that people ascribe to their lives and experiences in the selected organization. Narrative inquiry uses interviews, life stories, autobiographies, journals, field notes, conversations, photos, other artifacts, and life experiences (Clandinin and Connelly 2000) as sources of data to create a holistically constructed narrative.

Narrative inquiry has been chosen as the research method because it can provide rich insights that shed light into benevolent leadership in an organizational setting. As care and compassion are topics that are complex and many-layered, narrative inquiry can surface hidden assumptions and values of organizational members through stories. Analysis of people's stories provides their own perspectives and experiences of benevolent leadership in the context of an Anatolian tiger: Bereket. Semi-structured interviews have been used to elicit people's personal narratives of compassion and allow more flexibility for respondents to tell their own stories. In narrative inquiry, it is important that the respondents are given the time and space to tell their stories. We have adopted a qualitative approach and used semi-structured interviews to give voice to human feelings and experiences. We have conducted 32 interviews with managers, employees, and other representative stakeholders. Open questions such as "What was it like for you to experience compassion at work?" or "Can you tell me a specific example?" have been asked to probe more details or to elicit personal narratives. Increasing the contextual richness of storytelling has been an important feature of this narrative inquiry. The emergent narratives offered opportunities for respondents from all levels of the organization to raise their own voices, share their contextual understanding of their life stories, and participate in knowledge construction (Mishler 1991).

We have used interpretive phenomenological analysis as a guiding methodological framework for analyzing the narratives found in interview data (Smith et al. 2009); putting an emphasis on shared experiences and values to capture commonalities in respondents' views on what makes Bereket unique. Data analysis progressed from transcription to the preparation of analytical and reflective memos, to independent iterative coding, to comparison of the themes/categories across researchers, to central theme selection and tentative narrative theme development, and to theme/coding verification. Following the model of Plowman et al. (2007), we have used a predetermined (benevolent leadership) framework as a guiding overall model in our narrative analysis; which is in contrast with starting with a blank slate and using a grounded theory approach. We have used beneficence/benevolence as a theoretical lens to identify representations and manifestations of a class of virtues rooted in goodwill, generosity, and compassion directed at others in the workplace. We have coded each narrative separately based on whether each of the benevolent leadership themes or codes was present or not. We allowed for the possibility that more than one theme might be present in each narrative. In instances where independent coding diverged from one another, we have discussed the case further comparing respective interpretations regarding the themes. As we have developed more

robust patterns or more integrated story lines, we triangulated in the field by asking stakeholders to comment on the themes to check if these resonated with their experiences and if they could challenge the themes or categories. We have revised and probed the narrative themes further based on participant feedback, ethnographic field observation, and triangulation achieved through data from multiple interviews conducted with diverse stakeholders.

Narratives of Spirituality

Data analysis revealed a consistent set of spirituality themes across the narratives told by Bereket employees. The first recurrent theme is the centrality of inner peace in forming a spirit of compassion. CEO Salih Tas explains his own spirituality as follows:

> Islam asks me to nurture the knowledge of the mind and heart. The word Islam has the root word, peace; and it means being in peace with your colleagues, your neighbours, your family, yourself, and the universe. My inner voice tells me to open up my heart to all humans. At the heart of every religion is compassion. This is what all Prophets including Jesus and Mohammed preached. Peace be upon them. Compassion is the beginning of being; without it everything is chaos. The universe itself is a symphony of compassion. I just go with the flow. I love every creation because of the Creator. I think this summarizes my spirituality best.

The second theme is a lack of separation between work and life. Salih Tas incorporates a deep sense of interconnectedness into his daily work and into relationships with his employees. Employees call him "Salih abi" (elder brother) and share their personal problems with him. One manager, Murat (28), mentions how Mr. Tas helped him when he got married:

> Salih abi has been as close to me as my own brother. He even helped me organize my wedding. He is my mentor. I rely on him as my spiritual guide and I seek advice from him. His time, energy, and patience have no limits. He is an extremely sincere and modest person. I feel very lucky to know him.

The third recurrent theme across narratives of spirituality is the sustainability of high quality relationships among people in the organization. These relationships go far beyond the formal roles and titles in the organization; and they seem to be driven by mutual affection and connections that are deeply spiritual. For example, some employees comment that they pray for each other mentioning their names and good wishes for them. "We love each other and we believe our friendship will continue in the hereafter" says Zeynep (31); one of the employees in Accounting. There is a spiritual ecosystem in the organization that gives room to deep and sincere relationships among people:

> There is a lot of fresh air and ample space to express my inner child. In fact, we are a group of kindred spirits helping and supporting each other.

The final recurrent theme is the tendency of leaders to engage in constant spiritual self-questioning while striving to devote themselves to the people around them. "I need to be alert to the potential traps of my ego; such as becoming too self-centered or acting selfishly. We are here to serve the people around us." says Ahmet (39), one of the team leaders in People Department:

> We act as each other's true friend, so that we may be able to warn each other about our mistakes. It takes an effort to be able to receive honest feedback with an open ear, mind, and heart. Everyone is dedicated to his or her colleagues. Everyone genuinely supports the success of each other. This atmosphere of compassion and collegiality is not easily found in today's barren workplaces.

