



CREaTE

Canterbury Research and Theses Environment

Canterbury Christ Church University's repository of research outputs

<http://create.canterbury.ac.uk>

Please cite this publication as follows:

Scherer, B. and Waistell, J. (2016) Höpfl and Hanh's metaphorical mediation of intercorporeal ethicality. *Culture and Organization*, 23. pp. 118-130. ISSN 1475-9551.

Link to official URL (if available):

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14759551.2016.1239103>

This version is made available in accordance with publishers' policies. All material made available by CReaTE is protected by intellectual property law, including copyright law. Any use made of the contents should comply with the relevant law.

Contact: create.library@canterbury.ac.uk



Inter-(c)are

Inter-(c)are:

Höpfl and Hanh's metaphorical mediation of intercorporeal ethicality

Abstract

We identify one of Höpfl's key contributions; her metaphorical mediation of intercorporeal ethicality. Höpfl uses metaphor to communicate an ethics that is not based on cognitive, calculative and theorising rationality but is a state of being ethical that proceeds from the heart and a recognition of interconnected bodies. We direct the research question that emerges from Höpfl's work towards that of Thich Nhat Hanh, an Engaged Buddhist leader: how does his metaphorical discourse communicate the relationship between mindfulness and intercorporeal ethicality? Our analysis reveals how Hanh employs metaphors to mediate how mindfulness provides insight to our physical interdependence and thereby promotes mutual care: realising our indivisible unity, we care for each other. Key contributions are new theories of embodied ethicality (an ethics based on interconnected bodies) and embodying metaphor (metaphors that communicate the unity, interconnectedness and interdependence of bodies that care for one other).

Keywords: Embodied ethicality, Engaged Buddhism, Heather Höpfl, metaphor, mindfulness, Thich Nhat Hanh.

Inter-(c)are

Introduction to selected Höpfl themes

This paper commemorates and builds on Heather Höpfl's impact on organisation studies, with reference to her writings on the body, ethics, the other, religiosity and metaphor. We select these topics given that Heather integrates them in her contribution to the field of organisational ethics. Building on her work, we explore how metaphors explicate and mediate the relationship between mindfulness and intercorporeal ethicality. Our article shows how Hanh's metaphorical discourse mediates interdependence and promotes ethicality. From our analysis, we produce new theories of embodied ethicality and embodying metaphor.

Our interdisciplinary approach is in accordance with Heather's legacy. Just as she drew on Catholicism, we explore the themes in one Buddhist tradition, namely Thich Nhat Hanh's teachings on mindfulness. We take up and develop Höpfl's legacy by exploring it with reference to Hanh's mindfulness, given the strong similarity in how both authors address religiosity and intercorporeal ethicality, and use metaphors to mediate their understanding. Although these authors discuss different faith traditions, exploring their commonalities is commensurate with the notion of intercorporeality. Furthermore, both traditions encourage interfaith dialogue – and Hanh (2000) conceives of 'Jesus and Buddha as Brothers'.

A more general examination of the themes is beyond our scope. For example, there is no space here to explore organisational ethics generally, the fundamental tensions between homogeneity and heterogeneity, or the relationship between corporate discourse about intercorporeality and the complexities, difficulties and tensions in workplace relationships. Also beyond our scope are other Buddhist traditions and exponents of mindfulness; instead, we restrict ourselves to Hanh as one significant

Inter-(c)are

example that is highly salient to our selected Höpfl themes: religiosity, embodied ethics and alterity, and metaphorical mediation.

Religiosity

Höpfl (2007) argues that organisations and religiosity possess common ground, given their shared emphasis on rituality, theatricality and performativity, and their mutual desire for meaning, order and enchantment. Critchley, Höpfl et al. (2012, 270) do not construct a separate theology of organisation with its own ethics. Instead, they enquire ‘how theological concepts are already at work within organizational theory and practice’ and how they can aid theories and practices, as ‘concepts of organization can often be recognized as secularized, theological concepts’. They introduce Case et al. (2012), commenting that the article calls for ‘more contemplative understandings of organizations, and suggest how such a possibility may be present in forms of embodied ethics’ (Critchley, Höpfl et al. 2012, 277). Case et al. (2012) posit contemplation as a way to be present, receptive and aware of organisational relations. They refer to ‘corporeal enactment of ethics over rational and cognitive theorization’, and ‘the situated facticity of the body’ in ‘an apprehension and appreciation of ethical moments’ (Case et al. 2012, 358). Furthermore, they note Rhodes and Pullen’s (2009) arguments that corporeal ethics exceed codes, observing how the former posit generosity and altruism rooted in human relationships.

Case et al. (2012) suggest a possible close parallel between corporeal ethics and contemplation, as both entail situated connectedness, and argue for future research that articulates the relationship between them. We take up that challenge with reference to Hanh’s exposition of the relationship between mindfulness and intercorporeal

Inter-(c)are

ethicality: being aware of our interdependence (inter-are) can translate into ethical orientation towards each other (inter-care). This leads us to our next Höpfl theme.

Embodied ethics and alterity

Some academics explore the theme of embodied ethics and alterity. For example, Dale and Latham (2015, 166) ‘argue for an approach to embodiment which recognises its inextricable relationship with multiple materialities’. Bevan and Corvellec (2007, 217) argue that corporations lack the bodily subjectivity that is the precondition of an orientation to the other; hence ‘only humans can act ethically and because corporations are not humans, it is impossible to speak of corporate ethics’. We question their rejection of the literality of metaphorical understandings of corporate corporeality, as an organisation consists of bodies and acts as one body.

