

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Scientization, instrumentalization, and commodification of mindfulness in a professional services firm

Karjalainen, Mira

2021-05

Karjalainen , M , Islam , G & Holm , M 2021 , ' Scientization, instrumentalization, and commodification of mindfulness in a professional services firm ' , Organization , vol. 28 , no. 3 , 1350508419883388 , pp. 483-509 . <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508419883388>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/340702>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508419883388>

unspecified

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.


 Organization

Scientization, Instrumentalization and Commodification of Mindfulness in a Professional Services Firm

Journal:	<i>Organization</i>
Manuscript ID	ORG-18-0334.R2
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Mindfulness, Critical Management Studies, Well-being, Spirituality, Management Training
Abstract:	<p>Mindfulness programs, and related practices of contemplation and spirituality, are a growing trend in contemporary work organizations. Increasingly adopted into corporations, mindfulness is often described as a remedy for workplace challenges such as constant hurry, interruptions and stress. Despite increasing research on mindfulness, little research examines how mindfulness is adapted in corporate settings, including concerns of co-optation during implementation. The current paper addresses this gap by qualitatively examining corporate mindfulness practices within an international, knowledge-intensive firm. We identify the processes of scientization, instrumentalization, and commodification of mindfulness programs, exploring the mechanisms by which these three processes interact with each other. We conclude by discussing the importance of scientization, instrumentalization and commodification for understanding mindfulness in practice, and for building a research agenda around emic and situated understandings of corporate mindfulness.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Abstract

Mindfulness programs, and related practices of contemplation and spirituality, are a growing trend in contemporary work organizations. Increasingly adopted into corporations, mindfulness is often described as a remedy for workplace challenges such as constant hurry, interruptions and stress. Despite increasing research on mindfulness, little research examines how mindfulness is adapted in corporate settings, including concerns of co-optation during implementation. The current paper addresses this gap by qualitatively examining corporate mindfulness practices within an international, knowledge-intensive firm. We identify the processes of scientization, instrumentalization, and commodification of mindfulness programs, exploring the mechanisms by which these three processes interact with each other. We conclude by discussing the importance of scientization, instrumentalization and commodification for understanding mindfulness in practice, and for building a research agenda around emic and situated understandings of corporate mindfulness.

Keywords: mindfulness, critical management studies, spirituality, workplace well-being

“2,500 years of product development by Buddhist monks”

– The Mindfulness Guide, from field notes

Mindfulness discourses are increasingly prevalent in contemporary society, and have become prominent within companies (Purser, 2019; Good et al., 2016). Mindfulness, derived from Buddhist thought and characterized by Kabat-Zinn (1994: 3-4) as non-judgmental, purposeful attention to the present moment, has been hailed as a “revolution” in well-being practices (Harrison, 2017; Boyce, 2011). What is sometimes referred to as the “mindfulness movement” (Stanley, Purser & Singh, 2018; Farb, 2014) claims a holistic approach to physical, psychological, and often spiritual, development (see Pawar, 2016). The rapid spread of mindfulness within companies, however, has raised questions about what some call “corporate mindfulness” (Purser, 2018), a heterogeneous complex of practices and policies broadly related to existing forms of “new age” or spiritual managerial trends (e.g. Zaidman, Goldstein-Gidoni and Nehemya, 2009; Bell & Taylor, 2003). How corporate mindfulness unfolds in practice is not yet well understood in organizational scholarship (Purser, 2018; Islam, Holm & Karjalainen, 2017; Purser & Milillo, 2015).

Across this broader field of workplace spirituality and well-being movements, critical perspectives have arisen around suspicions that such movements may act as a Trojan horse for neoliberal ideologies, or at least a complex entanglement of control and resistance possibilities whose contours remain to be understood (e.g. Gog, Simionca, Bell & Taylor, in press; LoRusso, 2017). Such concerns echo wider emergent critiques of humanistic and therapeutic approaches to management, often termed “soft capitalism” (Costea, Crump & Amiridis, 2008; Heelas, 2002) and reflective of the ideological complexities of capitalism’s “new spirit” (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005).

Emblematic of such “new age” workplace initiatives, mindfulness programs have drawn similar critiques, (Purser, 2019; Kucinskas, 2018), specifically, that attempts to re-enchant the

1
2
3 workplace can lead to ideological capture and foreclose more effective forms of worker
4 mobilization (cf., Endrissat, Islam & Noppeney, 2015). Such critiques echo sociological
5 critiques of therapeutic culture (Illouz, 2008), and intersect spirituality, psychology and
6 management.
7
8
9
10

11
12 Despite such critiques, academic research on mindfulness remains largely focused on
13 questions of “impact”, i.e. the statistical influence of mindfulness meditation and programs on
14 various well-being or performance-related outcomes (for recent reviews, see Eby et al., 2017;
15 Good et al., 2016; McGill et al., 2016). Taking a positivistic approach, most literature
16 supports positive outcomes of mindfulness training, although recent surveys have questioned
17 the methodological, conceptual and empirical foundations of such studies (Van Dam et al.,
18 2018). Over the last decade, however, a critically-oriented research stream has emerged to
19 focus on the historical and ethical foundations of mindfulness and point out divergences
20 between Buddhist teachings and contemporary popular and corporate mindfulness programs
21 (e.g. Stanley et al., 2018; Vu & Gill, 2018; Purser & Milillo, 2015). Composed mostly of
22 conceptual and historical studies, this literature notes divergences from “right mindfulness”,
23 rooted in Buddhism, when mindfulness is brought into corporate settings (e.g. Lindhal, 2015).
24 Moreover, critical approaches have broadened such ethical concerns to link corporate
25 mindfulness programs to ideological programs of neoliberalism (Saari, 2018), bio-politics
26 (Walsh, 2018) or depoliticization (King & Badham, 2018).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Between the positivist and the emerging critical literatures, however, a small number of
48 studies have focused empirically on the adoption and adaptation of mindfulness for corporate
49 practice in non-Buddhist contexts (e.g. Islam et al, 2017; Brummans, 2014). Such work,
50 primarily using qualitative methodologies, attempts to qualify “impact” research by showing
51 how individuals derive meaning and other positive benefits from such programs (Brummans,
52 Huang & Cheong, 2013). It also empirically grounds critical research “from the bottom up”
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by showing how processes of domination, governmentality or ideology openly or tacitly
4
5 operate through such programs (Islam et al., 2017). By treating mindfulness as a concept in
6
7 construction, open to reinterpretation in concrete situations, this approach sidesteps questions
8
9 of “true” mindfulness to interrogate directly how mindfulness comes to take on characteristics
10
11 of its context.
12
13

14 The current study contributes to this emerging line of research by asking how
15
16 mindfulness is experienced and reconfigured during its implementation in a corporate setting,
17
18 to inform the broader question of mindfulness’ role in contemporary business organizations.
19
20 Specifically, we qualitatively examine how actors experience, make sense of, and discursively
21
22 adapt mindfulness practices. Our data is gathered in a professional services firm, marked by
23
24 work intensification and demands for flexibility (Correl et al., 2014), multitasking (O’Carroll,
25
26 2015), and work-life spillover (Nippert-Eng, 1996), a situation into which a mindfulness
27
28 program was initiated as a holistic solution for the resulting anxiety. Focusing on this
29
30 program, we examine the reception of mindfulness from a multi-dimensional perspective,
31
32 involving embodied experiences, meanings and discursive justifications.
33
34
35
36

37 In what follows, we discuss mindfulness as contextually embedded, noting the pressures
38
39 of corporate mindfulness programs to adapt to contemporary corporate settings. Turning to
40
41 our empirical case, we describe three adaptation processes—scientization, instrumentalization
42
43 and commodification. We examine how these processes are related and intertwine within the
44
45 implementation process, proposing a conceptual framework to link them to mindfulness
46
47 adaptations. Based on this theorization, we discuss its implications for comprehending
48
49 corporate mindfulness, broadening our discussion to “new age” spirituality and wellness
50
51 initiatives more broadly, and raising questions for further research.
52
53
54

55 **Mindfulness and Corporate Mindfulness**

56

57 The popularization of mindfulness in the West is often attributed to Kabat-Zinn (1994;
58
59
60

1
2
3 1991) who introduced what has been characterized as a secularized, light-weight version of
4
5 Buddhism, removed from the communal and ethical dimensions of Buddhist tradition
6
7 (Wilson, 2016; Purser & Milillo, 2015). Although the mindfulness movement is quite recent,
8
9 it draws upon a tradition of occidental “Buddhist-inspired” spirituality dating back to the
10
11 1830’s (cf. Kucinkas, 2018). While a larger treatment of occidental uses of Buddhism has
12
13 generated a large literature (e.g. Shonin, Van Gordon, & Singh, 2015; Harris, 2006; Carrete
14
15 & King, 2005) that is beyond the scope of this paper, this tradition forms this wider
16
17 background of contemporary applications of mindfulness in organizations (Kucinkas, 2018).
18
19

20
21 In its contemporary forms, mindfulness is largely promoted as a tool to increase
22
23 alertness to the present moment and enhance quality of life (Kabat-Zinn, 1991). References to
24
25 Buddhism coexist with psychological or performance discourses to create some ambiguity
26
27 around the mindfulness concept (Sharf, 2014). Claims that mindfulness increases
28
29 concentration, focus, and awareness accounts for why many corporations began to adopt
30
31 mindfulness programs with a view to increasing worker performance (Caring-Lobel, 2016).
32
33 ‘Mindfulness’ or ‘mindfulness meditation’ became synonymous with a wide array of
34
35 practices and programs from 2-minute apps to weekend meditation retreats (Wilson, 2014).
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Mindfulness as a Heterogeneous Phenomenon

43
44 Mindfulness as a model of corporate intervention emerged amidst preoccupations of
45
46 self-enhancement and individual achievement characteristic of neoliberal workplace
47
48 transformations (Karjalainen, 2016; Stanley, 2012). The conceptual roots of mindfulness
49
50 programs are often attributed to Kabat-Zinn’s “Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction”
51
52 Program (MBSR), introduced in the late 1970s (Samuel, 2015). Linked to medicine and
53
54 psychiatry, MBSR was originally developed to treat chronic illnesses such as anxiety and
55
56 depression (Salmon et al., 2011). Yet it soon developed into a medium for workplace
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 improvement and a form of managerial intervention (Purser, 2015; Purser & Milillo, 2015).
4