Narratives of Morality

When we asked Bereket managers about the ethical rules that they refer to in their actions and decisions, they consistently pointed to a common source of ethical code; the *Ahilik* code. The "Ahilik" system represents the overarching social and professional organizations in Anatolia that enforce ethical and social rules upon their members during the Ottoman state. The *ahilik* system was established in the thirteenth century and since then played a significant role in the everyday functioning of trade associations and represented the ethical system of rules for the wider society. Those who are engaged in degrading or unethical behaviour cannot be members. All members of the profession are advised that they act honestly and responsibly in all their businesses and in their relationships with their customers. The most important ethical principles are summarized as follows (these principles were placed on the desks of senior managers at Bereket):

> "Keep your hand open (generosity, benevolence, and charity)
> Keep your dining-table open (sharing, hospitality, and generosity)
> Keep your door open (helping, altruism, and benevolence)
> Keep your eyes tied (focus on spirituality and the hereafter instead of materialism)

Control your waist (decency, morality, and self-restraint)

Hold your tongue (dignity, silence, and wisdom)"

These *Ahi* principles have their roots in Sufism—the mystical branch of Islam—which has important teachings on ethical conduct. Among the Sufi rules of conduct, compassion has a central place as a necessary moral virtue. For example, Rumi, whose philosophy based on universal compassion shaped and deeply influenced Anatolian ethical wisdom, says on compassion:

"Come, come whatever you are/Whether you are atheist, or worship fire/Whether you have broken your oath thousand times/Our convent is not the convent of despair/Our door is the door of hope come/Come as your true self, like you are."

Rumi's words embody the ethics of compassion as a reflection of the Golden Rule: *Do to others what you would have them do to you*. This requires constant questioning, self discipline and self control. Therefore, the ethics of compassion is about the need to act ethically, to reach the ideal, to be responsible, to live life the right way, and to improve the world. The ethics of compassion is also related to being dedicated for a larger cause and contributing to the common good. However, as the individual behaves as the judge of his or her own, he or she should behave as the advocate of others. This means avoiding judging and criticising other people and being tolerant, open, and forgiving towards everyone.

This sense of forgiveness and openness obviously reflects a different sense of morality and departs from typical normative rules or evaluative moral judgments. The organizational culture at Bereket is based on an appreciative sense of morality and a deep desire of special bonding with other people at work. Employees engage in meaningful and inspiring conversations with each other. They feel a deeper responsibility and show genuine concern for people around them.

I have learned the meaning of real friendship in this organization. We care for each other here and we are all for one another. If one of us is ill, we will be there offering soup. If I fall in debt, my friends will lend me. This sacrifice and devotedness for each other is very rare in today's workplaces and we feel really lucky to be part of it. (Osman 33).

While some of the narratives cited under spirituality and morality streams draw on Islam, and in particular Sufi spirituality in this article, these streams are meant and proposed to recognize diverse spiritual and cultural traditions. The methodological approach used here can be equally attempted in, for example, a Buddhist or Christian spiritual worldview.

Narratives of Positivity

Data analysis revealed a consistent set of positive engagement themes across the narratives told by Bereket employees. This contagious and collective nature of positive engagement is illustrated well by the following narrative:

"You can feel warmth the minute you walk in. There is always positive energy around you that you can tap into. You feel that everyone cares about you; and you want to care more. There is a virtuous cycle around you and you want to be part of it. The Bereket atmosphere is just fabulous." (Aysegul 41).

Salih Tas echoes similar views when he narrates the philosophy and the brand name of his company:

I established this company to enrich the lives of people—not only materially; but more importantly spiritually and emotionally. We have 'bereket' (abundance and blessing) here; like the rain. Bereket implies positive movement. It reminds us of God's constant help and gifts for us. God is pouring us bounties, opportunities and resources. I am just a custodian here. It is my duty to share all these with the amazing people here. I am just thankful to have such a wonderful team around me. This is bereket. People are the real richness. All the wealth created here is meaningless if I break a heart.

Although these narratives emphasize the contagious nature of positive engagement at the organizational level, positive engagement is also a recurrent theme at the individual level. Employees mentioned a constant striving and search for a more benevolent and transcendent self:

I am in a continuous battle with myself. I am in search for a better self—more compassionate, kind, and considerate. If you ever want to progress and transcend yourself, you need to engage in constant reflection and struggle with yourself. You have to keep questioning yourself each and every minute. You have to go beyond comfort and convenience, and always force yourself to pursue challenges. It is not easy, but this constant striving and self-awareness is the key to progress and positive change." (Handan 45).

