POS HANDBOOK
Introduction

Kim Cameron and Gretchen Spreitzer

The primary objective of the *Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* is to compile and synthesize much of the knowledge that has been generated after approximately ten years in existence as an area of inquiry. The Handbook identifies what is known as well as what is not known and what is in need of further investigation in Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS). The 79 chapters in the Handbook are not intended to be a comprehensive summary of all related POS topics, but they represent a good sampling of work that has adopted a POS perspective. This introductory chapter helps clarify the definition and domain of POS, why it is an important field of study, and why POS began as a field of study within organizational studies in the first place. Nine key clusters are used to organize the chapters' themes in the Handbook. The concluding chapter summarizes major contributions, key findings, and explanations for the results discussed in the Handbook's chapters.

What is POS?

Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) is an umbrella concept used to unify a variety of approaches in organizational studies each of which incorporates the notion of "the positive." Several different descriptions have been used in past publications which define the domain of POS including, "*the states and processes that arise from and result in life-giving dynamics, optimal functioning, and enhanced capabilities and strengths*" (Dutton and Glynn, 2007: 693); "*an emphasis on identifying individual and*

collective strengths (attributes and processes) and discovering how such strengths enable human flourishing (goodness, generativity, growth, and resilience)" (Roberts, 2006:292); *"the study of especially positive outcomes, processes, and attributes of organizations and their members,"* and a *"focus on dynamics that are typically described by words such as excellence, thriving, flourishing, abundance, resilience, or virtuousness"* (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003:4); and *"organizational research occurring at the micro, meso, and macro levels which points to unanswered questions about what processes, states, and conditions are important in explaining individual and collective flourishing. Flourishing refers to being in an optimal range of human functioning"* (Dutton, 2010, OMT website). These descriptions share an emphasis on similar terms that describe processes, dynamics, perspectives, and outcomes considered to be positive.

In brief, the "O" (organizational) in Positive Organizational Scholarship focuses on investigating positive processes and states that occur in association with organizational contexts. It examines positive phenomena within organizations and among organizations, as well as positive organizational contexts themselves. The "S" (scholarship) in Positive Organizational Scholarship focuses on pursuing rigorous, systematic, and theory-based foundations for positive phenomena. POS requires careful definitions of terms, a rationale for prescriptions and recommendations, consistency with scientific procedures in drawing conclusions, a theoretical rationale, and grounding in previous scholarly work.

The most controversial concept associated with POS is the "P"—*positive*. Most of the misunderstanding and criticism of POS has centered on this concept. It has created

controversy in organizational studies and has spawned skeptics as well as advocates. The term "positive" is accused of having a potentially restrictive connotation and values bias (George, 2004; Fineman, 2006) and as being a naïve and dangerous term producing more harm than good (Ehrenreich, 2009). It is criticized as implying that most organizational science is negative, that an ethnocentric bias is being represented, or that a narrow moral agenda is being pursued. The term has been credited, on the other hand, with expanding and enriching the domain that explains performance in organizations and with opening up, rather than restricting, organizational studies (Dutton & Glynn, 2007; Caza & Cameron, 2008). These contradictions have arisen at least partly because of the definitional ambiguity surrounding this term.

A review of dictionary definitions of "positive" reveals that the concept has such a wide range of connotations and so many applications as to defy the establishment of precise conceptual boundaries (e.g., Webster's, Oxford, American Heritage). Literally, scores of meanings are offered. However, precise conceptual definitions of a variety of terms do not necessarily provide scientific clarity (for example, definitions of "love " or of "effectiveness"), yet people know what love is through experience, for example, more than through an explanation of its conceptual boundaries or nomological network.

On the other hand, some convergence on the meaning of "positive" has begun to occur as the term has been employed in scholarly work over the past decade, and four different approaches help specify the domain of POS. Identifying these themes helps provide a conceptual explanation of what "positive" means in the context of POS.

One approach to "positive" is the adoption *a unique lens or an alternative perspective*. Adopting a POS lens means that the interpretation of phenomena is

altered, so that, for example, challenges and obstacles are reinterpreted as opportunities and strength-building experiences rather than tragedies or problems (Gittell, Cameron, Lim, & Rivas, 2006; Lee, Caza, Edmondson, & Thomke, 2003; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003). Variables not previously recognized or given serious consideration become central, such as positive energy (Baker, Cross, & Wooten, 2003), moral capital (Godfrey, 2003), flow (Quinn, 2005), inspiration (Thrash & Elliot, 2003), compassion (Dutton et al, 2006), elevation (Vianello, Galliani, & Haidt, 2010), and callings (Wrzesniewski, 2003) in organizations. Adopting a POS lens means that adversities and difficulties reside as much in the domain of POS as do celebrations and successes, but a positive lens focuses attention on the life-giving elements or generative processes associated with these phenomena. It is the positive perspective, not the nature of the phenomena, which brings an issue under the domain of POS.

A second consensual approach to the concept of "positive" is *a focus on extraordinarily positive outcomes or positively deviant performance* (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003). This means that outcomes are investigated which dramatically exceed common or expected performance. Investigations of spectacular results, surprising outcomes, and extraordinary achievements have been the focus of several investigations (e.g., Gittell, Cameron, Lim, & Rivas, 2006; Hess & Cameron, 2006; Tutu, 1999; Worthington, 2001), each treating "positive" as synonymous with exceptional performance. Reaching a level of positive deviance, in other words, extends beyond achieving effectiveness or ordinary success in that it represents "intentional behaviors that depart from the norm of a reference group in honorable ways" (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003:209). For example, the closure and clean-up of the Rocky Flats

Nuclear arsenal exceeded federal standards by a factor of 13, 60 years ahead of schedule, and $30 billion under budget (Cameron & Lavine, 2006).   An examination of how the number 1 rated delicatessen in America—located in Ann Arbor, Michigan—achieved that distinction (Baker & Gunderson, 2005), the cultural and organizational transformations that occurred in South Africa with the release of Nelson Mandela from prison (Tutu, 1999), and the extraordinary success of a financial services organization that adopted POS as a corporate strategy (Vanette, Cameron, & Powley, 2008) illustrate these studies. Investigating the indicators of and explanatory processes accounting for such positively deviant performance is one area where "positive" has taken on a consensual connotation.

A third area of convergence regarding the term "positive" is that it represents *an affirmative bias which fosters resourcefulness.* POS accepts the premise that positivity unlocks and elevates resources in individuals, groups, and organizations, so that capabilities are broadened and capacity is built and strengthened (Fredrickson, 2002, 2009). "Resourcefulness" means that individuals and organizations experience an amplifying effect when exposed to positivity, so that resources and capacity expand (Dutton & Sonenshein, 2009; Fredrickson, 2003). All living systems have a heliotropic inclination toward positive energy (Cameron, 2008a), so that, indeed, positivity is life-giving (Diener, 2009; Cooperrider & Srivastra, 1987). Adopting an affirmative bias, therefore, prioritizes positive energy, positive climate, positive relationships, positive communication, and positive meaning in organizations (Cameron, 2008b) as well as the value embedded in difficult challenges or negative events (Losada & Heaphy, 2004; Harter & Clifton, 2003; Worline & Quinn, 2003).   POS is unapologetic in emphasizing

affirmative attributes, capabilities, and possibilities more than problems, threats, and weakness, so strengths-based activities and outcomes are highlighted (Clifton & Harter, 2003). Again, an affirmative approach does not exclude consideration of negative events. Rather, they are incorporated in accounting for life-giving dynamics, resource generation, and flourishing outcomes (e.g., Dutton, et. al., 2006; Weick, 2003; Dutton & Glynn, 2008).