5 The backbone of corporate mindfulness practice—fixing one’s focus upon noticing
6 one’s breathing—invokes the Buddhist notion of “right mindfulness”, the seventh limb of the
7 Noble Eightfold Path that builds upon the previous, and integrally connected, limbs, through
8 the intention of accessing truth (Goldstein, 2003). As Purser & Milillo (2015) describe, this
9 tradition includes a component of “right mindfulness” in which ethical and critical
10 possibilities are central (see also Vu & Gill, 2018; Lindhal, 2015). Corporate derivations of
11 mindfulness, however—from deeply committed engaged practice to more incidental
12 workplace training variants of mindfulness—are more heterogeneous, leading Germer (2013)
13 to speak about mindfulnesses in the plural. This heterogeneity makes mindfulness in practice
14 a political process whereby these heterogeneous discourses and practices are articulated in
15 new forms. Today, many of the largest companies in the USA, such as Google, Target, Lego
16 and McKinsey, offer their employees tailored mindfulness programs (Caring-Lobel, 2016;
17 Hougard et al., 2016), adding to this complexity. Such programs take their place in a
18 growing market for wellbeing that was valued at 4.3 trillion USD in 2017, where in the US
19 alone, the meditation business generated 1.2 billion USD revenue in 2017 (Global Wellness
20 Economy Monitor, October 2018; Webwire, Sept. 26, 2017).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In its role as a managerial solution, mindfulness is used to assist in coping with tight
43 deadlines, multitasking, interruptions and disruptions (Wajcman & Rose, 2011), demands for
44 constant availability due to mobile technology (Kossek & Lautsch, 2012), and task focus
45 (Echelt et al., 2006). Consistent with broader societal and organizational trends for worker
46 enhancement (e.g. Payne, 2016), organizations value flexibility, autonomy and self-
47 governance, as temporal and spatial arrangements in knowledge work become blurred, with
48 substantial changes in work, divisions of labor and organizational forms, structuring work
49 processes in new ways.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 While modern work organizations often consider spirituality as belonging to the
4 personal sphere (e.g. Bloom, 2016), the mindfulness movement may illustrate how such
5 movements operate within capitalist workplace settings (cf., Kamoche & Pinnington, 2012;
6 Bell & Taylor, 2003). As some have noted, contemporary capitalism has adapted many
7 “holistic” features from eastern spirituality, characterizing “new age” management practices
8 as those based on a search for unity, employee integration and harmony (Williams, 2012;
9 Zaidman et al., 2009). As these “technê-zen” practices become linked to high performance
10 knowledge work (Williams, 2011), they may require re-thinking in their applications to self-
11 help, personal development and well-being (e.g. Joiner, 2017) as well as performance-related
12 outcomes (Dane, 2010). Ultimately, such movements sit ambiguously in relation to
13 spirituality traditions, drawing from diverse philosophical and religious traditions (Roof,
14 1999). While mindfulness scholars ask to what extent Buddhist-based conceptions continue to
15 characterize the contemporary mindfulness movement (Purser & Milillo, 2015; Sharf, 2014),
16 managers and workers are confronted with new forms of meditative practice that are
17 ambiguously coupled to any cultural and religious moorings.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Adaptations of Mindfulness

41
42 The mindfulness movement may be emblematic of “new age” workplace spirituality
43 movements (Zaidman et al., 2009), in that these face pressures to be malleable in the face of
44 corporate exigencies (Kamoche & Pinnington, 2012; Case & Gosling, 2010). This
45 malleability begs the question of how mindfulness adapts in its popularization and practice
46 within corporate settings. The somewhat counter-intuitive idea that contemplative traditions
47 would proliferate in corporate contexts (see Healey, 2015) may lead practitioners to expect
48 Buddhist traditions to lack legitimacy, forcing them to seek rhetorical legitimation by drawing
49 on alternative discourses such as those of medicine or psychology (King & Badham, 2018).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Articulating its own goals with those of “Western science” has been seen as a validation
4 strategy of “Eastern” movements, reframing these as self-improvement projects (Brown &
5 Leledaki, 2010) and seeking legitimation in “data” around the health and performance perks
6 of mindfulness. Emerging mindfulness programs (Gotink et al., 2015), for example, reflect
7 this shift to standardized programs and measurement. Simultaneously, a plethora of bespoke
8 programs are being thought up and proffered by specialized consultancies as well as by
9 individuals, both with and without requisite training and certifications, to cater to this new
10 niche (Islam et al., 2017). Drawing on fields such as psychology, neurosciences and medicine
11 provides a surrogate legitimacy source, even while exemplifying the lack of a unified
12 discourse across the mindfulness field.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 As a result, the expectation that esoteric or “exotic” traditions are a hard sell to
27 corporate clients lead promoters of mindfulness to adopt rationalistic discourses. In the
28 process, spiritual aspects of mindfulness are selectively included, omitted or altered (Purser &
29 Milillo, 2015). To present mindfulness as a value-neutral practice based on scientific evidence
30 (cf., Pickering, 2006), mindfulness practices have to be recalibrated as services broadly
31 resembling HRM programs. In this process, mindfulness is situated alongside other programs
32 such as exercise, relaxation, or psychotherapy, more familiar to western audiences.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The resulting ‘trademark’ programs, such as the Search Inside Yourself program by
43 Google, MBSR by Kabat-Zinn and mindfulness programs by the Potential Project, have
44 gained ground in the corporate well-being market (Hougaard et al., 2016). The need for
45 marketability, in turn, favors an instrumental focus on product features and an openness to
46 tailor their contents to company demands. How understandings of mindfulness practices are
47 established in the midst of such demands, however, and what forms they take, is an area in
48 need of empirical examination.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As mentioned, some emerging research has qualitatively examined bottom-up processes
4 of constructing mindfulness in practice; however, such work remains limited. For instance,
5 Brummans et al. (2013) examine how, in the context of leadership, mindfulness is used to
6 create a sense of meaningful work and vocation. By contrast, Islam et al. (2017) examine the
7 ideological use of mindfulness to establish dominant visions based around individual
8 performance. While the latter treats mindfulness as a social construction with political
9 implications, neither approach focuses on how spiritual conceptions of mindfulness are
10 expressed or transformed within the corporate context. How mindfulness is made sense of and
11 rhetorically legitimated in corporate contexts, and how this involves the reproduction or
12 adaptation of mindfulness practice, is the objective of the current study.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Method**

30
31
32 The study is drawn from a larger research project on cognitive techniques within the post-
33 industrial service economy; within this project, mindfulness was identified as an emergent
34 workplace intervention. Our data was gathered in a multinational, intensive knowledge-work
35 corporation in Finland that is one of the largest corporations in its field, nationally and
36 globally. The organization is a professional firm providing business-to-business services to
37 firms and public organizations in domains including law, accounting and management
38 consulting.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The current organization (which we give the pseudonym “MindCorps”) emphasizes
49 individual responsibility, capabilities and constant self-improvement through education,
50 training, personal development, and resilience. They operate in a wider societal and cultural
51 context emphasizing and celebrating self-reinvention, instant change, social acceleration,
52 speed and dynamism (e.g., Kristensen, 2018). High knowledge intensity and a
53 professionalized workforce (Alvesson, 2004) characterize these domains, where companies
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 focus on human capital, professional knowledge, qualifications, intellectual capital and
4
5 expertise. In the current professional service firm, strong pressures existed regarding
6
7 exhibiting the ‘right’ attitude, flexibility and ability to deliver despite demanding time-
8
9 schedules, sometimes leading to overwork and constant competition (Karjalainen et al.,
10
11 2015). Amid growing concerns over how these new kinds of demands were affecting
12
13 employees’ ways of being, the company decided to respond by formulating new coping
14
15 solutions, which led to the adoption of a mindfulness-based program for its employees. Thus,
16
17 while our main focus is on the mindfulness program in practice, the context of the
18
19 professional service firm allows us to situate this phenomenon against a wider backdrop of
20
21 mindfulness in white-collar work (e.g. Saari & Harni, 2016).
22
23
24
25

26 MindCorps launched a mindfulness program in February 2015, complementing
27
28 existing activities such as running clubs, dance classes, and massage. Specifically, the HR
29
30 manager explained that these activities were important, but that something more than physical
31
32 exercise was needed to address the stress issue, saying that “*this is a professional firm, we*
33
34 *were missing the other block.*” Subsequent discussions with the marketing director during a
35
36 recruitment process brought the marketing department on board, and with two sponsoring
37
38 departments for the initiative, it was decided at the executive level to establish a program until
39
40 the end of the fiscal year to address this “other block”. Consequently, *The Mindfulness*
41
42 *Breathing Space* (henceforth MBS) was organized weekly, during lunchtime, in an internal
43
44 meeting room located at the national headquarters. This program was tailor-made for the
45
46 company, although it drew heavily from Jon Kabat-Zinn’s work on mindfulness (cf. Creswell,
47
48 2017; Kabat-Zinn, 1982), while claiming diffuse influences from spirituality, self-
49
50 compassion, coaching and neuroscience literatures. This diffuse range of influences and the
51
52 corporate-tailoring supported the idea that such a program would be ideal for studying
53
54 corporate implementation, while noting the heterogeneity of such programs with the caveat
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 that not all mindfulness programs in companies should be considered “corporate mindfulness”
4
5 in Purser’s (2018) sense.
6

7
8 The company had been previously known to the field researcher, who had conducted a
9
10 previous study on work-life balance at the same site with over 50 interviews, giving
11
12 background knowledge for this research, helping to understand the nature of the organization
13
14 and work that took place there, and facilitating access (see Karjalainen et al., 2015; Buchanan
15
16 et al., 1988). The organization had expressed interest in cultivating mindfulness, and the
17
18 prospect of allowing observation around this new program was welcomed in light of this
19
20 larger interest. Thus, the researcher was able to follow the program from the beginning,
21
22 interviewing the HR manager in these initial phases. The resulting access involved both direct
23
24 participation and observation of MBS, as well as interviews with participants and access to
25
26 company discourses and written materials.
27
28
29

30
31 Because of our focus on experiences, understandings and discourses, we examined three
32
33 principal types of data (see Table 1 below). First, participant observation was used to
34
35 understand the lived, embodied moment of mindfulness practice at MindCorps, but also to
36
37 provide context for analyzing interviews, diaries and corporate discourses. Second, individual
38
39 interviews and mindfulness diaries of participants were used to understand how participants
40
41 made sense of the interventions and their relation to the organization and their own work.
42
43 Third, the rhetoric of HR and management was examined to understand corporate discourses
44
45 around the mindfulness program. We elaborate on each aspect of this data and analysis below.
46
47
48

49 < Table 1 about here >
50

51 52 Ethnographic fieldwork 53

54
55 Our first source of data involved ethnographic fieldwork during the launch of the
56
57 mindfulness program. MBS program was divided into 30-minute sessions, following a
58
59
60

1
2
3 standardized format – an initial 5-minute period was dedicated to entering the space and
4
5 settling down, with yoga mats to lie or sit on, while others sat on office chairs. The
6
7 mindfulness practice was led by a guide for the remaining 20-25 minutes. One or multiple
8
9 exercises were practiced, with different exercises each time, varying from yoga-type
10
11 movements to breathing meditation, body scanning, and visualization. No discussion or
12
13 questions followed the exercise – immediately after the ‘Breathing Space’ participants
14
15 quickly returned to their desks or headed to meetings. 51 individuals participated in MBS,
16
17 around 17% of the staff at the firm’s national headquarters and on each MBS the number of
18
19 participants varied between six and seventeen. Notably, all but two of the 51 participants were
20
21 women, and the two male participants discontinued the program; we note below some
22
23 possible meanings of this gender asymmetry. Some attended weekly, others less frequently,
24
25 based on their working schedules, enthusiasm and whether they were travelling or in the
26
27 headquarters.
28
29
30
31
32

33 The fieldwork, lasting four months in spring 2015, involved weekly MBS attendance by
34
35 the first author who had previously practiced meditation based on Buddhist traditions
36
37 intermittently for two decades. As requested by the Mindfulness Guide, the fieldworker
38
39 participated in the exercises along with the group. The guide said that researchers tend to
40
41 “float in theories” and she wanted to ensure that the researcher would understand what
42
43 mindfulness meant in an embodied way, as mindfulness is a deeply embodied practice that
44
45 encourages practitioners to pay attention to the particular moment in its lived specificities.
46
47 Field notes were taken subsequently, so as not to interfere with this immediate experience of
48
49 the program; these notes included the fieldworker’s own bodily experiences of attendance in
50
51 mindfulness meditation, as well as observations made before, after and during the sessions.
52
53 The unease of sitting still, the wandering mind and boredom, as well as the calm mind, delight
54
55 and body awareness were part of that experience, and provided a basis for gaining first-hand
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 knowledge of the bodily, mental and spiritual aspects of mindfulness meditation, as the
4 embodied experience became involved in constitution of knowledge (Turner 2000). The
5 embodied ethnography gave first-hand knowledge of these perceptions/feelings to better
6 understand what the participants said in the interviews and wrote in the diaries, and what
7 became the shared understanding of the mindfulness practice.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 These shared experiences provided a natural starting point because the participants had
15 seen the field researcher meditating with them. This kind of embodied ethnographic approach
16 allows closer familiarity of practice than mere participant observation (Spradley, 1980) or
17 shadowing (Czarniawska-Joerges, 2007), putting the embodied experience of the researcher
18 directly into focus. This also allowed the observation of bodily experiences before and after
19 MBS, for example, the difficulty to 'rise' from mindfulness meditation immediately the
20 exercise was over and begin a pre-scheduled interview.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Interviews & Written Documentation