This engagement with the self has its merits; because this constant striving for a better self creates positive dynamism in the organization. As individuals reflect on themselves, analyze their shortcomings, and see potential opportunities for improvement; they also start a positive cycle of progress. They develop new skills and engage in new learning and projects. They are more open to new

perspectives and diverse views. Whatever they do, they do it with enthusiasm and passion. As employees feel a sense of progress, they are further motivated and they work harder. The momentum creates a further momentum. Furthermore, engaging in self criticism prevents employees from falling into ego traps such as complacency, arrogance, and false pride. Questioning the self enables an individual to recover from success traps easily ("I can do better" replaces "I am the best"). All these positive dynamics of engagement lead to an upward spiral. This upward spiral reflects a cycle of hope, faith, passion, hard work, persistence, reflection, and renewal. The following narrative illustrates this spiral:

> We had an urgent order and deadline to be delivered on Monday morning. It was a moment of make or break for the company. It was already Friday evening and we were far from finishing the order. We had to produce 30 thousand uniforms. Under normal circumstances, there was no chance that we could make it. However, we met on Friday evening and made a commitment together. We vowed that we would make this happen. We called our close friends and neighbours for help. We worked extremely hard for the whole weekend. We slept for only five hours on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday nights. Some of us just did not go home, spent the whole night at the factory, and they slept for a few hours during the day. You won't believe it, but it was the best weekend of our lives. We felt as if we were making history. You should have seen the spirit and the shared passion here. All bodies were working relentlessly and all eyes were shining. We finished all of the uniforms on Monday morning. We were exhausted, but we were extremely happy. We knew that a miracle was happening and we were just feeling very grateful to be a part of it.

Narratives of Community

Multiple themes have emerged as a result of the analysis of the narratives on community responsiveness. The first theme that is recurrent across the narratives told by Bereket employees is the Anatolian wisdom that emphasizes nourishing the human spirit and serving the needs of diverse people. Twenty-seven civilizations that emerged in Anatolia have all benefited from nourishing the human spirit and serving diverse people. For example, the Ottoman state envisioned and implemented a multicultural, multilingual, and multi-faith social design to nurture the well-being of its people. Bereket managers emphasized the words and wisdom of *Sheikh Edebali*, who can be considered as the spiritual guide and the spiritual founder of the Ottoman state:

> "Dear my child, now, you are the leader! From now on, anger is for us; calmness is for you. Being offended is for us; pleasing is for you. Incapacity and mistakes are for us; tolerance is for you. Disagreements and disparity are for us; justice is for you. Unfairness is for us; forgiveness is for you. Dividing is for us, unifying is for you. Know how to be patient; a flower will not flourish until its time comes. Never forget: Flourish the human being and the human spirit, so that the community can flourish."

Edebali's advice has implications for designing virtuous and compassionate organizations. Salih Tas, CEO of Bereket, carries this advice on his desk to remind himself of the principles of caring and compassion in his daily work and life. "We need compassion as much as water and air. We try to foster high quality relationships and bonds of compassion among us. We do this through positive actions and interactions in the social fabric of this organization", states Mr. Tas.

In Bereket, community responsiveness is reflected in a number of corporate social responsibility projects and initiatives. Bereket employees work as volunteers and collaborate with a Turkish NGO (Light House Aid and Solidarity Association) to implement community service projects including "Shall Children Not Feel Cold" (sharing coats for the winter), "Health for Little Eyes" (offering optical solutions and eyeglasses for children), "1001 children, 1001 wishes" (online matching service for the wishes of children and the donors who realize these wishes), "Water is Civilization" (providing sustainable water sources for villages), "Blue Butterfly" (providing books, clothing, and educational resources for primary school students), "Bridging Hearts" (an exchange program sending children to spend 1 week with a sister family in another city or village) and "White Dreams" (offering donations of wedding dresses, suits, and dowry sets to marrying low income couples). Salih Tas narrates their approach to philanthropy as follows:

> I remember feeling hungry as a child. I remember how I would be ashamed of asking for food. I remember how my father would feel when he could not bring home enough bread. I know what poverty is and I know that there are thousands of hungry children out there. They may not have food or money; but I know that these people have the highest dignity and nobleness. What kind of a person are you if you eat your fill and sleep well when your neighbours are hungry? How can we be so insensitive and indulge in our cocoons when other people are suffering? Giving

to community is not an option of social nicety; it is indispensible to our core values here. We are trying to make philanthropy institutional and sustainable; but we also want to keep its personal touch and spirit.

Proposal for a Benevolent Leadership Model

The benevolent leadership model that we are proposing is built on three critical assumptions. First, these four streams can be used to encourage and initiate collective capabilities of care and compassion in organizations. Second, these four streams are distinct, in the sense that the goals they seek are not interchangeable, even though they are highly interactive with each other. Third, these four streams can provide a holistic set of assumptions and research findings on creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. Although one may articulate the existence of additional streams related to creating positive change in organizations, we propose that these four streams together make up a meaningful whole and they craft a big picture of creating virtuous and compassionate organizations.

These four streams can be viewed as useful streams of research to investigate how leaders create and enable collective capabilities of care and compassion in organizations and the world around them. It is useful to picture these streams as four overlapping circles sharing common conceptual space yet possessing distinctive intellectual properties. Each of them has arisen in response to the specific changes in the contexts in which organizations and leaders recently operate. Although some of the research in these streams could be reviewed and collapsed together, there are enough differences to keep them conceptually distinct from each other.