A fourth area of convergence regarding the concept of positive is *the examination of virtuousness or the best of the human condition.* POS is based on a eudaemonic assumption—that is, the postulation that an inclination exists in all human systems toward achieving the highest aspirations of humankind (Aristotle, Metaphysics; Dutton and Sonenshein, 2007). The study of virtuousness is the examination of excellence and goodness for its own sake—captured by the Latin *virtus* and the Greek *arête.* Whereas debate has occurred regarding what constitutes goodness and whether universal human virtues can be identified, all societies and cultures possess catalogues of traits that they deem virtuous, that represent what is morally good, and that define the highest aspirations of human beings (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Comte-Sponville, 2001).

POS examines the development of and the effects associated with virtuousness and eudemonism (Cameron, 2003; Bright, Cameron, & Caza, 2006; Ilies, Nahrgang, & Morgeson, 2007), or "that which is good in itself and is to be chosen for its own sake" (Metaphysics XII, p. 3). Studies of virtuousness *in* organizations focus on the behaviors of individuals in organizational settings that help others flourish (Fowers & Tjeltveit, 2003) including investigations of character strengths, gratitude, wisdom, forgiveness, hope, and courage (Grant & Schwartz, 2011; Luthans, et al., 2008). Studies of

virtuousness *through* organizations focus on the practices and processes in organizations which represent and which perpetuate what is good, right, and worthy of cultivation (Park & Peterson, 2003; McCullough & Snyder, 2001). This includes, for example, investigations of profound purpose and transcendent objectives (Emmons, 1999), healing routines (Powley & Piderit, 2008), institutionalized forgiveness (Cameron and Caza, 2002), and human sustainability (Pfeffer, 2010).

These four convergent uses of the concept of "positive"—adopting a positive lens, investigating extraordinarily positive performance, espousing an affirmative bias, and exploring virtuousness or eudaemonism—do not precisely *define* the term "positive" per se, but they do identify the scholarly domain that POS scholars are attempting to map. Similar to other concepts in organizational science whose definitions are not precisely bounded (e.g., "culture," "innovation," "core competence"), this mapping provides the conceptual boundaries required to locate POS as an area of inquiry.

It is important to underscore that POS is not value-neutral. It advocates the position that the desire to improve the human condition is universal and that the capacity to do so is latent in almost all human systems. This means that whereas traditionally positive outcomes such as organizational improvement, goal achievement, or profitability are not excluded from consideration, POS has a bias toward life-giving, generative, and ennobling human conditions regardless of their attachment to traditional economic or political benefits.

How did POS emerge?

Unlike positive psychology, POS did not emerge to try to rebalance a prodigious amount of emphasis on illness and languishing in organizations. Organizational research has not been overwhelmingly focused on failure, damage, and demise. In fact, the study of organizational decline was first introduced in organizational studies in 1980 (Whetten, 1980) because most organizational theories focused almost exclusively on growth. Big was assumed to be better than small, and getting more was preferable to getting less. Negative phenomena did not dominate the organizational studies literature as it did in psychology, even though plenty of attention had been paid to alienation, stress, injustice, and the evils of bureaucracy in traditional organizational studies (e.g., Weber, 1997).

Rather, POS arose because a large array of organizational phenomena were being ignored and, consequently, neither systematically studied nor valued. It was usually not legitimate in scientific circles, for example, to discuss the effects of virtues in organizations, or to use terms such as "flourishing" or "positive deviance" to describe outcomes. Studies of compassion and forgiveness—two of the early studies in the POS literature (Dutton, et al., 2002; Cameron & Caza, 2002)—were certainly out of the main stream of organizational science. Similarly, certain kinds of organizational processes— i.e., "generative dynamics"—remained largely uninvestigated such as high quality connections (Dutton & Ragins, 2007), thriving (Spreitzer, et al., 2005), "connectivity" (Losada & Heaphy, 2004), and positive energy networks (Baker, Cross, & Wooten, 2003).

POS also arose because the outcome variables that dominated the organization literature focused mainly on profitability, competitive advantage, problem solving, and

economic efficiency (Davis & Marquis, 2005; Goshal, 2005; Jensen, 2002). Granted, outcomes such as job satisfaction, justice, and teamwork appeared frequently in the organizational studies literature (Kramer, 1999; Guzzo & Dickson, 1996; Smith, Kendall, and Hulin, 1969) , but alternative outcomes such as psychological, social, and eudaemonic well-being (Gallagher, Lopez, Preacher, 2009; Keyes, 2005)—including social integration, social contribution, social coherence, social actualization, and social acceptance—as well as human sustainability (Pfeffer, 2010) were largely outside the purview of mainline organizational science. The best of the human condition—what people care about deeply and profoundly—was much less visible in organizational scholarship. The famous quotation by Robert Kennedy in an 18 March 1968 speech at the University of Kansas is illustrative:

> *"The gross national product does not allow for the health of our children, the quality of their education, or the joy of their play. It does not include the beauty of our poetry or the strength of our marriages, the intelligence of our public debate, or the integrity of our public officials. It measures neither our wit nor our courage, neither our wisdom nor our learning, neither our compassion nor our devotion to our country. It measures everything, in short, except that which makes life worthwhile."*

POS might be argued to have a long history, dating back to William James' (1902) writings on what he termed "healthy mindedness", Allport's (1960) interest in positive human characteristics, Jahoda's (1959) emphasis on prevention-based community psychology, Maslow's (1968) advocacy for the study of healthy people in lieu of sick people, Cowan's research (1973, 1986) on resilience in children and

adolescents, Diener's (1984) investigations of happiness and subjective well-being, and Organ (1988) and Batson's (1994) consideration of "citizenship behaviors" and "prosocial" activities.

Similarly, the early foundations of the organizational development field advocated a "new attitude of optimism and hope" (Bennis, 1969:3) and an emphasis on *The Human Side of Enterprise* (McGregor, 1960) as a reaction to the dehumanizing and economically-directed emphases in work organizations. Cooperrider and Srivastva's (1987) introduction of Appreciative Inquiry placed a spotlight on positive dynamics associated with planned change and organizational development efforts. POS, therefore, is not so much a new field of investigation as it is a coalescing force that brings together themes, perspectives, and variables that have been dispersed in the literature and underdeveloped or ignored in scientific investigation.

Most importantly, much this earlier work possessing a positive theme was not based on scientific research and empirical investigations. It was, rather, focused largely on advocacy and on the promotion of an approach to addressing problems, overcoming ills, and resolving difficulties (e.g., Bennis, 1963; Maslow, 1965). Moreover, little of this work explicitly addressed organizations as the entities of interest. Therefore, the emergence of POS does more than merely construct a repository for earlier work. It highlights the organization as a context for study while, at the same time, emphasizing the importance of multiple levels of analyses including individuals, groups, and societies. POS highlights the processes and practices that occur in organizations which are associated with positive outcomes, the empirical rationale for claims about positivity,

and the theoretical rationale for the life-giving dynamics and outcomes associated with organizations.