Höpfl (2000, 32) notes Kristeva’s (1983) notion of “‘herethics’”: a praxis based on love’, arguing that it is ‘an implicit ethical practice’ (Höpfl 2003a, 33). She proposes that ‘an understanding of goodness and organisations’ relates to ‘borders and their demarcation’ and ‘the boundary of the body and sociality and love; it concerns ethics...’ (Höpfl 2003a, 33). Heather refers to Docherty (1996, 66) regarding a disposition towards alterity that involves confusing ontological statuses and the ‘ethical implications of this “seeming otherwise”...in the disappearance of a totalized selfhood.’ ‘The ethics of alterity’ (Höpfl 2003a, 33) makes possible the ‘ethics of the interpersonal, the encounter with otherness...’ (34). Heather advocates a nurturing, compassionate community that develops concern for the other through embodied goodness: she is not concerned with abstract goodness but with ways of interacting. Accordingly, she conceives of ‘the organization as living, physical bodies’ (Höpfl 2002, 11) and concerns herself with often painful embodied organisational experiences

Inter-(c)are

(Höpfl 2000). Höpfl (2003c, xix) recognises the equivocality of embodied experience and subject (e.g. in her reference to ‘division, separation, rupture, tearing, and blood’). In this context, she advocates an ethics ‘where we choose voluntarily to bear each others burden’ [sic] (Milbank 2006, 402, in Critchley, Höpfl et al. 2012, 270) and to do so ‘what is demanded to enter the organisational performance is an acquiescent heart’ (Höpfl 2007, 157). We next examine Heather’s use of metaphor, as both she and Hanh rely on metaphors, such as the heart, to convey intercorporeal ethics.

Metaphorical mediation

Heather recognises the deficiencies of narrative, which reveals but subjects (Höpfl 2003b), and of metaphor (e.g. that it does not do justice to the experience that it aims to convey) (Höpfl 2000). Nevertheless, she metaphorises organisations and analyses the metaphors at play within them; for example, she saw ‘organizations as theatre (theatre as metaphor)’ (Schreyögg and Höpfl 2004, 691). She regards the trope as ‘the vehicle for movement’, which carries meanings that confer identity, moving the subject to another position or state (Höpfl 2000, 26). In relation to the previous discussion, she particularly focuses on ‘transformational metaphors as the vehicle for change; to incorporation’ (30). An example of such a metaphor is the heart, which moves organisational members towards compassion, generosity and a disposition towards others (Höpfl 2008). Such religious metaphors take on a specific meaning in organisations, moving participants towards particular performances and outcomes: hence, the heart is a powerful organisational metaphor, restoring the body to the management text. The heart metaphorises love, compassion and a disposition towards others, while the Sacred Heart metaphorises ‘a loss of meaning in organizational life: where abstract symbols and rituals of corporate life come to substitute for humanity and

Inter-(c)are

compassion' (Höpfl 2008, 237). Heather's study calls for a further exploration of the heart metaphor 'in order to recover love and generosity at the heart of the symbol' (Höpfl 2008, 239). Our study responds to this call.

The heart metaphor – related to love, compassion and generosity – links with other studies on these topics. For example, Hughes et al. (2005) highlight the importance of embodied interdependence, reciprocity in human relationships, relational caring, and an ethics of care. Similarly, Dutton et al. (2006, 59) theorise 'how individual compassion in response to human pain in organizations becomes socially coordinated through a process' they call 'compassion organizing.' The theory specifies five mechanisms, one of which is 'enabling of attention', and the process of compassion organising enables members to move from pain to healing – themes that we will elaborate next.

Thich Nhat Hanh's mindfulness and metaphors

Developing Höpfl's themes, we critically examine embodying metaphors within the mindfulness discourse of Thich Nhat Hanh, leader of the 'Community of Interbeing', a network of Engaged Buddhists. Exiled from Vietnam, following his 1966 peace mission to the U.S. and Europe, in 1982 Hanh founded his core community in Plum Village, France (plumvillage.org). He travelled worldwide to explain how mindfulness fosters ethical engagement. Hanh is widely credited for coining the term 'Engaged Buddhism', which is 'a contemporary form of Buddhism that engages actively yet non-violently with the social, economic, political (...), and ecological problems of society' (King 2009, 1). He is one of Engaged Buddhism's most prominent proponents, holding a uniquely influential position in the dialogue and negotiations of Buddhism(s) with

Inter-(c)are

contemporary work and life. Therefore, his teachings on interbeing and mindfulness promise to yield valuable insights for organisational ethicality.

In Early Buddhism, ‘mindfulness’ is a function of mind and an important practice (Kuan 2008, 1) that is explained as various contemplative techniques and states pertaining to the body, feelings, states of mind, and mental concepts. Observing the breath plays a prominent role. Mindfulness remains one of the core meditational techniques within most mainstream Buddhist traditions. It is often seen as the only path to liberation and interpellated or even identified with the technique of *vipassanā*, analytical insight meditation (Kuan 2008, 9).

Buddhist mindfulness traditions ought not to be confused with their modernist, transnational, and predominantly secular appropriations in the form of ‘mindfulness’ in organisational studies. As Weick and Putnam (2006) and Brummans et al. (2013, 347-348) note, the mainstream (secular) concept of mindfulness in management theory differs from Buddhist concepts of mindfulness, focusing more on reducing mindlessness rather than cultivating mindfulness. Yet there are examples of explicitly Buddhist understandings successfully invoked in organisations (Brummans et al. 2013).

Building on Höpfl’s work, we investigate how Hanh’s teaching and metaphors of mindfulness inform embodied ethicality in organisations. In Hanh’s Engaged Buddhism, mindfulness that focuses on interbeing and inter-care necessarily forms the foundation for any meaningful ethicality (see King 2009, 48-49). Notwithstanding the complex nature of Buddhist ethics, with its virtues and codes, we elucidate how Hanh’s metaphorical discourse explicates and mediates the relationship between mindfulness and intercorporeal ethicality.

To make our discussion of Hanh’s (inter)corporeal mindfulness fruitful for business ethics, we contextualise it within relevant management literature. Generally,

Inter-(c)are

organisation theory ought to integrate the body, in order to understand how organisations operate (Styhre 2004). More specifically, Roberts (2001, 109) asserts that ‘the ground of ethics lies in our corporeal sensibility to proximate others. Such moral sensibility, however, is readily blunted by a narcissistic preoccupation with self.’ Ethics is both corporeal and intercorporeal (Diprose 2002). Accordingly, Pullen and Rhodes (2014) argue that organisational ethics is both embodied and focused on the other; countering rational and managerial approaches in organisational ethics research, they articulate an ethics that is pre-reflective in origin, embodied in character, and oriented to the other.

This empirical paper substantiates and extends Hancock’s (2008) theorising of an organisational ethics of generosity that is embodied and cooperative, and in doing so distances itself from the legislative (rational and rule-governed) and virtue (self-constitutive, self-identity, and self-improvement) perspectives that dominate business ethics; ‘in contrast to these approaches an ethics of generosity would seek neither simple legislative compliance nor the pursuit of virtue through the objectification of the other, but rather would pursue an openness to the other...’ (Hancock 2008, 1370).

