

Integrating Principles of Care, Compassion and Justice in Organizations: Exploring Dynamic Nature of Organizational Justice

Journal of Human Values
20(2) 167–181
© 2014 Management Centre
for Human Values
SAGE Publications
Los Angeles, London,
New Delhi, Singapore,
Washington DC
DOI: 10.1177/0971685814539411
<http://jhv.sagepub.com>



Khuram Shahzad
Hassan Sohaib Murad
Naveda Kitchlew
Shahid A. Zia

Abstract

This article aims to respond to the long-lived perceived incompatibility between care and compassion and justice in organizational literature. It is argued that principles of care and compassion and principles of justice are compatible with each other and can be integrated in organizations in such a way that both will supplement each other. Previous researches tend to view concepts of care and compassion and justice either as competing or inheriting some fundamental trade-offs. This article argues that the highlighted incompatibility between care and compassion and justice is mainly due to the limited understanding about the nature of organizational justice. Care and compassion carry elements of subjectivity and are dynamic in nature, whereas literature on organizational justice has described justice as an objective, static and linear construct due to which an incompatibility between these two very important phenomena is prevailing. This incompatibility can be removed by changing the way of looking at organizational justice and by exploring its dynamic nature.

Keywords

Care and compassion, organizational justice, dynamic nature of organizational justice, compassionate-just organization

Introduction

Miseries, misfortunes and hardships are acknowledged as inevitable realities of life which humans experience during their economic, political and social encounters (Peus, 2011). During the last decade it

Khuram Shahzad (corresponding author), University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan. E-mail: khuram.shahzad@umt.edu.pk

Hassan Sohaib Murad, University of Management and Technology, Pakistan. E-mail: hassan@umt.edu.pk

Naveda Kitchlew, University of Management and Technology, Pakistan. E-mail: naveda.kitchlew@umt.edu.pk

Shahid A. Zia, Akhuwat College of Business Studies, Lahore, Pakistan. E-mail: lahorelse@yahoo.com

has been acknowledged that individuals' personal life directly affects their professional outcomes at workplace (Frost & Hoggett, 2008; Madden, Duchon, Madden & Plowman, 2012).

This situation cautions organizations for greater responsibility to mitigate members' sufferings and promote collective well-being. Care and compassion, in this regard, have recently grasped much attention of organizational scholars and practitioners (Eddington, 2010; Rynes, Bartunek, Dutton & Margolis, 2012). As organizations have realized the pivotal role of human resources in building and sustaining competitive advantage; the concepts of 'common good' (Lefkowitz, 2008), well-being (DeNisi, 2007) and social relationships have gained significant attention (Rousseau, 1995). Care and compassion in organizations enables individuals to respond to each other's needs and miseries in a timely and caring fashion through social/reciprocal relationships that glue different organizational members (Gittell & Douglass, 2012; Powell, 1990).

Caring and compassionate behaviours, however, because of their congenial, relational and personal orientation have been criticized due to the limited scalability, replicability, sustainability and increased vulnerability to favouritism in organizations (Gittell & Douglass, 2012); lack of which can potentially imperil the essence of equality, justice and fairness in organization (Folger & Greenberg, 1985; Tang & Sarsfield-Baldwin, 1996; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). Literature on organizational justice suggests that a fair and equitable treatment of employees has a positive impact on their productivity and commitment level. Equality and justice perceptions have also been identified as strong predictors of various favourable organizational outcomes including strong social relationships (Cropanzano, Prehar & Chen, 2002; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002). Many classic as well as contemporary scholars have declared care and compassion in stark clash with principles of justice that deteriorates the implementation of justice in organizations (Gallagher, 2009; Joan, 1993; Margalit, 1996; Nussbaum, 1995; Whitebrook, 2002). However, regarding the operationalization and supremacy of both compassion and justice concepts in organizations, there exists a serious disagreement among scholars and practitioners. Justice-based organizations are criticized due to the little capacity to provide caring and compassionate treatment to unique needs/problems of their individuals (Heckscher, 1994).

Although the need for principles of justice has been widely acknowledged, there still exists a serious concern regarding application of justice among the scholars who advocate 'need' and/or 'desert' (Barry, 1973; Cupit, 2013; Miller, 1999; O'neill, 2000; Rawls, 1972). This justice-compassion interplay has brought a tough trade-off to organizational decision makers. Justice, by following the paradigms of positivism and objectivity, envisions impersonal decision-making based on fairness, equality and rules and thus rejects the feminist notions of particularity and need, whereas care and compassion ground their rationality in holism and context and envisage the necessity of empathy, harmony and emotions for people needs and miseries in decision-making process (Hall, Brinchmann & Aagaard, 2012). Many influential philosophers, that is, Plato, the Stoics, Descartes, Nietzsche and Kant have opposed the role of compassion (or emotions) in decision-making and implementation process (Gallagher, 2009; Sznajder, 2002). They were strong advocates of reason and justice in making social and economic judgements, and viewed emotions and/or compassion as something personal and vulnerable to impersonal principles of reason and justice. Weber (1958/1904), a leading management thought leader, stated that personal relations naturally lead to misuse/abuse of power, favouritism and eventually inefficiencies. He was of the view that people were vulnerable to work on personal calls instead of organizational calls.