This paper develops a conceptual model of benevolent leadership by building on four streams of organizational research that are centered on main aspects of leadership responsibility towards creating virtuous and compassionate organizations: (1) spiritual depth, (2) ethical sensitivity, (3) positive engagement, and (4) community responsiveness. *Spiritual depth* refers to the leader's search for a sense of meaning and purpose at work. *Ethical sensitivity* refers to the leader's process of moral reflection and consideration of what is right and wrong conduct at work. *Positive engagement* refers to creating positive change in the organization through inspiring hope and courage. Finally, *community responsiveness* refers to the leader's role in solving social problems and enabling social innovation to contribute to society.

These four aspects are based upon four inter-related streams of research: (1) spirituality, (2) morality, (3) positivity, and (4) community (see Table 1). The benevolent leadership model underlines the importance of taking all four dimensions into account while theorizing or researching on care and compassion in organizations.

Discussion

This research has used narrative inquiry methods to give voice to employees and to learn about their perspectives and experiences on compassion in an Anatolian tiger. To ensure research quality, we have evaluated the invitational quality, depth, wholeness, and authenticity of the narratives and we ensured to take perspectives of employees from all levels, departments, and backgrounds. However, narratives as socially constructed as they are produced by people in the context of specific social and cultural conditions and they are inherently interpretive devices through which people represent themselves and their worlds to others (Chase 2005). Stories are inherently multilayered and ambiguous, so narrative inquiry is bounded by the constructed nature of truth (Reissman 1993).

This paper contributes to the advancement of virtue ethics scholarship and practice by first reviewing four large bodies of research associated with nurturing virtues in organizations and then integrating them to develop a conceptual benevolent leadership model towards creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. The proposed benevolent leadership model sits at the crossroads of four important research streams in organizational behaviour. First, in the spirituality stream, we draw on spirituality at work research (Ashmos and Duchon 2000; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003) that portrays leaders as individuals searching for a sense of meaning (Mitroff and Denton 1999) and deeper self-awareness (Kriger and Seng 2005). Second, in the morality stream, we build from the literatures of business ethics, values in management, and ethical decision making to explain how leaders act ethically (Brown and Trevino 2006; Kanungo and Mendonca 1996). Third, in the positivity stream, we build on strength based approaches; namely positive organizational scholarship (Cameron et al. 2003), and appreciative inquiry (Cooperrider and Whitney 1998) in order to develop theoretical understandings of how leaders cultivate human strengths and lead to positive change. Fourth, in the community stream, we draw on research on corporate social responsibility (Carroll 1999; Garriga and Melé 2004), and organizational citizenship behaviour (Dyne et al. 1994) to inquire how leaders fulfil their social responsibilities and contribute to their communities.

There is a delicate balance that comes from integrating these four dimensions or anchors. In cases of extreme values, the equilibrium of benevolent leadership is disrupted. If spiritual depth is too shallow, we face barren workplaces that lack a sense of meaning, which can be called the state of apathy. If spiritual depth is too high, we face the risk of a new age philosophy with no focus on results. There is also the problem of reconciling religious and spiritual diversity. If ethical sensitivity is too low, there

is risk of violating moral codes of conduct, which may be denoted as atrophy. If ethical sensitivity is too high, the risk is a judgmental atmosphere with strict rules and formulas, which stifles creativity and empowerment. If positive engagement is too low, the risk is being passive and lacking initiative as well as showing low morale and commitment. This state of being can be called lethargy. If positive engagement is too high, the risk is manipulation of employees through popular motivational techniques or quick fix programs. If community responsiveness is too low, the risk is lack of cohesion and social support, which brings isolation and social disorder. This state can be called entropy. If community responsiveness is too high, the risk is losing focus on organizational goals, such as shareholder value and profits.

As outlined above, there may be a possibility of conflict among the inputs of these different research streams and the corresponding dimensions or anchors. In such cases, it is important to provide customized coaching and mentoring for leaders to help them overcome the dominance of one perspective at the expense of others. One of the next steps of this research will be to create a practical inventory that helps leaders to explore their own profiles and perspectives with respect to these four dimensions. This inventory will also include practical recommendations for leaders to find a balance among these four anchors and create balanced solutions in case of potential problems.

Implications for Theory and Research

The benevolent leadership model implies that leaders should consider and balance all four perspectives in their decisions and actions. This model purports that a holistic consideration of these four sets of factors at work provides leaders the big picture and guidance on how to create virtuous and compassionate organizations. As organizations are confronted by ethical, spiritual, transformational, and social challenges, the benevolent leadership model can provide leaders with a fresh perspective on addressing those challenges. Therefore, the added value of the model comes from its unique holistic perspective it provides leaders.

