Business & Society
Volume 45 Number 2
June 2006 211-234
© 2006 Sage Publications
10.1177/0007650306286737
http://bas.sagepub.com
hosted at
http://online.sagepub.com

Organizational Spiritualities

An Ideology-Based Typology

Miguel Pina e Cunha
Universidade Nova de Lisboa

Arménio Rego
Universidade de Aveiro

Teresa D'Oliveira
Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada

The topic of spirituality is gaining an increasing visibility in organizational studies. It is the authors contention that every theory of organization has explicit or implicit views of spirituality in the workplace. To analyze the presence of spiritual ideologies in management theories, they depart from Barley and Kunda's *Administrative Science Quarterly* article and analyze management theories as spirituality theories with regard to representations of people and the organization. From this analysis, we extract two major dimensions of people (as dependent or independent workers) and the organization (as spiritually informed or spiritually uninformed) that, in combination, result in a typology that advances four organizational types of spirituality: the soulful organization, the holistic organization, the ascetic organization, and the professional organization. The expression of spirituality in each of these forms is discussed with the aim of contributing to a critically informed analysis of organizational spirituality.

Keywords: *management ideologies; organizational spirituality; religion*

The world of organizations is undergoing a period of change from employment relationships characterized by security, continuity, and loyalty to relationships denoted by exchange and future employability (Arthur & Rousseau, 2001)—from an era in which employee's responsibilities were those of loyalty, attendance, satisfactory performance, and compliance with authority

Authors' Note: Miguel Cunha acknowledges financial support from Institute Nova Forum.

to a time in which people are exhorted to be entrepreneurs, innovators, enactors of change, and excellent performers (Schalk & Rousseau, 2001). These changes have made clear the need to view people as the creators of knowledge and thus as valuable organizational resources (Pfeffer, 1994). Considering both the need to treat people with dignity and the relationships between psychological well-being and organizational results (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000), people should not be treated as human resources (Burroughs & Eby, 1998) but as integral human beings. To treat people in their entirety means understanding and responding to both their material and immaterial needs. These may be said to include spiritual needs.

The fulfillment of spiritual needs in the workplace has been associated with principles based on spirituality, ethics, and values that may guide the daily actions and decisions of an organization's members (Burroughs & Eby, 1998). This and other similar ideas have created a momentum for the topic of organizational spirituality in recent years. Esprit's Susie Tompkins described the 1980s as a decade of style and lifestyle and the 1990s as that of soul searching (Nichols, 1994). Delbecq (2000) illustrates this trend, pointing out that his own interest in spirituality resulted from sharing the intense spirituality of Silicon Valley senior executives. In response to the rising call to include spirituality in the workplace, the transcendental meditation movement of the 1960s and 1970s led to the creation of the Maharishi Corporate Development Program in the 1990s (Maharishi Center for Excellence in Management, 1997). In 1993, Judith Neal, an academic author, founded the Association for Spirit at Work. In the corporate world, some companies urged their members to join several types of human potential programs or what he called *psychospiritual technologies*, including meditation, prayer, and guided imagery (Butts, 1999). The trend also knocked at the door of the scientific arena, with a sudden increase in conferences, workshops, and publications on workplace spirituality (Neal & Biberman, 2003, p. 363). In 1999, the topic was formally recognized as a field of inquiry by the Academy of Management, with the creation of the management, spirituality, and religion interest group (K. L. Dean, Fornaciari, & McGee, 2003). Additionally, journals such as the *Journal of Management Education*, the *Journal of Management Inquiry*, the *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, the *American Behavioral Scientist*, and the *Journal of Organizational Change Management* have devoted special sections or issues to the subject. The *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion* was launched in 2004.

Most writings on the topic have adopted a very optimistic view of the relationship between work, organizations, and spirituality. Some of them argue that it is necessary to put an end to the Cartesian split that characterizes much of Western thought, which distinguishes between mind or spirit

and body, subjective and objective, material and immaterial (Waddock, 1999). Some authors suggest that spiritual transformation is important in and of itself, and others even claim that spirituality contributes positively to organizational performance (Benefiel, 2003; Butts, 1999; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003a; Konz & Ryan, 1999; Milliman, Ferguson, Trickett, & Condemi, 1999; Neck & Milliman, 1994).

This burning optimism is surprising because work, from a religious perspective, may be viewed either as a punishment or as a path toward liberation. More than advocacy of the organizational spirituality topic as something inherently positive, what is now necessary is a critically informed analysis of how organizations may deal with spirituality.

The relative lack of theoretical development and critical analysis may result from the fact that spirituality as an organizational scholarly topic is a fairly recent discovery (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Waddock, 1999). However, in their history of the firm, Micklethwait and Woolridge (2003) suggest that this is a lasting relationship in the world of business. They quote Francesco di Marco Datini, a 12th-century Italian businessman, whose motto reads "for God and for profit" (p. 10). In this article, we argue that every management theory has implicit or explicit views of spirituality in the workplace. We begin with Vaill's (1998) argument that organizations have a spiritual dimension and explore the spiritual underpinnings of management theories; as will be discussed, in some theories, the spiritual element is explicitly considered as an organizational dimension; in other theories, spirituality is viewed as lying outside the range of managerial concerns. In line with Steingard (2005), we designate the first spiritually informed and the latter spiritually uninformed theories.

In this article, we explore the presence of spirituality in management ideologies over time, thus departing from its recent faddish appearance. Our discussion runs in two steps: We start with an analysis of the representation of people and organization in managerial ideologies, and based on this analysis, we build a typology of organizational spiritualities. After defining spirituality and distinguishing it from religion, we analyze the spiritual ideologies of the phases considered by Barley and Kunda (1992). We select this work as our frame of reference because (a) it provides a parsimonious view of the evolution of organizational theories, (b) its focus on ideology makes it particularly appropriate to the study of spirituality, and (c) organizational spirituality itself can be viewed as a form of ideology. From this analysis, we extract interpretations on models of people (viewed as dependent or independent) and of the organization (viewed as a spiritually informed or a spiritually uninformed place). Subsequently, we cross these two dimensions to build a typology of organizations according to the

spiritual dimension. We conclude that there are both enabling and coercive possibilities associated with organizational spirituality. If our analysis is correct, it means that none of the diverse approaches to spirituality is intrinsically good or bad.