These scholars, being more focused on the economic and political periphery of value enhancement, suggest organizations to maintain the supremacy of principles of justice over care and compassion, if to be successful. However, scholars with relational and human orientation widely challenge the

overwhelming focus of organizations on the rules, equality and universalism and suggest organizations to maintain a humanistic orientation while focusing on humans' needs/problems, motivation, social harmony and reciprocal relationships in order to gain success and excellence (Crisp, 2003; Ehrhart & Naumann, 2004; Frost, Dutton, Maitlis, Lilius, Kanov & Worline, 2006; Grant, Dutton & Rosso, 2008; Hazen, 2003; Kahn, 1998; Lilius et al., 2008; Miller, 1999; Rynes et al., 2012; Van Dyne & LePine, 1998; Wageman & Hackman, 2007).

In her call for paper (2010) from the platform of Academy of Management, Anne Tsui explicitly invited management scholars to look deeper into care and compassion, saying it was the right time to do so. Frost, Dutton, Worline and Wilson (2000) wrote in their book that 'Care and Compassion are not separate from "being a professional" or "doing the work of the organization" instead, it is the natural and living representation of people's humanity in the workplace.'

Due to these opposing but convincing views there is a serious concern among scholars and practitioners regarding the possibility of combining benefits of both principles of justice and principles of compassion in organizations simultaneously, as focusing on any one side and overlooking the other can potentially hinder organizations to compete and grow sustainably. This situation calls for a new approach that should integrate the principles of compassion and justice to allow organizations to take advantage of both the phenomenon instead of having one at the cost of other. However, while doing so, the questions under strong consideration are that 'how a balance between the principles of justice and principles of care and compassion can be created within an organization' and 'how these two apparently opposing concepts will be complementing each other instead of standing in front of each other.'

The objective of this article is to argue that it is rationally possible to integrate/combine the principles of justice and care/compassion in organizations in such a way that both would be supplementing instead of nullifying the existence of each other, thus paving the way towards emergence of compassionate justice in organizations. The prevailing tension between the principles of justice and care/compassion in literature is primarily due to the incompatibility between the natures of these concepts where justice has been conceptualized as a 'static/linear' one and compassion as a 'dynamic/non-linear' construct. It is therefore argued that, by exploring the dynamic/non-linear nature of 'justice', an alignment between principles of justice and care and compassion can be achieved and thus incompatibility highlighted by the previous literature be removed. This argument is consistent with contemporary social scientists' attempts to explore new possibilities in human relations by using concepts and principles of multiple disciplines, namely, sociology, neurology, psychology etc. (Brown, Brown & Penner, 2012).

This article starts by highlighting the seminal and contemporary discussions about the nature of care and compassion and organizational justice to provide a context for more in-depth understanding that how care and compassion have been viewed as dynamic construct whereas organizational justice as a static and linear one. After that, article explores the dynamic nature of organizational justice and its possible relationship with emotions and others related outcomes. In the last section, article integrates the newly explored dynamic nature of organizational justice with the same of care and compassion in organization.

Care and Compassion Conceptualized

The existence of care and compassion can be traced thousand years back to different philosophical, theological and scientific discussions (Armstrong, 2011); however its debate in organizations and management literature is quite recent (Rynes et al., 2012).

Compassion has been defined in relation with different emotions and feelings such as pity (Nussbaum, 1996; Whitebrook, 2002) empathy (Arendt, 1973) care etc. which an individual exerts for other's sufferings and tragedies. Clark (1998) has defined compassion as a phenomenon of noticing, feeling and responding to the suffering of others where a compassionate person in first glance, notices and becomes aware of the suffering of other (Frost, 2003), then he feels for other's suffering (Batson, 1994) and finally he responds by taking appropriate action to lessen others' sufferings (Nussbaum, 2001).

Despite the fundamental philosophical differences, compassion has been preached by all the religions as a foremost human virtue. Islam declares 'Allah/God' as an ultimate source of compassion and teaches tolerance, love and compassion to individuals. The Holy Qur'an, Islam's divine book, says 'O people, be compassionate to others so that you may be granted compassion by God.' Jesus endorsed mercy and/or compassion in Christianity (Sears & Carper, 1998). Hinduism preaches not to do any harm to others and treat all as oneself. Confucianism declares benevolence and humanity as 'the loftiest ideal of moral excellence' (Chong, 2007). In Judaism, justice and righteousness are viewed as key instruments to bring peace and prosperity to the world (Sears & Carper, 1998). Buddhism declares compassion as an inherent attribute of individual that is the source of greater wisdom (Dalai Lama, 1995).

The concept of compassion in philosophy can be traced back to Aristotle's thoughts who defined it as an emotion that one demonstrates towards 'the misfortune one believes to have befallen another'. According to Aristotle, an individual in order to have compassion for other has to believe that (i) the person's suffering is serious, (ii) sufferer does not deserve it and (iii) the same can happen to him/her-self (Gallagher, 2009). Philosophers like Plato, Stoics and Kant took a sceptical stance on care and compassion and declared these feelings as substitute of reason and justice. Aristotle, unlikely Plato and the Stoics, appreciated the role of feelings and emotions but stressed the role of cognition (reason) in stimulating the feelings of compassion for others. Rousseau (1995), Schopenhauer (1998/1840) and Aristotle viewed care and compassion as something supplementing justice and reasoning instead of being substitute of and incompatible with justice.

