



**AALBORG UNIVERSITY**  
DENMARK

**Aalborg Universitet**

## **The Relationship between Caring for Employees and the Well-being of the Organisation**

Poškienė, Eglė; Coudounaris, Dafnis N.; Kazlauskaitė, Rūta

*Published in:*  
Management of Organizations: Systematic Research

*DOI (link to publication from Publisher):*  
[10.1515/mosr-2020-0012](https://doi.org/10.1515/mosr-2020-0012)

*Publication date:*  
2020

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Poškienė, E., Coudounaris, D. N., & Kazlauskaitė, R. (2020). The Relationship between Caring for Employees and the Well-being of the Organisation. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 84, 45-60.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/mosr-2020-0012>

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

# The Relationship between Caring for Employees and the Well-being of the Organisation

The aim of this paper is to better understand the meaning of caring for employees at the organisational level as well as to disclose its relationship with the well-being of the organisation. It explores literature on caring for employees at the organisational level by integrating two research streams – the relational and morality perspectives. Building on the findings of this literature review, a number of propositions are proposed that associate the well-being of the organisation with many antecedent factors, i.e., strategic caring, perceived organisational support, disinterested organisational support, organisational caring, caring culture, caring climate and caring leadership. This paper contributes to the literature on the well-being of the organisational members at the level of the organisation.

**Keywords:** organisational caring for employees, relational and morality perspectives, employee well-being, well-being of organisation, human welfare.

Šio straipsnio tikslas yra geriau suprasti rūpinimosi darbuotojais esmę organizaciniu lygmeniu, taip pat atskleisti jo ryšį su organizacijos gerove. Literatūra apie rūpinimąsi darbuotojais organizaciniu lygmeniu nagrinėjama integruojant du tyrimų srautus – santykių ir moralės perspektyvas. Remiantis šios literatūros apžvalgos išvadomis, siūloma keletas organizacijos gerovės sąsajų su daugeliu jos antecedentų, t. y. strateginiu rūpinimusi, suvokiama organizacijos parama, nesuinteresuota organizacijos parama, organizacijos rūpinimusi, rūpinimosi kultūra, rūpinimosi klimatu ir rūpestinga lyderyste. Šis straipsnis prisideda prie literatūros apie organizacijos narių gerovę organizacijos lygmeniu.

**Raktiniai žodžiai:** organizacijos rūpinimasis darbuotojais, santykių ir moralės perspektyvos, darbuotojų gerovė, organizacijos gerovė, žmogaus gerovė.

## Introduction

This study develops the scientific discourse on caring for employees in management by drawing on the concept of caring in different domains of management and

other disciplines, such as ethics, feminist theory, positive psychology, etc. In this paper our interest lies in personal caring, which is not associated with particular professions (Smylie, Murphy, Louis, 2016) and refers to interpersonal or individual,

---

Eglė POŠKIENĖ – PhD student at ISM University of Management and Economics. Address: Arklių str. 18, LT 01305, Lithuania. Phone: +370 612290150. E-mail: [egleposk@gmail.com](mailto:egleposk@gmail.com)

Dafnis N. COUDOUNARIS – PhD in Industrial Marketing from Lulea University of Technology, Sweden; assoc. prof. of Innovation Management at School of Economics and Business Administration of the University of Tartu, Estonia. E-mail: [dafnis.coudounaris@ut.ee](mailto:dafnis.coudounaris@ut.ee)

Rūta KAZLAUSKAITĖ – Professor of Human Resource Management at ISM University of Management and Economics, Lithuania. Address: Arklių str. 18, LT 01305, Lithuania. E-mail: [rutkaz@ism.lt](mailto:rutkaz@ism.lt)

mostly face-to-face encounters where one person cares for another (Noddings, 2002). Being fully aware that caring is not an easy mainstream topic (Adler, Hansen, 2012) and caring as a construct is difficult to distinguish from numerous care-related conceptualisations, in this paper we “dare to” (Adler, Hansen, 2012; Delios, 2010) look into organisational caring for employees and provide suggestions for future research. Thus, **the research object** is organisational caring for employees, i.e., caring exerted by the organisation or its representatives to its internal stakeholders.

What has particularly encouraged us to study caring is that it, as a concern for others, refers to the well-being of the cared-for in its very definition (Fine, 2006). In the organisation caring relates to activities of the organisation or its representatives aimed at fostering employee well-being. Thus, to study caring means to study employee well-being, the importance of which in organisations has been long recognised. More recently growing attention has been given to caring as a phenomenon and a concept in business, social policy and research (Delios, 2010; Gabriel, 2015; Rynes et al., 2012; Setter, Zsolnai, 2019; Sewell, Barker, 2006). Caring, sharing and acting in the interest of others are moral values in most societies (Grant, 2014; Setter, Zsolnai, 2019); however, the concern for human welfare is still more of a rhetoric than reality in many organisations (Delios, 2010; George, 2014; Simpson, Clegg, Freeder, 2013; Smylie et al., 2016). Thus it is necessary to build organisations that “dare to care” by fostering mutual love and helping, a sense of community where caring is inspired by a deep understanding

of human conditions and vulnerability, and rooted in the DNA of the organisation (Bouckaert, 2019; Delios, 2010; Héjj, 2019). The current context of the global pandemic has made it even more critical. Studying caring for employees also contributes to the humanistic management research, which is growing in importance (Adler, Hansen, 2012; Pirson, 2019; Tsui, 2013). All of this stimulates the analysis of caring in management and drawing implications for research on the institutionalisation of caring for employees.

Research still lacks a common understanding of the character, definition and meaning of caring (Carmeli, Jones, Binyamin, 2016; Fine, 2007; Weber, 2014). Furthermore, caring has been primarily studied in the context of education (Louis, Murphy, Smylie, 2016; Van der Vyver, Van der Westhuizen, Meyer, 2014) and in caregiving institutions serving their clients via personal relationships between caregivers and care-seekers (Kahn, 1993), such as hospitals, social organisations or nursing homes, which can be regarded as extreme cases of caring environments (e.g. Kahn, 1993; Martela, 2012). As regards management literature, it abounds with *care-related* concepts and constructs that bring forward the idea of caring for employees but do not use the very notion of caring, like for instance, perceived organisational support (Rhoades, Eisenberger, 2002). Such care-related constructs have been vastly studied, while the research of caring constructs that use the term of caring explicitly, is still scarce, with a few exceptions of quantitative studies, such as J. D. Houghton et al. (2015) and A. Carmeli et al. (2016).

