

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Spirituality, symbolism and storytelling in 21st century organizations: Understanding and addressing the crisis of imagination

Abstract

This article introduces the Special Issue concerned with organizational spirituality, symbolism and storytelling. Stressing the growing scholarly interest in these topics, the article makes a two-fold contribution. First, it critically assesses their development over time while identifying the emerging trends and new ways spirituality, symbolism and storytelling are taken up in management and organization studies. We make a case for utilizing their promise to transcend the epistemic boundaries and extend the scope of our academic practice beyond self-referential approaches or 'fashionable' topics. Second, it links them to what we term the current crises of imagination, calling into question extant institutional and organizational paradigms, as well as the theoretical frames we rely on in our teaching and research. The multiple crises we face - economic, financial, food, water, energy, climate, migration and security - we suggest, are partly due to the fragmentation of meaning that bedevils our scholarship and, implicitly, the failure of our collective imagination. Reaching across foundational disciplines and core methodologies, we bring into the conversation the interlocking fields of spirituality, symbolism and storytelling highlighting their potential for addressing the cardinal challenges we face as citizens of this world as much as organizational scholars.

Key words: spirituality, religion, symbolism, storytelling, imagination, metaphor, ethnography, anthropology

Introduction

With the acceleration of communication technologies, the fragmentation of meaning in our world has never been greater. It is evidenced in splits and divisions among people within and without our societies, as apparent on the ground as it is in cyberspace. This concerns opportunities and resources that make lives liveable, under conditions of rapidly increasing inequality (Pickett & Wilkinson, 2009; Scheidel, 2017); it also concerns coping in a post-truth era, where boundaries between truth and lies, honesty and dishonesty, fiction and nonfiction have become blurred or, it is argued, even irrelevant (Faroughi, Gabriel, & Fotaki, 2019; Snyder, 2019). While there is common agreement in acknowledging the multiple crises we face: economic, financial, food, water, energy, climate, migration and security; there is an absence of shared understanding about their causes and on the ways to address them. This, we suggest, is partly due to the fragmentation of meaning and the failure of imagination.

The failure of imagination concerns the inability to conceive new possibilities, like the refusal to consider the consequences of the world's better-offs action and inaction for tens of millions of dispossessed, manifested in the hostility toward refugees and forced migrants arriving at the shores of the European Union or knocking on the border gates of the USA. Our collective failure to imagine how things could be different concern burning global issues such as how to fight the rise of anti-Semitism and the spread of Islamophobia; what to do about the pollution of our oceans and about drinking water shortage; the ways to embrace new technologies yet prevent encroachment on our privacy and freedom. Here we wish to highlight the issue of moral imagination (or the lack thereof), as capacity to think (Singer, 1999) and create (Narvaez & Mrkva, 2014) solutions to the most pressing and vexing problems we face (Johnson, 1993; Chappell, 2014). In so doing we wish to pay homage to the likes of Frankl (1959), Schumacher (1977), de Beauvoir (1949), Olson (1982) and Levinas (1985) who addressed the crises which

1
2
3 the post WW2 generation faced as it was rebuilding itself from the ashes of Auschwitz, the
4
5 aftermath of colonialism, the challenge of women liberation and in facing the 'other'.
6
7
8
9

10 For organizational scholars like ourselves, who see institutionalization as a value-infused
11
12 process (Scott, 1987, p. 494) of meaning giving (Selznick, 1957, p. 17) and sense making
13
14 (Weick, Sutcliffe, & Obstfeld, 2005, p. 409), extending beyond the functional remit of the
15
16 organization, the current crises put our responsibility and integrity as researchers and
17
18 knowledge producers, square at the forefront of academic debates. Taken together, we felt that
19
20 these crises have called into question extant institutional and organizational paradigms, as well
21
22 as the theoretical frames we rely on in our teaching and research (Fotaki & Prasad, 2015). We
23
24 further argue that these crises have exposed the weaknesses of the dominant imaginaries
25
26 underpinning the symbolic norms they represent. In an era characterized by the proliferation of
27
28 populism and the normalization of xenophobia in political discourses and everyday life, the
29
30 responses to the crises we face seem increasingly inadequate. We must deploy different forms
31
32 of imagination collectively (Komporozos-Athanasiou & Fotaki, 2015) for radical re-imagining
33
34 of current governance arrangements and ways of organizing.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The urgency to mobilize collective abilities of organizations in pursuing pathways that will
43
44 challenge dominant modes of mis-representation and loss of meaning, is self-evident. The turn
45
46 to ecological visions, cultural myths and spiritual narratives, as well as to philosophy, theology
47
48 and anthropology as foundational disciplines and to ethnography and storytelling as base
49
50 methodologies, marks the search for new ways and approaches to re-think and re-imagine, re-
51
52 write and re-examine the role of organizations, organizing and managing in society - past,
53
54 present and future. Metaphors, symbols, myths, stories and legends are important means for
55
56 meaning creation: they shape our imagination and help us represent the world and our
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 experiences that would otherwise be incomprehensible. Moreover, spirituality and religion are
4
5 in themselves a symbolic representation of worldviews, with storytelling a key mode for the
6
7 generation of reflection and experience going back to the dawn of (human) history (Greenblatt,
8
9 2017). Reaching across disciplines such as anthropology or studies of religion, we bring
10
11 together the broadly defined and interlocking fields of spirituality, symbolism and storytelling
12
13 into conversation, to propose an integrative approach for addressing these issues in the context
14
15 of organization studies.
16
17
18
19
20

21 The ubiquity of spirituality (Carrette & King, 2005) and the central role religion occupies in
22
23 the lives of so many people (Park, 2005) is mediated and evoked through symbols and stories
24
25 (Grant, 2001). Symbols such as metaphors are also pervasive in everyday language and thought
26
27 (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003). In organizations we trace symbolic artefacts to unconscious
28
29 archetypes (Kostera & Kociatkiewicz, 2013) and images (Gagliardi, 2015), whereby
30
31 storytelling (Gabriel, 2000, Boje, 1991) is a primary mode of transmission.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The idea for this Special Issue emerged almost four years ago on the background of the global
39
40 crises we encounter. By bringing together these elements: spirituality, religion, symbolism,
41
42 ethnography and storytelling, we aim to capture the topics, frameworks and methodological
43
44 approaches which have until now been under-represented or misrepresented in mainstream
45
46 organizational scholarship, despite the growing interest in these fields. Furthermore, taken
47
48 together, we hope the debates presented here would bring fresh insights and novel
49
50 understandings to the challenges that we and our organizations face in the new era that has
51
52 dawned upon us, helping to re-envision ways out of the present mire.
53
54
55
56
57

58 **Spirituality and religion**
59
60

1
2
3 Spirituality and religion have enjoyed a comeback in the social sciences of recent, and
4 consequently, they have started to make inroads into organization studies too¹. Whilst
5 recognized as foundation pillars of the social science disciplines: sociology (Durkheim, 1912),
6 psychology (James, 1917), anthropology (Frazer, 1900) and economics (Weber, 1992/1905), the
7 pivotal role of spirituality and religion in explicating core societal phenomena was
8 considered passé by the second half of the last century, as secularization theory took hold.
9 Posited as a necessary companion to global modernization, the secularization thesis was
10 considered almost sacrosanct. With the progress of the Enlightenment project and modernity
11 comes an inevitable decline in religiosity, it was argued, ultimately leading to the demise of
12 religion itself. This position has changed by the turn of the century, as Peter Berger succinctly
13 put it: “The world today, with some exceptions... is as furiously religious as it ever was, and in
14 some places more so than ever. This means that a whole body of literature by historians and
15 social scientists loosely labelled ‘secularization theory’ is essentially mistaken” (Berger, 1999,
16 p. 3). Thus for example, the postsecular turn is seen to pose challenges to European feminism as
17 it made manifest that the notion of agency, or political subjectivity, could be conveyed
18 through and supported by religious piety, or even engaged spirituality (Braidotti, 2008). For
19 Taylor (2007), religion’s central position in our lives has never really changed since the Axial
20 age ushered in the major religions of the world (Arnason, Eisenstadt & Wittrock, 2012).

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 Historically, spirituality was not distinguished from religiosity until the rise of secularism at
48 the turn of the last century (Turner et al., 1995). Conceptually, spirituality and religiosity are

51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
¹ E.g. The establishment of the Management, Spirituality & Religion (MSR) Special Interest Group in the
Academy of Management in 2001 <https://msr.aom.org>; the founding of the Journal of Management,
Spirituality & Religion (JMSR) in 2004 and the creation of the International Association of Management,
Spirituality & Religion (IAMSAR) in 2010 www.iamsr.org.

A Google Scholar search as of 01/01/2019 reveals that the keyword combination *spirituality and religion and organization* over the period 2010 to date, yields 42,200 results. The keyword combination *spirituality and religion and workplace* for the same period yields 18,200 results.

