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Abstract: Over the last decade or so, we have witnessed a growing interest in the role of spirituality within traditional management and organisation discourse and research – a move beyond focusing on rational and non-rational issues, including those of emotion and intuition, to something perhaps more encompassing and holistic, maybe best popularised initially by Zohar and Marshall’s monograph on Spiritual Intelligence (2000). Yet, the questioning of the legitimacy of the construct of spirituality and its appropriateness in organisation discourse continues. In light of this ongoing debate, we offer an evolutionary-frame perspective on the development of the construct of spirituality, to demonstrate that while the ideas of organisational spirituality became quite popular in the twenty first century, the origins of this construct are present in the longer evolution of organisation and management thought. The paper forms part of a broader study of spirituality within contemporary organisations, investigating the relationship between employees and organisations from a spiritual perspective. The question addressed here is how did interest about and an increased presence of spirituality in organisational life evolve, the answers to which should assist comprehension of the phenomenon and contextualise further research in the field. In answering within the scope of a paper, we have combined the work of Bolman and Deal (2008) who provide a frame (multi-perspective) model that summarises traditional management and organisation literature, and that of Wilber (1996, 2000), whose meta-framework offers an integrated, non-dual perspective on reality, where external and internal, collective and individual are part and parcel of each other. We focus on how organisational thought developing within broader societal development, scientific discoveries, and achievements in philosophy, spurred the evolution of the concept of spirituality as connected and opposed to religion. This crucial dimension in answering our question is explored by outlining the main trends in conceptualising spirituality and religion, and making our case for defining both in the context of organisation discourse.
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Introduction

Over the last decade or so, we have witnessed a growing interest in the role of spirituality within traditional management discourse and research. Motivation in some cases is quite pragmatic – to make business more competitive and profitable (Krahnke, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2003); and, in others, it is driven by the realisation, that ‘different times produce different minds’ (Beck & Cowan, 1996:17) and we need new mindsets and thinking to confront contemporary organisational challenges.

Yet, while interest in spirituality grows in organisational and academic communities, pragmatism and scepticism remain (Benefiel, 2003a), grounded in difficulty with the validity...
and rigour of the construct of spirituality itself. In this paper the authors aim to address these concerns through outlining the place and role of spirituality and religion in the evolution of diverse organisational thought, and by drawing on the work undertaken in a much broader study focused on understanding the relationship between employees and organisations from a spiritual perspective. The motivation for the research is to help organisations maximise the potential of their human resources for the benefits of sustainability, especially in times of crisis.

This is achieved by exploring approaches to and definitions of spirituality and religion evolving over time; presenting an evolution-frame perspective, based on combining Bolman and Deal’s frame-based analysis of organisations with Wilber’s (1996) four quadrant meta-framework of reality; and applying this combined approach to tracing the evolution of the role and place of spirituality and religion in organisation thought through five different frames - the structural, human resource, political, symbolic and integral (holistic).

The contribution of this theoretical paper, therefore, is in using well-established frameworks from different disciplines in a novel way by creating an interdisciplinary and synergistic lens for exploring a challenging intellectual terrain.

Definition of Spirituality and Religion

To lay the foundation for discussing the evolution of the constructs of spirituality and religion in organisation and management discourse, the authors identify the overarching pattern over time of the ascendance of the former (Gibbons, 2000) and descent of the latter. These dynamics are traced through three trends in which different definitions of religion imply different attitudes to spirituality. Such a systemic approach allows the authors to avoid ‘reinvention of the wheel’ as they acknowledge historic trends in the development of thought around these two complex constructs.

The first trend is the equation of the terms of spirituality and religion. In this view, historically religion was associated with the personal (Pargament, 1999), what today we refer to as spirituality. In particular, James (1902/1997) defined religion as the experiences of individuals in their solitude, their feelings and acts. This trend evolved throughout the twentieth century with religion ascribed the characteristics of mankind’s relationship to some transcendent plane (Twigg, Wyld, & Brown, 2001). Specifically, religion (spirituality) was about a belief and attitude (James, 1902/1997), a search for meaning in life (Frankl, 1998; King & Nicol, 1999), and a desire to be more in contact with a transcendent entity (Allport & Ross, 1967).