The benevolent leadership model has implications for leadership theory and research. This paper proposes the utility of benevolent leadership as a unifying construct to provide direction for further research on how leaders can create virtuous and compassionate organizations. This model provides an opportunity for leadership researchers to conceptualize and integrate diverse fields of organizational research centered on creating common good: business ethics, spirituality at work, positive organizational scholarship, and corporate social responsibility. Through this

unified framework, leadership researchers can better make use of concepts and theories on how leaders can contribute to the world around them. The disciplines of virtue ethics and leadership are still largely isolated from one another, each with their own vocabulary and theoretical constructs. The field of leadership can be advanced through broader insights and principles derived from the discipline of virtue ethics.

Further research is needed to solidify the contributions of this study to the fields of leadership and virtue ethics. First, future research should develop psychometric, experimental, and ethnographic methods for further exploration, operationalization, and measurement of benevolent leadership in organizations. Interview-based methodologies can offer rich descriptions of how benevolent leaders create positive change in organizations. Longitudinal studies could delineate the processes through which benevolent leaders reflect on themselves, make decisions, take positive actions, improve organizational effectiveness, and influence people around them. The construct of benevolent leadership needs to be refined through additional empirical research. The qualitative data in this study mostly relied on self-perceptions and attitudes of the respondents. More empirical research is needed to measure and observe the actual behaviours of managers who have benevolent tendencies. Mixed designs combining in-depth qualitative methods and large-scale survey data can be used to inquire the nature and scope of benevolent leadership and its behavioural manifestations.

Second, there are alternative leadership styles that managers can adopt to achieve positive results, such as ethical leadership, spiritual leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership. The benevolent leadership model needs to be further refined and differentiated from other leadership models through empirical research. Future research is needed to address how different leadership styles and roles interrelate and complement one another to create compassionate and virtuous organizations.

Third, benevolent leadership may have curvilinear effects on various organizational outcomes and the four components need to be in equilibrium to achieve positive organizational outcomes. This hypothesis needs to be empirically tested and further researched.

Implications for Practice

First, using the framework developed in this research, organizations can learn more about enabling a positive community where employees feel authentic and connected to their inner selves, their co-workers, and their community. The benevolent leadership model underlines the importance of specific dimensions of corporate environments—a shared

mission, a shared sense of purpose, high quality connections, and a positive organizational culture—that support creating positive change in organizations. Similarly, flatter organizational structures where leadership is distributed or shared among people may be more conducive to benevolent leadership. However, more empirical research is needed to identify specific organizational structures, procedures, and policies which will support benevolent leadership. Organizations can provide leadership development programs and training that fosters a benevolent leadership perspective and disseminates best practices of benevolent leaders who have succeeded in creating positive change. Organizations may further support benevolent leadership by institutionalizing and encouraging positive change agendas and social initiatives. This support can be in the form of encouraging, reinforcing, and rewarding benevolent leadership behaviours. Organizations may look for opportunities to recruit individuals who possess benevolent leadership characteristics to create a benevolence-oriented organizational culture.

Second, the narratives presented in this paper suggest a strong connection between benevolent tendencies of top managers (e.g., the CEO) and an organizational culture of compassion. Thus, the narratives reveal and illustrate the mechanisms and discourses by which top managers shape culture through their words and deeds.

Third, the results of this research can be used by leaders to develop deeper self awareness through individual reflection. The road to becoming a benevolent leader involves personal reflection, growth, and transformation. Reflecting on and exploring one's own benevolent tendencies enables a leader to discover the underlying structure of his/her values, attitudes, and motives. Leaders who can assess and evaluate their unique individual values, gifts, and skills can utilize these talents and strengths. Leaders who reflect on their benevolent tendencies can discover the essence of their inner wholeness and accordingly channel their search for mission, meaning, and purpose at work. Furthermore, using benevolent leadership framework, leaders can create supportive team and work environments for employees centered on ethical sensitivity, spiritual depth, positive engagement, and community responsiveness. Benevolent leadership entails discovering and embracing employees and team members as whole persons, acknowledging not only their cognitive faculties but also their social, emotional, and spiritual faculties, to engage their hearts, spirits, and minds. Leaders who are aware of benevolent tendencies can act as catalysts for individual growth, helping each employee tap into the boundless human potential for personal and organizational transformation.

Lastly, the benevolent leadership model has the potential to create virtuous and compassionate organizations beyond corporate environments. The model can be applied to different types of organizations such as non-profit or governmental organizations. For example, how does a benevolent academician interact with his or her students, colleagues, administrators, and the wider society in quest for a more humane, creative, and compassionate university? How can one contribute to creating a spirited university engaged with passion, alive with meaning, and connected with compassion? How can a benevolent academician encourage passionate engagement based on spiritual renovation, intellectual renewal, and emotional revitalization? These questions merit further exploration of benevolent leadership in academic institutions.

