

**“I used to care but things have changed¹”:
A Genealogy of Compassion in Organizational Theory**

Ace Simpson
UTS Business School
University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), Australia
15 Broadway, Ultimo, NSW 2007
Email: ace.simpson@uts.edu.au
Phone: +61 (0) 422709853

Stewart Clegg
UTS Business School
University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), Australia
15 Broadway, Ultimo, NSW 2007
Email: stewart.clegg@uts.edu.au
Phone: +61 (0) 422709853

Tyrone Pitsis
Newcastle University Business School
5 Barrack Road, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 4SE
Email: tyrone.pitsis@newcastle.ac.uk
Phone: +44 (0) 191 208 1500

¹ The title comes from “Things have changed”, composed by Bob Dylan, copyright 1999 Special Rider Music

“I used to care but things have changed”:

A Genealogy of Compassion in Organizational Theory

Abstract

We explore the use of compassion as a technology of power and subjectivity within organizations. Using a genealogical method we trace the history of concern with compassion in organizations as a mode of employee discipline. The paper applies a perspective developed from Foucault, focused on power/knowledge relations and the role that they play in the formation of the subject in organizations. Organizational compassion has been constantly re-defined and re-evaluated according to changing organizational objectives for shaping employee subjectivity. While one may think of compassion as a ‘good’ phenomenon we counsel caution against doing so in all contexts as a generic endorsement of a ‘positive’ agenda. As we show, compassion may be a mode of power.

Keywords

Positive organizational scholarship (POS); compassion; organization studies; genealogy; power; Foucault.

“I used to care but things have changed”:

A Genealogy of Compassion in Organizational Theory

Introduction

Compassion is increasingly becoming a focus of management inquiry and management practice. A September 2013 post on the Harvard Business Review blog network advises “Don’t look now, but all of a sudden the topic of compassionate management is becoming trendy” (Fryer, 2013). The “trends” described include an increasing number of business conferences on compassion at work with high achieving keynote speakers such as eBay founder Pierre Omidyar, Karen May (VP of Talent at Google), and Linked In CEO Jeff Weiner; as well as the Conscious Capitalism movement whose membership includes Southwest Airlines, Google and Nordstrom. The author attributes “compassion’s rise in the workplace” to a growing body of academic literature suggesting a positive association between organizational compassion and positive organizational outcomes, speculating that: “perhaps years of research are finally making a dent. Over and over, it’s been shown that compassion concretely benefits the corporate bottom line”. Another blog post from April 2013, on the page of The Greater Good Science Center, University of California, Berkley is titled “Why compassion in business makes sense” (Sepalla, 2013). Authored by the Associate Director of the Stanford University Center for Compassion and Altruism Research and Education (CCARE), the post explains how “compassionate workplaces are good for employee health and the corporate bottom line”. The article concludes, “Research on compassion is setting a new tone for the workplace and management culture... Scientists are exploring the most effective ways to foster compassion in the workplace, and to help these best practices spread across organizations”.

The research mentioned in both of these blog posts on the web pages of respected US universities, is a reference to the past decade and a half during which time compassion has become a key area of concern in organization theory, particularly within the field of Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) (Dutton & Workman, 2011; Lilius, Kanov, Dutton, Worline, & Maitlis, 2012). As indicated by the enthusiasm of these authors, growth in the study of compassion in organizations is widely viewed as a

positive trend. In this article we seek to problematize this assumption by arguing that there is an under-recognition in the work of those attracted to the ‘positive’ agenda that a particular ‘kind’ of compassion has come to be conceptualized and operationalized, one that selectively avoids its darker aspects (Simpson, Clegg, & Cunha, 2013; Simpson, Clegg, & Freeder, 2013; Simpson, Clegg, & Pitsis, 2013).

A relatively simple research question motivates our enquiry: ‘how and why has organization compassion become a topic of interest for organization theory?’ The answer we arrive at is that a significant effect of the concern with compassion in contemporary organizational inquiry is that the compassion’s application has become inscribed in practice as a mode of organizational discipline and control. To see things in this light is hardly conventional: most accounts of the origins of Positive Organizational Scholarship stress the changing focus of psychology turned from deviant to positive behaviors (Cameron & Gaza, 2004; Dutton & Glynn, 2008; Dutton, Glynn, & Spreitzer, 2006; Spreitzer & Sonenshein, 2003). In POS these concerns are transposed to the organizational level in a quest to reveal and nurture the highest level of human potential through the exercise of managerial and leadership compassion, empathy and energy (see: positiveorgs.bus.umich.edu/an-introduction).

From our perspective, POS belongs to a tradition grounded in the changing genealogy of power relations at work in organizations which subordinates social justice to concerns for economic growth; in other words neoliberalism. No longer construed purely as negatively and as coercively disciplinary, as these power relations once were, compassion serves as a form of positivity cloaking the underlying pursuit of business as usual. We argue this by using a genealogical method, drawing primarily on Foucault, to construct a history of the present through analysis of academic discourse on compassion in organizations. The primary focus is on power/knowledge relations and the changing modes of subjectivity that they constitute (Foucault, 1984b, 1984c). In the present era, as neoliberal employment relations have become more contingent, uncertain and insecure, in an environment of a global ‘risk society’ (Beck 2002), the expression of compassion for the fates of those being managed becomes a device with highly political implications.

We structure the paper as follows: we introduce Foucault’s genealogical method with

which to analyze organizational compassion and briefly review existing organizational studies literature that draws on Foucault's method and ideas about power. We then undertake genealogical analysis of organizational compassion, tracing foundational literature to the Human Relations movement in the 1930s, following it through to the early 1980s, when an explicit concept was initially formulated and introduced. The concept has begun to attract serious academic attention within the field of POS in the last fifteen years or so. Our analysis and subsequent discussion reveals the social-historical construction of organizational compassion as a technology of power used for employee subjectification – that is, the constitution of the employee as a subject of control.

Powerful compassion and genealogy

Organizational compassion is a social construct on which the community of POS has expended considerable entrepreneurial energy (Dutton & Workman, 2011; Rynes, Bartunek, Dutton, & Margolis, 2012). However, this energy has largely been dedicated to contemporary cases and isolated analysis rather than to questioning what role the compassionate turn may play. While compassion is bathed in an ether of legitimacy within POS, as a social phenomenon, we will argue, its relation will always be implicated in power and its legitimacy thus contingent rather than given.

Considering Foucault's influence on organizational theory (see Carter, McKinlay, & Rowlinson, 2002 for a review; Adelstein & Clegg, 2013 for a recent application) in particular where power relations are concerned, it is appropriate to use work on power influenced by Foucault to address compassion. Clegg's (1989) seminal text, *Frameworks of Power*, drew extensively on Foucault (amongst others) to develop a general model for the analysis of organizational power relations, further developed by Clegg, Courpasson and Phillips (2006). In the latter work the political economy of the body and a moral economy of the soul are sketched as evolving managerial techniques of discipline. Similarly, Townley (1993; 1994; 1999) has applied Foucault within the field of Human Resource Management to explore how knowledge and power interplay to shape worker subjectivities through seemingly innocuous disciplinary practices of recruitment, selection and induction.