Research on caring in organisational science is also largely focused on caring

as an aspect of interpersonal relationships (Smylie et al., 2016; Weber, 2014), while a macro perspective to caring on the organisational level is missing. The literature on caring also suggests a necessity to go beyond caring in family and professional caring on the individual level, and to build caring organisations (Bear, 2019; Engster, 2004; Fuqua, Newman, 2002; Smylie et al., 2016; Tronto, 2010). In this paper, we focus on organisational level, since it is organisational processes, culture and environment that make organisational members behave in caring or uncaring ways. Thus, **the aim of this paper** is to better understand the meaning of caring for employees at the organisational level as well as to disclose its relationship with the well-being of the organisation. **The objectives of this paper** are defined as follows: 1. to explore the origins and evolution of research on the construct of caring; 2. to analyse concepts and approaches to caring in management; 3. to reveal how organisational caring for employees fosters the well-being of organisational members.

To achieve the aim and objectives of this paper, **the methods** of overview, analysis, and synthesis of scientific literature are applied.

### **The evolution of the construct of caring**

This section presents the evolution of caring as a separate area of management research. Caring for human beings is not a new phenomenon. It takes its roots in philosophy (Aristotle, Plato and Stoics) and spiritual traditions (Curzer, 2007; Held, 2006; Kovacs, 2019; Rynes et al., 2012). The construct of caring has deep research

traditions in certain vocations and professional norms, ethics, identities and competences dominating in them, which is referred to as a professional caring (Smylie et al., 2016). Research of caring in management on the individual level takes its roots from the professional caring in human-service occupations, such as health-care (Swanson, 1991; Watson, 2008), social services (Kahn, 1993; Martela, 2012), ministry (Smylie et al., 2016), and education (Noddings, 2005), where caring is anchored in human problems and responses to them, and is largely oriented towards external organisational stakeholders, i.e. clients, patients and students. Therefore research on caring in organisational science is largely focused on caring as an aspect of interpersonal relationships (Smylie et al., 2016; Weber, 2014). Some authors have integrated the construct of caring from these research areas into management research (Martela, 2012; Weber, 2014).

The majority of attempts to conceptualise organisational caring for management research (e.g. Kahn, 1993; Kroth, Keeler, 2009; Noddings, 1984) do it at the individual level. Along with the importance of professional caring, as an integral part of services provided for clients, the relevance of caring for employees, as service providers, has been emphasised in work relationship literature too. It has been recognised that client service is highly dependent on how employees who take care of clients are taken care of themselves (Chuang, Liao, 2010; Kahn, 1993; Liedtka, 1996). Research on caring in the organisational setting has emerged in positive organisational scholarship together with studies on compassion (Dutton, Workman, Hardin, 2014). The understanding of caring is extended

from personal attitudes and behaviours towards caring as a value and a practice (Held, 2006; Tronto, 2010) and a cognitive decision (Kawamura, 2013, p. 116): “Humans and their organisations have always made choices to care (or not) and where to place their care”. Qualities and attitudes of a caring personality are seen as values not only between persons but also between members of caring societies (Held, 2006; Kawamura, 2013); thus, caring has been lifted to the organisational level.

To summarise, research on caring in organisational science rests on the individual level, which comes from professional caring.

### **The demarcation of the area of caring for employees in management**

This section presents concepts and approaches to caring in management research. The words “care” and “caring” in management literature are used at different levels in reference to caring within and outside the organisation: *institutional*, when talking for instance about care for environment or particular social groups of people (Engster, 2004; Starik, Rands, 1995; Tronto, 2010), *organisational*, which refers to the caring of organisations about different stakeholders including employees (Liedtka, 1996; Weber, 2014), and *personal* caring, which looks at caring at the group level (Houghton et al., 2015) or individual (Carmeli et al., 2016; Kahn, 1993; Kroth, Keeler, 2009): between co-workers, managers and employees, etc. Besides, different concepts are used in different level studies, as well as actors who are involved in caring.

To date the terms of “caring” or “care” are often used *implicitly* across different strands of management and organisational behaviour research. For instance, positive organisational scholarship (Luthans, Youssef, 2007), sustainability and corporate social responsibility research refer to caring as a phenomenon in an implicit sense (indirectly) without defining caring as a concept. Sometimes caring, as a term, is referred to not as a construct but as a *phenomenon* (e.g. Delios, 2010). Literature that analyses caring differs in its approach to caring even when it uses the notions of “care” or “caring” *explicitly*. For someone, it is a *philosophy of care* (Simpson et al., 2013), *strategic caring* (Weber, 2014), *care as practice* (Tronto, 2010) and *value* (Held, 2006), *caring climate* (Victor, Cullen, 1988) or *caring managerial strategy* (Kroth, Keeler, 2009).

Moreover, the vast body of management research refers to caring through *care-related constructs* that refer to caring *implicitly* when the term “caring” is not mentioned. Conceptualisations using care-related constructs have made a significant contribution to our understanding of caring and its impact in the work environment on the individual and organisational levels. Those are *compassion* (Dutton et al., 2014), several types of leadership, such as *servant*, *spiritual*, and *ethical leadership* (Yukl, 2013), social exchange-based conceptualisations, such as *perceived organisational support* (Rhoades, Eisenberger, 2002). It is noteworthy that although often used synonymously caring is distinct conceptually from compassion (Fuqua, Newman, 2002; Grant, Dutton, Rosso, 2008; Lawrence, Maitlis, 2012; Weber, 2014), since caring towards another person does not necessarily mean

that the other person is in pain, and caring, unlike compassion, is not necessarily induced by one's suffering.