1
2
3 thus often posited closely tied to one another, sharing common characteristics (Seybold & Hill,
4 2001) yet seen as distinguishable entities (Hill & Pargament, 2003; Zinnbauer et al., 1997). In a
5
6 ground-breaking study in the USA, a country with a high number of people identifying
7
8 themselves as ‘religious’ and a large number as ‘spiritual’, Zinnbauer et al. (1997) found that
9
10 self-rated religiosity and spirituality were “modestly but significantly correlated ($r = .21$), and
11
12 most respondents indicated that they consider themselves both spiritual and religious (S+R,
13
14 74%)” (p. 561). Thus, both spirituality and religiosity can involve personal transformation and
15
16 the search for an ultimate truth. In particular, spirituality is harder to define across cultures, as
17
18 its characteristics are not easily agreed upon, and it may mean different things for different
19
20 people in different places (Koenig, King, & Carson, 2012). Accordingly, we define religiosity
21
22 as the communally held beliefs, rituals, knowledge, and practices that are related to the
23
24 commonly accepted notion of the sacred. Spirituality we define as a set of beliefs concerning
25
26 the individual’s subjective perception of their extended relationships, which may include their
27
28 construal of ‘the sacred’ or transcendent dimension of existence, i.e. an individual's convictions
29
30 about self, others, the community at large and the world, along with their values regarding
31
32 moral conduct derived from such convictions. In this definition we follow and expand Ashmos
33
34 & Duchon (2000), the most commonly used definition in the extant literature (Vasconcelos,
35
36 2018). Though the two concepts are often considered together, on balance religiosity has
37
38 received more attention in scholarly work than spirituality (Zimmer et al., 2016). For the
39
40 purposes of this paper, we treat them in unison.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Spiritual beliefs play a central role in the lives of religious adherents (Faulkner & De Jong,
52 1966; Pew Research Centre, 2010) as well as the non-religious and atheists (Bullivant, 2013);
53
54 and are a prime indicator of an individual’s faith (Angelidis & Ibrahim, 2004) and ways of life
55
56 (Bellah et al., 2007). Belief in God(s) is the foundational spiritual belief that unfolds a universe
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of related artefact beliefs, whether beliefs in the Hereafter, Paradise, and Hellfire (Badawi,
4 2001; Kobeisy, 2004) or beliefs in karma and incarnation (Narayanswamy, Altman &
5 Sengupta, 2018), for example. Importantly, these beliefs are not confined to followers of
6 organized religion or established faiths. Thus, in the UK, where church attendance is in
7 continuous decline and at an all-time low, belief in God and related artefact beliefs is
8 nevertheless strong (Davie, 2015).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Ethical values, anchored in principles shared by most faiths, may be seen as a core cluster that
20 amounts to a universal ethical code of conduct (Smith, 1992; Schwartz, 2012) and importantly
21 to us here, may be extended to organizations too. Thus, for example, extant research has found
22 an overlap between individual and organizational values (beliefs) that may be considered
23 spiritual, as concerns the establishment of trust (Li, Bai & Xi, 2011); and of normative
24 behaviour, as concerns propensity for innovation (Assouad & Parboteeah, 2018). With the
25 inroads that the study of spirituality and religion has made into organization studies, we find at
26 one end, scholarship on specific faith aspects of organizational life, such as the deployment of
27 industrial chaplains at the workplace (Wolf & Feldbauer-Durstmüller, 2018); and at the other
28 end, the import of religious practice into organizational life, like mindfulness (Vu & Gill, 2018)
29 and discernment (Falque & Duraiu, 2004). Leadership, perhaps the most studied aspect of
30 management in organizations, has seen the development of new constructs such as spiritual
31 leadership (Fry, 2003) and servant leadership (Van Dierendonck, 2011), as well as inputs from
32 the realm of spirituality/religion into extant constructs, such as transformational leadership
33 (Pravichai & Ariyabuddhiphongs (2018). In practically all organization and management
34 scholarly areas, attempts were made to employ the lens of spirituality/religiosity; in some:
35 entrepreneurship (e.g. Hoffman & Shipper, 2018; Kovacs, 2019) and family business (e.g.
36 Madison & Kellermanns, 2013; Mohapatra & Verma, 2018) more than others. In the field of
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 consumer behaviour (though not, strictly speaking, an organization studies domain),
4 spirituality/religiosity correlates are considered fundamental (Belk, Wallendorf & Sherry,
5 1989). It is no surprise therefore, that the idea of viewing the entire organization as a spiritual
6 enterprise has been proposed, notably for faith-based organizations (Delbecq, 2010) though
7 secular organizations too were found to be infused with spiritual characteristics (Fry & Altman,
8 2013). It has been suggested that the spiritually based organization will not be a passing
9 fashion, and ought to be an imperative for the third millennium (e.g., Vasconcelos, 2015).
10 However, in spite of its intuitive appeal, the nature of the relationship between spirituality and
11 religiosity and an individual's moral stand or an organization's ethical conduct (let alone
12 performance), remains elusive (Craft, 2013; Longenecker, McKinney, & Moore, 2004;
13 Marquette, Pavarala, & Malik, 2014; Parboteeah, Hegel, & Cullen, 2008; Weaver & Agle,
14 2002) and potentially, aspirational (Koning & Waistell, 2012).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33 Are spirituality and religiosity relevant to stakeholders in organizations? Most religions in the
34 world teach a form of the "golden rule" – to treat others as you would have them treat you
35 (Ramasamy et al., 2010; Smith, 2008; Weaver & Agle, 2002). The majority of religions also
36 provide a system of norms and values, sharing a belief in God or gods as beings who care about
37 morality and punish for transgressions (Calkins, 2000; Longenecker et al., 2004). However,
38 despite these connections, the relationship between spirituality, religiosity and ethical
39 judgment in organizational contexts is not straightforward, nor unidirectional. For example,
40 some studies have suggested that spiritual individuals are more likely to perceive differences
41 between right and wrong (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003), hold moral virtues (Kaptein, 2008),
42 are more humanistic (Lefkowitz, 2008), encourage corporate social responsibility (Gond,
43 Akremi, Swaen, & Babu, 2017) and are more likely to engage in prosocial behaviours
44 (Ghuman, Ryan, & Park, 2016). Other studies have found no significant connections between
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 religion and work values (Chusmir & Koberg, 1988; Craft, 2013) and contrary to implicit
4 expectations, religiosity, as measured by both religious affiliation and religious attendance, has
5
6 not been found to predict un/ethical judgment (e.g. Randolph-Seng & Nielsen, 2007). And yet
7
8 other studies have shown increased religiosity being associated with unethical judgment. Thus,
9
10 for example, it is argued that faith-based organizations may be more prone to fraud (Koerber &
11
12 Neck, 2006)², that spiritual leadership may be corrupting (Krishnakumar et al., 2015) and
13
14 indeed that the entire workplace spirituality movement may have a dark side to it, detrimental
15
16 to both individuals and organizations (Lips-Wiersma, Lund-Dean & Fonciari, 2009).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Three recent literature reviews on spirituality and religion in organizations and work offer
25
26 opposing views. According to Tracey (2012) “management literature does not offer a clear
27
28 picture of the effects of religious beliefs on individual values, attitudes, or behaviors” (2012, p.
29
30 26), due in part to the reluctance of organization behavior/ organization theory scholars to
31
32 engage with the topic of religion (spirituality) (Tracey, Phillips, & Lounsbury, 2014). On the
33
34 other hand Vasconcelos (2018) point to a vibrant activity in the field, counting publications in
35
36 no less than 40 academic journals; and Houghton, Neck & Krishnakumar (2016) comment:
37
38 “the workplace spirituality construct has showed signs of moving into [a] second stage of
39
40 development... Measurement scales have been advanced and refined resulting in a flurry of
41
42 empirical research... In addition, researchers have begun to explore mediators of the
43
44 relationships between workplace spirituality and other constructs of interest. A few isolated
45
46 examples of workplace spirituality serving as mediator or moderator in models of the
47
48 relationships between other variables are now beginning to appear, indicating that the
49
50 construct’s development continues to progress” (2016, p. 198).
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ² But see the rejoinder by Albrecht (2007).
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 The difference in interpretation among these review articles lies in the body of literature they
7
8 reviewed. Tracey's focus on "the major journals that count for tenure at the leading business
9
10 schools" (2012, p. 38) excluded the principal journal dedicated to the topic - the *Journal of*
11
12 *Management, Spirituality & Religion* (Vasconcelos, 2018) that alone published over the period
13
14 surveyed by Tracey more than the 86 papers he examined. His review also ignored the *Journal*
15
16 *of Business Ethics* that over the period reviewed published over 40 relevant papers and a
17
18 similar number in the *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, including four (!)
19
20 special issues, the earliest appearing in 1994. Similarly, the *Journal of Managerial Psychology*
21
22 and the *Journal of Management Inquiry* published more than 20 papers each during the said
23
24 period. And that is far from an exhaustive list.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Hence, when Tracey et al. (2014) lament on "the paucity of work on religion and
32
33 organization" (2014, p. 6) finding it "puzzling and unfortunate that management scholars have
34
35 so studiously avoided one of the most pervasive influences on organizations
36
37 [religion]" (2014, p. 4) they, alas, convey a somewhat misleading impression, which amounts
38
39 to an error of the third type: researching the wrong question with the right methods (Mitroff
40
41 & Silvers, 2009). Thus the critical question is not why "management researchers have not
42
43 explored the intersection between religion and organization in a more meaningful and
44
45 determined way" (Tracey, 2012, p. 1), but rather, why "*all the major journals that count for*
46
47 *tenure at the leading business schools*" (Tracey, 2012, p. 38; italics added) do not publish on
48
49 the topic. We propose therefore the following question: why is it that so little attention has
50
51 been devoted to these important issues in prominent and influential management and
52
53 organizational journals?
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 King (2008) offers an explanation. He suggests that engaging with such research is a high-risk
4 career strategy for business and management academics, given the fields' emphasis on tangible
5 output variables and since "the idea of studying a construct that is closely associated with not
6 just the unknown but also the unknowable seems foreign and disconcerting to some" (2008, p.
7 217). Hence, the mindful ambitious high-flying academic, targeting the top journals, may well
8 steer away from entangling oneself in these matters. Vasconcelos (2018) hints at another
9 possible explanation. His exhaustive search identified 882 published studies on spirituality, the
10 workplace, management and organizing over a 16 years period (2000 - 2015) - none in top tier
11 journals; which represent "encapsulated knowledge derived from research initiatives of a wide
12 range of distinct areas such as religion, psychiatry, psychology, gerontology and
13 nursing" (2018, p. 809) in addition to organization and management studies. Hence, the
14 dispersion of knowledge among numerous outlets, many of them unknown and inaccessible to
15 business and management scholars, does not facilitate the creation of a canonical body of
16 knowledge that would confer academic 'respectability' and drive theorization. We propose two
17 other possible explanations for the lacuna of publications in top tier business and
18 management journals: an apparent reluctance of mainstream academic researchers to engage in
19 religion and spirituality research, and the challenge of finding adequate methodologies to
20 capture the essence of religiosity/spirituality in a work and organization context.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The assumed reluctance of mainstream business and management academics to engage with
48 religion and spirituality may be due to different reasons in different places. We speculate about
49 three geographies noted by Vasconcelos (2018) for their lack of relevant research: France,
50 China and the UK. In the case of France, secularism (*laïcité*) is a foundational principle of the
51 Republic and in public affairs whereby academics (in universities) are public servants. In
52 China, officially an atheist nation, religion is frowned upon. Hence in both countries engaging
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in religion and spirituality research may be conceived as politically incorrect (in more than one
4 sense). In the UK, positivist research in organizational spirituality and religion has fallen foul
5 of the influential critical management movement (Lips-Wiersma & Mills, 2014) due to the
6 apparent “commodification and *appropriation* of matters spiritual within predominantly
7 capitalist forms of organization” (Case & Gosling, 2010, p. 258; italics in original). Since from
8 time immemorial academic scholarship is bound to dogma, conditioned by peer pressure and
9 subject to institutional scrutiny, the conservatism, inherent to top tier journals (Altman &
10 Laguecir, 2012) may have enacted a gate-keeping role to deny access to this field’s
11 scholarship.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Vasconcelos (2018) comprehensive review of the field notes the predominance of quantitative
27 methods and the lack in longitudinal, autoethnography and experimental designs. Criticism
28 has also been levelled that the domain is lacking in sound theoretical foundations (Parboteeah
29 et al., 2008; Steffy, 2013; Weaver & Agle, 2002; Tracey, 2012). Quite possibly, the
30 challenge this field is facing is in finding ways to embrace contributions from outside the
31 social sciences. For example, we only see the beginnings of attempts to import from the vast
32 field of theology into the discourse on workplace spirituality/religion (Tackney, 2018); and the
33 scope to engage with anthropology as a bedrock for theorizing the interface of religion,
34 culture and society, remains wide open.³ Thus, the field may be conceived as yet
35 theoretically underdeveloped, militating against publication in top tier journals.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 Other aspects implicit to research in this domain may further impede the advancement of our
52 knowledge. Enquiring about one’s beliefs may be sensitive and understandably subjects may
53 be reluctant to reveal information they perceive as private and possibly discriminatory

54
55
56
57 ³ See Asad (1993, 2003); Turner (2010); Hunt (2017); as well as anthropologists studying religious organizations
58 (see Koning & Njoto-Feillard, 2017; Wiegele, 2005). Their studies problematize and illuminate local experiences
59 of multiple modernities and the moral limits of modern-day capitalism.
60

1
2
3 (Alshehri, Kauser & Fotaki, 2017). Therefore, research into this area is likely to create social
4 desirability biases and self-deceptions that may result in unreliable findings (Jones & Elliott,
5 2016). Last but not least, the overwhelming majority of empirical studies are concerned with
6 religious norms derived from Western mainstream Christianity. Other major religions, such as
7 Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, Taoism, Confucianism, Eastern Christianity and Pentecostalism –
8 remain understudied (Essers & Benschop, 2009; Jingjit & Fotaki, 2010; Syed & Van Buren,
9 2014; Alshehri et al., 2017). We also know very little indeed about African and Afro-Caribbean
10 religions as well as the spirituality of most other indigenous people in relation to work, the
11 workplace, management and organizing.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Imagining new pathways for managing and organizing may imply going back in time, listening
27 attentively to the wisdoms of the great religions and old folkways. Management and organizing
28 are not new. They hark back some 10,000 years to the first settlements of *homo sapiens* and the
29 cultivation of agriculture. Management and organising moved up step with the
30 establishments of cities in the third millennia BC. The challenges we face today: coordination,
31 competition, embracing change, power and resistance, have always been around us. Perhaps
32 the prophet is right: ‘there is nothing new under sun’ (Ecclesiastes 1:9). Learning from the past
33 may well be the best pathway into the future.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In conclusion, it would be fair to say that religion and spirituality have made significant
48 contributions to organization studies in the past twenty years. It would be also fair to say that as
49 yet it is unclear whether these would make lasting impressions. In any case, given that
50 spiritual and religious beliefs have become recognized as pivotal in numerous societies (Pew
51 Research Center, 2010), of relevance for a diversified workforce in a global world (Ghuman et
52 al., 2016; King, 2008; Treviño, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006) and since the intertwining of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the spiritual and the religious with the secular is fast becoming a hallmark of 21st century ‘post-
4 secular’ societies (Molendijk, 2015), their contribution to organizational studies should no
5 longer be ignored by top mainstream management and organization journals (Gebert et al.,
6 2013; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Longenecker et al., 2004; Tracey, 2012; Weaver & Agle,
7 2002) - a deficiency this Special Issue aims to address.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 **Symbolism and meaning making in organizations**

