INTRODUCTION TO SPECIAL TOPIC FORUM

CARE AND COMPASSION THROUGH AN ORGANIZATIONAL LENS: OPENING UP NEW POSSIBILITIES

SARA L. RYNES
University of Iowa

JEAN M. BARTUNEK
Boston College

JANE E. DUTTON
University of Michigan

JOSHUA D. MARGOLIS
Harvard University

In this article we introduce *AMR*'s Special Topic Forum on Understanding and Creating Caring and Compassionate Organizations. We outline why the time is right for such a forum, uncover scholarly and philosophical roots of a focus on compassion and care, and provide a brief introduction to the diverse and rich set of articles contained in this forum. We describe the innovative theorizing uncovered by the special issue articles and summarize the rich set of possibilities they suggest for the practice of organizing.

Compassion surprises. In 1970 twenty-four of forty Princeton Theological Seminary students walking to an adjacent building to deliver a talk—for some of them, about the Good Samaritan—either failed to offer aid to an ill victim they encountered on the way or failed to notice the victim altogether (Darley & Batson, 1973). Thirty-one years later and fifty-five miles to the north, in New York City, as the bare-knuckled center of capitalism scrambled to get back on its feet, Wall Street veterans extended a helping hand to one of their competitors in the wake of September 11 (Whitford, 2011). Such surprising puzzles extend beyond the United States and encompass care as well as compassion. In Mumbai, India, in 2008, kitchen workers at the Taj Hotel risked their lives to care for customers under terrorist siege (Deshpandé & Raina, 2011), whereas in 2011 in Kolkata, medical staff fled from their patients as fire raged through their hospital (*Times of India*, 2011). Care and compassion, it would seem, may emerge where they are least expected and may well be endangered where they are most expected.

Compassion is a timely topic. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, compassion comes from the ecclesiastical Latin stem compati, or to "suffer with." Clearly, the world does not lack suffering. In the course of their daily work lives, people suffer the death of loved ones, losses from illness, and grief from restructuring and change (e.g., Hazen, 2008). On a larger scale,

suffering is everywhere. The recent global financial crisis has destroyed the livelihoods of millions, and daily we witness those in our own countries and throughout the world living with inadequate food and shelter. Natural disasters such as hurricanes, tornadoes, tsunamis, and droughts have created thousands of orphans, disabled victims, and homeless in their wake. Similar results have occurred as a result of man-made catastrophes, such as the Fukushima power plant disaster and the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. Residential, energy, and agricultural developments have dislocated both native peoples and animal species, while wars continue to maim and kill thousands in various parts of the world. The gap between the rich and poor continues to increase, while more than a billion people do not get enough to eat (Food and Agriculture Organization, 2011).

Compassion is also timely because of the growing interdependence of the world's economies, nations, and ecosystems. Financial crises on one continent spill over onto others. Dwindling forests in one country shift weather patterns in others. Lax labor laws in some states threaten the well-being of workers in others. At the same time, damaging events in one part of the world elicit aid efforts from all over, and revolutions in one country are emulated in others. As organizations, nations, and people become more interdependent, collaboration and coordination become more essential to the achievement of both individual and collective goals. Care and compassion, which are grounded in relationships and relatedness, have much to contribute to an interconnected, suffering, and surprising world.

New scientific discoveries and conversations are causing scholars to reevaluate what we think we know about human motivations and behavior. A sharpened focus on care and compassion in organizations is consistent with a paradigm shift in the social sciences that emphasizes neurological, psychological, and sociological bases of human interrelating that have other-interest as opposed to self-interest at their core (Brown, Brown, & Penner, 2012; Mansbridge, 1990). These accounts, sometimes closely aligned with evolutionary theories of human development, give new insights into the power and pervasiveness of compassion and caregiving systems as central to human survival and flourishing (e.g., Goetz, Keltner, & Simon-Thomas, 2010). These dis-

coveries also reflect new conversations and new visions of possibilities opened up when Western behavioral and social scientists engage with Tibetan Buddhism (e.g., Davidson & Harrington, 2002; Goleman, 2003) and when new interdisciplinary research collaborations put compassion (Stanford University, http://ccare.stanford.edu/), generosity (Notre Dame University, http://generosityresearch.nd.edu/), the study of virtues (University of Chicago, http://scienceofvirtues.org/), and links between the role of hope and compassion fatigue (http://www.hope-lit.ualberta.ca/ResearchHFA.html) center stage.

Together, these new intellectual paths—along with broader social collaborations such as the Charter for Compassion (http://charterforcompassion.org/), business school collaborations such as 50 + 20 (http://50plus20.org/), and nonprofits such as Compassionate Action Network International (http://www.compassionateactionnetwork.com/home.asp)—remind us that care and compassion are more than feelings and actions with instrumental outcomes. They symbolize values that are also a "means of expression, a way of behaving, a perspective on society" (Wuthnow, 1991: 308). No less than the most famous scientist of the twentieth century suggested that widening our circle of compassion is the means by which we might revise the misguided assumptions we carry about our humanity:

> A human being is a part of the whole called by us "Universe," a part limited in time and space. He experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings as something separated from the rest, a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest to us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty. Nobody can achieve this completely, but the striving for such achievement is, in itself, a part of the liberation and a foundation for inner security (Albert Einstein, personal letter from 1950; quoted in the *New York Times*, 1972).

The world's growing interdependence, the reality of suffering as part of the human condition, and the possibilities that are opened up by a focus on care and compassion prompt this special topic forum. Compassion has deep roots in intellectual history. Aristotle described compassion as an emotion, directed toward "the misfor-

tune one believes to have befallen another" (Nussbaum, 1986: 306). In contrast to Plato and the Stoics writing at a similar time, who focused primarily on the emotion associated with compassion, for Aristotle the emotion of compassion necessarily also included a cognitive component in the form of three beliefs: that the other person's suffering is serious (not trivial), that it is unmerited, and that it is something that might befall the self (Gallagher, 2009).

Although care and compassion are not new to philosophical, theological, and scientific inquiry (indeed, their study goes back thousands of years), they have only occasionally been the explicit focus of management scholarship. Anne Tsui (2010) challenged management scholars to adopt a more explicit focus on compassion in her call for papers for the 2010 Academy of Management meeting, and, indeed, there are sound rationales for bringing care and compassion to the fore in management research at this time.

For example, comparatively recent psychological research has illuminated the positive effects on well-being and resilience of empathy (Batson, Turk, Shaw, & Klein, 1995; Davis, 1996), receiving and giving care and social support (e.g., Broadhead et al., 1983; Brown, Ness, Vinokur, & Smith, 2003; Cohen & Willis, 1985), and forgiveness (e.g., Worthington & Scherer, 2004). Conversely, there is plenty of evidence of the negative effects of contrasting behaviors, such as neglect, incivility, derision, bullying, and abuse (e.g., Ashforth, 1994; Frost, 2003; Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001; Pearson & Porath, 2009; Tepper, 2007). Theories and research on organizational and individual care and compassion can also draw from diverse works by researchers writing about caring systems (Kahn, 1993), care and caring work (e.g., Lopez, 2006; Meyer, 2000), caring and relational practices (e.g., Benner & Wrubel, 1989; Steyaert & Van Looy, 2010), organizational healing (e.g., Powley & Piderit, 2008), care and knowledge enabling (e.g., Von Krogh, Ichijo, & Nonaka, 2000), and applications of an ethic of care in organizations (Gilligan, 1982; Liedtka, 1996; Walker, 1991).

Interest in compassion in the management sciences was catalyzed by Frost's (1999) proclamation that "Compassion Counts!" and by his (2003) assertion that the inevitable pain generated within organizations requires an academic response. These early forays in management research on compassion were further extended by Kanov et al. (2004), who, building on Clark (1998), proposed a tripartite model of the compassion process. By incorporating cognitive (noticing), affective (feeling), and behavioral (acting) components, Kanov and colleagues synthesized a long historical tradition in philosophy and theology and set up the rich possibilities for inquiry that this issue of *AMR* seeks to advance.

This special topic forum explores what happens to our understanding of management and organizations when theorists focus on and draw from theories related to care and compassion. What happens when analysis and theorizing move beyond efforts to explain striking individual episodes of compassion and care (or their absence) and go on to consider the role played by compassion and care in the ongoing life and functioning of organizations and the individuals within them? What new states, processes, and dynamics are revealed when compassion and care become more center stage in management scholarship? What does an organization look like when its organizing principles are based on the logics and principles of caring and compassion? This special topic forum illuminates the novel insights we gain into the work of managing and organizing when care and compassion serve as a focal point for theorizing.