How can organisational members communicate embodied ethics? Metaphors enable comprehension and expression of embodied experiences, acting as ‘vehicles for embodying the unconscious and expressing feeling-states that would be otherwise difficult to communicate through linear thought’ (Kupers 2013, 499). Moreover, being in the flesh, moral philosophy relies on bodily metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson 1999). Accordingly, Hanh’s metaphorical discourse conveys (inter)corporeal ethicality: a visceral ethics that is embodied in the carnal body (Merleau-Ponty 1968), not an ‘ethics that is out of touch with the body’ (Shildrick 1997, 172).

Inter-(c)are

Developing the themes

Intercorporeality and ethicality

In Buddhism, there is no independent self; this doctrine of no-self proceeds from the observation that everything is interdependent. For embodied experience, this means that the artificial subject body ultimately incorporates the object bodies; this universal interconnectedness generates the Buddhist ideal of universal compassion (Stoler Miller 1979). The ethical implication of interconnectedness is that ‘we cannot but care for our neighbor, not because we ought to do so, but because we are inseparable’ (Roberts 2001, 124). Accordingly, Hanh (1988, 63) coins the term ‘interbeing’, which is comparable to ‘intercorporeity’ (Merleau-Ponty 1964, 168), ‘intercorporeality’ (Diprose 2002, 90) and ‘inter-esse’ (Roberts 2001, 125).

Constructing an independent self results in alienation from the other and a ‘sense of lack’ (e.g. Loy 2008, 15-23), the resolution of which is fallaciously attempted through clinging to others. Buddhist traditions have developed a variety of practices aimed at reversing the dualistic experience of self/other, including practices of non-attachment (through not clinging to what we perceive to be outside the self) and meditation techniques such as mindfulness, which gradually erodes both attachment and the distinction between self and not-self. Consequently, ‘since there is no self which does the possessing, there simply cannot be any possession (Puligandla and Puhakka 1970, 346).

Liberation involves entering a non-egotistical state and experiencing the interdependent nature of all beings (Mishra 2004). Alienation from other beings is delusion but, freed from egocentricity, we unify with their suffering (Jones 1989). Self-liberation becomes a delusive notion because there is no longer a separate self from which to be liberated; liberation becomes freedom of all beings from suffering. The

Inter-(c)are

search for individual enlightenment ceases and the focus moves to helping others (Shen-yen in Brazier 2002). The preoccupation is no longer private liberation from suffering but the ‘nirvana of society’ (Dalai Lama in Brazier 2002, 97). Hence, Engaged Buddhism stresses that letting go of the illusion of a separate self extends self-interest to all beings (King 2005).

In Engaged Buddhism, the level of analysis broadens, shifting the aetiology of suffering from individual psychological attachment to collective social greed and exploitation. Accordingly, Buddhism’s traditional three root ‘stains’ of greed, hatred and delusion apply not only to individuals but also to large-scale socio-economic forces (Kraft 2000). Internal and external liberation are simultaneous and reciprocal processes; awakening begins with a practical understanding of the Four Noble Truths within a person’s community (Ariyaratne 1982):

- (1) a concrete understanding of suffering in terms of poverty and oppression,
- (2) suffering is caused by greed, competitiveness and egoism,
- (3) there is hope that this suffering can cease, and
- (4) resolving problems within the community addresses suffering.

Cessation of suffering and liberation involve prerequisite material conditions and social relationships (Ambedkar 1984) and, in this context, the goal of Engaged Buddhism shifts from personal liberation to social reform (Lin 1929). Hence, Engaged Buddhism is prominently concerned with ethicality.

Mindfulness and ethicality

For Hanh, mindfulness develops intercorporeal ethicality. Present-centred (Hanh 1975) ‘awareness’ involves ‘looking deeply’ (Hanh 2008a, iii), which potentiates meditation for ethical action; ‘once there is seeing, there must be acting’ (Hanh 1995, 91).

Inter-(c)are

While the various Buddhist teachings on mindfulness are not identical with those in business, the management literature suggests a link between mindfulness and ethicality. Mindfulness has a positive impact on ethical decision-making because it entails awareness and is discerning yet non-judging, open to, and accepting of ideas (Ruedy and Schweitzer 2010). It is ‘the degree to which individuals are mindful in their work setting’ (Dane and Brummel 2014, 105) and ‘refers to the degree that an individual is aware of the impacts of their activities on others’ (Hales et al. 2012, 570). Similarly, on an organisational level, Valentine et al.’s (2010, 455) study found that ‘perceived ethical values and a shared ethics code were associated with...increased mindfulness.’ Mindful organisations ‘pay close attention to what is going on around them’ (Ray et al. 2011, 188).

Organisational mindfulness involves present moment orientation and attentional breadth (Dane 2011) and questions routinised action in complex unpredictable settings (Jordan et al. 2009). Diverse perceptual and cognitive processes ‘induce a rich awareness of discriminatory detail and a capacity for action’ (Weick et al. 1999, 88). Conversely, scripts can mindlessly enact organisational behaviour (Ashforth and Fried 1988). Mindlessness adopts a single perspective, with no awareness of alternatives, and acts on ‘automatic pilot’ (Weick et al. 1999, 90). Mindful and less mindful approaches can be complementary, although they have implicit normative claims, and mindfulness entails opportunity costs (Levinthal and Rerup 2006). Mindfulness has both costs and benefits (Dane 2011, 1013). It helps organisations to detect, address and process problems carefully. However, it is demanding and difficult, and both mindfulness and mindlessness can help or harm organisations (Rerup 2005).

Inter-(c)are

Hanh's metaphorical discourse

Hanh (1993b) explains mindfulness meditation with metaphors that flesh out his (inter)corporeal ethicality and enable his readers to relate to his account. A primary metaphorical focus for him is the practitioner's body awareness and transcending mind/body dualism. He considers it essential to mindfully observe the body and breathing, in order to harmonise and unify body and mind. Awareness of bodily actions, positions and parts leads to contact with the body.