Given that the study of organizational compassion is a significant recent innovation in the conceptualization of organizational relations then it is fruitful to apply a genealogical approach to its emergence. The genealogical method is a process of argument and critique founded by Nietzsche and gradually embraced by Foucault (Minson, 1985). Nietzsche's genealogy is value laden, intended to enhance life and creativity (Hussain, 2011; Mahon, 1992). His approach questioned prejudices of traditional philosophy, which favor notions of substance, unity, duration, identity, materiality, cause and being—relocating notions traditionally considered as eternal into processes of becoming. According to Nietzsche (1998) all Platonic notions of form in Continental European philosophy needed to be uprooted and given an all-too-human spin, to point out their shortcomings and dangers. Foucault (1985) acknowledged his roots in Nietzsche's genealogy, a relationship analyzed by many scholars (for examples see Lash, 1994; Merquior, 1987; Rorty, 1986; Sheridan, 1980). Much as his predecessor, Foucault's genealogies are focused on undermining taken-for-granted current assumptions to provide opportunities for new ways of thinking.

Foucault never clarifies his procedures exactly but important sources are for example *Nietzsche, genealogy, history* (Foucault, 1984a) and *Questions of method* (Foucault, 1991). His approach is grounded in empirical documentary analysis, a method that involves interrogating seemingly unimportant details and statements in mundane documents, cultivating “the details and accidents” to recreate the historical conditions leading to current conditions of existence (Foucault, 1984a, p. 80). Genealogy, as Foucault deploys it, is characterized by questioning those current values held in high esteem by tracing their historical contingency and ignoble conditions of emergence. Rather than searching for pristine purity in the origin of concepts, genealogy seeks to uncover a complex multiplicity of relational forces that provide the conditions for the emergence of entities, values, and events (Brown, 1998). Current values often have a forgotten or hidden history; thus, Foucault's genealogy avoids prescription pertaining to good and bad, truth and legitimacy. He rejects all total knowledge in favor of identifying relations of power, emergence and contingency in discursive practice (Foucault, 1984a).

Genealogical questioning derails and denaturalizes conventional unitary historical accounts of power/knowledge relations (Foucault, 1984a). The self-evidence of historical accounts that assume the triumph of reason working in a progressively singular direction serving a higher teleological purpose is questioned. Genealogical histories emerge from hidden histories of power and subjection as multiple series of discontinuous and directionless episodes, constituted by and constituting systems of domination and control. The jurisdiction of inquiry is both the present and the distant past. The past is not to be regarded as the source of a pristine metaphysical origin or primordial pre-material essence; rather, it is something constructed, something to be probed and deconstructed by asking about the multiple rationalities that have produced current practices (Foucault, 1991). The present is probed by asking about the nature of current values, beliefs and assumptions: it must not be accepted as being what it apparently is but should be seen in terms of a history in which contingency and multiple reconfigurations of meaning play a central role. The rationalities of the present do not reveal the hidden histories of competition, malice, hatred, passion and devotion “that inscribe themselves in practices” (Foucault, 1991, p. 79).

Foucault’s genealogical project is neither nihilistic nor relativistic, nor does it simply recast the past as seen through the present, as Habermas (1987) suggests. On the contrary, by derailing and disrupting the conventions of history, Foucault opens up space for the emergence of critical analysis, debate and positive political intervention. Genealogy creates opportunity for the emergence of alternative ways of thinking, being and doing (Foucault, 1984a) that replaces the dominant ontology of being with an ontology of becoming (Bardon & Josserand, 2011; Bjørkeng, Clegg, & Pitsis, 2009). Foucault’s genealogy lends itself to the address of contemporary empirical issues (Mahon, 1992; Minson, 1985), such as we encounter in organization studies. Bardon and Josserand (2011) stress the futility for organization studies of being faithful to either Foucault or Nietzsche’s approach to genealogy. It is more appropriate to apply Foucault in a manner fit for a specific empirical purpose: here, analyzing organizational compassion (see Foucault 1975, as cited in Bardon & Josserand, 2011, p. 501).

Seen genealogically, history appears less as a field characterized by historical determinism and more as “a field of openings – faults, fractures and fissures. Conversely, rather than promising a certain future, as progressive history does, genealogy is deployed to incite possible futures” (Brown, 1998, p. 37). Through questioning assumptions, genealogy emancipates analysis from prescriptive and a transcendent ideal such as compassion has been conceived to be, thus creating discursive space for innovative intervention into the constructs of the present. Refusal of a deterministic ontology embedded in either the laws of history or taken for granted social construction has a liberating effect on conceptions of agential possibility by exposing taken-for-granted power/knowledge relations. These relations in the field of organization studies have been explored in a number of seminal articles (e.g: Adelstein & Clegg, 2013; Andersen, 2011; McKinlay, 2006; Weatherbee, Durepos, Mills, & Mills, 2012). However, to this point, there has been no investigation of the conditions of existence of the notion of the compassionate subject.

The Birth, Emergence and Development of Concepts and Practices

The compassionate subject

Having reviewed the genealogical method and its objectives, we now wish to investigate the construction of the employee as a subject of compassion. Our investigations will be guided by questions relating to the birth, emergence, and development of concepts and practices of organizational compassion. We will also be guided by questions relating to the subjects and objects of discourse, its epistemological rationale, the legitimacy of its truths, as well as the technologies of power and the self on which the notion of organizational compassion relies. Our objective in applying genealogical method to question research and theory on organizational compassion seeks to enhance scholarship by creating openings that reveal other possibilities for research and practice to those presently charted.

Our analysis of the birth, emergence and development of concepts of organizational compassion will reveal that its discourse has followed a path of constant redefinition and interpretation according to the socio-political needs of a given period. Historically social élites, interest groups, and other ‘emotional entrepreneurs’ broker shifts in

cultural norms by clarifying, reinforcing, questioning and innovating grounds for their support (Clark, 1997; Clegg et al., 2006), as we see in the genealogy of a concern with compassion.

Defining events

In 1999 Gallup sponsored the first Positive Psychology Conference (Luthans, 2002). Positive Psychology was on the rise: for instance, the movement rapidly translated from a narrower psychological preserve to the broader terrain of organization studies (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003). The intersubjective realm of ideas about the world cannot but be socially constructed; hence, the genealogy of analysis is punctuated not only by the internal rhythms of evolving debates within the history of ideas but also as a consequence of the impact of major events in everyday collective life. The genealogy of compassion scholarship within POS shows evident traces of such an impact. One of the defining events that framed global worldviews in various ways was the terrorist attack of 9/11. In the United States, especially, the attack was an occasion for much rethinking of taken-for-granted assumptions about security, defense and organization. From a now-defunct University of Michigan Web page (University of Michigan Business School 2001) that was hosted after 9/11, dedicated to “Leading in Trying Times,” there were a number of examples of what compassionate leadership might be.²

² Among the organizations featured were “Windows of Hope: Family Relief Fund”, established by three leading figures in the New York restaurant industry: David Emil, owner of Windows on the World, the restaurant on top of the World Trade Center building; the restaurant’s executive chef, Michael Lomonaco; and Tom Valenti, Chef/Owner of Ovest Restaurant and Waldy Malouf, Chef/Owner, Beacon Restaurant. Together they established “Windows of Hope” as a way to help the families of the people who worked in the food service profession who died in the World Trade Center. On October 11, participating restaurants around the world donated up to 10% of their proceeds to the fund. Another featured example was the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, which lured some of the former World Trade Center businesses across the Brooklyn Bridge by making office space available in different neighborhoods across Brooklyn. “We put together about a million square feet of space for different types of businesses”, said Kenneth Adams of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce. One construction firm, Two Trees, offered an incentive for displaced business: “Move in here and get three months rent-free”. The Chamber of Commerce also offered donated equipment, supplies and office furniture. A “skills bank” was also created in which volunteers used their professional skills by, for example, setting up Web sites or helping with paperwork.