The article contributes to the organizational literature in several ways. It suggests that organizational theories can be addressed from a spiritual perspective and that spiritual elements have a long-standing presence in the theories of organization. It offers four distinct approaches to organizational spirituality that are theoretically grounded and critically informed. It suggests that spirituality, in itself, is neither a source of employee liberation nor a vehicle for alienation. It can be both things, depending on how it is conceived and developed in a given organizational setting.

Ideologies of Spirituality

Sandelands (2003) recently argued that "Without God . . . management theory is nonsense and we who teach it are charlatans or worse" (p. 170), and Tinsley (2002) derived managerial lessons from the Old Testament's Book of Proverbs. Butts (1999) claimed that businesspeople, managers, and academic researchers should consider that citizens are hungering for spiritual values. These and other authors suggest that management can, or maybe should, be discussed from a spiritual perspective. They are among those claiming that organizations should manage spirituality, which can be defined as "a framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promotes employees' experience of transcendence through the work progress, facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy" (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003b, p. 13). The result of this search for spiritual meaning translates into such values as organizational excellence, the quest for some cosmic purpose or helping humankind or the natural world (Csikszentmihalyi, 2003). When such an individual attempt assumes an institutional form (meaning the adherence to dogma and the practice of rituals), it belongs to the field of religion.

The article focuses on spirituality rather than religion—two topics that, although related, do not mean the same (e.g., spirituality can exist without religion). We accept the argument of those authors who say that religion is an inappropriate form of expression in the workplace, except in terms of religious accommodation (Cash & Gray, 2000; Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2004; Mitroff, 2003; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a). Spirituality, on the other hand, may be a relevant component of life in organizations. Some authors

even consider it as integral to new economy, knowledge-based organizations (Dehler & Welsh, 2003)—hence, our focus on spirituality rather than religion.

To develop a systematic approach to the presence of spirituality in theories of organization, we follow the historical periods in the evolution of management ideologies as portrayed by Barley and Kunda (1992). By ideology, these authors refer to “a stream of discourse that promulgates, however unwittingly, a set of assumptions about the nature of the objects with which it deals” (p. 363). They add that every theory has an ideological component, in the sense that all theorists must adopt some ontological position. Instead of considering the multiple aspects of management dealt with by Barley and Kunda, we draw on their chronology to address and reinterpret the way each management ideology treats the issue of spirituality with regard to people and the organization. We follow the sequence advanced by these authors: industrial betterment, scientific management, human relations, systems rationalism, and organizational culture.

Industrial Betterment

Industrial betterment prevailed as a dominant ideology between 1870 and 1900. This ideology emerged in the sequence of what was perceived as a lack of attention given by employers to the working conditions of people. Presumed to be a consequence, riots and debauchery were part of organizational life (Wren, 1994). This state of affairs stimulated several agents, from religious ministers to industrialists, to propose a new approach to the management of people. As noted by Barley and Kunda (1992), one of the most prominent spokespersons of the industrial betterment movement was Washington Gladden, a Congregationalist minister who established a bridge between religion-based morality and industrial evolution.

As a management philosophy, industrial betterment was founded on the belief that industry development depended on perfecting the moral qualities of the working people. This perfecting process should be directed by managers. Organizational historians have noticed the abundance of inappropriate behaviors in many factories (Wren, 1994). In response to these behaviors (e.g., drinking, gambling), this movement sought to instill a moral code in workers. Partisans of industrial betterment considered that character developed solely if the material and moral environments were proper, and their management was aimed at creating proper environments. One example is the foundation of the Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA) by Cornelius Vanderbilt, the goal of which was to stimulate positive behavior among the workers of the railroad industry. Among the

reasons why positive behaviors were deemed necessary was the need to improve workforce reliability and concomitantly to keep workers away from alcohol. The following assertion of Robert Owen (quoted in O'Toole, 1995), one of the main interpreters of its time, is paradigmatic: "How can I make manufacturing pay without dooming my employees to misery and moral degradation?" (p. 203).

Management, spirituality, and religion were thus explicitly and vigorously embraced by this ideology. The image of infantile workers that emanated from the industrial betterment perspective required the guidance of enlightened-paternalistic and religious managers. As Gladden (Barley & Kunda, 1992) observed, "The Christian law is that we are to do good to all men as we have the opportunity; and certainly the employer's opportunity is among his employees" (p. 367). This advice was translated into direct initiatives to educate the workforce, instilling in people the virtues of frugality, industriousness, and temperance, whose lack was said to be at the root of industrial unrest. According to this view, managers were invited to improve the workingmen rather than improve the working conditions. Bettered employees would, it was expected, constitute a more docile workforce, more amenable to cooperation than to conflict and more adequate to the attainment of profitability and smooth industrial relations.

Scientific Management

A similar attempt at improvement was pursued by scientific management. However, a significant difference emerged between this ideology and the former: In this case, it was the design of work rather than religious principles that would change the workingman. Under scientific management, people would be directed by reason and the problems of industrial unrest would be appropriately (i.e., scientifically) addressed. As noted by Shenhav (1995), in the progressive period, business philosophy was crystallized around secular, engineering-based ideas rather than around religious, philanthropic, or paternalistic principles. Hence, the importance of a philosophy oriented toward the maximum gains possible to employees. Managers would guarantee that their subordinates would have access to the maximum of economic gains by means of rationalized processes. Organizations were portrayed as rationalized sites, designed and managed according to a rule of rationality imported from the world of technique. This new mechanical world was not only instrumental but was also attributed an aesthetic value, as suggested by the association between scientific management and the modernist movement in the arts (Guillén, 1997).

