MORAL COURAGE

&

COURAGEOUS PRINCPLED-ACTION

Margaret Meacham, MBA, PhD

April 2007

Worline and Quinn (2003) discussed courageous principled actions, which simply were courageous behaviors chosen based on a strong ethically principled standard. Brand (1984) felt that having certain beliefs, in and of itself, was not motivating enough to spur an individual to act on behalf of that belief. Frijda, Manstead, and Bem (2000) posited the inclusion of emotions to beliefs were prime motivators that led to action. Oakley (1992) and Schulman (2002) asserted the emotions of concern, gratitude, compassion, and courage could engage an individual to action. Frijda et al. (2000) indicated that emotions were prime motivators for spurring people toward action. Oakley (1992) and Schulman (2002) stressed that knowing "the right thing to do" would not be acted upon unless there was an emotional response of interest, concern, gratitude, compassion, or courage. Oakley (1992) added that emotional responses played an important role in acting upon value systems. Even other-directed values might not spur a person to action without an accompanying emotional response. The combination of emotional response and self-transcending values created the moral integrity to act.

Thoreau (1993) "defined 'action from principle' as the enactment of what was 'right'" (p. 7). Hence, Worline and Quinn (2003) asserted principled action was drawn from intuition, feeling, and knowledge that was both generalizable, as well as situated within the context of that institution. Courageous principled action was never a part of the accepted routine or status quo. It was often difficult, opposed, and unpopular. Individuals who undertook courageous principled actions were guided by their highest individual sense of moral values. Many scholars (Bell, 2002; Clemens, 1993; Miller, 2000; Worline, Wrzesniewski, & Rafaeli, 2002) supported the idea that individuals were not trapped by institutional culture. Individuals could and did act in accordance with

what they thought was right. Burns (2003) concluded that, "deep and durable change, guided and measured by values, is the ultimate purpose of transforming leadership, and constitutes both its practical impact and its moral justification. And *that* is the power of values" (p. 213).

Courage

Webster (1996) defined courage as "the quality of mind or spirit that enables a person to face difficulty, danger, pain, etc., without fear" (p. 464). Finfgeld (1999) defined courageous behavior as those behaviors resulting in a sense of personal integrity and thriving because these behaviors were characterized by efforts to be productive, make contributions, and help others. Kidder (2005) added there are two types of courage: physical and moral. Physical courage does not require any adherence to principles, values, or working for the good. Physical courage entails risk assessment, acting based upon that risk assessment, and enduring the hardships that are a consequence of the corresponding actions. Physical and moral courage combined allow individuals to act. Miller (2000) concluded "moral courage needs enough physical backing not to be deterred from its moral agenda with laughable ease" (p. 259); therefore, moral courage required determination, girt, and passion, which also required physical courage. Moral courage may be derailed by risk aversion, a mental overdramatization of the real or imagined dangers involved, and/or physical cowardice.

Finfgeld (1999) determined that being courageous was a dynamic process. Finfgeld (1992, 1998, 2000) further noted that developing courage involved a lifelong learning process that began in childhood and continued to develop through adulthood as perceived threats were managed. Finfgeld (1992) believed that strategies learned in early

childhood informed the strategies used later in life. Finfgeld (1999) added that courage lay within a continuum with noncourageous behaviors on one end and courageous behaviors on the other end with coping behaviors nestled in-between. Finfgeld (2000) noted that people acting courageously pushed themselves beyond the normally expected patterns of behavior for the perceived situation. They pushed beyond coping and toward the courageous. Finfgeld (1992, 1998, 2000) stressed that courage was a learned process, which was demonstrated within the context of a struggle. Long-term courageous determination actually resulted in a perpetuation of the struggle. If courage were not exhibited, the struggle would desist (conclude) rather than persist. Finfgeld (1998, 2000) noted the process of developing courage followed a circular path: the perception of threat was responded to with courage, which resulted in a sense of a courageous self. Finfgeld (1999) said, "over time, an intrapsychic awareness of one's courage...helps to sustain the capacity to be courageous" (p. 807). The courageous self that developed from sustained courageous behaviors had a strong sense of personal integrity and a strong sense of thriving rather than surviving.

Finfgeld (1999) established several intrapersonal and interpersonal factors that promoted and maintained courage, which influenced courageous development. Intrapersonal factors included having a purpose or mission in life, using values to promote and maintain courage, using values to help others, and using the perception of threat to clarify value systems. Hope and optimism promoted and maintained courage, which developed self-confidence that supported the ongoing usage of courage. Self-confidence allowed the transformation of threats into manageable challenges that led to decisions that promoted courageous actions. Finfgeld (2000) added that focusing on

feelings of making a positive contribution through the courageous actions promoted and maintained self-confidence and courageous development.

Finfgeld (1999) described the interpersonal factors that promoted and maintained courage, which led to courageous development. Interpersonal factors included observed role models who modeled exemplary behaviors, which included positively facing adversity, courageously acting above and beyond, and focusing on positive contributions for society (other-directed). Gestures of support from respected individuals often helped to sustain courageous behaviors even when psychically fatigued. Expressions of respect, admiration, validation, affirmation, and kindness often buoyed the individual along their path of courageous behavior.

Worline and Quinn (2003) summarized by contending that individuals derived courage from their personal resources, their intrinsic sense of morality, and through the encouragement of others. The individual's ability to reason and act courageously was based on their own internal, intuitive, emotional, and cognitive dimensions relating to their value system.

