

## **ORGANIZATIONAL INTEGRITY: A TOOL FOR CORPORATE PERFORMANCE.**

**Dr. Dumo Nkesi Opara and Odegoke Kayode Ramon**  
**Department of Employment Relations and Human Resource Management**  
**Faculty of Management Sciences, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni**  
**Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria**

### **ABSTRACT**

*This paper examined the relationship between organizational integrity and corporate performance. The objectives of the study are to ascertain the relationship between empathy and corporate performance; to determine the relationship between sportsmanship and corporate performance; and to examine the relationship between virtuousness and corporate performance. Several literatures were reviewed relating to the concept of organizational integrity and its dimensions. The concept of corporate performance and its measures were also clarified conceptually. The work was anchored on Social Exchange Theory by Richard Emerson (1976) which revealed that "Individuals and organizations engage in relationships based on the expectation of reciprocal benefits, and the perceived integrity of the organization plays a crucial role in shaping these exchange relationship". Based on the literature reviewed, the paper concluded that the essence of organizational performance is a picture of the results of the work of collaborative activities among members of the organization to achieve organizational goals that have been determined. The study recommended among others that: Company leaders should have a process in place to identify, prioritize and publicly communicate relevant ethic issues to the company, for this will enhance the firm process integrity capacity; Company leaders should have process in place to measure and transparently communicate progress in resolving ethics at work, for this will enhance the firm process integrity capacity.*

**Keywords: Organizational Integrity, Corporate Finance, Empathy, Sportsmanship, Virtuousness**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Our contemporary society is replete with instances of serious moral values such as personal gains, individual value in conflict with organizational goals, entrepreneur values and attitudinal competitive pressure, indiscipline, avarices and insatiable greed for wealth (Agwor & Osho, 2018). Consequently, business in the public arena today has gotten a lot of negative press over the previous decade due to the apparent (and genuine) lack of integrity both between organizations at the firm level and within the organization at the individual level (Macey, 2013; Stevens, 2013). This has prompt up the idea of investigating integrity at different organizational levels. The idea of examining the integrity of the firm is generally informed by the need to identify virtues as a key contributor to corporate reputation.

Integrity as a virtue has been examined both philosophically and psychologically. From the philosophical perspective it is seen as an ongoing reflective concern for distinguishing what is right from what is wrong and a sense of trustworthy loyalty to honestly examined beliefs (Quinn, 2020).

From the psychological perspective it is seen as a regular pattern of behavior that is consistent with espoused value, which is, practicing what one preaches (Petrick, 1997).

According to Kaptein and Wempe, (2012), organizational integrity identifies with the corporate endeavors that are limited in the corporate culture and structure and alludes to the intelligibility between corporate endeavors, lead, and outcomes . Much the same as an individual of integrity, an enterprise of integrity needs to strive for wholeness or consistency between (1) distinct qualities, standards, and goals that spur activity; (2) words and deeds; and (3) corporate practices and the global societal desires and requests.

There is no gain saying that small and medium scale enterprise business environment is volatile in terms of competition, induced by unrestricted entry into the industry, survival in such environment to a large extent depend on their performance. Performance is achieving organizational goals and objectives (Supriadi et al., 2020). This definition is applied in all fields of management (management control, general politics, human resources management). Performance is multidimensional when goals are manifold; performance is a subset of action; performance is subjective because it is the product of operation, which is subjective. Thus, this study measures performance in terms of market share, innovativeness and efficiency. Market share refers to the percentage or proportion of total sales of revenue that a company or brand captures within a specific market (King, 2015). Market share is an important metric for businesses as it provides insights into their performance and market position.

Innovativeness is the process of seeking ways for continuous betterment of production setting of an organization (Nofie in Aeba et al., 2020). This imperativeness of innovative and developing new solution that take advantage of data, advanced analysis, digital technologies and new delivery platforms has never been more important. Organizational are innovating in targeting expanding services, re-configuring delivery channels, delivering proactive advice, integrating payments and applying blockchain technology. Jayathilake (2018) sees efficiency as the organization's degree of success in using the least possible inputs in order to produce the highest possible outputs.

In recent years, corporate companies have begun to recognize the importance of protecting employee's mental health through creating a virtuous working environment such as by fostering appreciation, gratitude and encouragement, to enhance productivity and competitiveness and establish a positive organizational image (Occupational Safety and Health Council, 2016). Thus, organizational integrity is essential to organizations if they are to enhance their performance. Organizational integrity pertains to intellectual, moral and social excellences demonstrated through character traits and intentional behaviours involving the pursuit of human goodness and an optimal state of functioning as a valued end in itself (Bright & Fry, 2013). Modern research on virtues has been accelerated by the positive social science movement (Bright et al., 2014), which puts emphasis on the identification of positive behaviours that are indicative of virtuousness as well as their associated factors. In the light of the above, this study dimensionalized organizational integrity into empathy, sportsmanship and virtuousness.

Empathy is usually referred to as a distinctive part of moral emotions that generally leads to altruistic motivation as well as pro-social and altruistic behaviour (Itani & Inyang, 2015). Empathic employees are trusted more by customers, develop satisfaction and foresee their future interactions. Sportsmanship is a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and imposition of work without complaining (Ghasem et al., 2016). Sportsmanship brings additional benefit in dealing with daily negative events. By behaving as a "good sport" employees may buffer themselves from the harmful effects of daily negative work experiences. However, virtuousness seems to amplify positive contexts, attitude and behaviours. Employees experience positive emotions which in turn, lead them to exhibit virtuous acts, and eventually foster social capital (Bakern & Dutton et al., 2023) resulting in the enhancement of individual and organizational performance.

Studied related to organizational integrity and performance have been carried out. Illustratively, Suparjo et al. (2020) analyzed the influence of integrity, professionalism, and innovation in order to encourage the achievement of good service performance in seven Kantor Pelayanan Perbendaharaan Negars (KPPN) in the Regional Office of the Directorate General of Treasury. Jakarta Province, AL-Abrow et al. (2019) examined the effect of organizational integrity and leadership behaviour in organizational excellence by considering the mediating role of work engagement in the banking sector. Gamaliel et al. (2019) examined the effect of knowledge management and the integrity on organizational performance simultaneously at PT Bhinneka Mentari Dimensi. Supriadi et al. (2020) examined and analyzed the integrity and compensation of organizational performance through job satisfaction of PT Pubji Bijak Prestai. Waseem et al. (2018) investigate the indirect effect of Employee Empathy (EE) on Customer Loyalty (CL) and loyalty outcomes through intervening

variables among active users of telecommunication services from the province of Anhui, China. Demerouti and Cropanzano (2017) conducted a study on the buffering role of sportsmanship on the effects of daily events. Ghansem et al. (2016) examined the relationship between organizational citizenship behaviour and market orientation of Agricultural Jihad Organization of Mazandaran province.

Many factors have been identified contributing to this premature death of corporate firms. Key among them include: insufficient capital, irregular power supply, infrastructural inadequate (water, roads etc), lack of focus, inadequate market research, over-concentration on one or more markets for finished products, lack of succession plan, inexperience, lack of proper book keeping, lack of proper records or lack of any records at all, inability to separate business and family or personal finances, lack of business strategy, inability to distinguish between revenue and profit, inability to procure the right plant and machinery, poor human resource management inability to engage or employ the right calibre of staff, cut-throat competition (Basil, 2002). However, there seems to be one problem which has not been fully observed and watch negatively affect performance of corporate firms, and that is the issue of integrity.

