

Journal of Management Inquiry

<http://jmi.sagepub.com/>

Theorizing the Dark Side of the Workplace Spirituality Movement

Marjolein Lips-Wiersma, Kathy Lund Dean and Charles J. Fornaciari

Journal of Management Inquiry 2009 18: 288 originally published online 22 June 2009

DOI: 10.1177/1056492609339017

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://jmi.sagepub.com/content/18/4/288>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

[Western Academy of Management](#)

Additional services and information for *Journal of Management Inquiry* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jmi.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jmi.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://jmi.sagepub.com/content/18/4/288.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Nov 29, 2009

[OnlineFirst Version of Record](#) - Jun 22, 2009

[What is This?](#)

Theorizing the Dark Side of the Workplace Spirituality Movement

Marjolein Lips-Wiersma

University of Canterbury

Kathy Lund Dean

College of Business, Pocatello, ID

Charles J. Fornaciari

Florida Gulf Coast University

This article constructs an alternative analytic lens by which to consider the “everyone wins” conclusions drawn within most workplace spirituality (WPS) research. The article offers a critical 2×2 matrix that makes visible two potentially negative organizational dimensions of WPS: control and instrumentality. The article investigates into the four quadrants of WPS: seduction, evangelization, manipulation, and subjugation, through practical examples. It concludes with implications for the workplace and offers an agenda for future research.

Keywords: *spirituality at work; critical; religion at work; organizational design; workplace control; dark side*

Workplace spirituality (WPS) has received significant attention over the past decade. The question usually asked in connection to WPS is, “Would organizations be more productive and innovative, and individuals be able to live more satisfying lives, if they felt inwardly connected to their work, fellow workers, and workplace?” (Sheep, 2006, p. 357). Given the framing of the question, it should come as no surprise that the vast majority of the foundational work, both academic and popular, has been concerned with the study of beneficial outcomes and generally considers the WPS phenomenon as a positive development (Biberman & Whitty, 2000; Conlin, 1999; Gunther, 2001; Milliman, Ferguson, Trickett, & Condemi, 1999).

WPS is an organizational phenomenon describing employees’ spiritual or religious expressions and experiences in the workplace. Regularly used concepts are “meaningful work,” work as an avenue to establish a “connection to a Higher Power or the transcendent,” and work as an avenue to “deeply connect with others” (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Mitroff, 2003; Mitroff & Denton, 1999b). A central notion in WPS is that of bringing “the whole person” to work (Hicks, 2002; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a; Sheep, 2006). With this is meant that the person brings his or her physical, intellectual, emotional, and spiritual attributes to the workplace.

For example, WPS can facilitate greater employee engagement, creativity, authenticity, meaningful work, and emotional stability (Benefiel, 2005a; Cavanagh, 2003; Lips-Wiersma, 2002). Furthermore, the research offers some evidence of increased organizational effectiveness and bottom-line outcomes (Benefiel, 2005a; Duchon & Plowman, 2005; Milliman et al., 1999). Finally, a significant body of research is emerging in nonbusiness organizational settings. In the health field, for example, there is a growing empirical literature examining positive clinical outcomes from using spirituality in care-based settings (e.g., Dane & Moore, 2005; Grant, 2004) and how employees’ spiritual and religious lives in stressful organizational settings are significant factors in helping them cope (e.g., Edward, 2005; Faver, 2004).

In other words, to date WPS is widely acknowledged to be win-win-win: good for the employee, good for the employee’s coworkers, and good for the organization. There have been, however, a minority of critical voices that have entered the conversation. These would argue that instead of being helpful, WPS may be in fact harmful, particularly to employee well-being, and may be a negative force for hegemony and misuse (Driver, 2005; Kamoche, 2000, 2003; Lips-Wiersma, 2004; Polley, Vora, & SubbaNarasimha, 2005).

This manuscript builds on that nascent conversation. We construct an alternative analytic lens by which to consider the “everyone wins” conclusions drawn within most WPS research by theorizing the potential misuse of spirituality. We then offer a critical matrix that makes visible two potentially negative dimensions of organizational experience, control and instrumentality, and suggest that its four quadrants, “seduction,” “evangelization,” “manipulation,” and “subjugation” represent real prospects for WPS harm. The model is examined through examples of current workplace practice.

Management of the Soul

Bell and Taylor (2003), in examining the history of workplace commitment, proposed that WPS serves as a new integrative mechanism to return some of the religious and quasireligious commitment-based themes that have characterized work in the past. Though WPS is more overtly concerned with ideas of transcendence, meaningfulness, and soul (e.g., Ashforth & Vaidyanath, 2002; Cavanagh, 2003; Hart & Brady, 2005), we and others argue that religious and quasireligious themes have been brought back since the early 1980s when a significant shift occurred from a traditional quest for rational administrative behavior to the “management of meaning” (Casey, 1995, 2000; Smircich & Morgan, 1982). This literature identifies the rise in number of theories and practices that are concerned with the need for firms to inculcate individuals with values so that they continue to act as organizational members (e.g., Driver, 2007a; Pandey & Gupta, 2008). These practices become more important in the face of an increasingly degraded psychological contract (e.g., Aggarwal, Datta, & Bhargava, 2007; Hess & Jepsen, 2008).

Numerous authors who are not writing from a spiritual paradigm also identify spiritual and quasireligious themes in, for example, transformational leadership and organizational culture literature. McKinlay and Taylor (1998) referred to the “governing of the soul” in culture management practices and Jackson (Guthey & Jackson, 2005; Jackson, 2001) documents the “Guru phenomenon” in current leadership theory and consultancy practices wherein patriarchal, larger-than-life executives self-select as the key spokesman and identity for their organizations, shifting responsibilities for healthy workplace climate from management to employee. Costea, Crump, and Holm (2007) argued that work “has become a central therapeutic stage set for engineering and managing souls” (p. 153). Though evidence clearly shows that such engineering often produces high levels of cynicism and distrust (Thompson & Findlay, 1999), the

“spiritual turn” in organizations (Casey, 2004; Driver, 2005, 2007b) is not about to disappear.

Thus, though there is an increasing awareness that the field “needs to go beyond descriptions and warnings of misappropriation” (Driver, 2005, p. 1106), there has been little comprehensive theorizing on the misuse of “the governing of the soul” beyond pointing out that such misuse can potentially exist and somehow should not. We suggest that a more precise modeling of the possible detrimental effects of workplace spirituality (and the larger practice of the management of meaning) is required, forcing an acknowledgment of harms. As important, a holistic examination helps understand organizational conditions that give rise to potential WPS mishandling. WPS is not always a force for good and it must be acknowledged as having multiple facets in practice.

This article first reviews the critical workplace spirituality literature to show how two dimensions, “control” and “instrumentality,” are central, recurring constructs. Next, we offer a matrix that makes visible, and theoretically expands on, these two aspects of organizational experience. We investigate the four elements of the matrix, seduction, evangelization, manipulation, and subjugation, through practical examples. We conclude with implications for the workplace and topics for future research.