Hanh (1975, 15, 23) metaphorises breathing as a 'bridge' that unites body and thoughts. Conscious breathing enables an appreciation of 'impermanence, emptiness, interdependent origination, selflessness, and nonduality of all that is' (Hanh 2009, 4). Given nonduality, Hanh (1995, 35) emphasises that life should not be compartmentalised with a 'barrier between practice and non-practice'; instead, meditation proceeds out of the meditation hall to penetrate daily life and affect social concerns. He emphasises that mindfulness belongs neither to monastics nor to the temple, as anyone can mindfully breathe anywhere; 'breathing mindfully in any position at any time can help you recover yourself' (Hanh 1995, 16). Instead of seeing daily activities as a distraction from meditation, they are conceived as meditation exercises. In this way, meditation is not for avoiding problems (which would only invite their return) but for embracing them.

Mindfulness connects mind and body; accordingly, a mindful person treats her body as a 'musician' looks after her instrument, in a nonviolent way (Hanh 1995, 36). Mindfulness involves being in the here-and-now, so we must take care of the body, 'it is not merely a means to practice the Way, it is itself the Way. It is not only the temple, it is also the sage' (Hanh 1988, 21).

Inter-(c)are

Hanh (1975) explains that mindfulness is a ‘miracle’ (14) that restores and calls back dispersed minds, just as a ‘magician’ (14) who cuts up his body, places the parts in different places, and then works magic to reassemble them. Hanh refers to the ‘sword of conceptualisation’ (Hanh 1992a, 46, 47, 55, 70) that slices reality, which can be countered through meditation, enabling the realisation of non-duality that, once attained, dispels discrimination. The sword cuts up the body, slicing interbeing. This weapon of the discriminating mind that separates self and other, stands opposed to metaphors of interbeing. Hanh (1988, 129) states ‘we have to continue practicing until...the hunger and pain in the bodies of all living species are our own. Then we will have realized non-discrimination, real love.’ Embodying the pain of others enables realisation of their suffering and impels us to extinguish it. Hanh (2013) argues that the ‘heart has room for everyone’ (84) if it grows, and advocates speaking the heart (67) to ‘water the seeds of understanding and compassion’ (101) in the hearts of others.

Using the same imagery, Hanh (1998a, 35) advocates transforming ‘seeds of anger’ by practising mindful breathing/walking, and acknowledging, embracing, and looking deeply into anger. The ‘preventative medicine’ (35) of meditation heals the seeds of anger and hatred, and the light of awareness can shine on our unpleasant feelings to identify their roots. Instead of feeling angry, we can learn to be compassionate to others and ourselves; ‘when we grow a lemon tree, we want it to be vigorous and beautiful. However, if it is not vigorous and beautiful, we do not blame the tree. We observe it in order to understand why it isn’t growing well’ (Hanh 1998a, 34). Similarly, we should not blame human beings when they are not flourishing. Just as caring for a lemon tree rewards us, pleasantness rewards caring for others.

Hanh (1998b) metaphorises selfishness and not seeing the other as ‘dark curtains’ (103); without mindfulness, we can only see reality through the dark curtains

Inter-(c)are

of our selfish desires. Contrastingly, a ‘mother hen embraces all her chicks, with two fully spread wings’ encompassing others: love and understanding displaces taking sides, so that we non-dualistically embrace the whole of reality (Hanh 1988, 121).

Hanh (2006, 81-82) metaphorises interdependence and interpenetration with reference to the ‘Jewelled Net of Indra’; ‘when you look at any facet of any one jewel, you can see all the other jewels reflected in it...the one is present in the all, and the all is present in the one.’ Making the link between interdependence and ethicality, Hanh (1992a, 38) employs the metaphor of the left and right hand helping each other in a formless way that does not distinguish between them; ‘our right hand puts a band aid on our left hand, without discrimination’, conveying the message that helping another is helping oneself and vice-versa. Similarly, the ‘rose’ and ‘garbage’ (31, 32, 33) depend on each other and are equal, such that the ‘garbage’ is as precious as the ‘rose’. We must recognise the flower and the garbage aspects of people, if we are to live in peace and happiness with them. Not realising this leaves us in ‘fetters’ and ‘knots’ (Hanh 1995, 64): internal formations arise when we do not effectively communicate with and understand one another.

Hanh’s mindful embodied ethicality

Awareness of others’ breathing strengthens awareness that we ‘inter-are’ (Hanh 2008b, 83) and so we should inter-care. Breath awareness fosters embodying ethicality, as the in/out motion of the breath alternates between self and alterity. The alternating breath that connects mind and body, and people with people, dispels the Cartesian split between the planning mind and the passive acting body (Clegg et al. 2007). The exhaling self reflects metaphor’s alteration of meaning, when it inverts by aspiring beyond self-constriction towards alterity; breathing, ethics and metaphor are

Inter-(c)are

thus connected, with the ethical experience conceived as breathing, transcending the self, and developing a relationship with and for the other (Levinas 1991).

Embodying metaphors mediate intercorporeal ethicality. Metaphor expresses the inexpressible (Ortony 1975) and makes the abstract material (Boyle 2003) as it 'gives a body...to discourse' (Ricoeur 1979, 130), thus allowing the trope to incorporate alterity and convey ethicality. Embodying metaphors constitute a body with corporate responsibility, which Hanh metaphorises as a pregnant mother, creating an ethic of care towards the other. Such embodying metaphors transport (Chia 1996) and carry (Höpfl 2000) one body to the other. The consequence of being the other and, therefore, there being no other, is interdependent care. Hanh metaphorically rearticulates bodies, joining them together. Metaphors exemplify such unity (Bloor 1971).

From the above, we theorise that ethicality is possible through incorporating alterity, literally forming an 'ethical corporation'. In parallel with this is a new theory of embodying metaphor, which simulates physical processes through semantic innovation (birth) through recontextualisation (relating to others), and dead metaphor (dying and merging back into the Earth). Embodying metaphor encompasses alterity but, in order to do so, itself becomes embodied within discourse, a dead metaphor (with deceased novelty). Metaphor lives in terms of enlivening perception of one thing as another, so that 'with metaphor we experience the metamorphosis of both language and reality' (Ricoeur 1973, 111). Subsequently, the trope dies when it fades into the discourse in which it is situated (Ricoeur 1977).

The tropological movement from literal to metaphorical and back to literal parallels and mediates the physical embodiment of the other; they both move from 'as the other' to 'is the other'. The trope erases duality by oscillating between literal and

Inter-(c)are

metaphorical meanings. With familiarity of use, it fades into the body of discourse, just as alterity gives way to intercorporeality. Hanh's metaphors fade back to literal meaning through repetition (and echoing them with similar embodying metaphors), thus embedding and constituting intercorporeality.