Unintellectual, immoral, and poor levels of social tendencies demonstrated through routine behaviours and involvement in task handling has increasingly resulted to poor organizational performance. Not being altruistic and anti-social behaviour by employee during work operations initiates mistrust by customer, dissatisfaction in interactions among employees negatively affect operations and operations leading to ignoble vices, untruthfulness partiality and uncalled-for attitude and behaviours of employees are ways that seem to permeate low performance among firms (Henry et al., 2023). In the light of this, the study examined organizational integrity as a tool for corporate performance.

### **Aim and Objective of the Study**

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between organizational integrity and corporate performance. Specifically, the objectives of the study are to:

- (i) ascertain the relationship between empathy and corporate performance.
- (ii) determine the relationship between sportsmanship and corporate performance.
- (iii) examine the relationship between virtuousness and corporate performance.

### **The Concept of Organisational Integrity**

Integrity comes from the Latin "integrate" which means complete or flawless, perfect, without a visor. The point is what is in the hearts of the same with what we think, say and do (Bertens in Gamaliel et al., 2019; Nganga, 2015). Integrity is consistency and unwavering determination in upholding noble values and beliefs. Another definition of integrity is a concept that points to consistency between actions and values and principles. In ethics, integrity is interpreted as honesty and the truth of one's actions. Opponents of integrity are hypocrisy or hypocritical. A person is said to have "integrity" if his actions are following his values, beliefs, and principles (Wikipedia). Simply put the character of a person of integrity is marked by only words and actions, not by someone whose words cannot be held (Supriadi et al., 2020). Integrity is a consistent attitude and behavior to uphold work ethics and professional ethics. Integration requires the temptation or opportunity to commit misconduct. However, people who are not motivated misconduct because he had confidence in the importance of upholding the noble values in their environment (Gamaliel et al., 2019) A person who has integrity is not a human type with many faces and appearances that are adjusted to his motives and interests. Integrity becomes a key character for a leader. A leader who has integrity will get the trust of his employees. Leaders with integrity are trusted because what they say becomes their actions.

Simply put, the character of a person of integrity is marked by only words and actions, not by someone whose words cannot be held. A person who has integrity is not a human type with many faces and appearances that are adjusted to his motives and interests. Integrity becomes a key

character for a leader. A leader who has integrity will get the trust of his employees. Leaders with integrity are trusted because what they say becomes their actions. Understanding Integrity is a way of thinking, saying, behaving and acting properly and correctly and upholding the code of ethics and moral principles (Supriadi et al., 2020). Integrity is acting consistent with the values and policies of the organization as well as the code of professional conduct, even in a state that is difficult to do so. Simply put, motivation showed firmness attitude, merging deeds and moral values embraced by someone. People who have integration will not be deterred by the temptation to betray the moral values that are believed. Personal motivation is the person who maintains the level of honesty and high ethics in words and actions every day. They are the ones who are competent, conscientious and reliable in the act, it can be trusted by his co-workers, subordinates, and superiors as well as outsiders. They also treat others fairly (James, 2012)

People who become leaders or successful tend to have three qualities. The quality is according to the Cloud (2006), which has the specific ability, to build mutually beneficial relationships (more than just networking), and character. At least, the character in question here includes ethics and motivation. The success of a leader is not only seen from how much ability in a particular field, but more important is how motivated him to manage and use these capabilities following the moral values he believed. Integrity is the ability to be patient when life does not go smoothly (Gamaliel et al., 2019; Kreitner. 2015). Integrity is a test stand that requires predictable behavior. Integrity is a force that remains firm even though no one noticed. Integration remains firm on certain values despite perceived more popular to dump him. Integrity, living with confidence, rather than with what they like. Integrity is the foundation of life if the motivation is good, then the good life, and vice versa. Integration was formed through customs.

According to Kaptein and Wempe, (2002), organizational integrity identifies with the corporate endeavors that are limited in the corporate culture and structure and alludes to the intelligibility between corporate endeavors, lead, and outcomes. Much the same as an individual of integrity, an enterprise of integrity needs to strive for wholeness or consistency between (1) distinct qualities, standards, and goals that spur activity; (2) words and deeds; and (3) corporate practices and the global societal desires and requests.

### **Dimensions of Organisational Integrity**

**Empathy:** Empathy is usually referred to as a distinctive part of moral emotions that generally leads to altruistic motivation as well as pro-social and altruistic behavior (Itani & fnyang, 2015). The empathic employee responds to customers' needs and adjusts his/her attitude and behavior following the wants and desires of the customer's Lmasuthan et al. (2017). In formulating bonds with customers, frontline service employees display empathy during customer-employee interactions (Itani & Inyang, 2015). Empathic employees are trusted more by customers, develop satisfaction and foresee their future interactions successful. Empathy is considered as a significant variable for individual consideration among persons (Jones & Shandiz, 2015; Markovic et al., 2015). Particularly in the literature concerning service, empathy is regarded as an essential element for fruitful employee and customer communications that commonly lead to altruistic motivation and pro-social and altruistic behavior. Empathy is defined as "a person's ability to sense another's thoughts, feelings, and experiences, to share other's emotional experience, and to react to the observed experiences of another person" (Wieseke et al., 2012). Research confirms that empathy involves cognitive as well as emotional dimensions (Jones & Shandiz, 2015).

From a cognitive perspective, empathy is the service employee's potential to take the customer's view through understanding their mind, thoughts, and intentions (Daniels et al., 2014). Regarding the emotional viewpoint, empathy relates to employees' capability to involve in helpful actions toward customers, such as interpersonal concern and emotional contagion (Mayshak et al., 2017). As a form of social or mutual perspective, empathy relates to the gaining of particular insight into the experience of others, while distinguishing it as another person's experience instead of one's own (Itani & Inyang, 2015; Meneses & Larkin, 2012; Ratcliffe, 2012).

More so, empathy is an ability spectrum to recognize a broad spectrum of emotional signals, allowing leaders to feel the unspoken emotions of other individuals or groups (Cherry & Amy, 2023; Aubouin-Bormaventure et al., 2023). For this reason, leaders are capable of working with individuals from diverse personal and cultural backgrounds. Empathy provides a foundation for guiding our behaviors toward others. There are two distinct kinds of empathy in the human experience: Emotional empathy and cognitive empathy. Emotional empathy, also called affective or primitive empathy is the subjective state resulting from emotional contagion. It is our automatic drive to respond appropriately to another's emotions.