Limitations

The benevolent leadership model has several limitations that need to be addressed in future research. First, without collection of further case study data and replication of the empirical study in other cultural and organizational contexts, the results are not generalizable to different contexts. Benevolent leadership practices may need adaptation for different organizational contexts and across different cultures. For example, we expect that benevolent leadership can be better developed in nongovernmental and social purpose organizations due to their mission-driven organizational cultures. It is more convenient to focus on benevolence in customer-oriented industries where interpersonal sensitivity is regarded as more critical. Benevolent leadership is also more compatible with organizations having progressive, humanitarian, and compassionate cultures or practices. Moreover, we would expect that the benevolent leadership model more readily fit collectivist cultures due to higher communal sensitivity and community responsiveness prevalent in these cultures. However, we think benevolent leadership practices might also be developed in a secular Western cultural context and in a large multinational organization to facilitate a caring and compassionate culture. We are aware that there may be serious challenges in incorporating benevolent leadership in corporate environments where fierce economic pressures, harsh market realities, and hyper-competition can make benevolence and virtuousness seem too idealistic or utopian. Still, it is possible to develop benevolent leadership in organizations through a combination of consciousness-raising activities such as individualised mentoring, service-learning opportunities, community service projects, and professional development workshops. These experiences can help organizational members to explore and find their more profound and idealist selves. We are in the process of designing and implementing benevolent leadership development methods in the context of university teaching and executive consulting. More experimentation and results will be needed to discover what works or not.

Second, the benevolent leadership model might be perceived by practitioners as too difficult to implement because of current economic pressures. While the evidence in the case study of Bereket suggests that considering the deep needs of persons (moral, spiritual, emotional, social) as employees, customers, and consumers leads to sustainable organizational performance in the long run, benevolent leadership might still be seen as unfeasible, unreachable, or hyperbolic in a highly competitive environment in the present economic climate. It is therefore critical to engage with and closely work with practitioners as they face challenges in the implementation of benevolent leadership. Personal diagnosis, friendly mentoring, peer review, on-the-job training, acting as a model, and consciousness-raising conversations will all be helpful to support practitioners in putting benevolent leadership to practice.

Third, there might be some downsides to benevolent leadership. If benevolent leadership is not exercised mindfully, it might lead to an unhealthy sense of dependence or toleration for poor performance. A benevolent leader, for instance, might have a difficult time addressing performance problems, which might in turn harm the viability and sustainability of the business. For example, John Deere moved away from calling employees and dealers a 'family' as this resulted in poor-performing stakeholders staying around the company for long and ultimately threatening business success (Brat 2007).

Concluding Thoughts

In conclusion, the concept of benevolent leadership can be used as a higher-order construct that bridges diverse approaches to creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. The vitality and utility of the benevolent leadership model is based on the insight and the big picture the model provides leaders in their decisions and actions at work. Without such integration on a substantial level of nuanced thinking and balanced action, leaders may be confronted with the threats of facing analysis paralysis and making partial decisions. This paper purports that the usage of four critical aspects of benevolent leadership will be a critical success factor in leading positive change and creating virtuous and compassionate organizations in the twenty-first century.

Going forward, we envision a more inclusive vocabulary of leadership which is enriched and nurtured by different traditions and disciplines of humanity beyond the conventional paradigm dominated by power, self-interest, shareholder value, and profit maximization. Our leadership dictionary needs new definitions, new constructs, fresh and creative thinking, and a more integrative and interdisciplinary outlook. These traditions and disciplines of humanity extend well beyond the boundaries of the modern corporation. Some of these traditions are thousands of years old, such as the legacy of world religions. The power of the Golden Rule extends beyond specific religions. For example, the rule of compassion is more powerful than the conventional rationalized models of ethical decision making which are based on utilitarianism or moral reasoning. The issues of morality are not confined within the narrow limits of rational reasoning, however, most current business ethics courses seem to narrowly focus on such models. Accordingly, we should feel more comfortable in borrowing terms and concepts from the worlds of arts, humanities, and philosophy. These terms may not be fully rigorous or clear-cut, but they may reflect better the richness, depth, and density of these concepts. We need more inclusive terminology that bridges/encompasses disparate and isolated streams of research. We envision conceptualizing leadership performance in much broader terms than efficiency and to encompass legacy, contribution, positive impact, and service. We suggest analyzing patterns of extraordinary moments/events of benevolence in our daily lives and in the lives of people around us. This analysis will enable us to open up new spaces of inquiry on how leaders create virtuous and compassionate organizations in the twenty-first century.

References

Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 9*, 134–145.

Aycan, Z. (1999). *Anatolian tigers: Management and human resource practices*. Paper presented at the 6th national congress of management and organizations, Istanbul, Turkey.

Beauchamp, T. (2008). The principle of beneficence in applied ethics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopaedia of philosophy* (Fall 2008 ed.). Accessed on 24 Nov 2012. http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/principle-beneficence.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1995). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Business and Management Series.

Bornstein, D. (2007). *How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bowen, H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harper and Row.

Brat, I., & Aeppel T. (2007). Why Deere is weeding out dealers even as farms boom: Some veteran retailers feel betrayed by shift; 'We are not a family'. *The Wall Street Journal*, 14 Aug 2007, Accessed on 17 Aug, 2012. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB118705668767896842.html?mod=hps_us_pageone.

Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*, 595–616.

Bryson, J. M., & Crosby, B. C. (1992). *Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared power world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Butcher, D., & Harvey, P. (30 June, 1999). Be upstanding. *People Management* (pp. 37–42).

Cameron, K. (2011). Responsible leadership as virtuous leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics, 98*, 25–35.

Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between organizational virtuousness and performance. *American Behavioral Scientist, 47*, 766–790.

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cappelli, P. (2008). Talent management for the 21st century. *Harvard Business Review, 3*, 74–81.

Carroll, A. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business and Society, 38*(3), 268–295.

Cash, K., & Gray, G. (2000). A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*(3), 124–134.

Caslione, J. A. (2009). Chaotics: Leading, managing and marketing in the age of turbulence. *Ivey Business Journal, 73*(6), 4.

Chase, S. E. 2005. Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 651–679). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ciulla, J. B. 2004. *Ethics, the heart of leadership*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Clarkson, M. B. E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 20*(1), 92–117.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Dutton, J. (1998). *No limits to cooperation: the organization dimensions of global change (Newbury Park*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cooperrider, D. L., & Whitney, D. (1998). *Appreciative inquiry: A constructive approach to organization development and social change*. Cleveland, OH: Lakeshore Publishing.

Corkery, M., & J. R. Hagerty. 2008. *Continuing vicious cycle of pain in housing and finance ensnares market*. Wall Street Journal.

Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A narrative approach in organization studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daiute, C., & Lightfoot, C. (2004). Theory and craft in narrative inquiry. In C. Daiute & C. Lightfoot (Eds.), *Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Daly, H. E., & Cobb, J. B. (1989). *For the common good: Redirecting the economy toward community, the environment, and a sustainable future*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Dehler, G. E., & Welsh, M. A. (1994). Spirituality and organizational transformation: Implications for the new management paradigm. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(6), 17–26.

Demir, O., Acar, M., & Toprak, M. (2004). Anatolian tigers: Prospects and challenges. *Middle Eastern Studies, 40*(6), 166–188.

Driver, M. (2007). Meaning and suffering in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 20*(5), 611–632.

Dyne, L. V., Graham, J. W., & Dienesch, R. M. (1994). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(4), 765–802.

Esty, D. C., & Winston, A. S. (2006). *Green to gold: How smart companies use environmental strategy to innovate, create value, and build competitive advantage*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist, 56*, 218–226.

Frost, P. J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 693–727.

Fry, L. W., & Slocum, J. W. (2008). Maximizing the triple bottom line through spiritual leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 37*, 86–96.

Garriga, E., & Melé, D. (2004). Corporate social responsibility theories: Mapping the territory. *Journal of Business Ethics, 53*(1–2), 51–71.

Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Gini, A. (1997). Moral leadership: An overview. *Journal of Business Ethics, 16*(3), 323–330.

Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T. S. (1995). Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *The Academy of Management Review, 20*(4), 874–907.

Greenhalgh, H. 2008. *Poor ethical standards causing financial crisis*. Financial Times.

Hollender, J., Breen, B., & Senge, P. (2010). *The responsibility revolution: How the next generation of businesses will win*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hosgor, E. (2011). Islamic capital, Anatolian tigers: Past and present. *Middle Eastern Studies, 47*(2), 343–360.

Hsieh, T. 2010. Delivering happiness: A path to profits, passion, and purpose. New York: Grand Central Publishing.

Jenkins, R. L. (2003). Crisis in confidence in corporate America. *Mid: American Journal of Business, 18*(2), 5–7.

Kanungo, R. N., & Mendonca, M. (1996). *Ethical dimensions of leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Karakas, F. (2010). Positive management education: Creating creative minds, passionate hearts, and kindred spirits. *Journal of Management Education, 35*(2), 198–226.

Karakas, F., & Sarigollu, E. (2012). Benevolent leadership: Conceptualization and construct development. *Journal of Business Ethics, 108*(4), 537–553.

Kernochan, R. A., McCormick, D. W., & White, J. A. (2007). Spirituality and the management teacher: Reflections of three Buddhists on compassion, mindfulness, and selflessness in the classroom. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 16*(1), 61–75.

Kotter, J. P. 2008. *A sense of urgency*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kriger, M., & Hanson, B. (1999). A value-based paradigm for creating truly healthy organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*(4), 302–317.

Kriger, M., & Seng, Y. (2005). Leadership with inner meaning: A contingency theory of leadership based on the worldviews of five religions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 771–806.

Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J., Dutton, J. E., & Frost, P. (2008). The contours and consequences of compassion at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*, 193–218.

Maak, T. 2006. *Responsible leadership*. London: Routledge.

Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review, 78*(1), 69–77.

Mair, J., & Martí, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41*(1), 36–44.

Maitlis, S., & Ozcelik, H. (2004). Toxic decision processes: A study of emotion and organizational decision making. *Organizational Science, 15*, 375–393.