Embodying metaphor thus incorporates alterity. This phenomenon conveys Hanh's Engaged Buddhist liberation; awakening to see that all things are one and, realising non-duality, helping all beings: '...the boundary between ourselves and the other is not real' (Hanh 1992b, 62-63); 'we see ourselves everywhere, and we see our life everywhere. That is why we go to help all living phenomena...' (62). With alterity thus altered to unity, there can be no ethics towards another, only non-dual mindful and responsible care, within one corporeality.

Discussion

Critchley, Höpfl et al. (2012) saw theological concepts as aiding understanding and intervening in theories and practices, while Hanh's (2013) message is that mindfulness provides insight to human interconnectedness and guides work relationships. Critchley, Höpfl et al. (2012, 277) refer to the importance of embodied ethics and introduce Case et al. (2012)'s proposal that contemplation could aid awareness of the relations in our organisations. The current article responds to their call for research that develops and articulates the relationship between mindfulness and embodied ethics.

Hanh (1988) advocates meditating on and becoming the other person. His metaphorisation of one as the other mediates the message that mindfulness can enable an orientation towards colleagues that is characterised by awareness, understanding, empathy and a sense of an ontological unity. Hanh (2013) advances the centrality of

Inter-(c)are

‘interbeing’ awareness to mindful organising. He proposes that at the core of mindful organising is empathy (deep listening, understanding and loving communication). Christianity has a commensurate perspective: that Christians embody each other in a moral union for the common good (see Fitzmyer 1990, 863 on Romans 12:5, which states that Christians are members of one body). This claim translates to contemporary organising in terms of offering a wholly different paradigm: organising rests on the assumption of a pre-existing ‘organism’, instead of managers needing to construct the body corporate. Accordingly, Höpfl’s (2003a) Catholic religiosity does not demarcate bodies with boundaries but celebrates interpersonal unity, characterised by sociality, love and ethicality. Höpfl (2000, 2008) mediates this through incorporating metaphors such as the heart, which metaphorises compassion between organisational members.

Höpfl (2003a) advocates an inter-ontological embodied ethics of alterity within a nurturing, concerned and compassionate community. Commensurately, Hanh’s discourse on mindfulness conceives organisational members as interbeing, with interpenetrating, interconnected, and interdependent relationships. Höpfl conceives of the organisation as bodies (Höpfl 2002) and concerns herself with often painful embodied organisational experiences (Höpfl 2000). Therefore, she advocates an ethics where we bear each other’s suffering (Critchley, Höpfl et al. 2012) with an acquiescent heart (Höpfl 2007). Similarly, Hanh metaphorises our working experience as characterised by suffering, therefore advocating inter-care. This approach to care is supported by Sander-Staudt and Hamington’s (2011) care ethics that has a moral approach and ‘conceptualizes mutual interdependency and cooperative relationship as ontologically basic’ (x) and which esteems traits of ‘compassion, empathy, and concern for others’ (xiii). Again, Hawk’s (2011) ethic of care highlights relationality,

Inter-(c)are

interconnectedness and seeking mutual wellbeing, while Hamington's (2004) embodied care privileges corporeality, interconnectedness and interdependence.

We develop and extend Höpfl's approach to metaphor. Both Höpfl (2000) and Hanh utilise metaphors as the vehicle for incorporation – and both use metaphors of the heart and maternal/maternity to represent the desired disposition of organisational members towards each other. Hanh displays no awareness of Höpfl's work. However, he develops her metaphorical mediation of intercorporeal ethicality. Hanh's (2013) extended metaphors of mindfulness foster a practical understanding of organisational members as ontologically interpenetrated. His mindfulness and metaphors are complementary in that both coherently mediate and realise awareness, human interconnectedness, and mindful work relationships.

Both Hanh and Höpfl recognise the reality of workplace suffering and the need to alleviate it. Höpfl (2000, 2002) more graphically illustrates the existence of workplace suffering, while Hanh provides more solutions (in accordance with Buddhism's approach of both recognising and providing steps to reduce suffering).

Hanh (1993a) recognises the need for systemic change but tends to privilege change at the individual level as a necessary precursor, failing to address sufficiently and directly the range of obstacles to mindfulness and intercorporeal ethicality in workplaces (e.g. the systemic pressures of overly challenging targets, corporate austerity, individual competitiveness, etc.). These obstacles frame and contribute to the suffering Hanh's mindfulness is trying to alleviate; he could take his approach further by showing how inter-(c)are can influence organisations at a systemic level.

Future research could strengthen critiques of mindfulness. Bell and Taylor (2016, 556) argue the 'need to understand how spiritualities can be used to challenge established moralities...' Again, Bell (2008) argues for a critical spirituality of

Inter-(c)are

organisation that develops a concern with the socio-political aspects of religion (mentioning that Buddhism has the potential to inform critical spirituality). The following critique is an example of how mindfulness research could develop. Purser and Loy (2013) criticise the colonisation, marketisation, compartmentalisation and individualisation of mindfulness as a method for personal self-fulfilment: such instrumentalisation inhibits critical reflection and action on the causes of collective suffering. Corporations have welcomed mindfulness as it focuses attention on individual resilience but the mindfulness movement must focus attention on why stress is so pervasive in organisations (Purser and Loy 2013). Indeed, a ‘denatured mindfulness’ that is divorced from its context ‘reduces it to a self-help technique that is easily misappropriated for reproducing corporate and institutional power, employee pacification, and maintenance of toxic organizational cultures’ (Purser and Milillo 2015, 3).

Research could examine how Hanh’s ‘Community of Interbeing’ embodies his teachings; to what extent do his lessons influence ethicality within this and other Buddhist communities at work? The specific role of mindfulness could be scrutinised, as its expansion of attentional breadth could help take account of ethical issues, by looking beyond a given frame, or it may encourage self-interest (Dane 2011).

Academics could explore the relationship between corporate discourse about intercorporeality and the tensions in workplace relationships. In practical terms, the implementation of Hanh’s teachings could enhance teamwork, shared decision-making, collaboration, and the reduction of interpersonal conflict, although there has been no empirical work to establish this.