**Sportsmanship:** Sportsmanship is a dimension of organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB). It involves "a willingness to tolerate the inconveniences and annoyances of organisational life without complaining" (Organ in Demerouti & Cropanzano, 2017) or "tolerating less-than ideal circumstances or minor workplace distractions and discomforts without complaining" (Nielsen et al., 2012). Sportsmanship is employees' tendency to tolerate the condition which is the least condition for them, without complaining. Sportsmanship represents avoiding the damage to the organization. Sportsmanship is defined as a willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining (Ghasem et al., 2016). Sportsmanship brings additional benefit in dealing with daily negative events. By behaving as a "good sport" employees may buffer themselves from the harmful effects of daily negative work experiences. Whereas negative events are, almost by definition, difficult for most of us, on days in which individuals exhibit high sportsmanship they should report greater feelings of positive affect and also higher work engagement. Central to the arguments made here is not only that negative events diminish daily positive affect and work engagement but also that individuals can minimize these detrimental effects by engaging in sportsmanship. This is based on the idea that people are not victims of events that impinge on them; "rather they have a wide latitude in how they evaluate the meaning of events in their daily lives" (Robertson, 2010).

When individuals behave as "good sports," they eschew testy complaints and other cantankerous responses. There is evidence that avoiding negative conversations immediately after a negative event can promote better psychological adjustment. Rime" and colleagues in James (2020) found that most people do share their emotions with others regarding a negative event. Although such sharing leads individuals to report perceived benefits, it does not predict actual emotional recovery. Seery et al. (2008) challenged the notion that sharing leads to better adjustment. These researchers raised the question whether lack of expression in the face of negative events (collective trauma in their study) reflects vulnerability or resilience. Whereas there are circumstances under which sincere and meaningful self-disclosure can promote better psychological adjustment (Stanton & Low, 2012), such as when writing helps a victim find meaning in a traumatic event, this is distinct from haphazardly complaining when something goes awry. Discussing events immediately during or after they occur, forces the brain to re-live or "rehearse" the negative emotional response. This creates a stronger association in memory, exaggerating the influence of the emotional episode (Seery et al., 2008).

For this reason, expressive responses make affect-provoking occasions more memorable, thereby enhancing their influence on well-being (Hies et al., 2011). This does not occur on those days in which employees are "good sports." When we engage in sportsmanship, we avoid complaining (Organ in Demerouti & Cropanzano. 2017), and in this way block the formation of salient memory links between the event and our feelings. Similarly and in line with the voice literature, the effectiveness of proffering one's concerns is often enhanced if the employees express something supportive, as opposed to something critical. In addition, voice is more effective if negative emotions are minimized (Grant, 2013) and timing is appropriate (Morrison, 2014). Daily complaints, of course, are less likely to meet these criteria. The decision of whether to speak up is a process, which unfolds over time. An employee may need time to decide whether, when, and how to communicate a concern or particular issue. Unfortunately, it may be problematic for workers if they fail to take the time to prepare their concerns carefully.

In summary, we have made two arguments. First, complaining about negative events on the day that they occurred makes their impact stronger because it reifies the relevant memory traces. Second, if the complaint is poorly timed or expressed with too much emotion, then it is less likely to be received constructively and addressed. As a result of these two mechanisms, behaving stoically (i.e., acting with high sportsmanship) at least on the day that a negative event has occurred should reduce the detrimental effects of these events on both work engagement and positive affect. Specifically, we predict a significant two-way interaction of the following form. Negative events will lower work engagement and positive affect but only on days where an employee behaves with low sportsmanship. On days when sportsmanship is high, work engagement and positive affect will not be affected. Hence, it follows that sportsmanship should similarly prevent the unfortunate carry-over effects that come from negative events. This is also in line with the findings of Nielsen et al. (2012). Nielsen and colleagues examined team performance with a demanding situation. They found that performance was higher when individuals show high sportsmanship whereas the utility of sportsmanship is on independent tasks.

**Virtuousness:** According to Rego et al. (2010), the origin of the virtuousness in Latin is "virtus" which means "strength" or "excellence". Virtues are habits, desires, and actions that produce personal and social good. Peterson and Seligman (2004) have defined it as "core characteristics valued by moral philosophers and religious thinkers." These include six broad categories: wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence. Bright et al. (2014) suggested, an organisational spirit of virtuousness refers to the pursuit of the highest aspirations in the human condition. Virtuousness is identical with internalization of moral rules that produce social harmony. Cameron (2011) emphasized that "virtuousness possesses an affirmative bias and focuses on elevating, flourishing, and enriching outcomes. In the light of the above, organisational virtuousness is defined as collective positive attributes and behaviors supported by and characteristic of an organization that promote hedonic well-being, eudemonic well-being, and optimal performance (Meyer, 2018). This conceptualization adopts the synergy hypothesis, representing the idea that "the collective has some kind of multiplicative and amplifying effect such that the overall virtuousness comes to be greater than the sum of the virtuousness of individual members" (Bright et al., 2014). It highlights the role of the social context and group dynamics (Cropanzano et al., 2017), whereby members of an organization build upon each other's strengths and compel each other to engage in virtuous acts. Cameron et al., (2011) proposed a non-exhaustive list of the dimensions of organisational virtuousness, including gratitude, kindness, caring, forgiveness, meaning, and inspiration.

Virtuous leaders are ethical stewards who seek to optimize the creation of wealth and value for all parties by creating organisational relationships and systems that build high trust and that earn the commitment of others (Caldwell et al., 2015). Pearce et al. (2008) define virtuous leadership as distinguishing right from wrong in one's leadership role, taking steps to ensure justice and honesty, influencing and enabling others to pursue righteous and moral goals for themselves and their organizations and helping others to connect to a higher purpose. Hackett and Wang (2012) emphasized that virtuous leader achieves effectiveness by increasing his/her referent power and the proper exercise of that power; Enhancing idealized influence on followers; and enhancing follower's inspirational motivation. Organisational virtuousness could be the key pertaining to the supportive and faithful workforce even during financial crisis periods, since organisational virtuousness could help organizations to recover from shocks e.g., by decreasing its volumes. Monitoring virtuousness could create positive emotions with building relationships with ideal principles on the long term and allow individuals to perform in a way that is beneficial to others. Moreover, leadership contributes to comprehending the importance of difficulties and actions that face managers and have the ability to absorb the negative reactions of the workers resulting from some organisational procedures. Moreover, leadership may be considered as another factor that may influence the internalization of the EFQM model, in addition to being a fundamental predictor of business results in the context of the EFQM model, as previous research has found (Escrig-Tena

et al., 2019; Raharjo & Eriksson, 2017). Importantly, neither individuals nor organizations are completely virtuous or non-virtuous. Rather, virtuousness in and through organizations can be manifested as a single individuals' activities or as collective action, and characteristics of an organization's culture or processes may enable or disable virtuous deeds. Cameron et al. (2011) identified three key definitional attributes that are associated with organisational virtuousness: human impact, moral goodness, and social betterment. Virtuousness is associated with human beings with flourishing and moral character, with human strength, self-control, and resilience (Baumeister & Exline in Ellwood, 2020), and with meaningful human purpose and transcendent principles. Desires or actions without human effects are not virtuous.

The structure of an organization, for example, is inherently neither virtuous nor non-virtuous since it does not necessarily have intrinsic positive or negative human impact. However, this structure was designed specifically to perpetuate flourishing interpersonal relationships, meaningful work, enhanced learning, and personal development among employees (Baucus & Beck-Dudley as cited in AlHalaseh & Al-Rawadyeh, 2020). The intended positive human effects of this unique structure illustrates one key aspect of virtuousness in organizations— positive human impact. Organisational virtuousness represents what is good, right, and worthy of cultivation. Of course, much debate has occurred regarding what constitutes goodness and whether universal virtues can be identified. Yet all societies and cultures possess catalogues of traits that they deem virtuous.