18
19 Organizations exist as systems of shared meanings that are developed and sustained through
20 the symbolic process (Smircich, 1983). Indeed, the notion of culture has been described as
21 ‘consisting of symbolic vehicles of meaning, including beliefs, ritual practices, art forms, and
22 ceremonies, as well as informal cultural practices such as language, gossip, stories, and rituals of
23 daily life’ (Swindler, 1986, p. 273). The power of symbols and their significance lies in their
24 ability to carry and communicate cultural meaning beyond their utilitarian value (for instance in
25 consumer goods – see McCracken, 1986). Symbolism, alongside power, are the two major
26 variables that pervade all social life (Hallett, 2003).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Organizational symbolism emerged from the ‘cultural turn’ in the study of organizations in the
41 late 1970s and early 1980s⁴. Devoted to the analysis of organizations as ‘cultures’ characterized
42 by distinct paradigms, symbolism developed in parallel with the research strand examining
43 how cultural values shape organizational forms beyond the pursuit of their rational goals. It
44 was closely linked to the postmodernist view of organizations calling for non-traditional
45 positivist theories and methods (Alvesson & Berg, 1992) to not only capture their instrumental
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 The *Standing Conference for Organisational Symbolism* (SCOS) <https://www.scos.org/> with its flagship journal
58 *Culture and Organization* has been pivotal in this movement, though recent years have seen a marked decrease
59 of academic interest in the field (for a discussion see Gagliardi, 2007, 2015).
60

1
2
3 and economic aspects, but also their ideational and symbolic ones, using holistic and
4
5 interpretative research models (Gagliardi, 2015, p. 179).
6
7
8
9

10 Symbolism expresses the underlying character, ideology, or value system of an organization: it
11 provides a prism through which organizational stakeholders can communicate their
12 experiences, successful actions as well as dysfunctional aspects of organizational work
13 (Dandridge, Mitroff, & Joyce, 1980) integrating emotions, cognition and behaviour into shared
14 codes, which undergird organizational culture and the organization itself (Raffaeli & Worline,
15 1999). In organizational settings, symbols count as any event, relationship or object that
16 conveys meaning, comprising physical artefacts, institutional routines and group interactions
17 (Pratt & Rafaeli, 2001). Symbols act both as carriers and repositories of meaning condensing
18 organizational knowledge (Lemon & Sahota, 2004) for instance, through innovation narratives
19 between organizational symbolism and studies of religiosity on the one hand and storytelling on
20 the other hand. Symbolic interpretation has been used in developing an approach for
21 assessing religion's influence on individuals' ethical behavior in organizations (Waeber & Agle,
22 2002); and the link between symbolism and storytelling is also reflected in a growing interest in
23 religion's meaning-making (Grant, 2001). Organizational symbolism has also contributed to
24 legitimizing the narrative approach in organization studies by emphasizing the importance of the
25 stories and myths produced in organizations to understanding core processes (Czarniawska &
26 Gagliardi, 2007). Morgan's *Images of Organization* (1986) reinterpreted organizational
27 social science and theories of organization from the perspective of metaphor. It has introduced
28 several root metaphorical expressions that influenced subsequent developments in research on
29 metaphors in organization studies (Cornelissen, & Kafouros, 2008; Jermier & Forbes, 2011;
30 Örtenblad, Putnam, & Terhan, 2016). Over the years, many researchers used descriptive and
31 critical approaches to understand how metaphors are employed in certain settings, focusing on
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 power, control, resistance, and related concepts (e.g., Höpfl & Maddrell, 1996; Martin,
4
5 Knopoff, & Beckman, 1998; Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, 2011).
6
7
8
9

10 Metaphors have been considered as normative constructs in organizational development and
11
12 planned change (e.g. Burke, 1992; Cornelissen, Holt, & Zundel, 2011; Jacobs & Heracleous,
13
14 2006); and together with archetypes, metaphors have also been applied in the context of gender,
15
16 power and culture to better understand women's position in organizations and for addressing
17
18 the pervasive, elusive and ambiguous nature of gender in work settings (Gherardi, 1995, 2000).
19
20 The research on metaphors extends beyond organizational culture and symbolism to include
21
22 literature on organizational discourse (e.g., Örtenblad et al., 2016). Metaphors and other forms
23
24 of analogical reasoning are increasingly being seen as central to all aspects of theory
25
26 construction (Cornelissen, 2006, Cornelissen et al., 2011); they are now regarded as having
27
28 positive semantic qualities that grant them the role of developing imaginative thought trials,
29
30 mental experiments and iterative ways of seeing, sensing, conceptualizing and comprehending
31
32 organizational phenomena (Cornelissen, 2005).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 While metaphors provide essential aspects of cognitive frameworks for organizational
41
42 members as mechanisms through which they see and construct organizational life, archetypes
43
44 help us to articulate issues for which we do not have specific language (Bowles, 1990).
45
46 Archetypes underlying deep structures can be thought of as interpretive schemes of shared
47
48 understandings that give meaning to experience and guide imagination of organizational
49
50 members (Greenwood & Hinings, 1993). Archetypes and metaphors may also direct us to the
51
52 underlying unconscious of an organization's dynamics (Koçoğlu, Akgün, & Keskin, 2016). In
53
54 that context, organizational symbols act as the sources of 'unthought known' (Dimond, 2008)
55
56 that is, they stand in for the knowledge that the individuals are unable to think about; while
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 analysis of the dominant metaphors in the public discourse, can be helpful for the revealing
4
5 and assimilating of unconscious content at the level of organizations (Bowles, 1990).
6
7
8
9

10 Another strand of related research focusing on the symbolic meaning of language emerges from
11
12 the recent turn to Lacan's work in critically-oriented organizational scholarship (e.g.
13
14 Stavrakakis, 2008; Driver, 2009, 2013; Vidaillet & Gamot, 2015; Arnaud & Vanheule, 2007)⁵.
15
16 Indeed, as Lacan put it "the unconscious is structured like the language" (Lacan, 1981, p. 20).
17
18 Central to Lacan's re-reading of Freud is the constitution of the subject through its (violent)
19
20 entry into the language/the symbolic order expressed in a set of prohibitions and rules as the law
21
22 (of the father)⁶. The subject recognizes himself/herself in relation to the symbolic order,
23
24 acknowledging that we cannot exist socially outside of a system of symbolic signification: "the
25
26 symbolic provides a form into which the subject is inserted at the level of its being. It's on this
27
28 basis that the subject recognizes himself as being this or that" (Lacan, 1993, p. 179). There is a
29
30 proliferation of articles using major aspects of his theories to analyse core organizational
31
32 issues such as identity (Driver, 2009) and identification (Stavrakakis, 2008), leadership
33
34 (Driver, 2013), resistance (Hoedemaekers & Keegan, 2010; Vidaillet & Gamot, 2015),
35
36 gendered discourse (Kenny, 2009; Fotaki & Harding, 2013), or social enterprise (Kenny, Haug,
37
38 & Fotaki, 2019).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 A creative fusion of psychoanalysis, organizational narrative and storytelling (Gabriel, 1995) is
48
49 another manifestation of organizational symbolism. Organizational stories and narratives are
50
51
52

53
54 ⁵ See for instance Special Issue in Organization *Jacques Lacan in organization studies* - a collection of articles
55
56 applying Lacanian ideas in various empirical settings; for a further exploration of the use of psychoanalytic
57
58 concepts in organization studies see Fotaki, Long, & Schwartz (2012) and Arnaud & Vidaillet (2018) tracing
59
60 Lacan's influence in the field of organization studies.

⁶ For a detailed discussion of the application of Lacanian concepts of symbolic and imaginary see Fotaki, 2009,
2010; and Driver, 2009, 2013 among others.

1
2
3 expressed as symbolic artefacts drawing on deep mythological archetypes. But they are also a
4 vital part of an individual's and organization's sensemaking apparatus; as features of
5 organizational politics representing attempts at control and resistance; as elements of individual
6 and group identities; and as means for sharing, disseminating, and contesting knowledge and
7 learning (Gabriel, 2000). The stories can be presented as archetypal tales, that is, as stories
8 that touch profound aspects of culture and psyche (Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, 2013). The
9 unconscious knowledge is also likely to play an important role as individuals translate
10 innovation narratives in ways that activate imagination about the future while drawing on both
11 memory and current experience (Bartel & Garud, 2009).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 As the next section will discuss in greater detail, stories and storytelling are a form of reality
27 construction. Their strength relies on constructing a commonality of meaning, but this also
28 suggests that events and knowledge outside of such frame of meaning are evaluated and
29 regarded from a common stance of the stories (Boje, 2001). As such, the plurivocality,
30 alternative stories and the voices of the less powerful are excluded or silenced (Boje, 1995).
31 Psychoanalytically inflected notions of fantasy and imagination (Stavrakakis, 2008; Fotaki,
32 2010; Vince, 2018; Kenny et al., 2019) offer a promise for overcoming these challenges.
33 Fantasy is indispensable for struggling towards a better future (Kenny et al., 2019) while
34 imagination, which is both creative and self-creating, symbolic and material (Komporozos-
35 Athanasiou & Fotaki, 2015), enables us to envision the shapes it might take. Weick (1989)
36 highlighted the role of disciplined imagination for producing better but also useful theorizing,
37 while Morgan (1986) stressed the importance of imagination in creating metaphorical images
38 that drives theory construction. However, the usefulness of theorizing can be very limited if it
39 is confined to the academic community and mainstream fields of knowledge. For scholars to
40 fully claim their role as contributors to society, we must become part of the solution to the
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 multiple challenges we face. This, we suggest, requires developing our capacity of imagination to
4
5 research topics and issues including political and societal problems that matter to people within
6
7 and outside our research community and our own paradigmatic commitments.
8
9

12 **Anthropology, ethnography and storytelling**

14 Current times, characterized by multiple crises, call for sensitizing approaches that can move
15
16 beyond the technical and operational elements of organizing and managing; approaches that
17
18 offer us alternatives to re-think and re-imagine, re-formulate and re-examine the role of
19
20 organizations and the processes by which organizational actors imbue their actions/being with
21
22 meaning. The discipline of anthropology, and ethnography as its core methodology, are such
23
24 alternative approaches, their synergy is nicely captured by McGranahan (2018): “ethnographic
25
26 research is attentive to the actual conditions of life, rather than to laboratory-produced or
27
28 predicted conditions. It traffics in *stories* rather than numbers” (2018, p.5, italics added).
29
30
31 Storytelling was at the beginning, long before the written word was invented; much longer
32
33 before religion was canonized. Storytelling was the communication procedure for oral history, for
34
35 community bonding, for the first organized work, as we are told in the Babylonian myth of
36
37 Gilgamesh. Storytelling, if you will, is the first research method. Anthropology, where the
38
39 method of storytelling is most embedded, is possibly the oldest among the social science
40
41 disciplines, tracing its origins to Herodotus (Boas, 1904).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Over the years, ethnography (Kostera, 2007; Neyland, 2008; Rosen, 1991; Van Maanen, 1988;
50
51 Ybema et al., 2009)⁷ and storytelling (Boje, 1991, 2001; Czarniawska, 1998; Gabriel, 1991,
52
53
54

55
56 ⁷ In addition see, e.g. Ciuk, Koning, & Kostera (2018); Van Maanen (2011); Watson (2011); Yanow, Ybema, &
57
58 Van Hulst (2012) and Ybema et al. (2019) for an extensive overview of ethnographic work from its early
59
60 beginnings. Equally, see the debate in *Journal of Management Studies* on the role of ethnographic research in
management and organization studies (Watson, 2011; van Maanen, 2011).