Together, the articles in this special issue open new windows for seeing possibilities in and about organizations. First, they humanize people working inside organizations as people who suffer, people who care, and people who individually and collectively may respond to pain (e.g., Atkins & Parker; Gittell & Douglass; Lilius). Second, they illuminate how organizations as contexts—with members, tasks, roles, shared values, resources, and norms—meaningfully and importantly shape patterns of interpersonal thoughts, emotions, and behaviors both within and outside organizational boundaries (e.g., Fehr & Gelfand; Gittell & Douglass; Lawrence & Maitlis; Madden, Duchon, Madden, & Plowman). Third, they illustrate how the motivations and actions of a single individual can matter in terms of changing the culture of a work unit (Grant & Patil) or determining the purpose of an entire organization (e.g., Miller, Grimes, McMullen, & Vogus). Fourth, they illuminate how the ways in which we speak about our experiences at work can create self-fulfilling prophecies (e.g., Lawrence & Maitlis). Fifth, they

suggest the underlying dynamics by which alternative organizational forms that are typically regarded as mutually exclusive can be melded into hybrids that incorporate the strengths of each (e.g., relational bureaucracies for Gittell & Douglass and social entrepreneurship for Miller et al.). Sixth, they respond to a call from organizational researchers (e.g., Feldman & Rafaeli, 2002; Felin & Foss, 2009) to create a deeper understanding of the micro emotional and relational mechanisms that underlie caring and compassion at the organizational level (e.g., Fehr & Gelfand; Gittell & Douglass; Madden et al.).

In order to place the articles in this special issue in context, we first examine some of the intellectual foundations of research on care and compassion, both historically and in recent years. We then introduce the articles and their central contributions.

CARE AND COMPASSION: BOTH TIMELY AND TIMELESS

Care and compassion have very long intellectual and moral histories. Compassion "lies at the heart of all religious, ethical and spiritual traditions, calling us always to treat all others as we wish to be treated ourselves" (Armstrong, 2011: 6). For example, in Confucianism compassion (rén) or benevolent love and humaneness toward others is "the loftiest ideal of moral excellence" (Chong, 2007: 24). In Hinduism the concept of ahimsa, the injunction to do no harm and to treat all creatures as oneself, is key (Jackson, 2008). In Judaism there are mandates to pursue justice and righteousness, to imitate God's compassion, to seek peace, and to work for the healing of the world (Sears, 1998). In Christianity actions of mercy or compassion are "central for Jesus. To gain his favor, the poor and the sick had only to say, 'Sir, have mercy on me'" (Sobrino, 2009: 454). Gülen (2004) suggests that tolerance, love, and compassion have been primary values throughout Islamic history and reflect God, or Allah, as the source of compassion, from whom these values flow to individuals.

In philosophy compassion has had a more contentious history. Many influential philosophers (including Plato, the Stoics, Descartes, Nietzsche, and Kant) were skeptical of compassion as a basis for decision making and taking action (Gallagher, 2009; Sznaider, 2001). Focus-

ing mostly on compassion's emotional aspects, they viewed compassion (and emotion more generally) as potentially incompatible with other moral principles, such as reason and justice, which were held in higher regard. They worried that feelings of compassion might lead to sentimentality, which would cloud judgment and reasoning. Moreover, they argued that compassion actually increases suffering by causing people to share in the misery of others (White, 2008). In addition, the Stoics often portrayed compassion as a weakness and a feminine trait.

Still, the historical view of compassion in philosophy has sometimes been very positive. Philosophers such as Aristotle saw compassion as complementary with concepts such as justice, reason, and self-interest. Rousseau emphasized compassion as the foundational virtue that helps society to develop. He did not see compassion as a substitute for justice or as inconsistent with reason. Rather, he argued that compassion "can modify and be modified by reason for the individual's good and the good of others" (Marks, 2007: 728). Similarly, Schopenhauer (1998/1840) argued that compassion—rather than rational rules or God-given commandments—was the central basis of morality and ethics (Madigan, 2005). Even Adam Smith, who is often invoked as the patron saint of self-interest, wrote about the positive effects of compassion. Indeed, compassion was the first virtue mentioned in his *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Smith, 2010/1759). Smith viewed pity and compassion (he used the terms interchangeably) as complementary to self interest: "Nature endowed us with these sentiments for the good of mankind," and they "persist because they promote the survival of people as a species" (quoted in Frank, 1988: 44). Contemporary moral philosophers have continued with the line of argument that compassion fundamentally contributes to the well-being of individuals and society, although they are also mindful of compassion's limits and blinders (e.g., Nussbaum, 1996, 2003).

The philosophy that perhaps elevates compassion to the highest level is Buddhism. For Buddhists all beings desire happiness, while at the same time all beings suffer. Compassion is a fundamental attribute or potential inherent in all people—the highest form of moral wisdom (Dalai Lama, 1995). However, Buddhism recognizes that people are often more motivated by

Rynes, Bartunek, Dutton, and Margolis   507

greed, anger, hatred, or similar hindrances rather than by this fundamental attribute (e.g., Sullivan, Wiist, & Wayment, 2010). Compassion is generated by the mind but focused outward. It manifests in generosity directed toward others. The ultimate goal of Buddhist compassion (*karuna*) is to remove suffering (*dukkha*), including that which arises from our (self-centered) desires and attachments to various ambitions, people, and material objects.

It may seem odd to juxtapose Buddhist compassion with business enterprises where the primary focus is so often material in nature. So, in attempting to place this long and venerable history of compassion in context, it is useful to draw on recent empirical evidence and conceptual arguments that suggest the potential fruitfulness of focusing more explicitly on care and compassion in management and organizational studies. In the past twenty-five years or so, empirical evidence has begun to suggest the possibility of symbiotic positive relationships between emotions and reason, compassion and justice, and altruism and self-interest. For example, there has been a growing understanding by neuroscientists that emotions are not separate from reason and that, contrary to earlier beliefs, emotions often enhance reasoning abilities rather than detract from them (e.g., Damasio, 1994; Frank, 1988). Related findings concern the enhancing effect of positive emotions and positive interrelating on creativity, motivation, emotional and physical well-being, resilience, and many types of performance (e.g., Amabile & Kramer, 2011; Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008; Dutton & Ragins, 2007; Fredrickson, 2001, 2009; House, Umberson, & Landis, 1988; Staw, Sutton, & Pelled, 1994). These arguments are consistent with efforts in psychology (e.g., Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000) and organizational research (e.g., Cameron & Spreitzer, 2012) to broaden consideration of the types of psychological and social conditions and processes that foster individual and collective flourishing.

In social sciences, which have human behavior at their root, there is increasing recognition that we are born to interrelate. For example, Brown, Brown, and Preston (2012) offer a neuroscientific model of compassionate motivation suggesting that humans enjoy a dedicated neurobiological system that is responsive to social bonds and that fosters other-interested feelings and behaviors. Similarly, Crocker and Cane-

vello (2012) describe and compare an egosystem versus ecosystem, where the latter model, in contrast to self-interested theories, portrays individuals as being motivated by caring about the well-being of others. In their account these motivations arise from people seeing themselves as part of a larger whole and seeing desired outcomes of the other and self as non zero sum. Although fairly new to the field of experimental psychology, theoretical models that put care and concern for others at their core in order to explain behavior, personal and professional development, and even organizational effectiveness have long been staples of applied disciplines, such as education and nursing, where relationships are foundational to the work of the profession (e.g., Noddings, 2003).

Rather than seeing care and compassion as antithetical to or outside of "normal" or "important" work in and of organizations, the contributors to this special issue view them as central: "Compassion and care are not separate from 'being a professional' or 'doing the work of the organization.' They are a natural and living representation of people's humanity in the workplace" (Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson, 2000: 25). Further, the authors in this issue make important contributions toward enriching our understanding of relational dynamics and behaviors in organizations (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000; Ferris et al., 2009; Gersick, Bartunek, & Dutton, 2000).

Theoretical developments such as these provide important fuel for more deeply understanding patterns and consequences of interrelating through care and compassion in and among organizations. They echo and strengthen related calls to see our species (e.g., de Waal, 2009; Keltner, 2009) and our civilization (Rifkin, 2009) as more collaborative, empathetic, and caring than typically portrayed in our management theories. These developments beckon researchers to move beyond theories of human interrelating based on reward or punishment (self-interest) and suggest that other-interest, emotion, and biology are central to explaining how and when care and compassion happen and how and when they matter.