### **The Concept of Performance**

One of the important questions in business is that why some organizations are successful in spite of their failure in the completion with other organization. Corporate, business or organizational performance is the most important issue for profit and non-profit organizations. Awareness of the factors affecting the performance of the organization is very important for managers, because it is important to take appropriate steps at the beginning (Gamaliel et al., 2019). However, definition, conceptualization, and measurement of performance are not easy. Researchers have different beliefs and definitions about corporate performance, but still remains a controversial issue (Barney, in Ghasem et al., 2016). Performance literally means the quality of work. So, corporate or organisational performance is an overall structure referring to the organisational operation (Rahnavard, 2008).

Okechukwu and Okoronkwo (2018) asserted that organisational performance is one of the most important variables in the management research and arguably the most important indicators of organizations' growth and development. Organisational performance reflects the achievement of organisational objectives. Therefore, it is the extent to which the operational activities of a corporate entity bring about the achievement of targets and satisfaction of customers' expectations. It indicates the sum of accomplishment that has been achieved by all departments of the organization. Thus, organisational performance could be seen as an ability of cooperation to satisfy their customers regardless of the challenges they face. In order to achieve the desired level of organisational performance, many organizations have restructured, and implemented total quality management programs and introduced competitive staff benefits. Analyses of the sustained superior business performance of some organizations have attributed their success to the specific cultures of the respective organizations (Zheng & McLean, 2010).

Organisational performance is a vital issue for all profit making and non-profit organizations. Also, business performance is the most important criterion in assessing organizations, their actions, and their environments (Shadi et al., 2018). Improving business performance is a prerequisite for strategic management of the organization that seek maximum performance (Cania, 2014). Performance is a comprehensive concept for all activities in organizations of all types.

However, let's consider some definitions organisational performance by different authors: Organisational performance is defined as a quality of work, efficiency of staff in decision making, improvement and development of processes, staff relationship with their leaders, diversity of

services and products, innovations, market share, staff skills and experience in problem solving, new methods and modern techniques of product development (Imran, 2014). In the view of Pandey and Dutta, (2013) Organisational performance is the degree by which the organization meets its own needs and the needs of stakeholders to survive and grow. Organisational performance refers to the ability of the organization to access and handle various organisational resources in order to achieve its goals and objectives (Sangiorgi & Siboni, 2017).

Base on the above definitions, there is an agreement among researchers that a performance measurement system is vital for organizations because it provides information on the quality of their operations within organizations which helps in the development of strategic plans. Performance evaluates the achievement of organisational goals (Tomislav et al., 2012). Organisational performance targets the real output or outcome of an organization as measured against its intended outputs, goals and objective. It cuts across strategic planners, operations, finance, legal, and organization development as a matter of concern to authorities in many fields of endeavor. Organisational performance is analysis of an organization's output as measured by goals and purpose. Business performance is tied to work performance of the organization. Work performance here means the way management and employees perform their work as related to the technological environment and adoption of technological devices to run the business, effectively and efficiently. Organisational performance is an indicator of the level of achievement that can be achieved and reflects the success of an organization, as well as the results achieved from the behavior of organisational members. Performance can also be said as a result (output) of a particular process carried out by all components of the organization against certain sources used (input). Performance is also the result of a series of process activities carried out to achieve certain organisational goals (Supriadi et al., 2020). For an organization, performance is the result of collaborative activities among members or components of the organization to realize organisational goals.

Corporate performance is the totality of the work achieved by an organization achieving the goals of the organization means that the performance of an organization can be seen from the degree to which the organization can achieve goals based on the goals set previously". The results of work achieved by an agency in carrying out their duties within a certain period, both related to input, output, outcome, benefits, and impact with responsibility can facilitate the direction of structuring government organizations. The existence of the work achieved by the agency with full responsibility will be achieved effective and efficient performance improvement. According to Sinambela in Millar (2017), corporate performance is cumulative employee performance, therefore the higher the employee's performance the higher the organisational performance.

In the context of this work, market share, innovation and efficiency are discussed as the measures of corporate performance.

**Market Share:** Market share refers to the percentage or proportion of total sales or revenue that a company or brand captures within a specific market. It is a measure of a company's competitiveness and its position relative to its competitors in a particular industry or market segment. Market share can be calculated based on various metrics, such as unit sales, revenue, or customer base (King, 2015; Zheng & McLean, 2010).

Market share is an important metric for businesses as it provides insights into their performance and market position. It allows companies to assess their relative strength and weaknesses compared to competitors and helps in making strategic decisions. By analyzing market share, companies can identify growth opportunities, evaluate the effectiveness of their marketing strategies, and understand customer preferences (Agnihotri & Krush, 2015; Sostek, 2016).

Importantly, market share can be measured at different levels, such as global, regional, national, or even at a product category level. It can also be analyzed over different time periods to track changes in market dynamics and competitive landscape (Richard, 2018). Market share is an essential metric for businesses as it provides valuable insights into a company's competitive position within an industry. By comparing their market share with competitors, companies can

assess their relative strength and identify areas where they need improvement (Agnihotri & Krush, 2015). Market share helps in evaluating a company's performance over time. By tracking changes in market share, companies can determine the effectiveness of their strategies and initiatives. A declining market share may indicate a loss of competitiveness, while an increasing market share suggests successful growth strategies. Market share data is crucial for making informed strategic decisions. It helps companies identify growth opportunities, target specific customer segments, allocate resources effectively, and develop competitive pricing and marketing strategies (Zheng & McLean, 2010).

**Innovation:** Innovativeness is the ability to seeking ways for continuous betterment of production setting of an organization (Nofie in Aeba et al., 2020). Innovativeness refers to the ability to generate and implement new ideas, products, processes, or services that bring about significant improvements or advancements. It involves thinking creatively, taking risks, and introducing novel solutions to address existing problems or meet emerging needs. Innovativeness is a key driver of progress and competitiveness in various fields, including business, technology, science, and social development (Twiss, 2015). Here, the total production system such as processes and methods used to transforming tangible inputs (raw materials, semi-finished goods, subassemblies) and intangible inputs (ideas, information, knowledge) into goods or services are improved for the benefits of the organization in line with its predetermined goal and attainment. Here, management ensures that organization's production mechanisms fall in line with the vision, mission and objectives. This is enhanced through the deployment of sophisticated equipment, ideas, knowledge and time (Sanket, 2017).

Pitra (2016) described innovativeness as the art of creating something new, not yet existent, which potentially has the ability to attract a customer's attention. The imperativeness of innovation and developing new solutions that take advantage of data, advanced analytics, digital technologies and new delivery platforms has never been more important. Organizations are innovating in targeting, expanding services, re-configuring delivery channels, delivering proactive advice, integrating payments and applying blockchain technology. Pierre et al (2017) stated five rules of innovation, which are delivering value for the customer, getting processes under control, syncing processes as a system, shortening throughput times and continuous improvement.