The human element was viewed as a nuisance, a source of uncertainty to be reduced by means of science (Shenhav, 1999). The scientific way of solving problems could be easily contrasted with the industrial betterment perspective. According to Frederick Taylor (1911),

> Perhaps the most important of all the results attained was the effect on the workmen themselves. A careful inquiry into the condition of these men developed the fact that out of the 140 workmen only two were said to be drinking men. . . . The fact is that a steady drinker would find it almost impossible to keep up with the pace which was set, so that they were practically all sober. (pp. 71-72)

The scientific approach to work reduced the spiritual element to a nonwork issue. Workers did not expect charity from their employers. The unshakable belief in science's superiority prevented religion, and even spirituality, from having a relevant role, if any, in the management of organizations. In any case, as observed by Crainer (2000), scientific management was not immoral: "It simply subsumed moral considerations under the rationalist drive toward efficiency. People were fodder. . . . In Taylor's mind management was an ascetic science rather than a humane one" (p. 15).

The separation between science and religion, however, was not necessarily as clear as suggested in the preceding argument. Some scientific managers showed betterment inclinations. This was the case of Henry Ford, a key figure in the application of scientific management. Ford combined a very strict management style on the shop floor with the defense of proper behaviors: He believed that men who lived aright would work aright—hence, the explicit ambition of "making men as well as automobiles" (Corbett, 1994, p. 124). Ford's approach was a curious mélange of the religious zeal of industrial betterment with the modernist faith in science and technology. Ford simultaneously designed factories according to the principles of scientific management and expected men "made by his factory" (p. 124) to show morally acceptable behaviors. This excluded, for example, gambling, extramarital sex, smoking, and drinking and included, as formalized in a 1932 edict, the growth of potatoes by employees in their gardens or courtyards, an interesting agricultural reminiscence in a man who fought to escape the destiny of being a farmer and built his industrial empire on the refusal of becoming a farmer (Kets de Vries, 1998). Employees' behavior was strictly controlled by a Sociological Department, both inside and outside the factory, including night raids on employees' homes and other forms of management by fear (Corbett, 1994). The limitations of this approach would be exposed by the succeeding movement, human relations.

Human Relations

Despite the dramatic productivity improvements introduced by scientific management (Drucker, 1999), human problems emerged in Taylorist-Fordist factories, giving rise to the human relations movement (Mayo, 1945). The key element in this school of thought was no longer morality or duty, as in the industrial betterment period, but efficiency, the watchword of scientific management. There were elements of spirituality, however, in the human relations approach. These included the need to belong, to gain self-recognition, and to find meaning in the organization. Wren (1994) noted that evangelism and mysticism often characterized human relations training. The response of human relationists to people's needs for meaning led to a new representation of the worker regarding spiritual needs: The worker was viewed as dependent and manipulable. Because of employees' needs for belonging and social esteem, the organization should persuade them that it constituted an ideal environment. Such a concern with the management of people's well-being is certainly laudable and is still pursued today in such domains as the retention of knowledge workers (Alvesson, 2000) and the creation of authentizotic organizations (Kets de Vries, 2001).

There is more, however, to some applications of the principles of the human relations school than making people feel better: As remarked by Wren (1994), supervisors in some companies were instructed to listen more than speak, to avoid moral recommendations and, in a somewhat perverse fashion, to hide their own emotions. In other words, they were taught how to manipulate the emotions of others to increase the meaningfulness of work and the fulfillment of needing to belong to the organization. The image of the employees born out of these descriptions was one of naive, dependent people, whose cooperation could be secured with soft tactics and emotional inclusion. Once again, the ultimate goal of the organization was profitability, which in this case, was grounded on the equivalence between effective organizations and inclusive collectivities. Workers' spiritual needs, namely, meaning and belonging, should thus be addressed for the sake of the organization's goals.

Systems Rationalism

Systems rationalism marked the return of organization theory to cold thinking after the warmer times of human relations. The growing diffusion of computers and cybernetics led to a focus on cognition rather than emotion. Cognitive images of organizations pervaded the field (Beer, 1981; Ilgen &

Klein, 1988), and the workforce was now portrayed as being composed of calculative evaluators of the resourceful, evaluative, maximizing model type (Jensen & Meckling, 1994). Emotional and spiritual needs were again relegated to the background. Computer science brought a new perspective to management, whose principles and functions were thought of as technical issues. The core of management education in elite universities was then centered on hard disciplines such as management science, accounting, statistics, and operations research. Free of the touchy-feely human factor, managers were developing the idea of the organization as a cybernetic system whose functioning depended on such tasks as forecasting, planning, and controlling. The earlier affective-laden theories of motivation (Maslow, 1954) gave place to cognitive theories (Adams, 1965; Locke & Latham, 1984; Vroom, 1964). In short, the organization was now portrayed as a cerebral system. Barley and Kunda (1992) argued that systems rationalism lacked an explicit model of the workforce. Another interpretation is to view the worker in systems rationalism as a cognitive persona. As in scientific management, human facets such as emotion and spirituality were viewed as irrelevant. But, once again, the pendulum was about to swing.

Organizational Culture

The cold images of the person portrayed in systems rationalism were challenged by the ideology that followed: organizational culture and quality. The emergence of this ideology was due, on one hand, to the global success of several Japanese companies (Pascale & Athos, 1981) and, on the other, to the massive popularity of the concept of *culture* as a management tool (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Peters & Waterman, 1982). As a consequence of the inception of culture in management theory, companies rushed to create meaningful and shared values as well as vibrant missions (Collins & Porras, 1994). The perspective of organizations as systems of meaning evokes the spiritual dimension of organizing. Taking organizations as systems of meaning inevitably leads to the conception of leaders as managers of the symbolic (Smircich & Morgan, 1982). Through shared values, managers expected to turn employees into members, hence the use of such terms as *we*, *us*, and *our family* as synonyms of the organization.

The idea of becoming a member of an organization has since been increasingly associated with the concept of *citizenship* (Manville & Ober, 2003): Organizations need to treat their people as citizens, not as cogs in the machinery, infants, or brains at the service of the company. The notion of membership appeared as particularly powerful to knowledge-intensive

companies, whose professionals, because of their expertise and value, gained a bargaining power that is stimulating the discovery of new ways of managing this volunteer workforce of talented and difficult to retain professionals (Byrnes, 2005; Gratton & Ghoshal, 2003).