Critical Workplace Spirituality

Critical Workplace Spirituality (CWPS) does not argue that workplace spirituality per se is inappropriate but rather focuses on the ways in which spirituality can be misused or misappropriated, particularly for managerial control (Bell & Taylor, 2004; Boje, 2008; Driver, 2008) and toward instrumental gain (Benefiel, 2003; Lips-Wiersma & Nilakant, 2008; Steingard, 2005). As Conger (1990) pointed out in his seminal critical analysis of then-heralded executive heroes, behaviors and organizational phenomena must be considered for their potential harms alongside their potential benefits to form a more complete picture. With this in mind, we examine these constructs in the following paragraphs.

Control

Control is the degree of direction exercised by the organization over its members in the conduct of their work. The majority of WPS scholarship does not explore the role of social, political, and power processes and the degrees of freedom that shape identities. Much extant scholarship assumes at minimum a neutral organizational orientation toward WPS; more likely it assumes a facilitative (Hicks,

2002) or even enthusiastic orientation (Milliman et al., 1999). It proceeds from the assumption that individuals can and do create their own destiny (Bell, 2008) irrespective of organizational structural and power norms. Typically it assumes that the blending of the self and one's work is the pathway toward creating fulfillment (Fineman, 2006). In this section, we discuss CWPS work that challenges the assumptions under which most WPS work is written by examining the forms control may take: structural hegemony, experiential ownership, work-life balance, and organizational unity.

The win-win focus of much WPS work is based on very similar assumptions to that of positive organizational scholarship (POS). Fineman (2006) examined POS' broad claims for emancipator workplace experiences and determined that it "tends to be driven by a psychologically reified, relatively depoliticized picture of the individual at work and of change, where the managerial prerogative is rarely problematized and the structural conditions of the competitive workplace are taken for granted" (p. 283). As analogous to POS literature, then, WPS presents unproblematic organizational experience unbesmirched with worries of how controlling organizational structures may affect its expression (see also Sugarman, 2007, for a review).

Although Kamoche (2000) acknowledged the potential hegemonic impact on WPS of ill-intentioned senior managers, he does not follow the cascading effects of such to everyday employee experience. It is Perrow (2002, 2007) who consistently draws attention to the underreported role of concentrated control and power in organizations. WPS mismanagement occurs when leaders are complicit with inherent organizational power structures in subsuming employees' spiritual selves to the demands of organizational culture, outcomes, or infrastructure. In Perrow's thinking, unquestioned control allows leaders to cede responsibility for spiritual hegemony to an immutable and ultimately inculpable structure, and leadership failure is inevitable due to concentrations of power.

Experiential ownership is a control issue when considering WPS' individualized therapeutic orientation. Such orientation may keep collective acknowledgment of and resistance to organizational control at bay by transforming organizational problems into individual ones, which the individual must now own and resolve (Holmer Nadesan, 1999). Bell and Taylor (2004) argued that

it [WPS] does not encourage the deepening of inner resources to challenge the external world. Instead it encourages the individual use of inner resources to

cope with organizational demands more effectively . . . [such] privatization of spirituality, [has] the potential to become repressive rather than enlightening (p. 462)

because WPS can offer an illusion of control over individual workplace experience.

Driver (2005) argued that current idealized representations of the fully integrated, balanced, complete, and fulfilled self that is harmoniously integrated with the organization can lead to delusion or repression. By attaching the separate ego to the organizational identity, organizations may control egoistic fantasies toward its own ends. It is here where "designer culture" (Casey, 1996, 1999) and "designer spirituality" meet. In a designer culture, individual employees are to be good, happy "family" or "team" members, energetically laboring toward increased company profitability by conflating their source of identity and self-fulfillment with working for the company (Casey, 1999).

This matches nicely with designer spirituality, in which "[people operating from a spiritual basis] would be more likely to trust others, share information, and work in concert with teams and coworkers to accomplish mutual objectives" (Biberman & Whitty, 1997, p. 133). Casey warns that these new designer cultural practices serve as processes of regulation, discipline, and control of employee selves, without employees' genuine understanding of their own complicity.

Furthermore, Driver (2007b) followed Jackson's work (Guthey & Jackson, 2005; Jackson, 2001), expressing concern over programmatic meaning making. Those in positions of power construct meaning and impose their ideology to encourage ownership of current organizational conditions and prevent systematic critiques. Such discourses can pressure employees into accepting stressful conditions by drawing on their own spiritual strength, hence allowing management to abdicate responsibility for improving the conditions that caused such stress in the first place. Driver argues that future research needs to distinguish between other-made meaning (as prescribed and controlled by the organization) and individual uncovering of meaning (as controlled by the individual and driven by his or her will to meaning).

Centrality of work or work-life balance also merits discussion. Meda (1996) observed that work now occupies the central life position, where it is "the only means of fulfilling all individual and social aspirations and . . . self-fulfillment" (p. 633). The discussion is not about whether this is appropriate, but whether we should be alarmed that corporations wholly substitute for family

and community life (Holmer Nadesan, 1999) while real families and communities recede in prominence. Caproni's (2004) remarkably self-revealing account of her own struggle toward work-life balance led her to the conclusion that

The emphasis on work/life balance may be another individualistic, achievement-oriented model based in modern bureaucratic organizational thought, setting us up to strive for one more thing that we cannot achieve and, in doing so, keeping us too focused, busy, and tired to explore the consequences of our thinking and actions. (p. 212)

Not questioning basic work-life balance assumptions allows spirituality to become another control mechanism for getting individuals to work harder in their paid jobs, often at the expense of other avenues toward meaningful and fulfilled lives such as family and volunteerism. Aligning "work" and its needs with "life" and its separate needs, including a full spiritual foundation, is *a priori* set forth as structurally consistent.

Unity is a control-based construct in CWPS. Current WPS in the academic and popular literature often assumes that if organizations allow spiritual expression, the organization will be more unified (e.g., Polley et al., 2005). This assumption is predicated on an unexamined level of WPS homogeneity, including only the unifying and adaptable values all people are supposed to hold (Hicks (2002). White (2003) pointed out that behavior stemming from spiritual beliefs often causes conflict when values collide (p. 244). In this case, then, WPS can intensify workplace control by admonishing managers to manage away differences for the sake of efficiency. The "problem" is other peoples' differences (Sinclair, 2006, p. 518).

CWPS scholars have made significant contributions to our understanding of the various ways in WPS can become a control mechanism. However, on the whole, our theoretical understanding of how the various dimensions of control might relate to each other has not been significantly advanced. Many who are concerned with control also acknowledge that "control is indispensable to organization, because it makes cooperation possible and in turn enables the production of a range of complex goods and services" (Stansbury & Barry, 2007, p. 241).