It is noteworthy that effectiveness comes before efficiency. This means to start with a focus on creating value for the customer must not be trivialized. Quality is expected to be taking into cognizance as it is conformance to customer requirements. Do not overload processes, equipment or people. Queuing theory gives mathematical proof that, when utilization gets closer to 100 %, chaos grows exponentially. If the key to the first principle is quality, the key to this principle is a deep respect for the organization's resources first and foremost respect for people. Technology is a great means to get processes under control. Digitalization and automation is here to help, but it is expected of management to maintain robust practices. It is a good tips for management to start focusing on the bottleneck processes in the operations.

The third rule is to sync processes. It requires a system perspective. It is expected of management to know that variation is one of the biggest enemies of productivity, thus they should be sought reduced (Hopp & Spearman, 2011). However, management must differentiate between strategic and dysfunctional variation. It is only the dysfunctional variety that should be sought eliminated. The strategic variation gives organizations competitive edge and should be kept or cultivated. Many practical techniques help sync the processes, including assembly lines, standardization, modularization, take time-paced production and just-in-time logistics, to mention a few. For productivity, fast flow is an ideal (Schmenner, 2012). But not on the expense of any of the three first rules! A good way to make throughput times and lead-times shorter is to reduce non-value adding activities in and between all processes, so called waste.

There are two good reasons for seeking continuous improvement (Womack & Jones, 1996). First, because systems never get perfect, there is always room for increasing productivity in your

processes. Second, the external environment is constantly changing. Improvements range from incremental process improvements (exploitation) to more radical technological and organisational innovations (exploration). Building a learning organization, capable of both exploration and exploitation, is the most certain way to sustain and improve productivity over the long run.

More so, Domeher et al (2014) asserted that the ease with which customers can use the innovation, the compatibility of the innovation with customers' needs, the perceived usefulness thereof, the amount of information provided on the innovation and the level of customers' education all have a significant positive impact on the adoption of innovations in a Nigerian organization (Agboola as cited in Ghasem et al., 2016).

**Efficiency:** For an organization to succeed at accomplishing its aims, it must be able to create the right plans needed to accomplish those aims, pull together the resources needed to implement those plans, and then use resources such as cash and labor in the actual implementation of those plans. Organisational efficiency is the organization's ability to implement its plans using the smallest possible expenditure of resources (Sharmin et al., 2016). It is an important factor in the firm's organisational effectiveness, this being the ease and degree of success with which the organization is able to accomplish its aims.

Jayathilake (2018) sees organisational efficiency as the organization's degree of success in using the least possible inputs in order to produce the highest possible outputs. For example, if one business is able to produce 10 units of its products by spending 3 naira per unit, it is more efficient in production than a similar business that produces 10 units of the same product spending 4 naira per unit. Organisational efficiency is gauged using a number of quantitative figures such as production costs and production times because it is too broad of a concept to be encapsulated in a single figure (Lei & Schmit in Avila, 2014). Also, Organisational efficiency is all about figuring out how you can be more effective by using fewer resources, as well as less time and less money to achieve the same goal. Organisational efficiency is time-based, effort-based and measurable. According to Osorio et al. (2012), efficiency is always about the financial costs and the results of doing something. Efficiency is especially important when it comes to measuring the return-on-investment of marketing and sales.

Organisational efficiency describes the degree of organization's ability to fulfill its mission with the smallest costs or resources (Ozoigbo & Chukuezi in Henry et al., 2023). As many organizations are created for a cause, it is better they are created in such a way that it costs less to its creators (or owners, operators, employees etc.) to get to the desired goals. That may require process improvement, but more than anything - finding the right people to do the job. The efficiency is also usually and ultimately measured in monetary terms.

### **Organizational Integrity and Corporate Performance**

Organizational integrity is a fundamental concept in business ethics and organizational behavior. It refers to the consistency, honesty, and ethical soundness of an organization's actions, values, methods, and decisions. Organizational integrity goes beyond mere compliance with laws and regulations. It encompasses the alignment of an organization's stated values with its actual practices. Palanski and Yammarino (2007) define integrity as "the consistency between words and actions." Several components contribute to organizational integrity: a) Ethical leadership: Leaders play a crucial role in setting the tone for integrity. Brown and Treviño (2006) emphasize the importance of ethical leadership in fostering a culture of integrity. b) Transparency: Open and honest communication about organizational decisions and actions. c) Accountability: Willingness to take responsibility for actions and their consequences. d) Consistency: Alignment between stated values and actual behaviors across all levels of the organization. Organizational integrity is critical for several reasons: a) Trust building: It fosters trust among employees, customers, and other stakeholders (Mayer et al., 1995). b) Reputation management: Integrity helps maintain and enhance

organizational reputation (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990). c) Risk mitigation: It reduces the likelihood of ethical breaches and associated legal and reputational risks (Weaver et al., 1999).

Organizational integrity is not just an ethical imperative but also a strategic asset. It contributes to long-term sustainability, stakeholder trust, and overall organizational effectiveness. However, maintaining integrity requires ongoing commitment, vigilance, and adaptation to changing business environments and societal expectations.

Multiple studies have found a positive relationship between organizational integrity and various measures of corporate performance. Guiso et al. (2015) found that firms with high perceived integrity and ethical cultures had higher financial performance and productivity. Their analysis showed these firms had higher Tobin's Q ratios and return on assets. Organizational integrity helps build trust with stakeholders, enhancing reputation and brand value. Roberts and Dowling (2002) demonstrated that firms with strong reputations for integrity were better able to sustain superior financial performance over time. Companies known for integrity tend to have higher employee satisfaction and engagement. Chun et al. (2013) found that organizational integrity was positively related to employee commitment and job satisfaction, which in turn improved organizational performance.

Strong ethical practices can help companies avoid costly scandals and legal issues. Kaptein and Schwartz (2008) showed that effective ethics programs reduced the incidence of unethical behavior in organizations, potentially avoiding reputational damage and legal costs. An ethical culture can foster an environment where employees feel safe to take risks and innovate. Riivari et al. (2012) found a positive relationship between ethical organizational culture and organizational innovativeness. Integrity-driven practices often align with sustainable business models, supporting long-term success. Eccles et al. (2014) demonstrated that companies with strong sustainability practices, which often correlate with high integrity, outperformed their counterparts over the long term.

While these studies suggest a positive relationship between organizational integrity and corporate performance, it's important to note that causality can be difficult to establish definitively. Other factors may also influence both integrity and performance.

## **Theoretical Review**

### **Social Exchange Theory**

The Social Exchange Theory suggests that social behaviour or human relationships are the outcome of the exchange process (Blau in Henry et al., 2022). The purpose of this exchange is to maximize benefits and minimize costs. According to this theory, developed by sociologist George Homans, people weigh the potential benefits and risks of social relationships. When the risks outweigh the rewards, people will terminate or abandon that relationship. Most relationships are made up of a certain amount of give-and-take, but this does not mean that they are always equal. Social exchange suggests that it is the valuing of the benefits and costs of each relationship that determine whether or not we choose to continue a social association. Where an exchange starts with one party giving a benefit to another, if the recipient reciprocates, and consequently a series of beneficial exchanges occurs, feelings of mutual obligation between the parties are created (Coyle-Shapiro & Shore, 2015). The social exchange theory helps to make people understand relationships well; it explains why a few relationships work while others fail why we begin and continue some certain relationship and demonstrates that communication and interaction are components governing interaction in people (Riley, 1993). It says that people base their behaviour on rational calculations designed to make individual profit. In that most people value acceptance, loyalty, financial support, affection and companionship and so we might find it rewarding to be in a relationship with a person who enhances our social status (Riley, 1993).