Makridakis, S., Hogarth, R. M., & Gaba, A. (2010). Why forecasts fail. What to do instead. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 51*(2), 83–90.

Manz, C., Cameron, K., Manz, K., & Marx, R. (2006). Values and virtues in organizations: An introduction. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 3*(1–2), 1–12.

Marques, J., Dhiman, S., & King, R. (2007). *Spirituality in the workplace: What it is, why it matters, how to make it work for you.* Fawnskin: Personhood Press.

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*, 151–171.

McCormick, D. W. (1994). Spirituality and management. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(6), 5–8.

Mishler, E. (1991). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review, 40*(4), 83–92.

Molinsky, A., & Margolis, J. (2005). Necessary evils and interpersonal sensitivity in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 30*, 245–268.

Neal, J. A., Lichtenstein, B. M. B., & Banner, D. (1999). Spiritual perspectives on individual, organizational and societal transformation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*(3), 175–185.

Neubert, M. J. (2011). Introduction: The value of virtue to management and organizational theory and practice. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 28*(3), 227–230.

O'Bannon, G. (2001). Managing our future: The generation X factor. *Public Personnel Management, 30*(1), 95–109.

Ogden, S., & Watson, R. (1999). Corporate performance and stakeholder management: Balancing shareholder and customer interests in the U.K. privatized water industry. *Academy of Management Journal, 42*(5), 526–538.

Pech, R. J. (2009). Delegating and devolving power: A case study of engaged employees. *Journal of Business Strategy, 30*(1), 27–32.

Pelletier, K. L., & Bligh, M. C. (2008). The aftermath of organizational corruption: Employee attributions and emotional reactions. *Journal of Business Ethics, 80*(4), 823–845.

Pless, N. M. (2007). Understanding responsible leadership: Role identity and motivational drivers. *Journal of Business Ethics, 74*(4), 437–456.

Pless, N. M., & Maak T. 2011. Responsible leadership: Pathways to the future. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1–11. doi:10.1007/s10551-011-1114-4

Plowman, D. A., Baker, L. T., Beck, T. E., Kulkarni, M., Solansky, S. T., & Travis, D. V. (2007). Radical change accidentally: The emergence and amplification of small change. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*, 515–543.

Pugh, S. D., Skarlicki, D. P., & Passell, B. S. (2003). After the fall: Layoff victims' trust and cynicism in re-employment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76*, 201–212.

Reissman, C. (1993). *Narrative Analysis.* London: Sage.

Russell, R. F. (2001). The role of values in servant leadership. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 22*(2), 76–84.

Rynes, S., Bartunek, J., Dutton, J., & Margolis, J. (2010). Call for papers: Academy of Management Review special topic forum: Understanding and creating virtuous and compassionate organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 35*(2), 334–336.

Savitz, A. W., & Weber, K. (2006). *The triple bottom line: How today's best-run companies are achieving economic, social, and environmental success- and how you can too.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. In C. R. Synder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology (3–9).* New York: Oxford University Press.

Senge, P., & Carstedt, G. (2001). Innovating our way to the next industrial revolution. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 42*(2), 24–38.

Shanz, K. (2009). Maintaining stakeholder trust in difficult times: Some fundamental reflections in light of the credit crisis. *The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance, 34*(2), 260–270.

Sison, A. J. G., & Fontrodona, J. (2011). The common good of business: Addressing a challenge posed by «*Caritas in Veritate*». *Journal of Business Ethics, 100*(1), 99–107.

Sison, A. J. G., & Fontrodona, J. (2012). The common good of the firm in the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 22*(2), 211–246.

Smith, J., Flowers, P., & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretive phenomenological analysis: Theory, method and research.* London: Sage.

Steenland, S., & Dreier S. 2008. *It's a Moral Meltdown, Too.* Newsletter of Center for American Progress.

Treviño, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 601–617.

Tsui, A. (2010). *Call for papers: Dare to care: Passion and compassion in management practice and research.* Montreal: Academy of Management Meeting.

Vickers, M. H. (2010). From the editor-in-chief's desk: feelings, work, and beautiful theory: Toward engaging the hearts and minds of employees and employers. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 22*, 79–81.

Voegtlin, C., Patzer, M., & Scherer, A. G. (2012). Responsible leadership in global business: A new approach to leadership and its multi-level outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics, 105*(1), 1–16.

Waddock, S. A. (2004). Parallel universes: Companies, academics, and the progress of corporate citizenship. *Business and Society Review, 109*(1), 5–30.

Walker, D. M. (2005). Reclaiming public trust in the wake of recent corporate accountability failures. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, 2*(3), 264–271.

Wang, A., & Cheng, B. (2009). When does benevolent leadership lead to creativity? The moderating role of creative role identity and job autonomy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 106–121.

White, J. (1999). Ethical comportment in organizations: A synthesis of the feminist ethic of care and the buddhist ethic of compassion. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 12*(2), 109–128.

Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism.* Philadelphia, PA: Penguin Books.

Zuboff, S. (2009). *The old solutions have become the new problems.* Business Week.