31
32
33 Second, individual interviews were conducted across participating members, as well as
34 management and HR. A total of 32 individual interviews (averaging 60 minutes) were
35 conducted with members and support staff who frequently participated in MBS. The
36 interviews were pre-scheduled with the interviewees and took place in the company
37 headquarters. To preserve anonymity, the interviews were arranged directly with individuals,
38 rather than being invited by management, and names were kept confidential. During the
39 negotiations regarding the study, the HR personnel was pessimistic about the likelihood of
40 interviewing the planned 10 individuals, given the intense time demands at this organization.
41 However, this presumption proved to be wrong as 22 participants volunteered to interview,
42 some twice, leading to 32 total interviews over 2 rounds. 25 interviews were tape-recorded
43 and seven were conducted online. Reflecting the composition of the program, all interviewed
44 research participants were women, along with those who wrote mindfulness diaries.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The interviews employed an adapted version of the Collaborative Interactive Action
4 Research (CIAR) method (Bailyn & Fletcher, 2007), involving follow-up interviews with
5 each available participant whenever possible, and multiple interviews with HR personnel (two
6 interviews with each of the three HR people) and the Mindfulness Guide (two formal
7 interviews plus informal interviews and chats). These interactions and the ethnographic
8 components guided the formulation of our questions, in addition to the previous knowledge
9 about the company that had been acquired in the earlier study on work life balance of
10 professional knowledge workers. Interviews were informed by the extensive participant-
11 observation fieldwork conducted for this study as the field researcher reviewed and adjusted
12 the questions while she gained more knowledge through participating in MBS.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 As part of the research design, research participants also wrote a semi-structured
27 mindfulness diary in which they reflected on: a) How often they thought about mindfulness
28 during the day, b) Whether they engaged in any kind of formal or informal mindfulness
29 activity, c) How they felt about the activity d) Whether they had difficulties concentrating (or
30 relaxing) during the day, and e) Any further thoughts about mindfulness they wished to share.
31 The diaries complemented the interview data, providing another medium for participants to
32 reflect on their experience, and allowing for their reflections to develop over time, and to
33 build reflexively on past entries.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Finally, written documentation in terms of program documents, online texts and
45 correspondence around the program was collected. Although these were less rich than the
46 ethnographic observations and interviews, they provide a supplemental source that
47 represented mindfulness discourse at the company level, and gave insight into the company's
48 views on the program.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56
57
58 Analytical Strategy
59
60

1
2
3 As an analytical starting point, we drew upon a broad conception emphasizing
4 discursive construction of organizational reality (e.g. Jarzabkowski & Sillince, 2007).

5
6
7 Although there is a rapidly growing body of research on mindfulness, few study mindfulness
8 from a workplace perspective (Dane & Brummel, 2013), mobilizing qualitative and
9 participant-observation data to understand how mindfulness is experientially and discursively
10 constructed.
11
12
13
14
15

16
17 Given the multi-source approach to data collection, our analytical strategy was also
18 multi-faceted. The fieldnotes gave a sense of the situated experiences of members within the
19 workshop and the nuances of implementation – senses, spaces, felt emotions and micro-
20 interactions that allowed mindfulness to take on meaning for actors. The interview data, as
21 well as the written diaries, allowed participants to articulate their ongoing construction of the
22 situation and the meanings of mindfulness, including its wider objective and place within their
23 work lives. Finally, the archival and management-driven documentation (company materials
24 and online presentations) allowed us to explore how the company framed mindfulness and to
25 note the discursive and legitimating strategies around the program. The reflexive position of
26 embodied ethnography naturally highlighted direct and face-to-face experiences, which make
27 up the central part of the discussion, but we attempted not to lose touch with these wider
28 objectives and to contextualize the experience in the light of the broader issue of how
29 mindfulness was put into practice.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 This broadly constructionist approach involved the thematic coding and theorization of
48 these data, moving from data to theory and back in an iterative fashion to formulate an
49 evolving set of conceptual categories (Charmaz, 2006). First, we closely read the transcripts
50 of interviews, mindfulness diaries and HR statement, as well as the ethnographic field notes.
51 The latter were particularly useful in cases of spontaneous discussions with the Mindfulness
52 Guide, other participants and management, that were not recorded due to their ad hoc nature.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Searching for parallels and discrepancies among these sources allowed groups of themes to
4 begin to emerge, which we regrouped into overarching themes. These themes were arrived at
5 abductively, where intuition, previous knowledge and literature reviews gave ideas to the
6 analysis, which nevertheless were steered by subsequent data analysis steps in a manner of
7 constant comparison (cf., Walton, 2014).
8
9

10
11 Specifically, we noted early in the analytical process that participants, as well as HR
12 and management, often focused on discourses that would allow them to buttress the
13 legitimacy of mindfulness by articulating it together with more commonly accepted company
14 values. Starting with this initial institution, we noted that this kind of cross-articulation could
15 explain how heterogeneous conceptions of mindfulness arise, and we began to look at the
16 kinds of cross-articulations that were made and what were the resulting conceptions of
17 mindfulness. Some of these were around the epistemic legitimation of mindfulness as a form
18 of knowledge, and we grouped these responses around an aggregate category we termed
19 “scientization”. Others involved a practical orientation to the multiple benefits of
20 mindfulness and their workplace potentials, which we aggregated as “instrumentalization”.
21 Finally, the market potential of mindfulness, and its articulation as a kind of high-value
22 product or capital, we termed “commodification”. Across these categories, an over-arching
23 concern with the construction of mindfulness as appropriate to a technical, knowledge-
24 oriented professional culture seemed to be at work, but each articulated their concerns from a
25 different angle, allowing us to subsequently theorize these processes together in an emerging
26 framework. Below, we describe each articulation before laying out an initial conception of
27 such a framework.
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 Findings

57
58 Three distinct yet related processes, which we term “scientization, instrumentalization and
59
60

1
2
3 commodification”, appeared across data sources and characterized how mindfulness was
4
5 discursively constructed at MindCorps. To empirically illustrate our key concepts, we provide
6
7 exemplary data excerpts in Table 2 below.
8

9
10 < Table 2 about here >
11
12

13 Scientization: Gaining Epistemic Authority

14
15 As observed in situ and across interviews, MBS was presented as embodying a
16
17 “scientific” model of well-being related to physiological, neuropsychological and
18
19 psychological expertise. Claiming a basis in empirical evidence and scientific theory, this
20
21 aspect characterized an “epistemic” approach to mindfulness, as a form of knowledge or
22
23 expert authority. The program, for instance, was marketed by HR as a scientifically proven,
24
25 rigorously measurable stress-reduction solution. The idea of a homogeneous and authoritative
26
27 “Western science” buttressed the program from the outset, as the company decided to launch
28
29 a new corporate program and persuade employees to participate. For instance, the HR
30
31 manager explained that “*Mindfulness has been studied in the West for 30 years and it has*
32
33 *been proven to alter the right and left lobes of the brain and all these changes can be made*
34
35 *through mindfulness practice.*” Likewise, the Mindfulness Guide describes, “*I mean,*
36
37 *thousands and thousands of studies, oh my God, starting from skin diseases...*” We term
38
39 “scientization” the process by which a cultural or spiritual tradition or practice is legitimized
40
41 through scientific discourse and studies to persuade the audience of its validity. With the
42
43 increasing cognitivist orientation of mindfulness conceptions (Hülshager et al., 2015; Siegel
44
45 et al., 2009; Wilson, 2014), a wide array of legitimating discourses was available to link
46
47 cognitive science to mindfulness.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 Scientization appeared at different levels/dimensions of the mindfulness program: at the
56
57 level of daily practice experience, embodied feelings, emotions and reactions were monitored
58
59 through surveys and feedback about participants’ feelings. At the level of meanings,
60

1
2
3 ‘scientific’ explanations were used to explain mindfulness practices and effects. Finally, as a
4 rhetorical legitimization device, scientific discourse was used to validate bringing mindfulness
5 practice into the corporation. Claiming a basis in empirical evidence, the aura of religiosity or
6 spirituality around mindfulness was dispelled, making it amenable to prevailing work norms.
7
8
9

10
11
12 In terms of the fieldworker’s embodied experience, the moment of measurement was
13 felt as a disruptive cut in the flow of experience. We were directed to sit and given a pen
14 immediately upon entering the space, an embodiment of inscription and surveillance rather
15 than the felt safety of a shared meditative space. The Mindfulness Guide brought
16 questionnaires (Freiburg Mindfulness Inventory FMI and Mindful Attention Awareness Scale
17 MAAS) to assess participants’ mindfulness ‘levels’, signaling the scientific legitimacy of the
18 operation, and noted that the questionnaires were based on academically published research.
19 Completing the diagnostic physically positioned participants in desks to complete a what felt
20 like a bureaucratic exercise. The felt reaction was that of reactivating a sense of evaluation
21 familiar from other logistic and administrative tasks. The fieldworker felt her body become
22 alert and ready for reaction, activated to perform. It was an unpleasant shift from the
23 anticipated bodily experience of safety and relaxation often experienced in MBS.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The spatial and material arrangements of the mindfulness program reinforced the
41 austerity of exercise, lacking any artefacts serving to humanize the atmosphere. Artefacts
42 associated with religious or spiritual traditions of Eastern/Buddhist meditation were absent –
43 for instance, an easily portable gong or bowl to sound the beginning and end of meditation.
44 As the sole artefacts upon which to cling, the completion of the surveys took on an almost
45 ritualistic feeling. They were described as providing “tested results based on science”, as
46 explained by the Mindfulness Guide. Physical health benefits were invoked, with the guide
47 claiming to be *‘almost embarrassed by how good mindfulness practice is for health and well-*
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *being*'. Despite these promises, as an embodied experience, scientization was felt as a moment
4
5 of measurement and self-explanation.
6

7
8 In interviews, participants within MBS also drew upon scientific concepts, expressing
9
10 more comfort with these as opposed to the more “strange” esoteric mindfulness techniques
11
12 (e.g., those associated with Buddhism). As knowledge work professionals, citing scientific
13
14 proof for positive mindfulness effects was appealing to dispel the aura of spirituality or
15
16 religion and also in the promise of boosting one’s brain and performance. As a consultant
17
18 explains, “*Spirituality is really strange to me, I am really scientific and mindfulness is based*
19
20 *on facts.*” She continues: “*For me this is rather to improve the brain.*” This formula became
21
22 familiar – initially citing discomfort with spirituality, the interviewee would then revamp the
23
24 program in scientific terms. A senior manager who earlier in the interview claimed to do
25
26 mindfulness for work purposes, reflects on her reasons for practicing mindfulness at work: “*If*
27
28 *you think [of] this scientifically, you can get your brain into a different mode. That is what I*
29
30 *am interested in, I do not think of the spirituality*”. Another consultant explains her view on
31
32 MBS: “*Better that there was no spiritual side to mindfulness, I am interested in the scientific*
33
34 *side*”. Although notions derived from spiritual practice did appear (For example, a participant
35
36 explained in the interview that mindfulness taught her to be merciful towards herself,
37
38 explicitly citing the Buddhist concept of self-compassion), their explanations then turned to
39
40 scientific processes, often including medical explanation.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 Scientization was also apparent in how spiritual aspects of mindfulness were selected à la
49
50 carte, rather than in a systematic or holistic way. Not seen as part of a dogma or way of life,
51
52 elements of mindfulness formed a smorgasbord where employees could choose elements most
53
54 suitable for each time and situation. When a business controller was asked about her view of
55
56 the foundations of mindfulness, she answered: “*I do not really think that it originally utilizes*
57
58 *a certain religion or a way of thought. I believe that everyone picks up things they find*
59
60