Moral Courage

Miller (2000) defined moral courage as "the capacity to overcome the fear of shame and humiliation in order to admit one's mistakes, to confess a wrong, to reject evil conformity, to denounce injustice, and also to defy immoral or imprudent orders" (p. 254). Through his research, he concluded that "moral courage is *lonely* courage. It often requires making a stand, calling attention to yourself, or running the risk of being singled out in an unpleasant and painful way" (p. 255). "The obstacles that oppose moral courage --derision, ostracism, loss of status, demotion, loss of job – are not trivial" (p.

258). Kidder (2005) added "...moral courage may be a means whereby one overcomes fear through practical action" (p. 73).

Kidder's (2005) research posited "...courage grew out of an ethical commitment, a kind of inner moral compass calibrated by a set of core values" (p. viii). "Standing up for values is the defining feature of moral courage" (p. 3) since "...values count for little without the willingness to put them into practice" (p. 3). Moral courage is always driven by principle (virtues and/or core values) where physical challenges and mental challenges must be met; "...moral courage ... lifts values from the theoretical to the practical and carries us beyond ethical reasoning into principled action" (p. 3). Mackenzie (1962) concluded moral courage's greatest test comes when individuals take action based on conscience against the status quo and then stand up to the disapproval of others opposed to those actions.

Kidder (1994) researched the universal values that were cross-cultural and determined that eight separate core values kept surfacing, which he believed represented the highest rung on the visionary ladder. The eight core values included: love (compassion, caring, kindness, empathy), truthfulness (integrity, honesty), fairness (justice, social justice, equality), freedom (liberty, individuality, democracy), unity (solidarity, cooperation, oneness), tolerance (acceptance, support, respect), responsibility (self-respect, accountability, rights), and respect for life. Based on priorities expressed, the top six values in 1994 were responsibility, compassion, honesty, respect, fairness, and courage. Through further research, Kidder (2005) compressed the list by priority to responsibility, respect, fairness, honesty, and compassion. Maslow (1970) included 14 spiritual values that he categorized as "being-values," which included truth, justice,

goodness, wholeness, and uniqueness. He asserted these spiritual values were the responsibility of humankind, not just religious institutions.

Ultimately, Kidder (2005) realized that moral courage took place at the intersection of individuals' strongly held principles, their awareness of the danger inherent in the situation, and their ability to endure and persevere through the process of acting upon their moral courage. Ethical dilemmas that required moral courage were rarely transparent enough to be right vs. wrong situations. Kidder (1995) suggested strongly held values and principles were required to manage the typical ethical dilemmas, which fell into four paradigms: truth versus loyalty, individual versus community, short term versus long term, and justice versus mercy. Kidder (2005) stated "...the toughest decisions are not right versus wrong but right versus right. Determining which side has the higher claim to rightness often requires some deep ethical reasoning" (p. 87). Kidder (1995) concluded that justice (fairness, equity, even-handed application of the law) often conflicted with mercy (compassion, empathy, love). Short-term (now, immediate needs) often conflicted with long-term (then, future needs). Individual (us, self, the smaller group) often conflicted with community (them, others, the larger group). Truth (honesty, integrity) often conflicted with commitment, responsibility, and promise-keeping.

Kidder (2005) discussed how the awareness of danger influenced moral courage "where danger is endured for the sake of an overarching commitment to conscience, principles, or core values" (p. 109). A proper assessment of risk is essential to determine accurate outcomes (consequentialist). Moral courage exhibited based on an underassessment of risk results in pointless self-sacrifice and imprudence. Moral courage exhibited based on an overassessment of risk results in perceptions of bravura, bluster,

and rant. Therefore, individuals who accept moral risk are tolerant of ambiguity, exposure, and loss. Maturity and experience (self-regulation) foster the skill sets to read the faint signals, penetrating the obtuse, and getting it right, which manages ambiguity. A willingness to be morally, emotionally, and cognitively open, unprotected, and vulnerable allays fears of exposure. Fear of loss can dampen the urge to act morally. Mortgages, tuition for children, and responsibilities for the elderly are significant obligations; morally courageous actions can endanger these familial obligations. Significantly, professionals risk the loss of their position, financial security, and career opportunities by speaking out.

Finally, Kidder (2005) understood strongly held principles and awareness of danger converged with individuals' abilities to persevere and endure through hardship. Maturity and experience often influenced individuals' abilities to endure such hardship. Trust in knowing and benefiting from doing the right thing, as well as a lifetime of experience learning from succeeding and not succeeding, superseded self-will and blind determination. "A sense of trust is vital to morally courageous decision making" (p. 146) and morally courageous action. Cooper and Sawaf (1997) added, "the warm, solid gut feeling you get from trust – from counting on yourself and in trusting and being trusted by others – is one of the greatest enablers of life" (p. 84). Kidder (2005) concluded confidence in values, competencies, and the ability to apply these attributes to self and others enhanced trustfulness, which supported the ability to endure hardships. Therefore, experience, character, faith, and intuition fostered trust, which led individuals toward exercising morally courageous actions.