Concepts of care and compassion in management sciences can be drawn from the works of Kahn (1998) on caring systems, Lopez (2006) on caring work, Steyaert and Van Looy (2010) on caring relationships, Von Krogh, Ichijo and Nonaka (2000) on care as knowledge management enablers and Gilligan (1982) on the concept and application of ethics of care. Similarly, the work on theories of care and compassion in management science can be attributed to the contributions of Frost and Hoggett (2008) on significance of compassion and Kanov, Maitlis, Worline, Dutton, Frost and Lilius (2004) on cognitive, affective and behavioural components of compassion.

Scholars in social science have grounded care and compassion in theories of human behaviour. Brown, Brown and Preston (2012) explained the positive impact of social bonds on different human behaviours through neurobiological system by proposing the neuro-scientific model of compassionate motivation. This work is consistent with the prior work of (Damasio, 1994) who, contrary to the conventional wisdom, explored the positive impact of emotions on the cognitive and reasoning abilities of individuals by studying the neuro-biological systems of respondents. While studying the biological nature of compassion Davidson and Harrington (2001) and Nitschke, Heller, Imig, McDonald and Miller (2001) identified the link between compassionate feelings and brain's activities. Bio-psychological research has also identified that being helpful to others initiates same activities in brain that are observed when the person is in state of happiness/pleasure. Amabile and Kramer (2011), Cohn, Fredrickson, Brown, Mikels and Conway (2009) and Dutton and Ragins (2007) have identified the strong impact of positive emotions and relatedness on individuals' performance, innovation, creativity, motivation and physical well-being.

Organizational Justice Conceptualized

Literature on organizational justice begins with the seminal work of Adams (1965) equity theory which was influenced by the cognitive dissonance theory of Festinger (1957). Adams's equity theory served as a foundation for organizational justice. Weick (1966) acknowledged the equity theory as 'among the more useful middle-range theories of organizational behavior'. Embedded in the philosophy of Adams and Festinger concerning justice and equity was the notion of fairness and equality, which is consistent with organizational justice's contemporary notion of perceived fairness at workplace (Fortin, 2008). According to Adams (1965), cognitive dissonance (Festinger's theory) arises when things do not unfold according to one's expectations. He studied the impact of pay and other external factors on the perceived inequities and concluded that individuals develop their perception of justice by getting into social comparison which they do by calculating the balance between inputs (knowledge, skills, efforts, etc.) which they put and outputs (rewards, money, recognition, authority, etc.) which they receive. Any perceived imbalance in input-output ratio ignites perception of injustice which further motivates individuals to do something to remove the perceived inequity. However, a good perceived balance leads individuals into a satisfied and peaceful state of mind. Blau (1964) further generalized this justice phenomenon and endorsed the presence of notion of social comparison in every sphere of social exchange.

In the mid 1980s, researches on equity and organizational justice reported conflicting findings. Huseman, Hatfield and Miles (1987) took this notion to the next step and brought in the concept of equity sensitivity. According to them, people respond to inequities differently due to their varying level of sensitivity towards situation causing inequity. He identified three types of such people, namely, equity sensitive people, benevolent people and entitled people. Equity sensitive people view equity by doing conventional comparison of input-output ratio and then act to remove that inequity if either input exceeds output or output exceeds input. Benevolent people, on the other hand, do the social comparison, but act only when inputs exceed outputs. The third category which contains entitled people includes those who act when their outputs exceed inputs. According to Huseman et al. (1987) the preventive measure of people either positive or negative varies across these three categories.

Organizational justice, in general, refers to fairness perceptions that people hold about the decision-making and resource allocation process in organizations (Greenberg, 1987). However, contemporary researchers categorize organizational justice into four general types such as distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice and newly emerged dimension informational justice (Colquitt, 2001). Distributive justice has been the central focus of economics and political theories due to its focus on the fair distribution and allocation of rewards and resources by equalizing the inputs-outputs ratio (Adams, 1965; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Gilliland, 1994). In procedural justice, Thibaut and Walker (1975) and Leventhal (1976) viewed the fairness of processes, which are used to distribute and allocate resources and rewards, in direct link with equity theory. They focused on the reactions that people demonstrate regarding unfair processes and procedures. People develop their perceptions about organizational justice on the basis of perceived fairness in the procedures and processes which their companies use for decision-making and the treatment which they receive from top management on just matters. Bies and Moag (1986) and Tyler and Bies (1990) took this research further and presented the concept of interactional justice which they viewed as a component of procedural justice. They identified the opportunities to interact with and treatment received from decision makers and authorities as the factors which shape individuals' perception about the organizational justice. People give importance to interact with authorities and treatment which they receive from them and thus are

concerned with the fairness of authorities to provide everyone with equal interactional opportunities and respect (Ambrose, 2002). An offshoot of interactional justice is informational justice that refers to the degree of fairness of explanations, justification and information that people receive from organizations (Colquitt, 2001)

Researchers have empirically identified the impact of different dimensions of organizational justice on number of individual and organizational outcomes such as job satisfaction, selection, deviant workplace behaviour, citizenship behaviours, commitment, performance and on many others. For example, Leung, Smith, Wang and Sun (1996) have identified the positive effect of all three types of justice on job satisfaction. Kim and Mauborgne (1993) found a strong relationship between procedural justice, performance, decision-making, turnover and trust. Greenberg and Bies (1992) identified the positive role of organizational justice in creating ethical organizations. Baker, Hunt and Andrews (2006) identified the strong impact of perception of employees regarding fairness of their company's policies, procedures and decision-making on their morality, ethical decision-making and other related ethical behaviours.