Despite the potential advantages of emotional or spiritual inclusion brought about by the culture or quality movement, there was a flip side to this ideology. As pointed out by many authors, culture can be a mechanism of control as much as a process of inclusion (e.g., Barker, 1993; Pfeffer, 1997). People can be forced, for instance, to join happy family organizations (Boje, 1995), which reveals the potential paradox involved in the management of spiritual inclusion. It is certainly not by coincidence that spiritual training was so common in Japanese companies embracing a quality management philosophy, whose implementation is apparently facilitated by attitudes of reality acceptance, perseverance, and cooperation (Clegg, 1992). Because of increasing levels of professionalism, organizations working in the knowledge economy felt the need to replace their obtrusive control mechanisms by nonobtrusive or transparent controls such as organizational design (Sewell, 1998), peer pressure (Barker, 1993), or hagiographic leadership (Kamoche, 2003). Leaders sometimes became the high priests of their organizations, leading the membership through a number of rituals with quasi-religious qualities. As such, what may be viewed as a mechanism of liberation can also be seen as a means for tightening the iron cage. Corporate culturalism dissolves the individual in an artificial and instrumental community (Hancock, 1997) and nurtures new and subtle forms of resistance (Fleming & Sewell, 2002).

From the discussion on the evolution of management ideologies, two major streams emerge: (a) The model of the person evolves from the representation of human beings as dependent to their representation as independent, and (b) the representation of organizations shows a pendulum swing between spiritually informed and spiritually uninformed approaches. Next, we explain these two interpretations (see also Table 1).

We consider that workers are taken as being dependent when they are viewed as unable to devise the best for themselves. If that is the case, someone (namely, managers and supervisors) has to take care of them (e.g., to help them avoid undesirable behavior, to develop their careers, and so forth). People are viewed as being independent when they are expected and encouraged to make their own autonomous choices. They are treated as organizational citizens, not as passive-reactive employees. The movement from the dependent to the independent workforce has been discussed by several authors, including Aktouf (1992) and Gratton and Ghoshal (2003). It was triggered mainly by the

Table 1
Ideology, Model of the Person and Implications for Organizational Spirituality

Ideology	Model of the Person	Model of Management
Industrial betterment	Dependent: Employees are unable to make the good choices. Vulnerable to immoral behaviors.	Spiritually informed: Employees must be guided by their bosses to a lifestyle congruent with Christian values.
Scientific management	Dependent: Unable to make the good choices. Egoistic and externally motivated by economic gains.	Spiritually uninformed: Managers must create scientifically designed organizational contexts. These will give employees access to better outcomes.
Human relations	Dependent: Employees are unable to make the good choices. Childish and vulnerable to manipulation. Motivated by social belonging.	Spiritually informed: Managers must view organizations as spiritual climates where people feel included.
Systems rationalism	Independent: People as rational decision makers. Competent people collect, process, and make use of information.	Spiritually uninformed: Managers should design organizations as information-processing machines, operated by cognitive personae.
Organizational culture	Independent: The need to increase autonomy and participation must be complemented with invisible and acceptable mechanisms of control. Culture may be one such mechanism, allowing the combination of independent action and organizational control.	Spiritually informed: The organization can be designed as a source of personal identity. Employees are invited to become members and to devote both their hearts and minds to the organization.

transition from work-intensive to knowledge-intensive organizations. In the first case, with the exception of the professional elite, workers were expected to execute orders as obediently and diligently as possible. Passive dependence went in hand in hand with organizational needs and design. In knowledge-intensive organizations, professional employees are asked to be active thinkers. In the words of Aktouf, the employee as a passive cog gave place to the active and willing accomplice. In other words, dependence is replaced by a greater sense of independence, with the organizational man of the 1950s (see Whyte, 1956) giving place to the voluntary employee of our days.

Table 2
A typology of organizational spiritualities

	Dependent Person	Independent Person
Management as spiritually informed practice	**The soulful organization**	**The holistic organization**
Source of liberation	Search for integration between individuals and the firm	Integral attention to human needs, inner meaning at work
Source of alienation	Spiritual imposition and intrusion, organizational cynicism	The organization as religion
Management as spiritually uninformed practice	**The ascetic organization**	**The professional organization**
Source of liberation	Rationality and clarity	No spiritual demands placed on employees; pastoral power is not exerted over the individual
Source of alienation	Narrow view of the organization's purposes	Calculative bonds with the organization, self-directed behaviors, social detachment

Regarding the second dimension, management is represented as a spiritually informed practice when it assumes that there is a spiritual component in the managerial activity that should be taken as an integral part of the profession. It is viewed as a spiritually uninformed practice when the organization is taken as an a-spiritual entity.

A Typology of Organizational Spiritualities

Combining the two dimensions introduced in the previous section, a framework can be derived that supports a differentiated understanding of several forms of organizational spirituality. Such a framework, presented in Table 2, helps us understand why organizational spirituality may be a source of human development as well as an irresistible mechanism of compliance. This is a relevant aspect for the analysis of organizational spirituality considering that (a) worker compliance is a crucial topic in organizational analysis (Bendix, 1956), with spiritual indoctrination constituting a possibility for achieving compliance through the apparent search for inner meaning;

and (b) the search for inner meaning is frequently portrayed as the essence of organizational spirituality. As such, our typology allows an interpretation of organizational spirituality from multiple angles and advances the topic beyond anecdote, conviction, and proselytism. Four types of organization will be discussed later on, resulting from the combination of the two variables considered: the soulful organization, the ascetic organization, the holistic organization, and the professional organization. These are, of course, theoretical archetypes that need to be further tested.

The Soulful Organization (Management as Spiritually Informed Practice, Dependent Workers)

Spiritualism has been recently presented as being good for performance (Benefiel, 2003; Bolman & Deal, 1995). It was announced as an organizational resource (Bell & Taylor, 2003), a foundation for success and survival (Waddock, 1999), and even the ultimate source of competitive advantage (Overell, 2003). The perspective of organizational spirituality as resource opens many avenues for researching, consulting, and managing, given that it promises to fuse organizational interest with individual growth and development. In this case, organizations claim the soul of the individual, more than simply his or her body (Kunda, 1992). Managing with soul implies the alignment between the organizational vision and the employees' sense of purpose. If there was already a research stream on the organization of exclusion (Martin, 1994), the managing with soul perspective represents an effort to understand the organization of total inclusion. Martin, Knopoff, and Beckman's (1998) study of The Body Shop provides an example of a soulful organization, as will be discussed later on.