Positive Organizational Scholarship as an identifiable field of study essentially began in earnest approximately a decade ago at the University of Michigan. As with all historical accounts of the beginnings of movements and initiatives, various scenarios are available regarding the beginnings of scholarly interest in POS, and no single description will capture all of the motivations and significant events that produced this field of scholarly endeavor. That said, POS emerged as result of Jane Dutton, studying individual and organizational compassion, and Kim Cameron, studying organizational forgiveness, joining with colleague Robert Quinn, investigating positive personal change, in sponsoring a conference on topics that did not seem to be at home in mainstream organizational studies. The objective was to bring together researchers in psychology and organizational behavior to examine what could be learned collaboratively about positive phenomena in organizations.

During the planning stages of this event, the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001 occurred in New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania. Like most other citizens, a strong desire arose among the conference organizers to contribute resources that might be beneficial to those suffering from the pain and tragedies associated with these horrific events. The decision was made to launch a website—*Leading in Trying Times (http://www.bus.umich.edu/Positive/CPOS/Publications/tryingtimes.html)*—which shared what had been learned from research relating to positive approaches to difficult situations. Brief articles on topics including compassion, transcendence, hope, resilience, healing, forgiveness, helping, courage, character, and finding strength were

written. Responses to this website from scholars and practitioners highlighted the need for more attention directed at understanding how to cultivate flourishing in the context of challenge and pain in organizational settings.

The subsequent conference brought together scholars working in a variety of academic domains to discuss not only how to address difficult circumstances and problems but also how to foster flourishing and capability-building at the individual, group, and organizational levels. The Center for Positive Organizational Scholarship was subsequently formed at the University of Michigan (*www.bus.umich.edu/positive*) with colleagues Wayne Baker, David Mayer, Gretchen Spreitzer, and Lynn Wooten in order to foster and facilitate this work. The title, Positive Organizational Scholarship, was selected to describe the common themes that were being pursued.

Why is research on POS important?

In addition to revealing and highlighting phenomena that have largely been ignored in organizational studies, scholarly attention focusing on the positive is important because positive conditions produce a "heliotropic effect" (Drexelius, 1627, 1862; Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987). Heliotropism is defined as the tendency in all living systems toward positive energy and away from negative energy—or toward that which is life-giving and away from that which is life-depleting (e.g., Smith & Baker, 1960; D'Amato & Jagoda, 1962; Mrosovsky & Kingsmill, 1985). In nature, positive energy is most often experienced in the form of sunlight, but it may occur in other forms as well (e.g., interpersonal kindness) (Erhardt-Siebold, 1937; Dutton, 2003). A positive environment, based on the heliotropic argument, is the preferred condition because it

engenders positive energy and life-giving resourcefulness. Following this logic, human systems, like biological systems in nature, possess inherent inclinations toward the positive, so understanding this tendency and its implications is an important need in social and organizational sciences (Camewron, 2008a).

For example, people are more accurate in processing positive information—whether the task involves verbal discrimination, organizational behavior, or the judgment of emotion—than negative information (Matlin & Stang, 1978). People think about a greater number of positive things than negative things, and each positive thing is thought about for a longer period of time. People are more accurate in learning and remembering positive terms than neutral or negative terms (Kunz, 1974; Matlin, 1970; Taylor, 1991). When presented lists of positive, neutral, and negative words, for example, people are more accurate over time in recalling the positive (Akhtar, 1968; Rychlak, 1977; Thompson, 1930), and the longer the delay between learning and recalling, the more positive bias is displayed (Gilbert, 1938).

People reported thinking about positive statements 20 percent longer than negative statements and almost 50 percent longer than neutral statements, so mental rehearsal is biased toward positivity, and positive information can be recalled easier and more accurately (Matlin and Stang, 1978). Positive phenomena are learned faster than negative phenomena (Rychlak, 1966; Bunch & Wientge, 1933), and people judge positive phenomena more accurately than negative phenomena. Managers, for example, are much more accurate in rating subordinates' competencies and proficiencies when they perform correctly than when they perform incorrectly (Gordon, 1970).

People tend to seek out positive stimuli and avoid negative stimuli (Day, 1966; Luborsky, et al., 1963), so people judge from two-thirds to three-quarters of the events in their lives to be positive (Bradburn, 1969; Havighurst & Glasser, 1972; Meltzer & Ludwig, 1967), and most people judge themselves to be positive, optimistic, and happy most of the time (Young, 1937; Goldings, 1954; Wessman & Ricks, 1966; Johnson, 1937). Positive words have higher frequencies in all the languages studied, and positive words typically entered English usage more than 150 years before their negative opposites (for example, "better" entered before "worse") (Mann, 1968; Zajonc, 1968; Boucher & Osgood, 1968). Central nervous system functioning (i.e., vagus nerve health) is most effective when positive emotions are fostered (Kok & Fredrickson, 2010), and bodily rhythm "coherence" is at its peak in a positive or virtuous state (McCraty & Childre, 2004).

A bias toward the positive, in other words, appears to characterize human beings in their thoughts, judgments, emotions, language, interactions, and physiological functioning. A tendency toward the positive appears to be a natural human inclination, and empirical evidence suggests that positivity is the preferred and natural state of human beings, just as it is of biological systems.

Emerging empirical evidence also exists that organizations respond in a similar way to individuals in the presence of positive influences (see Cameron, 2008a, for references). The irony in these findings is that, by definition, positive influences do not need to produce traditionally-pursued organizational outcomes in order to be of worth. An increase in profitability, for example, is not the criterion for determining the value of positivity in organizations. Positivity is inherently valued because it is eudaemonic.

Nevertheless, studies show that organizations in several industries (including financial services, health care, manufacturing, and government) which implement and improve their positive practices over time also increased their performance in desired outcomes such as profitability, productivity, quality, customer satisfaction, and employee retention. That is, positive practices which were institutionalized in organizations, including providing compassionate support for employees, forgiving mistakes and avoiding blame, fostering meaningfulness of work, expressing frequent gratitude, showing kindness and caring for colleagues, led organizations to perform at significantly higher levels on desired outcomes (Cameron, Mora, & Leutscher, 2010; Cameron, Bright, & Caza, 2004; Gittell, Cameron, Lim, & Rivas, 2006).

Several explanations have been proposed for why heliotropic tendencies exist and why individuals and organizations have inclinations toward the positive. For example, Erdelyi (1974) explained that mental processes develop in such a way as to favor the positive over the negative. Most information available to human beings is disregarded, so what is retained tends to life-giving rather than life-depleting. Becker (1973) explained natural positive biases as resulting from the fear of death, meaning that the negative is repressed and the positive—or the life-preserving—is reinforced and, consequently people develop a bias toward it. Learning theorists (e.g., Skinner, 1965) explained positive biases as being associated with reinforcement—i.e., positive reinforcement leads to repetitiveness—and Sharot, Riccardi, Raio, and Phelps (2007) found that the human brain has a tendency to produce optimistic and positive orientations in its natural state. More mental acuity and mental activation occurs in a positive compared to a negative condition.