1
2
3 *important to themselves. [---] I do not think [of] the religious background.*” Likewise, one
4
5 manager explained: *“For me, mindfulness and yoga and these, I do not see them religion-*
6
7 *bound. I mean you can do all them no matter what you believe in.”* Similar to the previously-
8
9 cited HR manager, the business controller and the manager considered the ‘Eastern’ origins of
10
11 mindfulness to be irrelevant and saw that everyone can pick-and-choose elements they like.
12
13

14
15 Such rearticulations of mindfulness according to specific goals were key to the
16
17 rhetorical legitimation of the mindfulness program by management. In this case, the
18
19 scientization of mindfulness used the notion of “brainpower” to claim legitimacy for the
20
21 program. The Mindfulness Guide explained: *“According to research, one can go only so far*
22
23 *with it [mindfulness without compassion]. But somehow the compassion rises when your*
24
25 *frontal cerebral cortex on the left lobe... when you develop better connections. Then empathy*
26
27 *strengthens naturally.”* Here, the Mindfulness Guide takes a spiritual concept ‘compassion’,
28
29 which has been discussed as a backbone of Buddhist tradition (Purser & Milillo, 2015) and
30
31 explains it through the legitimating lenses of neuroscience.
32
33

34
35 The HR manager, largely responsible for bringing the mindfulness program into
36
37 MindCorps, describes the legitimacy of mindfulness as independent of any religious tradition:
38
39 *“Mindfulness is so researched academically already [---]. If some practice came from*
40
41 *Christianity or Islam and it was scientifically studied and well-tried, that could be trained in*
42
43 *our premises too.”* The manager’s comment, meant to show equanimity across religious
44
45 contexts, suggests that the only criteria for inclusion is scientific validity, and that associated
46
47 traditions of Buddhism, Christianity or Islam were incidental or irrelevant. As we see below,
48
49 however, tradition does reappear in processes of instrumentalization, and the disavowal of
50
51 spirituality turned out not to be as simple as the scientific discourse suggested.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Instrumentalization: Mindfulness and Utility

A related but distinct process to scientization involved considering mindfulness less as a way of being than as an instrumental tool to reach specific outcomes. We term “instrumentalization” the process by which practices are framed to emphasize goal-directedness and business-as-usual norms. As seen in the previous quote, scientization and instrumentalization were related, particularly around health-related outcomes. However, instrumentalization distinctively framed mindfulness as a behavioral-managerial technique to increase task performance.

Rather than the epistemic dimension of mindfulness-as-knowledge, instrumentalization involved the pragmatic dimension of how mindful practice could be used to achieve corporate and personal goals. Instrumentalization emerged in the experiential aspects of mindfulness through structuring mindfulness through task assignments, as noted in the fieldwork extract from MBS:

The Mindfulness Guide liked to use such vocabulary as assignment, when she guided us through mindfulness practices. One time the Mindfulness Guide asked us to write down on paper the text ‘multitasking slows things down’ and numbers from one to twenty-six. Then she asked us to rewrite them in the following order: m, 1, u, 2, l, 3, t, 4, i, ... and she counted the time it took to accomplish these two tasks. It turned out that the latter took almost double the amount of time and this was to demonstrate to us that multitasking is not efficient or productive for work. We all participants sweated through the assignment and experienced through our embodied selves how the latter felt too slow, and thus frustrating – this was vividly discussed (exceptionally) right after the exercise. (Field journal)

This assignment depicts the work conditions of the corporation, and the lesson to be learned was that one should concentrate on one task at the time. The Mindfulness Guide made us experience this viscerally, as the stressful assignment promised to increase the efficiency of our task. The embodied experience of instrumentalization was one of self-testing to find and challenge limits, framing mindfulness as a tool to optimize performance.

From the first-person experience, the fieldworker struggled to separate MBS from the other parts of the company premises. The sessions were held in a well-equipped corporate

1
2
3 meeting room where participants sat around a large boardroom table. None of the common
4 artefacts of business meeting rooms were removed or downplayed and we sat facing each
5 other among laptops, microphones, pens and other work-related artefacts. In brief, it felt like
6
7 being in a meeting, and mental acrobatics were necessary to try to abstract the session from its
8 physical space; these acrobatics were felt as a sense of dissonance and dissimulation. The
9
10 setting reinforced the continuity of the practice with business norms and established the type
11 and purposes of the mindfulness to be practiced in MBS. The corporate business furniture and
12
13 electronic gadgets gave an impression of instrumental corporate practice with no evident link
14 with spiritual or contemplative traditions. This image was amplified by the Skype/Lync
15
16 connection the Mindfulness Guide opened for potential participants outside the headquarters
17
18 (left open even in the absence of online participants).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 During interviews, instrumentalization was conveyed through emphasis on practical
29 tasks, individual responsibility and the need for constant self-renewal in which mindfulness
30 has become popular, as this extract from a senior manager in consultancy shows:
31
32
33

34
35 *I: What made you become interested in mindfulness?*

36 *R: Life-coping. Organizing and intensifying. I want to be more present, searching for*
37 *lost stuff, keys and such, takes way too much time. [---] I want to control my life more,*
38 *my use of time, time management.*
39

40
41 This manager went on to describe the pressures of being a career woman with two children
42 and expressed the need to find instruments to handle her life-puzzle individually and
43 effectively. Thinking that mindfulness would help to solve or cope with her problems in
44 practice, she embraced the instrumentalization process of mindfulness. Likewise, a director in
45 her forties explains why mindfulness is useful to her, in her job: *“For example, at the*
46 *managerial level we may end up in situations where it is useful to understand and manage*
47 *one’s feelings, so that we won’t react in a wrong way to a given situation.”* In this quote,
48 management of the self and behavioral control are considered as instrumental outcomes of
49 mindfulness practice, allowing self-control so as not to “react in a wrong way”.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Instrumentalization also appeared in situations where the participants were not satisfied
4 with the program. This excerpt from a mindfulness diary of a consultant in her twenties
5 reflects the instrumental value she places on mindfulness: *“I have my own practice for*
6 *focusing, which I believe I have developed all by myself and which works for me. Therefore, I*
7 *find the guided MBS a bit useless, as I get the best success by myself.”* There were also other
8 critical voices, some resisting corporate spirituality *tout court*, others appropriating it for their
9 own purposes. A management assistant in her fifties notes rather critically: *“We have laughed*
10 *at unicorn therapy, it’s humbug. Mindfulness is probably not quite as bad, but close enough.”*
11 Yet she continued to attend the classes, explaining *“It is always nice to sit down and just be,*
12 *no matter with what name it is called.”* Similarly, a consultant using MBS for her own needs
13 seemed to both resist and appropriate the practice: *“I don’t believe yet that this is of any use*
14 *to me, but I like taking a break”.* Alternatively, MBS could be framed individually as an
15 opportunity for growth, as noted by a controller in her forties: *“That I would become a better*
16 *me, I have so many roles in my life. That there would be improvement in all of them.”*
17 Each of these views reflects an enrollment of mindfulness as a win-win situation between the
18 company and the person, as participants appropriate and amend practices to fit their own
19 needs.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The HR manager, cited above as abstracting mindfulness from any religious tradition,
43 went on to speculate on an interest shown by their workforce: *“To our ambitious goal-*
44 *oriented workers—although there is also the element of peace—there is a possibility that you*
45 *get to re-code your brain and thus get to another level, to become superhuman”* The idea of
46 “superhuman”, in contrast to enlightenment humanism, is linked to a “re-coding” of the brain,
47 a kind of mental upgrade that would take workers to “another level”. Seen against a Buddhist
48 disavowal of desire and self, the “superhuman” suggests a kind of fantasy of power,
49 enlightenment turned into a high-performance machine.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As a form of organizational legitimation, instrumentalization discourse aligned the
4 program with other company imperatives. The Mindfulness Guide framed MBS as corporate
5 mindfulness by using terms like ‘assignment’ and ‘work assignment’ to guide pupils through
6 mindfulness meditation, and such language was reiterated in discussions. For instance, an HR
7 manager explained that “*The special focus for us and our staff is that they constantly have*
8 *dozens of tasks and projects*”, leading the fieldworker to wonder whether the multitasking
9 assignment in Mindfulness Breathing Space was actually the handiwork of HRM.
10
11 Instrumentalization was apparent in using work rhetoric and testing the ability of the
12 workforce to multitask during MBS.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 In the organizational discourse, instrumentalization marked the translation of
25 mindfulness discourse into corporate terms. The marketing leader thus describes mindfulness’
26 place in their organizational modus operandi:
27
28
29

30
31 *It is expected here that people deliver more than can be done during a regular work*
32 *day. All that is expected to get done on the top of the normal workload. So rather – I*
33 *think this way – if the organization’s nature is to go forward by pushing overwork and*
34 *by pressing schedules, so it is better that the organization offers mindfulness program*
35 *than if it would offer nothing. They understand that we are not machines, that we need*
36 *oiling and maintenance.*
37

38
39 Positioning mindfulness as an instrument for coping with work pressures is described as a
40 component of a sustainable politics of overwork, described in terms of tools (*we need oiling*
41 *and maintenance*). Ironically, the very argument that humans are not machines is itself
42 undermined by the mechanistic language, as mindfulness provides the “oil” and
43
44
45
46
47
48 “maintenance” needed to function.
49
50
51

52 *Commodification: Marketing Mindfulness*

53
54
55 Commodification refers to the transformation of ideas, services, goods and people into
56 commodities, as objects of exchange (Appadurai, 2005). Rather than the epistemic
57 (scientization) or pragmatic (instrumentalization) aspects of mindfulness, commodification
58
59
60

describes the relational dimension as one of economic exchange, viewing mindfulness as a product that could be circulated, or an aspect of branding or investment.

Commodification in business contexts has been noted in literature around spiritual movements more generally (Healey, 2015; Vu & Gill, 2018); our analysis noted a similar phenomenon in the mindfulness context, involving the adoption of corporate discourses to emphasize economic circulation. In our analyses, both HRM and the Mindfulness Guide, as well as participants, commodified mindfulness by framing the phenomenon around business jargon and shaping understandings during the program. Commodification manifested itself through the idea of mindfulness as ‘an innovative product’.