Caring is difficult to distinguish from numerous care-related conceptualisations; however, different approaches to caring share several commonalities: (a) caring is particularistic and situational, which means it is specifically appropriate in addressing the immediate needs of employees (Engster, 2004, 2011; Fine, 2006; Louis et al., 2016; Smylie et al., 2016); (b) caring has distinctive features, such as authenticity, orientation to and interest in another person, responsiveness to others' needs (Carmeli et al., 2016; Kroth, Keeler, 2009; Louis et al., 2016; Tronto, 2010); (c) caring is mutual, and those who are caring for others can become cared for in another situation, which assumes agency for all parties (Kahn, 1993; Liedtka, 1996; Louis et al., 2016; Luthans, Youssef, 2007; Smylie et al., 2016; Von Krogh, 1998); (d) intentions to do good for others underly the actions of caring (Finkenauer, Meeus, 2000; Hamington, Sander-Staudt, 2011; Held, 2006; Lawrence, Maitlis, 2012; Weber, 2014).

The latter two features of caring deserve more attention as they provide a basis for building our propositions for future research. Since caring is used in reference to activities concerning the well-being of the cared for, in an organisation it may refer to its activities aimed at fostering employee well-being. It is not only belonging to an organisation, team or social network, but caring for particular individuals that fosters well-being of employees in the organisation who are mutually dependent on other internal organisational members for their well-being (Tronto, 2010). People in caring relations

seek to preserve or promote a relation between themselves and particular others; thus, as a result caring between individuals generates the cooperative well-being of the organisation. It follows that this study focuses on employee well-being on both the individual and organisational levels. The well-being of the organisation constitutes the well-being of those in the relation and the well-being of the relation itself, in which extremes and conflict situations (egoism versus altruism, selfishness versus abstract humanity) may be avoided (Held, 2006). Overall, well-being research, as well as research on caring, has been primarily performed at the individual level of analysis (George, 2014). Therefore, at this point, this paper contributes to the knowledge of the well-being of the organisation.

Researchers of caring differ in their understanding of individual well-being. For instance, the ethics of care approach is primarily concerned about the "growth" (Gilligan, 1982) of a person, i.e. "moving [the cared for] toward the use and development of their full capacities, within the context of their self-defined needs and aspirations" (Liedtka, 1996, p. 185). Van der Vyver et al. (2014) regard caring as directed at the well-being of an employee as a human being *per se*.

To summarise, prior research is lacking the definition and operationalisation of caring as a construct. Besides caring can inflict further caring: networks of caring constitute an environment where people share their knowledge and learn about caring from experiencing it, and the totality of caring that person experience in an organisation leads to a spread of caring and its positive outcomes.

## Relational perspective to organisational caring

In this section, caring is studied from the relational perspective. Approaches or theories of caring in management put forward relationships among individuals, i.e. treat caring as relational. Research on caring acknowledges the relevance of relationships and interconnectedness as an indispensable part of humans (Fotaki, Prasad, 2015; Grant, 2007) by putting forward employees as humans, not merely a resource or human capital (Héjj, 2019; Kawamura, 2013). Multiple dimensions of relationships (Ferris et al., 2009) pertain to caring, such as trust, support, affect, respect, accountability, etc. As emotions are embedded in relationships, caring is also a largely emotional construct in the majority of caring theorizing (e.g. Bell, Richard, 2000; Kahn, 1993). Care is by and large associated with many positive emotions, such as sympathy, empathy, sensitivity, responsiveness (Held, 2006). Clearly, not all relationships are caring (Faldetta, 2016). For instance, positive organisational scholarship embeds caring in high quality relationships (Cameron, Dutton, Quin, 2003). Transactions like economic leader-member exchange are hardly associated with caring. Caring is a quality, or a property of relationships (Smylie et al., 2016), and values of caring are especially articulated in caring relations, rather than in persons as individuals (Held, 2006).

Research on caring stresses responsiveness and mutuality in a caring relationship, which refers not only to the responsiveness of the caregiver but the cared-for too (Finkenauer, Meeus, 2000; Held, 2006; Kroth, Keeler, 2009; Martela,

2012; Noddings, 2005). For those who provide care it is necessary to evaluate its appropriateness, i.e., see if caring is appreciated as such and recognised by the cared-for (Noddings, 2005). Recipients of care sustain caring relationships through their responsiveness (Held, 2006). The ethics of care (e.g. Held, 2006) puts relations of caring and mutual responsiveness at both the intrapersonal and wider social levels. The personal attitude to show concern for another person becomes an organisational-level value of caring (Held, 2006).

According to an ethics of the care theorist N. Noddings (1984, 2002), caring provides conditions to grow in relationships and to sustain them. Rooting ethical caring in maternal relations (so-called “natural caring”) allows approaching it as a continuous source of receptivity, relatedness, and responsiveness for people (Noddings, 1984). As the ethics of care infuses caring into a continuous relationship, from the positive organisational scholarship point of view caring is also found in discrete interactions that emerge on certain occasions (Stephens, Heaphy, Dutton, 2012). Positive organisational scholarship tends to view caring as a micro-relational mechanism (Carmeli et al., 2016; Stephens et al., 2012). In this strand of literature being respected and cared for in a relationship means being regarded positively (Stephens et al., 2012; Wiegand, Geller, 2005).

## Morality perspective to organisational caring

The morality perspective to caring embraces ethics and morale-based views

to caring. Its core conceptual framework of caring is known as the ethics of care (Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1984). The ethics of care refers to the notions of care and caring explicitly and argues for a system of morality that places particular and situational needs of individuals ahead of abstract and universal judgments of right or wrong and ideal virtues since general rules and policies violate particular and variable needs of individuals (Engster, 2004; Simola, Barling, Turner, 2010; Tronto, 2010).

Caring is a disposition and attitude of attending to others that is motivated by morality. As an „active virtue“ caring needs to be enacted not only naturally but also based on a moral commitment (“I must”) (Held, 2006). N. Noddings (2002, p. 13) proposes consciousness in caring relations like “what we are like” when we engage in caring. Caring from the morality perspective for some is consistent with an altruistic orientation (Gabriel, 2015), or responsibility and benevolence (Fuqua, Newman, 2002). An important distinction made in the ethics of care is that caring is not the same as benevolence or altruism. Benevolence is an individual state and caring is a social relation, which is more than an individual state (Held, 2006). Caring involves concern not only for others but also for oneself and one’s own well-being within the relations of care (Engster, 2004; Held, 2006) when persons in a caring relation are not competitors for benefits; thus, caring may not be equalled to altruism either (Held, 2006).