Social process theorists have explained positive biases on the basis of the functions they perform in perpetuating social organization (Merton, 1968). Simply stated, organizing depends on positive social processes that reinforce mutual benefit. Observing and experiencing positivity unlocks predispositions to act for the benefit of others, leading to increasing social connections in an organization (Feldman and Khademian, 2003; Fredrickson, 2008). Similarly, Gouldner (1960) proposed that positive role modeling and positive social norm formation create a tendency toward organizational sustainability. These positive social processes are more likely to survive and flourish over the long run than negative social processes because they are functional for the organization's survival. Weigl, et al (2010) explained that "positive gain spirals" are associated with positivity because it leads individuals to more effectively protect, retain, accumulate, and conserve resources which are instrumental in helping organizations perform successfully.

Of course, abundant evidence also exists that human beings cognitively react more strongly to negative phenomena than to positive phenomena (Baumeister, et al.,2001; Wang, Galinsky, & Mirnighan, 2009), and evolutionary theory reminds that living systems respond strongly and quickly to stimuli that threaten their existence or that signal maladaptation (Darwin, 2003). Negatively valenced phenomena have a greater impact on human beings than positively valenced phenomena of the same type, so the positive achieves precedence over the effects of the negative only by sheer force of numbers (Baumeister, et al., 2001; Fredrickson & Losada, 2006).

This dynamic helps explain why a bias has existed in organizational sciences toward studying the negative much more than the positive (Seligman, 1999; Czapinski,

1985). A larger effect (R^2) can usually be detected by accounting for negative

phenomena compared to positive phenomena—that is, the bad has stronger effects

than the good (Baumeister, et al., 2001)—so it is understandable that researchers have

focused on the strongest factors accounting for the most variance. Negative effects

often dominate heliotropic inclinations, they account for a larger amount of variance in

behavior change, and they capture more attention in scholarly analyses. Even more

important is that, over time, organizations also tend to emphasize negative phenomena

for the same reasons—survival and adaptation are associated with addressing

obstacles, competitive pressures, or threats (Nadler & Tushman, 1997; Williamson,

1998; Porter, 1998; Davis, 2009). If greater organizational effects can be created by

addressing the negative, it is logical that organizational policies, practices, and

processes will, over time, also tend toward focusing on and organizing around negative

factors more than positive factors. Evidence of this tendency is confirmed by Margolis

and Walsh's (2003) findings that negative phenomena dominate positive phenomena in

the business press and organizational studies literature by a factor of four.

An important function of POS, therefore, is to provide more attention to the

processes and practices that can unleash heliotropic effects and elevation in

resourcefulness. Empirical evidence suggests that when positive factors are given

greater emphases than negative factors, individuals and organizations tend to flourish.

The positive overcomes the negative primarily by sheer force of numbers (Baumeister,

et al., 2001). Research on POS is important, in other words, because positive

phenomena in and through organizations explain variance that has largely been ignored

in previous empirical investigations. Processes and attributes are highlighted that have

received little attention in previous organizational research. Adopting a positive lens illuminates research questions and relationships that have been under-investigated and are frequently otherwise ignored. Thus, studying positivity in individuals and in organizations provides fertile territory for understanding the mechanisms and outcomes associated with the naturally occurring, but under-investigated, inclination toward the positive.

Criticisms of POS

On the other hand, the desirability of POS as a legitimate field of scientific study is by no means universally accepted, and three primary criticisms of POS have been promoted: (1) POS ignores negative phenomena; (2) POS adopts an elitist (managerial) viewpoint; (3) POS is not defined precisely, does not acknowledge that positive may not be the same for everyone, and the concepts and phenomena associated with POS are fuzzy terms that lack construct and discriminant validity and careful measurement.

The first criticism is that POS ignores issues such as conflict, poverty, exploitation, unemployment, war, and other negative circumstances that are typical of the human condition and are commonplace in organizational functioning. Positivity is equated with Pollyannaishness and just "putting on a happy face" in the midst or serious problems and challenges. Some authors, such as Ehrenreich (2009), for example, can find little that is positive in POS, claiming that positivity unrealistically assumes unremitting growth and guaranteed success in organizations, excuses excess and folly, denies reality, mitigates against hard work, implies pride and boastfulness, avoids

difficult questions, invites unpreparedness, assumes that all success is deserved, and leads to "reckless optimism" and "delusional thinking." Little evidence exists, according to critics, that positivity fosters success (Ehrenreich, 2009; Hackman, 2008).

To be sure, empirical evidence exists that bad is stronger than good (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, & Vohs' (2001). That is, human beings react more strongly and more quickly to negative phenomena than to positive phenomena because existence is threatened. When equal measures of good and bad are present, the psychological effects of bad ones outweigh those of the good ones. For example, negative feedback has more emotional impact on people than positive feedback (Coleman, Jussim, & Abraham, 1987), and the effects of negative information and negative events take longer to wear off than the effects of positive information or pleasant events (Brickman, Coates, & Jason-Bulman (1978). The negative tends to disrupt normal functioning longer than does the positive, so that a single traumatic event usually has longer lasting effects on behavior than a single positive event. When negative things happen (for example, people lose a wager, endure abuse, or become a victim of a crime), they spent more time trying to explain the outcome or to make sense of it than when a positive outcome occurs (Gilovich, 1983; Pratto & John, 1991). Moreover, undesirable human traits receive more weight in impression formation than desirable traits (Hamilton & Huffman, 1971).

It is inaccurate, however, to argue that POS ignores negative phenomena inasmuch as some of the greatest triumphs, most noble virtues, and highest achievements have resulted from the presence of the negative (e.g., Cameron & Lavine, 2006). Common human experience, as well as abundant scientific evidence, supports

the idea that negativity has an important place in the investigation of positive processes and outcomes. The development of positive identities in negative environments, organizational healing after trauma, and achieving virtuous outcomes in the face of trials exemplify cases where negative conditions have been investigated with a POS lens (Powley & Cameron, 2006; Kanov, et al., 2004; Powley & Taylor, 2006; Weick, 2003, 2006). POS does not ignore the negative but rather seeks to investigate the positive processes, outcomes, and interpretations embedded in negative phenomena.

A second criticism of POS is that it adopts an elitist perspective. Critics claim that POS is oriented toward exploiting human beings in favor of corporate profits, productivity, and maintaining power for the advantaged over the disadvantaged. Perpetuating the positive for the sake of organizational success, to make managers look good, to manipulate the workforce, or to reinforce unequal employment status are common criticisms (e.g., Fineman, 2006; Ehrenreich, 2009; George, 2004). These critiques fundamentally center on the claim that POS has a narrow focus on managers rather than on the exploited underclass. Detractors accuse POS of not asking the question, "positive for whom?" and suggest that unexamined assumptions are biased toward western philosophies and toward power-elites.