Social Exchange Theory (SET) provides a valuable framework for understanding organizational integrity and its impact on relationships within and outside an organization. The key assumption of Social Exchange Theory in relation to organizational integrity can be stated as follows:

*"Individuals and organizations engage in relationships based on the expectation of reciprocal benefits, and the perceived integrity of the organization plays a crucial role in shaping these exchange relationships."*

This assumption implies several important points:

1. **Reciprocity:** SET posits that social interactions are based on an exchange of resources, both tangible and intangible. In the context of organizational integrity, this means that stakeholders (employees, customers, partners) offer their trust, loyalty, and effort in exchange for fair treatment, honest dealings, and ethical behavior from the organization.
2. **Trust as a currency:** Blau (1964), one of the pioneers of SET, emphasized trust as a critical element in social exchanges. Organizational integrity builds trust, which facilitates more positive and productive exchanges.
3. **Long-term orientation:** Unlike economic exchanges, social exchanges often lack explicit contracts and are based on the expectation of future reciprocation. Organizational integrity signals a commitment to long-term, mutually beneficial relationships.
4. **Cost-benefit analysis:** Individuals continually assess the costs and benefits of their relationships with organizations. High organizational integrity reduces perceived risks and transaction costs in these relationships (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).
5. **Norm of fairness:** SET assumes that people expect fair treatment in exchanges. Organizational integrity aligns with this expectation, fostering perceptions of organizational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001).
6. **Psychological contracts:** The theory supports the idea of psychological contracts between individuals and organizations. Organizational integrity helps fulfill these unwritten expectations, leading to more positive exchange relationships (Rousseau, 1989).
7. **Reputation effects:** SET recognizes that past behaviors inform future expectations. Consistent demonstrations of organizational integrity build a positive reputation, enhancing the quality of future exchanges (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990).

This assumption of SET in relation to organizational integrity suggests that organizations with high integrity are likely to foster more positive, stable, and beneficial exchange relationships with their stakeholders. These improved relationships can lead to various positive outcomes, including increased employee commitment, customer loyalty, and stakeholder trust.

### **Empirical Review**

*Henry et al. (2022)* conducted a one-year prospective study on organisational virtuousness, well-being, and organisational commitment. A 3-wave prospective study was conducted with a sample of 444 primary and secondary schoolteachers in Hong Kong. Organisational virtuousness, cognitive reappraisal, psychological capital (PsyCap), life satisfaction, flourishing, affective commitment, and contextual performance were assessed. The results showed that cognitive reappraisal and PsyCap served as sequential mediators of the relationships between three components of organisational virtuousness and all four indicators of well-being and organisational commitment. Collective gratitude, kindness, and forgiveness at T1 had significant indirect effects through cognitive reappraisal at T2 and then PsyCap at T3 on satisfaction with life, state of flourishing, emotional attachment to the organization, and engagement in extra-role activities that contribute to the organization's efficacy. The results lead to a discussion of how organizations might shape a grateful, kind, and forgiving work culture using virtue-based management to achieve optimal individual and organisational functioning.

*Aubouin-Bonnaventure et al. (2023)* examined the relationships between virtuous organisational practices, a new psychological integrative construct, and three indicators of workers' hedonic, eudaimonic, and social well-being, namely job satisfaction, thriving at work, and work-life balance, and to test the mediational role of psychological capital in these relationships. The sample comprised 400 French employees working in non-profit, private, and public organizations. Structural equation modelling confirmed the direct effects of virtuous organisational practices on

the three indicators of wellbeing, and a bootstrapping procedure demonstrated that psychological capital partially mediates these relationships. The results of this study have many practical applications because virtuous organisational practices can easily be implemented and optimized in work organizations to develop the individual resources of workers and, in detail, to promote their psychological well-being.

AlHalaseh and Al-Rawadyeh (2020) examined the impact of virtuous leadership on institutional excellence, and the level of virtuous leadership elements as well as the existence of institutional excellence aspects at Mutah University. The study considered Optimism, forgiveness, trust, compassion, and integrity as the virtuous elements that predict organisational excellence as well it considered the dimensions of organisational excellence represented by leadership, partnership and resources, people management, policy and strategy, process management. This study was applied to a sample of 384 faculty members at Mutah University, to illustrate the effect of virtuous leadership on achieving organisational excellence in a higher education institution in Jordan. The importance of the study stems from the fact that few studies dealt with organisational excellence in institutions of higher education with regard to the concept of virtue. The study found that there is a statistically significant impact of the virtuous leadership on institutional excellence in general, and the faculty members at Mutah University perceive that the virtue is trust, compassion, and integrity among university leaders.

*Suparjo et al.* (2020) analyzed the influence of Integrity, Professionalism, and Innovation in order to encourage the achievement of good service performance. This study involved 207 people from 384 employees in seven Kantor Pelayanan Perbendaharaan Negara (KPPN) in the Regional Office of the Directorate General of Treasury, Jakarta Province. The seven KPPNs were chosen because they have the same service user characteristics as other KPPNs and can represent KPPNs throughout Indonesia. Nationally, in terms of the budget managed and the number of work units served, more than half are served by the seven KPPNs. The average amount of the state budget managed by the seven KPPNs is 75.5% of all funds nationally. The technical analysis used is descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, with hypothesis testing tools using Path Analysis. The results of the study show that Integrity has a positive and significant effect on Service Performance, Professionalism has a positive and significant effect on Service Performance, Innovation has a positive and significant effect on Service Performance, Integrity positive and significant effect on Innovation, Professionalism positive and significant effect on Innovation and Integrity. Professionalism, and Innovation together have a positive and significant effect on Service Performance AL-Abrrrow et al. (2019) examined the effect of organisational integrity and leadership behaviour on organisational excellence by considering the mediating role of work engagement in the banking sector. The quantitative (questionnaire survey) design was used to gather data from 285 employees of the banking sector in Southern and Central Iraq. The findings revealed a partial mediation role of work engagement in the relation between organisational integrity and organisational excellence and a full mediation role between leadership behaviour and organisational excellence.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on some of the opinions above it can be concluded that the essence of organizational performance is a picture of the results of the work of collaborative activities among members of the organization to achieve organizational goals that have been determined. Organizational performance is cumulative employee performance, therefore the higher the employee's performance the higher the organizational performance. Meanwhile, organizational performance is also defined as the effectiveness of the organization as a whole to meet the needs set by each group regarding systemic efforts and continuously improve the organization's ability to achieve their needs effectively.

Integrity is consistency and unwavering determination in upholding noble values and beliefs. Another definition of integrity is a concept that points to consistency between actions and values and principles. In ethics, integrity is interpreted as honesty and the truth of one's actions. Integrity

is one of the most important/key attributes that a person must possess. Integrity is a concept related to consistency in the actions, values, methods, measurements, principles, expectations and various things produced.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Deriving from the literatures reviewed in this study, the researcher recommends as follows;

1. In improving organizational performance it is necessary to develop empathy, sportsmanship and virtuousness. Work integrity is developed by taking into account the needs of workers in the company.
2. Company leaders should have a process in place to identify, prioritize and publicly communicate relevant ethics issues to the company, for this will enhance the firm process integrity capacity. This process should be in line with the operational framework of the firm.
3. Company leaders should have process in place to measure and transparently communicate progress in resolving ethics at work ,for this will enhance the firm process integrity capacity.