The second trend started with the surfacing of the distinct construct of spirituality in the scholarly psychological literature (Jung, 1932; Maslow, 1970). Later on, it took a clear route in opposition to religion. The consequent fierce discussion created two camps. The first looks at spirituality as widely embraceable, personalised, even secularized, spiritual faith traditions (Mitroff & Denton, 1999). Spirituality, through this lens, is ascribed with an inclusive, personal search for meaning and spiritual experiences of a higher power or higher purpose (Tisdell, 2002). Religion, on the other hand, is described negatively as dogmatic, oppressive, restrictive, exclusive, and narrow (Mitroff & Denton, 1999). In the second camp, it is religion that is given a positive stance of depth, commitment, obligations, and focus (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985), while spirituality is criticised for its shallowness and seeking-oriented attitude (Wuthnow, 1998).
The third trend, the perspective adopted in the present research, attempts to reconcile spirituality and religion. It emphasises the internality of spirituality and the externality of religion, while believing there is no reason for opposition to exist between the two. For instance, Edwards (2003) applies Wilber’s (1996) integral framework to the concept of spirituality and concludes that interior (individual and collective) (spiritual) experiences are represented by the exterior (individual and collective) (religious) practices.

Drawing from the wealth of discourse on spirituality and religion, then, spirituality is conceptualised in accord with two main themes that are present in the literature: the existentialist or human (expressed through the search for meaning) (Driver, 2007; Neck & Milliman, 1994; Pauchant, 1995; Sheep, 2004); and the transcendent or sacred. The latter theme is expressed through connection to something greater than oneself (Ashforth & Pratt, 2003; Konz & Ryan, 1999), through the outgrowth of limitations and transcendence of consciousness (Helminiak, 2001; Rothberg, 1993; Wilber, 2006), and through the content of one’s ultimate concerns (Emmons, 1999; Tillich, 1959).

In light of this theoretical analysis, the authors conceptualise spirituality, then, as the inherently human condition of searching for meaning and connecting to the transcendent, and religion as the exterior-based expression of spirituality through rituals. The overwhelming contemporary use of the term ‘religion’, which implies organisational, ritual and ideological dimensions is, nonetheless, also acknowledged (Gibbons, 2000).


Having determined the definitions of spirituality and religion, we move to providing a brief evolutionary-frame perspective on the development of the construct of spirituality in organisation discourse to demonstrate that, while notions of organisational spirituality are currently growing in popularity, this construct originated much earlier, evolving over centuries into present organisation and management thought.

This effort, then, is applied to increasing the legitimate weight of the construct of spirituality within organisation discourse by sketching the evolution of interest in and presence of spirituality to assist comprehension of the phenomenon and to contextualise further research in the field. This is achieved by combining Bolman and Deal’s (2008) multi-perspective model summarising traditional management and organisation literature, with Wilber’s (1996, 2000b) meta-framework - an integrated, non-dual perspective on reality where external and internal, collective and individual, are part and parcel of each other. In particular, the focus and assumptions of each of Bolman and Deal’s (2008) four frames – structural, human resources, political, and symbolic - coincide with those of the four quadrants of Wilber’s (1996) meta-framework (see Table 1). By demonstrating the correlation and commonality between these two well-recognised frameworks, one from management discourse and the other from consciousness and evolution discourse, the authors endeavour to produce a convincing case for theoretical analysis of the various facets of the construct of spirituality and religion as they evolved together with management and organisation phenomena.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual (Part)</th>
<th>Individual (Part)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Intentional)</td>
<td>(Behavioral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>Political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscious:</td>
<td>Bodily:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings, meanings, Desires, beliefs</td>
<td>Behaviour, habits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collective (Whole)</th>
<th>Collective (Whole)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td>Exterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cultural)</td>
<td>(Social)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-subjective</td>
<td>Inter-objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>Structural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Shared:</td>
<td>Societally Structured:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs, goals, meaning, values</td>
<td>Behaviour, rules, roles, structure/function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Integral*

Combines all four perspectives; Represents the non-dual level of consciousness; Admits the validity of inner experiences; Holographic interpretation of relationship between parts and wholes