Soulful organizations may take different shapes: from new age businesses (Nichols, 1994) to devotional workplaces (Adler & Adler, 1988). They can also be marked by the inclusion of *love* in the organizational terminology. The arrival of *love* to the CEO vocabulary, or what journalist Lucy Kellaway (2003) called "love by internal memo" (p. 5) is an interesting feature of some soulful organizations: "This emotional language is a new kind of patois spoken almost exclusively by chief executives. They are all speaking it, yet everyone else . . . hates it" (p. 5). Its effects need to be addressed. As reported by one shop clerk, "The Body Shop is nice because I don't feel like I have to fit some kind of mold. At The Body Shop I feel I can be more myself" (Martin et al., 1998, p. 449). This sense of authenticity, often combined with praise for the singularity of the organization (Cunha, 2002), may be of high instrumental value. As noted by Martin et al. (1998, p. 461), people in

this kind of environment may feel invited to think "I can do my best work when I can be myself." Some employees at The Body Shop reported in the same study, however, that the need to show emotional expressiveness was somewhat uncomfortable, if not even manipulating, as when people were required to seem relaxed, cheerful, and happy, when in fact they were feeling otherwise.

Soulful, inclusive environments can be a source of plenitude for some people and a totalitarian experience for others; although they may be paths to a meaningful organizational life, they may also be unacceptable sources of ideological imposition. For this reason, companies that have been too successful in their efforts to create bonds with employees tend to be regarded with both fascination and suspicion by outside observers (Pratt, 2000a). When employees in this type of organization perceive the existence of discrepancies between the rhetoric and the practice of managers, the soulful approach may lead to organizational cynicism (J. W. Dean, Brandes, & Dharwadkar, 1998).

The management of inclusion in the soulful organization can be achieved by several means: organizational missions and visions, cult managers, transformational leaders, practices of indoctrination, physical space (such as spaces for praying and meditation), the creation of liminal spaces conducive to spiritual awareness (e.g., management retreats), corporate development programs based on transcendental meditation (e.g., Maharishi Corporate Development Program), courses on miracles, shamanic journeying, and various yogic paths and even the adoption of best spiritual practices (Butts, 1999; Mitroff & Denton, 1999b). Taken to the extreme, this perspective may turn into a source of colonization of multiple life domains by an organization that talks up its ability to fulfill every human need, perhaps founded on the religious-based belief that work is an act of virtue in itself (Bell & Taylor, 2003). Organizations imbued with the sacred power arising from their liberating force may become total institutions or ideological fortresses (Pratt, 2000b), imposing their worldviews on workers through an overarching system of meaning, impervious to attack by people who might oppose it. Parker (1997) questions the truthfulness of organization spiritual inclusion, as he considers that members may only be allowed to echo the master's voice.

The Ascetic Organization (Management as Spiritually Uninformed Practice, Dependent Workers)

The ascetic organization combines the perspective of management as spiritually uninformed practice with a view of the worker as dependent.

Organizations of this type can be viewed as founded on rationality and technique. They may develop when a professional and highly qualified group of managers leads a less qualified workforce. The rational orientation precludes the will to manage the spiritual side of the organization; instead, the company is managed according to the principles of technique and rationality. The management project is viewed as an ascetic one in the sense that it should be technically rigorous and efficient. Concerns with spirituality are viewed as lying outside the managers' sphere of influence.

The focus on the technical a-spiritual side of the organization may bring process clarity and goal orientation. These may in turn facilitate goal attainment, being potentially functional from an effectiveness perspective. Goal clarity, as evidenced by goal-setting theory, may facilitate good performance (Latham, 2000). There is a possible downside, however, in this ascetic approach to organizing. As suggested by Peters and Waterman (1982), organizations where people share a common set of values and feel some kind of emotional bond with the company may stimulate a sense of membership that will benefit the company. Emery and Thorsrud (1976) claimed that to satisfy psychological needs, organizations must provide employees with a sense that they are contributing to social welfare in a meaningful way (Ellsworth, 2002). This contribution may be less than explicit in the ascetic organization, focused on the technical rather than the social.

Because of their nature, ascetic organizations may preferentially develop psychological contracts of a transactional type (Rousseau, 1995). Given the link between organizational flexibility and the willingness of the employees to exhibit behavior of the organizational citizenship type, ascetic organizations may not be the most competent in the elicitation of extra-role behaviors (Tepper, 2003). Additionally, people may view themselves as employees, not as members, given the combination of a lack of emotional inclusion and the potentially low autonomy and empowerment in organizations where workers are simply viewed as a dependent workforce (Drucker, 2002; Gilbreath, 2004).

General Motors during Alfred Sloan's years provides a good illustration of the ascetic organization. The company achieved very good results based on a management system strongly directed toward efficiency, rationalization, and profit maximization. According to O'Toole (1995), Sloan built a very objective organization, a company that attributed significant attention to "policies, systems, and structures and not enough to people, principles and values. Sloan, the quintessential engineer, had worked out all the intricacies and contingencies of a foolproof system" (p. 174). But this system left out employees and society (Drucker, 1946). One of the main consequences

of this management philosophy was a culture that resisted change, which explains many of the difficulties and troubles that the company suffered some years later (Burack, 1999; O'Toole, 1995). Regarding Sloan's (1963) book *My years with General Motors*, Drucker (1978) emphasized that although interesting and revealing, it was also very frustrating: it included no reference to people and no mention to Sloan's greatest strength, the leadership of people. O'Toole (1995) resumed the criticism arguing that