Regarding the negative outcomes of perceived organizational injustice, researchers have identified several counterproductive behaviours as caused by organizational injustice. For example, when employees feel that they are being treated unfairly, they tend to get into negative work attitudes (Daly, 2003), retaliation and unethical actions (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001), stealing and theft (Greenberg & Scott, 1996), more conflicts (Cropanzano & Baron, 1991), low job performance (Cropanzano et al., 2002), hiding errors and holding important information (Treviño & Weaver, 2001).

Exploring Dynamic Nature of Organizational Justice: New Lens

Before jumping into the exploration of dynamic nature of justice, it is pertinent to describe the meanings of static and linear justice and how it is different from dynamic nature of care and compassion. In order to make things simple, the dictionary meaning of static or linear can be used here. Dictionary defines static as 'something which is fixed and not moving or changing'. Similarly, linear is something 'relating to and consisting of lines which are developed sequentially without any in-depth understanding'. By static and linear justice, we mean that people form their perceptions of fairness/unfairness about anything on the basis of pre-determined, objective, explicit and unanimously declared rules (which are fixed lines). These stated rules or points further serve as an institutionalized reference point for individuals to form their perceptions about the fairness or integrity of a phenomenon without getting into their subjective judgements (without in-depth understanding). These points become legitimized through organizational approval and then govern the distributive, procedural, interactional and informational justice behaviours of organization and its members.

On the other hand, dynamic is referred to 'something which contains a sense of purpose and produces or undergoes change and development'. Care and compassion are attributed as dynamic because people form their caring and compassionate behaviours with regard to others' needs and miseries by using their subjective judgements, emotions and feelings. Since, in theory, individuals' needs, miseries, emotions, feelings and judgements have been identified as dynamic concepts; care and compassion being outcome of all these should also be viewed as a dynamic concept. All these concepts cannot be predicted on a straight line and therefore peoples' judgements and perceptions are developed in a unique context and do not follow any pre-determined stated criteria given by the respective organization.

However it is pertinent to understand some fundamental questions related to organizational justice. For example, why people care about justice? how people make their judgements about justice? how people shape their reactions in unfair situations (Blader & Tyler, 2009). Seminal work on organizational justice, mostly influenced by political philosophies and scientific management, has attempted to produce answers of these questions by declaring organizational justice as a static and linear phenomenon. However, from recent years organizational scholars have started conceptualizing organizational justice as a dynamic phenomenon. This new orientation, by revealing that people change and adjust their fairness perceptions over time, has brought in the evolutionary and dynamic nature of organizational justice. Researchers who have followed longitudinal methodologies in studying organizational justice have criticized the limited ability of static and cross-sectional methodologies to explore about justice and its effects and have revealed that people change their perceptions about justice over time because of unique situations, new experiences and information (Ambrose & Cropanzano, 2003; Boswell, Boudreau & Tichy, 2005; Holtz & Harold, 2009). Given the impact of situation, time, information and experiences on people's fairness and justice perceptions, it seems counter rationale to make concrete inferences about the organizational justice's outcomes just by exploring its static and linear nature only.

Despite the substantial progress of prior research on organizational justice, there is yet still much more to be explored. New avenues and perspectives such as 'dynamic nature of organizational justice' have emerged which previous studies have not taken it into account while studying its relationships with other organizational variables (Hausknecht, Sturman & Roberson, 2011). It is reasonably expected that by changing the lens from static to dynamic nature of organizational justice; the theories, findings and inferences will change accordingly.

Kahneman, Fredrickson, Schreiber and Redelmeier (1993) highlighted the framed ability of cognition which uses certain characteristics of previous experiences as a point of reference in their future interpretation. This phenomenon of heavy reliance of cognition on experiences has been termed as 'experience profile' by Ariely and Carmon (2000). This notion of subjective judgement and cognitive variability is also strengthened by different related theories and researches. For instance, fairness heuristic theory explains the role of subjective judgement in developing fairness perceptions which they draw through their social interactions with seniors, colleagues and top management (Lind, 2001b). Similarly, individuals use their past justice experiences to make sense of the future justice experiences. Evident from these findings is the fact that subjective nature of perceptions and judgements is an input element for justice judgements and since subjectivity is dynamic in its nature so this is reasonably rational to consider the resultant output, which is justice perception, as a dynamic construct and not a static one (Holtz & Harold, 2009).

Integrating Care/Compassion and Organizational Justice: A Dynamic Conceptualization

The main objective of this article is to argue that it is logically possible to integrate the principles of care and compassion and principles of justice in organizations in such a way that both will supplement each other's strengths instead of diffusing them. Previous researches have been sceptic in this regard and have either viewed justice and compassion as competing, or something which inherits trade-off. So far it has been argued that the highlighted incompatibility between justice and care and compassion in literature is

due to the limited understating of the organizational justice's nature. Principles of care and compassion are dynamic in nature, whereas organizational justice literature has described justice as something static and linear in nature due to which an incompatibility between these two has taken place. The previously identified incompatibility between principles of justice and principles of care and compassion can be removed by changing the way of looking at organizational justice and especially by exploring its dynamic nature. In previous parts of this article effort has been made to conceptually explore how principles of justice are dynamic in nature. From this point onward, article will try to build several arguments as to how dynamic nature of organizational justice is compatible with principles of care and compassion in organizations.

The work of Tronto (1993) on the multiple senses of care, Frost et al. (2006) on three lenses of compassion, Crisp (2003) on equality and care, Cropanzano (2002) on social exchange theory through justice, Gittell (2012) on theory of relational bureaucracy and Hausknecht et al. (2011) on dynamic nature of justice, is significant in this regard to integrate principles of care and compassion and principles of justice in organizations.