Thus, although real control-based concerns have been expressed, they do not, in large part, examine the interactivity between organization and member, or, among members themselves. CWPS indicates that control in various forms can lead to alienation, disengagement, or co-optation; none of these appears to allow the self to

function more or less intact within the organizational setting. Consequently, we argue, the very notion of attempting to formally include spirituality in modern firms will *always* include the potential for misuse and misappropriation through control and it is for this reason it is important to obtain a further understanding of the manner in which control is exercised through WPS.

Instrumentality

Instrumentality is the extent to which employees are treated as means toward a goal. The argument for the majority of WPS scholarship follows the same basic logic structure: "Care must be taken that a firm's overriding profit orientation does not instrumentalize the noble goals of WPS." This argument accepts, *prima facie*, that WPS and the economic firm are compatible within modern management structures as long as diligence is taken. In this section, we briefly discuss current WPS writing about instrumentality, and argue, by reviewing work historically, that current research misses the fundamental instrumentality issue.

Polley et al. (2005) explored a list of common potential instrumentality-inducing WPS issues that are familiar to almost any manager in any modern firm, ranging from organizational costs, to organizational commitment by workers, to productivity, and to profit. However, despite professed concerns, those authors ultimately agree that WPS "could be an important organizational resource" (p. 53).

Likewise, Porth, Steingard, and McCall (2003) worried whether WPS will primarily be a bottom-line enhancing tool or whether it is just another fad that will fade away with time—a concern also expressed by Cavanagh (2003; Cavanagh & Bandsuch, 2002). Ashforth and Pratt (2003) laid out multiple WPS organizational options and potential issues within them but ultimately indicate that "spirituality alone cannot sustain an organization: Even avowedly spiritual organizations . . . must turn a profit" (p. 95).

Although important discussions about potential WPS instrumentality, they still miss what we believe to be the most fundamental instrumentality issue relating to WPS. Understanding of the limits of the above critiques and the true scope of potential negative effects first requires that we consider the basis of modern work.

Many work practices found in organizations today originated with medieval Benedictine monks in their monasteries. There, work was conceived as a visible and community-based demonstration of one's service and dedication to God. One worked to serve God, and one

was given unique talents by Him to serve His needs. Work was a visible demonstration of one's spirituality (White, 1958). Those engaged in work practices for other motives, such as merchants seeking a profit, were often viewed with suspicion or hostility (Ashforth & Vaidyanath, 2002; Cox, 1965).

The emergence of Protestantism and capitalism starting in the 18th century, coincided with (some would argue caused) the replacement of work as a spiritual demonstration to work as the instrumental means to serve the firm's profit motive (Ashforth & Vaidyanath, 2002; Weber, 1958). Work also replaced religious communities as the source of authority (McCann, 2001). The industrial revolution, crucial to increasing firms' profits, sapped the humanity and dignity of individual workers. The rise of management schools in the latter half of the 20th century sought to hone management techniques, but the fundamental premise that firms, and therefore management, exist to maximize profits remains largely unchallenged to this day (Dehler & Welsh, 2003).

Consequently, the transcendental nature of work has been slowly replaced with the more materialistic and prosaic aim that dominates business thinking today—modern management exists to ultimately enhance the firm's economic viability. Spiritual and religious leaders may deliberately reject the business community for fear of being corrupted by its instrumental nature (Miller, 2007; Nash, 2003). Thus, today's view of work and organizational form leads, at best, to a tough dilemma, and at worst to an intractable paradox when WPS is added. The appropriate question is not the commonly asked one, "How can we avoid instrumentality issues regarding managing spirituality in the workplace?" but rather, "Is the entire question of any systemized attempt by scholars and firms to study and manage workplace spirituality by definition instrumental?" We offer extant reconciliation efforts below.

Ashforth and Pratt (2003), while acknowledging the need for firms to make a profit, indicated that "because of the locus (individual) and focus (intangibles, process) of spirituality, work organizations are not readily compatible with spiritual strivings" (p. 95). They present a model that suggests how organizations can approximate spirituality by matching person–organization fit with level of organizational control. In essence, they acknowledge that they are attempting to fit a round peg into a square hole and model a "resolution." Likewise, Kurth (2003) advocated for practices that Jackson (2001; Sinha & Jackson, 2006) critiques as instrumentally corrupt by circumventing firm-level discussion of WPS and delineating wholly individual behaviors designed to bring spiritual renewal to the self.

Porth et al. (2003) proposed a solution called authentic spirituality. Their model essentially resolves the whole profit–spirituality dilemma by arguing for organization practices that are more consistent with churches than profit-generating enterprises. Their core argument advocates that managers and firms, in their newfound desire to treat employees simply as ends unto themselves, accept whatever outcomes may result, even those that "*do not always produce the expected gains for the organization*" (p. 256, italics added).

Like Porth et al. (2003), Polley et al.'s (2005) suggestion is that spirituality in organizations will work if we simply ignore benefits questions—difficult for practicing managers who constantly must deal with measurable results, benefits, tradeoffs, and profits. Driscoll and Wiebe (2007) reviewed "technical" WPS literature and found that extant scholarship is "largely reductionistic," focusing solely on the efficiency imperative of minimizing costs and maximizing profits (p. 336). Practices such as creativity and empowerment are undertaken only with an eye toward increasing bottom lines.

Firms by design are instrumental, goal-driven entities with a clear focus on ends, and any means adopted into the firm will have present some level of instrumentality for its employees. Consequently, the very notion of attempting to formally include spirituality in modern firms will *always* include the potential for misuse and misappropriation and it is for this reason that it is so important to further theorize the dimensions of such misappropriation.

Modeling Control and Instrumentality Dimensions

Thus far, we have argued that CWPS literature revolves ultimately around issues of control and instrumentality and extant WPS literature revolves ultimately around positivity and organizational benevolence. Combining these, we suggest that future empirical and conceptual work in the management discipline must include the "dark side" by interrogating avenues for potential misuse and harm. The alternative, to us, seems that we will continue to have two streams of theoretical management contributions: one that continues to focus on organizational performance and control without questioning its potential for harm and another that critically identifies harms but does so from the margins. Such a development is neither theoretically rigorous nor practically desirable, as it simply does not engage the realities of organizations. In the next section, based on our review, we offer a more comprehensive theory of WPS

so that we can better identify and understand potential misuse as it occurs in organizational life.

Both control and instrumentality occur at the intersection of individual and organization. Thus, we neither take the perspective that organizations, by their very nature, imprison human beings nor the perspective that human beings, by their very nature, are always likely to make conscious choices irrespective of the system in which they operate, but rather that the dark side of WPS is of particular concern where individual and organization meet.