Ferraro, Pfeffer, and Sutton (2005) and Ghoshal (2005) remind us that theories not only attempt to explain but also shape behavior. In the words of economist Robert Frank:

Our beliefs about human nature help shape human nature itself. What we think about ourselves and our possibilities determines what we aspire to become, and shapes what we teach our children, both at home and in the schools. Here the pernicious effects of the self-interest theory have been most disturbing. It tells us that to behave morally is to invite others to take advantage of us. By encouraging us to expect the worst in others, it brings out the worst in us: dreading the role of the chump, we are often loath to heed our nobler instincts (1988: xi).

Given this reality, it is crucial that we have theories that reflect the accumulating evidence that other-centeredness and interconnectedness are central aspects of humanity. Furthermore, we (and our students) need access to theories and discourses that help us understand the complex and important processes and conditions that enable and thwart care and compassion. With this in mind, it is our pleasure to introduce the articles selected for this special topic forum.

THE ARTICLES

The nine articles selected for this special issue represent an interesting mix of characteristics. Five are positioned mainly at the individual level of analysis (Atkins & Parker; Grant; Grant & Patil; Lilius; Miller et al.), while the other four primarily address the group or organizational level (Fehr & Gelfand; Gittell & Douglass; Lawrence & Maitlis; Madden et al.). Some focus on how care and compassion might emerge and be sustained without formal planning (e.g., Madden et al.), while others present testable models for enacting planned change (e.g., Grant & Patil). Still others present models that appear to be typically intuitive, spontaneous, or emergent but might nevertheless (by using the proposed model) be used to guide planned change (e.g., Lilius). Some present models or theories of how one set of organizational norms or assumptions (e.g., independence and self-reliance) might be replaced with a different set of norms (e.g., relational and interdependent; Lawrence & Maitlis), while others suggest how two presumably oppositional or competing models (e.g., relational versus bureaucratic forms of organization) might be melded into new forms (e.g., Gittell & Douglass; Miller et al.). The articles and their major characteristics, including the possibilities they suggest for future research and practice, are summarized in Table 1.

The first five articles in this issue focus primarily on the individual level of analysis. In the first of these, "Understanding Individual Compassion in Organizations: The Role of Appraisals and Psychological Flexibility," Paul Atkins and Sharon Parker expand on Kanov et al.'s (2004) model of compassionate responding. Specifically, in addition to the three components of compassionate responding specified by Kanov et al. (i.e., noticing, feeling, and acting), Atkins and Parker add a fourth (mainly cognitive) component: people's appraisal of the situation. Appraisal comes between noticing and feeling and influences the specific types of feelings generated: "After noticing that another is suffering, a person might feel empathic concern (necessary for compassion), but he or she might equally feel anger, distress, sadness, coldness, or other emotions that do not lead to compassion" (this issue: 526). This observation is consistent with discussions about compassion in political science, where people with a wide range of political views have adopted compassion as one of their signature issues yet disagree considerably on who merits compassion and what should be done about suffering, depending on the attributions they make about why people are suffering and what will improve the situation (e.g., Marks, 2007; Stone, 2008).

Drawing on relational frame theory, Atkins and Parker then discuss how and why people who are higher in psychological flexibility—"being open and curious regarding the present moment and, depending on what the situation affords, acting in accordance with one's chosen values" (this issue: 528)—have a greater propensity to respond to situations of suffering in a compassionate way. In the authors' view, psychological flexibility "provides a way of bridging the apparent tension between distancing and connection—distancing so that one does not become absorbed in another's suffering and one can place it in context, and connection so that one cares" (this issue: 539).

In "Challenging the Norm of Self-Interest: Minority Influence and Transitions to Helping Norms in Work Units," Adam Grant and Shefali Patil develop a temporal model of how a single individual might successfully challenge work unit norms favoring self-interested behavior, particularly in low task-interdependent work units where self-interested norms tend to predominate. Drawing on minority influence

TABLE 1
Content and Characteristics of the Special Topic Forum Articles

Article	Primary Purpose	Primary Level of Analysis	Primary Focus Within the Domain of Care and Compassion	Future Possibilities for Research	Future Possibilities for Practice
Atkins & Parker	To develop an expanded model of compassionate responding that adds appraisal to noticing, feeling, and acting	Individual	Develops processes through which noticing suffering leads to compassionate action. Describes how mindfulness and values-directed action can foster the elements of compassion	Use multiple methods (survey, laboratory, qualitative) to explore the role of appraisals and psychological flexibility in compassion. Investigate contextual moderators of the relationship between psychological flexibility and compassionate responding. Examine the relationships between motivation and capability in compassionate responding	Provide training in psychological flexibility
Grant & Patil	Use research on minority influence to develop theory about how an individual can successfully challenge nonhelping work unit norms	Individual within work unit	Proposes that transitions toward norms consistent with caring are most likely when a high-status challenger models prosocial helping for middle-status and agreeable work unit members. Describes how sequences of inquiry, modeling, and advocacy are most likely to trigger norm transitions	Examine tipping points that govern norm transitions. Examine the consequences of helping behaviors in task-independent work units. Investigate interactions between organizational characteristics and outcomes of normative challenges	Use the model to develop appropriate "challenger" strategies. Combine role modeling, advocacy, and inquiry to change norms
Lilius	To explain how caregivers might become restored during client interactions rather than only during "off-work" periods	Individual and caregiver-client interactions	Explores variability in caregivers' interactions with clients in terms of the cognitive and emotional resources required versus the resources generated. Argues that some interactions are restorative rather than depleting, thus providing a form of on-the-job "respite" from burnout	Conduct episodic studies with care workers to reveal variability in restoration versus depletion across clients. Use interview methodologies, taking precautions to reduce socially desirable responding	Become more aware of variability in resource patterns across clients. Sequence client interactions with resources in mind. Improve client-caregiver fit. Reinforce positive prosocial cues for caregiver

(Continued)

TABLE 1
(Continued)

Article	Primary Purpose	Primary Level of Analysis	Primary Focus Within the Domain of Care and Compassion	Future Possibilities for Research	Future Possibilities for Practice
Grant	To develop a theory of the factors, particularly work design, that support sustainable corporate volunteering programs	Individual	Explores corporate volunteering programs as channels for expressing care and compassion. Proposes that such programs may be more motivating (and thus sustained over longer periods of time) for employees whose jobs are depleted in terms of task, social, and knowledge characteristics	Empirically test the corporate volunteering model. Examine on-the-job and volunteer work spillover. Examine the sustainability of volunteer efforts focused on care versus compassion. Examine differential effects of motives on initial versus continuing volunteer initiatives. Investigate corporate volunteering as a "pure" form of organizational citizenship behavior	Use the model to develop appropriate corporate volunteering programs for the situation at hand. View volunteer programs as a potential substitute for enriched jobs
Miller, Grimes, McMullen, & Vogus	To explain compassion as a motivational origin and developmental mechanism that underlies social entrepreneurship	Individual (organizational founders)	Specifies the cognitive and emotional processes through which compassion sustains efforts by individuals to surmount the difficulties and long odds of launching a social enterprise that relieves others' suffering. Shows how key institutional conditions make social entrepreneurship a viable option such that compassion can fuel the integrative thinking, prosocial cost-benefit analysis, and durable commitment necessary to then actually launch a social enterprise	Examine whether social entrepreneurs accept more risk than commercial entrepreneurs. Do values of successful social enterprises change over time? What are the relationships between prosocial and proself motivations in social entrepreneurship?	

| Lawrence & Maitlis | To develop a model of how an ethic of care can be enacted in organizations through narrative practices embedded in enduring work relationships, and how such an ethic can foster resilience in work teams | Groups or teams within an organization | Describes three narrative practices in organizations—constructing histories of sparkling moments, contextualizing struggles, and constructing polyphonic future-oriented stories—in which care can be embedded. Describes structural, cultural, and skilled practice characteristics of organizations that can foster an ethic of care and suggests its positive impacts on resilience within work teams | Conduct research rooted in maternal relations. Incorporate feminist politics into the study of care and compassion to identify social and organizational structures that create adversity for members. Research which narrative practices are most effective. Examine relationships between organizational narratives and collective outcomes (such as resilience) | Work teams can adapt the recommended discursive practices. Organizations can treat discursive and dialogical practices as a trainable skill |
| Fehr & Gelfand | To explain how a forgiveness climate emerges in organizations and to explore its cross-level influences on employees | Organization | Specifies how organizational environment, practices, and leader attributes are linked to compassion as well as other values. Compassion as a shared value is a base condition that supports organizational practices that foster the emergence of a forgiveness climate | Empirically test the proposed relationships between forgiveness climate, employee commitment, interpersonal citizenship, and performance. Develop measures of a forgiveness climate. Investigate alternative forms of climate emergence | Cultivate a forgiveness climate that can help to foster employees' prosocial responses to conflict. Develop cultural values, organizational practices, and leadership behaviors that make the emergence and institutionalization of a forgiveness climate more likely |