As has been argued earlier, care and compassion are required to establish a society where fairness, equality and rule of law will be valued and cared. Berlant (2004) asserts that despite the increasing awareness of other's sufferings caused by sensationalist media, the rate of people's compassionate responses to these sufferings is discouraging. It is not necessary that people will personally find it important and valuable to respond to other's miseries; therefore, compassion is supposed to help in developing policies and justice to safeguard sufferers (Eddington, 2010). Tragedies, miseries and sufferings can be experienced by any person and having caring and compassionate treatment in times of suffering from the organization is a source of greater emotional attachment and commitment with firms and several other positive emotional outcomes at workplace (Lilius et al., 2008).

Given the rational, logical and reason-oriented nature of justice, the compassionate behaviour must be developed after a delicate thinking process where urgency, relevance and importance of compassion should be well rationalized. This is not something where emotions and reasoning are divorced; instead these will work together in a synergetic manner. Eddington (2010) has termed this combination as 'intelligent emotion' which is very similar to the notion of emotional intelligence. For instance, fairness heuristic theory explains the role of subjective judgement in developing fairness perceptions which they draw on through their social interactions with seniors, colleagues and top management (Lind, 2001a). Subjective judgement is required to understand the requirements of justice on the basis of which a caring and compassionate response will be produced that will adhere to the 'justice claims' (Crisp, 2003). It is not always possible to externalize the policies of justice due to social complexities involved, and in case of absence of any mechanistically designed and publically declared course of action, the only form of justice is compassion. Research has empirically identified the impact of organizational justice practices on social exchanges which take place between organizational members (Cropanzano et al., 2002; Rupp & Cropanzano, 2002).

Tronto (1993) explained the term 'phases of caring' and categorized caring senses into 'caring about', 'caring for', 'care-giving' and care-receiving. 'Caring about' involves the overall concern of a person for other's needs and problems. 'Caring for' is based on one's focus on any specific need/problem of other. 'Care-giving' involves getting into activities to provide relief to the needy/sufferer. 'Care-receiving' covers one's caring attitude about his/her own needs/problems. This 'caring sense' approach has been questioned in terms of its compatibility with perspectives of organizational justice. It is yet to explain if the notion of justice and care and compassion are complementing or defeating each other. It is argued

that care and compassion can establish a potential platform for justice where it will be based on equality and solidarity (Hoggett, 2006). This idea of compassionate justice is consistent with Eddington's (2010) concept of 'compassion tempered by justice'. In organizations, incompatibility between principles of care and compassion and principles of justice usually arises when some complex social situations create trade-offs between individual's need/problem and institutional rules and procedures. Tronto's taxonomy of caring responses seems appealing in such situations as individuals can adopt best caring response among the above four by gauging its appropriateness with organizational justice requirements. This argument is consistent with Gilligan's notion of care. Fairness, rights, duties, principles are primary moral notions behind justice. According to Gilligan (1982), care is a moral stance, which manifests one's preferences regarding selection of moral response in a particular situation. Consistent with Eddington's (2010) concept of intelligent emotion, the selection of moral response naturally involves the thinking and reasoning which is aligned with justice's requirements of rationality as highlighted by Nussbaum (2001).

Care and compassion, because of the 'personalized' orientation, are criticized due to their incompatibility with organizational control system which organizational justice, due to its 'impersonal' orientation, is viewed more compatible for. Kahn (1998) asserts that caring responses take place in a perspective of personal relationships and attachments; however control systems is maintained through explicitly stated processes and rules that ensure personal detachment of an individual with the system; a very basic requirement of organizational justice. Researches on organizational justice have widely used this Kahn's and other similar logics to establish supremacy of justice over care and compassion. As argued earlier, the notion of justice as a superior predictor of organizational control system is based on the static and linear nature of organizational justice, the philosophy of which is mainly grounded in the scientific management principles and bureaucratic rules. The main assumption behind this philosophy is that the stated rules and procedures will serve as reference points, based on equality and fairness, for people to select appropriate behaviours in organizations. As long as the equality and fairness of a system is concerned this approach holds utility; however, regarding the utility of this approach in terms of providing organizations with competitive advantage in twenty first century's competition, this approach seems problematic. These philosophies, in fact, were conceived when the business environment was relatively simple and stable and focus of organizations was on efficiency and production. However, as the contemporary business environment has witnessed increased complexity and dynamism characterized by learning, innovation, knowledge management and interdependence; the reliance of organizations on such business philosophies and static rules is endangering their survival and growth. Organizations, in order to perform competitively, have to adopt human-centred philosophies and organizational designs that allow learning, knowledge sharing, creativity and innovation, adaptability, risk taking and experimentation. It is pertinent to mention here that this article does not intend to undermine the role of rules, procedures and principles in organizations; instead aim is to create a logical theoretical base for the integration of principles of care and compassion and justice where principles of 'care and compassion' will serve as 'reference points' for people to interpret justice requirements and to select appropriate behaviours. And given the fact that contemporary organizations are operating in an ever increasing competitive business environment, 'this is not a choice instead this is a compulsion'.