Kidder (2005) discussed multiple barriers to moral courage. Inhibitors included dysfunctional cultures, an overriding desire to be liked, timidity, foolhardiness, and a focus on physical courage over moral courage. Other forces suppressing moral courage included the tendency to redefine deviant behaviors as acceptable, misdirected (manipulative) altruism, excessive reflection, bystander apathy, groupthink, and reducing any obligation to help by valuing others differently.

Kidder (2005) noted several effective strategies for using moral courage to manage ethical dilemmas. Most ethical dilemmas were a matter of right-versus-right dilemmas where individuals had to determine the higher right. The most commonly used principles included ends-based principles (consequentialism), rule-based principles (deontology), or care-based principles (compassion and reciprocity). Moral courage often involved one or two values, the elevation of one of these values over another, and a sense of obligation toward supporting or protecting that value, despite the possible consequences. Moral courage was more about deontology (sense of duty, rule-based) than consequentialism (focus on the outcome, ends-based). Conscience was the prevailing factor rather than consequences. "That commitment to core principles remains to this day a defining characteristic of moral courage" (p. 107).

Kidder (2005) asserted organizational culture shaped decision making by supporting the expression or lack of expression of moral courage. Fundamentally ethical cultures fostered integrity, which created trust that led to sound ethical decision-making. Dysfunctional cultures created a need for moral courage while creating barriers to the communication of that very moral courage.

Kidder's (2005) research determined moral courage could be developed through discourse and discussion (self-awareness), modeling and mentoring (positive modeling), and persistence (self-regulation) and practice (authentic action). "From educators to consultants, from writers to researchers, a consensus exists that people of all ages can benefit from instruction in this core value" (p. 230). "Women and men are by now equally adept at expressing (or failing to express) moral courage" (p. 155).

Kidder (2005) surmised that perhaps the linkage that connected principles, awareness of danger, and persistence to moral action was the decision to engage. In situations where two powerful moral arguments exist, "the role of moral courage is not to help us take a stand for right but to help us engage. It is to encourage us to step firmly up to the decision-making process rather than duck responsibility" (p. 251). "Failing to engage...is at times the worst kind of failure of moral courage. It's the sort of passive, do-nothing inertia" that allows evil to triumph over good (p. 252). "The moral courage needed to address these issues is the courage of engagement, the willingness to cut through all the reasons for inaction and step forward with determination" (p. 257). Hence, "...the willingness to take tough stands for right in the face of danger will remain, as it has always been, the pinnacle of ethical action" (p. vii).

Kidder (2005) discussed the six conditions required for morally courageous action, which also defines integrity: honesty, responsibility, respectfulness, fairness, compassion, and courage. Moral courage was the courage to be honest, fair, respectful, responsible, compassionate, and courageous, which was required to have "... a commitment to moral *principles,* an awareness of the *danger* involved in supporting

those principles, and a willing *endurance* of that danger" (p. 7). Therefore, significantly, "moral courage, it seems, begets and replicates itself" (p. 130).

Miller (2000) concluded "standing up for what we think is right is not easy, but it may well get easier if we cultivate the habit of doing so" (p. 65). Kidder (2005) acknowledged morally driven individuals must assess the situation, scan for values, stand for conscience, contemplate the dangers, endure the hardship, avoid the pitfalls, and develop moral courage, which allowed them to question the person, policy, or culture that supported unethical, illegal, or immoral situations.

Kidder (2005) posited morally courageous individuals had five attributes in common: greater confidence in principles than in personalities, high tolerance for ambiguity, exposure, and personal loss, acceptance of deferred gratification and simple rewards, independence of thought, and formidable persistence and determination. Individuals lacking in moral courage may hold the same core values, but act differently to defend these values because of their differing priorities. "It is perfectly possible for individuals to express these five core values vibrantly and profoundly within a small circle of family, friends, and community, while failing to extend them outward to a broader world" (p. 65). They do so because their moral boundaries included only those around them rather than all of humankind. Without sufficient levels of moral courage, courageous principled actions were nonexistent.

Courageous Principled Action

Worline and Quinn (2003) stated that individuals who used courageous principled actions to defy institutional constraints did so based on their high level of moral development and (Bell, 2002; Worline et al., 2002) their emotional and intuitive sense of

what was “right.” Appropriate behaviors based on what was normal and expected were framed for individuals by the institution’s culture. Therefore, Clemens (1993), Giddens (1979), Orlikowski (2000), and Schein (2004) noted that leaders who took courageous principled actions that violated this status quo based their actions on their individual values that competed with institutional values. Worline and Quinn (2003) explained that principled actions always required both courage and principle.

Bateman and Porath (2003) defined transcendent behavior as “self-determined behavior that overrides constraining personal or environmental factors and effects extraordinary (positive) change” and “constructive, high-impact change” (pp. 122-123). Behavior was transcendent when it overcame environmental pressures and personal limitations, thereby creating extraordinary change in the individual or institution. Transcendent behaviors were neither driven by or constrained by internal or external pressures. Unethical, immoral, or illegal behaviors were disqualified as transcendent behaviors.

Bateman and Porath (2003) noted that individuals exhibited transcendent behaviors based on intrinsic motivation and personal goals. Ryan and Deci (2000b) defined intrinsic motivation as “the inherent tendency to seek out novelty and challenges, to extend and exercise one’s capacities, to explore, and to learn” (p. 70), while (Pinder, 1998) involving feelings of enjoyment, interest, challenge, and flow. Bateman and Porath (2003) added that these individuals turned crisis into opportunities, overcame obstacles, accepted challenges others avoided, and created positive outcomes. McGregor and Little (1998) asserted that personal goals were about creating major change or

fulfilling important needs that led to personal growth, greater energy, and positive emotions, which Bateman and Porath (2003) asserted led to transcendent outcomes.