TABLE 1
(Continued)

Article	Primary Purpose	Primary Level of Analysis	Primary Focus Within the Domain of Care and Compassion	Future Possibilities for Research	Future Possibilities for Practice
Madden, Duchon, Madden, & Plowman	To explain the system conditions and informal processes that increase the organizational capacity for compassion, and how this capacity alters organizational features over time	Organization	Explains organizational capacity for compassion as a self-organizing process. Argues that organizational capacity for compassion is manifest in adapted roles, new norms, expanded routines, and adjusted scanning mechanisms. Identifies system conditions (e.g., agent diversity, interdependent roles, social interactions) that foster the self-organization process around compassion	Extend system conditions to explore how organizational mission and structure affect compassion capacity. Extend the conceptualization of agent diversity, role interdependence, and the quality and quantity of interactions and their links to compassion capability. Explore whether and how organizational capacity for compassion has impacts beyond organizational boundaries	To develop an organization's capacity for compassion, consider creating more cognitive, emotional, and resource diversity of members, higher levels of role and task interdependence, and greater quantity and quality of interaction between members
Gittell & Douglass	To describe a relational bureaucratic form of organizing that has at its core three types of reciprocal interrelating that foster patterns of attentiveness explaining caring, timely, and knowledgeable responsiveness in a way that is scalable, replicable, and sustainable	Organization	The model of relational bureaucracy specifies the process by which universal caring becomes particularized through reciprocal interrelating that happens between workers and customers, workers and workers, and workers and leaders. Identifies a range of structures and practices that foster these forms of reciprocal interrelating and, thus, the level of caring responses in and of organizational members	Explore synergies across different reciprocal relationships (e.g., relational leadership and relational coordination). Examine the possibility of mutually reinforcing causality between structures and relationships in relational bureaucracies	Consider how diverse organizational structures can foster reciprocal relating among organizational workers, between workers and customers, and between workers and leaders. If such structures can foster more role-based reciprocal interrelating, where there are more shared goals, shared knowledge, and mutual respect, there will be an increased likelihood of more universalistic norms for caring for particular others

theories and previous empirical research, they argue that such a shift requires two types of proactive behaviors on the part of individuals who would challenge social norms. The first of these is repeated behavioral modeling of helping behaviors that are perceived as both prosocial and impactful by others in the group. The second is voice, which consists of two subtactics: inquiring about current practices in such a way as to destabilize shared understandings, along with (smaller amounts of) advocacy of helping behaviors. They argue that the appropriate temporal pattern for these behaviors includes inquiry, followed by modeling, followed by advocacy. Together, these are hypothesized to create uncertainty, stimulating new sensemaking and norm building. Although their model begins by describing the necessary proactive behaviors of the individual "challenger," it also incorporates characteristics of work unit members. Several of these characteristics—agreeableness, openness, status, and stage of unit's development—are likely to act as moderators of whether there will be a sustained shift from self-interested to helping norms as a result of the individual proactive behaviors.

In "Recovery at Work: Understanding the Restorative Side of 'Depleting' Client Interactions," Jacoba Lilius focuses on ways to combat the burnout caregivers often experience in response to the "chronic emotional strain of dealing extensively with other human beings" (Maslach, 1982: 3). Until now, most research directed toward mitigating this strain has focused on finding respite away from work, either through vacations or holidays (e.g., Westman & Eden, 1997) or through on-site breaks throughout the workday (Trougakos, Beal, Green, & Weiss, 2008). Drawing on Sonnentag and Fritz (2007), Lilius indicates that this prior focus on nonwork activities for restoration reflects "a core assumption within both the ego depletion literature and work recovery literature that work activities are effortful and, thus, regulatory resource depleting" such that "recovery is thought to require engagement in nonwork activities that do not further tax regulatory resources" (this issue: 570).

In contrast, Lilius illuminates how certain caretaker-client interactions while performing the work itself may themselves be restorative, depending on two variables: the amount of self-regulatory resources required by the interaction and the amount of personal resources generated by it. Whereas previous work on caregiving and burnout has generally emphasized the depletion of resources, Lilius draws on new research suggesting that effortful work can also generate resources through positive feelings of increased mastery, self-efficacy, or prosocial contribution, particularly when a successful outcome is reached on a difficult case. Using an episodic performance perspective (Beal, Weiss, Barros, & MacDermid, 2005) and a 2×2 typology of personal resources required and resources generated, Lilius proposes four types of caregiver-client interactions: draining, low maintenance, replenishing, and breakthrough. She further develops a process model of the dynamics believed to underlie restorative and breakthrough interactions in the hope that application of the model might increase the proportion of such interactions in caregiving situations and provide a useful guide for future research.

In "Giving Time, Time After Time: Work Design and Sustained Employee Participation in Corporate Volunteering," Adam Grant explores the rapidly growing phenomenon of corporate volunteering as an important vehicle for delivering care and compassion to worthy causes and communities in need. Integrating work design and volunteering theories, he generates a somewhat counterintuitive model of what causes employees to participate in sustained (rather than one-time) volunteering activities associated with their workplaces. Specifically, his model suggests that employees whose jobs are weakest in intrinsic task-, social-, or knowledge-related motivators are the ones most likely to find sustained volunteering activities most enriching. Grant proposes that, for such employees, volunteer activities are more likely to compensate for the deficit of motivational features inherent in the work itself, making it more likely that volunteer activities will be self-reinforcing and become part of the employee's identity. He develops a work design model of long-term corporate volunteering that incorporates work characteristics of the employee's job; the employee's volunteering motives; the task, social, and knowledge characteristics of the volunteering project; and organizational practices such as volunteering pressure, matching incentives, managerial support, and whether the organization's identity is aligned with the volunteer cause.

Grant's model presents a new way of understanding employees' involvement in care and compassion by conceptualizing organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in an alternative way. Most previous work on OCB has been focused on behaviors that benefit coworkers, supervisors, and customers. Doing work that benefits organizational members and customers is often viewed as a role requirement or core aspect of job performance, thus raising the question of whether it is actually "true" citizenship (e.g., Bolino, 1999). Because corporate volunteering is directed toward beneficiaries and causes outside the organization's main mission, sustained participation in corporate volunteering is less likely to reflect perceived obligations and may therefore reflect a purer form of citizenship behavior. If so, examination of corporate volunteerism may enable researchers to gain a deeper grasp of the forces that motivate employees to offer care and compassion not only to people inside their place of employment but also to communities, charities, and disadvantaged groups.

In "Venturing for Others with Heart and Head: How Compassion Encourages Social Entrepreneurship," Toyah Miller, Matthew Grimes, Jeffery McMullen, and Timothy Vogus explore the mechanisms through which compassion encourages social entrepreneurship among organizational founders. They begin by emphasizing just how difficult it is to create a social enterprise of this type, which seeks to meld two principles that are often thought to be incompatible—that is, an enterprise that seeks "to create social value" but "employ[s] a market-based organizational form to sustain this value creation" (this issue: 616). Because the underlying assumptions of traditional market-based logics and compassion-based logics are nearly the flip side of one another (e.g., while market logics emphasize the primacy of the self, compassion logics emphasize the connectedness of all things and the primacy of others), marrying the two in a single organization form makes social entrepreneurship "both admirable and theoretically problematic" (this issue: 616).

The core of Miller et al.'s article is a model that begins with how compassion facilitates three emotional and cognitive processes that increase the likelihood of engaging in (and persisting with the challenges of) social entrepreneurship. In particular, the authors describe

how compassion increases integrative thinking, spurs prosocial judgments of costs and benefits, and strengthens commitment to alleviating others' suffering. The theoretical model explains how these emotional and cognitive processes, when unleashed amid institutional conditions that make social entrepreneurship pragmatically thinkable and normatively legitimate, motivate and sustain social entrepreneurship behavior that would otherwise seem irrational and ill advised.

In "Care and Possibility: Enacting an Ethic of Care Through Narrative Practice," Thomas Lawrence and Sally Maitlis explore how Carol Gilligan's (1982) notion of an "ethic of care" might be realized in teams and workgroups. They characterize an ethic of care as accepting local truth and evaluating it in terms of its effects, recognizing vulnerability as ubiquitous, and valuing growth in the cared-for and uncertain future.