> [W]hereas Taylor occasionally backs off to justify his ardor for efficiency in human terms, not once does Sloan make reference to any other values. Freedom, equality, humanism, stability, community, tradition, religion, patriotism, family, love, virtue, nature—all are ignored. In the one personal element in the book, he makes passing reference to his wife: he abandons her on the first day of a European vacation to return to business in Detroit. His language is as calculating as that of the engineer-of-old working with calipers and slide rule, as cold as the steel he caused to be bent to form cars: economizing, utility, facts, objectivity, systems, rationality, maximizing—that is the stuff of his vocabulary. (p. 176)

The Holistic Organization (Management as Spiritually Informed Practice, Independent Workers)

The search for the best companies to work for usually points to companies that are spiritual in the sense that they try to create meaning in an expressive fashion (Levering & Moskowitz, 1993). These organizations can be distinguished from the previous types because they emphasize the individual, not the organization. There is a clear, explicit, and voluntary investment in individual development. It is the individual's development (on the personal, spiritual, and professional grounds) that supports organization development. As such, organizational efforts should emphasize personal growth and progress—hence the focus on issues such as work or nonwork balance, work-family conflict, and psychological well-being as sources of meaning, development, and spiritual fulfillment. The previous characteristics clearly evoke Kets de Vries's (2001) concept of the *authentizotic organization*, Csikszentmihalyi's (2003) concept of *good business*, and Gratton's (2004) notion of the *democratic enterprise*. In spite of the potentially thin line separating the authentizotic organization and the soulful company, the distinction lies in the spiritual locus: the individual in this case, the organization in the former.

Southwest Airlines (SWA) provides one example of a holistic organization as described by Milliman et al. (1999). The company has been designated

several times as one of the best companies to work for and has been described in the following way: (a) Even putting a strong emphasis on customers, SWA states that its employees always come first; (b) not only are employees encouraged to be part of the company but so are their families, who are often invited to participate in company activities and celebrations; (c) SWA employees feel they are part of a cause: Offering the lowest airfares, frequent flights, and a personable service characterized by fun and humor, the company seeks to give an opportunity to fly to people who could not ordinarily afford it; (d) if employees make errors of judgment, they are not punished but given feedback on how to improve; (e) the company places an extraordinary focus on showing heart—caring for its customers and employees; (f) leaders stimulate every person to be authentic; and (g) the company values humor and enthusiasm.

As their downside, holistic organizations may impose themselves too strongly on individual lives. Because of the uniqueness of the firm and the effort invested in the creation of a human environment, people may feel intimidated to make an adequate contribution. When an organization is so special, it can occupy space from the private sphere of life, something that is apparently common in knowledge-intensive firms, whose investment in worker retention is well known (Alvesson, 2000). Therefore, some conditions need to be fulfilled to prevent the holistic organization from becoming a totalitarian one: authenticity, employee participation, respect for diversity, allowing people to really be themselves (Milliman, Czaplewski, & Ferguson, 2003).

The Professional Organization (Management as Spiritually Uniformed Practice, Independent Workers)

When the organization does not manage the spiritual side and an independent view of the worker prevails, it can be described as professional. This perspective corresponds to the notion that the business of business is business (Friedman, 1970). As such, organizations should be treated as instrumental, a-spiritual, and legally respectful places, where ethical cultures and behaviors may prosper regardless of spiritual incentives (Victor & Cullen, 1988). Competitive firms, in this view, have not been conceived to satisfy the spiritual and religious needs of people. The fulfillment of those needs is the mission of religious, nongovernmental, and voluntary organizations, not of business firms. This position is thus closer to the scientific management or system rationalism approaches, with their emphases on the instrumental side of the organization. Good management does not necessarily imply an explicit focus on the creation of the so-called spiritual workplaces.

It is through the adequate management of people that organizations may aspire to be viewed as meaningful (Pfeffer, 2003).

In this type of company, spiritual development is not the object of a systematic approach but rather an individual initiative. Individuals will pursue their personal motives and the organization will be as ethical as its members. This is the place where unethical people will find opportunities to succeed. When personal unethical agendas multiply, corporate scandals may erupt. But this is also a potentially fruitful working environment for the voluntary professional described by Gratton and Ghoshal (2003), whose work ethic derives more from personal reputation and professional socialization than from organizational indoctrination and control.

Conclusion

In their review of the evolution of management thought, Barley and Kunda (1992) stated that all theories have an ideological component. We add that all theories, as part of their ideological component, have implicit or explicit views of spirituality in the workplace—hence the analysis of management ideologies from a spiritual perspective. With this approach, we contribute to a theoretically informed critical analysis of organizational spirituality. We tried to avoid two common weaknesses of organizational spirituality studies: the tendency toward prescription and proselytizing (Kamoche, 2003) and the relative lack of theoretical framing (Weaver & Agle, 2002). We have tried to do so in two ways.

First, we suggested that organizational ideologies may be approached from a spiritual perspective. Some ideologies offer more or less clear guidelines on how to deal with spirituality when not with religion (which is the case of so-called Christian organizations or spiritual communities; see Pratt, 2000b) although others exclude it from the agenda. Considering organizations as a-spiritual places is indeed a strong position regarding workplace spirituality. The critical debate on the meaning and practice of spirituality in organizational settings is relevant, considering the intensification in contemporary societies of the recourse to technologies of the self (i.e., means by which people, by themselves or with the help of other people, act on their bodies, thoughts, and conduct to attain happiness, fulfillment, success, wealth, or wisdom; Covaleski, Dirsmith, Heian, & Samuel, 1998). Organizational spirituality qualifies as a technology of the self, whose reach is still to be investigated. We have contributed to the organizational spirituality debate

with the construction of a typology that considers both the enabling and the coercive forces present in the notion of organizational spirituality.