During participant observation, the fieldworker was sometimes bewildered by the proliferation of modular, non-integrated mindfulness techniques that were showcased as new and valuable innovations. This created some anxiety which was felt as a pressure to rush through one mindfulness technique so as to get to the next one. As ethnographical extract from MBS fieldwork notes:

There is always a new meditation practice in the Mindfulness Breathing Space. Each time there has to be something new to offer. Unlike in other meditation practices I have attended, this is rather a showcase of what all kinds of things mindfulness has to offer, instead of helping to deepen the practice. (Field journal)

The showcase approach created an embodied experience of trying to anticipate what kind of meditation we were to encounter, making it difficult to mentally prepare for a given practice. This aspect, however, was touted by the Mindfulness Guide as a practical innovation of her approach, as she exclaimed: *“I am really pleased. I made a new exercise for each session. It was a surprise that there was no time for theory, though.”* The sense was of MBS as a marketing opportunity for deploying different kinds of meditative practices, rather than focusing on a single exercise to go deeper in the practice. Mindfulness here felt like a marketplace of solutions and obscured any all-encompassing holistic philosophy of living, echoing critiques within mindfulness scholarship (Purser & Milillo, 2015). Commodification

1
2
3 is reflected in the use of mindfulness as a branding tool for the company, as expressed by the
4 marketing leader: *“I believe it [mindfulness] is useful for branding. [---] When you think of*
5 *the corporate brand in the eyes of the future employees and our juniors, who join us straight*
6 *out of school. I see mindfulness as a big part of palette we offer.”* As part of the “palette”,
7
8 MBS is a good within a basket of other goods that can be leveraged for recruiting and
9
10 retention purposes.
11
12

13
14
15
16
17 During interviews, participants expressed commodification by using business language
18 to discuss mindfulness, or by describing it in product innovation terms. A controller explains
19 why mindfulness is so good for modern hectic knowledge work, where one needs to be able
20 to focus, prioritize and deal with disruptions: *“Mindfulness is a really old invention. May one*
21 *say invention? Anyway, it fits really well into current mishmash where all tasks are*
22 *interlaced.”* Herself pausing on the term “invention”, as if seeming to betray some kind of
23 tension, she then contrasted the “really old” nature of mindfulness with its place as invention
24 within the “current mishmash”. This comment highlights the point that participants could both
25 appreciate the idea of mindfulness while holding critiques of its corporate implementation and
26 were savvy in their critical assessments. A manager working in consultancy, also a participant
27 in the program, recounts a similar reflection in her individual interview: *“This is not a new*
28 *innovation, but it has been wrapped very well to fit the hectic lifestyle and we need this when*
29 *we live in the sea of stimuli”*.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Both of these extracts demonstrate the commodification of mindfulness as participants
47 articulate its meaning within a corporate setting. Words like ‘invention’ or ‘innovation’
48 construct meaning of mindfulness as a product to be exchanged and capitalized on.
49
50 Descriptive language such as ‘current mishmash’ and ‘the sea of stimuli’ describe
51 contemporary work norms, while constructions like ‘fits really well’ and ‘has been wrapped
52 very well’ frame mindfulness as a product catering to contemporary work settings.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the corporate discourse, a rhetoric of business jargon was overlaid on the mindfulness
4 initiative, such as when the Mindfulness Guide boasted in a weekly-organized Mindfulness
5 Breathing Space session that mindfulness is based on “2,500 years of product development by
6 *Buddhist monks*”. This kind of rhetoric (i.e. mindfulness as a “product”), framing mindfulness
7 in commodity terms, spread among managers and was reproduced in other corporate contexts.
8 The “product development” theme had a particular currency and was repeated by other
9 respondents: “[the] Mindfulness Guide has talked about monks, how they have made 2,500
10 years of product development in mindfulness”, repeated a marketing leader almost verbatim
11 from the earlier statement; her role was to promote the mindfulness program in the Company.
12 The meme-like repetition of the “product-development” trope allowed the concept to circulate
13 without having to question the business-as-usual logic of the firm. Rhetorics of ‘invention’
14 and ‘innovation’ echoed a similar orientation.

15
16
17 From our archival documents, the below advertisement of MBS was published in the
18 intranet and screens in the headquarters, displaying commodification in the corporate rhetoric.

19
20
21 *Why should I attend?*

22
23
24 *I warmly recommend you use this opportunity to practice the techniques of mind that
25 are already utilized in several big companies like Google, Intel and IBM. The idea is to
26 stop for a moment and learn to notice our own mind and bring mindfulness to situations
27 where we have learned to switch autopilot on. [---] I am happy to tell you more, if you
28 are not sure if mindfulness suits your personal preferences.*

29
30
31 *See you on Tuesday!*

32
33
34 *Best regards,*

35
36
37 *Your very own Mindfulness Guide NN (Marketing & Communications)*

38
39 *P.S. If all this seems distant to you, check these out:*

40
41 Google’s head of mindfulness: ‘goodness is good for business’/ The Guardian
42 Mindfulness Helps You Become a Better Leader / Harvard Business Review
43

44
45
46 Here, the Mindfulness Guide employs several means of commodifying mindfulness practice.

47
48
49 Firstly, “to use this opportunity” uses an advertising rhetoric of the offer being ‘one time only,’
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 just for you'. Secondly, the infomercial cites successful corporations that have adopted the
4
5 practice, reinforcing the profit-motive behind such programs. Third, the infomercial connects
6
7 mindfulness with business and leadership skills. Fourth, the Mindfulness Guide caters to
8
9 individual tastes by offering to discuss personal needs and wishes, signing her message with
10
11 "Your very own". Finally, the business side of the affair is underlined with a signature line
12
13 linking the mindfulness practice to the marketing and communications department, and with
14
15 business related popular press articles.
16
17

18 19 **Knowledge, Practice and Relation: Theorizing Mindfulness in Corporate Settings**

20
21 As analyzed above, mindfulness went through three distinct but interrelated adaptations
22
23 involving its epistemic, pragmatic and relational dimensions. The epistemic level relied on a
24
25 claim to empirical science, especially quantitative psychology and neuroscience. The
26
27 pragmatic level evoked goal-orientation and instrumentality, taking a practice orientation that
28
29 promised increased efficiency and the ability to work longer and harder. The relational level
30
31 articulated mindfulness as an object of economic exchange, a source of profits, innovation or
32
33 competitive advantage.
34
35

36
37 Although separated for analytical purposes to illustrate these three adaptations and their
38
39 underlying conceptual dimensions (including embodied, cognitive and discursive elements,
40
41 see Table 3 below), our ultimate goal was to understand the mutual relations between these
42
43 elements in align mindfulness to a corporate culture. Each dimension gives an analytical
44
45 frame within which scientization, instrumentalization and commodification represent possible
46
47 ways of knowing, doing and relating around mindfulness, respectively. In terms of their
48
49 interrelations, however, scientization provides a technical support and authoritative
50
51 legitimation for applied practice, while it supports commodification through framing
52
53 mindfulness as a scientific "discovery" or invention, facilitating its conceptualization within a
54
55 product development frame. Instrumentalization, in turn, supports commodification by
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 lending mindfulness practice an efficiency and value-generation purpose, while supporting
4
5 scientization by its orientation to providing “proven results” though doing what “works”.
6
7 Finally, commodification provides a motor for scientization and instrumentalization by
8
9 spurring the search for evidence of efficacy and “validating” knowledge and practice through
10
11 its market acceptance. Although we arrived at each concept independently, by “theorizing the
12
13 arrows” between them (Feldman & Orlikowski, 2011), we formulated an emergent theoretical
14
15 framework ground future explorations of corporate adaptations of mindfulness. We sketch
16
17 this emergent framework in Figure 1, including the theoretical constructs, their analytical
18
19 dimensions, and their theorized relations.
20
21
22
23
24

25 < Table 3 about here >

26
27 < Figure 1 about here >
28
29
30

31 Figure 1 emphasizes both the relative autonomy of each of the process and their co-
32
33 articulation in a constellation that, taken together, frames a technocratic and business-oriented
34
35 practice of mindfulness. The epistemic aspect of scientization supports the other practices by
36
37 providing an evidentiary presumption for personal utility and “innovation” claims.
38
39 Instrumentalization and commodification motivate the scientizing motive though articulating
40
41 personal and economic value with enhanced self-knowledge. Finally, instrumentalization and
42
43 commodification reinforce the link between personal and market-based value. Taken together,
44
45 scientifically based self-knowledge, performance improvement and innovation constitute a
46
47 mutually-reinforcing complex for legitimizing mindfulness initiatives. At the same time, an
48
49 implication of this approach is that, in diverse settings, these elements or others may be dis-
50
51 articulated or recombined in new ways and that that the heterogeneity of mindfulness
52
53 described above may be explained in terms of the concrete formations formed in this process.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

MindCorps' mindfulness program was launched against a background of work-life concerns and workplace acceleration; its claims to spiritual self-help were expressed as a scientifically proven performance enhancement technique; its way of "right practice" (Purser & Milillo, 2015) was framed as business best practice, and its discovery by the firm took on the character of a new product innovation. As a result, mindfulness became understood as a quick fix for unfortunate but inevitable workplace stress, a palliative for the symptoms of work pressures. In scholarly discussions about the possibilities and pitfalls of such programs (cf., Van Dam et al., 2018), such on-the-ground processes are rarely discussed, as well as mindfulness' complex relation with corporate goals and its possibility to provide a source of critique of business-as-usual.

Despite increasing research on mindfulness, and increasing concerns about its misappropriation (Purser, 2019; Kucinskas, 2018; Purser & Milillo, 2015; Stanley, 2012), we know surprisingly little about its enactment in corporate settings. Our objective was to build an empirical basis for theorizing mindfulness applications without relying on an original or "essential" point of reference (e.g. Buddhism); rather, given the heterogeneous and often undefined "source" discourses feeding into the program (Islam et al., 2017), a gap remained in understanding how these play out in practice.

Examining mindfulness implementation in a knowledge-based firm, we noted processes of scientization, instrumentalization and commodification, characterized as analytically distinct but related processes. Scientization supported instrumentalization in that empirical studies were mobilized for practice, and commodification situated knowledge and practices in the context of product development and profit. By thematically identifying, in a first step, these distinct yet related concepts, and in a second step, sketching an emerging theoretical

1
2
3 integration of the three, the current study lays a conceptual and empirical groundwork for
4
5 future qualitative and critical research on mindfulness and similar interventions.
6
7

8 In our setting, mindfulness was experienced, understood and discussed through the lens
9
10 of organizational concerns. These included measurement, efficiency and value-creation, but
11
12 also individuals' abilities to cope with the resulting demands on their time and energy.
13

14 Although Western readings of Buddhist spiritual practices date back over a hundred years
15
16 (cf., Burger, 2006), we know little about how these practices take new forms in the corporate
17
18 world as profit-driven organizations shape mindful practices to contemporary concerns (Islam
19
20 et al., 2017; Kamoche & Pinnington, 2012).
21
22

23
24 Our multi-faceted approach allowed us to examine the implementation of the program
25
26 between lived experience, personal narrative and firm-level discourses. Scientization was
27
28 embodied through practices of measurement and bodily discipline, while at level of meanings,
29
30 it was created by reinterpreting meditation practice as brain rewiring and other "scientific"
31
32 processes, and discursively legitimated otherwise exotic-sounding practices.
33
34

35 Instrumentalization reframed mindfulness from a way of being to a way of achieving goals,
36
37 finding meaning its continuity with firm tasks and legitimation through plugging into the
38
39 business-as-usual of occidental corporate traditions. The commercial terminology used on
40
41 mindfulness commodified and shaped understandings of the program as 'an innovative
42
43 product'.
44
45

46 Exploring the passage of mindfulness to business practice aims at understanding what
47
48 Purser terms McMindfulness (Purser, 2019), recognizing corporate versions and the ways that
49
50 they reconfigure holistic mindfulness discourses, along with psychologistic and management
51
52 discourses. Moreover, it suggests that professional practitioners are often complicit in
53
54 enrolling these new configurations into their own motives and concerns. While a profuse
55
56 literature examines mindfulness' workplace impacts, through largely quantitative and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 correlational assessments (cf., Eby et al., 2017; Good et al., 2016), our study contributes to a
4
5 smaller qualitative and critical emerging discussion of how the meanings of mindfulness
6
7 change through its processes of adoption (Purser et al., 2016; Stanley, 2012).
8
9

10 Given the recent nature of this discussion and the ambivalence between positive aspects
11
12 of the concern for humanistic and spiritual practices, on the one hand, and its manipulation,
13
14 on the other, our study reveals areas for theoretical and empirical development. First, our
15
16 study has clear points of contact with critical perspectives on mindfulness (e.g. Purser, 2018;
17
18 Cederström & Spicer, 2015; Stanley, 2012); yet, we also attempt to provisionally bracket
19
20 these developing critiques with the intention to describe and theoretically develop processes
21
22 of adaptation. On the wager that descriptively modeling on-the-ground processes provides an
23
24 empirical ground to support for critical theorizing (Boltanski, 2011), we focus on participants'
25
26 practices and discourses within the program. The starting point begs such question as “how do
27
28 the instrumentalization and commodification of mindfulness impact the personal and social
29
30 benefits of practice?” or “how does the scientific, and especially quantitative, assessment of
31
32 mindfulness processes relate to the holistic and “lived” aspect of meditative experience?”
33
34 Such questions move from empirical description to the emancipatory versus manipulative, or
35
36 strategic approaches of individuals and organizations, possibilities of mindfulness in the
37
38 workplace. Ultimately, the goal of such work would be to understand the role of mindfulness
39
40 and similar practices within the ideological and political structures of contemporary
41
42 management.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **Mindfulness, Humanistic Management and Organizational Spirituality**