Regarding operationalization of the presented concept in the organization, the logic and explanations of Gittell and Douglass (2012) can be used. They presented a relational bureaucratic form of organization based on scalable, replicable and sustainable caring, timely and knowledgeable responses towards people needs/problems. They addressed the problems of balancing the individual's responses towards

organizational and individuals' needs. They further explained that this balance can be achieved through social interaction, knowledge sharing and participation in goal setting and mutual respect in the organization. Through this process organizational members can know each other's perspectives and needs in order to form organizationally aligned compassionate responses. Watson, Teague and Papamarcos (2004) identified 'individual-organization values congruence' as a scalable mechanism to shape and govern individuals' cognitive frameworks, thinking, perceptions or behaviours. Values can be used to form or change individuals' perceptions about the event or behaviour and to induce them to build their identity around others instead of individual self (Singhal & Chatterjee, 2006).

Gittell and Douglass (2012) narrated an example of a school teacher, earlier given by Douglass (2011) where the school teacher due to unexpected arrival after a year of his soldier son applies for leave. His colleague had already applied for same day leave before him. According to justice's principles, leave should be awarded to the teacher who had applied before him, however, principles of care and compassion find it important to approve soldier's father's request. If a decision is made through a departmental meeting and voluntary consent of the person next in line for leave, then this situation encompasses both the principles of justice and care and compassion. If one interprets this situation by taking justice as a static and linear construct, a clash between justice, care and compassion may arise. However, by taking justice as a dynamic phenomenon where people adjust their perceptions about justice according to the context, the clash may not arise. According to the dynamic view of justice, people's justice perceptions change over time due to their experiences, social interactions and received treatment. In this situation people would form their justice perception based upon how the decision was made; if the decision is made through combined consent, then they might not doubt application of justice since the action is interpreted in the light of the context of this action. On the other hand, if the action was a unilateral one by the person in charge then there is a reason to doubt justice. In both cases decision is taken on the basis of personal relations, attachments and individual's need, however, in the second scenario perceptions about justice take a negative form. A collective- and consent-based decision, as in the first scenario institutionalizes people's personal response to another's need/problem. Institutionalizing care and compassion is necessary as caring and compassionate response at personal level without the involvement of organization clouds the scalability, replicability and sustainability of caring responses. People set the standards of justice for future interpretation on the basis of their past similar experiences. This situation endorses our main argument of the possibility of integrating principles of justice and principles of care and compassion in a systematic and synergetic manner. Arguments and points made out of this situation are also consistent with the inferences of Faraj and Xiao (2006) work on situational awareness and Weick, Sutcliffe and Obstfeld (2005) work on heedful social relationships.

Conclusion

Regarding the possibility of integrating 'virtue of justice' and virtue of 'care and compassion' in organization, there has been a much debate among scholars and practitioners. Central concern of the debate is the question that 'is it possible to integrate the principles of care and compassion and principles of justice in organizations in a synergetic manner so that organizations can avail advantages of both without losing one because of the other'. In most of the existing influential literature there exists either a notion of serious doubt or impossibility regarding this integration because of the potential

incompatibility between these concepts. This article argued that the highlighted incompatibility is due to the limited understanding about the dynamic nature of organizational justice. Care and compassion are relatively dynamic constructs whereas organizational justice has been conceptualized as a static and linear concept due to which an incompatibility between these two has taken place. By exploring and understanding the dynamic side of organizational justice its compatibility principles of care and compassion can be created.

Review of the seminal as well as contemporary literature revealed that people change and adjust their justice perceptions over time because of new experiences, information and social interactions. Impact of time, information, social interaction and experiences on people's fairness and justice perceptions makes organizational justice a dynamic construct; therefore it seems counter rational to study organizational justice as a static and linear construct. By exploring the dynamic nature of organizational justice instead of static one, care and compassion can be well integrated with principles of justice in a synergetic manner. In organizations, incompatibility between principles of care and compassion and principles of justice usually arises when some complex social situations create trade-offs between individual's need/problem and institutional control system. Justice requirements such as rationality, logic and reasoning can be applied to select organizationally aligned caring and compassionate behaviours after a delicate thought process and by keeping the urgency, relevance and importance of others' needs, problems and miseries.

Aligned with Nussbaum's 'intelligent emotions', Eddington's 'compassion tempered by justice', Tronto's 'caring justice responses' and Gittell's 'relational bureaucracy' concepts, principles of justice (care and compassion) will serve as 'reference points' for people to interpret care and compassion (justice) requirements and to select appropriate behaviours, thus leading towards a new concept of 'compassionate justice' in organizations. This is not something where emotions and reasoning are divorced; instead these will work together in a synergetic manner where individuals can adopt best caring responses by gauging their appropriateness with organizational justice requirements.