Second, we have added to the literature by suggesting that spiritual workplaces of the various types are not intrinsically good or bad, in the same sense that spiritual organizations are not necessarily positive or negative. We do not conceive organizational spirituality as a panacea for solving the moral problems of contemporary corporations (see also Boyle & Healy, 2003) but as a relevant dimension of organization life, which should be studied in the same way as any other topic in the research agenda. There may be many problems of the ethical or moral type in today's firms (Handy, 2002; Mintzberg, Simons, & Basu, 2002) leading to a crisis of confidence in corporations (Child, 2002), but as discussed here, it is arguable whether the spiritual remedy is a necessary or a sufficient condition to address them. Researchers have claimed that personal spirituality may help to understand ethical issues in organizations (Weaver & Agle, 2002). We agree and add, however, that the organizational position toward spirituality should itself be scrutinized from an ethical perspective. That accepted, organizational concern with management of spirituality as something intrinsically good is simply untenable. Spirituality can even be managed as a part of business (i.e., as a manipulative tool for more productivity and profit) and not as something valued by virtue of what it is, as an end in itself (Krahnke, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2003). Other potential negative effects include the potential for proselytizing a set of spiritual values as the right path, which can breed intolerance. It is also possible that employees who experience a high degree of spirituality at work may become deeply attached to the current practices of the company and thereby become resistant to change (Milliman et al., 2003).

The article has several limitations. It advances a preliminary approach to the topic, which needs to be tested empirically. Empirical evidence may validate some types advanced here, invalidate others, and suggest new possibilities. Empirical studies may also suggest connections between different types of firms as well as developmental steps from one type to another. Another limitation refers to the movement toward the model of the voluntary employee: It may cover only a minority of the working population. Additionally, our categories may sometimes overlap, as suggested in the discussion of Henry Ford. Recognizing these weaknesses, we have advanced a number of possibilities for future research and suggested that organizational spirituality is too complex to be optimistically reduced to the softest source of organizational advantage.

References

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1988). Intense loyalty in organizations: A case study of college athletics. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*, 401-417.

Aktouf, O. (1992). Management and theories of organization in the 1990s: Toward a critical radical humanism? *Academy of Management Review*, *17*, 407-431.

Alvesson, M. (2000). Social identity and the problem of loyalty in knowledge-intensive companies. *Journal of Management Studies*, *37*, 1101-1123.

Arthur, M. B., & Rousseau, D. (2001). Conclusion: A lexicon for the new organizational era. In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era* (pp. 370-382). New York: Oxford University Press.

Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *9*, 134-145.

Barker, J. R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *38*, 400-437.

Barley, S. R., & Kunda, G. (1992). Design and devotion: Surges of rational and normative ideologies of control in managerial discourse. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *37*, 363-399.

Beer, S. (1981). *Brain of the firm* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley.

Bell, E., & Taylor, S. (2003). The elevation of work: Pastoral power and the new age work ethic. *Organization*, *10*, 329-349.

Bendix, R. (1956). *Work and authority in industry*. New York: John Wiley.

Benefiel, M. (2003). Mapping the terrain of spirituality in organizations research. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *16*, 367-377.

Boje, D. M. (1995). Stories of the storytelling organization: A postmodern analysis of Disney as Tamara-Land. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*, 997-1035.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. E. (1995). *Leading with soul: An uncommon journey of spirit*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boyle, M. V., & Healy, J. (2003). Balancing mysterium and onus: Doing spiritual work within emotional and emotional-laden organizational contexts. *Organization*, *10*, 351-373.

Burack, E. H. (1999). Spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*, 280-291.

Burroughs, S. M., & Eby, L. T. (1998). Psychological sense of community at work: A measurement system and explanatory framework. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *26*, 509-532.

Butts, D. (1999). Spirituality at work: An overview. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12,* 328-332.

Byrnes, N. (2005, October 10). Star search. *BusinessWeek*, pp. 44-52.

Cash, K. C., & Gray, G. R. (2000). A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace. *Academy of Management Executive*, *14,* 124-133.

Child, J. (2002). The international crisis of confidence in corporations. *Academy of Management Executive*, *16*, 142-144.

Clegg, S. R. (1992). Postmodern management? *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *5*, 31-49.

Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York: Harper Business.

Corbett, J. M. (1994). *Critical cases in organisational behaviour*. London: Macmillan.

Covaleski, M. A., Dirsmith, M. W., Heian, J. B., & Samuel, S. (1998). The calculated and the avowed: Techniques of discipline and struggles over identity in big six public accounting firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*, 293-327.

Crainer, S. (2000). *The management century*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2003). *Good business: Leadership, flow and the making of meaning*. London: Coronet.

Cunha, M. P. (2002). The best place to be: Managing control and employee loyalty in a knowledge-intensive company. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *38*, 401-415.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. (1982). *Corporate culture: The rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 341-352.

Dean, K. L., Fornaciari, C. J., & McGee, J. J. (2003). Research in spirituality, religion, and work: Walking the line between relevance and legitimacy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *16*, 378-395.

Dehler, G. E., & Welsh, M. A. (2003). The experience of work and the new workplace. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 108-122). New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Delbecq, A. L. (2000). Spirituality for business leadership. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *9*, 117-128.

Drucker, P. F. (1946). *Concept or corporation*. New York: John Day.

Drucker, P. F. (1978). *Adventures of a bystander*. New York: Harper & Row.

Drucker, P. F. (1999). Knowledge-worker productivity: The biggest challenge. *California Management Review*, *41*(2), 79-94.

Drucker, P. F. (2002, February). They're not employees, they're people. *Harvard Business Review*, 70-77.

Ellsworth, R. R. (2002). *Leading with purpose*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Emery, F., & Thorsrud, E. (1976). *Democracy at work: The report of the Norwegian industrial democracy program*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.

Fleming, P., & Sewell, G. (2002). Looking for the good soldier Svejk: Alternative modalities of resistance in the contemporary workplace. *Sociology*, *36*, 857-873.

Friedman, M. (1970, September 13). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profits. *New York Times Magazine*, p. 32.

Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (Eds.). (2003a). *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003b). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3-28). New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Gilbreath, B. (2004). Creating healthy workplaces: The supervisor's role. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 93-118). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Gratton, L. (2004). *The democratic enterprise*. London: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.

Gratton, L., & Ghoshal, S. (2003). Managing personal human capital: New ethos for the "volunteer" employee. *European Management Journal*, *21*(1), 1-10.

Guillén, M. (1997). Scientific management's lost aesthetic: Architecture, organization, and the taylorized beauty of the mechanical. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *42*, 682-715.

Hancock, P. G. (1997). Citizenship or vassalage? Organizational membership in the age of unreason. *Organization*, *4*, 93-111.