1
2
3 1995, 2000)⁸ have been offering us novel ways of engaging with and examining the
4 complexities of organizational life and the processes of narrative meaning making, as well as
5
6 illuminating the interconnectedness (often ignored) of organizations, and organizational
7
8 members, with their wider environment. Important in these developments has been the
9
10 ‘interpretive turn’ (hand-in-hand with the ‘linguistic turn’) in the second half of the twentieth
11
12 century, which (re)focused the attention to the centrality of meaning in human life, the
13
14 importance of language, and a reflexive stance on how knowledge is created. Yanow and
15
16 Schwartz-Shea (2006) explicate that the turn is both a turning away from and a turning toward;
17
18 “a turning away from [...] the idea of a social scientific practice in which humans are
19
20 conceptualized as objects” and “turning toward a re-humanized, contextualized set of
21
22 practices” (2006, p. xiv).⁹
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Ethnography, through its close and personal engagement, and storytelling due to its value in
32
33 uncovering how we make sense, have delivered on this promise, even though recently both
34
35 were subject to criticisms for blind spots to which we will return below. Ethnographic research,
36
37 subscribing to a historical and culturally sensitive perspective, has shown to be able to make
38
39 explicit some of the more hidden aspects of organizations and organizing, including ambiguity,
40
41 complexity, emotions and power; as well as reveal the daily routines of organizational life
42
43 (O’Doherty & Neyland, 2019; Ybema et al., 2009). Storytelling research demonstrates how
44
45 organizations and organizational actors make sense of identities, enact change (power and
46
47 politics), express resistance, nurture belonging, share ridicule, let off steam and reduce the
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ⁸ In addition see e.g. Boyce (1995); Brown, Gabriel, & Gherardi (2009); Colville, Brown, & Pye (2012); Whittle
56 & Mueller (2012).

57 ⁹ Also in anthropology and ethnography, a ‘turn’ took place in the late 1980s with the ‘crisis of representation’;
58 the essays in ‘Writing Culture’ (Clifford & Marcus, 1986) sparked a debate on representing ‘the Other’ and
59 ethnographic authority; as well as of the ethnographers’ ethnocentric lens (see also Cunliffe, 2010).
60

1
2
3 equivocality of organizational life (Beigi, Callahan, & Michaelson, 2019; Dawson & Sykes,
4
5 2019; Rhodes & Brown, 2005; Van Hulst & Ybema, 2019)¹⁰.
6
7
8
9

10 Stories, notwithstanding some major differences on how these should be defined (see Beigi,
11
12 Callahan, & Michaelson, 2019 and Dawson & Sykes, 2019 for discussion about the differences
13
14 between the two core storytelling approaches of Boje and Gabriel), open “windows into the
15
16 emotional, political and symbolic lives of organizations” (Gabriel, 2000, p. 2) marking
17
18 organizations as storytelling systems and organization studies as a set of storytelling practices
19
20 (Rhodes & Brown, 2005). Storytelling research has not only been able to offer a counter
21
22 narrative to the overly positivistic narrative of management science (as pointed out by Rhodes &
23
24 Brown, 2005), but also to infuse a more critical voice, juxtaposing sensemaking with
25
26 subverting, communicating with manipulating, change and learning with challenging, power
27
28 with dissent and identification with alienation (Beigi, Callahan, & Michaelson, 2019). Indeed, if
29
30 we “are to take the lives of others seriously and sympathetically [...] and to engage with
31
32 lived experience rather than to abstract from it” (Rhodes & Brown, 2005, p. 182), we cannot do
33
34 without narratives and storytelling.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Whilst ethnography is “part of the staple diet of anthropologists and sociologists” (Cunliffe,
43
44 2010, p.226), anthropology seems to have mainly played a role on the sidelines of
45
46 organizational research; confined to the perception as the ‘mother’ discipline from which
47
48 ethnographic method was brought into the organizational studies field. There is however, good
49
50 reason, against the background of the multiple crises we face, to be more proactive in
51
52 embracing the discipline that asks questions such as “what is it that makes us human”, “what
53
54
55
56

57
58 ¹⁰ These four articles offer a wealth of resources on organizational storytelling as well as ways forward for the
59 field.
60

1
2
3 is it that we all share”, and “what is it that we inherit from the circumstances of society and
4 history”? (Engelke, 2017, p. 5). Not only does anthropology offer an holistic way of thinking and
5 researching (which takes time), paying attention to, and integrating, both the ‘complex’ and the
6 ‘particular’ (Garsten & Nyqvist, 2013); it also strives to challenge and re-examine the ‘taken-for-
7 granted’ through a contextual approach that focuses on actors and their voices (polyphony)
8 within a wider milieu (Bate, 1997). It may be argued that of all main social sciences
9 disciplines that inform organizational studies, anthropology is most attuned to
10 incorporating a historical perspective against the others’ ‘here’ and ‘now’ propensity (Sarason,
11 1981).
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 From the early years of the discipline anthropologists have always had an interest in
27 organizations and organizing since “we live most of our lives within and among
28 organisations” (Garsten & Nyqvist, 2013, p.1). Indeed the study of human organizing can be said
29 to be core to anthropology. In their path-breaking paper, Nancy Morey and Fred Luthans (1987,
30 p. 131)¹¹ present what anthropology has to offer to organization and management studies, starting
31 with the now well-known story of the Hawthorne studies (the role of both Mayo and
32 the anthropologist Warner in the success of the research and research outcomes). They divide
33 these contributions into theoretical ones, such as “existence of parallel formal and
34 informal organizations”, “participatory management’ and “worker morale”; and methodological
35 ones, such as the “precise details and thoroughness in direct observation” (Morey & Luthans,
36 1987, p. 130).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 ¹¹ The paper was reprinted in 2013 in the *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* with commentaries in order to
56 reflect on the treatment of the history of anthropological work in organizational studies, titled: “Reclaiming
57 Anthropology: the forgotten behavioral science in management history”, the commentaries were provided by Fred
58 Luthans; Ivana Milosevic, Beth Bechky, Edgar Schein, Susan Wright, John van Maanen, and Davydd Greenwood
59 (*Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 2(1), 92-116).
60

1
2
3 Since the 1980s, we have seen new subfields emerging, such as Organizational Anthropology
4 (Carsten & Nyqvist, 2013; Jordan & Caulkins, 2013; Wright, 1994) and Business
5
6 Anthropology (Jordan, 2012; Tian et al., 2013), the latter with its own journal, the *Journal of*
7
8 *Business Anthropology* (in press since 2012). These fields, instigated by anthropologists, show
9
10 that there are many synergies in the kind of organizations being studied, from corporations to
11
12 NGOs and indigenous organizations, as well as in terms of the research themes, which run
13
14 from internal organizational dynamics, to interorganizational relationships, and the interaction
15
16 between organizations and their wider context (Jordan & Caulkins, 2013). There are however
17
18 several important differences, relevant to our call for alternative approaches. Organizational
19
20 anthropologists demonstrate a greater interest in studying less mainstream organizations and
21
22 engage a longitudinal research frame (often in cultures other than their own), such as NGO-
23
24 church links (Kamsteeg, 1998), secret societies (Mahmud, 2013), or monasteries (Lohuis,
25
26 2013; Paganopoulos, 2010). At a more theoretical level one finds an emphasis on classical
27
28 anthropological issues, such as kinship (e.g. Verver & Koning, 2018), and rites of passage (e.g.
29
30 Popova, 2016) employed in current organizational and managerial research.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Still, there are hesitations (and institutional barriers) that seem to constrain a more fruitful
41
42 engagement between anthropology and organization studies; interestingly enough, in particular
43
44 due to the position and meaning ethnography takes in both fields. Although we are able to track a
45
46 long time engagement of anthropological research with organizational foci, debates regularly
47
48 flare up with regards to fieldwork (ethnography, participant observation) done by non-
49
50 anthropologists (e.g. Bate, 1997; Gaggiotti, Kostera, & Krzyworzeka, 2017). These include, the
51
52 neglect of long-term fieldwork, considered a necessity not only to understanding other
53
54 people's lives, but also to question one's own understanding of the world (Howell, 2017; Shah,
55
56 2017); the lack of a holistic perspective which "recognizes that we cannot understand one
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 aspect of social life in isolation from another” (Shah, 2017, p. 52); and the inseparability of
4 anthropology from ethnography, or how fieldwork and theorizing are intertwined (Bloch, 2017;
5 Howell, 2017).¹² Not many organizational ethnographers follow these principles, but the few who
6 have, were to put their stamp and keep pushing the field forward through their
7 ethnographic perspectives: Barbara Czarniawska, John van Maanen, Tony Watson, Sierk
8 Ybema, to name some of our prominent contemporaries.¹³ For them, as for mainstream
9 anthropologists, ethnography is the doing, thinking, seeing, sensing and writing combined; it is
10 therefore much more than a method (Gaggiotti et al., 2017; Watson, 2012) - it is a cosmology of
11 research and theory development.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Organizational storytelling, and organizational ethnography (particularly through a close
27 interaction with anthropology), we argue, thus have much to offer in addressing the
28 complexities of contemporary organizational worlds and the many internal and external
29 challenges both organizational members and organizational researchers are confronted with.
30 Both approaches however, also have some blind spots and shortcomings that have recently
31 been aired.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Some of the main concerns raised on storytelling as we know it today, include the omission of in
43 situ, contextual or setting-specific considerations in storytelling (Van Hulst & Ybema, 2019;
44 Luhman, 2019), a focus on time and temporality (Dawson & Sykes, 2019), and lack of attention
45 to underrepresented groups and themes such as empathy, as well as a need to engage with
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 ¹² Anthropologists do not all agree on this; Ingold (2008, 2017) argues that anthropology and ethnography have
55 different aims and that ethnography is not the means to anthropological ends. He argues (2017, p. 21 italics in
56 original), “To study anthropology is to study *with* people, not to make studies *of* them; such study is not so much
57 ethnographic as educational”. While we acknowledge that such divergence of views exist, we part company with
58 Ingold on this issue.

59 ¹³ Some of their main works are found in the reference list.
60

1
2
3 current developments in social media and contexts such as the post-truth era (Beigi et al., 2019). We
4 address each of these in more detail below.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Van Hulst and Ybema (2019) make an ethnographically grounded argument for adding a
11 missing layer to organizational storytelling, namely the setting (meetings rooms, canteens,
12 workstations, closed door rooms) in which storytelling in organizations takes place. This
13 illuminates the point that what is talked about by whom and to whom, matters; for instance, from
14 private one-to-one conversations (closed-door talk) to a joke shared collectively (canteen).
15 Their typology indicates that storytelling varies “considerably across settings within the
16 organization” and that each setting has “its own combination of story tellability, story triggers,
17 story(telling) forms and story work” (Van Hulst & Ybema, 2019, p.19). The theoretical
18 implications of this setting-sensitive approach to studying storytelling lie in acknowledging
19 that particular settings instigate particular talk (e.g. the intersection of discourse and setting) inviting,
20 for instance, a more nuanced investigation of the situated performance of identity work in
21 organizations. As said, the underlying method to reveal these nuances is ethnography, whereby
22 the researcher spends time in the organization; and by following and engaging with people, can
23 ‘witness’, first hand, the storytelling in multiple settings¹⁴. The anthropology of storytelling
24 argues that it is the cultural relevance of the story as exposed via characters, plot, theme - that
25 informs us why a particular story appeals to a particular audience (Maggio, 2014).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Organizational storytelling research is also judged to have a rather linear conception of time (and
50 structure; the past, present, future sequence). This, argue Dawson and Sykes (2019),
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ¹⁴ An alternative approach, is to reconstruct the ‘ex situ’ collected stories via an archaeological method, much
59 akin to how an archaeologist would infer meaning from past artefacts (Luhman, 2019).
60