Bateman and Porath (2003) claimed that transcendent behaviors were initially inspired by intrinsic motivation and goals. However, other variables influenced success. Five predictors of successful transcendent behaviors included self-control, self-management, decision-making processes, positive cognitions, and virtues held. Transcendent behaviors were not possible without self-control and self-management. Muraven and Baumeister (2000) asserted self-control focused on long-term interests through control of the self by the self, while constraining inappropriate urges, behaviors, or desires. Karoly (1993) used self-management more broadly to indicate individuals' ability to direct their goals over time and across varying circumstances using processes of self-monitoring, goal-setting, discrepancy analysis, evaluation, and actions that reduced discrepancies between goals and progress. Ryan and Deci (2000a) understood that self-management enhanced human achievement. Colarelli, Dean, and Konstans (1987) added that self-management enhanced strengths and talents, which encouraged personal growth while fostering well-being.

Additional predictors of transcendent behaviors included mastery motivation, positive cognitions and emotions, self-efficacy, virtues held, and strategic planning skills. Winner (2000) posited individuals who were motivated to master their talents, skills, and profession had mastery motivation. Their powerful interest, deep intrinsic motivation to excel, high energy levels, and intense focus strengthened their self-management while promoting extraordinary performance with attendant outcomes. Bateman and Porath (2003) suggested individuals with a strong mastery motivation would enhance personal

growth and transcendent performance, which would probably lead to sustainable outcomes. Positive cognitions and emotions increased persistence toward transcendent outcomes. Carver and Scheier (1985) defined optimism, a positive cognition, as the expectation of favorable outcomes that supported persistence during difficult situations, which promoted transcendent outcomes. Schulman (1999) asserted optimism transformed thinking, assisted with maintaining confidence, and allowed individuals to persist and rebound from difficulties.

Bandura (1982) defined self-efficacy as the personal perception of how well one could take effective actions that managed situations appropriately. Luthans (2002a, 2002b) felt that self-efficacy was the most important psychological mechanism for positivity, which had a major influence on the success of transcendent behaviors. Finally, virtues held also influenced transcendent behaviors.

Bateman and Porath (2003) believed virtues or moral excellences, such as wisdom, empathy, passion, courage, compassion, positive deviance, and resilience enhanced transcendent behaviors. Baltes and Staudinger (2000) defined wisdom as a focus on excellence while attending conjointly to personal and collective well-being, which required a coordinated and balanced interplay of intellectual, affective, and motivational aspects of human functioning. Hoffman (2002) defined empathy as the cognitive awareness of another individual's plight and the vicarious affective response to that plight. Perttula (2004) asserted passion for work was characterized by positive emotions, intrinsic motivation, and a desire for full engagement. Webster (1996) defined courage as the state of mind enabling individuals to face dangers or conflicts without fear. Frost, Dutton, Worline, and Wilson (2000) defined compassion as allowing feelings

to guide behaviors in response to other individuals' distress. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003) defined positive deviance as extraordinary norm-breaking behaviors that promoted well-being. Finally, Sutcliffe and Vogus (2003) defined resilience as "the capacity to rebound from adversity strengthened and more resourceful" (p. 97).

Individuals effective with strategic and tactical decision-making facilitated transcendent behaviors. Langer (1989) asserted mindfulness (considering and creating new possibilities) facilitated the attainment of transcendent goals and outcomes by disengaging from past ways of thinking and behaving. Thoms and Greenberger (1995) included a future time perspective for effective decision-making that required a long-term orientation toward thinking, planning, and behaving. Bateman and Porath (2003) concluded a long-term perspective required self-control, which enhanced transcendent behaviors.

Bateman and Porath (2003) argued that transcendent behaviors resulted in personal growth, expanded personal capabilities, and subjective well-being. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) suggested that subjective well-being allowed individuals to view the past with contentment and satisfaction, experience happiness and flow in the present, and anticipate the future with hope and optimism. Bateman and Porath (2003) concluded that the temporal perspective of past, present, and future benefit, as well as enhanced broader positive outcomes, were what distinguished other motivated behaviors from transcendent behaviors. Bateman and Crant (1993) maintained that proactive behaviors were considered more transcendent than reactive behaviors. Kohlberg (1969) suggested that self-determined decisions, rather than externally controlled decisions that maximized goals with a minimal cost to other goals, indicated transcendent behavior.

Bolino, Turnley, and Bloodgood (2002) believed that transcendent behaviors led to trust, reciprocity, and cooperation while enhancing the individual's reputation, creating social capital, and supporting a positive professional environment. Bandura (2001) indicated transcendent behaviors caused others to adapt to the newly created changes and associated pressures. Bateman and Porath (2003) surmised many individuals did not engage in transcendent behaviors because of the extraordinarily high levels of self-efficacy, wisdom, empathy, passion, courage, compassion, positive deviance, and resiliency required.