Caring about employees is also implied in with the underlying ethics of “doing good” in corporate social responsibility as well as in sustainability initiatives that integrate social justice,

environmental, economic, and human factors to achieve the triple bottom line (De Bakker, Groenewegen, Den Hond, 2005). This research, like the ethics of care, also views caring from an ethics lens; however, it refers to caring implicitly. From a holistic view of corporate sustainability (Starik, Kanashiro, 2013; Van Marrewijk, 2003), each individual and organisation have universal responsibility towards all other human and non-human beings for resource regeneration and renewal. Social sustainability, also referred to as social responsibility or human sustainability (Pfeffer, 2010), is one of the key dimensions of corporate sustainability and embraces organisational obligations to its social stakeholders in respect to its economic, social and environmental performance (De Bakker et al., 2005). Sustainability research also emphasises the relevance of meeting human needs and taking care of the social welfare of both internal (including employees) and external social stakeholders of the organisation seeking for long-term quality of life (Starik, Rands, 1995).

Caring, like the notion of corporate sustainability (Pfeffer, 2010), is a representation of internal values and beliefs, such as protection, respect, acceptance, empathy, preservation, restoration, recognition, altruism, to name just a few, as opposed to external values such as an obsession with the continued attainment of material wealth and excess consumption (Florea, Cheung, Herndon, 2013; Held, 2006; Starik, Kanashiro, 2013). The primary motives of corporate social responsibility are based on maintaining ethical standards and moral principles (Aguilera et al., 2007), which refer to the common understanding of corporate social responsibility as corporate actions targeted at



furthering some social good, beyond and above the self (mostly economic) interests and mandatory (mostly legal) requirements (Aguinis, Glavas, 2012).

To summarise, the conceptual frameworks related to the morality perspective, bring into play the interests and needs of other organisational stakeholders beyond shareholders, employees among them. The morality perspective emphasises particular organisational and individual values and attitudes that guide personal and caring work behaviours. Respectively organisational caring, being relational and mutual, becomes a responsibility, a natural duty and an obligation enacted by affection and regard. It addresses genuineness and volunteering and is not prescribed in one's job description.

### **Antecedents of organisational well-being: propositions**

The literature reviewed above suggests that relational and moral perspectives should be combined and viewed as constituent parts of organisational caring. Organisational responsibility is a moral element that manifests through responsible actions; however, it cannot be attained without the relationality of caring, which is embedded in relationships between individuals (Poškienė, Kazlauskaitė, 2015; Van Marrewijk, 2003). Thus, future studies should approach caring for employees from a combination of relational and morality perspectives.

In this section, first, we review caring and care-related constructs offered in management literature on these perspectives. Further on, propositions on

the relationships between these constructs and organisational well-being are suggested.

Caring for employees at the organisational level has been studied through strategic caring (Weber, 2014), perceived organisational support (Rhoades, Eisenberger, 2002), organisational care (Liedtka, 1999), caring climate (Victor, Cullen, 1988), caring organisational culture (Galanaki, Papagianakis, 2015), and caring leadership (Gabriel, 2015; Smylie et al., 2016) that are presented below.

T. Weber (2014) offered a construct of *strategic caring*, defined as actions taken by top managers within the context of ongoing stakeholder relationships to improve the joint well-being of both the stakeholders and the organisation. It implies that top management of the organisation that is guided by strategic caring will exert caring behaviors towards its employees, shareholders, suppliers, customers, communities, other stakeholders, and itself. According to T. Weber (2014), many manifestations of strategic caring are similar to corporate social responsibility. Though the definition of strategic caring is broader than the focus of this paper, which is caring for employees, it is proposed that:

*Proposition 1:* Strategic caring is positively related to the well-being of the organization.

*Perceived organisational support* (Rhoades, Eisenberger, 2002) is a widely researched construct and the organisational level placeholder among care-related constructs. It is defined as an employee's global belief about the extent to which the organisation they work for values

their contribution and cares about their well-being (Rhoades, Eisenberger, 2002). M. Kroth and C. Keeler (2009) however argue that an organisation might value an employee's contribution without caring for an employee at all. In agreement with them and providing some critique to perceived organisational support in regards to its excessive emphasis on the norm of reciprocity, which always embraces interest from the giving party, K. Mignonac and N. Richebé (2013) have offered the notion of *disinterested organisational support*. They argue that based on the norm of disinterestedness (i.e. acting beyond and above self-interests and legal requirements), disinterested organisational support could contribute to a better understanding of how employees subjectively evaluate organisational investment that are beneficial to them. Hence, it can be proposed that:

*Proposition 2:* The perceived organisational support and disinterested organisational support are positively related to the well-being of the organisation.

In line with the ethics of care perspective, J. M. Liedtka (1999) has proposed the term of *organisational care*, which is an organisation-focused phenomenon reflecting perceptions regarding a broad provision of care by the organisation to all its employees (McAllister, Bigley, 2002). It differs from perceived organisational support, which is an individual-centred phenomenon representing the perceived individualised receipt of support by an employee from the organisation (McAllister, Bigley, 2002). The essence of organisational care lies in the "deep structure" of values and organising principles

that over time and across situations bring coherence to organisational routines and practices (Liedtka, 1999). Thus, it is proposed that:

*Proposition 3:* Organisational care is positively related to the well-being of the organisation.

In a *caring organisational culture* high degree of being in communion, belongingness and meaningfulness is cultivated: executives and leaders develop and maintain trust among the members of the organisation, share responsibility, build strong and open relationships with team members, listen to their feedback, and encourage voices of all organisational members (Engster, 2004; Kawamura, 2013; Smylie et al., 2016). Caring cultures are people-centred and are based on collectivism and humane orientation under which 1) all people are important; 2) people shape the culture; 3) people working together perform at higher levels; and 4) all people should benefit (Black, Venture, 2017; Galanaki, Papagiannakis, 2015). The value of caring needs to be encapsulated in management culture over time (Florea et al., 2013; Liedtka, 1999) and is likely to be reflected through beliefs and managerial practices that create and support caring culture. Therefore, it can be proposed that:

*Proposition 4:* Caring organisational culture is positively related to the well-being of the organisation.