Specifically, Bolman and Deal’s (2008) structuralist frame, with its focus on organisation rules, roles, functions and hierarchies, is congruent with Wilber’s (1996, 2000a,b) lower right (LR) inter-objective quadrant, which is about social communication, systems, and socially structured behaviours. Bolman and Deal’s (2008) human resources frame fits into Wilber’s (1996; 2000) upper left quadrant (UL), a subjective ‘I’ domain, which represents the world of personal feelings, desires, and beliefs. Wilber’s (1996, 2000) exterior individual level, upper right quadrant (UR) is about objectively expressed behaviours, encompassing Bolman and Deal’s (2008) political frame, dealing with the instrumentality of relationships between people in organisations. The inter-subjective lower left (LL) quadrant is Wilber’s (1996; 2000) ‘we’ concept - shared beliefs, goals and values. It represents culture and symbolic thinking - Bolman and Deal’s (2008) symbolic frame.

Implicitly present in both frameworks is the integral/holistic frame, based on a premise that each quadrant/frame is a different representation of the same phenomenon. For instance, if we look at the objectively registered behaviour (UR) of an individual according to Wilber’s model, it has its representation in the subjective experiences of this individual (UL), as well as his/her experiences in a group as part of the collective subjective experience (LL), which, in turn, can be manifested objectively (LR). Thus, in this work, the fifth holistic frame is introduced to exhaustively cover the place of spirituality in management literature and research, understood through accounting for different sets of assumptions complementing each
other and creating the holistic reality of organisation and management discourse, and the role of spirituality and religion therein.

**The Structural Frame**

Given the main assumptions of Bolman and Deal’s (2008) structural frame - that organisations exist with well-defined roles, to increase efficiency and performance through specialisation, we differentiate between human beings’ inherent need for structure and the transient nature of the still dominant image in organisational thought - the mechanistic Newtonian-Cartesian paradigm (Capra, 1975; Chalofsky, 2003; Zohar, 1990).

Here, we trace the emergence of personal spirituality at the dawn of the 16th-19th centuries, grounded in discoveries in physics and astronomy revealing the primacy of the human mind - the ‘valorisation’ of man – celebrating the individual’s dignity and value (Bruni, 2002). The dysfunctional result of ‘valorisation’ was individualism as a dominating mindset for creating a new economics described in Adam Smith’s seminal work (Weymes, 2005) for the emergent industrial society, premised on a lack of individual spirituality. Examples include separateness of individuals as they began to barter (Bruni, 2002); self-interest, and egoism, as individuals displayed ‘optimal’, self-interest oriented behaviour (Bruni, 2002; Weymes, 2005); an increasing lack of morality grounded in the priority of satisfying desires without questioning their content (Novak, 1996); and illusion about and imposition of control as individuals are guided by the deterministic cause-effect principle (Chalofsky, 2003).

As personal spirituality, in the form of the principles of interconnectedness, selflessness, ethics, and responsibility for one’s actions (Cash, Gray, & Rood, 2000; Gibbons, 2000), was removed from organisational life, the role of organised religion increased. Idealistically, 19th century thinkers saw religion as a uniting force (Durkheim, 1914/1983; Weber, 1930). In practice, Weber’s (1930) argument for seeing work as the Calvinist concept of ‘calling’ in the context of his view of Protestant ethics (Klenke, 2005), took the form of ‘industrial betterment’. Although it was an idealistic and genuine attempt on the part of philosophers to provide workers with meaningful work (Barley & Kunda, 1992), organisational spirituality, in reality, became the imposition of religious guidance as moral codes and control by enlightened-paternalistic managers over the behaviour of what were perceived as the dependent, infantile, and immature minds of workers (Ackers & Preston, 1997; Cunha, Rego, & D’Oliveira, 2004; Rose, 1990; Wren, 1994).

From the early 20th century and Taylor’s, Gilbreth’s and Fayol’s dominant scientific management approach (Weymes, 2005), personal spirituality was feared as the source of uncertainty, something being challenged by scientific developments, resulting in spirituality being reduced to charity work and after-work church attendance (Alvesson, 1982).