Based on this ethic, Lawrence and Maitlis develop a model of how organizations might move away from viewing coworkers primarily as independent, self-sufficient actors toward a way of thinking and acting that considers them as relational and interdependent. They focus on work teams, elaborating the types of narrative practices—constructing histories of sparkling moments, contextualizing struggles, and constructing polyphonic future-oriented stories—among team members that might institutionalize an ethic of care, even in organizations where caregiving is not the primary function (e.g., manufacturing). They suggest that the enactment of an ethic of care through these narrative practices can help foster a belief system that emphasizes possibility, and they conclude with a discussion of the likely impact of adopting an ethic of care on team resilience.

The last three papers address the organizational level of analysis. In "The Forgiving Organization: A Multilevel Model of Forgiveness at Work," Ryan Fehr and Michele Gelfand examine the concept of forgiveness at the organizational level of analysis and develop a cross-level model that reveals how individuals' prosocial responses to conflict can emerge from and be supported by organizational-level features. To this end, they introduce the "construct of *forgiveness climate*—the shared perception that empathic, benevolent responses to conflict from victims and offenders are rewarded, supported,

and expected in the organization" (this issue: 665), and they develop a multilevel model of how such a climate is created and sustained in organizations.

Their three-phase model begins with a discussion of the values—restorative justice, compassion, and temperance—that "provide the bedrock" (this issue: 667) of a forgiveness climate in the climate construction stage. In this phase they also discuss characteristics of the organizational environment (national culture, stakeholder culture, and geographic dispersion) and the organizational leader (justice orientation, servant leadership, and self-control) that foster and support organizational practices such as restorative dispute resolution procedures, employee support programs, and mindfulness training and feedback. In the sensemaking phase the authors focus on how a forgiveness climate triggers empathy, produces emotional shifts in both victims and offenders, and facilitates restorative changes such as offers of apology and forgiveness. In the action phase the authors focus on the relational consequences of forgiveness climates—in particular, relational commitment and interpersonal citizenship.

In "Emergent Organizational Capacity for Compassion," Laura Madden, Dennis Duchon, Timothy Madden, and Donde Ashmos Plowman propose that organizations can develop an enduring capacity for compassion without direction from the formal organization. Drawing on complexity theory (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Chiles, Meyer, & Hench, 2004), as well as previous empirical research by Dutton, Worline, Frost, and Lilius (2006) and Plowman et al. (2007), they explicate how an initially painful triggering event can set off a series of processes that, particularly in the presence of facilitating conditions, can lead to self-organizing compassion that is capable of enduring long past the triggering event. Specifically, they propose that complex adaptive systems (Axelrod & Cohen, 1999) "composed of highly interactive, interdependent agents who learn and adapt in order to produce behaviors that would not be predicted by observing the system's past" (this issue: 693) result in new structures, norms, scanning mechanisms, and cultures. In addition, they elaborate specific system conditions that enhance the likelihood of self-organizing compassion, in which agents modify roles and norms to include compassionate responding.

Finally, in "Relational Bureaucracy: Structuring Reciprocal Relationships into Roles," Jody Hoffer Gittell and Anne Douglass theorize about how two organizational forms that are typically regarded as oppositional can be melded into a sustainable relational bureaucratic form. This form combines the strengths of relational or network organizations with the strengths of bureaucracies. This hybrid form is "not a hodgepodge of misaligned characteristics but, rather, a logically coherent higher synthesis of the two organizational forms from which it emerges" (this issue: 709).

In relational bureaucracies (like Southwest Airlines) formal structures support three critical processes of reciprocal interrelating. The first process is manifest in the way workers and customers interrelate, which involves ongoing co-production between organizational participants and the outside parties for whose benefit the work is done. The second process, relational coordination, highlights reciprocal interrelating that happens between workers in the horizontal division of labor. The third type of critical reciprocal interrelating process, relational leadership, takes place between workers and managers. All three interrelating processes are characterized by shared goals, shared knowledge, and mutual respect. The authors' model of relational bureaucracy specifies how several structures and practices (e.g., hiring and training, cross-role protocols) foster embedding reciprocal interrelating into these different roles. Propositions link the three forms of reciprocal interrelating in roles to caring, timely, and knowledgeable responses that are simultaneously scalable, replicable, and sustainable.

GOING FORWARD

While recent scholarly contributions to care and compassion have been made in many social science fields, a number of management scholars (e.g., Ferraro et al., 2005; Ghoshal, 1996, 2005; Khurana, 2007; Mintzberg, 2005) have traced the processes by which the academic field of management, following trends in economics and finance, has increasingly moved away from humanistic, multistakeholder models of management to models centered on self-interest, the primacy of owners and shareholders over other constituents, and the "need" to provide financial incentives for effort-averse ex-

ecutives who would otherwise "shirk" while pursuing "self-interest with guile" (Williamson, 1981: 554).

For example, Walsh, Weber, and Margolis (2003) showed that management researchers' concern about stakeholders other than shareholders has been dropping over time. Based on a forty-two-year analysis of articles appearing in the *Academy of Management Journal* (*AMJ*), they found a large shift over time in terms of the dependent variables studied—in particular, whether the dependent variables were performance related, welfare related, or both. Overall, they found 383 articles that examined performance (and not human welfare), 227 that examined human welfare (and not performance), and 115 that examined both. However, they found that the relative emphasis placed on performance versus welfare largely reversed itself between 1978 and 1999. Specifically, in 1978, 32 percent of articles focused on human welfare as compared with only 19 percent in 1999. In contrast, 17 percent of articles examined performance in 1978 as compared with 35 percent in 1999. Walsh and colleagues concluded that "researchers' increasing fascination with organization-level performance has not been matched by a parallel fascination with organizational or societal-level welfare" (2003: 862).

In contrast to this trend, in his Academy of Management presidential address given in 2010, Walsh asked, "What can we do as an Academy to embrace the sacred and inspire and enable . . . [a] better world?" (2011: 225). Thus, this special topic forum comes at a potentially pivotal time in management scholarship, when there is considerable social science scholarship on care and compassion to draw from and much greater awareness that management research has not made as many contributions as it might to these very important issues.

Implications for Future Theory and Research

As indicated in Table 1, each of the articles suggests possibilities and implications for future empirical research. The suggestions they make all reflect ways of carrying the present theorizing forward. Further, there are now a limited number of studies in diverse areas of management that at least touch on notions of compassion, including negotiation (Galinsky, Gilin, & Maddux, 2011), emotional labor (Hsieh, Yang,

& Fu, 2012), negative emotional reactions (Shepherd & Cardon, 2009), corporate image and reputation (Bennett & Gabriel, 2003), sexual harassment (Serri, 2006), and leadership (Boyatzis, Smith, & Blaize, 2006). The articles in this special topic forum may serve as intellectual stimuli for areas such as these, suggesting ways that care and compassion can be more fully incorporated both conceptually and empirically in organizational research.

Taken as a whole, the canvas of articles in this issue suggests three ways in which future theory and research on care and compassion might relate to more traditional lenses on organizational phenomena. First, care and compassion can *contend with or replace* what are taken to be competing perspectives, providing an alternative rendering of what is going on inside organizations and, through that conceptual dichotomy, bringing to light otherwise diminished aspects of organizational life. Care is contrasted with justice, or compassionate relationships are juxtaposed with economic exchange or contracts, or other-regarding motives are set opposite self-interested ones. Lawrence and Maitlis, for example, contrast an interdependent, relational model of action in organizations—inspired by a focus on care and compassion—with the taken-for-granted model of independent, self-sufficient action that undergirds so many assumptions within existing theories.

Second, care and compassion can be cast not as substitutes for alternative perspectives but as *complements*, unearthing what other theoretical approaches do not or cannot explain about the management of organizations. Where other accounts leave off, care and compassion pick up. Miller et al., for example, suggest that traditional theories of entrepreneurship cannot and do not explain what drives entrepreneurs to pursue for-profit social enterprises. Rationality and self-serving motives might explain traditional entrepreneurial behavior, but they simply cannot account for the motivation and persistence of social entrepreneurs. However, as Miller et al. argue, compassion can serve as a missing ingredient that explains the cognition and emotion that spark and sustain such social entrepreneurship.