Another organisational environment-based notion close to caring culture is that of *caring climate*. The employee-oriented, or caring climate, as a facet of

organisational climate, or a specific type of climate, is conceptualized differently in literature. From the perspective of the *Ethical Climate Theory* (Victor, Cullen, 1988) organisational caring climate refers to a few of its theoretical types: *friendship* (*benevolence* – individual) and *team interest* (*benevolence* – local) (Galanaki, Papagiannakis, 2015; Simha, Cullen, 2012) that are best illustrated by sample items of their measures „Our major concern is always what is best for the other person“, “What is best for everyone in the company is the major consideration here“ (Victor, Cullen, 1988; Wang, Hsieh, 2012). Thus, it is proposed that:

*Proposition 5:* Caring climate is positively related to the well-being of the organisation.

Leadership is however central in research on the caring environment in organisations, since caring leaders cultivate caring environments (Smylie et al., 2016). *Caring leadership* is mostly researched in education management (Louis et al., 2016; Van der Vyver et al., 2014) and may be defined as influencing followers through the caring matter, manner, and motivation of leader actions and interactions that goes beyond the call of duty in dispatching a leader’s responsibilities (Gabriel, 2015; Hasu, Lehtonen, 2014; Smylie et al., 2016). From a leadership perspective, managers’ caring is well articulated in *ethical leadership*, which according to G. A. Yukl (2013), includes transforming, servant, spiritual and authentic leadership. Although different these schools of leadership have much in common. They emphasize the same values, such as integrity, altruism, humility, empathy and healing, personal growth,

fairness and justice, and empowerment (Yukl, 2013). Their comparison demonstrates that the broad domain of ethical leadership includes a moral element, is highly people-focused and stimulates intrinsic motivation of followers. Hence, it can be proposed that:

*Proposition 6:* Caring leadership is positively related to the well-being of the organisation.

## Conclusions

Our review has revealed that being context-specific, caring is particularistic and situational, thus specifically appropriate in addressing the immediate needs of employees. This also means that caring may pertain to different things in diverse settings: workplace, education, consulting or professional care work. It is therefore necessary to support the existing theoretical considerations with future empirical investigations of the caring concept in different research contexts. While research on caring in management is in a nascent stage, inductive empirical research would be valuable to provide answers on how caring for employees manifests in various organisational contexts, profit-oriented business environments in particular, where empirical research on caring is still lacking. This literature review is not an exhaustive study of caring for employees. It has included those studies that allowed to gain a better understanding of organisational caring for employees at the organisational level. Additionally, it takes a multidisciplinary view by reviewing literature from several disciplines. Looking beyond management disciplines, the study argues

that caring has firmly established its place in the research of human-service professions, such as nursing, and education research. Further research on caring in management requires a multidisciplinary approach combining psychology, education, organisational behaviour, leadership and fields of management research, where research on caring is more mature.

This review also showed that relational and morality approaches to organisational caring for employees should be applied in combination. Connections in social networks, interaction and sharing are primary motives for caring for organisational members. Therefore, caring is best articulated within research frameworks, the ethics of care among them, that embrace both the relationality and morality of caring. However, to date, the relationship-based literature and research on morality in the form of pro-social behaviours have been largely evolving as separate directions in management and organisational behaviour research. One of the contributions of this study is the combination of two research streams, i.e. the relational and morality perspectives, which helps to better understand organisational caring for employees.

This study has also demonstrated the variety of terms and concepts used in organisational sciences in regards to studying caring at the organisational level, or organisational activities concerning employee well-being, such as strategic caring, perceived organisational support, disinterested organisational support,

organisational caring, caring culture, caring climate and caring leadership. Their variety allows proposing to view caring as a phenomenon and umbrella term for the concepts, notions and constructs that explicitly or implicitly refer to caring for employee well-being. When studying caring for employees, it is suggested to choose between caring and other care-related constructs, including those analysed in this review, to best serve the aims of the study.

Since the domain of caring in management is still lacking clear boundaries, further research is needed to investigate whether the existing care-related constructs cover the relational and morality dimensions of the phenomenon of caring in the field of management at the organisational level. Empirical research on the nomothetic network of caring and care-related constructs is needed to understand whether the distinct construct of “caring” is needed, or it would be excessive in the existing diversity of care-related constructs.

This paper also contributes to the knowledge on well-being of the organisation by suggesting an array of its antecedents as constructs appropriate for the study of caring at the organisational level. Future research could also study other antecedents of employee and organisational well-being and may test empirically the relationships proposed in this study as well as their mechanisms; therefore, mediators and boundary conditions of the proposed relationships need to be explored.