50
51 While we have focused on mindfulness specifically, in its historical and conceptual
52
53 relation to an amalgam of eastern spirituality, psychology and management discourses, our
54
55 theorization resonates more broadly with recent critiques of wellness and humanistic
56
57 management initiatives (e.g. Cederström & Spicer, 2015; Endrissat et al., 2015). Such
58
59
60

1
2
3 initiatives may be analyzed as instantiations of “soft capitalism” (Costea et al., 2008; Heelas,
4
5 2002), in which self-related control mechanisms take on a therapeutic veneer (cf., Illouz,
6
7 2008), becoming vehicles for work intensification and increased exploitation. Critical
8
9 organizational scholarship has increasingly recognized that the “new spirits” of self-
10
11 expressive work (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005) have given way to new forms of
12
13 organizational control (Fleming & Sturdy, 2011). The ambivalence of soft capitalism creates
14
15 demands to study participants’ experiences in situ and in its diverse contexts, of which
16
17 mindfulness seems to be a more recent variation on this theme.
18
19

20
21 Relatedly, the ambivalence we describe between spiritually-related movements and
22
23 profit-driven applications is applicable across workplace spirituality contexts (e.g. Bell &
24
25 Taylor, 2003; Kamoche & Pinnington, 2012). Echoing Weber’s (1930) classic thesis about
26
27 spiritual underpinnings of capitalism, organizational scholars have explored the spiritual
28
29 supports that underpin and give coherence to business narratives (e.g. Ganzin, Islam &
30
31 Suddaby., 2019). Understanding the role from a critical perspective, Bell & Taylor (2003)
32
33 point out that “pastoral” workplace spirituality constitutes a disciplinary form in the “New
34
35 Age” work ethics. Zaidman et al., (2009), similarly, note that the packaging of spirituality in
36
37 New Age management arises from implementation and negotiation with business norms.
38
39 Although these studies do not treat mindfulness specifically (although see also Walsh, 2018),
40
41 our work has clear lines of dialogue with such approaches. These may be emblematic of a
42
43 wider link between spirituality and new forms of capitalist organization (cf., Gog et al., in
44
45 press), what Williams (2011) calls a “technê-zen” imagination in which managerial control
46
47 and spiritual holism integrate seamlessly. To the extent, however, that different spiritual
48
49 traditions promote diverse dynamics as they move into corporate settings, such differences
50
51 can reveal important aspects of the relation of economy and wider social and cultural
52
53 movements. For instance, how corporate adoptions of Eastern spiritual traditions relate to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 corporate uses of native traditions (e.g. Weber's "Protestant Ethic" or less "exotic" spiritual
4 importations) is a complex area of inquiry that remains to be explored.
5
6

7
8 Our study contributes to this wider spirituality literature through the example of
9
10 mindfulness, but also through the broader theoretical approach that posits spirituality in
11
12 practice as an outcome of articulations that can vary across time and space. Rather than adopt
13
14 an essentialist position on these traditions, we study them as semi-independent articulations
15
16 that can exist in temporary constellations that are historically contingent. Thus, we suggest a
17
18 path for organizational scholarship to study how spirituality movements are made and remade
19
20 in contingent ways, highlighting that these can be sites of political and discursive struggles,
21
22 whose study constitutes an agenda in organization studies.
23
24

25
26 At the same time, it is important to note that the diversity of mindfulness and other
27
28 kinds of spirituality programs mean that such studies should begin from the situated, local
29
30 context of each program, so as to avoid thinking of all mindfulness training as
31
32 McM mindfulness (Purser, 2019). Locally tailored programs are likely to have different kinds of
33
34 pressures than standardized programs, and more openly spiritualist practices are likely to be
35
36 used in different ways than medicalized or human resource influenced programs, for example.
37
38 Understanding the background contextual features that contribute to or buffer against
39
40 corporate cooptation of mindfulness and other new age initiatives is an important next step in
41
42 developing an empirically grounded critical perspective on such initiatives.
43
44
45

46 **Limitations**

47
48
49 Our study was based on a qualitative design aiming at understanding mindfulness in
50
51 practice in a corporate setting. This approach led us to draw upon multiple data sources,
52
53 including observational field notes, interviews and company documents, to facilitate a
54
55 multifaceted view of mindfulness in practice. Some limitations to this approach exist,
56
57 however. Observations and ethnographic participation, for instance, apply only for the
58
59
60

1
2
3 program duration and cannot demonstrate its evolution as a process; thus, latent influences of
4
5 the program are not immediately visible. Similarly, a limitation of embodied ethnography is
6
7 that it was sometimes challenging to ‘rise’ from the meditative state, moments afterward, to
8
9 discursively articulate interview responses about the experience. This firsthand experience of
10
11 MBS, however, which included the researcher, illuminated the challenges of going back to
12
13 work right after mindfulness practice – a problem several participants reported. Further,
14
15 organizational discourses involved data provided by the organization, meaning that the
16
17 researchers were not privy to behind-the-scenes documentation that may have existed
18
19 concerning the program or its goals. Ultimately, however, these factors meant that the
20
21 researcher experience was largely parallel to that undergone by participants, and the
22
23 implementation of practices was experienced less as strategically planned execution than as
24
25 grounded adaptations to an immediate situation.
26
27
28
29

30
31 As a second limitation, as noted above, strong gender asymmetry characterized a
32
33 program almost exclusively attended by women. This is not entirely surprising, given recent
34
35 research showing how “new age” organizational programs often carry gender discourses that
36
37 both reflect gendered power difference and open possibilities for women to negotiate
38
39 workplace challenges (Zaidman, Janson & Keshet, 2018). This signals a complex and
40
41 ambivalent relationship between gender and workplace mindfulness, as Peticca-Haris et al. (in
42
43 press) note in describing yoga as marked by the ambivalences of postfeminism. Indeed, as
44
45 Sointu and Woodhead (2008: 73) argue, “contemporary forms of holistic spirituality both
46
47 legitimate and challenge traditional discourses and practices of femininity”. As we noted in
48
49 our findings, mindfulness was often instrumentalized as a work-home balance related to
50
51 gender issues. In short, while our research question was not about gender dynamics per se, the
52
53 parallels between new age discourses and emerging debates in gender and organization make
54
55 this line of research a promising one to develop.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Third, our context of professional service work involves a knowledge-intensive sector, a
4 type of work likely to be a locus for such programs because of the key issues of attention and
5 mental exhaustion in knowledge-intensive industries. This focus, however, reinforces the
6 point that mindfulness may relate to knowledge professionals' "ways of being" (e.g. Sandberg
7 & Pinnington, 2009) and reinforce mindfulness' reputation as a white-collar phenomenon
8 (Saari & Harni, 2016). This characterization seems to suggest that such programs would make
9 strange bedfellows with broader worker movements and may frame it as a fringe benefit or
10 workplace luxury. While our current context may reinforce such conclusions, some have
11 noted the possibility for mindfulness programs to reinforce or support workers or other social
12 justice movements (e.g. Berila, 2015). An important extension of the current study would be
13 to examine such interventions in situations where they may be more likely to avoid cooptation
14 by market logics and may offer more emancipatory potentials.

30 **Conclusion**

31
32 The current paper has begun the initial stages of such a research agenda by asking the
33 simple but foundational question regarding what happens to a spiritual tradition when it enters
34 the corporate landscape. How such traditions constitute critical voices within organizations,
35 or alternatively, fall into complicity with dominant norms, speaks volumes both about the
36 critical potential of spiritual movements and about the ability of the environment to integrate
37 new elements and turn diverse inputs into sources of value. Capitalist organizations have been
38 adept at retooling and redeploying potentially critical and transformative voices into sources
39 of strength and continuity (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2005); it remains to be seen whether
40 mindfulness is able to change capitalist organizations from within, or whether it will
41 inevitably be converted into a form that is palatable to current managerial norms. The
42 mindfulness fad, while relatively new, is gaining steam; answering this question will require
43 scholarship to track its path, watching for points at which it might reveal an opening in the
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 repetitive cycles of business-as-usual.
4
5
6

7 8 **References**

- 9
10 Alvensson, M. (2004). *Knowledge work and knowledge-intensive firms*. Oxford, UK: Oxford
11
12 University Press.
13
14 Appadurai, A. (2005). Definitions: Commodity and commodification, In M. Ertman & J.
15
16 Williams (Eds.), *Rethinking commodification: Cases and readings in law and culture*
17
18 (pp. 34-45). New York, NY: NYU Press.
19
20
21 Bailyn, L., & Fletcher, J.K. (2007). *Collaborative interactive action research: Basic concepts*
22
23 *and definitions*. Retrieved from
24
25 http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=6386&area=All
26
27
28 Bell, E., & Taylor, S. (2003). The elevation of work: Pastoral power and the New Age work
29
30 ethic. *Organization*, 10(2), 329–349.
31
32
33 Berila, B. (2015). *Integrating mindfulness into anti-oppression pedagogy: Social justice in*
34
35 *higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
36
37
38 Bloom, P. (2016). Work as the contemporary limit of life: Capitalism, the death drive, and the
39
40 lethal fantasy of ‘work-life balance’. *Organization*, 23(4), 588-606.
41
42
43 Boltanski, L. (2011). *On critique: A sociology of emancipation*. London, UK: Polity Press.
44
45 Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2005). *The new spirit of capitalism*. London, UK: Verso.
46
47 Boyce, B. (2011). *The mindfulness revolution*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
48
49 Brown, D., & Leledaki, A. (2010). Eastern movement forms as body-self transforming
50
51 cultural practices in the West: Towards a sociological perspective. *Cultural Sociology*,
52
53 4(1), 123-154.
54
55
56 Brummans, B.H. (2014). Pathways to mindful qualitative organizational communication
57
58 research. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(3), 440-447.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Brummans, B.H., Hwang, J.M., & Cheong, P.H. (2013). Mindful authoring through invoc
4 ation: Leaders' constitution of a spiritual organization. *Management Communication*
5 *Quarterly*, 27(3), 346-372.
6
7
8
9
10 Buchanan, D., Boddy, D., & McCalman, J. (1988). Getting in, getting on, getting out, and
11 getting back" in A. Bryman (Ed.), *Doing Research in Organizations*, London, UK:
12 Routledge.
13
14
15
16
17 Burger, M. (2006). What price salvation? The exchange of salvation goods between India and
18 the West. *Social Compass*, 53(1), 81-95.
19
20
21 Caring-Lobel, A. (2016). Corporate mindfulness and the pathologization of workplace stress.
22 In R.E. Purser, D. Forbes, & A. Burke (Eds), *Handbook of Mindfulness* (pp. 195-
23 214). Cham, CH: Springer.
24
25
26
27
28 Carrete, J., & King, R. (2005), *Selling spirituality: The silent takeover of religion*. London,
29 UK: Routledge.
30
31
32
33 Case, P., & Gosling, J. (2010). The spiritual organization: critical reflections on the
34 instrumentality of workplace spirituality. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and*
35 *Religion*, 7(4), 257–282.
36
37
38
39
40 Cederström, C., & Spicer, A. (2015). *The wellness syndrome*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
41
42
43 Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative*
44 *analysis*. London, UK: SAGE Publications.
45
46
47 Correll, S., Kelly, E.L., O'Connor, L.T., & Williams J.C. (2014). Redesigning, Redefining
48 Work. *Work and Occupations*, 41(1), 3–17.
49
50
51
52 Costea, B., Crump, N., & Amiridis, K. (2008). Managerialism, the therapeutic habitus and the
53 self in contemporary organizing. *Human Relations*, 61(5), 661–685.
54
55
56
57 Creswell, J.D. (2017). Mindfulness interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 68, 491-516.
58
59
60 Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (2007). *Shadowing and other techniques for doing fieldwork in*