Third, care and compassion can work *symbiotically* with other theoretical accounts to explain what neither could explain adequately on its own. Whereas a conceptual relationship of

contention replaces other accounts with one that emerges from an eye on care and compassion, and conceptual complementarity explains what would otherwise be overlooked or go unexplained, symbiotic integration pairs traditional theoretical accounts with findings and theories about care and compassion to provide a fuller, more extensive explanation of certain phenomena in organizations. For example, Grant integrates the motivational power of both work design and compassion to explain how people remain motivated across work designs that vary in their motivational power. Care and compassion work alongside work design, his model suggests, thereby sustaining motivation at work by driving people to pursue volunteer opportunities. It is not that care and compassion displace work design in explaining motivation, and Grant's point is not simply that care and compassion drive volunteerism whereas work design does not; rather, job design and compassion work in tandem to provide a fuller portrait of how motivation is sustained across the broad spectrum of people and jobs that characterize most organizations. In sum, whether it is by contending with, complementing, or symbiotically integrating with more conventional and accepted accounts of organizational behavior, care and compassion fundamentally broaden and enrich what it is we see and understand about organizations.

Implications for Practice

The principal intent of the articles in this special topic forum is to make a conceptual contribution; theoretical contributions are, after all, the primary purpose of *AMR*. However, all of the articles, most of them explicitly, suggest implications for practice as well. Reviewing their implications for practice offers another way to appreciate the contributions of the articles and suggests the potentially frame-breaking nature of their visions of organizing.

Bartunek and Rynes (2010) suggest that implications for practice can be characterized in terms of three features: primary audience(s) for the recommendations, types of actions suggested, and kinds of outcomes hoped for from those actions. In a special topic forum like this one, it is possible to get an "overall" sense of what the articles contribute to practice—what kind of picture they jointly portray of what car-

ing and compassion look like in organizations. Comparison of the types of recommendations made in the articles in this special issue to those that most stood out in the Bartunek and Rynes study suggests that there are truly some different perspectives being offered in this special forum.

In Table 1 we have included a brief overview of some characteristics of the implications for practice in the different articles published in the forum. Here, drawing from the complete articles, we suggest their common audiences, actions, and hoped-for outcomes.

Target audience. Similar to Bartunek and Rynes' (2010) findings, recommendations for action are often addressed to the organization as a whole (Atkins & Parker; Fehr & Gelfand; Lawrence & Maitlis), as well as to managers or leaders (including social entrepreneurs; Atkins & Parker; Fehr & Gelfand; Grant; Grant & Patil; Miller et al.). In contrast to Bartunek and Rynes, however, a large number of the implications are also addressed to individuals and/or workgroups who are not in formal leadership positions (Grant; Grant & Patil; Lawrence & Maitlis; Lilius; Madden et al.). In other words, there is a broader expectation in these articles that the impetus for action (in this case, with respect to compassion and caring) does not need to come from "above" in an organization. Rather, it may come from individuals who are trying, for example, to change group norms away from self-interest (Grant & Patil) or to improve the quality of caregiving while simultaneously achieving greater self-restoration at work (Lilius).

Recommended actions. Bartunek and Rynes found that the general types of actions most frequently recommended in implications for practice sections include increasing awareness of particular phenomena, getting training or acquiring more knowledge in an area, making structural changes, and altering hiring and retention practices. Those same types of actions are suggested in the present articles.

For example, with respect to awareness, Atkins and Parker discuss the importance of individuals' recognizing that caring is part of their role, Lilius advises individuals in caregiving roles to pay attention to the variability in and sequencing of life-giving versus -draining client interactions, and Miller et al. focus on the benefits of being aware of compassion as a prosocial motivator when taking on the difficult tasks

associated with social entrepreneurship. In the articles in this special topic forum, then, increasing awareness is a meaningful and important activity.

The articles also discuss the fact that, to foster care and compassion, it is often necessary for individuals or groups to receive training and/or increase learning of some kind. For example, Atkins and Parker and Fehr and Gelfand suggest the usefulness of mindfulness training, while Lawrence and Maitlis discuss the importance of training in using narrative practices consistent with an ethic of care.

Some of the articles also address structural features. For example, Gittell and Douglass talk about embedding relational bureaucracy into roles, and Fehr and Gelfand discuss the importance of organizational practices, such as restorative dispute resolution and employee support programs, in creating a forgiveness climate. And hiring is not ignored, either: Madden et al. focus on the importance of a diverse workforce for care and compassion to flourish, and Gittell and Douglass discuss how reciprocity can be embedded into roles through hiring and training.

In addition to these types of initiatives (previously outlined by Bartunek & Rynes), several of the articles also emphasize the importance of interactions that model care and compassion. Such initiatives are not at all prominent in other literature. For example, Grant and Patil discuss modeling prosocial behaviors, accompanied by inquiry and advocacy. Madden et al. discuss how, during self-organizing compassion, agents modify their roles to include compassionate behavior and then spread these role modifications throughout the organization via their interactions with other employees, customers, and managers. Lawrence and Maitlis describe and call for caring narrative practices, while Gittell and Douglas discuss treating each other as subjects rather than objects.

Expected outcomes. Bartunek and Rynes (2010) found that by far the most frequent outcome listed in most implications for practice sections is some sort of enhanced productivity or success. However, that is not by any means a prominent outcome in the present articles.

Some of the articles focus particularly on outcomes for individuals: a higher level of well-being (Atkins & Parker), an enhanced quality of caring and more self-restorative interactions

with clients (Lilius), or an internalized volunteering identity (Grant). Others focus more on group- or organization-level outcomes, such as creating climates and cultures that embody an ethic of care (Lawrence & Maitlis) and forgiveness (Fehr & Gelfand), or formalized structures that enable care and compassion (Madden et al.), such as relational bureaucracies (Gittell & Douglass) or market-based ventures with social missions (Miller et al.).

Care and Compassion As Radical Practice

Taken together, the articles in this special topic forum present somewhat diverse but complementary views of what organizing might be like if care and compassion were to move to the forefront: care and compassion would be the responsibility of everyone in the organization, there would be much to be learned to carry out this responsibility but also available practices that could help, and the outcomes would be beneficial for individuals and organizations alike. Thus, in addition to their conceptual contributions, as a set the articles present initial blueprints for what compassionate organizing might look like in practice.

Reviewing the differences between the audiences for, practices, and ultimate objectives of the articles in this issue and those of the more traditional management literature reviewed by Bartunek and Rynes (2010) and Walsh et al. (2003), one is left with the thought that if care and compassion were to move to the forefront of organizational scholarship, the results might be truly radical. Rather than targeting research and theory primarily at managers and productivity, organizational scholarship would be addressed to people at all levels of the organization. Rather than assuming that revenues, profits, and wages or salaries are the ultimate (and, often, sole) objectives of organizations and organizing, attention would be focused additionally or instead on the health, happiness, well-being, and sustainability of organizations, their members, and those they serve. Although some of the processes for attaining these outcomes would be similar for multiple types of organizations (e.g., embedding norms in roles, creating new structures, providing training), others might differ considerably (e.g., changing norms through narrative practices or prosocial behaviors, inquiry, and advocacy).

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Even as we embrace the need for greater sensitivity and attention to care and compassion in and of organizations, we also believe that we ourselves are not exempt from that call. That same concern applies to our own organizations and profession. For example, there is nothing like the journal review process to both awaken and deaden compassion (Day, 2011). Noticing the efforts of authors, empathically grasping their struggle and stakes, and responding with care to their ideas is met—at the very same time—with the cold reality of deadlines and a sense of responsibility to the profession to deliver intellectual contributions worthy of readers' time and effort. Loyalty to both sets of demands takes work and support.

More broadly, working on this special issue raised for us probing questions about how we do our academic and educational work. Do we adequately consider the potential toxicity and suffering that are an inevitable part of our work with others (Gallos, 2008)? Do we care deeply enough about our phenomena, our subjects, and our students (Adler & Hanson, 2012)? Or do we run the risk of treating them as mere means to our own ends? Do the dynamics of power and distress increase our insensitivity to the pain of others (Van Kleef et al., 2008)? If fifteen-minute conference presentations, relentless productivity measures, tenure letters, and faceless journal reviews create conditions inhospitable to fostering care and compassion—even as they foster other virtues of utmost importance to our profession—what complementary institutions and practices do we need if we are to infuse our scholarly community with care and compassion? How can we foster self-compassion (Neff, Kirkpatrick, & Rude, 2007) as we suffer the inevitable setbacks and disappointments that are part of our work lives?