On the other hand, this criticism seems to miss the unequivocally stated focus of POS on life-giving dynamics, resource generation, and flourishing outcomes whether for workers or managers, the under-class or the upper-class, the individual or the organization (e.g., Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Dutton & Sonenshein, 2007; Roberts, 2006). The fundamental assumption of POS is a eudaemonic assumption— that all human systems are biased toward achieving the highest aspirations of

humankind—or excellence and goodness for its own sake.   Adopting an affirmative bias prioritizes positive energy, positive climate, positive relationships, positive communication, and positive meaning for individuals and organizations, so exploitation in order for one party to achieve advantage over another is inconsistent with the fundamental assumptions of POS. Thus, "positivity for whom?" is not exclusive.

Fletcher (1998), for example, documented how positive practices actually reverse the disadvantaged status of under-privileged employees. Positive energy (Baker, Cross, & Wooten, 2003), flourishing relationships (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003), empowerment (Spreitzer, 1992) and virtuousness (Cameron, 2003) all represent non-zero-sum dynamics that benefit all parties. Moreover, abundant research has examined cultural differences regarding positive phenomena, including the well-being of employees in more than 50 countries (Diener, 2009; Veenhoven, 1996, 2010; Diener & Suh, 1997) and has identified universal attributes and predictors as well as unique cultural differences across a wide variety of cultures. Non-western cultures are well-represented in positive research (including some chapters of this Handbook).

A third criticism of POS, related to the first two, is that a precise definition of the term "positive" is lacking. Positive is subjectively experienced, so what may be positive for one person is not necessarily positive for another. What is defined as "good" or "ennobling" may be individualistic. Imposing a definition of positive on others is an act of power and, therefore, is, by definition, non-positive (Caza & Carroll, 2011). Moreover, other related terms used in POS research lack precise definition and scientific validity.

Of course, many core scientific terms are the subjects of investigation, measurement, and theory-building without precise definitions. Well-used and frequently

discussed terms such as "life," "leadership," and "quality" are examples, none of which has been precisely and consensually defined. These terms are considered to be "constructs," meaning terms constructed to capture the meaning of something that is ambiguous and difficult to precisely circumscribe. In such circumstances, investigators artificially constrain the meaning or dimensions of the construct in order to examine certain aspects of it. The key is to be precise about what is and is not included in the construct's measurement. Individualistic definitions are addressed, therefore, by defining the concept scientifically and precisely in scholarly investigations.

As in many domains in the organizational sciences, this requirement is important in research on positive phenomena and constant attention to this requirement is crucial. Improvement can certainly be made on this score in POS. On the other hand, a variety of positively-oriented constructs such as "thriving" (Spreitzer, et. al., 2005), "virtuousness" (Cameron, Bright, & Caza, 2004), "positive emotions" (Fredrickson, 1998), "meaningfulness" (Pratt & Ashforth, 2003), "energy" (Fritz, Lam, & Spreitzer, 2011), "best-self" (Roberts et. Al., 2005), "resilience" (Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003), "positive deviance" (Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003) and many others have been quite carefully defined in POS investigations. Scientific standards have not been ignored.

Nevertheless, vigilance must be maintained to be as precise as possible regarding what is and is not defined as positive. By identifying the four different domains of the term "positive" (as discussed earlier), the conceptual boundaries of POS become clearer, and the same requirement applies to all POS-related constructs. In other words, mapping the conceptual terrain of "positive" is not so much an act of power as a scientific necessity in order for cumulative work to be conducted and for the

nomological network surrounding the constructs to be expanded. Some progress has been made in this regard, although much is left to be done.

The Organization of the Handbook

To that end, the domains of "positive" in the *Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* have been organized into nine categories. The Handbook does not claim to contain a comprehensive list of relevant or important topics, nor does it claim to cover the entire conceptual landscape of POS. Nevertheless, the chapters do represent a good sampling of significant subjects in this field of study, and they help map the terrain of the discipline.

Each chapter contains a review of relevant literature—essentially addressing the question, "What do we now know about this topic?"—as well as the findings of current scholarship. Chapters also offer suggestions and recommendations for needed future research—essentially addressing the question, "What else do we need to know about this topic?" Hence, chapters serve as a useful summary of up-to-date knowledge as well as a guide to future scholarship in POS for the decades ahead.

The groupings into which chapters are organized represent a somewhat arbitrary categorization of major themes. They exemplify different levels of analysis—from individual-level topics to organization and societal-level topics—and they include topics that are traditionally considered to be negative or problem-centered—such as trauma, stress, crises, and conflict—and topics not usually considered to be in the domain of POS—such as economic theory, sustainability, and social movements. Each chapter

adopts a positive lens and emphasizes the relevance of these topics to the broad area of inquiry called POS.

Certain sections in the Handbook address issues of practice—such as the section on human resource practices and the section on leadership and change—and other sections address key theoretical issues embedded in organization studies—such as organizational processes and positive relationships. The placement of chapters in a particular section does not imply that other sections may not also be appropriate, but these nine categories provide for a reasonably clear schema for highlighting the domains of POS, and the chapter placements illustrate and highlight these themes. The nine categories are described below.

Positive Individual Attributes. This first section contains chapters focusing on the positive attributes of individuals in organizations. These chapters treat the individual as the relevant level of analysis but position individuals in the context of work organizations. Chapters address these themes:

Psychological capital

Prosocial motivation

Callings in work

Work engagement

Positive identity

Proactivity

Creativity

Curiosity

Positive traits

The neuroscience underpinnings of POS.

Positive Emotions. The second section focuses on aspects of positive feelings, sentiments, and affect among individuals and groups in organizations. An examination of emotions and subjective experience are themes that are shared in common across these chapters. Topics addressed include:

Positive energy

Positive emotions

Subjective well-being

Passion

Socio-emotional intelligence

Group emotions.

Strengths and Virtues. The third section addresses the concepts of virtuousness in organizations and virtues in the individuals who work in organizations. A wide variety of virtues have been proposed as being universal and have been examined in previous literature, so this section contains but a limited sampling of topics, including:

Virtuousness

Forgiveness

Humility

Compassion

Hope

Courage

Justice

Integrity

Positive ethics

Leveraging strengths

Character strengths in global managers.

Positive Relationships. This section focuses on temporary encounters as well as long-term relationships among organization members. It analyses the dynamics that emerge in interpersonal interactions, temporary connections, and organizational processes that relate to relationships. The chapters examine these topics:

High quality connections

Relational coordination

Reciprocity

Intimacy

Civility

Trust

Trustworthiness

Humor

Psychological safety.

Positive Human Resource Practices. The chapters in this section provide perspective on practices in organizations relating to the management of human capital and human resource systems. Topics of potential interest to human resource professionals, and which are addressed in human resource management functions, include:

Career development

Mentoring

Socialization

Diversity

Communication

Conflict resolution

Negotiating

Work-family dynamics.

Positive Organizational Processes. This section contains chapters that examine dynamics in organizations which are not usually considered to be in the positive domain. The chapters address organization-level topics, and by adopting a positive lens, the chapters highlight how POS has relevance to a broad variety of phenomena. They include:

Symbolism in organizations

Resourcefulness

Collective efficacy

The design of work

Mindful organizing

Goal attainment

Organizational identity

Organizational energy

Innovation

Organizational boundaries.