Gibbs (2003) noted "prosocial behavior is social action intended to benefit others without anticipation of personal reward, indeed, perhaps at some cost or risk to oneself" (p. 112) and was promoted when high levels of empathy put a "human face" on individuals or groups. Hoffman's theory asserted that empathy alone could goad individuals to prosocial behaviors. However, a sense of reciprocity (equality) could move individuals to take prosocial actions, as could a sense of justice. Ultimately, an empathic-orientation might be more morally beneficial than a justice-orientation.

Gibbs' (2003) research identified three requirements for moral prosocial behaviors. First, individuals must have a mature moral perspective before they would choose to engage in prosocial behaviors. Second, individuals' moral perspective must coincide with a truthful reality (veridicality). Finally, individuals must have a strong sense of persistence to link with their mature and veridical moral perceptions. Only then, would they be motivated toward prosocial behaviors.

Cameron (2003) asserted that positive deviance was a requirement for moving beyond the ordinary toward the truly extraordinary. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003)

defined positive deviance as “intentional behaviors that depart from the norms of a referent group in honorable ways” (p. 209). Norms supported the status quo. The psychological conditions necessary to create a mindset strong enough to defy these norms included meaning, other-focus, self-determination, personal efficacy, and courage. Spreitzer (1995) defined meaning as a sense of deep caring related to what people did and how that mattered in important ways. Without a personal sense of meaning, individuals would not utilize positive deviance. Wrzesniewski (2003) posited individuals lacked a desire to act unless they cared deeply about something. Deci and Ryan (1985) asserted that intrinsic motivation was not influenced by external factors, but it promoted resiliency during difficult times. Ryan and Deci (2000) noted individuals were more apt to initiate new behaviors, seek out challenges, and extend their capacities when intrinsically motivated. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003) concluded that those individuals who had a strong sense of meaning based on intrinsic motivation were more likely to seek to make a proactive difference through their actions.

Warren (2003) identified eight types of positive deviance from the management literature. Tempered radicalism, counterrole behavior, whistle-blowing, principled organizational dissent, exercising voice, prosocial behavior, organizational citizenship behavior, and functional or creative disobedience were all viewed as positive forms of deviance because they deviated from established organizational norms. Tempered radicalism was behavior that challenged the status quo. Counterrole behaviors were actions that opposed prescribed work-role behaviors. Whistle blowing occurred when illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices were disclosed. Principled organizational dissent entailed protests designed to change the organizational status quo. Exercising

voice referred to voicing opinions. Prosocial behavior, as well as organizational citizenship behavior, described behaving outside or beyond required behaviors. Finally, functional or creative disobedience implied disobeying morally questionable orders. The individual behaviors required to overcome social norms required a departure from norms while resisting external social pressures to conform. In most cases of positive deviance, autonomy played a critical role. Individual autonomy or job autonomy often emboldened individuals to action.

Quinn and Quinn (2002) noted that positive deviance required being other-focused. Parker and Axtell (2001) maintained being other-focused required empathizing with others' needs and having the ability of perspective-taking. Brief and Motowidlo (1986) concluded that being other-focused promoted helping behaviors and interpersonal facilitation. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003) reiterated that an other-focus was necessary for the mindset needed to transcend the norms of the referent group.

Deci and Ryan (1985) said self-determined individuals had a sense their behaviors were internally driven from the self, which made them feel autonomous while perceiving they had an internal locus of causality in life. They felt in control of their own destiny so were intrinsically motivated to make greater efforts toward goal attainment. Frese, Garst, and Fay (2000) found that the greater control felt in one's job through a sense of agency, the stronger the predictor of initiative-taking. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003) believed a sense of agency was the underlying concept of self-determination, which facilitated positive deviance. "Agency links thought with action" (p. 215). Bateman and Porath (2003) posited that self-determination promoted transcendent behaviors, prosocial

behaviors, and positive deviance based on intrinsic conscious choices rather than external pressures.

Webster (1996) described courage as the willingness to do what was right even when at risk. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003) asserted that a lack of risk negated any need for courage. Risk could be physical, emotional, psychological, or professional. The potential loss of affection, respect, or profession could only be overcome by tapping into one's own courage. Quinn (1996) said most individuals favored staying within their comfort zone where they were in control and could minimize risks related to loss. Courage was what allowed individuals, even though they were at risk, to push through their fears and engage in positive deviant behaviors. Heckert (1998) and Jones and George (1998) found institutions often punished individuals who practiced positive deviant behaviors. Mathews and Wacker (2002) and Posner (1976) asserted that individuals in support of the status quo often created resistance toward or stigmatized those willing to engage in positive deviant behaviors. Quinn (1996) confirmed this finding when noting how institutions would pressure the individual back toward normative behaviors, even when positive deviant behaviors would affect positive change. Warren (2003) noted that even when institutions opposed such behaviors, outsiders often found these positive deviant behaviors honorable, perceiving that the behaviors adhered to a higher-level norm. Worline et al. (2002) postulated without courage, individuals' intrinsic pressures would not be able to overcome such external pressures. Courage allowed them to break away from the status quo and engage in transcendent, prosocial, and positive deviant behaviors.