We can consider the presence and effects of potential WPS harm in organizations as a 2×2 matrix where instrumentality and control can independently vary from high to low (see Figure 1). The following paragraphs briefly explore these conditions, seduction, evangelization, manipulation, and subjugation, and the issues related to each through practical examples.

Figure 1
A Model of Critical Workplace Spirituality Effects

		<i>Instrumentality</i>	
		Low	High
<i>Control</i>	Low	Seduction	Manipulation
	High	Evangelization	Subjugation

Seduction

Organizations exhibiting low instrumentality and low levels of control practice *seduction*. In these firms individuals can pursue personal growth toward a variety of outcomes for themselves and the organization. Individualized forms of WPS allow members to choose their own paths after perceiving the organization's tacit approval, and employees bring their faith identities and behaviors into the firm. Despite the seemingly benign nature of these types of firms, potential for harm abounds. Because organizational members are free to select in or out of WPS activities and determine the nature and form of their WPS, cultural fragmentation occurs. Certain employees' WPS may speak for the organization as a whole, either by contagion or by publicity, or when the WPS practice amounts to discrimination.

For example, widespread media attention is following cases where health care administrators throughout the United States are struggling to create policies that respect

a patient's right to receive treatment or prescribed medication while respecting providers' rights to refuse such due to religious beliefs. Pharmacists may refuse to dispense birth control pills to those patients holding a valid prescription (Schoeff, 2006; Stein, 2005). Physicians may refuse to perform abortions, sterilization procedures, or to prescribe contraception (Parker, 2007, August 3) due to religious beliefs—without considering the impact on patients or peers.

The dark side of WPS threatens when health care providers refuse treatment only to certain individuals, in certain cases. California's Supreme Court ruled in favor of a lesbian plaintiff whose doctors refused to artificially inseminate her because she is gay (Dolan, 2008, August 19). In another case, a physician refused to prescribe Viagra to a gay man, a case that was eventually settled out of court (Parker, 2007, August 3). At issue is a physician's right to pick and choose deniability of services only for certain types of patients, a right ripe with implications of power and hegemony.

Furthermore, in the 'anything goes' organisation employees may not care whether WPS is being used instrumentally because they are only engaged in the workplace for what they themselves get out of it and organizations do not care at all what form or flavor WPS takes. The potential negative effects for these employees and the firm are the risks of disconnection and cynicism resulting from a "What's in it for me?" orientation dominating the thinking of all parties involved—thus challenging the very nature of the notion of WPS.

For our purposes, the individual meets the organization when individuals disengage from the organization by protecting their own identity, career, or well-being from those exploiting the firm's laissez-faire WPS orientation. And correlatively, organizations disengage from potentially disruptive or difficult employee situations, leaving the employee to fend for him or herself. In her defense against claims of sexual orientation discrimination in the California artificial insemination case, the attending physician publicly and in court denied that her patient's sexual orientation played a part in her refusing services to the patient (the plaintiff). If refusing service was an authentic expression of religious values, is denying such not a repudiation of the self?

Evangelization

Organizations exhibiting low instrumentality orientation and high control practice *evangelization*. In these firms spirituality is not readily conceived as a tool for improving performance. However, the form and nature in which WPS is incorporated into the organization is

highly specified by management. The agenda of management (hidden or overt) is to convert employees to the spiritual beliefs of management and these beliefs are judged to be superior to other beliefs. In many ways, the organization will display formal and informal characteristics of religious cults—with the most successful organization members being those that buy into management's view and expression of WPS.

In Otsego, Minnesota, the Riverview Community Bank was founded on evangelical Christian principles and continues to be run as a ministry that happens to offer financial services (Shorto, 2004, October 31). Loan officers, for example, pray with their customers to get the best selling price for their homes; evangelism is an integral part of bank operations. While deliberately Christian, the bank's religious infusion exists not as a tool by which to differentiate itself in the marketplace, but as a home for Christians during the workweek to practice their faith. The disconnect between Sundays and the rest of the week leaves "a moral vacuum in the modern workplace, which leads to backstabbing careerism, empty routines for employees, and C.E.O.'s [sic] who push for profits at the expense of society, the environment, and their fellow human beings" (Shorto, 2004, October 31, p. 42).

In its most direct form, management might organize prayer meetings, include scripture quotes on official company communications, and note which employees participated in these behaviors and evaluate them as worshipful. In the indirect form, the manager draws on religious/spiritual language that inspires and is aimed at providing meaning to everyday workplace events.

In this ideological enculturation (Casey, 1995; Wilmott, 1993), the individual meets the organization at three key events: The human desire for salvation from the possibility that all is meaningless takes over, the individual seeks "infinite duration" through the company's legacy (Becker, 1973), and the individual has internalized the idea that work is the main vehicle by which to form social relationships and to gain self-fulfillment (Meda, 1996). The potential for employees to get lost occurs when the organization fails to deliver on these highly individualized and human needs (whether deliberately or not) and leaves the employee with no other avenues by which to fulfill them.

Manipulation

Organizations exhibiting high instrumentality orientation and low control practice *manipulation*. In these organizations, spirituality is primarily a tool for improving performance, but the form and nature in which WPS

is incorporated into the organization is left open for determination by individual firm members. In this worldview, upper management believes that WPS is simply another potentially manipulatable variable to try and wrest more productivity from its workers, and it will immediately focus on strategies to do so.

Most organizations in this quadrant will be open to how employees choose to pursue WPS because the form of the variable is less important than its existence; it essentially becomes WPS *à la carte* or *du jour*. In whatever form, WPS is supposed to be perceived as being empowering and inclusive and is touted as such by organizational leaders. Practices can consist of prayer groups, religious text discussion groups, or some form of ethics with a religious twist.

"Affinity groups" represent a potential manipulation of WPS. These are informal, employee organized, but organizationally sanctioned, interest groups that usually receive company resources with which to meet. The articulated idea behind affinity groups is equal organizational treatment of disparate employee ideologies; groups can include "parents," "new college graduates," "transgendered," and any religious affiliation. By not accepting certain groups and rejecting others, companies hope to avoid unpleasant and equally expensive possible litigation and to be perceived as inclusive (Lund Dean, Fornaciari, & Safranski, 2008).

However, the statement of the Coca-Cola's Christian fellowship offers some insights into how manipulation may operate. It reads:

1) We use the Holy Bible, which is the foundation of this fellowship to reach integrity, accountability, building relationships, respect and diversity, which are all essential to the company's long term success. 2) We are committed to living, working and supporting these values. We do this by embracing the "Heart and Soul" of our enterprise—Our people. We envision a community where morality is bred, integrity is lived, and diversity is deliberate. 3) We further endeavor to foster a sense of belonging such that each associate feels personally accountable for the consistent quality of every service and product that the Company produces. (cited in Miller, 2007, p. 184)

Control is seemingly low in that any employee group within Coca-Cola can set up an affinity group around any interest—spiritual or otherwise—and be allowed to meet during work time. The dark side of WPS appears when religious practice is subsumed under the instrumental goals of the organization, or when spirituality is

utilized to inculcate quietism (Casey, 2002), rather than to encourage critical engagement or chosen spiritual expression. In this case, manipulation might discourage open discussion of persistent allegations that Coca-Cola has contributed to negative societal outcomes in some international markets (Foust, Smith, & Woyke, 2006; Gardiner, 2005).