However, contemporary views on organisational spirituality were initiated by Mary Parker Follett (1918, 1924) who believed that creation of community at work, through harmony and humility, would create a spiritual organisation – a visible manifestation of God, with organisation as ‘theophany’. Subsequent post-war organisation thought introduced new collaborative organising principles and flatter, more democratic structures which indicated that personal spirituality, through increased personal responsibility and awareness, was once more ascendant (Cloke & Goldsmith, 2002). Simultaneously, worker-priests (Bell, 2007) represented the church’s concern with working class estrangement and aimed at ‘freeing’ their minds through ‘liberation theology’ (Gutiérrez, 1973, 1999).
Today, the social context of globalisation and advanced technologies challenges traditional organisational structures and provides opportunities for considering transformative understanding of the spiritual traditions in management and leadership theory and practice. For instance, Frost and Egri (1994) look at the process of organisational change through the spiritual (shamanic) lens. For them, the classical paradigm, in this spiritual view, is classified as the ordinary world of reality (as opposed to the symbolic world, the world of energy and the world of holism), where the ego-centric individual is separate from the world, with a linear time perspective and restricted to direct sensory experience. Their solution to changing structures and rules lies in altering the mindset of managers who should become like shamans, entering different ‘realities’ with a heightened state of awareness.

Thus, the history of the constructs of spirituality and religion, through the structural frame, display the evolution of the organisational paradigm and show that the strength of the construct of personal spirituality in organisations is a sign of a developing organisational mindset, while strengthening of the role of organised religion displays the concerns of a managerial elite to sustain control over productivity and performance. According to Wilber’s (1996, 2000b) integral principle of the mutual quadrants’ representation, the way the role of organisational structure is seen is also expressed through the role of an individual within it, covered by Bolman and Deal’s (2008) human resource frame.

The Human Resource (HR) Frame

Revelations in the mid 20th century, that people’s perceptions and feelings affect work quality (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1966), led owners/executives to focus on individuals’ inner characteristics, prompting questions about human freedom and dignity (Bolman and Deal, 2008).

To find answers, a more sensitive understanding was required which the human resources/human relations approach displayed. New assumptions about the nature and role of individuals and organisations emerged: organisations should serve human needs, not the reverse; people and organisations require each other to achieve their goals (Bolman and Deal, 2008:122); and the relationship between individuals and organisations should be built on the principle of alignment of human and organisational needs (Quatro, 2004). Humanisation of the workplace might be considered a ‘romantic’ aspiration, most clearly expressed in McGregor’s (1960) acclaimed Theory Y, positing that people are genuinely good. This premise included both – workers (who were trusted and given responsibility) and managers (who had clear motives and were not inclined to manipulate employees). The anti-organisation theory of the late 1970’s was a vivid example of priorities given to humanistic values (including maximisation of human potential) as opposed to instrumental rationality (Alvesson, 1982; Kriger & Hanson, 1999).

While humanisation of the workplace had spiritual potential, debate around incorporating humanistic principles into organisational life was limited by post-war organisational thinking focused on self-preservation, survival, and a belief in the scarcity of financial and human resources (Biberman & Whitty, 1997; Quatro, 2004). What is spiritual here was introduced by Maslow, a psychologist deeply interested in the spiritual development of individuals (Quatro, 2004). His concept of spirituality included not only self-actualising, as self fulfillment, but also self-transcendence, and achieving selflessness, the ultimate expression of one’s real self (Bell & Taylor, 2001; Quatro, 2004). Moreover, he argued that organisations
have a responsibility to provide employees with meaningful work that helps them self-actualise, thus marrying job design, motivational theory, and spirituality (Quatro, 2004).

In contemporary organisation discourse, the infusion of HR practices with organisational spirituality discourse is increasing (Brandt, 1996), with reports on innovative HR practices of high performing organisations encouraging and rewarding employees for their holistic approach to life, such as healthy lifestyles, eco-friendly choices, etc. (Laabs, 1995). Researchers discuss the incorporation of moral codes inspired by holy scriptures, such as the Bible and Talmud, to establish employer-employee relationships based on trust, fair treatment, respect, and clear understanding of responsibilities (Cohn & Friedman, 2002). Positive correlations have been established in research on workplace spirituality aspects and job design (Garg & Rastogi, 2006), and individual values have been identified as predictors of HR decision-making (McGuire, Garavan, Saha, & O’Donnell, 2006).