For the Michigan researchers, already involved in building POS, these cases were highly engaged examples of problematizing compassion relations in the face of huge trauma, whereby outstanding leadership and compassion helped companies rebuild (Dutton, Frost, Worline, Lilius, & Kanov, 2002). The shock of a collective trauma to the nation's psyche served as a stimulus to scholars already engaged with building a positive organization studies agenda to focus particularly on compassion work. However, there are historical roots that reach back much earlier.

Historical roots

The roots of the modern notion of organizational compassion emerged in the 1930s after the dawn of Taylor's (1911) highly rational scientific management, in which there was little sense of compassion manufactured for the employee being produced as the subject of management science (Jacques, 1996). By the emergence of the Great Depression such technically rational science was falling out of favor. Legitimacy in terms of technically rational organization at the macro-level was in short supply with the ample evidence of the economic dysfunctions of widespread unemployment and depression (Miller & Rose, 1990, 1995).

While Taylor's methods proved useful for war-production during the First World War (Clegg & Dunkerley, 2013), it was techniques that were developed in its aftermath that were coming into vogue by the 1930s. The locus of these techniques was in psychology rather than engineering. Psychologists proved useful in contributing to the recovery of troops from emotional trauma in the military during and after WWI. With the cessation of hostilities and the onset of peace, key figures such as Elton Mayo (1949, p. 64) generalized these therapeutic techniques. Increasingly, they were applied as solutions to emergent problems of resistance to non-military organizations in which management's 'right' to manage was under attack in the wake of the Bolshevik revolution³.

The introduction of expert knowledge based on psychology saw the emergence of

³ See Clegg and Dunkerley (2013), especially pp. 106-21, for the context of the workers control movement that emerged in many places in the wake of the war and revolution. Although the former discussion is of Italy, and Turin in particular, Mayo saw the same conflictual tendencies in the Trades Hall organization of workers in Brisbane, where he lived in the immediate post war period.

“sympathetic tact” as a ‘compassionate’ management strategy (Jacques, 1996, p. 138). Emotional projection began to supplement rational design with the appearance of Mayo’s (1949, 2003) later theories that emphasized the importance of human relations, marking a shift in the discourse of corporate selfhood to one focused on empathy and sympathetic emotional transactions (Susman, 1984). Communications between managers and workers thereafter began to mimic sessions of psychological therapy as encounters between personnel managers and employees shifted discourse towards a register couched in the psychological imagery of feelings (Miller & Rose, 1994). Increasingly, values of equality, fairness, need responsiveness and reflexivity in language became employed as techniques of subjectivity formation and governmental control. Boundaries between concepts such as organization and family became increasingly blurred (Illouz, 2012).

One of the earliest explicit references to organizational compassion is made by V. A. Thompson (1975) in the book *Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm: The Problem of Administrative Compassion*, in which he critiques the erosion of bureaucratic objectivity and rationality in favor of the particularisms of what he refers to as ‘tribalism’, a non-rational condition in which organizational relations are marked by irrational preferences and prejudices. The “need for personalized, individualized, compassionate treatment by the ever more ubiquitous organization” (p. 19), which he sees developing in the Human Relations field pioneered by Mayo, conflicts with bureaucratic principles of justice and equality, limiting efficiency. In Thompson’s view, “The modern organization, by its nature, can only offer only impersonal, categorized, noncompassionate treatment”. Borrowing an idea from agency theory (Ross, 1973) Thompson further argues that the manager who acts compassionately towards particular employees takes the owner’s resources and engages in “theft” (p. 11). According to Thompson (1975, p. 20):

Administrative “compassion” can be thought of as special treatment, as “stretching” the rules, as the premodern “rule of men” rather than the “rule of law”. In the modern period such behavior is denigrated in such terms as “animism” (“pull” from highly placed friends or relatives), nepotism, and corruption (purchased compassion). While such behavior will continue so long

as people will continue feel the need for compassionate, individualized treatment, it can hardly be suggested as a solution of our problem.

The 1980s were subsequently to see bureaucratic values questioned through the privatization of much of the welfare state under the neoliberal governments of Thatcher in the UK and Reagan in the USA. These reforms gave rise to strongly anti-bureaucratic sentiments in influential analysis (Gaebler & Osborne, 1992; Peters & Waterman, 1982), part of a process, as researchers such as Hochschild (1983) have argued, in which a commodification of emotions occurred as employees were no longer expected just to *do* their work but to also exhibit delight, pleasure and smiles while doing so – by command.

Compassion, competition and job layoffs

The 1980s saw the declining international competitiveness of manufacturing by Western nations (Miller & Rose, 1990, 1995; Rose, 1989). A dominant rhetoric stressing the need to focus on total quality and the paramount importance of the customer characterized managerial responses to this era (Kelemen, 2000, 2002). Widespread skepticism about the benefits of public welfare and regulation by government and unions saw a neo-economically liberal stress on neglected values of autonomy, individual motivation, and entrepreneurship, emerge. Thatcherism and Reaganism (as the economic policies came to be known) sought to free managers to manage and reduce regulation. All organization, including hospitals, universities, and other government enterprises, was to be reformed for greater productivity, efficiency and profitability. Correspondingly, the subjectivity of employees was to be reformulated in terms of individual self-actualization and self-fulfillment, as entrepreneurial subjects (du Gay, 2008).

One of the most influential business books ever published, *In search of excellence*, authored by McKinsey consultants Peters and Waterman (1982), argued that new entrepreneurial styles of management required as a corollary a duty of employee care. One of the things that distinguished the most productive American companies from their less successful competitors operating in similar industries was the quality of their care for employees, they maintained. “Although most top managers assert that their

companies care for their people, the excellent companies are distinguished by the intensity of this concern” (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 242). The ‘natural’ human tendencies of employees to search for meaning, purpose, responsibility and achievement could enable “productivity through people” (Peters & Waterman, 1982, p. 235) where care was taken. In this context, bureaucracy and hierarchy were reevaluated as inflexible obstacles to innovation, enterprise and self-actualization. Employee subjectivities, ethics and normalizing modes of providing ‘care of the self’ became increasingly expressed through the literatures of popular psychology and self-help aligned and linked up with programs of organizational productivity and governmentality (Rose, 1985). According to McCoy (2007), Peters and Waterman (1982) advocated compassion based upon empowerment and enacted through a culture of self-directed teams, flexible work hours, open structures and shared information, prefiguring the emergence of the compassionate subject.