1
2
3 seriously inhibits our understanding of organizational sensemaking as well as the
4 accommodation of 'multiple accounts' and 'multiple times'. A change from retrospective to
5
6 prospective sensemaking would require some conception of non-linearity, as would the way
7
8 people story their lived experiences under changing circumstance due to "digital technologies and
9
10 the global convergence of universal standard time" (Dawson & Sykes, 2019, p. 109). Due to
11
12 technological developments and innovation, there is furthermore scope to delve deeper into social
13
14 media storytelling and storytelling manipulation, particularly salient in the post-truth era.
15
16 Questions are also raised as to the inclusivity of organizational storytelling research, about the
17
18 voices of underrepresented identities such as disabled workers and LGBTQ+ (Beigi et al.,
19
20 2019). Beigi et al (2019) also propose exploring the impact of storytelling at a more emotional
21
22 level (organizational empathy), for instance via fictional storytelling and the relevance of
23
24 classic stories and myths for contemporary, political sensitive, organizational circumstances.
25
26 Storytelling remains an important approach to explore how people make sense of their
27
28 experiences, more so during times of upheaval and change. Some of these newer storytelling
29
30 developments, in addition to exposing the value of combining storytelling, ethnography and
31
32 anthropological sensitivities, are especially suited to address core concerns that permeate our
33
34 times, such as insecurity, inequality and precarity.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Organizational ethnography too is undergoing important new developments, pulling the field in
46
47 different directions. One urges us to reclaim the discipline's roots of social imagination, of 'being
48
49 amazed by the world': "a task of great importance and urgency in times of interregnum, when
50
51 new solutions and even institutions are vitally needed" (Gaggiotti et al., 2017, p. 327). The other
52
53 is pushing in the direction of the unknown territory of an ethnography of objects and non-humans
54
55 in order to "push at the limits of our current paradigms in management and organisation
56
57 studies" (O'Doherty & Neyland, 2019, p. 13). Both have merit. Showered with
58
59
60

1
2
3 breakthrough technology such as algorithms, bitcoins, and drones, the question indeed needs to be
4 asked how ethnography and storytelling can help us grasp and represent these. Depending on what
5 is investigated, the “complex embedding of organisations in society makes an isolated one-site
6 and in-situ focus next to impossible” (Schubert & Rohl, 2019, p. 177). A ‘post-reflexive
7 ethnography’ is suggested as ‘solution’, in which “there is no divide between theory and practice,
8 or representation and reality, which remain the dominant tropes for ethnographers keen to find a
9 method that permits latitude for their own interpretative efforts and reflexivity” (O’Doherty &
10 Neyland, 2019, p. 12). This does not imply however, that the traditional in situ and long-term
11 engagement with social actors is no longer needed or relevant. It is, and ethnography
12 permits us to “being perpetually pulled beyond the limits of one’s own taken-for-granted
13 world” (Narayan in McGranahan, 2018, p. 7). However, alternative modes of
14 organizational ethnography, enabled due to digital developments and electronic accessibility, are
15 coming to the fore, such as participatory organizational ethnographic documentary-making and
16 associated ‘witness’ thinking (the focus being on ‘with’). With filmmakers,
17 organizational researchers and participants joining a common reflexive space, the ethnographic
18 documentary can expose, in novel ways, the “inevitably affective and embodied character of
19 organizational life [...] through analysis which stresses human sensitivity, feeling and
20 emotion” (Hassard, Burns, Hyde, & Burns, 2018, p. 1417).

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 An ongoing and unsettled matter in discussions on organizational ethnography and
48 ethnographic based storytelling, concerns packaging these approaches into a generalized
49 qualitative research method; a danger also witnessed in organization research (Gaggiotti et al.,
50 2017) whereby time to conduct long-term participant observation or fieldwork in general,
51 striving for total immersion in search of a holistic understanding, is excused due to practical and
52 institutional barriers. This raises the question whether organizational researchers should
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 accept limitations in their ethnographic research or abandon it altogether; or, perhaps, challenge
4 disciplinary confines and institutional barriers by questioning our own cultural mores in
5 research, writing and publishing. A starting point would be the provision of adequate space in
6 journals to present the richness of ethnographic and storytelling work.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 To address the acute crises of today, instead of self-referential conversations on ‘fashionable’
15 topics in closed epistemic communities, we need research that pushes and crosses the
16 boundaries: disciplinary boundaries, ‘valid’ methods boundaries (inherently an
17 epistemological question). An organizational VUCA¹⁵ world, such that we find ourselves in,
18 surely negates a ‘business as usual’ approach; nor should it condone a ‘business research as
19 usual’ attitude.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **The content of the Special Issue**

32
33 This Special Issue offers an eclectic mix of the issues and approaches discussed above; and is a
34 product of much deliberation. Many excellent articles on different aspects of religiosity and
35 spirituality, symbolism and storytelling, are not included in this collection. We had to choose
36 from among 100 articles submitted. The first criterion for choosing an article for review was how
37 it addressed any of the three topics in the context of organization studies scholarship; hence
38 we excluded many excellent articles in spirituality or religiosity on the basis of their limited
39 relevance to debates in organizations. Our preference was for articles that successfully integrated
40 spirituality (religion), symbolism and storytelling or ethnography. The second criterion was
41 how important is the topic for scholars outside our field of organization studies and how
42 persuasively was it presented. Finally, we wanted to include topics that were novel,
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 ¹⁵ Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014).
60

1
2
3 and/or intriguing. The first round of selection led to a decision to review less than one third of all
4
5 submissions with five articles making it to the final round.
6
7
8
9

10 The article on symbolic construction of contemporary cultural heroes by Garcia-Blanco
11 examines the role of archetypes in leadership by comparing and contrasting two prominent
12 public personas that have captured the public imagination: Julian Assange and Mark
13 Zuckerberg. Both have been in the limelight since their founding and running of WikiLeaks and
14 Facebook respectively, over the past fifteen years; and by all signs they will continue to feature
15 prominently in the public eye for some time yet. Assange and Zuckerberg, Janus-like, on the face
16 of it antagonistic figures, in reality complimentary heroes/villains. Theirs is an ongoing
17 contemporary saga.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 This is followed by the article on ‘the magical world of Santa’ by Palo, Mason and Roscoe, who
31 explore the myth of Santa Claus, and how the performative power of this myth sustains and
32 organizes a market in which tourists travel to visit Santa at his ‘home’ in Finland for a single
33 day. They consider how, as a model of reality, myth becomes materialized, organized and
34 preformed into markets. Their contributions lie in empirically linking a myth
35 (conceptualized as a locution created through second-order semiological system) to a market, and
36 offer ‘translocution’ as a new analytic category to account for the laborious organizational process
37 of talking myth into a series of ‘magical’ performatives. Doing so, they reveal how accounts of
38 performativity may shed critical light on late capitalism’s capacity to create value out of the most
39 ephemeral of resources, myth. Their paper is an excellent example of how myths are translated
40 and integrated into the stories and ‘worlds’ of others, that is, how myth becomes performative.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Staying in the magical realm, in the next article, Ganzin, Islam and Suddaby develop the idea of
4
5 ‘magical realist thinking’ to better understand how entrepreneurs navigate risk and
6
7 uncertainty in their daily experiences. This magical realism is a form of spiritually charged
8
9 sensemaking that describes an orientation to future decisions that combines realism with
10
11 moments of spiritual resilience in the face of risk. The study is based on life-story research
12
13 conducted among Canadian entrepreneurs and presents three cognitive orientations that
14
15 collectively combine to capture a magical-realist worldview as they each integrate somewhat
16
17 paradoxical themes of belief in fatalism and agency, past and future, and science and magic.
18
19 Magical realism in the context of entrepreneurial cognition, as argued by the authors, involves a
20
21 category of sensemaking in which scientific and magical cosmologies usefully coexist; the
22
23 conclusion is that spirituality plays a critical but largely unrecognized role in entrepreneurial
24
25 cognition. The paper raises some important questions as to how cosmological views of one’s
26
27 actions may sideline conventional accounts of time in current debates on retrospective and
28
29 prospective sensemaking.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The penultimate article by Brummans, Hwang and Cheong report on the findings of their
39
40 ethnographic investigation of a Buddhist NGO organization in Taiwan, examining how a terse
41
42 retelling of an inspirational story encapsulated in a mantra, contributes to materializing and
43
44 reproducing of its ethos and worldview. This is achieved by encapsulating an inspirational
45
46 story in a relatable, appropriable way, by developing a model explaining the processes by
47
48 which this occurs. The study indicates, how even the most faithful recitation of a mantra always
49
50 implies a form of appropriation by organizational leaders, employees, and volunteers, as well as
51
52 non-members. They are all shown to choose to creatively weave the specific mantra phrase into
53
54 their accounts to accomplish their specific goals in a given situation. As such it provides
55
56 guidance for future studies to investigate more deeply to what extent mantras help promote the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 circulation of an organizational culture in which dissent and conflict are often suppressed or
4
5 avoided.
6
7
8
9

10 The final article by Deslandes, offers a theoretical contribution to developing the contours of
11 *weak management* through the study of theological *oikonomia* in the work of postmodern
12 theologians Gianni Vattimo and John Caputo. The essay provocatively argues that stripping
13 *oikonomos* of its cognitive omnipotence will ultimately curtail its power (all italics in the
14 original). Mobilizing this lesser power, which is also a principle of self-limitation, will then
15 open a new different interpretative path to the notion of management, by taking it out of the
16 realm of strategy, control, and so on – basically, that of power – and by adding an element of
17 doubt and unease. The study makes a contribution to addressing the hegemonic claims by
18 management; but whether this is the only way for organizational scholars to make a positive
19 impact on society is open to debate.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Combined, these articles exemplify new ways in which both researchers and the researched
36 imagine and/or re-imagine the task of organizations, the pathways to organizing and ways of
37 managing in this brave new world of ours. We hope that having read our exposition, readers will
38 feel empowered to engage with the themes and the methods presented here; which we believe
39 open promising routes to a richer, more nuanced understanding of the challenges our societies
40 face. We invite you to join the narrative of this Special Issue, that will take you from the lives of
41 heroes/villains Julian Assange and Mark Zuckerberg to the performative myth of Santa Clause in
42 Finland, through the magical realism of Canadian entrepreneurs to a Buddhist NGO in Taiwan
43 and a contemplation on the future of power and management. Have a safe journey!
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Albrecht, C. (2007). A Comment on Koerber and Neck's (2006) Religion in the workplace: Implications for financial fraud and organizational decision making. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 4(1), 87-94.
- Alshehri, F., Kauser, S., & Fotaki, M. (2017). Muslims view of God as a predictor of ethical behaviour in organization: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Business Ethics* (1-19)
- Altman, Y. & Laguecir, A. (2012). Leadership in the academic field of management and the question of country-of-origin. *British Journal of Management*, 23(4), 233-255.
- Alvesson, M., & Berg, P.-O. (1992). *Corporate culture and organizational symbolism: An overview*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Angelidis, J., & Ibrahim, N. (2004). An exploratory study of the impact of degree of religiousness upon an individual's corporate social responsiveness orientation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 51(2), 119-128.
- Arnason, J.P., Eisenstadt, S.N., & Wittrock, B. (2012). *Axial civilizations and world history*. Den Hague: Brill.
- Arnaud, G., & Vanheule, S. (2007). The division of the subject and the organization: A Lacanian approach to subjectivity at work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20, 359–369.
- Arnaud, G., & Vidaillet, B. (2018). Clinical and critical: The Lacanian contribution to management and organization studies. *Organization*, 25(1), 69–97.
- Asad, T. (2003). *Formations of the secular: Christianity, Islam, modernity*. Stanford University Press.
- Asad, T. (1993/2009). *Genealogies of religion: Discipline and reasons of power in Christianity and Islam*. JHU Press.