## References

1. Adler, N. J., Hansen, H. (2012). Daring to Care: Scholarship that Supports the Courage of our Convictions // *Journal of Management Inquiry*. Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 28–139. doi: 10.1177/1056492611427801
2. Aguilera, R. V., Rupp, D. E., Williams, C. A., Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S Back in Corporate Social Responsibility: A Multilevel Theory of Social Change in Organizations // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 836–863. doi: 10.5465/amr.2007.25275678
3. Aguinis, H., Glavas, A. (2012). What we Know and don't Know about Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review and Research Agenda // *Journal of Management*. Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 932–968. doi: 10.1177/0149206311436079
4. Bear, J. B. (2019). The Caregiving Ambition Framework // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 99–125. doi: 10.5465/amr.2016.0424
5. Bell, D. C., Richard, A. J. (2000). The Search for a Caregiving Motivation // *Psychological Inquiry*. Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 124–128. doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1102\_03
6. Black, J., Venture, K. L. (2017). The Human Factor to Profitability: People-Centered Cultures as Meaningful Organizations // *Journal of Organizational Psychology*. Vol. 17, No. 2, 24–34. Internet access: [http://www.na-businesspress.com/JOP/BlackJ\\_Web17\\_2\\_.pdf](http://www.na-businesspress.com/JOP/BlackJ_Web17_2_.pdf) [accessed August 16, 2019].
7. Bouckaert, L. (2019). Caring for Being and Caring for the Other / In *Caring Management in the New Economy: Socially Responsible Behaviour Through Spirituality*, ed. O. Setter and L. Zsolnai. – Cham, Switzerland: Springer, pp. 47–61.
8. Cameron, K., Dutton, J., Quin, R. E. (2003). *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
9. Carmeli, A., Jones, C. D., Binyamin, G. (2016). The Power of Caring and Generativity in Building Strategic Adaptability // *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. Vol. 89, No. 1, pp. 46–72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12106>
10. Chuang, C. H., Liao, H. (2010). *Strategic Human Resource Management in Service Context: Taking Care of Business by Taking Care of Employees and Customers // Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 63, No. 1, pp. 153–196. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01165.x
11. Curzer, H. J. (2007). Aristotle: Founder of the Ethics of Care // *The Journal of Value Inquiry*. Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 221–243. doi: 10.1007/s10790-007-9088-2
12. De Bakker, F. G., Groenewegen, P., Den Hond, F. (2005). A Bibliometric Analysis of 30 Years of Research and Theory on Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Social Performance // *Business & Society*. Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 283–317. doi: 10.1177/0007650305278086
13. Delios, A. (2010). How can Organizations be Competitive but Dare to Care? // *Academy of Management Perspectives*. Vol. 24, No. 3, pp. 25–36. doi:10.5465/AMP.2010.52842949
14. Dutton, J. E., Workman, K. M., Hardin, A. E. (2014). Compassion at Work // *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 277–304. doi:10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091221
15. Engster, D. (2004). Care Ethics and Natural Law Theory: Toward an Institutional Political Theory of Caring // *The Journal of Politics*. Vol. 66, No. 1, pp. 113–135. doi:10.1046/j.1468-2508.2004.00144.x
16. Engster, D. (2011). Care Ethics and Stakeholder Theory / In *Applying Care Ethics to Business*, ed. M. Hamington and M. Sander-Staudt. – Dordrecht: Springer. Vol. 34, pp. 93–110. doi:10.1007/978-90-481-9307-3\_5
17. Faldetta, G. (2016). Organizational Caring and Organizational Justice: Some Implications for the Employment Relationship // *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 64–80. doi: 10.1108/IJOA-07-2013-0697
18. Ferris, G. R., Liden, R. C., Munyon, T. P., Summers, J. K., Basik, K. J., Buckley, M. R. (2009). Relationships at Work: Toward a Multidimensional Conceptualization of Dyadic Work Relationships // *Journal of Management*. Vol. 35, No. 6, pp. 1379–1403. doi: 10.1177/0149206309344741
19. Fine, M. D. (2006). *A caring Society? Care and the Dilemmas of Human Service in the twenty-First Century*. – Palgrave Macmillan.

20. Fine, M. D. (2007). The Social Division of Care // *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. Vol. 42, No. 2, pp. 137–149. doi: 10.1002/j.1839-4655.2007.tb00045.x
21. Finkenauer, C., Meeus, W. (2000). How (Pro-) Social is the Caring Motive? // *Psychological Inquiry*. Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 100–103. Internet access: [www.jstor.org/stable/1449023](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1449023) [accessed September 8, 2019].
22. Florea, L., Cheung, Y. H., Herndon, N. C. (2013). For all Good Reasons: Role of Values in Organizational Sustainability // *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 114, No. 3, pp. 393–408. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1355-x
23. Fotaki, M., Prasad, A. (2015). Questioning neoliberal capitalism and economic inequality in business schools // *Academy of Management Learning & Education*. Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 556–575. doi: 10.5465/amle.2014.0182
24. Fuqua, D. R., Newman, J. L. (2002). Creating Caring Organizations // *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*. Vol. 54, No. 2, pp. 131–140. doi: 10.1037/1061-4087.54.2.131
25. Gabriel, Y. (2015). The Caring Leader - What Followers Expect of their Leaders and Why? // *Leadership*. Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 316–334. doi: 10.1177/1742715014532482
26. Galanaki, E., Papagiannakis, N. (2015). Effects of the Discrepancy between Ideal and Actual Caring Culture on Employee Commitment and Satisfaction. - Paper presented at the 2015 *European Academy of Management Conference*, Warsaw, June 17–20.
27. George, J. M. (2014). Compassion and Capitalism: Implications for Organizational Studies // *Journal of Management*. Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 5–15. doi: 10.1177/0149206313490028
28. Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. - Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
29. Grant, A. M. (2007). Relational Job Design and the Motivation to Make a Prosocial Difference // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 393–417. doi: 10.5465/amr.2007.24351328
30. Grant, A. M. (2014). *Give and Take: Why Helping Others Drives our Success*. - Penguin.
31. Grant, A. M., Dutton, J. E., Rosso, B. D. (2008). Giving Commitment: Employee Support Programs and The Prosocial Sensemaking Process // *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 51, No. 5, pp. 898–918. doi: 10.5465/amj.2008.34789652
32. Hamington, M., Sander-Staudt, M. (2011). Introduction: Care Ethics and Business Ethics / In *Applying Care Ethics to Business*, ed. M. Hamington and M. Sander-Staudt. - Dordrecht: Springer, Vol. 34, pp. vii–xxii.
33. Hasu, M., Lehtonen, M. (2014). Leadership with Care—Constructing Responsibility as ‘Shared Caring’ in a Complex Public Service Organisation // *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*. Vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 9–28. Internet access: <http://ub016045.ub.gu.se/ojs/index.php/sjpa/article/view/3052/2608> [accessed December 11, 2015].
34. Héjj, T. (2019). Dignity, Love and Servant-Leadership / In *Caring Management in the New Economy: Socially Responsible Behaviour Through Spirituality*, ed. O. Setter and L. Zsolnai. - Cham, Switzerland: Springer, pp. 139–162.
35. Held, V. (2006). *The Ethics of Care: Personal, Political, and Global*. - NY: Oxford University Press. Internet access: <https://e-docs.eplo.int/phocadownloadpap/userupload/aportinou-eplo.int/The-Ethics-of-Care-Personal-Political-and-Global-by-Virginia-Held.pdf> [accessed August 29, 2019].
36. Houghton, J. D., Pearce, C. L., Manz, C. C., Courtright, S., Stewart, G. L. (2015). Sharing is Caring: Toward a Model of Proactive Caring through Shared Leadership // *Human Resource Management Review*. Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 313–327. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2014.12.001
37. Kahn, W. A. (1993). Caring for the Caregivers: Patterns of Organizational Caregiving // *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 539–563. doi: 10.2307/2393336
38. Kawamura, K. M. (2013). Understanding the Concept of Care in Cross-Cultural Settings: Toward a Resource Definition of Care in Work Organizations // *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*. Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 100–123. doi: 10.1108/13527601311313373
39. Kovacs, G. (2019). The Caring Attitude of Christian and Buddhist Entrepreneurs / In *Caring Management in the New Economy: Socially Responsible Behaviour Through Spirituality*, ed. O. Setter and L. Zsolnai. - Cham, Switzerland: Springer, pp. 81–196.
40. Kroth, M., Keeler, C. (2009). Caring as a Managerial Strategy // *Human Resource Development Review*. Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 506–531. doi: 10.1177/1534484309341558