Scholars could explore the impacts of Höpfl and Hanh’s approaches to embodied ethics on organisational ethics generally, and examine the tensions between

Inter-(c)are

the discourses and practices of interbeing (given its inherent homogeneity) and those of diversity and heterogeneity within organisations. What are the potential consequences of incorporating and thus erasing alterity: might this also erase ethicality? After all, ‘ethics begins with alterity’ (Rhodes 2012, 1318), which is ‘the alter of the compassionate self, and one does for the other as one would do for the self’ (Brown 2005, 253). Equally, might there be an inherent danger of ethical absolutism in Hanh’s philosophy; being others could invasively impose ethical frameworks on them, alter-ing them all over again. Pullen and Rhodes (2014, 782) counsel that corporeal ethics should ‘defy the negation of alterity within organizations’ and resist ‘those forms of organizing that close down difference and enact oppression; a practice we refer to as an ethico-politics of resistance.’ In the same vein, Bauman (1993, 11) argues that ‘the impulse to care for the other, when taken to its extreme, leads to the annihilation of the autonomy of the other, to domination and oppression.’ Furthermore, metaphors of care need to be carefully chosen, in order not to invalidate the ‘subjects’ (Hughes et al. 2005). At worst, the metamorphosis of the care subject could even lead to abuse and neglect (Kafka 2015 [1915]).

Research could enquire if embodied ethics is diminishing with trends towards virtual and physically dispersed corporations. According to Styhre (2004, 110), ‘the increased emphasis on various intellectual, emotional and communicative skills and capabilities in contemporary organization life does not really exclude the human body. It rather shifts focus to other embodied practices and routines.’

Academics could explore how metaphor makes sense of ethical decision-making. This is commensurate with Styhre’s (2004, 111) proposal that ‘a research agenda on embodiment and organizations could include...studies of how the notion of embodiment is used to make sense of managerial activities and techniques, i.e. how

Inter-(c)are

the root metaphor of embodiment and the body is used to make sense out of abstract and complex organizational activities and objectives.’

Studies could enquire as to how effectively metaphor mediates ethical problems in practice. Worryingly for business ethics, the trope conceals how it shapes thoughts (Kendall and Kendall 1993) and deflects dissent by simplifying, deferring, conflating, masking (Milne et al. 2006) and shading out other meanings (Morgan 1998). According to Kupers (2013, 501), ‘there exists the danger that they are reified and used as ideological distortions, guiding consciousness into biased directions.’ Metaphors can produce unreliable communication and interpretation (Ramsay 2004) and result in relativism and subjectivity (Morgan 1996). Furthermore, metaphorically reducing people to traits could destroy the moral self, as traits do not attract moral consideration (ten Bos 1997).

Conclusions

Commensurate with Höpfl’s approach, we develop an (inter)corporeality that goes beyond self to inter-are and beyond ethics to inter-care. Hanh’s mindfulness discourse and its embodying metaphors address empathy and other-awareness to such an extent that it connotes ‘becoming the other’, within one warm and wise body that is mindful of its own health and care, in contrast to an ethics that involves alter-ing (othering and objectifying) and being cold, cognitive and calculative towards the other. The self becomes another, just as a word adopts another meaning through embodiment within a different context, a context that ultimately incorporates the trope, so that metaphorical unity becomes literal unity, thus mediating literal intercorporeality.

In showing how ethicality becomes possible through incorporating alterity, we extend Hancock’s (2008) theorising of an organisational ethics of generosity that is

Inter-(c)are

embodied, cooperative, and characterised by ‘...an openness to the other...’ (Hancock 2008, 1370). However, language alone cannot achieve embodied ethicality; for Hanh, practising mindfulness, with its focus on (inter)corporeal awareness, translates the philosophy of non-dualism into practical care for others. Likewise, Höpfl’s (2003a, 34) ‘ethics of the interpersonal’ relates to practical ways of interacting.

Jones et al. (2005) lament that business ethics is individualistic, narrowly defines what is considered to be ethical, and forecloses philosophy. The current article addresses such deficiencies by privileging collectivism, embodying ethical considerations in relationships with others, and exploring how Hanh implements his philosophy through mindfulness.

This study identifies one of Höpfl’s key contributions; her metaphorical mediation of intercorporeal ethicality, and shows how Hanh elucidates the relationship between mindfulness and ethical engagement. Developing some of Höpfl’s themes, we explored how Hanh’s metaphorical discourse explicates and mediates the relationship between mindfulness and intercorporeal ethicality. Then we showed how his metaphorical discourse mediates non-dualism in order to promote ethicality. Key contributions are new theories of embodied ethicality and embodying metaphor. Hanh incorporates alterity in two ways: through mindfulness discourse on the non-duality of mind/body and self/other; and by metaphorical mediation of non-dualism. His privileging of embodying metaphors, mindfulness and non-dualism incorporates and transcends alterity and ethics; without an other, there can be no ethics towards another. Instead, the meta-metaphor is of one body that encompasses and incorporates others; inter-are gives birth to inter-care. This leads to a new theory of ‘corporate ethics’; ethicality becomes possible through incorporating alterity. In parallel with this is a new theory of embodying metaphor that simulates physical processes. Just as individuals

Inter-(c)are

aspire to, fuse with and care for one body, so embodying metaphor enlivens discourse, only to die through absorption within the body of discourse, thus completing the mediation of intercorporeal care. Realising our non-dual unity (inter-are) translates into care for others (inter-care).

References

- Ambedkar, B.R. 1984. *The Buddha and His Dhamma*. Bombay: Siddharth.
- Ariyaratne, A.T. 1982. In *Search of Development: The Sarvodaya Movement's Effort to Harmonize Tradition with Change*. Moratuwa, Sri Lanka: Sarvodaya Press.
- Ashforth, B.E., and Y. Fried. 1988. "The Mindlessness of Organizational Behaviors." *Human Relations* 41(4): 305-329.
- Bauman, Z. 1993. *Postmodern Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bell, E. 2008. "Towards a Critical Spirituality of Organization." *Culture and Organization* 14(3): 293-307.
- Bell, E., and S. Taylor. 2016. "Spirituality, Religion and Organization." In *The Routledge Companion to Philosophy in Organization Studies*, edited by R. Mir, H. Willmott & M. Greenwood, 550-558. Routledge: Abingdon.
- Bevan, D., and H. Corvellec. 2007. "The Impossibility of Corporate Ethics: For a Levinasian Approach to Managerial Ethics." *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 16(3): 208-219.
- Bloor, D. 1971. "Dialectics of Metaphor." *Inquiry* 14: 430-444.
- Boyle, M.-E. 2003. "Reconciling Aesthetics and Justice in Organization Studies." In *Art and Aesthetics at Work*, edited by A. Carr and P. Hancock, 51-64. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Inter-(c)are