May, Chan, Hodges, and Avolio (2003) indicated that when individuals positively adapted to significant adversity, they displayed moral resiliency. Sustaining authentic moral behavior over the long-term, following one's own values and beliefs, even when pressured by significant others internal or external to the institution, modeled moral resiliency to other individuals. "Those who are better able to positively adapt to dealing with adversity or risk arising from taking difficult stances are more likely to sustain authentic moral behaviors over time" (p. 350). Youssef and Luthans (2005) noted the importance of resiliency, which they referred to as being "able to survive, adapt, swiftly bounce back, and flourish despite uncertainty, change, adversity, or even failure..." (pp. 303-304). Luthans (2002a, 2002b) stressed the significance of the power of a positive orientation and approach, such as being resilient. Luthans and Avolio (2003) included resilience as an attribute of the self-awareness dimension. Youssef and Luthans (2005) viewed individual resiliency as being open to change, dynamic, and open to development. Hence, resiliency could be developed further through self-awareness.

Masten and Reed (2002) identified three strategies for resiliency development: risk-focused strategies, asset-focused strategies, and process-focused strategies. Risk-focused involved analyzing, understanding, and avoiding risks and stressors that had a high probability of negative outcomes. Asset-focused involved analyzing and utilizing effective adaptive processes that had a high probability of positive outcomes. Finally, process-focused required the mobilization of the self's adaptive processes.

Youssef and Luthans (2005) noted that high levels of resiliency served to buffer and enrich individuals' lives, which increased the probability of feeling a sense of fulfillment and success in life. Resiliency was a life-long journey that developed

competence in the face of adversity. Individual antecedents that contributed to development included assets, risk factors, and values. Assets referred to personal characteristics, temperament, self-regulation, emotional stability, backgrounds, insights, perceptual biases, educational levels, strengths, and vulnerabilities the individuals acquired over a lifetime. Risk factors included alcoholism, drug use, poor health, undereducation, unemployment, underemployment, exposure to traumatic events or violence, stress, burnout, and personal traumatic experiences. The higher the assets and the lower the risk factors, the more resilience developed. Finally, values and beliefs provided a powerful source of meaning in life. Values used to interpret meaning from negative events promoted the development of higher levels of resilience. The stronger the values, the more stable their source of meaning to the individual, and the more innately these values were embedded into the individual's framework, the higher the levels of resiliency developed.

Bandura (1997, 2000, 2001) noted self-efficacy as a mediator to resiliency's antecedents of assets, risk factors, and values. Self-efficacy was the intrinsic assurance an individual had that they were willing, able, and dedicated to acting upon challenging endeavors and persevering through any challenges that might arise. Gist and Mitchell (1992) defined efficacy as the self's estimate of its capacity to perform various tasks. Bandura (1997, 2000, 2001) added that self-efficacy was developed through mastering experiences, vicariously learning, through social persuasion, and through psychological and physiological arousal. Youssef and Luthans (2005) posited self-efficacy mediated assets, risk factors, and values by predicting higher success rates, higher levels of social capital attainment, greater probability of access to relevant mentors, and greater levels of

social persuasion developed by the individual. Finally, "stable values and a sense of meaning and purpose are likely to increase leaders' acceptance of challenges, effort to achieve goals, and persistence when faced with obstacles, i.e., their self efficacy" (p. 320). Krueger and Dickson (1993, 1994) asserted less self-efficacious individuals focused on avoiding risks while more self-efficacious individuals focused on opportunities that furthered their purpose or mission. Youssef and Luthans (2005) noted self-efficacy had the greatest direct impact on the development of resiliency; therefore, an important impact on the development of authenticity.

Glazer and Glazer (1999) noted that those who courageously behaved against the status quo of unethical, illegal, or irresponsible organizational power had "displayed impressive strength and resilience in caring for others and in their willingness to put themselves at risk" (p. 279). They often had to overcome multiple fears based on the organization's intimidation efforts. Organizations often attempted to extract a heavy price from those willing and able to challenge the status quo. Those who behaved courageously within the context of these fears and intimidations did so because of their determination, based on their faith in the justice of their cause, to persist no matter what the obstacles. Without their willingness to endure based on their beliefs, they would not have maintained or sustained courageous behaviors. Their decisions complied with their value system even in the face of resistance from their superiors. They would not deny their beliefs to follow the status quo, or say they were following orders and therefore were not responsible for their decisions or consequences. Their intrinsic value system acted as a counterforce to the external pressures of silence, conformity, collusion, collaboration, and cohesion. "They believed that the costs of inaction were even higher"

than the costs of action (p. 290). Organizational retaliation often included intimidation, reprisal, and termination. "These kinds of retaliation are not trivial. To withstand them requires the fortitude to stay the course no matter how severe the organizational reaction" (p. 291). Kidder (2005) added, "acts of moral courage carry with them risks of humiliation, ridicule, and contempt, not to mention unemployment and loss of social standing" (p. 10).

Kolditz and Brazil (2005) analyzed how individuals managed dangerous or high-risk (*in extremis*) situations and found those with high degrees of resilience, hope, and optimism were able to powerfully influence the outcomes of *in extremis* situations. Police officers and military personnel were not the only individuals involved in dangerous or high-risk situations. Professionals stressed from organizational intimidation while courageously resisting unethical, immoral, or illegal activities often feared for their position, career, livelihood, mental health, physical health, and spiritual well-being. Danger and high-risk could threaten the physical, mental, or spiritual dimensions of the individual. For those involved with long-term, dangerous, high-risk, and life-altering conflicts, courageous resistance would be required to survive the exhausting situation.