The individual and organization meet where the individual wants to feel good or be secure and avoid life's pain, emptiness, and contradictions (Beder, 2000) rather than suffer the discomfort of actively engaging with society at large. Difficult questions about organizational practices, for example, may arise for employees; they may feel conflicted or disloyal to the organization that supports their beliefs by posing such questions and demanding responses.

Subjugation

Organizations exhibiting high instrumentality orientation and high control practice *subjugation*. In these organizations spirituality is not only a clear tool for improving performance, but the form and nature in which WPS is incorporated into the organization is highly specified by management. Thus, employees are asked (through some direct or indirect spiritual practice) to bring more of themselves to work, but the culture of control encourages people to behave and even "feel" in prescribed ways. Subjugation can lead employees to suppress disruptive feelings such as envy, resentment, and fear of dependency, which leads to depersonalization and alienation (Hirschhorn, 1997).

Steve Butterfield, an ex-Amway distributor, describes in his book, *Amway, the Cult of Free Enterprise* (Butterfield, 1985), how, step-by-step, one gets hooked into the Amway lifestyle. Techniques include rallies, product use, and positive-thought doctrine. One's critical intelligence is drowned in what he refers to as a cycle of fake love and plastic dreams. Pratt (2000), in an ethnographic study of Amway, shows that the organization used two techniques to harmonize the identities of individual members with the goals of the organization: sense breaking and sense making. The process of sense breaking was designed to "create a need for meaning" by "inducing a sense of seekership" (p. 464). It involved a deliberate questioning process to induce a chasm between one's current identity and one's potential Amway identity, creating a void of meaning that only Amway could subsequently fill.

Within Amway, this chasm was achieved through a needs analysis in which distributors were taught to identify what they want so much that they would be willing

to do anything to get. Pratt's analysis revealed that most dreams centered on lifestyle issues, such as financial freedom. Amway ensured a perpetual state of dissatisfaction and striving by reframing satisfaction to mean becoming trapped in comfort zones. Distributors were encouraged to continually develop bigger, usually more abstract dreams, such as saving the United States and the world through selling Amway.

Amway appeared to ensure that more of their distributors' nonwork lives became intertwined with their identity as distributors. Constant ratcheting-up of dreams ensured that members were constantly seeking self-validation from organizational values systems. New members were socialized by encouraged values duplication, and advice about making money was interwoven with expressions of care and concern. Pratt describes how mentors helped new distributors avoid those who were not supportive by creating relationship barriers between the distributor and these negative nonmembers. These may include friends who do not join or buy products from a distributor as they were seen as not being "true friends."

In this "totalizing regime of managerial control where employees are simply programmed automatons who diligently perform the logic of the dominant regime as is engineered by senior management and consultants" (Fleming & Sewell, 2002, p. 858), the individual shadow meets the organizational misuse where the human desire to abdicate responsibility for complexity and paradox takes over, and the organization eagerly steps in to prescribe employee identity. Material success is viewed to be the sole gateway to attaining nonmaterial desires, such as being a good family member or helping others.

Discussion and Going Forward

Organizations, by their very definition, are control oriented and instrumental. Though the excesses that derive from these constructs can be detrimental to their members, it is not sufficient to simply rail against harm, as much CWPS literature attempts to do, because their effects can never be entirely eliminated, even if we wished to do so. Similarly, WPS literature errs in its tendency to portray the benefits of the movement as all light and joy for individuals without acknowledging ever-present dark-side manifestations. Ultimately, we must examine organizations, and the individuals who inhabit them, at the intersection of control and instrumentality if we are going to achieve a realistic understanding of the WPS movement. The preceding sections derived a critical and applied model of various WPS effects at the intersection of the individual and the organization

through these constructs by merging the viewpoints of the two literatures. The following paragraphs consider themes and potential avenues for future research suggested by that exploration.

Management of Meaning Versus Meaningful Work

First, the preceding analysis makes clear that WPS is an increasingly important vehicle for gaining a fuller understanding of “the management of meaning” versus “meaningful work” as it relates to human spiritual and religious expression. In short, the positive cannot exist without the negative. We cannot fully understand WPS’s promise without also coming to know its potential for hegemony. Fineman (2006) explained how engaging with painful situations and negativity helps us construct and sustain moral character and emotional hardiness (p. 275).

Sugarman (2007) correlatively worried about an absence of authenticity in workplace experience due to negating or denying the ambiguity and stress that comes from engaging with moral questioning. Without conflicting and difficult experiences, Sugarman asserts, that endorsing values such as wisdom, justice, and transcendence has no meaning (p. 191). Thus, both Fineman and Sugarman serve to remind that bad experiences shape us as wholly as positive experiences do.

Choice Within the Organizational Context

A construct that emerges in our model is one of *choice* within the structural contingencies of instrumentality and control. At what level does an employee have choices about the expressions his or her WPS will take? Casey (2004) is representative of work describing low levels of control, demanding an extremely sophisticated *and* tolerant managerial skill set in which employees could choose WPS expression. For example, she cites activities undertaken by “senior, expertly skilled, successful organizational employees” (p. 67) such as consulting tarot cards, meditating on corporate floorspace, and displaying alchemist and Wiccan artifacts. While the population under Casey’s examination may be allowed this kind of deviation from organizational norms, indeed, they most likely set the rules as to what extent would average or even low-performing employees be allowed to choose such WPS activities?

Organizational Infrastructure Requirements

Our model makes it clear that allowing WPS choice requires organizational infrastructures, even if they are *laissez-faire*, to support it at every employee level. Casey

takes as a given that such a complex managerial enterprise exists, whereas Driver (2008) contended that bureaucracy’s constraints force employees to find ways of compensating for its inevitable alienation and that WPS *cannot* do so. O’Toole and Lawler (2006), citing Pfeffer’s research for their study, concurred with Driver in asserting that organizational community is a prerequisite to trust and mutual dependence and that the American workplace has moved “systematically to more market-like, distant, and transactional relationships with their people” (p. 137).

While O’Toole and Lawler (2006) indicated evidence of Gen Y workers taking back some ownership and control over their work lives and career trajectories, they also cite a common executive worldview that balance and enjoyment in the workplace are the purview of “ambivalent, entitled, uncommitted, incompetent” (mostly younger) workers (p. 98). They describe an organizational norm of high instrumentality and low control—manipulation in our model. Indeed, they validate our discussion of manipulation in that, despite chronicling both the increasing transactional workplace and the executive summation of employees who desire work-life balance, they include “Encourage work/family balance” and “Create a sense of community” in their list of managerial best practices (pp. 180-181)!