41. Lawrence, T. B., Maitlis, S. (2012). Care and Possibility: Enacting an Ethic of Care through Narrative Practice // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 641–663. doi: 10.5465/amr.2010.0466
42. Liedtka, J. M. (1996). Feminist Morality and Competitive Reality: A Role for an Ethic of Care? // *Business Ethics Quarterly*. Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 179–200. doi: 10.2307/3857622
43. Liedtka, J. M. (1999). Linking Competitive Advantage with Communities of Practice // *Journal of Management Inquiry*. Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 5–16. doi: 10.1177/105649269981002
44. Louis, K. S., Murphy, J., Smylie, M. (2016). Caring Leadership in Schools: Findings from Exploratory Analyses // *Educational Administration Quarterly*. Vol. 52, No. 2, pp. 310–348. doi: 10.1177/0013161X15627678
45. Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M. (2007). Emerging Positive Organizational Behavior // *Journal of Management*. Vol. 33, No.3, pp. 321–349. doi: 10.1177/0149206307300814
46. Martela, F. (2012). Caring Connections-Compassionate Mutuality in the Organizational Life of a Nursing Home. – PhD diss., Aalto University, Espoo.
47. McAllister, D. J., Bigley, G. A. (2002). Work Context and the Definition of Self: How Organizational Care Influences Organization-Based Self-Esteem // *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 45, No. 5, pp. 894–904. doi: 10.5465/3069320
48. Mignonac, K., Richebé, N. (2013). ‘No Strings Attached?’: How Attribution of Disinterested Support Affects Employee Retention // *Human Resource Management Journal*. Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 72–90. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-8583.2012.00195.x
49. Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring, a Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. – Berkeley: University of California Press.
50. Noddings, N. (2002). *Starting at Home. Caring and Social Policy*. – Berkeley: University of California Press.
51. Noddings, N. (2005). *The Challenge to Care in Schools: An Alternative Approach to Education*. – New York: Teachers College Press.
52. Pfeffer, J. (2010). Building Sustainable Organizations: The Human Factor // *Academy of Management Perspectives*. Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 34–45. doi: 10.5465/amp.24.1.34
53. Pirson, M. (2019). A Humanistic Perspective for Management Theory: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being // *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 159, No. 1, pp. 39–57. doi: 10.1007/s10551-017-3755-4
54. Poškienė, E., Kazlauskaitė, R. (2015). Translating Sustainability Principles into HRM. – Paper presented at the 2015 *European Academy of Management Conference*, Warsaw, June 17–20.
55. Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature // *Journal of Applied Psychology*. Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 698–714. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698
56. Rynes, S. L., Bartunek, J. M., Dutton, J. E., Margolis, J. D. (2012). Care and Compassion through an Organizational Lens: Opening up New Possibilities // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 503–523. doi: 10.5465/amr.2012.0124
57. Setter, O., Zsolnai, L. (2019). The Significance of Care in the Dark Times/ In *Caring Management in the New Economy: Socially Responsible Behaviour Through Spirituality*, ed. O. Setter and L. Zsolnai. – Cham, Switzerland: Springer, pp. 293–298.
58. Sewell, G., Barker, J. R. (2006). Coercion versus Care: Using Irony to Make Sense of Organizational Surveillance // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 934–961. doi: 10.5465/amr.2006.22527466
59. Simha, A., Cullen, J. B. (2012). Ethical Climates and their Effects on Organizational Outcomes: Implications from the Past and Prophecies for the Future // *Academy of Management Perspectives*. Vol. 26, No. 4, pp. 20–34. doi: 10.5465/amp.2011.0156
60. Simola, S. K., Barling, J., Turner, N. (2010). Transformational Leadership and Leader Moral Orientation: Contrasting an Ethic of Justice and an Ethic of Care // *The Leadership Quarterly*. Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 179–188. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.10.013
61. Simpson, A. V., Clegg, S. R., Freeder, D. (2013). Compassion, Power and Organization // *Journal of Political Power*. Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 385–404. doi: 10.1080/2158379x.2013.846558
62. Smylie, M. A., Murphy, J., Louis, K. S. (2016). Caring School Leadership: A Multidisciplinary, Cross-Occupational Model // *American Journal of Education*. Vol. 123, No. 1, pp. 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1086/688166>