Shepela, Cook, Horlitz, Leal, Luciano, Lutfy, et al. (1999) studied courageous resistance, which connoted high-risk courageous principled behaviors sustained over time, requiring much courage and resilience. Courageous resistance was defined as courage continued over time based on conscious, deliberative, voluntary, selfless, and sustained behaviors that entailed significant risk to individuals or their families and associates. Courageous resistance was a form of altruism because it was sustained and deliberative. It differed from heroic behaviors (risky bystander intervention), where

individuals exhibited courageous behavior spontaneously while limited to the current situational needs. "The cost of courageous resistance can be so high that most moral stances do not require of us that we take that risk. One can decide not to take the route of courageous resistance and still feel morally justified" (p. 789). Glazer and Glazer (1999) posited that courageous resistance could be applied to whistle-blowing, (Shepela et al., 1999) risky public demonstrations (civil rights), dissidents, constructive patriots, or environmental crusaders. Multi-faceted retaliations from organizations often resulted in professional dismissal, blacklisting, severe financial setbacks, severe impact to family and friends, and personal dislocation.

Shepela et al. (1999) noted that predictors of this extremer sustained version of transcendent, prosocial, and positive deviant behaviors included the usual: focus was other-directed, based on transcendent values or principles, self-efficacy, courage, and resilience. The most significant additional predictor was found to be the individual's strongly held belief of *heightened* inclusiveness. Others might have chosen to be inclusive, but these individuals had heightened levels of the belief in inclusiveness and a heightened sense of its value. Inclusiveness encompassed "the willingness to see all people as similar to themselves and the tendency to befriend others on the basis of their shared personal qualities" (p. 792). Other predictors included "a greater *comprehension* of the need for their help, their willingness to act despite perceived risk, and their access to supportive informal networks" (p. 792). Individuals who chose to act upon their courage, knowing this would be a sustained, dramatic, and unenviable struggle, had a strong "internal locus of control, greater attachments to people and a greater sense of responsibility for them, and a heightened empathy for the pain and helplessness of

others" (p. 792). They also had "a sense of self as linked to others through a shared humanity which requires mutual aid in time of danger and stress" (p. 793). Ultimately, empathy, attachment, and identification were required for courageous resistance. Fogelman (1994) declared that no single catalyst created the desire to resist courageously. A confluence of personal and situational variables converged simultaneously creating the transforming experience of courageous resistance. Shepela et al. (1999) noted that courageous resistance was counter-intuitive behavior, which meant only the extraordinary individual in an extraordinary situation would choose to sustain this level of courage over time. To choose to come to the aid of others while over-riding the powerful need for self-protection was courageous indeed.

Summary

Courageous principled actions required both courage and principle (moral courage). Those who used courageous principled actions did so in stressful situations rife with unethical, immoral, or illegal behaviors, policies, or persons. They took such actions at great risk and cost to themselves and their careers while affecting their colleagues, families, and friends.

References

Baltes, P. B., & Staudinger, U. M. (2000). Wisdom: A metaheuristic (pragmatic) to orchestrate mind and virtue toward excellence. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 122-136.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*(2), 122-147.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2000). Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (pp. 120-136). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 1-26.

Bateman, T., & Crant, M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*(2), 103-118.

Bateman, T. S., & Porath, C. (2003). Transcendent behavior. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 122-137). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Bell, D. (2002). *Ethical ambition: Living a life of meaning and worth*. New York: Bloomsbury USA.

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

Brand, M. (1984). *Intending and acting: Towards a naturalized action theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brief, A. P., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1986). Prosocial organizational behaviors. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(4), 710-725.

Burns, J. M. (2003). *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Cameron, K. S. (2003). Organizational virtuousness and performance. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 48-67). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1985). Aspects of self, and the control of behavior. In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.), *The self and the social life* (pp. 146-174). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Clemens, E. S. (1993). Organizational repertoires and institutional change: Women's groups and the transformation of U. S. Politics, 1890-1920. *American Journal of Sociology, 98*(4), 755-798.

Colarelli, S. M., Dean, R. A., & Konstans, C. (1987). Comparative effects of personal and situational influences on job outcomes of new professionals. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(4), 558-566.

Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). *Executive EQ: Emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations*. New York: Grosset/Putnam.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

Finfgeld, D. L. (1992). Courage in the chronically ill elderly: A grounded theory study. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53*(04), 1783B. (AAT 9225575).

Finfgeld, D. L. (1998). Courage in middle-aged adults with long-term health concerns. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research, 30*(1), 153-169.

Finfgeld, D. L. (1999). Courage as a process of pushing beyond the struggle. *Qualitative Health Research, 9*(6), 803-814.

Finfgeld, D. L. (2000). Courage in young adults with long-term health concerns. In J. F. Miller (Ed.), *Coping with chronic illness: Overcoming powerlessness* (pp. 145-164). Philadelphia: F. A. Davis.

Fogelman, E. (1994). *Conscience and courage: Rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust*. New York: Anchor.

Frese, M., Garst, H., & Fay, D. (2000). Control and complexity in work and the development of personal initiative: A four wave longitudinal study of occupational socialization: Working Paper, University of Giessen, Germany.

Frijda, N. H., Manstead, A. S. R., & Bem, S. (2000). *Emotions and beliefs: How feelings influence thoughts*. Cambridge, UK: University Press.