Thus, we observe a disconnect between organizational conditions that would support WPS and admonitions from scholars to create them irrespective of current structural realities. Perrow (2007) warned that choice and mobility are overrepresented by both the popular press and by generational scholars due to the operational conflation of power and structure; regardless, then, of where an organization falls with respect to instrumentality and control in our model, Perrow asserts organizations *are* instrumentality and control. But Perrow does not recognize that some employees find high levels of control and instrumentality comforting with respect to their WPS expression: Homogeneity and self-reinforcing experiential cycles may be highly desirable to block out an increasingly complex and threatening world.

Research Scope Issues

The model presented here represents a rich, testable opportunity for an integrated understanding of WPS. If scholars are truly going to gain a robust understanding of the whole domain, then our research needs more studies focused on organizations as a whole, especially as they relate to potential harms. Relatively little research exists at this level of analysis, however. A recent meta study of WPS-focused empirical research (Tischler, Biberman, &

Fornaciari, 2007) notes that 60% of all published articles investigate the individual, whereas just 26% touch on organization-level themes (and just 5% focus on groups). Even researchers who have explored the organization as a whole have typically approached the topic by investigating a single organization as their sample, thus limiting their generalizability. For example, Fry, Vitucci, and Cedillo's (2005) exploration of the causal relationship between spiritual leadership theory and organizational commitment and survival at an army squadron in Texas is typical of organization-level WPS research. And extant articles like Fry et al. still overwhelmingly seek to establish positive relationships, rarely acknowledging or exploring potential negative effects. Thus, scholars do not yet have an empirically based, generalizable, and holistic model of WPS at the organization level that explicitly considers both positive and negative.

Ironically, one of the discipline's foundational studies, Mitroff and Denton's *A Spiritual Audit of Corporate America* (1999a, 1999b), is based on their investigation of a large number of firms. Furthermore, it produced an organizational model of workplace spirituality, and it explicitly recognized both the potential positive and negative effects of WPS. Despite the stature of the work, many of its results have been ignored within the subsequent literature. Thus, perhaps one future empirical avenue for investigation arising from this article is for scholars to attempt to find a ways to extend Mitroff and Denton's work in describing the organizational archetypes described in this manuscript. Such distinctions, according to Driver (2007b), will significantly enhance WPS theorizing as they aid in better defining the spaces of programmatic versus existential meaning making.

Antecedents of Positive and Negative WPS Experiences

Given that all organizations are constructed within some level of both instrumentality and control, we have little understanding as to how, or why, some organizations foster positive WPS and why some foster harmful WPS. To what extent might employees, consciously or unconsciously, self-select into organizations representing our four quadrants? What are the antecedent conditions that lead to the expansion of harmful WPS and what are the consequences for organizational members?

Given our proposed model, what factors lead to organizations, for example, winding up more embedded in the seduction quadrant than the manipulation quadrant? Given the testable components of the model, can we get insights into questions such as under what conditions

firms can, or do, move from one quadrant to another? Finally, given the necessity of measuring organizational outcomes, what are the performance effects of how WPS is operationalized? While it has been noted that early WPS studies seem to demonstrate some positive correlations between nurturing WPS practices and firm performance measures, is this always the case? Are there conditions under which, for example, seduction can lead to improved organizational performance? If so, what are these conditions, and what are the moral and ethical implications of these insights?

Our preceding arguments are not intended to block the goal of trying to realize a model of healthy or integrative WPS or argue that healthy WPS is an organizational impossibility. Rather, it is to encourage a fuller and deeper understanding of the topic by encouraging others to explicitly incorporate the potential dark side within WPS models.

Hearing All Individual Voices

Our model suggests that some organization members experience WPS as a form of hegemony; thus, our methodologies must reflect this. Much WPS research at the individual level tends to focus on positive outcomes using standard positivistic data-gathering techniques such as survey instruments (Fornaciari, Sherlock, Ritchie, & Lund Dean, 2005; Tischler et al., 2007). This suggests that scholars may not actually be honoring the full experiences of those whom they are studying, thus leading to research validity issues.

If we are to truly honor those whom we are studying and consequently gain a deeper understanding of WPS, we must provide space within our research to support the exploration of damaging or unhelpful WPS experiences. This suggests the need for more ethnography and more case studies as potential data collection techniques (Lund Dean, Fornaciari, & McGee, 2003). For example, Margaret Benefiel's cases on Reel Precision in *Leadership Quarterly* (2005a) and in her book *Soul at Work* (2005b) help us understand personal interface with organizational norms in a less threatening way. In short, we must explore which methodologies enable us to honestly and accurately investigate the questions most critical to the WPS domain.

Moving Critical Research to Broader Audiences

Much of the literature in this article is drawn from critical organization theory, and though it may be familiar to readers of this journal, we need to extend the critical voice of WPS by publishing more of it in mainstream

U.S. journals rather than mainly European outlets like *Human Relations*, *Management Learning*, and the *International Labour Review*. The differences in approach and attitudes concerning WPS research are evident when comparing them to their mainly American counterparts like *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *Leadership Quarterly*, and even the critical studies-oriented *Journal of Organization Change Management*. Given the attention paid to the WPS movement in both the popular and academic literature in the United States, we believe that more critically voiced research needs to appear in the mainstream outlets typically accessed by American readers (both academic and nonacademic). Once again, we are not necessarily arguing for a wholesale move to viewing WPS as harmful, but rather we are again calling for more balance in exploring a phenomenon that has often been treated positively and uncritically within American journals, books, and magazines.

Practitioner and Consultant Concerns

Finally, as practitioners or consultants, we need to be alert to the potentially harmful uses of WPS. The continuing steady output of popular press books and articles on the topic clearly indicates the desire for real-world organizations to understand and engage WPS issues. For example, we should be alert when clients ask for assistance to "help me put in place a spirit program so our firm can be more productive." Given the scant attention paid to managerial instrumentality and control issues in both the popular and academic WPS literature, it is imperative that we make all attempts to help potential clients understand the full implications of their desires. As we have noted, the potential for harm is ever present within organizations, and a first step in the process of assisting our clients in improving their own organizations is helping them to recognize where and how their own potentially harmful agendas may emerge in the process.