- Brazier, D. 2002. *The New Buddhism: A Rough Guide to a New Way of Life* (2nd edition). New York: Palgrave.
- Brown, J.W. 2005. *Process and the Authentic Life: Toward a Psychology of Value*. Heusenstamm: Ontos Verlag.
- Brummans, B.H.J.M., J.M. Hwang, and P.H. Cheong. 2013. "Mindful Authoring Through Invocation: Leaders' Constitution of a Spiritual Organization." *Management Communication Quarterly* 27(3): 346–372.
- Case, P., R. French and P. Simpson. 2012. "From Theoria to Theory: Leadership without Contemplation." *Organization* 19(3): 345-361.
- Chia, R. 1996. "Metaphors and Metaphorisation in Organisational Analysis: Thinking Beyond the Thinkable." In *Metaphor and Organisations*, D. Grant and C. Oswick, 127-145. London: Sage.
- Clegg, S.R., M. Kornberger, and C. Rhodes. 2007. "Organizational Ethics, Decision Making, Undecidability." *The Sociological Review* 55(2): 393-409.
- Critchley, S., H. Höpfl, B.M. Sørensen and S. Spoelstra. 2012. "Theology and Organization." *Organization* 19(3): 267-279.
- Dale, K. and Latham, Y. 2015. "Ethics and Entangled Embodiment: Bodies–Materialities–Organization." *Organization* 22(2): 166-182.
- Dane, E. 2011. "Paying Attention to Mindfulness and its Effects on Task Performance in the Workplace." *Journal of Management* 37(4): 997-1018.
- Dane, E., and B.J. Brummel. 2014. "Examining Workplace Mindfulness and its Relations to Job Performance and Turnover Intention." *Human Relations* 67(1): 105-128.
- Diprose, R. 2002. *Corporeal Generosity: On Giving with Nietzsche, Merleau-Ponty and Levinas*. New York: SUNY.

Inter-(c)are

- Docherty, T. 1996. *Alterities*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dutton, J.E., M.C. Worline, P.J. Frost, and J. Lilius. 2006. "Explaining Compassion Organizing." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 51: 59-96.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 1990. "The Letter to the Romans." In *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, edited by R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer & R.E. Murphy, 830–868. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hales, D.N., J. Kroes, Y. Chen, and K.W.D. Kang. 2012. "The Cost of Mindfulness: A Case Study." *Journal of Business Research* 65: 570-578.
- Hamington, M. 2004. *Embodied Care: Jane Addams, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Feminist Ethics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hancock, P. 2008. "Embodied Generosity and an Ethics of Organization." *Organization Studies* 29(10): 1357-1373.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1975. *The Miracle of Mindfulness! A Manual on Meditation*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1988. *The Sun my Heart*. Berkeley: Parallax.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1992a. *The Diamond that Cuts through Illusion*. Berkeley: Parallax.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1992b. *Breathe! You are Alive! Sutra on the Full Awareness of Breathing*. London: Rider.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1993a. *Love in Action: Writings on Nonviolent Social Change*. Berkeley: Parallax Press.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1993b. *Transformation and Healing*. London: Rider.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat, 1995. *Peace is Every Step*. London: Rider.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1998a. *Interbeing: Fourteen Guidelines for Engaged Buddhism* (3rd Ed). Berkeley: Parallax.

Inter-(c)are

- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 1998b. *Fragrant Palm Leaves: Journals 1962-1966*. Berkeley: Parallax.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 2000. *Going Home: Jesus and Buddha as Brothers*. New York: Berkley.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 2006. *Understanding our Mind*. Berkeley: Parallax.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 2008a. *Transformation and Healing: Sutra on the Four Establishments of Mindfulness*. Berkeley: Parallax Press.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. 2008b. *The World we have: A Buddhist Approach to Peace and Ecology*. Berkeley: Parallax.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat 2009. *The Blooming of a Lotus: Guided Meditation for Achieving the Miracle of Mindfulness (revised edition) (translated by A. Laity)*. Boston: Beacon.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat 2013. *Work: How to Find Joy and Meaning in Every Hour of the Day*. Berkeley: Parallax.
- Hawk, T. 2011. "An Ethic of Care: A Relational Ethic for the Relational Characteristics of Organizations." In *Applying Care Ethics to Business*, edited by M. Hamington & M. Sander-Staudt, 3-34. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Höpfl, H. 2000. "On Being Moved." *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies* 6: 15-34.
- Höpfl, H. 2002. "Strategic Quest and the Search for the Primal Mother." *Human Resource Development International* 5(1): 11–22.
- Höpfl, H. 2003a. "Good Order: On the Administration of Goodness." *Tamara* 2(3): 28-35.
- Höpfl, H. 2003b. "The Body of the Text and the Ordinary Narratives of Organisation." In *Narratives we Organize by. Advances in Organization Studies* 11, edited by B. Czarniawska and P. Gargliardi, 75-92. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Inter-(c)are

- Höpfl, H. 2003c. "Introduction." In *Interpreting the Maternal Organization*, edited by H. Höpfl and M. Kostera, xvii-xxiii. London: Routledge.
- Höpfl, H. 2007. "Artaud's Passion, Sacrament and Excrement: Some Thoughts on the Relationship Between Catholicism and Organisational Performance." *Tamara* 6(2): 149-158.
- Höpfl, H. 2008. "Sacred Heart: a Comment on the Heart of Management." *Culture and Organization* 14(3): 225–240.
- Hughes, B., L. McKie, D. Hopkins, and N. Watson. 2005. "Love's Labour's Lost? Feminism, the Disabled People's Movement and an Ethic of Care." *Sociology* 39(2): 259–275.
- Jones, C., M. Parker and R. ten Bos. 2005. *For Business Ethics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jones, K. 1989. *The Social Face of Buddhism: An Approach to Political and Social Activism*. London: Wisdom.
- Jordan, S., M. Messner, and A. Becker. 2009. "Reflection and Mindfulness in Organizations: Rationales and Possibilities for Integration." *Management Learning* 40(4): 465-473.
- Kafka, F. (2015 [1915]). *The Metamorphosis*. Ballingslöv: Wisehouse.
- Kendall, J.E., and K.E. Kendall. 1993. "Metaphors and Methodologies: Living Beyond the Systems Machine." *MIS Quarterly* 17: 149-171.
- King, S.B. 2005. *Being Benevolence: The Social Ethics of Engaged Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- King, S.B. 2009. *Socially Engaged Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kraft, K. 2000. "New Voices in Engaged Buddhist Studies." In *Engaged Buddhism in the West*, edited by C.S. Queen, 485-511. Boston: Wisdom.