Moreover, there is increasing evidence that Management, Spirituality and Religion (MSR) discourse contributes particularly to transforming HR practice. Workplace spirituality is found to be related to such HR variables as positive employee attitudes, reduced intention to quit, increased intrinsic work satisfaction, job involvement, job and organisation commitment, enhanced organisational performance, increased morale and honesty, trust in the organisation, and employees’ enhanced sense of personal fulfillment (King, 2008; Krishnakumar & Neck, 2002; Milliman, Czaplewski, & Ferguson, 2003; Milliman & Ferguson, 1999; Moxley, 2000).

So, HR theory and practice has been significantly influenced by spiritual ideas and, in turn, has influenced HR practice focused on the relationship between employees and their organisations.

The Political Frame

Questions about the intentions of business towards workers are better highlighted through the political perspective. This looks at the relationship between an individual and an organisation via underlying assumptions, viewing organisations as coalitions where members’ values, perceptions of reality, and beliefs are different, and where people compete for scarce resources, making conflict an inevitable part of organisational life and power its most important asset (Bohlman and Deal, 2008).

Two main streams consider the place of spirituality and religion in political discourse. The first includes the religious rhetoric of using corporate culture as a tool of managerial control, including utilisation of pastoral power (Willmott, 1993), spiritual ideologies (Pratt, 2000), religious ‘self-creation of new identities’ (Martin, 1993), and conversion techniques such as management development (Ackers & Preston, 1997). The second includes the political rhetoric of workplace spirituality discourse, in particular – the debate between instrumental and non-instrumental camps of MSR discourse and discussion of the appropriateness of seeing workplace spirituality as an organisational resource (Bell & Taylor, 2003; Forray & Stork, 2002; Singhal & Chatterjee, 2006; Zhuravleva & Jones, 2005, 2006) and the ultimate source of competitive advantage (Overell, 2003).

The political use of religious and/or spiritual language in the interests of an organisational elite is best expressed through the construct of pastoral power, traced by Foucault back to the Christian metaphor of the shepherd, whose role is to gather together dispersed individuals as a flock and ensure their salvation by keeping watch over them (Bell & Taylor, 2003). As
a technology of power, Christian pastorship includes assumption of responsibility for every individual within the flock; proclaims individual obedience as a virtue and end in itself; implies a ‘peculiar type of knowledge’ between the pastor and his flock, based on knowledge of the individuals’ material needs, their public actions and their secret sins; and emphasises individual salvation achieved by getting to know an individual’s innermost thoughts through use of the Christian techniques of examination, confession, guidance and correction. As its application declined in ecclesiastical institutions, pastoral power was adopted by Western institutions, including corporations, and used through micro-technologies requiring detailed knowledge of the person (Foucault, 1982).

Its influence can be seen within many Japanese work organisations, where religious and spiritual expression forms an integral part of working life (Rohlen, 1974). For example, Kondo’s (1990) ethnographic study of a small confectionery factory examined the program of company-sponsored spiritual education whose objective was to develop self-reliant people, spiritually strong enough to work in the organisation. Kondo demonstrates that these discourses of self-transformation “are not innocent with respect to power relationships” (Kondo, 1987:269). Through the technologies of examination, confession, guidance and correction, pastoral power is exercised in relation to the individual, oriented towards achieving the disciplinary production of organisational subjects by ensuring compliance in task performance and attitudes to work.

Apart from Foucault’s framework, the literature from the sociology of religion richly informs the organisational discourse of culture as religion and religion (spirituality) as power, revealing how contemporary Western business understands the political importance of power over employees’ minds (Cunha, Rego, & D’Oliveira, 2003).

Pratt (2000), for example, explores the role of spiritual ideology in maintaining organisational control through the techniques of conversion (“how a “person gives up one such perspective or ordered view of the world for another”) and encapsulation (how organisational members are isolated from non-members and other sources of information that may be viewed as being in conflict with organisational beliefs, values, or practices). Further, Kunda’s (1992) study of a high-tech corporation reveals the whole method of colonisation through the process of socialisation of managers into the values of the organisation (Ackers & Preston, 1997), finding that the organisation wants not only ‘your seat’ but also ‘your soul’.