Other professions have looked critically inward and created the resolve to infuse care and compassion more fully into their values, beliefs, and practices. For example, in education, Noddings (2003) has been a strong proponent of the infusion of ethics based on caring as core to the educational enterprise. In professions as diverse as policing (e.g., DeValve & Adkinson, 2008), law (Gerdy, 2008), and engineering (Fleischmann, 2001), there have been recent calls to embrace and infuse compassion and

care into how one becomes a practitioner in these various fields. We are left to wonder and speculate what it would mean to infuse care and compassion into the practice of management as well the practice of management research and teaching. This special topic forum stands as one effort to begin asking these kinds of questions and inviting new forms of answers.

REFERENCES

Adler, N. J., & Hanson, H. 2012. Daring to care: Scholarship that supports the courage of our convictions. *Journal of Management Inquiry,* 21: 128–139.

Amabile, T. M., & Kramer, S. J. 2011. *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Anderson, P. 1999. Complexity theory and organization science. *Organization Science,* 10: 216–232.

Armstrong, K. 2011. *Twelve steps to a compassionate life.* New York: Knopf.

Ashforth, B. 1994. Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations,* 47: 755–778.

Atkins, P. W. B., & Parker, S. K. 2012. Understanding individual compassion in organizations: The role of appraisals and psychological flexibility. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 524–546.

Axelrod, R., & Cohen, M. D. 1999. *Harnessing complexity: Organizational implications of a scientific frontier.* New York: Free Press.

Bartunek, J. M., & Rynes, S. L. 2010. The construction and contributions of "implications for practice": What's in them and what might they offer? *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 9: 100–117.

Batson, C. D., Turk, C. L., Shaw, L. L., & Klein, T. R. 1995. Information function of empathic emotion: Learning that we value the other's welfare. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 68: 300–313.

Beal, D. J., Weiss, H. M., Barros, E., & MacDermid, S. M. 2005. An episodic process model of affective influences on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 90: 1054–1068.

Benner, P., & Wrubel, J. 1989. *The primacy of caring, stress and coping in health and illness.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennett, R., & Gabriel, H. 2003. Image and reputational characteristics of UK charitable organizations: An empirical study. *Corporate Reputation Review,* 6: 276–289.

Bolino, M. C. 1999. Citizenship and impression management: Good soldiers or good actors? *Academy of Management Review,* 24: 82–98.

Boyatzis, R. E., Smith, M. L., & Blaize, N. 2006. Developing sustainable leaders through coaching and compassion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 5: 8–24.

Bradbury, H., & Lichtenstein, B. M. B. 2000. Relationality in organizational research: Exploring the space between. *Organization Science,* 11: 551–564.

Broadhead, W. E., Kaplan, B. H., James, S. A., Wagner, E. H., Schoenbach, V. J., Grimson, R., Heyden, S., Tibblin, G., & Gehlbach, S. J. 1983. The epidemiological evidence for a relationship between social support and health. *American Journal of Epidemiology,* 117: 521–537.

Brown, S. L., Ness, R. M., Vinokur, A. D., & Smith, D. M. 2003. Providing social support may be more beneficial than receiving it: Results from a prospective study of mortality. *Psychological Science,* 14: 320–327 .

Brown, S. R., Brown, M., & Penner, L. A. (Eds.). 2012. *Moving beyond self interest.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, S. R., Brown, M., & Preston, S. 2012. The human caregiving system: A neuroscience model of compassionate motivation and behavior. In S. R. Brown, M. Brown, & L. A. Penner (Eds.), *Moving beyond self interest:* 75–88. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, K. S., & Spreitzer, G. 2012. *The Oxford handbook of positive organizational scholarship.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. 2008. Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 91: 1082–1103.

Chiles, T. H., Meyer, A., & Hench, T. 2004. Organizational emergence: The origin and transformation of Branson, Missouri's musical theaters. *Organization Science,* 15: 499–519.

Chong, K. 2007. *Early Confucian ethics: Concepts and arguments.* Peru, IL: Open Court.

Clark, C. 1998. *Misery and company: Sympathy in everyday life.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, S., & Willis, T. 1985. Stress, social support, and the buffering effect. *Psychological Bulletin,* 92: 257–310.

Crocker, J., & Canevello, A. 2012. Egosystem and ecosystem motivational perspectives on caregiving. In S. R. Brown, M. Brown, & L. A. Penner (Eds.), *Moving beyond self interest:* 211–223. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dalai Lama. 1995. *The power of compassion.* London: Thorsons.

Damasio, A. R. 1994. *Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain.* New York: Putnam.

Darley, J. M., & Batson, C. D. 1973. "From Jerusalem to Jericho": A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 27: 100–108.

Davidson, R. J., & Harrington, A. (Eds.). 2002. *Visions of compassion.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Davis, M. H. 1996. *Empathy: A social psychological approach.* New York: Westview Press.

Day, N. E. 2011. The silent majority: Manuscript rejection and its impact on scholars. *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 10: 704–718.

Deshpandé, R., & Raina, A. 2011. The ordinary heroes of the Taj. *Harvard Business Review,* 89(12): 119–123.

DeValve, M. J., & Adkinson, C. D. 2008. Mindfulness, compassion and the police in America: An essay of hope. *Human Architecture: The Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge,* VI(3): 99–104.

De Waal, F. 2009. *The age of empathy: Nature's lessons for a kinder society.* New York: Harmony Books.

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

Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. 2006. Explaining compassion organizing. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 51: 59–96.

Fehr, R., & Gelfand, M. J. 2012. The forgiving organization: A multilevel model of forgiveness at work. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 664–688.

Feldman, M. S., & Rafaeli, A. 2002. Organizational routines as sources of connections and understandings. *Organization Science,* 39: 303–331.

Felin, T., & Foss, N. J. 2009. Organizational routines and capabilities: Historical drift and a course-correction toward microfoundations. *Scandinavian Journal of Management,* 25: 157–167.

Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., & Sutton, R. I. 2005. Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review,* 30: 8–24.

Ferris, G. F., Liden, R. C., Munyon, T. R., Summers, J. K., Basic, K. J., & Buckley, M. R. 2009. Relationships at work: Toward a multidimensional conceptualization of dyadic work relationships. *Journal of Management,* 35: 1379–1403.

Fleischmann, S. 2001. *Needed: A few good knights for the information age—Competence, courage and compassion in the engineering curriculum.* Paper presented at the ASEE/IEEE Frontiers in Education Conference, Reno, NV.

Food and Agriculture Organization. 2011. *The state of food insecurity in the world: 2011.* Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Frank, R. H. 1988. *Passions within reason: The strategic role of the emotions.* New York: Norton.

Fredrickson, B. L. 2001. The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist,* 56: 218–226.

Fredrickson, B. L. 2009. *Positivity.* New York: Crown.

Frost, P. J. 1999. Why compassion counts! *Journal of Management Inquiry,* 8: 127–133.

Frost, P. J. 2003. *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Frost, P., Dutton, J., Worline M., & Wilson, A. 2000. Narratives of compassion in organizations. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotions in organizations:* 25–45. London: Sage.

Galinsky, A., Gilin, D., & Maddux, W. W. 2011. Using both your head and your heart: The role of perspective taking and empathy in resolving social conflict. In J. P. Forgas, A. W. Kruglanski, & K. D. Williams (Eds.), *The psychology of social conflict and aggression:* 103–118. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Gallagher, P. 2009. The grounding of forgiveness: Martha Nussbaum on compassion and mercy. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology,* 68: 231–252.

Gallos, J. V. 2008. Learning from the toxic trenches: The winding road to healthier organizations and healthy everyday leaders. *Journal of Management Inquiry,* 17: 354–367.

Gerdy, K. B. 2008. Clients, empathy and compassion: Introducing first-year students to the "heart" of lawyering. *Nebraska Law Review,* 87(1): 1–61.

Gersick, C. J. G., Bartunek, J. M., & Dutton, J. E. 2000. Learning from academia: The importance of relationships in professional life. *Academy of Management Journal,* 43: 1026–1044.

Ghoshal, S. 1996. Bad for practice: A critique of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review,* 21: 13–47.

Ghoshal, S. 2005. Bad management theories are destroying good management practices. *Academy of Management Learning & Education,* 4: 75–91.

Gilligan, C. 1982. *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gittell, J. H., & Douglass, A. 2012. Relational bureaucracy: Structuring reciprocal relationships into roles. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 709–733.

Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. 2010. Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin,* 136: 351–374.

Goleman, D. 2003. *Destructive emotions.* New York: Bantam Books.

Grant, A. M. 2012. Giving time, time after time: Work design and sustained employee participation in corporate volunteering. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 589–615.