Positive Leadership and Change. Chapters in this section address the process of positive organizational change as well as the leadership that is associated with

achieving positive change. Strategies and approaches to enabling organizational

change are addressed, and the leadership qualities associated with successful

organizations are examined. The topics addressed are:

Organizational development

Appreciative inquiry

Positive change attributes

Implementing positive change

Authentic leadership

Leadership development

Peak performance

Strategic change

Strengths-based strategy.

A Positive Lens on Problems and Challenges. Because POS is often accused of

ignoring non-positive phenomena, chapters in this section address challenges, issues,

and problems from a positive perspective. They illustrate the importance of the

negative in better understanding the positive. Chapters include:

Managing the unexpected

Healing after trauma

Organizational recovery

Responding to crisis

Resilience under adversity

Post-traumatic growth

Ambivalence

Responding to stress.

Expanding Positive Organizational Scholarship. The final section features chapters that explore the relationships between POS and areas of scholarly interest other than traditional organizational behavior and organizational theory. Disciplines such as economics, sociology, religion, and political science are included in the chapters which focus on:

Sustainability

Critical theory

Economic models

Social movements

Spirituality

Positive deviance

International peacemaking.

Conclusion

The *Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* seeks to provide a foundation for continuing POS research. It provides a good summary of the current state of the field by explaining relevant research and conceptual grounding for key concepts within the general domain of POS. Any scholarly field of endeavor will have a short life span unless founded on valid evidence, theoretical explanation, and practical utility, so the chapters in this Handbook seek to provide that foundation. Equally important, however, is the guidance each chapter provides regarding unanswered questions, puzzles, and needed investigations. Hopefully, the suggested directions for

future research provided in each chapter will not be dismissed as perfunctory

supplements to the chapters' content but as a roadmap for making significant progress

in understanding POS in the years ahead.

References

Akhtar, M. (1968). Affect and memory: An experimental note. *Pakistan Journal of Psychology, 1*(111), 25-27.

Allport, G.W. (1960) Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Aristotle, Metaphysics XII, 7, 3-4.

Baker, W., Cross, R., and Wooten, L. (2003) "Positive organizational network analysis and energizing relationships." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 328-342) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Baker, W.B. and Gunderson, R. (2005) "Zingermans community of businesses." Case, Center for Positive Organizational Scholarship, University of Michigan.

Batson, C.D. (1994) "Why act for the public good? Four answers." Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin. 20:603-610.

Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., Vohs, K. D. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology, 5*(4), 323-370.

Becker, E. (1973). The denial of death. New York,: Free Press.

Bennis, W. (1963). "New Role for the Behavioral Sciences: Effecting Organizational Change," Administrative Science Quarterly, 8(2), 125-165.

Bennis, W. (1969) Organizational Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Bless, H., Hamiliton, D. L., & Mackie, D. M. (1992). Mood effects on the organization of person information. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 22*, 497-509.

Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Bloodgood, J. M. (2002). Citizenship behavior and the creation of social capital in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 27*(4), 505-522.

Boucher, J., & Osgood, C. E. (1969). Pollyanna Hypothesis. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 8*(1), 1-8.

Bradburn, N. M., & Noll, C. E. (1969). *The structure of psychological well-being.* Chicago,: Aldine Pub. Co.

Brickman, P., Coates, D., & Janoff-Bulman, R. (1978). Lottery winners and accident victims: Is happiness relative? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 917-927.

Bright, D.S., Cameron, K.S., and Caza, A. (2006) "The amplifying and buffering effects of virtuousness in downsized organizations." Journal of Business Ethics, 64: 249-269.

Bunch, M. E., & Wientge, K. (1933). The relative susceptibility of pleasant, unpleasant, and indifferent material to retroactive inhibition. *Journal of General Psychology, 9*(114), 157-178.

Cameron, K. S. (2003) "Organizational virtuousness and performance." In K. S. Cameron, J. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), Positive Organizational Scholarship (pp. 48-65). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, K. S., & Lavine, M. (2006). *Making the impossible possible : leading extraordinary performance--the Rocky Flats story* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004) "Exploring the relationships between organizational virtuousness and performance." American Behavioral Scientist, 4: 766-790.

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

Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, K.S. (2003) Organizational virtuousness and performance." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 48-65) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, K.S. (2008a) "Paradox in positive organizational change." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 44: 7-24.

Cameron, K.S. (2008b) Positive Leadership. San Francisco: Berrett Koehler.

Cameron, K.S. and Caza, A. (2002) "Organizational and leadership virtues and the role of forgiveness." Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 9:33-48.

Cameron, K.S., Mora, C.E., and Leutscher, T. (2010) "Effects of positive practices on organizational effectiveness." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, (in press).

Caza, A. and Carroll, B. (2011) "Critical theory and POS." In Cameron, K.S. and Spreitzer, G. (Eds.) Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship. London, Oxford University Press.

Caza, A., & Cameron, K. S. (2008). Positive organizational scholarship: What does it achieve? In C. L. Cooper & S. Clegg (Eds.), *Handbook of Macro-Organizational Behavior*. New York: Sage.

Clifton, D. O. and Harter, J.K. (2003). "Investing in strengths." In Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., and Quinn, R. E., (Eds.) Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline, (pages 111-121) San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Coleman, L. M., Jussim, L., & Abraham, J. (1987). Students' reactions to teacher evaluations: The unique impact of negative feedback. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 17*, 1051-1070.

Comte-Sponville, A. (2001) A Small Treatise of the Great Virtues. (C. Temerson, Translator). New York: Metropolitan Books.

Cooperrider, D.L. and Sekerka, L.E. (2003) "Toward a theory of positive organizational change." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 225-240) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cooperrider, D.L. and Srivastva, S. (1987) "Appreciative inquiry in organizational life" In Pasmore, W. and Woodman, E. (Eds.) Research in Organization Change and Development. Volume 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Czapinksi, J. (1985). Negativity bias in psychology: An evaluation of Polish publications. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 16*, 27-44.

D'Amato, M. R., & Jagoda, H. (1962). Effect of Early Exposure to Photic Stimulation on Brightness Discrimination and Exploratory Behavior. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 101*(Dec), 267-&.

Darwin, C. (2003) *The Origin of Species.* New York: Signet Classics.

Davis, G.F. (2009) Managed by the Markets. New York: Oxford University Press.

Davis, G.F. and Marquis, C. (2005) "Prospects for organizational theory in the early twenty-first century: Institutional fields and mechanisms." Organization Science, 16: 332-343.

Day, H. (1966). Looking Time as a Function of Stimulus Variables and Individual Differences. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 22*(2), 423-&.

Diener, E. (1984) "Subjective well-being." Psychological Bulletin, 95: 542-575.

Diener, E. (2009) Culture and Subjective Well-Being. Champaign, IL: Springer.

Diener, E. (2009) The Science of Well-Being. New York: Springer.

Diener, E. and Suh, E. (1997) "Measuring quality of life: Economic, social, and subjective indicators." Social Indicators Research, 40: 189-216.

Diener, E. and Suh, E.M. (2000) Culture and Subjective Well-Being. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dreben, E. K., Fiske, S. T., & Hastie, R. (1979). The independence of evaluative and item information: Impression and recall order effects in behavior based impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1758-1768.