References

- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267–299). New York: Academic Press.
- Amabile, T. & Kramer, S. (2011). *The progress principle: Using small wins to ignite joy, engagement, and creativity at work*. Cambridge: Harvard Business Press.
- Ambrose, M.L. (2002). Contemporary justice research: A new look at familiar questions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 803–812.
- Ambrose, M.L. & Cropanzano, R. (2003). A longitudinal analysis of organizational fairness: An examination of reactions to tenure and promotion decisions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 266.
- Arendt, H. (1973). *The origins of totalitarianism* (Vol. 2). Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH): Mariner Books.
- Ariely, D. & Carmon, Z. (2000). Gestalt characteristics of experiences: The de® ning features of summarized events. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 13, 191–201.
- Armstrong, M. (2011). *How to be an even better manager: A complete AZ of proven techniques and essential skills*. London, Philadelphia: Kogan Page.
- Baker, T.L., Hunt, T.G. & Andrews, M.C. (2006). Promoting ethical behavior and organizational citizenship behaviors: The influence of corporate ethical values. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(7), 849–857.
- Barry, B.M. (1973). *The liberal theory of justice: A critical examination of the principal doctrines in a theory of justice by John Rawls*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Batson, C.D. (1994). Why act for the public good? Four answers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 603–610.
- Berlant, L. (2004). *Compassion: The culture and politics of an emotion*. New York: Routledge.
- Bies, R.J. & Moag, J.S. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 1(1), 43–55.
- Blader, S.L. & Tyler, T.R. (2009). Testing and extending the group engagement model: Linkages between social identity, procedural justice, economic outcomes, and extrarole behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 445.
- Blau, P.M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. *Sociological Inquiry*, 34(2), 193–206.
- Boswell, W.R., Boudreau, J.W. & Tichy, J. (2005). The relationship between employee job change and job satisfaction: The honeymoon-hangover effect. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 882–890.
- 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* (pp. 75–88). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chong, K.C. (2007). *Early Confucian ethics: Concepts and arguments*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company.
- Clark, C. (1998). *Misery and company: Sympathy in everyday life*. University of Chicago Press.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P.E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278–321.
- Cohn, M.A., Fredrickson, B.L., Brown, S.L., Mikels, J.A. & Conway, A.M. (2009). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, 9(3), 361.
- Colquitt, J.A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386–400.
- Crisp, R. (2003). Equality, priority, and compassion*. *Ethics*, 113(4), 745–763.
- Cropanzano, R. & Baron, R.A. (1991). Injustice and organizational conflict: The moderating effect of power restoration. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 2(1), 5–26.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A. & Chen, P.Y. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management*, 27(3), 324–351.
- Cupit, G. (2013). Desert. *The International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. Wiley Online Library: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. DOI: 10.1002/9781444367072.
- Dalai Lama, X. (1995). *The world of Tibetan Buddhism: An overview of its philosophy and practice*. Boston: Wisdom Publisher.
- Daly, K. (2003). Restorative justice: The real story. *Restorative Justice: Critical Issues*, 3(1), 195.
- Damasio, A.R. (1994). *Descartes & error*. New York: Putnam.
- Davidson, R.J. & Harrington, A. (2001). *Visions of compassion: Western scientists and Tibetan Buddhists examine human nature*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- DeNisi, A. (2007). *Theme: Doing well by doing good*. Introductory Note presented at 67th Academy of Management Meeting/Conference, Philadelphia.
- Douglass, A. (2011). Improving family engagement: The organizational context and its influence on partnering with parents in formal child care settings. *Early Childhood Research and Practice*, 13(2), 1–14.
- Dutton, J.E. & Ragins, B.R. (2007). *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eddington, C. (2010). Compassion tempered by justice. *Journal of Psycho-Social Studies*, 4(1), 1–15.
- Ehrhart, M.G. & Naumann, S.E. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior in work groups: A group norms approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 960.
- Faraj, S. & Xiao, Y. (2006). Coordination in fast response organizations. *Management Science*, 52(8), 1155–1169.
- Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance* (Vol. 2). New York: Stanford University Press.
- Folger, R. & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedural justice: An interpretive analysis of personnel systems. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 3, 141–183.

- Fortin, M. (2008). Perspectives on organizational justice: Concept clarification, social context integration, time and links with morality. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(2), 93–126.
- Frost, Peter J. (2003). *Toxic emotions at work: How compassionate managers handle pain and conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press.
- Frost & Hoggett, P. (2008). Human agency and social suffering. *Critical Social Policy*, 28(4), 438–460.
- Frost, Dutton, J.E., Worline, M.C., & Wilson, A. (2000). Narratives of compassion in organizations. *Emotion in Organizations*, 25–45.
- Frost, Dutton, J.E., Maitlis, S., Lilius, J.M., Kanov, J.M. & Worline, M.C. (2006). Seeing organizations differently: Three lenses on compassion. In C. Hardy, S. Clegg, T. Lawrence & W. Nord (Eds), *Handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed., pp. 843–866). London: SAGE.
- Gallagher, P. (2009). 8. The grounding of forgiveness: Martha Nussbaum on compassion and mercy. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 68(1), 231–252.
- Gilligan, Carol (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gilliland, S.W. (1994). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to a selection system. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(5), 691–701.
- Gittell, J.H. & Douglass, A. (2012). Relational bureaucracy: Structuring reciprocal relationships into roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 709–733.
- Goetz, J.L., Keltner, D. & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(3), 351–374.
- Grant, A.M., Dutton, J.E. & Rosso, B.D. (2008). Giving commitment: Employee support programs and the prosocial sensemaking process. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(5), 898–918.
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 9–22.
- Greenberg, J. & Bies, R.J. (1992). Establishing the role of empirical studies of organizational justice in philosophical inquiries into business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 11(5), 433–444.
- Greenberg, J. & Scott, K.S. (1996). Why do workers bite the hands that feed them? Employee theft as a social exchange process. In B.M. Staw & L.L. Cummings (Eds), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews*, 18, 111–156.
- Hall, E.O., Brinchmann, B.S. & Aagaard, H. (2012). The challenge of integrating justice and care in neonatal nursing. *Nursing Ethics*, 19(1), 80–90.
- Hausknecht, J.P., Sturman, M.C. & Roberson, Q.M. (2011). Justice as a dynamic construct: Effects of individual trajectories on distal work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 872–880.
- Hazen, M.A. (2003). Societal and workplace responses to perinatal loss: Disenfranchised grief or healing connection. *Human Relations*, 56(2), 147–166.
- Heckscher, C. (1994). *Defining the post-bureaucratic type* (pp. 16–62). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Holtz, B.C. & Harold, C.M. (2009). Fair today, fair tomorrow? A longitudinal investigation of overall justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1185.
- Huseman, R.C., Hatfield, J.D. & Miles, E.W. (1987). A new perspective on equity theory: The equity sensitivity construct. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 222–234.
- Joan, Tronto. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. New York: Routledge.
- Kahn, W.A. (1998). Relational systems at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 20, 39–76.
- Kahneman, D., Fredrickson, B.L., Schreiber, C.A. & Redelmeier, D.A. (1993). When more pain is preferred to less: Adding a better end. *Psychological Science*, 4(6), 401–405.
- Kanov, J.M., Maitlis, S., Worline, M.C., Dutton, J.E., Frost, P.J. & Lilius, J.M. (2004). Compassion in organizational life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 808–827.
- Kim, W.C. & Mauborgne, R.A. (1993). Procedural justice, attitudes, and subsidiary top management compliance with multinationals' corporate strategic decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 502–526.