- 1
2
3 Ashmos, D.P. and Duchon, D. (2000), Spirituality at work: a conceptualization and measure,
4
5 *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 134-145.
6
7
8 Assouad, A., & Parboteeah, K.P. (2018). Religion and innovation. A country institutional
9
10 approach. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 15(1), 20-37.
11
12 Badawi, J. (2001). Spiritual goods: Faith traditions and the practice of business. In S. W.
13
14 Herman & A. Gross-Schaefer (Eds.), *Spiritual goods: Faith traditions and the practice of*
15
16 *business* (pp. 295–323). Philosophy Documentation Center Society for Business Ethics. Bartel,
17
18 C. A., & Garud, R., (2009). The role of narratives in sustaining organizational innovation.
19
20 *Organization Science*, 20(1), 107-117.
21
22
23 Bate, S.P. (1997). Whatever happened to organizational anthropology? A review of the field of
24
25 organizational ethnography and anthropological studies. *Human Relations*, 50(9), 1147-1175.
26
27
28 Beekun, R. I., & Badawi, J. A. (2005). Balancing ethical responsibility among multiple
29
30 organizational stakeholders: The Islamic perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 60(2), 131-145.
31
32
33 Beigi, M., Callahan, J., & Michaelson, C. (2019). A critical plot twist: Changing characters and
34
35 foreshadowing the future of organizational storytelling. *International Journal of*
36
37 *Management Reviews*, 00, 1–19. DOI: 10.1111/ijmr.12203
38
39
40 Belk, R.W., Wallendorf, M. & Sherry, Jr. J.F. (1989). The sacred and the profane in consumer
41
42 behavior. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16(1), 1-38.
43
44
45 Bellah, N.B., Marsden, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S.M. (2007). *Habits of the*
46
47 *heart*. Oakland, CA.: CUP.
48
49 Bennett, N., & Lemoine, G.J. (2014). What VUCA really means for you. *Harvard Business*
50
51 *Review*, 92(1/2), 27.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Berger, P.L. (1999). The desecularization of the world: A global overview. In P. L. Berger,
4 (Ed), *The Desecularization of the World*. Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., pp. 1-18. Berry,
5
6 G. R., (2001). Telling stories: Making sense of the environmental behavior of chemical firms.
7
8 *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 10(1), 58- 73.
9
10
11
12 Bloch, M. (2017). Anthropology is an odd subject: studying from the outside and from the
13
14 inside. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 7(1), 33-43.
15
16
17 Boje, D. M. (1991). The storytelling organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 106–
18
19 126.
20
21
22 Boje, D. M., (1995). Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney
23
24 as ‘Tamara-Land’. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(4), 997-1035.
25
26
27 Boje, D. M., Luhman, J.T., & Baack, D.E., (1999). Stories and encounters between storytelling
28
29 organizations. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8(4), 340-360.
30
31
32 Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research*.
33
34 London: SAGE Publications.
35
36
37 Boyce, M. E. (1995). Collective centering and collective sense-making in the stories and
38
39 storytelling of one organization. *Organization Studies*, 16, 107–137.
40
41
42 Braidotti, R. (2008). In spite of the times: The postsecular turn in feminism. *Theory, Culture*
43
44 *and Society*, 25(6), 1–24.
45
46
47 Brown, A. D., Gabriel, Y., & Gherardi, S. (2009). Storytelling and change: An unfolding story.
48
49 *Organization*, 16(3), 323-333.
50
51
52 Bullivant, S. (2013). Defining ‘atheism’. In S. Bullivant & M. Ruse (Eds.), *The Oxford*
53
54 *handbook of atheism*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 11-21.
55
56
57 Burke, W. W. (1992). Metaphors to consult by. *Group & Organization Management*, 17,
58
59 255-259.
60

1
2
3 Chappell, T. (2014) Three kinds of moral imagination. In T. Chappell (Ed), *Knowing what to*
4 *do: Imagination, virtue, and Platonism in ethics*. OUP Online.

5
6
7 Carr, A. (2002). Jung, archetypes and mirroring in organizational change management:
8 Lessons from a longitudinal case study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*,
9 *15(5)*, 477-489.

10
11
12 Carrette, J., & King, R. (2005). *Selling spirituality. The silent takeover of religion*. London and
13 New York: Routledge.

14
15
16 Case, P. & Gosling, J. (2010) The spiritual organization: critical reflections on the
17 instrumentality of workplace spirituality, *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*,
18 *7(4)*, 257-282

19
20
21 Chusmir, L. H., & Koberg, C. S. (1988). Religion and attitudes toward work: A new look at an
22 old question. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *9(3)*, 251-262.

23
24
25 Ciuk, S., Koning, J., & Kostera, M. (2018). Organizational ethnographies. In C. Cassell, A.
26 Cunliffe, & G. Grandy (eds.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative business and management*
27 *research*. London: Sage, pp. 270-285.

28
29
30 Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.). (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of*
31 *ethnography*. University of California Press.

32
33
34 Cornelissen, J. P. (2005). Beyond compare: Metaphor in organization theory. *Academy of*
35 *Management Review*, *30(4)*, 751-764.

36
37
38 Cornelissen, J. P. (2006). Making sense of theory construction: Metaphor and disciplined
39 imagination. *Organization Studies*, *27*, 1579-1597.

40
41
42 Cornelissen, J. P., & Kafouros, M. (2008). The emergent organization: Primary and complex
43 metaphors in theorizing about organizations. *Organization Studies*, *29*, 957-978.

44
45
46 Cornelissen, J. P., Holt, R., & Zundel, M. (2011). The role of analogy and metaphor in the
47 framing and legitimization of strategic change. *Organization Studies*, *32*, 1701-1716
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Cossette, P., (1998). The study of language in organizations: A symbolic interactionist stance.
4
5 *Human Relations*, 51(11), 1355-1377.
6
7
8 Craft, J. (2013). A review of the empirical ethical decision-making literature: 2004–2011.
9
10 *Journal of Business Ethics*, 117(2), 221-259.
11
12 Cunliffe, A. L. (2010). Retelling tales of the field: In search of organizational ethnography 20
13 years on. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13, 224-239.
14
15
16 Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1992). *Exploring complex organizations: A cultural perspective*.
17
18 Newbury Park: Sage.
19
20
21 Czarniawska-Joerges B. (1997). Symbolism and organization studies. In G. Ortmann, J.
22
23 Sydow J, & K. Türk (Eds), *Theorien der organisation. Organisation und gesellschaft*.
24
25 Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
26
27
28 Czarniawska, B. (1998). *A narrative approach to organization studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA:
29
30 Sage.
31
32
33 Czarniawska, B., & Gagliardi, P. (Eds.) (2007). *Narratives we organize by*.
34
35 Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
36
37
38 Dandridge, T. C. (1985). The life stages of a symbol: When symbols work and when they can't.
39
40 In L. W. Pondy, P. J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T. C. Dandridge (Eds.), *Organizational culture* (pp.
41
42 141-153). Beverly Hills: Sage.
43
44
45 Dandridge, T. C., Mitroff, I., and Joyce, W.F. (1980). Organizational symbolism: A topic to
46
47 expand organizational analysis. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 77-82.
48
49
50 Davie, G. (2015) *Religion in Britain: A Persistent Paradox*. London: Wiley-Blackwell (2nd
51
52 ed.)
53
54
55 Dawson, P., & Sykes, C. (2019). Concepts of time and temporality in the storytelling and
56
57 sensemaking literatures: A review and critique. *International Journal of Management Reviews*,
58
59 21(1), 97-114.
60

- 1
2
3 De Beauvoir, S. (1949) *Le deuxième sexe*. Paris: Gallimard
4
5
6 Delbecq, A. L. (2010). How spirituality is manifested within corporate culture: perspectives
7
8 from a case study and a scholar's focus group. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*,
9
10 7(1), 51-71.
11
12 Dimond, M.A. (2008). Telling them what they know. Organizational change, defensive
13
14 resistance, and the unthought known. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(3), 348-364.
15
16 Driver, M. (2009). Struggling with lack: A Lacanian perspective on organizational identity.
17
18 *Organization Studies*, 30(1), 55-72.
19
20
21 Driver, M. (2013). The lack of power or the power of lack in leadership as a discursively
22
23 constructed identity. *Organization Studies*, 34(3), 407-422.
24
25
26 Durkheim, E. (1912). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. London: John Allen & Unwin.
27
28 Engelke, M. (2017). *Think like an anthropologist*. Penguin Random House.
29
30
31 Esposito, A., & Diaz, L. (2018). Migrants 'knock at front door' for asylum after Trump
32
33 crackdown. Reuters, 25th June [https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration-](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration-asylum/migrants-knock-at-front-door-for-asylum-after-trump-crackdown-idUSKBN1JL0)
34
35 [asylum/migrants-knock-at-front-door-for-asylum-after-trump-crackdown-idUSKBN1JL0](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration-asylum/migrants-knock-at-front-door-for-asylum-after-trump-crackdown-idUSKBN1JL0)
36
37
38 Essers, C., & Benschop, Y. (2009). Muslim businesswomen doing boundary work: The
39
40 negotiation of Islam, gender and ethnicity within entrepreneurial contexts. *Human Relations*,
41
42 62(3) 403-423.
43
44
45 Falque, L., & Duriau, V.J. (2004). Managerial discernment: An examination in the case of
46
47 employee appraisal. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 1(1), 51-76.
48
49
50 Faroughi, H., Gabriel, Y., & Fotaki, M. (2019). Leadership narratives in a post-truth era.
51
52 *Leadership*, [15\(2\), 135-151. doi.org/10.1177/1742715019835369](https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715019835369)
53
54
55 Faulkner, J.E., & de Jong, G.F. (1966). Religiosity in 5-D: An empirical analysis. *Social*
56
57 *Forces*, 45(2), 246-254.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fotaki, M. (2009). Maintaining the illusion of a free health service in post-socialism: A
4 Lacanian analysis of transition from planned to market economy. *Journal of Organizational*
5 *Change Management*, 22(2), 141-158.
6
7
8
9
10 Fotaki, M. (2010). Why do public policies fail so often? Exploring health policy making as an
11 imaginary/symbolic construction. *Organization*, 17(6), 703–720.
12
13
14 Fotaki, M. (2019). Relationality in the age of neoliberal dispossession: protecting the other. In U.
15 Lewin, & A. Zajenkowska (Eds), *A psychoanalytic and socio-cultural exploration of a*
16 *continent. Europe on the couch*. Routledge.
17
18
19
20
21 Fotaki, M., Long, S., & Schwartz, H.S. (2012). What can psychoanalysis offer organization
22 studies today? Taking stock of current developments and thinking about future directions.
23 *Organization Studies*, 33(9), 1104-1120.
24
25
26
27
28 Fotaki, M. & Harding, N. (2013). Lacan and sexual difference in organization and management
29 theory: Towards a hysterical academy?’, *Organization*, 20(2), 153-172.
30
31
32
33 Frazer, J.G. (1900). *The golden bough*. London: MacMillan.
34
35
36 Frankl, V. (1959). *Man's search for meaning*. Boston: Beacon Press
37
38 Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727. Fry,
39 L. W., & Altman, Y. (2013). *Spiritual leadership in action: The CEL story*. Charlotte, NC:
40 Information Age Publishing.
41
42
43
44 Gabriel, Y. (1991). Turning facts into stories and stories into facts. *Human Relations*, 44, 857–875.
45
46 Gabriel, Y. (1995). The unmanaged organization. *Organization Studies*, 16, 477–501. Gabriel, Y.
47 (2000). *Storytelling in organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Gaggiotti, H., Kostera,
48 M., & Krzyworzeka, P. (2017). More than a method? Organisational ethnography as a way of
49 imagining the social. *Culture and Organization*, 23(5), 325-340.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Gagliardi, P. (2006). Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life. In: C. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B., Lawrence, & W.R. Nord, (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizations Studies*, pp. 701–724. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Gagliardi, P. (2007). The collective repression of “pathos” in organization studies. *Organization*, 14, 331-338.
- Gagliardi, P. (2015). Myths and symbols: Organizational. In P. Bryant & J. Mathews (Eds) section *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences*, 2nd edition, Volume 16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.73088-1> 179 .
- Garsten, C., & Nyqvist, A. (2013). Entries: Engaging organisational worlds. In Garsten, C., & Nyqvist, A. (Eds), *Organizational anthropology: Doing ethnography in and among complex organizations*. Pluto Press, pp. 1-15.
- Gebert, D., Boerner, S., Kearney, E., King, J. E., Zhang, K., & Song, L. J. (2013). Expressing religious identities in the workplace: Analyzing a neglected diversity dimension. *Human Relations*, 67(5), 543–563.
- Gherardi (1995). *Gender, symbolism and organizational cultures*. London: Sage.
- Gherardi, S., (2000). Where learning is: Metaphors and situated learning in a planning group. *Human Relations*, 53(8), 1057-1080.
- Ghuman, S., Ryan, A. M., & Park, J.S. (2016). Religious harassment in the workplace: An examination of observer intervention. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 31(1), 279-306.
- Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). Right from wrong: The influence of spirituality on perceptions of unethical business activities. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 46(1), 85-97. Gola, E. & Ervas, F. (2013). A philosophical guide to metaphor use. In E. Gola, & F. Ervas (Eds), *Metaphor in focus: Philosophical perspectives on metaphor use*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 1-8.