A few years after publishing *In search of excellence*, Peters (1986) went on to publish an article explicitly advocating organizational compassion—albeit from a managerialist perspective. He argued for restructuring the US economy through deregulation and reducing taxes as well as developing smaller, flatter, more agile and less bureaucratic organizations focused on excellence, innovation and better customer service. Increased compassion towards employees was a key aspect of his proposal for increased productivity and competitiveness, “I so urgently suggest – competition and compassion” (Peters, 1986, p. 24). Peters suggested compassion would be supported by flattened hierarchies “where people finally count more than capital, where ingenuity supplants mass” (Peters, 1986, p. 14). He advocated further “removing demeaning barriers between management and labor” (p. 19) and replacing first-line supervisors with “elected coordinators” (p. 18) or the practice of “self-inspection” (p. 19). Peters (1986) was aware that the managerial and cultural revolutions he espoused would be costly in human terms. Hence, he proposed, “to ameliorate the consequences for those numerous individuals who suffer from the largely necessary dislocations associated with this extraordinary and inevitable economic transition” (p. 24) compassionate measures of investment in “programs to support retraining and adjustment for those who are displaced” (p. 25) would be necessary. A related article on organizational compassion by Lynchski (1995) also advocated that managers

should “use fairness and compassion” in employee job layoffs. The rationale for Lyncheski’s (1995, p. 19) organizational compassion was legal prudence: appearing to have compassionate policies in place would protect organizations from costly lawsuits.

Organizational compassion as feminist discourse

In the mid 1990s the governments of Bill Clinton and Tony Blair came to power in the US and the UK respectively, pursuing “third-way” social democratic political ideologies (Giddens, 1998). Essentially their policies sought to combine social democratic with capitalistic agendas as a reaction against the legacy of Reagan and Thatcher’s conservative neoliberalism. Concerns with social inclusion and equality, cultural pluralism and ecology shared the agenda with growth, entrepreneurship and individualism. With the new legitimacy of these concerns with inclusion and equality previously marginal discussions of organizational relations assumed more prominence. Within academia alternative discursive interpretations of organizational compassion arose that were more feminine – if not feminist.

Arguing against male dominated organizational discourse, organizational compassion began to be described as something that had been “excluded” “neglected” and “denied” in management. Much as the contributions of women were devalued in male dominated society, the same determinate absences were to be found in the business management literature (Kelan, 2008). The subjectivity of the employee was to be increasingly framed in terms of the traits of feminine humanity that had been for so long effaced by dominant masculine rational perspectives.

Solomon (1997, 1998) was the first author to write on organizational compassion from a feminist perspective. He challenged the view of the organization as calculating, competitive, self-interested and purely profit focused as merely a matter of perception that acted as a self-fulfilling prophecy. Solomon posited a “shift in corporate thinking” involving a “reconception of the very nature of the corporation” (Solomon, 1997, p. 144) as “executive women were breaking through the ‘glass ceiling’ prompting a “serious shift in values and the ‘feminization’ of attitudes in the corporation” (Solomon, 1998, p. 518). Solomon advocated recognizing that,

corporations are in practice, as communities, also places of humanity in which “caring and compassion is what we all in fact expect and demand in our various jobs and positions” (Solomon, 1998, p. 531). Solomon advocated the importance of changing perceptions towards a more realistic conception of business as not merely confined to ‘business’ but to also living the good life within a business society.

Another early publication on organizational compassion was an interview with Aung Sun Suu Kyi by White (1998) entitled “Leadership through compassion and understanding” published in the *Journal of Management Inquiry*. In the short introduction to the interview, White (1998, p. 286) framed it as relating to “the common elements of the feminist ethic of care and the Buddhist ethics of compassion in the context of individual and organizational ethical conduct”.

Compassion enters the modern mainstream

The most influential early publication on organizational compassion, judging by the number of citations as well the review by Dutton and Workman (2011), was an article by Peter Frost (1999). Frost’s argument referenced and conceptually borrowed the language of Fletcher’s⁴ (1998) feminist *relational practice*, a theoretical position that “seeks to expand the gendered definition of work by giving voice to a way of working” and “argues that the current, common sense definition of work in organizational discourse is not a passive concept, but is instead an active although unobtrusive exercise of power that silences and suppresses alternative definitions” (pp. 163-164). Frost (1999) likewise argues that compassion often disappears in organizations where employees’ self-respect and dignity is lost when people’s human worth is ignored. Frost concludes that, although compassion is so central to understanding organizations, it has been mostly ignored and invisible in organizational theory. In order to understand organizations properly, this imbalance had to be righted.

Frost (1999) took up his own call for further research on organizational compassion with a group of academics within the emerging field of POS. As stated earlier, the

⁴ It is noteworthy that Fletcher (1998) acknowledges the insights and comments of Jane Dutton (among others), considering that Dutton went on to become one of the leading theorists and researchers of organizational compassion.

emergence of POS paralleled that of positive psychology at the end of the 1990s, with a shift away from a focus on negative deviance towards a concern with “excellence, transcendence, positive deviance, extraordinary performance, and positive spirals of flourishing” (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 3). Among the areas of focus for positive organizational scholars, compassion has generated considerable interest with dozens of journal articles and book chapters by POS scholars such as Jane Dutton, Peter Frost, Jason Kanov, Jacoba Lilius, Sally Maitlis, and Monika Worline (most of whom were at some stage in their careers affiliated with the University of Michigan). The work of these scholars represents the most in-depth and systematic body of work on compassion in organizations.

As POS research unfolded the value of organizational compassion was usually seen in instrumental terms that framed the subjectivity of the employee in terms of strategic competitive advantage. Caza and Carroll (2012, p. 973) observed that in the ‘large majority of POS article ... the positive phenomenon was described as inherently valuable, but also having the happy side effect of enhancing profits.’ A review of the POS compassion literature provided by Lilius, Kanov, Dutton, Worline and Maitlis (2012) summarized the *benefits* of organizational compassion, the *processes* that support organizational compassion, and the *mechanisms* of support.

Benefits of organizational compassion being shown towards employees, particularly in times of crisis, include post-traumatic-growth (Dutton et al., 2002), strengthening positive identity (Frost et al., 2006); building resources of positive emotions (Dutton, Lilius, & Kanov, 2007); enhanced employee commitment to the organization and co-workers (Dutton et al., 2007), as well as overall enhanced effectiveness, performance and productivity (Kanov et al., 2004; Lilius et al., 2008). In power terms, the expansion of positive power to initiate and create actions both personally and organizationally beneficial would generally be taken as a sign of positive power at work.

Processes may be viewed as the governmental techniques that facilitate the subjectification of employees as objects and subjects of organizational compassion. These processes include compassionate leadership that involves perspective taking (Dutton et al., 2002; Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2006) and the creation of

certain organizational conditions, such as holding regular meetings and open architecture, which ensure people regularly congregate and, therefore, have a greater chance of noticing signs of distress (Kanov et al., 2004). These processes can embrace enhanced power relations through simple strategies such as assigning equal rights to speak in meetings that are predetermined in number – perhaps by assigning a set number of tokens to each person that have to be relinquished in order to speak – so that each person has the same rights to enter and not dominate the discourse as others. In this way, the negative power of exclusion, inattention to issues and marginalization can be managed compassionately.

Mechanisms for organizational compassion include the establishment of a harm notification network and the establishment of compassionate policies, routines, systems (Dutton et al., 2002; Dutton et al., 2007; Frost et al., 2006; Kanov et al., 2004; Lilius et al., 2008) values reflecting respect for humanity and individual personality (Dutton et al., 2007; Dutton, Worline, et al., 2006). An important mechanism would build on the practice of safety stewards, pioneered in Scandinavian *quality of working life* movements (e.g: see Abrahamsson & Broström, 1980), with the authority and power to stop work deemed dangerous, injurious or demeaning to an organization member for some reason. Of course, such powers have the potential for becoming strategies in broader industrial relations issues as they become a legitimate accounting for the withdrawal of labor power.