### REFERENCES

- Abbey, C. (2019). Workplace virtuousness and employee commitment. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour and Management*, 2(1), 67-72.
- Accounting Tools, (2018). *What is sales volume?* <https://www.accountingtools.com/articles/what-is-saks-volume.html>.
- Aeba, B., Gabriel, J. M O., & Lebura, S. (2020). Organizational integrity and performance of fast food companies in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 9(2), 29-39.
- Agnihotri, R. & Krush, M. T. (2015). Salesperson empathy, ethical behaviors, and sales performance: The moderating role of trust in one's manager. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 35(2), 164-174.
- AL-Abrow, H., Abdullah, H. & Atshan, N. (2019). Effect of organisational integrity and leadership behaviour on organisational excellence: Mediator role of work engagement. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 7(7), 1-16.
- AlHalaseh, R. H. & Al-Rawadyeh, W. E. (2020). The impact of virtuous leadership in organizational excellence as perceived by the academic staff at Mutah University. *Mu'tah Lil-Buhuth wad-Dirasat, Humanities and Social Sciences Series*, 35(5), 13-36.
- Asaolu, G. & Nassar, I. E. (2017). *Essential of management accounting and financial management*. Cedar Productions Ltd.
- Aubouin-Bonnaventure, J., Fouquereau, E., Coillot, H., Lahiani, F j. & Chevalier, S. (2023). A new gain spiral at work: relationships between virtuous organizational practices, psychological capital, and well-being of workers. *International Journal of Environmental Resources and Public Health* 2023(20), 1-16 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20031823>
- Avila, L. (2014). Incorporating the innovation process in a product development organization. *Master's Thesis, System Design & Management Programme, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*.

- Bambale, A.J. (2011). Understanding significant relationships between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and marketing function. Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies.
- Bright, D. S. & Fry, R. E. (2013). Introduction: Building ethical, virtuous organizations. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 49(1), 5–12
- Bright, D. S., Winn, B. A., & Kanov, J. (2014). Reconsidering virtue: Differences of perspective in virtue ethics and the positive social sciences. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77(4), 445-460.
- Caldwell, C., Hasan, Z. & Smith, S. (2015). Virtuous leadership-insights for the 21st century. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(9), 1181-1200.
- Cameron, K., Mora, C., Leutscher, T. & Calarco, M. (2011). Effects of positive practices on organizational effectiveness. *Journal Of Applied Behavioral Science*, 47(3), 266-308.
- Cania, L. (2014). The impact of strategic human resource management on organizational performance. *Econo-miaSeria Management journal*, 17(2), 373-383.
- Cherry, K. & Amy, M. (2023). *What is empathy?* <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-is-empathy-2795562>
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. & Shore, L. (2007). The employee-organization relationship: Where do we go from here? *Human Resource Management Review*, 17(2), 166-179.
- Cropanzano, R., Anthony, E. L., Daniels, S. R., & Hall, A. V. (2017). Social exchange theory: A critical review with theoretical remedies. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 479-516
- Daniels, K., Glover, J. & Mellor, N. (2014). An experience sampling study of expressing affect, daily affective well-being, relationship quality, and perceived performance. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 87(4), 781-805
- Demerouti, E. & Cropanzano, R. (2017) The buffering role of sportsmanship on the effects of daily negative events. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(2), 263-274
- Edgeman, R., Hammond, S., Keller, C. & McGraw, J. (2018). Virtuous cycles: Organizational dynamics of innovation and excellence. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 27(1), 1-17
- Ellwood, C. (2020). *Building trust through transparency*. <https://www.themyersbriggs.com/en-US/Connect-with-us/Blog/2020/March/Trust-and-Transparency>
- Escrig-Tena, A. B., Garcia-Juan, B. & Segarra-Cipres. M. (2019). Drivers and internalisation of the EFQM excellence model. *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 36(3), 398-419.
- Gamaliel, B. H., Abdul, R. & Suhart, T. (2019). Effect of knowledge management and integrity on organizational performance through organizational commitment Pt. Bhinneka Mentari

- Dimensi. *East African Schola-s Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 2(10), 607-612.
- Ghasem, S., Masoud, A. & Yazdi, M. T. (2016). The relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and organizational performance (case study: Agricultural Jihad Organization of Mazandaran Province). *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 14(3-4), 317-324
- Grant, A. M. (2013). Rocking the boat but keeping it steady: the role of emotion regulation in employee voice. *Academy of Management Journal*. 56, 1703-1723
- Hackett, R. & Wang, G. (2012). Virtues and leadership: An integrating conceptual framework founded in Aristotelian and Confucian perspectives on virtues. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 868-899.
- Henry C. Y. H., Wai, K. H., -Kai-Tak, P., Angel. N. M. L. & Kwan, J. L. Y. (2023). Being virtuous together: a one-year prospect! \e study on organizational virtuousness, well-being, and organizational commitment. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 18(1), 521-542
- Hopp, W. J. & Spearman, M. L. (2011). *Factory physics*. Waveland Press.
- Hosmer, L. R. T. & Kiewitz, C. (2005). Organisational justice: A behavioral science concept with critical implications for business ethics and stakeholder theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 15(1), 67-91.
- Howard, K. (2017). *Process innovation: characteristics, differences and examples*. <https://innoyatingsociety.com/product-innovation-and-process-innovation-characteristics-differences-and-examples/>
- Hwang, K. & Kim, H. (2016). Are ethical consumers happy? Effects of ethical consumers' motivations based on empathy versus self-orientation on their happiness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3(1), 1-20.
- Imran, R. (2014). Workforce diversity & organizational communication; analysis of human capital and productivity", *Journal of Diversity Management*, 3(1), 57-62.
- Itani, O. S., & Inyang, A. E. (2015). The effects of empathy and listening of salespeople on relationship quality in the retail banking industry. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 33(6), 692-716
- James, L. (2020). Ethical values and employee citizenship behaviour. *Journal of Management Sciences*, 4(2), 89-92
- Jayathilake, H. M. (2018). Product diversification strategies: A review of managerial skills for firm performance. *International Journal of Advancements in Research & Technology*, 3(7), 90-100.
- Johnsen, T., Calvi, R. & Philips, W. (2012). Discontinuous innovation: A challenge for purchasing. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Chain Management*, 2(3), 10-17.