1
2
3 Gond, J. P., Akremi, A. EL., Swaen, V., & Babu, N. (2017). The psychological
4 microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review.
5
6 *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 38(2), 225-246.
7

8
9
10 Grant, D.S. (2001). Symbols, stories, and practices: New empirical directions in the study of
11 religious meaning. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 42(2), 233-251.
12

13
14 Greenblatt, S. (2017). *The rise and fall of Adam and Eve* London: The Bodley Head. Hallett, T.

15
16 (2003). Symbolic power and organizational culture. *Sociological Theory*, 21(2), 128-149.
17

18
19 Greenwood, R., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). Understanding strategic change: The contribution of
20 archetypes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 1052–1081.
21

22
23 Hassard, J., Burns, D., Hyde, P., & Burns, J. P. (2018). A visual turn for organizational
24 ethnography: Embodying the subject in video-based research. *Organization Studies*, 39(10),
25 1403-1424.
26

27
28 Hatch, M. J., & Schultz, M. (1997). Relations between organizational culture, identity and
29 image. *European Journal of Marketing*, 31(5/6), 356-365.
30

31
32 Heracleous, L., & Marshak, R. J. (2004). Conceptualizing organizational discourse as situated
33 symbolic action. *Human Relations*, 57(10), 1285–1312.
34

35
36 Hill, P. C., & Pargament, K. I. (2003). Advances in the conceptualization and measurement of
37 religion and spirituality: Implications for physical and mental health research. *American*
38 *Psychologist*, 58, 64–74.
39

40
41 Hoffman, R.C., & Frank M. Shipper , F.M. (2018). Shared core values of high performing
42 employee-owned enterprises. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 15(4), 285-304.
43

44
45 Houghton, J.D., Neck, C.P. & Krishnakumar, S. (2016). The what, why, and how of spirituality in
46 the workplace revisited: A 14-year update and extension. *Journal of Management,*
47 *Spirituality & Religion*, 13(3), 177-205.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Howell, S. (2017). Two or three things I love about ethnography. *HAU: Journal of*
4
5 *Ethnographic Theory*, 7(1), 15-20.
6

7
8 Höpfl, H., & Maddrell, J. (1996). Can you resist a dream? Evangelical metaphors and the
9
10 appropriation of emotion. In D. Grant & C. Oswick (Eds.), *Metaphor and organizations* (pp.
11
12 200-212). London, England: Sage.
13

14
15 Hunt, S. J. (2017). *Alternative religions: A sociological introduction*. Routledge.
16

17
18 Ingold, T. (2008). Anthropology is not ethnography. *Proceedings of the British Academy*,
19
20 154(2007), 69-92.
21

22
23 Ingold, T. (2017). Anthropology contra ethnography. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory*,
24
25 7(1), 21-26.
26

27
28 Jacobs, C. D., & Heracleous, L. T. (2006). Constructing shared understanding: The role of
29
30 embodied metaphors in organization development. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences*,
31
32 42(2), 207-226.
33

34
35 James, W. (1917). *The varieties of religious experience*. NY: Longman, Green et co. Jermier, J.
36
37 M., & Forbes, L.C. (2011). Metaphor as the foundation of organizational studies: Images of
38
39 organization and beyond. *Organization & Environment*, 24(4), 444–458.
40

41
42 Jingjit, R. & Fotaki, M. (2011). Confucian ethics and the limited impact of the New Public
43
44 Management reform in Thailand. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(1): 61-73.
45

46
47 Johnson, M. (1993). *Moral imagination: Implications of cognitive science for ethics*. Chicago:
48
49 The University of Chicago Press.
50

51
52 Jones, A. E., & Elliott, M. (2017). Examining social desirability in measures of religion and
53
54 spirituality using the bogus pipeline. *Review of Religious Research*, 59(1), 47–64.
55

56
57 Jordan, A. T. (2012). *Business anthropology*. Waveland Press.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Jordan, A. T., & Caulkins, D. D. (2013). Expanding the field of organizational anthropology
4 for the twenty-first century. *A companion to organizational anthropology*. Wiley-Blackwell,
5
6 pp. 1-23.
7

8
9
10 Kamsteeg, F. H. (1998). *Prophetic pentecostalism in Chile. A case-study on religion and*
11
12 *development policy*. Lanham MD: Scarecrow Press.
13

14
15 Kaptein, M. (2008). Developing and testing a measure for the ethical culture of organizations:
16
17 The corporate ethical virtues model. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 29(7), 923-947.
18

19
20 Kenny, K. (2009). Heading the stains: Lacan and organizational change. *Journal of*
21
22 *Organizational Change Management*, 22, 214–228.
23

24
25 Kenny, K., Haug, H., & Fotaki, M. (2019). Organizational form and pro-social fantasy in social
26
27 enterprise creation, *Human Relations*, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718821413>
28

29
30 King, J. E. (2008). (Dis)Missing the obvious: Will mainstream management research ever take
31
32 religion seriously? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 17(3), 214-224.
33

34
35 Kobeisy, A. N. (2004). *Counselling American Muslims*. Westport, CT: Praeger. Kociatkiewicz,
36
37 J., & Kostera, M. (2012). The good manager: An archetypical quest for morally sustainable
38
39 leadership. *Organization Studies*, 33(7), 861-878.
40

41
42 Koçoğlu, I., Akgün, A. E., & Keskin, H. (2016). The collective unconscious at the
43
44 organizational level: The manifestation of organizational symbols. *Procedia - Social and*
45
46 *Behavioral Sciences*, 235, 296 – 303.
47

48
49 Koenig, H. G., King, D., & Carson, V. B. (2012). *Handbook of religion and health*. New York:
50
51 Oxford University Press.
52

53
54 Koerber, C.P., & Neck, C.P. (2006). Religion in the workplace: Implications for financial fraud
55
56 and organizational decision making. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 3(4),
57
58 305-318.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Komporozos-Athanasidou, A., & Fotaki, M. (2015). A theory of imagination for organization
4 studies using the work of Cornelius Castoriadis. *Organization Studies*, 36, 321–342. Koning, J.,
5 & Njoto-Feillard, G. (Eds.). (2017). *New religiosities, modern capitalism, and moral*
6 *complexities in Southeast Asia*. Palgrave/Springer Singapore.
7
8
9
10
11
12 Koning, J. & Waistell, J. (2012). Identity talk of aspirational ethical leaders. *Journal of*
13 *Business Ethics*, 107(1), 65-77.
14
15
16
17 Kostera, M. (2007). *Organisational ethnography: Methods and inspirations*. Lund:
18 Studentlitteratur.
19
20
21
22 Kovacs, G. (2019). The caring attitude of Christian and Buddhist entrepreneurs. In O. Setter, &
23 L. Zolnai (Eds), *Caring management in the new economy*. London: Palgrave. Krishnakumar, S.,
24 Houghton, J. D., Neck, C. P. & Ellison, C. N. (2015). The “good” and the “bad” of spiritual
25 leadership. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 12(1), 17-37. Lacan, J. (1981).
26 *The four fundamental concepts of psychoanalysis*. (Ed. J. A. Miller), (translated by A.
27 Sheridan), W.W. Norton & Company, New York, NY.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lindhardt, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Practicing the faith: The ritual life of Pentecostal-charismatic*
4 *Christians*. Berghahn Books.

7 Lips-Wiersma, M., Lund-Dean, K. & Fonciari, C. (2009). Theorizing the dark side of the
8 workplace spirituality movement. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 18(4), 288-300.

11 Lips-Wiersma, M. and Mills, A.J. (2014), "Understanding the basic assumptions about human
12 nature in workplace spirituality: beyond the critical versus positive divide", *Journal of*
13 *Management Inquiry*, 23 (2), 148-161.

16 Lohuis, E. G. E. (2013). *Glocal place, lived space: Everyday life in a Tibetan Buddhist*
17 *monastery for nuns in Northern India*. (Doctoral dissertation) Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit
18 Amsterdam).

21 Longenecker, J., McKinney, J., & Moore, C. (2004). Religious intensity, evangelical
22 christianity, and business ethics: An empirical study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 55(4),
23 371-384.

26 Luhman, J. T. (2019). Reimagining organizational storytelling research as archeological story
27 analysis. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*,
28 14(1), 43-54.

31 MacLean, T. L. (2008). Framing and organizational misconduct: A symbolic interactionist
32 study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78(1/2), 3-16.

35 Madison, K. & Kellermanns, F.W. (2013). Is the spiritual bond bound by blood? An
36 exploratory study of spiritual leadership in family firms. *Journal of Management, Spirituality &*
37 *Religion*, 10(2), 159-182.

40 Mahmud, L. (2013). The profane ethnographer: Fieldwork with a secretive organisation. In C.
41 Garsten, C. & A. Nyqvist (Eds), *Organizational anthropology: Doing ethnography in and*
42 *among complex organizations*, Pluto Press, pp. 189-207.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Marquette, H., Pavarala, V., & Malik, K. K. (2014). Religion and attitudes towards corruption
4 in India: A collective action problem? *Development in Practice*, 24(7), 854-866.
5

6
7
8 Martin, J., Knopoff, K., & Beckman, C. (1998). An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality
9 and emotional labor: Bounded emotionally at the body shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*,
10 43, 429-469.
11
12

13
14
15 McCracken, G. (1986). Culture and consumption: A theoretical account of the structure and
16 movement of the cultural meaning of consumer goods. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13(1)
17 71-84.
18
19

20
21
22 McGranahan, C. (2018). Ethnography beyond method: the importance of an ethnographic
23 sensibility. *Sites: A Journal of Social Anthropology & Cultural Studies*, 15(1), 1-10.
24
25

26
27
28 Micklethwait, J., & Wooldridge, A. (2009). *God is back: How the global revival of faith is*
29 *changing the world*. Penguin.

30
31
32 Mitroff, I.I. & Silvers, A. (2009). *Dirty rotten strategies: How we trick ourselves and others*
33 *into solving the wrong problems precisely*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Moberg,
34 D. J., & Seabright, M. A. (2000) The development of moral imagination. *Business Ethics*
35 *Quarterly*, 10(4), 845-884.
36
37

38
39
40 Mohapatra, S., & Verma, P. (2018). Tata as a sustainable enterprise: The causal role of
41 spirituality. *Journal of Human Values*, 24(3), 153-165.
42
43

44
45
46 Molendijk, A.L. (2015). In pursuit of the postsecular. *International Journal of Philosophy and*
47 *Theology*, 76(2), 100-115.
48

49
50
51 Morey, N. C., & Luthans, F. (1987). Anthropology: The forgotten behavioral science in
52 management history. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1987(1), 128-132.
53

54
55 Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

56
57
58 Moxnes, P., & Moxnes, A. 9(2016). Are we sucked into fairy tale roles? Role archetypes in
59 imagination and organization. *Organization Studies*, 37(10), 1519–1539.
60

1
2
3 Narvaez, D., & Mrkva, K. (2014). Creative moral imagination. In S. Moran, D. H. Cropley &
4 J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Ethics of Creativity* (pp. 25-45). New York, NY: Palgrave
5
6 MacMillan.
7

8
9
10 Narayanswamy, R., Altman, Y., & Sengupta, S. S. (2018). *Unbundling the sixth*
11
12 *sense: Explorations in spirituality and management*. Bangaluru: Sampada Publications.
13

14
15 Neyland, D. (2008). *Organizational ethnography*. London: Sage.
16

17
18 O'Doherty, D., & Neyland, D. (2019). The developments in ethnographic studies of
19
20 organizing: Towards objects of ignorance and objects of concern. *Organization*,
21
22 DOI:1350508419836965.
23

24
25 Olson, M. (1982) *The rise and decline of nations* Yale: Yale University Press
26

27
28 *Organization (2010) Journal of organization, theory and society*, Special Issue - Jacques
29
30 *Lacan and organization studies*, 17(3),
31

32
33 Örtenblad, A., Putnam, L., & Trehan, K. (2016). Beyond Morgan's eight metaphors: Adding
34
35 to and developing organization theory. *Human Relations*, 69(4) 875–889.
36

37
38 Paganopoulos, M. (2010). *Land of the Virgin Mary: An ethnography of monastic life on Mount*
39
40 *Athos* (Doctoral dissertation, Goldsmiths, University of London).
41

42
43 Parboteeah, K., Hoegl, M., & Cullen, J. (2008). Ethics and religion: An empirical test of a
44
45 multidimensional model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(2), 387-398.
46

47
48 Park, C. L. (2005). Religion and meaning. In R. F. Paloutzian & C. L. Park (Eds.), *Handbook*
49
50 *of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 295–314). New York: Guilford.
51

52
53 Pew Research Center. The global religious landscape. *Religion & Public Life*, (2010).
54
55 Retrieved from <http://pewrsr.ch/13srbmi>
56

57
58 Pickett, K., & Wilkinson, R. (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always*
59
60 *Do Better*. London: Allen Lane.