MSR researchers discuss the political frame as the clash between instrumental and non-instrumental (informed by spiritual Eastern and Western traditions) approaches to spirituality (Zhuravleva & Jones, 2006), where workplace spirituality (WPS) uses spiritual rhetoric as a sophisticated form of organisational power. In this debate, the advocates of non-instrumentality warn colleagues about the dangers of the instrumental handling of spirituality through manipulating employees ((Bell & Taylor, 2001; Fornaciari & Lund Dean, 2001), openly imposing top management spiritual views by proselytizing everyone into thinking alike (Cunha, Rego & D’Oliveira, 2003), forcing employees to join ‘happy families’ (Boje, 1995; Willmott, 1993), and trivialising deep spiritual traditions (Benefiel, 2003b).

The advocates of positivistic handling of organisational spirituality clearly state organisations need conclusive evidence showing that spirituality positively affects bottom line performance otherwise it will not be given priority (italics added) (Krahmke et al., 2003:398), their “long term goal [being] … to understand how spirituality can contribute to more productive organizations” (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000:143).
The Symbolic Frame

The symbolic frame encompasses thinking in common with a key aspect of spirituality – understanding the world as possibilities of multiple ‘realities’ (Frost and Egri, 1994), and human capacity to create and understand symbols (Brady & Hart, 2002). Bolman and Deal (2008) suggest the main focus of such thinking is on the interpretation of reality – not on ‘reality’ itself – the same events have multiple meanings because different people interpret them differently. It is symbolic thinking that channels and anchors our thoughts and feelings into the purpose and passion we strive to find in personal and work lives through stories, myths, heroes, rituals, and ceremonies (Bolman and Deal, 2008:253).

Over the last four decades, the symbolic frame has been fuelled by conversations about how organisations create meaning. Although both culture and spirituality studies are concerned with meaning creation, the dominating discussion of meaning happened in culture studies outside the framework of spirituality (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Martin, Frost, & O’Neill, 2006; Ouchi, 1981; Schein, 1985; Van Maanen & Barley, 1984).

In the last decade, at the organisational level of analysis, the culture and spiritual literature (MSR) unite in their descriptive accounts of meaning-providing organisations including excellent cultures (Peters & Waterman, 1982), empowering cultures (Nixon, 1994), inspiring workplaces (Fawcett, Brau, Rhoads, & Whittlark, 2008), contemplative organisations (Duerr, 2004), spiritually-based firms (Bradley & Kauanui, 2003; Wagner-Marsh & Conley, 1999), balanced spiritual cultures (Biberman, Whitty, & Robbins, 1999), and spiritual practices and rituals based organisations (Bell & Taylor, 2003).

At the personal level of analysis, the search for meaning at work is concerned with individuals’ expression of their inner spirituality at work. Some MSR researchers equate personal spirituality with the search (or quest) for meaning in life (Neck & Milliman, 1994).

Other conceptualisations equate culture to religion. Demerath and Schmitt (1998) point out that, if religion is defined not in terms of the divine or supernatural but, instead, as a system of meaning constructed around historical and mythical narratives and reinforced by specific ritual practices, any organisation that has explicitly articulated values intended to be shared by all members could be understood as religious. This treats religion as a dimension of social experience. Spirituality, then, becomes a transcendent component which motivates people outside known ‘religions’ (cultures) into a search for meaning and understanding, and exposes them, through cross-cultural, pluralistic interpretations of ideas, to multiple religious (cultural) traditions (Bell & Taylor, 2003).

A Holistic Frame

Finally, the integral frame as an overarching lens is used. The principles of holism originate from the works of Smuts (1926/1999), Bateson (1972/1999), and Pepper (1942). The underlying concept of the holistic/integral approach is that phenomena can be known only in context, so mind-body, subject-object are two aspects of the same process. The whole is more than, and different from, the sum of the parts (Craig, 2006).

Intuitively, all humans move towards balance, harmony and integration, which is why this frame in organisational discourse is so versatile. New millennium literature reveals many attempts at integrating, uniting, and balancing, with holistic models applied in knowledge management (Diakoulakis, Georgopoulos, Koulouriotis, & Emiris, 2004), professional and
management development (Cardno, 2005; Shefy & Sadler-Smith, 2006), holistic performance management (Andersen, Henriksen, & Aarseth, 2006), the HR based strategic approach to managing (Peach Martins, 2007), and organisational change (Ragsdell, 2000).