Drexelius, J. (1627). *The Heliotropium, or Conformity of the Human Will to the Divine* (R. N. i. Translated by Shutte, Trans.). New York: The Devin-Adair Company.

Dutton, J. E., & Glynn, M. (2007). Positive organizational scholarship. In C. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.), Handbook of Organizational Behavior. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dutton, J. E., & Ragins, B. R. (2007). *Exploring positive relationships at work : building a theoretical and research foundation*. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dutton, J.E. (2010) "Interview on Positive organizational scholarship by Mia Yan and Evelyn Micelotta." Academy of Management, Organization, Management, and Theory Division website.

Dutton, J.E. and Heaphy, E. (2003) "The power of high quality connections." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 263-278) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Dutton, J.E. and Sonenshein, S. (2009) "Positive organizational scholarship." In Lopez, S. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Positive Psychology, (pages 737-742) Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dutton, J.E., M.C. Worline, P.J. Frost, and J.M. Lilius (2006) "Explaining compassion organizing." Administrative Science Quarterly, 51: 59-96.

Dutton, J.E., Roberts, L.M., and Bednar, J. (2010) "Pathways for positive identity construction at work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social resources." Academy of Management Review, 35: 265-293.

Ehrenreich, B. (2009) Bright-Sided: How Positive Thinking is Undermining America. New York: Henry Holt.

Emmons, R.A. (1999) The Psychology of Ultimate Concerns: Motivation and Spirituality in Personality. New York: Guilford Press.

Erdelyi, E.H. (1974) "A new look at a New Look: Perceptual defense and vigilance." *Psychological Review,* 81: 1-25.

Erhard-Seibold, E.V. (1937) "The heliotrope tradition." Orisis, 3: 22-46.

Feldman, M. S., & Khademian, A. M. (2003). Empowerment and cascading vitality. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline* (pp. 343-358). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Fineman, S. (2006). On being positive: Concerns and counterpoints. *Academy of Management Review, 31*(2), 270-291.

Fletcher, (1998)

Fowers, B.J. and A.C. Tjeltveit: 2003, 'Virtue Obscured and Retrieved: Character, Community, and Practices in Behavioral Science.', American Behavioral Scientist, 47(4), pp. 387-94.

Fredrickson, B. L. (1998) "What good are positive emotions?" Review of General Psychology, 2: 300-319.

Fredrickson, B. L. and Joiner, (2002) "Positive emotions trigger upward spirals toward emotional well-being." American Psychologist, 13: 172-175.

Fredrickson, B. L., & Losada, M. F. (2005). Positive affect and the complex dynamics of human flourishing. *American Psychologist, 60*(7), 678-686.

Fredrickson, B.M. (2009) Positivity. New York: Crown.

Fritz, C., Lam, C.F., and Spreitzer, G. (2011) "It's the little things that matter: An examination of knowledge workers' energy management." Academy of Management Perspectives, (in press).

Gallagher, M.W., Lopez, S.J., and Preacher, K.J. (2009) "The hierarchical structure of well-being." Journal of Personality, 77: 1025-1049.

George, J.M. (2004) Book review of 'Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline.' Administrative Science Quarterly, 49: 325-330.

Ghoshal, S. (2005) "Bad management theories are destroying good management practice." Academy of Management Learning and Education, 4: 75-91.

Gilbert, G.M. (1938) "The new status of experimental studies on the relationship between feeling and memory." *Psychological Bulletin,* 35:P 433-441.

Gilovich, T. (1983). Biased evaluation and persistence in gambling. *Journal of Social and Personal Psychology, 44*, 110-1126.

Gittell, J. H., Cameron, K., Lim, S., & Rivas, V. (2006). Relationships, Layoffs, and Organizational Resilience: Airline Industry Responses to September 11. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 42*(3), 300-328.

Godfrey, P.C. (2003) The relationship between corporate philanthropy and shareholder wealth: A risk management perspective. Academy of Management Review,

Goldings, H. J. (1954). On the avowal and projection of happiness. *Journal of Personality, 23*(1), 30-47.

Gordon, M. E. (1970). Effect of Correctness of Behavior Observed on Accuracy of Ratings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 5*(4), 366-377.

Gouldner, A. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review, 25*, 161-179.

Guzzo, R.A. and Dickson, M.W. (1996) "Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness." Annual Review of Psychology, 47: 307-338.

Hackman, J.R. (2008) "The perils of positivity." <u>Journal of Organizational Behavior,</u> 30: 309-319.

Hamilton, D. L., & Huffman, L. J. (1971). Generality of impression formation processes for evaluative and non-evaluative judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 20*, 200-207.

Havighurst, R. J., & Glasser, R. (1972). Exploratory Study of Reminiscence. *Journals of Gerontology, 27*(2), 245-&.

Hess, E.D. and Cameron, K.S. (2006) <u>Leading with Values: Positivity, Virtue, and High Performance</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ilies, R., Nahrgang, J. D., and Morgeson, F. O. (2007). "Leader-member exchange and citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis." <u>Journal of Applied Psychology,</u> 92: 269–277.

Jahoda, M. (1959) <u>Current Concepts of Positive Mental Health.</u> New York: Basic Books.

James, W. (1902) <u>The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature</u>. FQ Press.

Jensen, M.C. (2002) "Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function." <u>Business Ethics Quarterly,</u> 12: 235-256.

Johnson, W. B. (1937). Euphoric and depressed moods in normal subjects. *Character and Personality, 6*, 79-98.

Kanov, J.M., Maitlis, S., Worline, M.C., Dutton, J.E., Frost, P.J., and Lilius, J.M. (2004) Compassion in organizational life," <u>American Behavioral Scientist</u>, 47: 808-827.

Keyes, C.L.M. (2005) "Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health." <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,</u> 73: 539-548.

Kok, B.E. and Fredrickson, B.L. (2010) "Upward spirals of the heart: Autonomic flexibility, as indexed by vagal tone, reciprocally and prospectively predicts positive emotions and social connectedness." <u>Biological Psychology,</u> doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2010.09.005.

Kramer, R.M. (1999) "Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions." <u>Annual Review of Psychology,</u> 50: 569-598.

Kuntz, D. (1974). Response Faults on Word-Association as a Function of Associative Difficulty and of Affective Connotation of Words. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</u>*, 42*(2), 231-235.

Lee, F., Caza, A., Edmondson, A., and Thomke, St. (2003) "New knowledge creation in organizations." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) <u>Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline</u>. (pages 194-206) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Losada, M., & Heaphy, E. (2004). The role of positivity and connectivity in the performance of business teams - A nonlinear dynamics model. <u>American Behavioral Scientist</u>*, 47*(6), 740-765.

Luborsky, L., Blinder, B., & Mackworth, N. (1963). Eye fixation and recall of pictures as a function of GSR responsivity. <u>Perceptual and Motor Skills</u>*, 16*(2), 469-483.

Luthans, F., Norman, S.M., Avolio, B.J., and Avey, J.B. (2008) "The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate – employee performance relationship. <u>Journal of Organizational Behavior,</u> 29: 219-238.