- 1
2
3 *modern societies*. Copenhagen, DK: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- 4
5 Dane, E. (2010). Reconsidering the trade-off between expertise and flexibility: A cognitive
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
- entrenchment perspective*. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 579-603.
- Dane, E., & Brummel, B.J. (2013). Examining workplace mindfulness and its relations to job performance and turnover intention. *Human Relations*, 67(1), 105-128.
- Eby, L.T., Allen, T.D., Conley, K.M., Williamson, R.L., Henderson, T.G., & Mancini, V.S. (2017). Mindfulness-based training interventions for employees: A qualitative review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, *onlinefirst*.
- Echelt, P.E., Glebbeck, A.C., & Lindenberg, S.M. (2006). The new lumpiness of work: explaining the mismatch between actual and preferred working hours. *Work, Employment and Society*, 20(3): 493–512.
- Endrissat, N., Islam, G., & Noppeney, C. (2015). Enchanting work. New spirits of service work in an organic supermarket. *Organization Studies*, 36(11), 1555–1576.
- Farb, N.A. (2014). From retreat center to clinic to boardroom? Perils and promises of the modern mindfulness movement. *Religions*, 5(4), 1062–1086.
- Feldman, M., & Orlikowski, W. (2011). Theorizing practice and practicing theory. *Organization Science*, 22, 1240–1253.
- Fleming, P., & Sturdy, A. (2011). “Being yourself” in the electronic sweatshop: New forms of normative control. *Human Relations*, 64, 177–200.
- Ganzin, M., Islam, G., & Suddaby, R. (2019). Spirituality and entrepreneurship: The role of magical thinking in future-oriented sensemaking. *Organization Studies*, *onlinefirst*.
- Germer, C. (2013). Mindfulness. What is it? What does it matter? In Germer, C., Siegel, R., & Fulton, P. (eds.). *Mindfulness and Psychotherapy* (2nd Edition, pp. 3-35). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Global Wellness Institute. (2018, October). *Global Wellness Economy Monitor*. Retrieved

From

https://globalwellnessinstitute.org/wpcontent/uploads/2018/10/Research2018_v5webfinal.pdf

Gog, S., Simionca, A., Bell, E., & Taylor, S. (Eds., in press), *Spirituality, organisation and neoliberalism*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Goldstein, J. (2003). *One dharma: The emerging Western Buddhism*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Gotink, R.A., Chu, P., Busschbach, J.J., Benson, H., Fricchione, G.L., & Hunink, M.G.

(2015). Standardised mindfulness-based interventions in healthcare: An overview of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of RCTs. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(4): e0124344.

Good, D.J., Lyddy, C.J., Glomb, T.M., Bono, J.E., Brown, K.W., Duffy, M.K., & Lazar, S.W.

(2016). Contemplating mindfulness at work: An integrative review. *Journal of Management*, *42*(1), 114–142.

Harris, E.J. (2006). *Theravada Buddhism and the British encounter: Religious, missionary and colonial experience in nineteenth-century Sri Lanka*. London, UK: Routledge.

Harrison, E. (2017). *The foundations of mindfulness: How to cultivate attention, good judgment, and tranquility*. New York, NY: Workman Publishing.

Healey, K. (2015). Disrupting Wisdom 2.0: The quest for “mindfulness” in Silicon Valley and beyond. *The Journal of Religion, Media and Digital Culture*, *4*(1), 67-95.

Heelas, P. (2002). Work ethics, soft capitalism and the turn to life. In P. du Gay, & M. Pryke (Eds), *Cultural economy: cultural analysis and commercial life* (78-96). London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Hougaard, R., Carter, J., & Coutts, G. (2016). *One second ahead: enhance your performance at work with mindfulness*. New York, NY: Springer.

Hülshager, U.R., Feinholdt, A., & Nübold, A. (2015). A low-dose mindfulness intervention

- 1
2
3 and recovery from work: Effects on psychological detachment, sleep quality, and sleep
4 duration. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 88(3), 464-489.
- 5
6
7 Illouz, E. (2008). *Saving the modern soul: Therapy, emotions, and the culture of self-help*.
8
9 London, UK: University of California Press.
- 10
11
12 Islam, G., Holm, M. & Karjalainen, M. (2017). Sign of the times: Workplace mindfulness as
13 an empty signifier. *Organization*, onlinefirst.
- 14
15
16 Jarzabkowski, P., & Sillince, J.A.A. (2007). A rhetoric-in-context approach to building
17
18 commitment to multiple strategic goals. *Organization Studies*, 28(11), 1639-1665.
- 19
20
21 Joiner, T. (2017). *Mindlessness: The corruption of mindfulness in a culture of narcissism*.
22
23 Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- 24
25
26 Kabat-Zinn J. (1982). An outpatient program in behavioral medicine for chronic pain patients
27
28 based on the practice of mindfulness meditation: theoretical considerations and
29
30 preliminary results. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 4(1), 33-47.
- 31
32
33 Kabat-Zinn, J. (1991). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to*
34
35 *face stress, pain, and illness*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- 36
37
38 Kabat-Zinn, J. (1994). *Wherever you go, there you are: Mindfulness meditation in everyday*
39
40 *life*. New York, NY: Hyperion Books.
- 41
42
43 Kamoche, K., & Pinnington, H. (2012). Managing people “spiritually”: A Bourdieusian
44
45 critique. *Work, Employment & Society*, 26(3), 497-513.
- 46
47
48 Karjalainen, M. (2016). Techniques of mind in the cross sea of scientization and
49
50 spiritualization. In Hämäläinen, R., Pesonen, H., & Utrianen, T. (Eds.), *Helsinki Study*
51
52 *of Religions* (pp 370-388). Helsinki, FI: Helsinki University Press.
- 53
54
55 Karjalainen, M., Niemistö, C. & Hearn, J. (2015). Unpacking the problem of research
56
57 access(es). The case of large knowledge-intensive international consultancies.
58
59 *Qualitative research in organizations and management: An international journal*,
60

- 1
2
3 10(3), 274-293.
4
5 King, E., & Badham, R. (2018). The wheel of mindfulness: A generative framework for
6
7 second-generation mindful leadership. *Mindfulness, onlinefirst*.
8
9 Kosseck, E.E., & Lautsch, B. (2012). Work–family boundary management styles in
10
11 organizations: A cross-level model. *Organizational Psychology Review, 2*(2), 152-171.
12
13 Kamoche, K., & Pinnington, A.H. (2012). Managing people “spiritually”: a Bourdieusian
14
15 critique. *Work, Employment & Society, 26*(3), 497–513.
16
17 Kristensen, M.L. (2018). Mindfulness and resonance in an era of acceleration: a critical
18
19 inquiry. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion, onlinefirst*.
20
21 Kucinkas, J. (2018). *The mindful elite: Mobilizing change from the inside out*. Oxford, UK:
22
23 Oxford University Press.
24
25 Lindahl, J.R. (2015). Why right mindfulness might not be right for mindfulness. *Mindfulness,*
26
27 *6*, 57–62.
28
29 LoRusso, J.D. (2017). *Spirituality, corporate culture, and American business: The neoliberal*
30
31 *ethic and the spirit of global capital*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic.
32
33 McGill, J.F. Adler-Baeder, F., & Rodriguez, P. (2016). Mindfully in love: A meta-analysis of
34
35 the association between mindfulness and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Human*
36
37 *Sciences and Extension, 4*(1), 89-101.
38
39 Nippert-Eng, C. (1996). *Home and work: Negotiating boundaries through everyday life*.
40
41 Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
42
43 O'Carroll, A. (2015). *Working time, knowledge work and post-industrial society:*
44
45 *Unpredictable work*. New York, NY: Springer.
46
47 Pawar, B.S. (2016). Workplace spirituality and employee well-being: An empirical
48
49 examination. *Employee Relations, 38*(6), 975–994.
50
51 Payne, R.K. (2016). Mindfulness and the moral imperative for the self to improve the self. In:
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 R.E. Purser (Ed.), *Handbook of Mindfulness: Culture, Context, and Social Engagement*
4
5 (pp. 121-134). San Francisco: Springer.
6
7
8 Peticca-Harris, A., Navazhylava, K., & Shanahan, G. (in press). A 'Juggly Mummy's' life
9
10 history of teaching yoga. In S. Gog, A. Simionca, E. Bell, & S. Taylor (Eds.),
11
12 *Spirituality, Organisation and Neoliberalism*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar
13
14 Publishing.
15
16
17 Pickering, J. (2006). The first-person perspective in postmodern psychology. In C. Tori, &
18
19 D. Nauriyal (Eds.), *Buddhist Thought and Applied Psychological Research:*
20
21 *Transcending the Boundaries* (pp. 3-19). London, UK: Routledge Curzon Press.
22
23
24 Purser, R.E. (2019). *McMindfulness: How mindfulness became the new capitalist spirituality*.
25
26 New York, NY: Watkins Media Ltd.
27
28
29 Purser, R.E. (2018). Critical perspectives on corporate mindfulness. *Journal of Management,*
30
31 *Spirituality and Religion, 15*(2), 105–108.
32
33
34 Purser, R.E. (2015). Clearing the muddled path of traditional and contemporary mindfulness:
35
36 A response to Monteiro, Musten, and Compson. *Mindfulness, 6*(1), 23–45.
37
38 Purser, R.E., & Milillo, J. (2015). Mindfulness revisited: A Buddhist-based conceptualization.
39
40 *Journal of Management Inquiry, 24*(1), 3-24.
41
42
43 Purser, R.E., Forbes, D., & Burke, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook of Mindfulness: Culture,*
44
45 *Context and Social Engagement*. Cham, CH: Springer.
46
47
48 Roof, W.C. (1999). *Spiritual marketplace: Baby boomers and the remaking of American*
49
50 *religion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
51
52
53 Saari, A. (2018). Emotionalities of rule in pedagogical mindfulness literature. *Journal of*
54
55 *Management, Spirituality & Religion, 15*(2), 141-154.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Saari, A., & Harni, E. (2016). Zen and the art of everything: Governing spirituality in
4 entrepreneurship education. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, 16(4), 99–
5
6
7 119.
8
9
10 Salmon, P., Sephton, S., & Dreeben, S. (2011). Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction. In
11
12 J.D. Herbert, J.D., & E.M. Forman (Eds.), *Acceptance and mindfulness in cognitive*
13
14 *behavior therapy: Understanding and applying the new therapies* (pp. 132-163).
15
16 Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
17
18
19 Samuel, G. (2015). The contemporary mindfulness movement and the question of
20
21 nonself. *Transcultural psychiatry*, 52(4), 485-500.
22
23
24 Sandberg, J., & Pinnington, A.H. (2009). Professional competence as ways of being: An
25
26 existential ontological perspective. *Journal of management studies*, 46(7), 1138-1170.
27
28
29 Sharf, R.H. (2014). Is mindfulness Buddhist? (and why it matters). *Transcultural Psychiatry*,
30
31 52(4), 1–15.
32
33
34 Shonin, E., Van Gordon, W., & Singh, N.N. (Eds.). (2015). *Buddhist Foundations of*
35
36 *Mindfulness*. New York, NY: Springer.
37
38 Siegel, R.D., Germer, C.K., & Olendzki, A. (2009). Mindfulness: What is it? Where did it
39
40 come from? In Didonna, F. (Ed.), *Clinical Handbook of Mindfulness* (pp. 17-35). New
41
42 York, NY: Springer.
43
44
45 Sointu, E., & Woodhead, L. (2008). Spirituality, gender, and expressive selfhood. *Journal for*
46
47 *the Scientific Study of Religion*, 47(2), 259-276.
48
49
50 Stanley, S. (2012). Mindfulness: Towards a critical relational perspective. *Social and*
51
52 *Personality Psychology Compass*, 6(9), 631–641.
53
54
55 Stanley S., Purser R.E., & Singh N.N. (2018). Ethical foundations of mindfulness. In: S.
56
57 Stanley , R.E. Purser, & N. Singh (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethical Foundations of*
58
59 *Mindfulness* (pp. 1-32). New York, NY: Springer.
60