Grant, A. M., & Patil, S. V. 2012. Challenging the norm of self-interest: Minority influence and transitions to helping norms in work units. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 547–568.

Gülen, M. F. 2004. *Toward a global civilization of love and tolerance.* New Jersey: Light.

Hazen, M. 2008. Grief and the workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives,* 22(3): 78–86.

House, J. S., Umberson, D., & Landis, K. R. 1988. Structures and processes of social support. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 14: 293–318.

Hsieh, C., Yang, K., & Fu, K. 2012. Motivational bases and emotional labor: Assessing the impact of public service motivation. *Public Administration Review,* 72: 241–251.

Jackson, W. 2008. Gandhi's art: Using nonviolence to transform "evil." *Religion East and West,* 8: 39–54.

Kahn, W. A. 1993. Caring for the caregivers: Patterns of organizational caregiving. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 38: 539–563.

Kanov, J. M., Maitlis, S., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. 2004. Compassion in organizational life. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 47: 808–827.

Keltner, D. 2009. *Born to be good.* New York: Norton.

Khurana, R. 2007. *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lawrence, T. B., & Maitlis, S. 2012. Care and possibility: Enacting an ethic of care through narrative practice. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 641–663.

Liedtka, J. M. 1996. Feminist morality and competitive reality: A role for an ethic of care? *Business Ethics Quarterly,* 6: 179–200.

Lilius, J. M. 2012. Recovery at work: Understanding the restorative side of "depleting" client interactions. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 569–588.

Lopez, S. 2006. Emotional labor and organized emotional care. *Work and Occupations,* 33: 133–160.

Madden, L. T., Duchon, D., Madden, T. M., & Plowman, D. A. 2012. Emergent organizational capacity for compassion. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 689–708.

Madigan, T. 2005. Schopenhauer's compassionate morality. *Philosophy Now,* 52(Aug.-Sept.): 16–17.

Mansbridge, J. J. (Ed.). 1990. *Beyond self-interest.* Chicago: University of Chcago.

Marks, J. 2007. Rousseau's discriminating defense of compassion. *American Political Science Review,* 101: 727–739.

Maslach, C. 1982. *Burnout: The cost of caring.* New York: Prentice-Hall.

Meyer, M. H. (Ed.). 2000. *Care work: Gender, class and the welfare state.* New York: Routledge.

Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., & Vogus, T. J. 2012. Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review,* 37: 616–640.

Mintzberg, H. 2005. *Managers not MBAs: A hard look at the soft practice of managing and management development.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Neff, K. D., Kirkpatrick, K. L., & Rude, S. S. 2007. Self-compassion and adaptive psychological functioning. *Journal of Research in Personality,* 41: 139–154.

Noddings, N. 2003. *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. 1986. *The fragility of goodness: Luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. 1996. Compassion: The basic social emotion. *Social Philosophy and Policy,* 13(1): 27–58.

Nussbaum, M. C. 2003. *Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. 2001. When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations,* 54: 1387–1419.

Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. 2009. *The cost of bad behavior: How incivility damages your business and what you can do about it.* New York: Portfolio Penguin.

Plowman, D. A., Baker, L. T., Beck, T., Kulkarni, M., Solansky, S. T., & Travis, D. V. 2007. Radical change accidentally: The emergence and amplification of small change. *Academy of Management Journal,* 50: 515–543.

Powley, E. H., & Piderit, S. K. 2008. Tending wounds: Elements of the organizational healing process. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science,* 44: 134–149.

Rifkin, J. 2009. *The empathetic civilization: The race to global consciousness in a world in crisis.* New York: Penguin.

Schopenhauer, A. 1998. (First published in 1840.) *On the basis of morality.* Cambridge, MA: Hackett.

Sears, D. 1998. *Compassion for humanity in the Jewish tradition.* Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. 2000. Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist,* 55: 5–14.

Serri, C. F. 2006. Self-compassion and the dynamics of investigating sexual harassment. *Business Communication Quarterly,* 69: 443–446.

Shepherd, D. A., & Cardon, M. S. 2009. Negative emotional reactions to project failure and the self-compassion to learn from the experience. *Journal of Management Studies,* 46: 923–949.

Smith, A. 2010. (First published in 1759.) *The theory of moral sentiments.* Lawrence, KS: Digireads.com.

Sobrino, J. 2009. Jesus of Galilee from the Salvadoran context: Compassion, hope, and following the light of the cross. *Theological Studies,* 70: 437–460.

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. 2007. The recovery experience questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,* 12: 204–221.

Staw, B., Sutton, R., & Pelled, L. 1994. Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science,* 5: 51–71.

Steyaert, C., & Van Looy, B. (Eds.). 2010. *Relational practices, participative organizing.* Bingley, UK: Emerald Group.

Stone, D. 2008. *The Samaritan's dilemma: Should government help your neighbor?* New York: Nation Books.

Sullivan, B. M., Wiist, B., & Wayment, H. 2010. The Buddhist health study: Meditation on love and compassion as features of religious practice. *Cross Currents,* 60: 185–207.

Sznaider, N. 2001. *The compassionate temperament: Care and cruelty in modern society.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Tepper, B. J. 2007. Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management,* 33: 261–289.

Times of India. 2011. AMRI hospital fire: Hospital staff abandon patients to fire. December 9: http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/kolkata/AMRI-hospital-fire-Hospital-staff-abandon-patients-to-fire/articleshow/11045537.cms.

Trougakos, J. P., Beal, D. J., Green, S. G., & Weiss, H. M. 2008. Making the break count: An episodic examination of recovery activities, emotional experiences, and positive affective displays. *Academy of Management Journal,* 51: 131–146.

Tsui, A. S. 2010. *Dare to care: Passion and compassion in management research.* Available at http://publications.aomonline.org/newsletter/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=387.

Van Kleef, G. A., Oveis, C., van der Löwe, I., LouKogan, A., Goetz, J., & Keltner, D. 2008. Power, distress, and compassion: Turning a blind eye to the suffering of others. *Psychological Science,* 19: 1315–1322 .

Von Krogh, G., Ichijo, K., & Nonaka, I. 2000. *Enabling knowledge creation: How to unlock the mystery of tacit knowledge and release the power of innovation.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Walker, L. J. 1991. Sex differences in moral reasoning. In W. M. Kurtini & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development,* vol. 2: 333–364. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Walsh, J. P. 2011. Embracing the sacred in our scholarly secular world. *Academy of Management Review,* 36: 215–234.

Walsh, J. P., Weber, K., & Margolis, J. D. 2003. Social issues in management: Our lost cause found. *Journal of Management,* 29: 859–881.

Westman, M., & Eden, D. 1997. Effects of a respite from work on burnout: Vacation relief and fade-out. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 82: 516–527.

White, R. 2008. *Radical virtues: Moral wisdom and the ethics of contemporary life.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Whitford, D. 2011. Sandler O'Neill's journey from Ground Zero. *Fortune,* 164: 94–106.

Williamson, O. E. 1981. The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. *American Journal of Sociology,* 87: 548–577.

Worthington, E. L., & Scherer, M. 2004. Forgiveness is an emotion-focused coping strategy that can reduce health risks and promote health resilience: Theory, review and hypotheses. *Psychology & Health,* 19: 385–405.

Wuthnow, R. 1991. *Acts of compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sara L. Rynes (sara-rynes@uiowa.edu) is the John F. Murray Professor of Management and Organizations at the University of Iowa. She received her Ph.D. from the Univer-

sity of Wisconsin. Her research focuses on organizational staffing, compensation, academic-practitioner relations, and management education.

Jean M. Bartunek (Bartunek@bc.edu) is the Robert A. and Evelyn J. Ferris Chair and Professor of Management and Organization at Boston College. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Chicago and is a past president of the Academy of Management. Her research interests focus on organizational change and academic-practitioner relationships.

Jane E. Dutton (janedut@umich.edu) is the Robert L. Kahn Distinguished University Professor of Business Administration and Psychology at the University of Michigan. She received her Ph.D. from Northwestern University. Her research focuses on compassion and organizations, positive identity processes, high-quality connections, and job crafting. She cares deeply about positive organizational scholarship.

Joshua D. Margolis (jmargolis@hbs.edu) is the James Dinan and Elizabeth Miller Professor of Business Administration in the Organizational Behavior Unit at Harvard Business School. He received his Ph.D. from Harvard University. His research focuses on the ethical challenges that companies and managers encounter and how people can meet those challenges with practical effectiveness and moral integrity.