While these organizational processes and mechanisms are compassionate in appearance, they can simultaneously represent the enactment of instrumental and normative power, wherein rewards of material goods (instrumental power) and intrinsic (normative power) benefits of esteem and symbolic prestige are manipulated to engender the obligation, moral commitment and involvement of employees (Etzioni, 1961). Because the management is explicitly committed to mechanisms that enact compassion towards employees then the implicit understanding may be that employees should behave appropriately, as grateful, as beneficiaries of actions with which accord is to be expected.

As indicated in the introduction, the effects of more than a decade of POS research on organizational compassion include not only altering the practices of organizational

compassion researchers but also introducing new lines of research and conversation to the field. Evidence of this can be found in the 2011 Academy of Management theme of “Daring to Care: Passion and Compassion in Management Practice and Research”. The conference received more than 7000 submissions and led to the production of a special edition of the *Academy of Management Review* (AMR) in October 2012 editorial by Rynes et al. (2012). The editors suggested that future research and theory on care and compassion in organizations would occur through contesting and replacing, complementing as well as symbolically integrating, existing organizational theories. However, despite this call for future work they do not address the hidden history of compassion that we have genealogically uncovered herein.

Conceptualizations of compassion as constituted in an interrelated web of agency, social relations, contingency dynamics, and social ideologies and values (Berlant, 2004; Nussbaum, 1996) is mostly lacking in the literature. This oversight ignores history, which has seen changes both in the usage of the term compassion (Garber, 2004) and modes of expressing compassion, including notions of who is worthy of compassion (Clark, 1997).

The AMR editors were seemingly unaware of the continuous redefinition and reconfiguration that has characterized concern with compassion as organizational behavior and employee subjectivities have been shaped in accordance with various projects of organizational governmentality (Randall & Munro, 2010). It is these projects that we see as shaping the changing discourse, and hence subject and object, of organizational compassion. By applying Foucault’s genealogical method to analysis of publications on compassion in organizations the constant revision of its socio-historical construction becomes apparent. Organizational compassion has been constantly re-defined: it has been seen as a sign of sympathy; as the expression of empowerment through the design of flat organizational structures out of compassion for the costs of hierarchy; as an essential part of the process of fair job layoffs; as something that has “disappeared”, been “neglected” or “ignored” in organizational practices, as well as a means towards achieving greater organizational efficiency and productivity. In early definitions, organizational compassion was seen as something expressed by managers *towards* employees. In later definitions compassion was also framed as something expressed *between* employees within organizations.

Compassion has moved from being a marginal and allegedly irrelevant theme in work by scholars such as Thompson (1975) to being central to an important branch of contemporary scholarship, where organizational compassion has received legitimacy under the banner of POS (Dutton & Workman, 2011) and become perceived as “trendy” (Fryer, 2013) and described as something that “makes sense” for an “improved bottom line” (Sepalla, 2013). We will now discuss the implications of our genealogical analysis by pointing out some limitations of the dominant discourse on organizational compassion that has emerged. These limitations primarily involve a failure to consider relations of power. First, we will consider how the dominant discourse maintains a limited perspective on the subjects and objects of compassion relations. Second, we will discuss the use of science to secularize an essentially traditional religious view of compassion in maintaining processes of domination and control.

Discussion

The subjects and objects of organizational compassion discourse

The organizational compassion literature explored earlier, so enthusiastically advocated on the web pages of leading US educational institutions, presents a limited understanding of the subject and object of compassion relations, an understanding that ignores power dynamics. Often the subject of organizational compassion discourse is the heroic manager or the leader who should or does sympathize (Mayo, 1949), empower (Peters & Waterman, 1982), dismiss fairly (Peters, 1986), and recognize employees as “disappeared”, “neglected” or “ignored” subjects, (Dutton et al., 2002; Dutton, Worline, et al., 2006; Frost, 1999), people for whom positive recognition by managers can unlock all manner of organizational benefits (Kanov et al., 2004; Lilius et al., 2008). Compassion is consequently generally represented as the prerogative of the powerful giver (organizational manager) who may or maybe not choose to be compassionate to a subordinate receiver (employee). In this portrayal the power of the receiver is not considered nor is the legitimacy of the giver questioned.

When the suffering of some individuals is unnoticed, marginalized, or excluded while that of others is recognized and responded to organizationally organizational

compassion is seen to be divisive (Frost et al., 2006). Institutionalized compassion may compound the suffering of those excluded by creating envy and resentment towards co-workers who are the beneficiaries of compassionate support.

Organizational compassion can thus be viewed as a form of selective attention and non-attention embedded within particular compassion organizing processes.

Within POS misconceptions about the subject, object and relations of compassion are reinforced by the dominant definition of organizational compassion as individual or collective noticing of another's suffering, feeling empathy for their pain, and responding to the suffering in some manner (Dutton et al., 2007; Frost et al., 2006; Kanov et al., 2004; Lilius et al., 2008). The definition is limited insofar as it underrepresents sociological and political dynamics in the experience of compassion because of its strongly psychological framing, one that disposes analysis to be unidirectionally transactional. It does not consider compassion as a social construct embedded within power relations in which participants experience both positive and negative outcomes (Berlant, 2004; Clark, 1987, 1997; Nussbaum, 2003; van Kleef et al., 2008), often in quite ambivalent ways.

Simpson, Clegg and Cunha (2013) along with Simpson, Clegg and Freeder (2013) point out that in the dominant definition the subjectivity of the giver is privileged over the experience of the receiver. In contrast, a conception of compassion as a social relation rather than merely a unidirectional projection by a powerful figure on to one whose position is of less consequence in power relations would accommodate a greater range of compassionate phenomena. Both the person noticing, feeling and responding to the pain of the other as well as the experience of the suffering person towards whom the gesture of compassion was made would be incorporated.

Experiences such as a feeling of being patronized, being placed in a position of indebtedness, having one's suffering taken advantage of for organizational objectives, or on the positive side, deep appreciation and gratitude (Clark, 1987, 1997), would enter into analysis. As we will discuss in the following section, the dominant unidirectional perspective of compassion is limited by an implicit metaphorical grounding in religious roots. These roots have been secularized by science but still

constitute the power relations of givers over receivers. The ‘Good Samaritan’ remains a dominant trope (Lancione, forthcoming).

Epistemological rationale and legitimacy of compassion as a technology of the self

The ‘virtue’ of compassion through the centuries has been the traditional domain of religion where compassion has been viewed as an eternal foundational principle. Christian charity is founded on compassion for the less fortunate, summed up in parables such as that of the ‘Good Samaritan’ (Lancione, forthcoming). Within Buddhist thought, when compassion is offered it is not only the receiver of that compassion that benefits but the giver also benefits from inner wellbeing and enlightenment (Goldstein, 1976; Narada, 2006). In the sciences one cannot proceed from the presumptions of faith, however. While faith may interpret compassion in terms of absolute truths, social science must be more empirically nuanced and theoretically justified. Yet, increasingly, compassion is advocated under the banner of objective science, in the interests of powerful elites. Throughout Foucault’s writings, but particularly in his late work, *The history of sexuality* (Foucault, 1986), we see an interest in how subjects are constituted through dominant knowledge and ethics, often grounded in religious power/knowledge. Foucault’s concerns about science perpetuating new regimes of subjectification that take over from earlier religious discourses in promoting certain values as a mode of self-control, self-surveillance, and even self-doubt seems well founded.