Inter-(c)are

- Kristeva, J. 1983. "Stabat Mater." In *The Kristeva Reader*, edited by T. Moi (1986), 161-186. Oxford: Blackwell (translated by L. Roudiez).
- Kuan, Tse-fu. 2008. *Mindfulness in Early Buddhism: New Approaches through Psychology and Textual Analysis of Pali, Chinese and Sanskrit sources*. London: Routledge.
- Kupers, W.M. 2013. "Embodied Transformative Metaphors and Narratives in Organisational Life-Worlds of Change." *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 26(3): 494-528.
- Lakoff, G., and M. Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic.
- Levinas, E. 1991. *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence* (translated by A. Lingus). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Levinthal, D., and C. Rerup. 2006. "Crossing an Apparent Chasm: Bridging Mindful and Less-Mindful Perspectives on Organizational Learning." *Organization Science* 17: 502–513.
- Lin, Q. 1929. "Class Struggle and Buddhism." In *Taiwan's Revolutionary Monk, Lin Qiuwu*, edited by X. Li. 1991. Taiwan Bentu Xilie 1st ser., 9: 171-172. Taipei: Zili Wanbao She.
- Loy, D.R. 2008. *Money, Sex, War, Karma: Notes for a Buddhist Revolution*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1964. *Signs*. Evanston IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 1983. *The Structure of Behaviour*. Pittsburgh: Dusquesne University Press.
- Milbank, J. 2006. *Theology and Social Theory* (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Inter-(c)are

- Milne, M.J., K. Kearins and S. Walton. 2006. "Creating Adventures in Wonderland: The Journey Metaphor and Environmental Sustainability." *Organization* 13(6): 801-839.
- Mishra, P. 2004. *An End to Suffering: The Buddha in the World*. London: Picador.
- Morgan, G. 1996. *Images of Organization*. London: Sage.
- Morgan, G. 1998. *Images of Organization: The Executive Edition*. London: Sage.
- Ortony, A. 1975. "Why Metaphors are Necessary and Not Just Nice." *Educational Theory* 25: 45-53.
- Plum Village Practice Centre. 2014. www.plumvillage.org. Accessed September 17 2015.
- Puligandla, R., and K. Puhakka. 1970. "Buddhism and Revolution." *Philosophy East and West* 20(4): 345-354.
- Pullen, A., and C. Rhodes. 2014. "Corporeal Ethics and the Politics of Resistance in Organizations." *Organization* 21(6): 782-796.
- Purser, R.E., and D. Loy. 2013. "Beyond McM mindfulness". www.huffingtonpost.com/ron-purser/beyond-mcmindfulness_b_3519289.html. Accessed 7 May 2016.
- Purser, R.E., and Milillo, J. 2015. "Mindfulness Revisited: A Buddhist-Based Conceptualization." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 24(1): 3-24.
- Ramsay, J. 2004. "Trope Control: The Costs and Benefits of Metaphor Unreliability in the Description of Empirical Phenomena." *British Journal of Management* 15: 143-155.
- Ray, J.L., L.T. Baker and D.A. Plowman. 2011. "Organizational Mindfulness in Business Schools." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 10(2): 188-203.

Inter-(c)are

- Rerup, C. 2005. "Learning from Past Experience: Footnotes on Mindfulness and Habitual Entrepreneurship." *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 21: 451–472.
- Rhodes, C. 2012. "Ethics, Alterity and the Rationality of Leadership Justice." *Human Relations* 65(10): 1311–1331.
- Rhodes, C., and A. Pullen. 2009. 'Organizational Moral Responsibility', in S.R. Clegg and C. Cooper (eds) *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behaviour*, 2, 340–355. London: Sage.
- Ricoeur, P. 1973. "Creativity in Language: Word, Polysemy, Metaphor." *Philosophy Today*, 17: 97-111.
- Ricoeur, P. 1977. *The Rule of Metaphor* (translated by R. Czerny, K. McLaughlin, and J. Costello, S.J.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ricoeur, P. 1979. "The Function of Fiction in Shaping Reality." *Man and World* 12: 123-141.
- Roberts, J. 2001. "Corporate Governance and the Ethics of Narcissus." *Business Ethics Quarterly* 11(1): 109-127.
- Ruedy, N.E., and M.E. Schweitzer. 2010. "In the Moment: The Effect of Mindfulness on Ethical Decision Making." *Journal of Business Ethics* 95: 73-87.
- Sander-Staudt, M., and M. Hamington. 2011. "Introduction: Care Ethics and Business ethics." In *Applying Care Ethics to Business*, edited by M. Hamington & M. Sander-Staudt, vii-xxii. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Schreyögg, G., and H. Höpfl. 2004. "Theatre and Organization: Editorial Introduction." *Organization Studies* 25(5): 691–704.
- Shildrick, M. 1997. *Leaky Bodies and Boundaries: Feminism, Postmodernism and (Bio)ethics*. London: Routledge.

Inter-(c)are

- Stoler Miller, B. 1979. "On Cultivating the Immeasurable Change of Heart: The Buddhist Brahma-Vihāra Formula." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 7: 209-221.
- Styhre, A. 2004. "The (Re)embodied Organization: Four Perspectives on the Body in Organizations." *Human Resource Development International* 7(1): 101-116.
- ten Bos, R. 1997. "Essai: Business Ethics and Bauman Ethics." *Organisation Studies* 18(6): 997-1014.
- Valentine, S., L. Godkin, and P.E. Varca. 2010. "Role Conflict, Mindfulness, and Organizational Ethics in an Education-Based Healthcare Institution." *Journal of Business Ethics* 94: 455-469.
- Weick, K.E., and T. Putnam. 2006. "Organizing for Mindfulness: Eastern Wisdom and Western Knowledge." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 15: 275–287.
- Weick, K., K.M. Sutcliffe, and D. Obstfeld. 1999. "Organizing for High Reliability: Processes of Collective Mindfulness." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 21: 81-123.