1
2
3 Popova, I. (2016). *Start-up incubation: A rite of passage of entrepreneurs and their Social*
4 *ventures* (Doctoral dissertation, Anglia Ruskin University).

7
8 Pratt, M. G., & Rafaeli, A., (2001). Symbols as a language of organizational relationships.
9
10 *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 93-132.

12
13 Pravichai, S. & Ariyabuddhipongs, V. (2018). Transformational leadership and turnover
14 intention: The mediating effects of right speech (Samma Vaca) and trust in the leader. *Journal*
15 *of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 15(3), 253-272.

17
18
19 Putnam, L., Phillips, N., & Chapman, P. (1999). Metaphors of communication and
20 organization. In: S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds), *Managing organizations: Current*
21 *issues*. Sage.

23
24
25
26 Raffaeli, A., & Worline, M. (1999). Symbols in organizational culture.
27
28 <https://web.iem.technion.ac.il/images/user-files/anatr/Symb-chapt-final.pdf>

29
30
31 Ramasamy, B., Yeung, M.C., & Au, A.K. (2010). Consumer support for corporate social
32 responsibility: The role of religion and values. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 91(1), 61-72.

33
34
35 Randolph-Seng, B. & Nielsen, M. (2007). Honesty: One effect of primed religious
36 representations. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 17, 303-315

37
38
39 Rhodes, C., & Brown, A. D. (2005). Narrative, organizations and research. *International*
40 *Journal of Management Reviews*, 7(3), 167-188.

41
42
43
44 Rosen, M. (1991). Coming to terms with the field: Understanding and doing organizational
45 ethnography. *Journal of Management Studies*, 28(1), 1-24.

46
47
48
49 Samuelson, P. L. (2007). Moral imagination in theory and practice. Dissertation, Georgia State
50 University, http://scholarworks.gsu.edu/epse_diss/45

51
52
53
54 Scheidel, W. (2017). *The great leveler: Violence and the history of inequality from the stone*
55 *age to the twenty-first century* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Schubert, C., & Röhl, T. (2019). Ethnography and organisations: materiality and change as
4
5 methodological challenges. *Qualitative Research*, 19(2), 164–181.
6
7 Schumacher, E.F. (1977). *A guide for the perplexed* NY: Harper & Row.
8
9 Schwartz, S.H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in*
10
11 *Psychology and Culture*, 2(2012), 1-20.
12
13 Seybold, K. S., & Hill, P. H. (2001). The role of religion and spirituality in mental and physical health.
14
15 *Current directions in psychological science: A Journal of the American Psychological Society*,
16
17 10(1), 21-24.
18
19
20
21 Shafranske, E. P., & Cummings, J. P. (2013). Religious and spiritual beliefs, affiliations, and
22
23 practices of psychologists. In K. I. Pargament, Mahoney, A. & E. Shafranske (Eds.).
24
25 *APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality: Vol. 2. An applied psychology of*
26
27 *religion and spirituality* (pp.23–42). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Shah,
28
29 A. (2017). Ethnography? Participant observation, a potentially revolutionary praxis. *HAU:*
30
31 *Journal of Ethnographic Theory*, 7(1), 45-59.
32
33
34 Singer, J. L. (1999). Imagination. *Encyclopaedia of creativity* (Vol. 2, pp. 13-25): Academic Press.
35
36 Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science*
37
38 *Quarterly*, 28, 338-58.
39
40
41 Smith, H. (1992). *Forgotten truth: The common vision of the world's religion*. SF, Ca.: Harper One.
42
43 Smith, C. (2008). Future directions in the sociology of religion. *Social Forces*, 86(4), 1561-1589.
44
45
46 Snyder, T. (2018). *The road to unfreedom*. London: Penguin Random House.
47
48 Stavrakakis, Y. (2008). Subjectivity and the organized other: Between symbolic authority and
49
50 fantasmatic enjoyment. *Organization Studies*, 29(7), 1037–1059.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Steffy, K. (2013). Religious orthodoxy and the American worker. *Sociology of Religion*, 74(1),
4
5 1-29.
6

7
8 Strati, A., (1998). Organizational symbolism as a social construction: A perspective from the
9
10 sociology of knowledge. *Human Relations*, 51(11), 1379-1402.
11

12
13 Stryker, S. (1980). *Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version*. Menlo Park, CA:
14
15 Benjamin/Cummings.
16

17
18 Stryker, S., & Serpe, R. T. (1982). Commitment, identity salience, and role behavior: Theory
19
20 and research example. In W. Ickes & E. S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, roles and social*
21
22 *behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 199-218.
23

24
25 Swindler, A. (1986). Culture in action: Symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*,
26
27 51, 273-286.
28

29
30 Syed, J., & Van Buren, H. J. (2014). Global business norms and Islamic views of women's
31
32 employment. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24(2), 251-276.
33

34
35 Tackney, C.T. (2018). Authenticity in employment relations: a theology of the workplace
36
37 analysis. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 15(1), 82-104.
38

39
40 Taylor, C. (2007) *A secular age*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
41

42
43 Tian, R. G., Lillis, M. P., & Van Marrewijk, A. H. (2013). *General business anthropology*.
44
45 North American Business Press; 2nd ed. Edition.
46

47
48 Tracey, P. (2012). Religion and organization: A critical review of current trends and future
49
50 directions. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 6, 87-134.
51

52
53 Tracey, P., Phillips, N., & Lounsbury, M. (2014). Taking religion seriously in the study of
54
55 organizations. In P. Tracey., N. Phillips., & M. Lounsbury (Eds), *Religion and organization*
56
57 *theory*. Emerald.
58

59
60 Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A
review. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 951-990.

1
2
3 Turner, B. S. (2010). Introduction: mapping the sociology of religion. *The new Blackwell*
4 *companion to the sociology of religion*, pp. 1-29.

7 Turner, R. P., D. Lukoff, R. T. Barnhouse and F. G. Lu. (1995). Religious or spiritual problem:
8 A culturally sensitive diagnostic category in the DSM-IV. *Journal of Nervous and Mental*
9 *Disease*, 183, 435-44.

14 Van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of*
15 *Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.

19 Van Hulst, M., & Ybema, S. (2019). From what to where: A setting-sensitive approach to
20 organizational storytelling. *Organization Studies*, 0170840618815523.

24 Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. University of Chicago
25 Press.

28 Van Maanen, J. (1995). Fear and loathing in organization studies. *Organization Science*, 6(6),
29 687-692.

33 Van Maanen, J. (2011). Ethnography as work. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48, 218–234.

35 Vasconcelos, A.F., (2018) Workplace spirituality: empirical evidence revisited,
36 *Management Research Review*, Vol. 41 (7), 789-821

39 Verver, M., & Koning, J. (2018). Towards a kinship perspective on entrepreneurship.
40 *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 42(4), 631-666.

44 Vidaillet, B., & Gamot, G. (2015). Working and resisting when one's workplace is under threat
45 of being shut down: A Lacanian perspective. *Organization Studies*, 36, 987–1011.

49 Vince, R. (2018). Institutional illogics: The unconscious and institutional analysis.
50 *Organization Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840618765866>

53 Vieten, C., Scammell, S., Pilato, R., Ammondson, I., Pargament, K., & Lukoff, D. (2013).
54 Spiritual and religious competencies for psychologists. *Psychology of Religion and*
55 *Spirituality*. 5. 129-145.

1
2
3 Vu, M.C., & Gill, R. (2018). Is there corporate mindfulness? An exploratory study of Buddhist-
4 enacted spiritual leaders' perspectives and practices. *Journal of Management, Spirituality &*
5
6 *Religion, 15*(2), 155-177.
7

8
9
10 Walker, A., Smither, J., & DeBode, J. (2012). The effects of religiosity on ethical judgments.
11
12 *Journal of Business Ethics, 106*(4), 437-452.
13

14
15 Womack, M. (2005). *Symbols and meaning: A concise introduction*. CA, Altamira Press.

16
17 Watson, T. J. (2001). *In search of management: Culture, control and chaos in managerial*
18
19 *work*. London: South-Western Cengage Learning.
20

21
22 Watson, T. J. (2011). Ethnography, reality, and truth: The vital need for studies of 'how things
23
24 work' in organizations and management. *Journal of Management Studies, 48*, 202–217.
25

26
27 Watson, T.J. (2012). Making organisational ethnography. *Journal of Organizational*
28
29 *Ethnography, 1*(1), 15-22.
30

31
32 Weaver, G. R., & Agle, B. R. (2002). Religiosity and ethical behavior in organizations: A
33
34 symbolic interactionist perspective. *The Academy of Management Review, 27*(1), 77-97.
35

36
37 Weber, M. (1992). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. London: Routledge.

38
39 Weick, K. E. (1989). Theory construction as disciplined imagination. *The Academy of*
40
41 *Management Review, 14*(4), 516-531.
42

43
44 Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

45
46 Weick, K., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the process of sensemaking.
47
48 *Organization Science, 16*(4), 409–421.
49

50
51 Whittle, A., & Mueller, F. (2012). Bankers in the dock: moral storytelling in action. *Human*
52
53 *Relations, 65*, 111–139.
54

55
56 Wiegele, K. L. (2005). *Investing in miracles: El Shaddai and the transformation of popular*
57
58 *Catholicism in the Philippines*. University of Hawaii Press.
59
60

1
2
3
4 Wimberley, D. W. (1989). Religion and role-identity: A structural symbolic interactionist
5 conceptualization of religiosity. *Sociological Quarterly*, 30, 125-142.

6
7
8 Wolf, T., & Feldbauer-Durstmüller, B. (2018). Workplace chaplaincy: a literature review.
9
10 *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 15(1), 38-63.

11
12 Wright, S. (Ed.). (1994). *The anthropology of organizations*. London: Routledge.

13
14
15 Yanow, D., & Schwartz-Shea, P. (2006). Introduction. In D. Yanow, D., & P. Schwartz-Shea
16
17 (Eds), *Interpretation and method. Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn*. New
18
19 York: ME Sharpe, pp. xi-xxvii.

20
21
22 Yanow, D., Ybema, S., & van Hulst, M. (2012). Practicing organizational ethnography. In: G.
23
24 Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative organizational research*. London: SAGE Publications,
25
26 pp.331-350.

27
28
29 Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H., & Kamsteeg, F. H. (Eds.) (2009). *Organizational*
30
31 *ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications.

32
33
34 Zimmer, Z., Jaggar, C., Chiu, C-T., Ofstedal, M.B., Rojo, F., & Saito, Y. (2016). Spirituality,
35
36 religiosity, aging and health in global perspective: A review. *Social Science and Medicine*.
37
38 *Population Health*, 2, 373-381.

39
40
41 Zinnbauer, B.J., Pargament, K.I., Cole, B., Rye, M.S., Butter, E.M., Belavich, T.G., Hipp,
42
43 K.M., Scott, A.B. & Kadar, J.L. (1997). Religion and spirituality: Unfuzzifying the fuzzy.
44
45 *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 36(4), 549–564.