Foucault (2007) focuses on pastoral power in a way that is relevant to the overall argument. The pastor, in religious terms, was expected to account for the actions of the individual members of the flock; be responsible for the well-being of each and willing to be a sacrifice in order to save the flock; finally, if the flock proves recalcitrant the pastor achieves greater glory by managing them successfully (pp. 170–72). Foucault (2007, p. 181) observes, “[t]he pastor must really take charge of and observe daily life in order to form a never-ending knowledge of the behavior and conduct of the members of the flock he supervises”. As Golder (2007, p. 165) suggests, ‘Foucault illustrates a model of power ... in which there is a complex (and thoroughly affective) tie between the pastor who exercises a minute and careful jurisdiction over the bodily actions and the souls of his flock’. In managerial terms,

pastoral notions hinge around a compassion for those who accept the truth of the pastoral way and are obedient to it: in other words, managerial compassion is hinged around relations of power conjured up in the idea of the manager ‘shepherding’ the flock. Lately, POS has extended the role of shepherding to include a duty of cultivating compassion for organization members. In contemporary multicultural and secular societies, as religious norms decline in importance, the pastoral role, while still retaining etymological traces of cultivation, has been secularized. The contemporary manager tends an organizational arena wherein his employees may be vicariously treated as the flock—that whose obedience is to be cultivated compassionately. POS helps to show ways in which compassion might be cultivated.

The dominant organizational compassion discourse and its associated research, particularly the academic work conducted under the banner of POS, is grounded on normative epistemological assumptions: it seeks to enhance human “goodness”. In POS this includes “admittedly” taking a “normative stance towards leadership that might be directed to the cultivation of positive states and processes in organizations of benefit to the “common good” (Dutton & Glynn, 2008, p. 706). Consequently, organizational compassion literature directs leaders to cultivate and legitimize compassion relations by paying attention to employee suffering (Dutton et al., 2002; Dutton, Worline, et al., 2006), by holding regular meetings and constructing buildings with open architecture to ensure that people regularly congregate and notice irregular states of suffering (Kanov et al., 2004) and by adopting compassionate policies such as allowing employees to donate unused vacation time to employees in need (Lilius et al., 2008). Employing the findings of neuroscience in support of these conclusions, Boyatzis, Smith and Blaize (2006) emphasize that compassion relations not only benefit the receivers but also the givers. When managers show compassion to employees they are replenished both neurologically and hormonally, ameliorating the negative impact of chronic stress: in other words, compassion facilitates positive embodiment.

The recent academic literature from the POS perspective, extolling the benefits of employees practicing organizational compassion (Dutton et al., 2007; Kanov et al., 2004; Lilius et al., 2008), could be interpreted as promoting an ascetic practice of

caring for the self by caring for the other. Yet, some members of the POS community have questioned these formulations: for example, with regard to the vacation donation time policy, Frost et al. (2006) asked if there could be negative social consequences for an employee who chooses not to contribute? Might they be viewed as non-compassionate or uncooperative, thus eliciting psychosocial power over them by inducing in them feelings of shame and guilt?

Related questions have also not been considered. For instance, the possible negative consequences for an employee of choosing not to accept help when it is offered, perhaps because they are resisting the shame of accepting charity that challenges their dignity. Might they also be viewed with contempt as ungrateful, isolates, not team players? Frost et al. (2006) further raise the question of the organization having co-opted the compassion of its members by adopting a program that costs little to the organization beyond administration expenses but that creates positive organizational returns. Are examples of compassion in caring organizations not perhaps a case of securing internal and external resources by the use of positive rhetoric? Finally, who decides which employees are approved or excluded from receiving support from the vacation donation program?

There is also a risk of compassion becoming over routinized and rationalized with institutionalization, as the rhetoric of compassion is used to legitimize regimes of domination and control with negative outcomes for employees. Examples of this kind involve *compassion work*, its appropriation in *compassion labor* (Ashforth & Humphreys, 1993; Morris & Feldman, 1996), and the related concept of *compassion fatigue* (Figley, 1995, 2002a, 2002b). Compassion work occurs where an individual makes great effort to 'feel compassionate' within the home or work environment. This usually transpires when people feel socially pressured and obliged (what Nietzsche referred to as guilt and shame) to express compassionate emotions that conflict with their actual feelings towards a particular colleague, priority, or project (Frost et al., 2006). Compassion labor is the organizational appropriation and institutionalization of compassion work common in professions such as nursing, social work, and counseling (Ashforth & Humphreys, 1993; Morris & Feldman, 1996). In such helping professions employees are expected to respond to others' pain with compassion as

part of their job description. In addition, it has become standard procedure to employ personality tests for potential employees with Myers-Brigg (MBTI) or other tests to evaluate their proclivity for such an emotional value. Employees who are not adequate in this regard may experience censure from their supervisors, while those who are adequate may experience *compassion burnout* (Cordes & Dougherty, 1993). The latter entails emotional and physical exhaustion from spending too much time providing care and compassion to others, often at great risk to their own emotional and physical wellbeing. A related concept is that of compassion fatigue, a state of physical, mental and emotional exhaustion and pain experienced by those who practice compassion work (Figley, 1995, 2002a, 2002b).

While power relations and negative outcomes of compassion relations are sometimes acknowledged in the organizational compassion literature, they are hardly developed, occurring largely in the “limitations” or “further research” sections of the articles (Dutton, Worline, et al., 2006 for examples see ; Frost, 1999; Frost et al., 2006; Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson, 2000; Kanov et al., 2004; Lilius et al., 2012; Lilius, Worline, Dutton, Kanov, & Maitlis, 2011). Rather than assuming compassion’s effects are necessarily positive and beneficial, we side with the minority position in arguing that the experiences of givers and receivers in compassion relations are likely to be multifaceted, on-going, and ambiguous in implication (Simpson, Clegg, & Cunha, 2013; Simpson, Clegg, & Freeder, 2013; Simpson, Clegg, & Pitsis, 2013).

Conclusion

There are major limitations to the extant theorizing and research on compassion within organizations: first, the focus on compassion as a psychological state rather than a social relational construct used to control organizational subjectivities; second, the tendency to neglect power dynamics inherent in compassion relations; third, the absolutist view of compassion as virtuous, ignoring the negative outcomes of compassion relations that can arise along with positive ones. In pointing out these limitations, we contributed a more nuanced understanding of organizational compassion relations that accommodated compassion as a social-historical technology used in forming the individual organizational subject. Whereas compassion is often thought of as sentimental, with an emphasis on feelings, our analysis suggests that

compassion can be analytical, rational and even calculated (Nussbaum, 2003; Woodward, 2002).

These conclusions may strike some as shocking: genealogical questioning and critique can appear to be overly negative, pessimistic and even nihilistic. Nonetheless, if nihilism is evident anywhere we would maintain that it is in management and organization theory that contributes, often unreflectively, to the constitution of docile bodies through championing the (ad)ministration of secular values of compassion. Foucault, as the writer of “the history of the present” (Foucault, 1977, p. 31) illuminates how current experience is deeply historically embedded and constituted. Our analysis has demonstrated that organizational compassion is a social construct whose provenance, rooted in the religious sphere, increasingly becomes recursively redefined in contemporary Organization Studies according to the requirements of organizational objectives in framing employee subjectivity. The rhetoric of good Samaritans has been transposed from the texts of Church, Chapel and Sunday school, to those texts that are found in the managerial bookcase, texts that we have interrogated.