Frost, P., Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., & Wilson, A. (2000). Narratives of compassion in organizations. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotions in organizations* (pp. 25-45). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Gibbs, J. C. (2003). *Moral development and reality: Beyond the theories of Kohlberg and Hoffman*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Giddens, A. (1979). *Central problems in social theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gist, M. E., & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Academy of Management Review, 17*(2), 183-211.

Glazer, M. P., & Glazer, P. M. (1999). On the trail of courageous behavior. *Sociological Inquiry, 69*(2), 276-295.

Heckert, D. M. (1998). Positive deviance: A classificatory model. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 26*(1), 23-30.

Hoffman, M. L. (2002). *Empathy and moral development: Implications for caring and justice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, A. L. (1998). Random acts of kindness: A teaching tool for positive deviance. *Teaching Sociology, 26*(3), 179-189.

Karoly, P. (1993). Mechanisms of self-regulation: A systems view. *Annual Review of Psychology, 44*, 23-52.

Kidder, R. M. (1994). *Shared values for a troubled world: Conversations with men and women of conscience* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kidder, R. M. (1995). *How good people make tough choices* (1st ed.). New York: Morrow.

Kidder, R. M. (2005). *Moral courage* (1st ed.). New York: W. Morrow.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-380). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kolditz, T. A., & Brazil, D. M. (2005). Authentic leadership in *in extremis* settings: A concept for extraordinary leaders in exceptional situations. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice:*

Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management (Vol. 3, pp. 345-356). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.

Krueger, N., & Dickson, P. (1993). Self-efficacy and perceptions of opportunities and threats. *Psychological Reports, 72*(3, Pt. 2), 1235-1240.

Krueger, N., & Dickson, P. (1994). How believing in ourselves increases risk-taking: Perceived self-efficacy and opportunity recognition. *Decision Sciences, 25*(3), 385-400.

Langer, E. J. (1989). *Mindfulness*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Luthans, F. (2002a). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(6), 695-706.

Luthans, F. (2002b). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive, 16*(1), 57-72.

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive developmental approach. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 241-261). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Mackenzie, C. (1962). *On moral courage*. London: The Quality Book Club.

Maslow, A. (1970). *Religions, values, and peak-experiences.* New York: Penguin.

Masten, A. S., & Reed, M. J. (2002). Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 74-88). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Matthews, R., & Wacker, W. (2002). *The deviant's advantage*. New York: Crown Business.

May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 32*(3), 247-260.

McGregor, I., & Little, B. (1998). Personal projects, happiness, and meaning: On doing well and being yourself. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 74*(2), 494-512.

Miller, W. I. (2000). *The mystery of courage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Muraven, M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). Self-regulation and depletion of limited resources: Does self-control resemble a muscle? *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(2), 247-259.

Oakley, J. (1992). *Morality and the emotions*. London: Routledge.

Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organizational Science, 11*(4), 404-428.

Parker, S. K., & Axtell, C. M. (2001). Seeing another viewpoint: Antecedents and outcomes of employee perspective taking. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 1085-1100.

Perttula, K. H. (2004). The POW factor: Understanding and igniting passion for one's work. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 65*(07), 2676A. (AAT 3140536).

Pinder, C. (1998). *Work motivation in organizational behavior*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Posner, J. (1976). The stigma of excellence: On being just right. *Socialogical Inquiry, 46*(2), 141-144.

Quinn, R. E. (1996). *Deep change: Discovering the leader within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Quinn, R. E., & Quinn, G. T. (2002). *Letters to Garrett: Stories of change, power, and possibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000a). On happiness and human potential: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 141-166.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000b). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schulman, M. (2002). The passion to know: A developmental perspective. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 313-326). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schulman, P. (1999). Applying learned optimism to increase sales productivity. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management, 19*(1), 31-37.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-14.

Shepela, S. T., Cook, J., Horlitz, E., Leal, R., Luciano, S., Lutfy, E., et al. (1999). Courageous resistance - a special case of altruism. *Theory & Psychology, 9*(6), 787-805.

Spreitzer, G. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1142-1465.

Spreitzer, G., & Sonenshein, S. (2003). Positive deviance and extraordinary organizing. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 207-224). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Sutcliffe, K., & Vogus, T. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 94-110). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Thoms, P., & Greenberger, D. B. (1995). Training business leaders to create positive organizational visions of the future: Is it successful? *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*, 212-216.

Thoreau, H. D. (1993). Civil disobedience. In H. D. Thoreau (Ed.), *Civil disobedience and other essays* (pp. 1-18). New York: Dover.

Warren, D. (2003). Constructive and destructive deviance in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 28*(4), 622-632.

Webster. (1996). *Webster's new universal unabridged dictionary* (Revised and updated ed.). New York, NY: Barnes & Noble Books.

Winner, E. (2000). The origins and ends of giftedness. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 159-169.

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

Worline, M. C., Wrzesniewski, A., & Rafaeli, A. (2002). Courage and work: Breaking routine to improve performance. In R. G. Lord, R. Klimoski & R. Kanfer (Eds.),

Emotions in the workplace: Understanding the structure and role of emotions in organizational behavior (pp. 295-330). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wrzesniewski, A. (2003). Finding positive meaning in work. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 296-308). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2005). Resiliency development of organizations, leaders and employees: Multi-level theory building for sustained performance. In J. W. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. Walumbwa (Eds.), *Authentic leadership theory and practice: Origins, effects and development; monographs in leadership and management* (Vol. 3, pp. 303-343). San Diego, CA: Elsevier.