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.

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,
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 healthcare (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 car-
ing, unlike compassion, is not necessarily
induced by one's suffering.

Caring is difficult to distinguish from
numerous care-related conceptualisa-
tions; 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 em-
ployees (Engster, 2004, 2011; Fine, 2006;
Louis et al., 2016; Smylie et al., 2016); (b)
caring has distinctive features, such as au-
thenticity, 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 car-
ing 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; Hamilton, Sander-Staudt, 2011;
Held, 2006; Lawrence, Maitlis, 2012; We-
ber, 2014).

The latter two features of caring de-
serve 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 organi-
sation 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 particu-
lar individuals that fosters well-being of
employees in the organisation who are
mutually dependent on other internal or-
ganisational members for their well-being
(Tronto, 2010). People in caring relations
seek to preserve or promote a relation be-
tween themselves and particular others;
thus, as a result caring between individu-
als 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 rela-
tion itself, in which extremes and conflict
situations (egoism versus altruism, self-
ishness versus abstract humanity) may be
avoided (Held, 2006). Overall, well-being
research, as well as research on caring, has
been primarily performed at the individu-
al level of analysis (George, 2014). There-
fore, 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 devel-
opment 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 di-
rected at the well-being of an employee as
a human being per se.

To summarise, prior research is lack-
ing the definition and operationalisation
of caring as a construct. Besides caring
can inflict further caring: networks of car-
ing constitute an environment where peo-
ple share their knowledge and learn about
caring from experiencing it, and the total-
ity 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, 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 organisation-al 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.
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Šis straipsnis papildo mokslinę literatūrą apie organizacijos narių gerovę organizacijos lygmeniu.


Pastebėta terminų ir sąvokų įvairovė tiriant rūpinimą vadybos moksle. Dėl šios įvairovės straipsnyje daroma išvada, kad rūpinimasis darbuotojais galėtų būti suprantamas kaip reiškinys ir skėtinis terminas sąvokoms, pavadinimams ir konstruktams, kurie tiesiogiai ar netiesiogiai nurodo rūpinimą darbuotojų gerove. Kadangi rūpinimosi sampratai ir tyrimų srčiai 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 psychologijos, švietimo, organizacinių elgsenų, lyderystės ir vadybos tyrimų kryptis, kur rūpinimasis labiau ištirtas. Remiantis literatūros apžvalgos išvadomis, siūloma keletas darbuotojų gerovės organizaciniu lygmeniu sąsajų su daugeliu gerovės antecedentų, t. y. strateginiu rūpinimusi, suvokiamas organizacijos parama, nesuinteresuota organizacijos parama, organizacijos rūpinimusi, rūpinimosi kultūra, rūpinimosi klimatu ir rūpestinga lyderyste. Būsimuose tyrimuose siūloma įvairių susijusių ryšių mechanizmų, t. y. tarpinius veiksnius ir ribines sąlygas.