We should stress that we are averse neither to managers practicing organizational compassion nor to the establishment of POS as a legitimate discipline. The genealogical approach in organization studies questions and critically reflects on the ways in which we account for, conceptualize and make sense of phenomena under investigation. For organization theorizing, the genealogical method scrutinizes how we make sense of compassion within social contexts in which power/knowledge relations are unavoidable. Compassion in organizations is a variable practice: it may be as routine as ticking boxes to show compliance with compassionate standards for legal and PR reasons or it can be spontaneous, heartfelt and sincere, while no less routine, in an organizational setting.

Using the genealogical method to point out the socially contextual origins of compassion in organizations does not imply that we hold organizational compassion to be instrumental and ignoble *per se*. On the contrary we are sympathetic to the concern to design organizations less exploitative and destructive of opportunities for selfhood. Genealogy, by separating out the historical influences that have made people

what they are, seeks to provide opportunity for people to become freed from the confines of accepted “self-evident” knowledge that restricts current thinking and acting. An implicit part of the argument that we have presented is that compassion can chain our freedoms just as much as more overt forms of exploitation and control. As such, what forms of compassion provide what kinds of freedoms (and unfreedoms: Bauman (1988) is an important and powerful question for research, theory and practice. Bondage is particularly pervasive when unrecognized as such. In terms of theory and research, rigorous scrutiny not only enables debate within the discipline but also provides heuristic potential for further research that can free knowledge and practice from invisible shackles.

In conclusion, we propose that ‘in these times of *compassion* when conformity’s in fashion’ (Dylan, 1991) a little deviance from conforming with the organizational compassion “trend” may be in order: organizational compassion may not be quite what it has been represented as being. Being compassionate is not necessarily invariably positive nor is it the universal good it is often presumed to be: we must always ask who benefits from what knowledge, what are its power effects, and what types of subject it constitutes. We hope our discussion promulgates further debate and research in this area.

References

- Abrahamsson, B., & Broström, A. (1980). *The rights of labor*. London: Sage.
- Adelstein, J., & Clegg, S. (2013). And rewind! Recycling discourses of knowledge work and knowledge society. *Management & Organizational History*(ahead-of-print), 1-23. doi: 10.1080/17449359.2013.821023
- Andersen, N. Å. (2011). Conceptual history and the diagnostics of the present. *Management & Organizational History*, 6(3), 248-267.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Humphreys, M. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 88-115.
- Bardon, T., & Jossierand, E. (2011). A Nietzschean reading of Foucauldian thinking: constructing a project of the self within an ontology of becoming. *Organization*, 18(4), 497-515.
- Bauman, Z. (1988). *Freedom*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Berlant, L. (2004). Introduction: compassion (and withholding). In L. Berlant (Ed.), *Compassion: The culture and politics of an emotion* (pp. 1-13). New York: Routledge.
- Bjørkeng, K., Clegg, S., & Pitsis, T. (2009). Becoming (a) practice. *Management Learning*, 40(2), 145-159.
- Boyatzis, R. E., Smith, M. L., & Blaize, N. (2006). Developing sustainable leaders through coaching and compassion. *The Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 5(1), 8-24.
- Brown, W. (1998). Genealogical politics. In J. Moss (Ed.), *The later Foucault: Politics and philosophy* (pp. 33-49). London: Sage.
- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). Foundations of Positive Organizational Scholarship. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 3-13). San Francisco Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Cameron, K. S., & Gaza, A. (2004). Introduction: Contributions to the discipline of positive organizational scholarship. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 731-739.
- Carter, C., McKinlay, A., & Rowlinson, M. (2002). Introduction: Foucault, management and history. *Organization*, 9(4), 515-526.

- Caza, A., & Carroll, B. (2012). Critical theory and positive organizational scholarship. In K. S. Cameron & J. P. Schneider (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 965-978). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, C. (1987). Sympathy biography and sympathy margin. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(2), 290-321.
- Clark, C. (1997). *Misery and company: Sympathy in everyday life*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clegg, S., & Dunkerley, D. (2013). *Organization, class and control*. London: Routledge.
- Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of power*. London: Sage.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and organizations*. London: Sage.
- Cordes, C. L., & Dougherty, T. W. (1993). A review and an integration of research on job burnout. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(4), 621-656.
- du Gay, P. (2008). 'Responsive' Public Management 'Without Affection or Enthusiasm': Problems of Involvement and Attachment in 'Responsive' Public Management. *Organization*, 15, 335-353.
- Dutton, J. E., Frost, P., Worline, M. C., Lilius, J. M., & Kanov, J. M. (2002). Leading in times of trauma. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(1), 54-61.
- Dutton, J. E., & Glynn, M. A. (2008). Positive organizational scholarship. In C. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 1: Micro Approaches, pp. 693-712). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dutton, J. E., Glynn, M. A., & Spreitzer, G. M. (2006). Positive organizational scholarship. In J. Greenhaus & G. Callanan (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Career Development* (pp. 641-644). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dutton, J. E., Lilius, J. M., & Kanov, J. M. (2007). The transformative potential of compassion at work. In S. K. Piderit, R. E. Fry & D. L. Cooperrider (Eds.), *Handbook of transformative cooperation: New designs and dynamics* (pp. 107-124). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Dutton, J. E., & Workman, K. M. (2011). Commentary on 'Why compassion counts!': Compassion as a generative force. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(4), 402-406.

- Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. (2006). Explaining compassion organizing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(1), 59-96.
- Dylan, B. (1991). *The bootleg series: volumes 1-3 [rare & unreleased] 1961-1991*. New York: Columbia.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *Complex organizations: A sociological reader*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Figley, C. R. (1995). *Compassion fatigue: Coping with secondary traumatic stress disorder in those who treat the traumatized*. London: Brunner-Routledge.
- Figley, C. R. (2002a). Compassion fatigue: psychotherapists' chronic lack of self care. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58(11), 1433-1441.
- Figley, C. R. (2002b). *Treating compassion fatigue*. London: Brunner-Routledge.
- Fletcher, J. K. (1998). Relational Practice A Feminist Reconstruction of Work. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 7(2), 163-186.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1984a). Nietzsche, genealogy, history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 76-100). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1984b). On the genealogy of ethics: An overview of work in progress. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 340-372). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1984c). What is enlightenment. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 31-50). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1985). Final interview. *Raritan*, 5(1), 1.
- Foucault, M. (1986). *The care of the self* (R. Hurley, Trans. Vol. 3). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Questions of method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 73-86). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (2007). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977--1978* (G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Frost, P. J. (1999). Why compassion counts. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8(2), 127-133.
- Frost, P. J., Dutton, J. E., Maitlis, S., Lilius, J. M., Kanov, J. M., & Worline, M. C. (2006). Seeing organizations differently: Three lenses on compassion. In S. R.

- Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organization studies* (pp. 843-866). London: Sage.
- Frost, P. J., Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., & Wilson, A. (2000). Narratives of compassion in organizations. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotions in organizations* (pp. 25-45). London: Sage.
- Fryer, B. (2013). The rise of compassionate management (finally). *HBR Blog Network*, from <http://blogs.hbr.org/2013/09/the-rise-of-compassionate-management-finally/>
- Gaebler, T., & Osborne, D. (1992). Reinventing government: An agenda for the 1990s. *Public Management*, 74, 4-8.
- Garber, M. (2004). Compassion. In L. Berlant (Ed.), *Compassion: The culture and politics of an emotion* (pp. 15-27). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Giddens, A. (1998). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Golder, B. (2007). Foucault and the genealogy of pastoral power. *Radical philosophy review*, 10(2), 157-176.
- Goldstein, J. (1976). *The experience of insight: a simple and direct guide to Buddhist meditation*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Habermas, F. G. (1987). *The philosophical discourse of modernity: Twelve lectures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: the commercialization of human feeling*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Hussain, N. J. Z. (2011). The role of life in the genealogy. In S. May (Ed.), *Nietzsche's on the genealogy of morality: a critical guide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Illouz, E. (2012). *Cold intimacies: The making of emotional capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jacques, R. (1996). *Manufacturing the employee: Management knowledge from the 19th to 21st centuries*: Sage Publications Limited.
- Kanov, J. M., Maitlis, S., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Frost, P. J., & Lilius, J. M. (2004). Compassion in organizational life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(6), 808-827.

- Kelan, E. K. (2008). The discursive construction of gender in contemporary management literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(2), 427-445.
- Kelemen, M. (2000). Too much or too little ambiguity: the language of total quality management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 37(4), 483-498.
- Kelemen, M. (2002). *Managing quality*. London: Sage.
- Lancione, M. (forthcoming). Entanglements of faith: Discourses, practices of care and homeless people in an Italian city of saints. *Urban Studies*.
- Lash, S. (1994). Genealogy and the Body: Foucault/Deleuze/Nietzsche. *Michel Foucault: Critical assessments*, 2, 14.
- Lilius, J. M., Kanov, J., Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., & Maitlis, S. (2012). Compassion revealed: What we know about compassion at work (and where we need to know more). In K. S. Cameron & G. Spreitzer (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 273-287). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Kanov, J. M., & Maitlis, S. (2011). Understanding compassion capability. *Human Relations*, 64(7), 873-899.
- Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J. M., Dutton, J. E., & Frost, P. J. (2008). The contours and consequences of compassion at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(2), 193-218.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(6), 695-706.
- Lyncheski, J. E. (1995). Employee terminations: Use fairness and compassion. *HR Focus*, 72(5), 19.
- Mahon, M. (1992). *Foucault's Nietzschean genealogy: Truth, power, and the subject*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mayo, E. (1949). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. London: Routledge.
- Mayo, E. (2003). *The human problems of an industrial civilization* (Vol. 6). London: Routledge.
- McCoy, B. H. (2007). *Living into leadership: A journey in ethics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- McKinlay, A. (2006). Managing Foucault: genealogies of management. *Management & Organizational History*, 1(1), 87-100.

- Merquior, J. G. (1987). *Foucault*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1990). Governing economic life. *Economy and Society*, 19(1), 1-31.
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1994). On therapeutic authority: Psychoanalytical expertise under advanced liberalism. *History of the human sciences*, 7(3), 29-64.
- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1995). Production, identity, and democracy. *Theory and Society*, 24(3), 427-467.
- Minson, J. (1985). *Genealogies of morals: Nietzsche, Foucault, Donzelot and the eccentricity of ethics*. London: Macmillan.
- Morris, J. A., & Feldman, D. C. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 986-1010.
- Narada. (2006). *The Buddha and his teachings*. Mumbai, India: Jaico.
- Nietzsche, F. (1998). *On the genealogy of morals* (D. Smith, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Compassion: The basic social emotion. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 13(01), 27-58.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2003). *Upheavals of thought: The intelligence of emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peters, T. (1986). Competition and compassion. *California Management Review*, 28(4), 11-26.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from American's best-run companies. *New York: Harper & Row*.
- Randall, J., & Munro, I. (2010). Foucault's care of the self: A case from mental health work. *Organization Studies*, 31(11), 1485-1504.
- Rorty, R. (1986). Foucault and epistemology. In D. H. Hoy (Ed.), *Foucault: a critical reader* (pp. 41-49). New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.
- Rose, N. (1985). *The psychological complex: Psychology, politics, and society in England, 1869-1939*: Routledge & Kegan Paul London.
- Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the soul*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Ross, S. A. (1973). The economic theory of agency: The principal's problem. *The American Economic Review*, 63(2), 134-139.

- Rynes, S., Bartunek, J., Dutton, J., & Margolis, J. (2012). Care and compassion through an organizational lens: Opening up new possibilities. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 503-523.
- Sepalla, E. (2013). Why compassion in business makes sense. *Greater good; The science of a meaningful life*, from http://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/why_compassion_in_business_makes_sense
- Sheridan, A. (1980). *Michel Foucault: The will to truth*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Simpson, A. V., Clegg, S., & Cunha, M. P. (2013). Expressing compassion in the face of crisis: Organizational practices in the aftermath of the Brisbane floods of 2011. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 21(2), 115-124.
- Simpson, A. V., Clegg, S., & Freeder, D. (2013). Power, compassion and organization. *Journal of Political Power*, 6(3), 385-404.
- Simpson, A. V., Clegg, S., & Pitsis, T. (2013). Normal compassion: A framework for compassionate decision making. *Journal of Business Ethics* (e-print ahead of publication DIO 10.1007/s10551-013-1831-y).
- Solomon, R. C. (1997). Competition, Care, and Compassion: Toward a Nonchauvinist View of the Corporation. In A. Larson & R. E. Freeman (Eds.), *Women's Studies and Business Ethics: Toward a New Conversation* (pp. 144-173). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Solomon, R. C. (1998). The moral psychology of business: Care and compassion in the corporation. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8(3), 515-534.
- Spreitzer, G. M., & Sonenshein, S. (2003). Positive deviance and extraordinary organizing. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 207-224). San Francisco, CA: Berrett Koehler.
- Susman, W. (1984). *Culture as history: The transformation of American society in the twentieth century*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York, NY: Harper Bros.
- Thompson, V. A. (1975). *Without sympathy or enthusiasm: The problem of administrative compassion*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, Power/knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(3), 518-545.

- Townley, B. (1994). *Reframing human resource management: Power, ethics and the subject at work*. London: Sage.
- Townley, B. (1999). Selection and appraisal: reconstituting 'social relations'? In J. Storey (Ed.), *New perspectives on human resource management*. New York: Routledge.
- van Kleef, G. A., Oveis, C., Van der Lowe, I., LuoKogan, A., Goetz, J., & Keltner, D. (2008). Power, distress, and compassion. *Psychological Science, 19*(12), 1315-1322.
- Weatherbee, T. G., Durepos, G., Mills, A., & Mills, J. H. (2012). Theorizing the past: critical engagements. *Management & Organizational History, 7*(3), 193-202.
- White, J. A. (1998). Leadership through Compassion and Understanding An Interview with Aung San Suu Kyi. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 7*(4), 286-293.
- Woodward, K. (2002). Calculating compassion. *Indiana Law Journal, 77*(2), 223-245.