63. Starik, M., Kanashiro, P. (2013). Toward a Theory of Sustainability Management: Uncovering and Integrating the Nearly Obvious // *Organization & Environment*. Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 7–30. doi: 10.1177/1086026612474958
64. Starik, M., Rands, G. P. (1995). Weaving an Integrated Web: Multilevel and Multisystem Perspectives of Ecologically Sustainable Organizations // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 908–935. doi: 10.5465/amr.1995.9512280025
65. Stephens, J. P., Heaphy, E., Dutton, J. E. (2012). High Quality Connections / In *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship*, ed. K. S. Cameron and G. M. Spreitzer. – New York, US: Oxford University Press, pp. 385–399.
66. Swanson, K. M. (1991). Empirical Development of a Middle Range Theory of Caring // *Nursing Research*. Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 161–166. Internet access: [http://nursing.unc.edu/files/2012/11/ccm3\\_032548.pdf](http://nursing.unc.edu/files/2012/11/ccm3_032548.pdf) [accessed January 1, 2016].
67. Tronto, J. C. (2010). Creating Caring Institutions: Politics, Plurality, and Purpose // *Ethics and Social Welfare*. Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 158–171. doi: 10.1080/17496535.2010.484259
68. Tsui, A. S. (2013). 2012 Presidential Address—On Compassion in Scholarship: Why Should We Care? // *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 167–180. doi: 10.5465/amr.2012.0408
69. Van der Vyver, C. P., Van der Westhuizen, P. C., Meyer, L. (2014). Caring School Leadership: A South African Study // *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*. Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 61–74. doi: 10.1177/1741143213499257
70. Van Marrewijk, M. (2003). Concepts and Definitions of CSR and Corporate Sustainability: Between Agency and Communion // *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 44, No. 2, pp. 95–105. doi: 10.1023/A:1023331212247
71. Victor, B., Cullen, J. B. (1988). The Organizational Bases of Ethical Work Climates // *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 101–125. doi: 10.2307/2392857
72. Von Krogh, G. (1998). Care in Knowledge Creation // *California Management Review*, Vol. 40, No. 3, pp. 133–153. doi:10.2307/41165947
73. Wang, Y., Hsieh, H. (2012). Toward a Better Understanding of the Link between Ethical Climate and Job Satisfaction: A Multilevel Analysis // *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 105, No. 4, pp. 535–545. doi: 10.1007/s10551-011-0984-9
74. Watson, J. (2008). *Nursing: The Philosophy and Science of Caring*. Revised edition. – Boulder, Colorado: University Press of Colorado.
75. Weber, T. (2014). *The Antecedents and Effects of Strategic Caring: A Cross-National Empirical Study*. – PhD diss., Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia.
76. Wiegand, D. M., Geller, E. S. (2005). Connecting Positive Psychology and Organizational Behavior Management // *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*. Vol. 24, No. 1–2, pp. 3–25. doi: 10.1300/j075v24n01\_02
77. Yukl, G. A. (2013). *Ethical, Servant, Spiritual and Authentic Leadership / Leadership in Organisations*. 8th ed. G. A. Yukl. – New York: Pearson Education, pp. 340–359.

The paper submitted: May 14, 2020

Prepared for publication: December 10, 2020

Eglė POŠKIENĖ, Dafnis N. COUDOUNARIS, Rūta KAZLAUSKAITĖ

## RYŠYS TARP ORGANIZACIJOS RŪPINIMOSI DARBUOTOJ AIS IR JOS GEROVĖS

### S a n t r a u k a

Šios literatūros apžvalgos tikslas – geriau suprasti rūpinimosi darbuotojais esmę organizaciniu lygmeniu, taip pat atskleisti jo ryšį su organizacijos gerove. Šiame darbe tyrimo objektas yra asmeninis rūpinimasis, nesiejamas su tam tikromis profesijomis (Smylie, Murphy, Louis, 2016). Jis

remiasi individualiais santykiais, dažniausiai asmeniniais susitikimais, kai vienas asmuo rūpinasi kitu (Noddings, 2002). Straipsnyje siekiama pateikti rekomendacijas tyrimams rūpinimosi darbuotojų gerove atlikti, nes atsižvelgti į žmonių gerovę yra labai svarbi organizacijų atsakomybė, kuri, deja, ne visuomet atspindi organizacijų vadybos realybėje.



Šis straipsnis papildo mokslinę literatūrą apie organizacijos narių gerovę organizacijos lygmeniu.

Literatūros apžvalga atskleidė, kad rūpinimasis sunku atskirti nuo daugybės su rūpinimusi susijusių teorinių sampratų; tačiau skirtingi teoriniai požiūriai išskiria rūpinimosi situacinį aspektą, o tai reiškia, kad rūpinimasis ypač tinka patenkinti darbuotojams aktualius poreikius (Engster, 2004, 2011; Fine, 2006; Louis ir kt., 2016; Smylie ir kt., 2016). Taigi, rūpinimasis gali būti susijęs su skirtingais dalykais skirtingose situacijose ir aplinkybėse, todėl būtina atlikti rūpinimosi sampratos empirinius tyrimus siekiant atskleisti, kaip rūpinimasis pasireiškia įvairiuose organizaciniuose kontekstuose, ypač į pilną orientuoto verslo aplinkoje, kur vis dar stokoja tokių tyrimų. Vienas iš šio tyrimo indėlių yra dviejų tyrimų srautų – santykių ir moralės – derinys, padedantis geriau suprasti organizacijos rūpinimasis darbuotojais. Šios literatūros apžvalga atskleidė, kad santykių ir moralės požiūriai į rūpinimąsi darbuotojais turėtų būti suderinti.

Pastebėta terminų ir sąvokų įvairovė tiriant rūpinimąsi vadybos moksle. Dėl šios įvairovės straipsnyje daroma išvada, kad rūpinimasis darbuotojais

galėtų būti suprantamas kaip reiškinys ir skėtinis terminas sąvokoms, pavadinimams ir konstruktais, kurie tiesiogiai ar netiesiogiai nurodo rūpinimąsi darbuotojų gerove. Kadangi rūpinimosi sampratai ir tyrimų sričiai vadyboje vis dar trūksta aiškių ribų, reikia atlikti papildomus tyrimus siekiant išsiaiškinti, ar esami su rūpinimusi susiję konstruktai aprėpia rūpinimosi reiškinio santykių ir moralės aspektus.

Tolesniems rūpinimosi darbuotojais vadybos mokslo tyrimams atlikti reikia tarpdalykinio požiūrio, jungiančio psichologijos, švietimo, organizacinės elgsenos, lyderystės ir vadybos tyrimų kryptis, kur rūpinimasis labiau iširtas. Remiantis literatūros apžvalgos išvadomis, siūloma keletas darbuotojų gerovės organizaciniu lygmeniu sąsajų su daugeliu gerovės antecedentų, t. y. strateginiu rūpinimusi, suvokiama organizacijos parama, nesuinteresuota organizacijos parama, organizacijos rūpinimusi, rūpinimosi kultūra, rūpinimosi klimatu ir rūpestinga lyderyste. Būsimuose tyrimuose siūloma empiriškai patikrinti šiame straipsnyje siūlomus ryšius. Reikia iširti ir šių ryšių mechanizmą, t. y. tarpinius veiksnius ir ribines sąlygas.