References

- Aggarwal, U., Datta, S., & Bhargava, S. (2007). The relationship between human resource practices, psychological contract and employee engagement—Implications for managing talent. *IIMB Management Review*, 19, 313-325.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Pratt, M. (2003). Institutionalized spirituality: An oxymoron? In R. Giacalone & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 93-107). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Vaidyanath, D. (2002). Work organizations as secular religions. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 11, 359-370.
- Becker, E. (1973). *The denial of death*. New York: Free Press.
- Beder, S. (2000). *Selling the work ethic: From Puritan pulpit to corporate PR*. Carlton North: Scribe.
- Bell, E. (2008). Towards a critical spirituality of organization. *Culture and Organization*, 14, 293-307.
- Bell, E., & Taylor, S. (2003). The elevation of work: Pastoral power and the New Age work ethic. *Organization*, 10, 329-349.
- Bell, E., & Taylor, S. (2004). 'From outward bound to inward bound': The prophetic voices and discursive practices of spiritual management development. *Human Relations*, 57, 439-466.
- Benefiel, M. (2003). Irreconcilable foes? The discourse of spirituality and the discourse of organizational science. *Organization*, 10, 383-391.
- Benefiel, M. (2005a). The second half of the journey: Spiritual leadership for organizational transformation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 723-747.
- Benefiel, M. (2005b). *Soul at work: Spiritual leadership in organizations*. New York: Seabury Books.
- Biberman, J., & Whitty, M. (1997). A postmodern spiritual future at work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 10, 130-138.
- Biberman, J., & Whitty, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Work & spirit: A reader of new spiritual paradigms for organizations*. Scranton, PA: University of Scranton.
- Boje, D. (2008). *Critical theory approaches to spirituality in business*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Butterfield, S. (1985). *Amway: The cult of free enterprise*. Boston: South End Press.
- Caproni, P. (2004). Work/life balance: You can't get there from here. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 40, 208-218.
- Casey, C. (1995). *Work, self and society: After industrialism*. London: Routledge.
- Casey, C. (1996). Corporate transformations: Designer culture, designer employees and post-occupational solidarity. *Organization*, 3, 317-339.
- Casey, C. (1999). "Come and join our family": Discipline and integration in corporate organizational culture. *Human Relations*, 52, 155-178.
- Casey, C. (2000). Work, non-work and resacralizing self. *Social Compass*, 47, 571-587.
- Casey, C. (2002). *Critical analysis of organizations: Theory, practice, revitalization*. London: Sage.
- Casey, C. (2004). Bureaucracy re-enchanting? Spirit, experts and authority in organizations. *Organization*, 11, 59-79.
- Cavanagh, G. F. (2003). Religion and spirituality in business: Obstacles and opportunities. In O. F. Williams (Ed.), *Business, religion, and spirituality: A new synthesis* (pp. 263-278). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame.
- Cavanagh, G. F., & Bandsuch, M. (2002). Virtue as a benchmark for spirituality in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 38, 109-117.
- Conger, J. (1990). The dark side of leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19, 44-55.
- Conlin, M. (1999, November 1). Religion in the workplace: The growing presence of spirituality in corporate America. *Business Week*, pp. 150-158.
- Costea, B., Crump, N., & Holm, J. (2007). The spectre of Dionysus: Play, work, and managerialism. *Society and Business Review*, 2, 153-169.
- Cox, H. (1965). *The secular city*. New York: MacMillan.
- Dane, B., & Moore, R. (2005). Social workers' use of spiritual practices in palliative care. *Journal of Social Work in End-of-Life & Palliative Care*, 1, 63-81.
- Dehler, G. E., & Welsh, M. A. (2003). The experience of work: Spirituality and the new workplace. In R. A. Giacalone &