- Lefkowitz, J. (2008). To prosper, organizational psychology should... expand the values of organizational psychology to match the quality of its ethics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(4), 439–453.
- Leung, K., Smith, P.B., Wang, Z. & Sun, H. (1996). Job satisfaction in joint venture hotels in China: An organizational justice analysis. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(5), 947–962.
- Leventhal, G.S. (1976). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships.
- Lilius, J.M., Worline, M.C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J., Dutton, J.E. & Frost, P. (2008). The contours and consequences of compassion at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2), 193–218.
- Lind, E.A. (2001a). Fairness heuristic theory: Justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations. *Advances in organizational justice*, 56, 88.
- . (2001b). Thinking critically about justice judgments. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 220–226.
- Lopez, S.H. (2006). Emotional labor and organized emotional care conceptualizing nursing home care work. *Work and Occupations*, 33(2), 133–160.
- Madden, L.T., Duchon, D., Madden, T.M. & Plowman, D.A. (2012). Emergent organizational capacity for compassion. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 689–708.
- Margalit, Avishai (1996). *The decent society*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States: Harvard University Press.
- Miller, D. (1999). *Principles of social justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nitschke, J.B., Heller, W., Imig, J.C., McDonald, R.P. & Miller, G.A. (2001). Distinguishing dimensions of anxiety and depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 25(1), 1–22.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. (1995). *Poetic justice: The literary imagination and public life*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- . (1996). *The therapy of desire: Theory and practice in Hellenistic ethics* (Vol. 2). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- . (2001). *Women and human development: The capabilities approach* (Vol. 3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O’neill, O. (2000). *Bounds of justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peus, C. (2011). Money over man versus caring and compassion? Challenges for today’s organizations and their leaders. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(7), 955–960.
- Powell, W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12(295–336).
- Rawls, J. (1972). *A theory of justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rousseau, D. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Rupp, D.E. & Cropanzano, R. (2002). The mediating effects of social exchange relationships in predicting workplace outcomes from multifoci organizational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 89(1), 925–946.
- Rynes, S.L., Bartunek, J.M., Dutton, J.E. & Margolis, J.D. (2012). Care and compassion through organizational lens: Opening up new possibilities. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 503–523.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur (1998/1840). *On the basis of morality*. Cambridge, MA: Hackett.
- Sears, J.T. & Carper, J.C. (1998). *Curriculum, religion, and public education: Conversations for an enlarging public square*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Singhal, M. & Chatterjee, L. (2006). A person–organization fit-based approach for spirituality at work development of a conceptual framework. *Journal of Human Values*, 12(2), 161–178.
- Steyaert, C. & Van Looy, B. (2010). *Relational practices, participative organizing* (Vol. 7). Emerald Group Publishing.
- Sznajder, N. (2002). Money and justice: Toward a social analysis of reparations. *Human Rights Review*, 3(2), 104–110.
- Tang, T.L.-P. & Sarsfield-Baldwin, L.J. (1996). Distributive and procedural justice as related to satisfaction and commitment. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 61, 25–31.

- Thibaut, J.W. & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*. Lawrence. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Treviño, L.K. & Weaver, G.R. (2001). Organizational justice and ethics program ‘follow-through’: influences on employees’ harmful and helpful behavior. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 11(4), 651–671.
- Tyler, T.R. & Bies, R.J. (1990). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of procedural justice. In J.S. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology and organizational settings* (pp. 77–98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Van Dyne, L. & LePine, J.A. (1998). Helping and voice extra-role behaviors: Evidence of construct and predictive validity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(1), 108–119.
- 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*. USA: Oxford University Press.
- Wageman, R. & Hackman, J. (2007). Asking the right questions about leadership: Discussion and conclusions. *American Psychologist*, 62, 43–47.
- Watson, G.W., Teague, B.T. & Papamarcos, S.D. (2004). Understanding values in organizations: A value dynamics perspective. *Journal of Human Values*, 10(1), 23–39.
- Weber, M. (1958/1904). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons.
- Weick, K.E. (1966). The concept of equity in the perception of pay. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11(3), 414–439.
- Weick, Sutcliffe, K.M. & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409–421.
- Whitebrook, M. (2002). Compassion as a political virtue. *Political Studies*, 50(3), 529–544.