Handy, C. (2002, December). What's a business for? *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 49-55.

Ilgen, D. R., & Klein, H. J. (1988). Organizational behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *40*, 327-351.

Jensen, M., & Meckling, W. (1994). The nature of man. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, *7*(2), 4-19.

Kamoche, K. N. (2003, August). *Organizational spiritualism: Toward a critical analysis*. Presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Seattle, WA.

Kellaway, L. (2003). Tell me, please tell me, the truth about love. *Financial Times*, *21*, 5.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1998). The leadership mystique. *Academy of Management Executive*, *8*(3), 73-92.

Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (2001). Creating authentizotic organizations: Well-functioning individuals in vibrant companies. *Human Relations*, *54*, 101-111.

Kinjerski, V. M., & Skrypnek, B. J. (2004). Defining spirit at work: Finding common ground. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *17*, 26-42.

Konz, G. N. P., & Ryan, F. X. (1999). Maintaining an organizational spirituality: No easy task. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*(3), 200-210.

Krahnke, K., Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). Point-counterpoint: Measuring workplace spirituality. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *16*, 396-405.

Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering culture: Control and commitment in a high tech corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Latham, G. P. (2000). Motivate employee performance through goal-setting. In E. A. Locke (Ed.), *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (pp. 107-119). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Levering, R., & Moskowitz, M. (1993). *The 100 best companies to work for in America*. New York: Doubleday.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1984). *Goal setting: A motivational technique that works*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maharishi Center for Excellence in Management. (1997). *The Maharishi corporate development program*. Retrieved on November 1, 2005, from www.tm.org/mcdp/index2.html

Manville, B., & Ober, J. (2003). *A company of citizens*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Martin, J. (1994). The organization of exclusion: The institutionalization of sex inequality, gendered faculty jobs, and gendered knowledge in organizational theory and research. *Organization*, *1*, 401-431.

Martin, J., Knopoff, K., & Beckman, C. (1998). An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labor: Bounded emotionality at the body shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*, 429-469.

Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Harvard University.

Micklethwait, J., & Wooldridge, A. (2003). *The company: A short history of a revolutionary idea*. New York: Modern Library.

Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A. J., & Ferguson, J. (2003). Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *16*, 426-447.

Milliman, J., Ferguson, J., Trickett, D., & Condemi, B. (1999). Spirit and community at Southwest Airlines: An investigation of a spiritual values-based model. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12*, 221-233.

Mintzberg, H., Simons, R., & Basu, K. (2002, Fall). Beyond selfishness. *Sloan Management Review*, pp. 67-74.

Mitroff, I. I. (2003). Do not promote religion under the guise of spirituality. *Organization*, *10*, 375-382.

Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999a, Summer). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review*, pp. 83-91.

Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999b). *A spiritual audit of corporate America*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nichols, M. (1994). Does new age business have a message for managers? *Harvard Business Review*, *72*, 52-60.

Neal, J., & Biberman, J. (2003). Introduction: The leading edge in research on spirituality and organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *15*, 363-366.

Neck, C. P., & Milliman, J. F. (1994). Thought self-leadership: Finding spiritual fulfillment in organizational life. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *9*(6), 9-16.

O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Overell, S. (2003, September 20). Spirituality in business: A reconnection with core values. *Financial Times*, p. 11.

Parker, M. (1997). Organizations and citizenship. *Organization*, *4*, 75-92.

Pascale, R. T., & Athos, A. G. (1981). *The art of Japanese management*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run corporations*. New York: Harper & Row.

Pfeffer, J. (1994). *Competitive advantage through people: Unleashing the power of the work force*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pfeffer, J. (1997). *New directions in organization theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pfeffer, J. (2003). Business and the spirit: Management practices that sustain values. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 29-45). New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Pratt, M. G. (2000a). The good, the bad and the ambivalent: Managing identification among Amway distributors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *45*, 456-493.

Pratt, M. G. (2000b). Building an ideological fortress: The role of spirituality, encapsulation and sensemaking. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, *6*, 35-69.

Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations: Understanding written and unwritten agreements*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sandelands, L. E. (2003). The argument for God from organization studies. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *12*, 168-177.

Schalk, R., & Rousseau, D. (2001). Psychological contracts in employment. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work & organizational psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 133-142). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sewell, G. (1998). The discipline of teams: The control of team-based industrial work through electronic and peer surveillance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *43*, 397-428.

Shenhav, Y. (1995). From chaos to systems: The engineering foundations of organization theory, 1879-1932. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *40*, 557-585.

Shenhav, Y. (1999). *Manufacturing rationality: The engineering foundations of the managerial revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sloan, A. (1963). *My years with General Motors*. New York: Doubleday.

Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *18*, 257-273.

Steingard, D. S. (2005). Spiritually-informed management theory: Toward profound possibilities for inquiry and transformation. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, *14*, 227-241.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Norton.

Tepper, B. J. (2003). Organizational citizenship behavior and the spiritual employee. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 181-190). New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Tinsley, D. B. (2002). The proverbial manager. *Business Horizons*, *45*, 27-34.

Vaill, P. B. (1998). *Spirited leading and learning: Process wisdom for a new age*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Victor, B., & Cullen, J. B. (1988). The organizational bases of ethical work climates. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*, 101-125.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Waddock. S. A. (1999). Linking community and spirit: A commentary and some propositions. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *12,* 332-345.

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

Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The organization man*. New York: Penguin.

Wren, D. A. (1994). *The evolution of management thought* (4th ed.). New York: John Wiley.

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *5*(1), 84-94.

Miguel Pina e Cunha, Ph.D., is an associate professor at the Faculdade de Economia, Universidade Nova de Lisboa. His research focuses on positive management, organizational improvisation, bricolage, and the development of peripheral vision.

Arménio Rego, Ph.D., is an assistant professor at the Universidade de Aveiro. His research focuses on organizational justice and citizenship and on authentizotic organizing.

Teresa D'Oliveira, Ph.D., is an assistant professor at the Instituto Superior de Psicologia Aplicada. Her research focuses on organizational safety and human factors at work.