We use Cacioppe and Edwards’ (2005) typology of integral approaches as a guide to identifying the presence of the holistic frame in organisational discourse and the role and place of spirituality in it. One stream concentrates on the ‘balancing’ of external (social) aspects of one’s life such as family, career, and community commitments (Drew & Murtagh, 2005; Eikhof, Warhurst, & Haunschild, 2007) with strategically oriented models, here attempting to combine external aspects of organisation (products, services, quality of people’s lives), such as McKinsey 7S framework (Kaplan & Norton, 2001; Rasiel & Friga, 2001), the balanced scorecard, and triple/quadruple bottom line approaches (Henriques & Richardson, 2004).

The more philosophically oriented perspective juxtaposes different worldviews. The discriminative power of these models illuminates much organisational discourse and stimulates holistic thinking, and shows why such models gained popularity as evident in Burrell and Morgan’s (1979) matrix, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) competing values framework, Harre’s (1984) ‘personal being model’, and Lonergan’s (1972) authentic subjectivity theory. Here the debate rotates around the holistic principle of the subject and object being parts of the same process.

Contemporary organisation discourse draws heavily on the seminal works of integral theories which attend to holistic principles of evolution and transcendence through both developmental and multi-paradigmatic lenses. Some concentrate more on the developmental aspect of consciousness, such as Gustavsson’s (2001) research on individual and organisational learning, grounded in transformation to higher stages of development. Others, such as Graves’ spiral dynamics theory, popularised by Beck and Cowan (1996), encompass all principles of holistic/integral thinking. However, the most influential figure to introduce the principles of integration and spirituality into organisation discourse remains, as mentioned throughout, Wilber (1996; 2000), whose integral theory is increasingly used by contemporary organisational researchers (Barrett, 1998; Burke, 2006; Cacioppe, 2000a, 2000b; Cacioppe & Edwards, 2005; Pauchant, 2005; Volckmann, 2005; Waddock, 1999; Young, 2002) in resolving challenges to achieving harmonious organisational life.

Various approaches to organisational spirituality attempt to explain such organisational life, covering both ends of the part/whole dimension (Mirvis, 1997; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Neal & Biberman, 2003). Some holistically oriented themes in MSR include research on authenticity and integrity, aligning one’s inner beliefs with actions, and being true to one’s Self (Druhl, Langstaff, & Monson, 2001; Lips-Wiersma, 2003); and research on balance and interconnectedness at the organisational level (Bierly III, Kessler, & Christensen, 2000; Smith & Rayment, 2007; Waddock, 1999).

Conclusion

In summary, notions of spirituality are not some new fangled touchy feely fix for contemporary organisation woes. This paper has demonstrated the longevity of the construct and addressed some concerns over its rigour and validity. This has been accomplished through revealing how its role in organisation discourse has escalated since the 20th century as organisational thinking evolved from scientific management to more flexible structures, with in-
creased individual freedom, and power over employees being transformed into power with employees, through applying the holistic principles of harmony and inclusion.

In general, application of five different frames of mind (assumptions), representing organisation and management discourse, helps to ground the concept of spirituality, differentiate it from the concept of religion, and demonstrate how the evolution of workplace spirituality, at both personal and organisational levels, has been part of the overall development of organisational thought. That it is now increasingly recognised, alongside the work of Seligman (1990, 2002) on happiness and the positive psychology movement, is important in our ongoing challenging and ambiguous global organisational environment, where the search for individual and corporate meaning is growing.

Moreover, the assertion of the theory of spiral dynamics, that different times produce different minds (Beck & Cowan, 1996), as mentioned earlier, has been tested as an evolutionary perspective on the development of the spirituality/religion construct. This has demonstrated that each organisational era challenges our spiritual and religious lives in specific ways, and, consequently, understanding how to enhance our spirituality can shed light on ways to improve organisational life in general.

In combining two well known theoretical frameworks, used to develop such understanding, further insight into the complexity of managing the sustainable 21st century organisation has emerged. Subsequent papers will extend the arguments and findings herein, reporting on results of the larger research project of which this forms the initial part. That research elaborates the relationships between individuals and organisations which enable or constrain organisational performance, grounded in the ability for individuals to develop spiritually both in their personal and professional lives.
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