Mann, J. W. (1968). Defining unfavorable by denial. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 7(4), 760-&.

Margolis, J. D., & Walsh, J. P. (2003). Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. Administrative Science Quarterly, 48(2), 268-305.

Maslow, A. (1965) Eupsychian Management: A Journal Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). Toward a Psychology of Being. New York: Van Nostrand.

Matlin, M. W. (1970). Response Competition as a Mediating Factor in Frequency-Affect Relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16(3), 536-&.

Matlin, M., & Stang, D. (1978). The Pollyanna Principle. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing Company.

McCullough, M.E. and Snyder, C.R. (2001) "Classical sources of human strength: Revisiting an old home and building a new one." Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19: 1-10.

McGregor, D. (1960) The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Meltzer, H., & Ludwig, D. (1967). Age Differences in Memory Optimism and Pessimism in Workers. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 110(1), 17-&.

Merton, R.K. (1968) Social Organization and Social Structure. New York: Free Press.

Mrosovsky, N., & Kingsmill, S. F. (1985). How Turtles Find the Sea. Zeitschrift Fur Tierpsychologie-Journal of Comparative Ethology, 67(1-4), 237-256.

Nadler, D. and Tushman, M. (1997) Competing By Design. Oxford University Press.

Organ, D.W. (1988) Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Park, N. and C.M. Peterson: 2003, 'Virtues and Organizations', in K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, and R.E. Quinn (eds.), Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline (Berrett Koehler, San Francisco), pp. 33-47.

Peterson, C. and Seligman, M.E.P. (2004) Character Strengths and Virtues. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pfeffer, J. (2010) "Building sustainable organizations: The human factor." Academy of Management Perspectives, 8: 34-45.

Porter, M. (1998) Competitive Strategy: Techniques for Analyzing Industries and Competitors. New York: Free Press.

Powley, E.H. and Cameron, K.S. (2006) "Organizational healing: Lived virtuousness amidst organizational crisis." Journal of Management, Spirituality, and Religion, 3: 13-33.

Powley, E.H. and Smith, S.N. (2006) "Values and leadership in organizational crisis." In Hess, E.D. and Cameron, K.S. (2006) Leading with Values: Positivity, Virtue, and High Performance. (pages 194-212), New York: Cambridge University Press.

Powley, E. H. & K. Piderit (2008) "Tending Wounds: Elements of the Organizational Healing Process," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 44(1), 134-149.

Pratt, M.G. and Ashforth, B.E. (2003) "Fostering meaningfulness in work and at work." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 309-327) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Pratto, F., & John, O. P. (1991). Automatic vigilance: The attention-grabbing power of negative social information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61, 380-391.

Quinn, R.W. (2002) "Flow in knowledge work: High performance experience in the design of national security technology." Administrative Science Quarterly, 50: 610-642.

Roberts, L.M. (2006) "Shifting the lens on organizational life: The added value of positive scholarship." Academy of Management Review, 31: 292-305.

Roberts, L.M., Dutton, J.E., Spreitzer, G.M., Heaphy, E.D., and Quinn, R.E. (2005) "Composing the reflected best-self-portrait: Building pathways for becoming extraordinary in work organizations." Academy of Management Review, 30: 712-736.

Rychlak, J. F. (1966). Reinforcement Value - a Suggested Idiographic Intensity Dimension of Meaningfulness for Personality Theorist. *Journal of Personality, 34*(3), 311-&.

Rychlak, J. F. (1977). *The psychology of rigorous humanism*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Seligman, M.E.P. (1999). "The president's address." *American Psychologist,* 54: 559-562.

Sharot, T., Riccardi, A.M., Raio, C.M., and Phelps, E.A. (2007) "Neural mechanisms mediating optimism bias." Nature, 450: 102-106.

Skinner, B.F. (1965) *Science and Human Behavior.* New York: Free Press.

Smith, J. C., & Baker, H. D. (1960). Conditioning in the Horseshoe Crab. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology, 53*(3), 279-281.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 38(5): 1442-1465.

Spreitzer, G., Sutcliffe, K., Dutton, J., Sonenshein, S. and Grant, A. (2005). A socially embedded model of thriving at work. Organization Science, 16(5): 537-549.

Spreitzer, G.M. and Sonenshein, S. (2003) "Positive deviance and extraordinary performance." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 207-224) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Sutcliffe, K.M. and Vogus, T.J. (2003) Organizing for resilience." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 94-110) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Taylor, S. E. (1991). Asymmetrical Effects of Positive and Negative Events: The Mobilization-Minimization Hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 110*(1), 67.

Thomson, R. H. (1930). An experimental study of memory as influenced by feeling tone. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 13*, 462-468.

Thrash and Elliott, (2003)

Tutu, D. (1999) No Future Without Forgiveness. New York: Doubleday.

Vanette, D., Cameron, K.S., and Powley, E. (2006) "Implementing positive organizational scholarship at Prudential." William Davidson Institute, University of

Veenhoven, R. (2010) World Databook on Happiness (since 1984). Boston: Dordrecht.

Veenhoven, R. (1996) "Happy life-expectancy. A comprehensive measure of quality-of-life in nations." Social Indicators Research, 39: 1-58

Vianello, M., Galliani, E.M., and Haidt, J. (2010) "Elevation at work: The effects of leaders' moral excellence." Journal of Positive Psychology,

Vinokur, A. D., & van Ryn, M. (1993). Social support and undermining in close relationships: Their independent effects on the mental health of unemployed persons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 350-359.

Wang, C.S., Galinsky, A.D., and Murnighan, J.K. (2009) "Bad drives psychological reactions, but good propels behavior." Psychological Science, 20: 634-644.

Weber, M. (1997) The Theory of Social And Economic Organization. New York: Free Press.

Weick, K.E. (2003) "Positive organizing and organizational tragedy." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 66-80) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Weick, K.E. (2006) "The role of values in high-risk organizations." ." In Hess, E.D. and Cameron, K.S. (2006) Leading with Values: Positivity, Virtue, and High Performance. (pages 55-67), New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wessman, A. E., & Ricks, D. F. (1966). *Mood and personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Whetten, D.A. (1980) "Organizational decline." Academy of Management Review, 5: 577-588.

Williamson, O. (1998) The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. New York: Free Press.

Worline, M.C. and Quinn, R.W. (2003) "Courageous principled action." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 138-158) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Worthington, E.L. (2001) "Unforgiveness, forgiveness, and reconciliation and their implications for societal interventions." In Helmick, R.G. and Petersen, R.L. (Eds.) Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy, and Conflict Transformation. (pp. 161-182) Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.

Wrzesniewski, A. (2003) "Finding positive meaning in work." In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., and Quinn, R.E. (Eds.) Positive organizational scholarship : foundations of a new discipline. (pages 296-308) San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Wrzesniewski, A. and Dutton, J.E. (2001) "Crafting a job: Employees as active crafters of their work." Academy of Management Review, 26: 179-201.

Young, P. T. (1937). Laughing and weeping, cheerfulness and depression: a study of moods among college students. *Journal of Social Psychology, 8*, 311-334.

Zajonc, R. B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9*, 1-27.