- Jones, J. L., & Shandiz, M. (2015). Service quality expectations: Exploring the importance of SERVQUAL dimensions from different nonprofit constituent groups. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 27(1), 48-69.
- Kimberlee, L. (2018). *What is market share?* <https://anallbusiness.chron.com/market-share-10349.html>.
- Kreitner, K. (2015). *Organizational behavior*. 8th Edition. McGraw-Hill.
- Kuczumski, T. D. (2017). *Managing new products: the power of innovation (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition)*. Prentice Hall.
- Lucey, T. (2016). *Management accounting*. Continuum Publisher.
- Markovic, S, Iglesias, O., Singh, J. J., & Sierra, V. (2015). How does the perceived ethicality of corporate services brands influence loyalty and positive word-of-mouth? Analyzing the roles of empathy, affective commitment, and perceived quality. *Journal of Business Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s10551-015-2985-6.
- Marquis, C. (2019). *Difference between the sales & sales volume*. <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/difference-between-sales-sales-volume-22452.html>
- Mathias, K. (2017). *The complete business process handbook*. Williams publishing.
- Meneses, R. W. & Larkiru M. (2012). Edith Stein and the contemporary psychological study of empathy. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*, 43(2), 151-184
- Metaxas, I. & Koulouriotis, D. (2017). Encouraging the heart: A leader's guide to rewarding and recognizing others. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 27(1), 1-30.
- Meyer, M. (2018). The evolution and challenges of the concept of organizational virtuousness in positive organizational scholarship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153(1), 245-264.
- Morrison, E. W. (2014). Employee voice and silence. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1(2), 73-197.
- Nganga, J. (2015). The impact of organizational culture on performance of educational. *Journal IJBSS net.com*, 3(8), 34-45
- Nielsen, T. M., Bachrach, D. G., Sundstrom, E. & Halfhill, T. R. (2012). Utility of OCB: Organizational citizenship behavior and group performance in a resource allocation framework. *Journal of Management*, 38, 668-694.
- Occupational Safety and Health Council (2016). *Joyful healthy workplace: tips on promoting mental wellbeing at workplace*. <http://www.job111healthyworkplace.hk/en/psy.php>
- Okechukwu, E. U. & Okoronkwo, B. O. (2018). Evaluation of technological environment on organizational performance among selected medium scale enterprise in Enugu State. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*, 7(3), 267-280.

- Osorio, B., Guerras L. & Jose, N. (2012). Four decades of research on product diversification. *Management Decision*, 50(2), 325-344.
- Pan-dey, S. G. & Dutta, A. (2013). Role of knowledge infrastructure capabilities in knowledge management. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(3), 435-453. Doi.Org/10.11087 Jkm-11-2012-0365
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. American Psychological Association
- Philips, M. R. (2016). *Industrial relations*. Prentice Hall. Pitra, Z. (2016). *Innovative strategies*. Grada publishing.
- Ratcliffe, M. (2012). Phenomenology as a form of empaltry. *Inquiry*, 55, 473-495.
- Rego, A., Ribeiro, N. & Cunha, M. P. (2010). Perceptions of organizational virtuousness and happiness as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93(2), 215-235
- Richard, B. (2018). Effectiveness and productivity of team building in organization. *Journal of Management*, 3(1), 18-31.
- Riley, M. (1993). *Special problems of sociological analysis. Sociological Research: A case approach*. Brace & World, Inc.
- Robertson, D. (2010). *The philosophy of cognitive-behavioral therapy: Stoic philosophy as rational and cognitive psychotherapy*. Karnac Books.
- Sangiorgi, D. & Siboni, B. (2017). The disclosure of intellectual capital in Italian universities: What has been done and what should be done. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 18(2), 354-372. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-09-2016-0088>
- Sanket, S. (2017). *Production: Meaning, definition, types and factors*. <http://www.economicdiscussion.net/production/production-meaning-definition-types-and-factors/12398>.
- Schmenner, R. W. (2012). *Getting and staying productive: applying swift, even flow to practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Seery, M. D., Silver, R. C., Holman, E. A., Ence, W. A., & Chu, T. Q. (2008). Expressing thoughts and feelings following a collective trauma: Immediate responses to 9/11 predict negative outcomes in a national sample. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 76(1), 657-667
- Shadi, A., Ra'ed, M., Khaled, B., & Ala'aldin, A. (2018). The role of knowledge management process and intellectual capital as intermediary variables between knowledge management infrastructure and organization performance. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 13(1), 279-309.

- Sharmin, S., Tasnim, I., & Shimul, D. (2016). Measuring customer satisfaction through servqual model: A study on beauty parlors in Chittagong. *European Journal of Business Management*, 8(1), 97-108.
- Sinambela. (2012). *Organizational performance: Theory and practices*. Graha Ilmu
- Sostek, A. (2016). *Studies shows a bit of office talk can boost productivity*. Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.
- Srivastava, G. (2018). *Education and human resources management*. A.P.A. Publishing Corporation
- Stanton, A. L. & Low, C. A. (2012). Expressing emotions in stressful contexts: benefits, moderators, and mechanisms. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(1), 124-128.
- Suparjo., Y. C. & Akbar, M. (2020). The effect of integrity, professionalism, and innovation on service performance. *Journal of Business and Behavioural Entrepreneurship*, 4(1), 26-42.
- Supriadi, K, Guswandi, D. D. & Bongsu, S. (2020). The effect of integrity and compensation on organizational performance through job satisfaction as a variable of mediation in Pt. Puji Bijak Prestasi. *East African Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 3(2), 122-127.
- Tai, C.L., Chang, J., Che-Ming, L., & Yu Hong, C.C. (2012). Alternative models for the relationship among leadership, organizational citizenship behavior, and performance: a study of new product development teams in Taiwan. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 57(1), 511-517
- Tomislav, E., Bach S. & Vuksic, P. (2012). *What is digital communication?*  
<https://www.quora.com/What-is-digital-communication>.
- Twiss, B. (2015). *Managing technology for competitive advantage: Integrating technological and organisational development: From strategy to action*. Trans-Atlantic Publications.
- Umasuthan, H., Park, O. J. & Ryu, J.H. (2017). Influence of empathy on hotel guests' emotional service experience. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 31(6), 618-635.
- Van, V. (2015). Suggestions for studying strategy process: A research note. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(4), 19-35.
- Waseem, B., Ali, N. K., Ahsan, A. & Muhammad, U. (2019). Investigating the effect of employee empathy on service loyalty: The mediating role of trust in and satisfaction with a service employee. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 2(1), 1-26  
file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/InvestigatingtheEffectofEmployeeEmpathyonServiceLoyaltyTheMediatingRoleofTrustinandSatisfactionwithaServiceEmployee.pdf
- Waseem, B., Saira, A. & Salman, Z. (2018). Effect of employee empathy on customer satisfaction and loyalty during employee-customer interactions: the mediating role of customer affective commitment and perceived service quality. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1491780
- Wieseke, J., Geigenmtiller, A., & Kraus, F. (2012). On the role of empathy in customer-employee interactions. *Journal of Service Research*, 15(3), 316-331.

- Wild, K.. (2021). *Integrity in the workplace*. <https://www.wikijob.co.uk/content/features/useful-resources/diversity-in-the-workplace>
- Womack, J. P. & Jones, D. T. (1996). *Lean thinking: Banish waste and create wealth in your corporation*. Free Press.
- Zeilstra, J. (2019). Do different product strategies require different innovative capabilities? An Exploratory Case Study Master's thesis, Entrepreneurship, Strategy and Organization Economics, School of Economics, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, 9-16.
- Zheng R. & McLean, O. (2010). Effects of managing gender of employees in enhancing organizational performance. A case study of Kenya Ports Authority. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(2), 45-49.