- C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 108-122). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Dolan, M. (2008, August 19). California doctors can't refuse treatment to gays on religious grounds, court rules. *Los Angeles Times*. Available from <http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-supreme19-2008aug2019,2000,2388017.story>
- Driscoll, C., & Wiebe, E. (2007). Technical spirituality at work: Jacques Ellul on workplace spirituality. *Journal Of Management Inquiry*, 16, 333-348.
- Driver, M. (2005). From empty speech to full speech? Reconceptualizing spirituality in organizations based on a psychoanalytically-grounded understanding of the self. *Human Relations*, 58, 1091-1110.
- Driver, M. (2007a). Meaning and suffering in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20, 611-632.
- Driver, M. (2007b). A "spiritual turn" in organization studies: Meaning making or meaningless. *Journal of Management, Spirituality, & Religion*, 4, 56-86.
- Driver, M. (2008). New and useless: A psychoanalytic perspective on organizational creativity. *Journal Of Management Inquiry*, 17, 187-197.
- Duchon, D., & Plowman, D. A. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 807-833.
- Edward, K.-I. (2005). The phenomenon of resilience in crisis care mental health clinicians. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 14, 142-148.
- Faver, C. A. (2004). Relational spirituality and social caregiving. *Social Work*, 49, 241-250.
- Fineman, S. (2006). On being positive: concerns and counterpoints. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 270-291.
- Fleming, P., & Sewell, G. (2002). Looking for the good soldier, Svejik. *Sociology*, 36, 857-873.
- Fornaciari, C. J., Sherlock, J. J., Ritchie, W. J., & Lund Dean, K. (2005). Scale development practices in the measurement of spirituality. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 13, 28-49.
- Foust, D., Smith, G., & Woyke, E. (2006). 'Killer Coke' or innocent abroad. *BusinessWeek*, p. 3968.
- Fry, L., Vitucci, S., & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 835-862.
- Gardiner, J. (2005, April 29). Comptroller asks Coca-Cola Company to probe violence. *New York Sun*. Available from <http://www.killercoke.org/sun0429.htm>
- Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. (2003). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In R. A. Giacalone & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3-28). Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
- Grant, D. (2004). Spirituality interventions: How, when, and why nurses use them. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, 18, 36-41.
- Gunther, M. (2001, July 16). God and business: The surprising quest for spiritual renewal in the American workplace. *Fortune*, pp. 58-80.
- Guthey, E., & Jackson, B. (2005). CEO portraits and the authenticity paradox. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42, 1057-1082.
- Hart, D. W., & Brady, F. N. (2005). Spirituality and archetype in organizational life. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 15, 409-428.
- Hess, N., & Jepsen, D. M. (2008, August 8-13). *The psychological contract: Investigation of generational and career stage differences*. Paper presented at the The Academy of Management, Anaheim, CA.
- Hicks, D. A. (2002). Spiritual and religious diversity in the workplace. Implications for leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 379-396.
- Hirschhorn, L. (1997). *Reworking authority: Leading and following in the post-modern organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Holmer Nadesan, M. (1999). The discourses of corporate spiritualism and evangelical capitalism. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 3-42.
- Jackson, B. (2001). *Management gurus and management fashion: A dramatic inquiry*. London: Routledge.
- Kamoche, K. (2000). Developing managers: The functional, the symbolic, the sacred and the profane. *Organization Studies*, 21, 747-774.
- Kamoche, K. (2003). *Organizational spiritualism: Toward a critical analysis*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Seattle, WA.
- Kurth, K. (2003). Spiritually renewing ourselves at work: Finding meaning through serving. In R. Giacalone & C. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 447-460). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Lips-Wiersma, M. (2002). Analysing the career concerns of spiritually oriented people: Lessons from contemporary organizations. *Career Development International*, 7, 385-397.
- Lips-Wiersma, M. (2004). Furthering management and spirituality education through the use of paradox. *Journal of Management Education*, 28, 119-133.
- Lips-Wiersma, M., & Nilakant, V. (2008). Practical compassion: Towards a critical spiritual foundation for corporate responsibility. In J. Biberman & L. Tishler (Eds.), *Spirituality in business: Theory, practice, and future directions*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lund Dean, K., Fornaciari, C. J., & McGee, J. J. (2003). Research in spirituality, religion, and work: Walking the line between relevance and legitimacy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16, 378-395.
- Lund Dean, K., Fornaciari, C. J., & Safranski, S. R. (2008). The ethics of spiritual inclusion. In J. Biberman & L. Tischler (Eds.), *Spirituality in business: Theory, practice, and future directions* (pp. 188-202). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McCann, D. P. (2001). Catholic social teaching in an era of economic globalization: A resource for business ethics. In S. W. Herman (Ed.), *Spiritual goods: Faith traditions and the practice of business* (pp. 87-105). Philosophy Documentation Center with Business Ethics Quarterly.
- McKinlay, A., & Taylor, P. (1998). Through the looking glass: Foucault and the politics of production. In A. McKinlay & K. Starkey (Eds.), *Foucault, management, and organization theory* (pp. 173-190). London: Sage.
- Meda, D. (1996). New perspectives on work as value. *International Labour Review*, 135, 633-644.
- Miller, D. W. (2007). *God at work: The history and promise of the faith at work movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Milliman, J., Ferguson, J., Trickett, D., & Condemni, B. (1999). Spirit and community at Southwest Airlines: An investigation of a spiritual values-based model. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 221-233.
- Mitroff, I. I. (2003). Do not promote religion under the guise of spirituality. *Organization*, 10, 375-382.
- Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999a). *A spiritual audit of corporate America: A hard look at spirituality, religion, and values in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999b). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review*, 40, 83-92.
- Nash, L. L. (2003). A spiritual audit of business: From tipping point to tripping point. In C. Williams & F. Oliver (Eds.), *Business, religion & spirituality: A new synthesis* (pp. 53-78). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- O'Toole, J., & Lawler, E. (2006). *The new American workplace*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Pandey, A., & Gupta, R. (2008). A perspective of collective consciousness of business organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80, 889-898.
- Parker, L. (2007, August 3). Some doctors refuse services for religious reasons. *USA Today*, pp. 1A, 3A.
- Perrow, C. (2002). *Organizing America: Wealth, power, and the origins of corporate capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Perrow, C. (2007). *Keynote speech of the Critical Management Studies division*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management.
- Polley, D., Vora, J., & SubbaNarasimha, P. N. (2005). Paying the devil his due: Limits and liabilities of workplace spirituality. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 13, 50-63.
- Porth, S. J., Steingard, D., & McCall, J. (2003). Spirituality and business: The latest management fad or the next breakthrough? In C. Oliver & F. Williams (Eds.), *Business, religion, and spirituality: A new synthesis* (pp. 249-262). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame.
- Pratt, M. G. (2000). The good, the bad and the ambivalent: Managing identification among Amway distributors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 456-493.
- Schoeff, M. (2006). Bill seeks to expand right to religious expression at work. *Workforce Management*, 85, 3.
- Sheep, M. L. (2006). Nurturing the whole person: The ethics of workplace spirituality in a society of organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66, 357-375.
- Shorto, R. (2004, October 31). Faith at work. *New York Times Magazine*, 40-46, 62, 66, 69.
- Sinclair, A. (2006). Critical diversity management practice in Australia: Romanced or co-opted? In A. M. Kondrad, P. Prasad & J. K. Pringle (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace diversity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sinha, P. A., & Jackson, B. (2006). A Burkean inquiry into leader-follower identification motives. *Culture and Organization*, 12, 233-247.
- Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18, 257-273.
- Stansbury, J., & Barry, B. (2007). Ethics programmes and the paradox of control. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 17, 239-261.
- Stein, R. (2005, March 28). Pharmacists' rights at the front of new debate. *The Washington Post*, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A5490-2005Mar5427_5492.html
- Steingard, D. S. (2005). Spiritually-informed management theory, Towards profound possibilities for inquiry and transformation. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 227-241.
- Sugarman, J. (2007). Practical rationality and the questionable promise of positive psychology. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 47, 175-197.
- Thompson, P., & Findlay, P. (1999). Changing the people: Social engineering in the contemporary workplace. In L. J. Ray & R. A. Sayer (Eds.), *Culture and economy after the cultural turn* (pp. 141-161). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tischler, L., Biberman, G., & Fornaciari, C. J. (2007). *The development & test of a research model for management, spirituality, & religion in organizations*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Meetings.
- Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- White, L. (1958). Dynamo and virgin reconsidered. *American Scholar*, 27, 183-194.
- White, R. D. (2003). Drawing the line: Religion and spirituality in the workplace. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 244-256). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Wilmott, H. (1993). Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 512-552.
- Marjolein Lips-Wiersma** is a senior lecturer at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand. Her research interests are in meaningful work, purpose beyond profit, the tensions between human and economic values and existentialism in organizations. She teaches business, society and the environment, workplace spirituality, and qualitative research methods. She is currently writing a book on "Meaningful Work Versus the Management of Meaning" based on her ongoing action research into meaningful and meaningless work.
- Kathy Lund Dean** is associate professor of management at Idaho State University. She earned her PhD in organizational behavior and ethics from Saint Louis University. Active in both the *Organizational Behavior Teaching Society* and the *Academy of Management* for over a decade, she's a founder of the Academy's Management, Spirituality, and Religion (MSR) interest group. Currently, she's researching non-traditional research methodologies (especially aesthetics), business ethics and decision making, and potential downsides of workplace spirituality. Prior to entering higher education, she enjoyed a career in banking and was partner in a small commercial business. With her family she enjoys hiking and swimming; in the winter, she strategizes on how to spend more time skiing.
- Charles J. Fornaciari** is a professor of management and the Uncommon Friends Chair in Ethics at Florida Gulf Coast University in Fort Myers, FL. He has published more than a dozen journal articles in areas such as role of spirituality and religion in management, ethics, strategic change, technology in education, and affective learning technique in journals such as *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *Journal of Managerial Issues*, *Journal of Business Research*, *Journal of Management Education*, *Journal of Management Spirituality and Religion*, the *Journal of Business Ethics Education*, and the *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. He is a founder member of the Academy of Management's Management, Spirituality, and Religion interest group. He is also a recipient of the Organizational Behavior Teaching Society's prestigious New Educator Award. He also serves as an associate editor for the *Journal of Management Education*.