- 1
2
3 Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant Observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
4
5
6 Sutcliffe, K.M., Vogus, T.J., & Dane, E. (2016). Mindfulness in organizations: A cross-level
7
8 review. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*,
9
10 3(1). 55-81.
11
12 Turner, A. (2000). Embodied ethnography. Doing culture. *Social Anthropology*, 8(1), 51-60.
13
14 Van Dam, N.T., van Vugt, M.K., Vago, D.R., Schmalzl, L., Saron, C.D., Olendzki, A., &
15
16 Meyer, D.E. (2018). Mind the hype: A critical evaluation and prescriptive agenda for
17
18 research on mindfulness and meditation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 13(1),
19
20 36–61.
21
22
23
24 Vu, M.C., & Gill, R. (2018). “Letting go of the raft” – The art of spiritual leadership
25
26 incontemporary organizations from a Buddhist perspective using skilful means.
27
28 *Leadership*, doi: 10.1177/1742715018761931
29
30
31 Wajcman, J., & Rose, E. (2011). Constant connectivity: Rethinking interruptions at work.
32
33 *Organization Studies*, 32(7), 941-961.
34
35
36 Walsh, Z. (2018). Mindfulness under neoliberal governmentality: critiquing the operation of
37
38 biopower in corporate mindfulness and constructing queer alternatives. *Journal of*
39
40 *Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 6086, 1–14.
41
42
43 Walton, D. (2014). *Abductive reasoning*. Tuscaloosa, AB: University of Alabama Press.
44
45
46 Weber, M. (1930). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. London, UK:
47
48 Allen & Unwin.
49
50 Webwire (2017, September 26). *\$1.2 Billion U.S. Meditation Market to Grow Strongly, Fol*
51
52 *lowing Path of Yoga Studios*. Tampa, FL: Webwire. Retrieved from [https://www.webw](https://www.webwire.com/ViewPressRel.asp?aId=214152)
53
54 [ire.com/ViewPressRel.asp?aId=214152](https://www.webwire.com/ViewPressRel.asp?aId=214152)
55
56
57 Williams, R.J. (2011). Technê-zen and the spiritual quality of global capitalism. *Critical*
58
59 *Inquiry*, 38(1), 17–70.
60

1
2
3 Wilson, J. (2014). *Mindful America: The mutual transformation of Buddhist meditation and*
4
5 *American culture*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

7 Wilson, J. (2016). Selling mindfulness: Commodity lineages and the marketing of
8
9 mindfulness products. In R.E. Purser, D. Forbes, & A. Burke (Eds.), *Handbook of*
10
11 *mindfulness* (pp 109-119). Cham, CH: Springer.

14 Zaidman, N., Janson, A., & Keshet, Y. (2018). “Power from within” and masculine language:
15
16 Does new age language work at work? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 27(4), 392–404.

19 Zaidman, N., Goldstein-Gidoni, O., & Nehemya, I. (2009). From temples to organizations:
20
21 The introduction and packaging of spirituality’, *Organization*, 16(4), 597–562.
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

Table 1. Data Sources

Data Source	Data Format/Type	Role in the Analysis
Ethnographic Fieldwork	<p>Field notes: ethnographic fieldwork during 1) visits to coordinate with HRM and the Mindfulness Guide in 2014-2015, 2) regular attendance in the Mindfulness Breathing Space for four months in 2015.</p> <p>Written records Afterwards written notes from conversations with the Mindfulness Guide, year 2015.</p>	<p>Ethnographic analysis of meetings and discussions with management and the Mindfulness Guide about corporate understandings of mindfulness.</p> <p>Ethnographic analysis of the lived embodied moments of mindfulness practice.</p>
Semi-Structured Interviews	<p>First round: 22 interviews comprising 15 individual in-person interviews, recorded (approx. 60 minutes each) and transcribed, and 7 interviews conducted by e-mail. Spring 2015.</p> <p>Second round: 10 interviews comprising 9 individual interviews, recorded and transcribed, and one interview conducted by e-mail. Spring and Summer 2015.</p>	<p>Thematically coding the sense-making processes of participants to understand the meanings they derived from the mindfulness program.</p> <p>Rhetorical analysis of the interview data with HR and management to understand corporate discourses around mindfulness.</p>
Written and Archival Documents	<p>Mindfulness diaries (11) written by MBS participants, Spring - Summer 2015.</p> <p>E-mail correspondence with 1) HRM, 2) the Mindfulness Guide, Fall 2014 – Fall 2017.</p> <p>Internal infomercials of the MBS: Infomercials, banners and calendar invitations sent by the Mindfulness Guide.</p> <p>Questionnaires (i.e. MAAS) used in the MBS copies of the forms distributed and responded in the MBS.</p>	<p>Discourses gathered via participant-written diaries regarding their mindfulness practice and reflections, focusing on both their thoughts and the discourse.</p> <p>Rhetorical analysis of the textual materials produced by HR, management and the Mindfulness Guide, focusing on the corporate level: program documents, online materials and correspondence.</p>

Table 2. Examples of the Aggregate Theoretical Dimensions

Theoretical Dimensions	Thematic Codes	Illustrative Data: Interview Extracts
Scientization	Secularism	<p>Interviewer: What comes to your mind from ‘non-judgmental mindful presence’? Participant: To be consciously in a particular moment, to pay attention to the surroundings. Interviewer: What about the ‘non-judgmental’ [in language of interview the term refers also to ‘accepting’]? Participant: Accepting? I do not know about that. (Senior manager, 30s)</p> <p>I do not really think that it originally utilizes a certain religion or a way of thought. I believe that everyone picks up things they find important to themselves (Business controller, 40s)</p> <p>We have laughed at unicorn therapies and like. What a humbug! Mindfulness is not as bad, but almost (Assistant, female, 50s)</p> <p>Discussion on the options the Mindfulness Guide gave participants to meditate for them to feel safe: As if it mattered what you pick? How that would make you feel safe? Or maybe if you would be religious. I am more a person-person. Or a flower bucket... as if that would make me feel secure! [laughs]. (Senior consultant, 20s)</p> <p>Interviewer: What made you interested in mindfulness? Participant: Because the Mindfulness Guide is so wonderful. I have always considered this kind of stuff as ‘yuck’, I am very cynical, I do not believe in anything.” (Assistant, 50s)</p> <p>*****</p> <p>Interviewer: What comes to your mind from ‘non-judgmental mindful presence’? Participant: What a bollocks, that’s what I think. Partially I think that this is nonsense. (Consultant, 20s)</p> <p>I have done ‘mindfulness’ without knowing it already previously. The MBS does not bring anything new to it, so it feels useless. Mindfulness Diary (Consultant, 20s)</p> <p>Mindfulness is so researched academically already [---] (HR manager, 20s)</p> <p>*****</p> <p>It has been researched that this can alter left and right lobe and make changes in brain. (HR manager, 20s)</p>
	Focus on Evidence	

- 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
- Instrumentalization**
- Clinical Terminology *If you think [of] this scientifically, you can get your brain into a different mode. That is what I am interested in, I do not think of the spirituality.* (Senior manager, 30s)
- *****
- I hope this will boost my work, tools for mind control.* (Consultant, 20s)
- Focus on Goal-directed behavior *I believe that mindfulness helps to focus, to control stress, and to control.* (Tax consultant, 20s)
- This is a tool for me to control myself.* (Assistant controller, 30s)
- Things could stay better in control. It would be better if I could enhance my performance.* (Senior manager, 30s)
- Focus and calm would support all functions.* (Senior manager talks about herself, 30s)
- [Mindfulness] brings me better focus to concentrate at work.* (Analyst, 20s)
- [Mindfulness is] a useful skill.* (Senior consultant, 30s)
- *****
- I began doing mindfulness due to my work, so that I could manage.* (Senior consultant, 20s)
- Task Focus *Mindfulness brings that too, that you're merciful, you have self-esteem, so you have strength to say that you have too much work.* (Senior consultant, 20s)
- My concern is if it would be more effective to use the time spent in MBS to do work.* (Tax consultant, 20s)
- I want to teach myself that I can focus on the moment at hand.* (Marketing leader, 30s)
- The reason I started in this is focus, I need to focus my energy in what I am doing, not on the three levels of other things.* (Senior manager, 40s)
-
- 41
42
43
44
45
46

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

Commodification

Mindfulness
as Product

I consciously brought up the effects on ones working life in the advertisement. It was a teaser, to bring in more people.
(Mindfulness Guide)

The Mindfulness Guide liked to use such vocabulary as 'assignment,' when she guided us through mindfulness practices. (Field journal)

That we as an employer offer this to our employees, that employees see that we invest in them.(Marketing leader, 30s)

As long I have been in the business world it has always been the same: 'how do I manage my time? How do I manage my time?'
Now mindfulness wraps this in a new form. (HR manager, 20s)

This is both in fashion and an old innovation. (Tax consultant, 20s)

Mindfulness
as Innovation

2,500 years of product development by Buddhist monks (Mindfulness Guide)

Mindfulness is a really old invention. (Controller, 40s)

I believe that mindfulness will get increasingly common in the future and it would be great if we [as a company] would lead the way in this. (Director, 40s)

Table 3 *Table 3. Conceptual and Empirical Dimensions of Scientization, Instrumentalization and Commodification of Mindfulness*

Name of Process	Scientization	Instrumentalization	Commodification
Definition	The processes by which a cultural or religious tradition or practice is legitimized by using scientific discourse and studies to persuade the audience of its validity	The adaptation by which knowledge is reframed to emphasize familiarity and continuity with the business-as-usual of occidental corporate traditions	The idea that everything can be turned into a commodity, into something intended for exchange, as the transformation of goods, services and ideas become commodities or objects of trade
Focus of Adaptation	Epistemic Aspect of Mindfulness	Practical Aspect of Mindfulness	Economic Aspect of Mindfulness
Key Characteristics	Science as homogeneous and authoritative Mindfulness as a scientifically proven solution to reduce stress and enhance well-being	Reframing from the 'exotic/esoteric' to the familiar	Mindfulness commodified by framing the phenomenon around business jargon and shaping understandings during the program Mindfulness as 'an innovative product'
Experiential Aspects from Ethnography	Entering practice and immediately completing assessments Feeling of being measured and surveyed	Space of room identical to an office, with equipment, business furniture and gadgets conveying a feeling of 'western' corporate practice	Multi-tasking, description of mindfulness as a product, discussion of efficiency and innovation
Sensemaking Aspects from Interviews and Diaries	Constructed by taking 'science' as one of the main motivations to encourage mindfulness practice	Spiritual aspects of mindfulness are selected à la carte, rather than in a systematic way, echoing the individualization and post-secularization of the 'west'	Use of business language when describing mindfulness and its benefits Mindfulness becomes commodified in the meaning making processes that adapt mindfulness into the corporate setting
Rhetorical Aspects from Organizational Discourses	Scientific discourse was used to validate bringing mindfulness practice into the corporation	The spiritual aspects of mindfulness are selected à la carte, rather than in a systematic way	Management used business language when describing mindfulness and its benefits: assignment, work assignment, innovation

Figure 1. Conceptual Figure of Mindfulness Adaptations

