SPIRITUAL LABOR AND SPIRITUAL DISSONANCE
IN THE TOTAL INSTITUTION OF THE PAROCHIAL BOARDING SCHOOL

_____

A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

_____

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

by
TAMMY MCGUIRE

Dr. Debbie Dougherty, Dissertation Supervisor

DECEMBER 2006

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

SPIRITUAL LABOR AND SPIRITUAL DISSONANCE
IN THE TOTAL INSTITUTION OF THE PAROCHIAL BOARDING SCHOOL

presented by Tammy McGuire,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Debbie S. Dougherty

Dr. Peggy Placier

Dr. Michael Kramer

Dr. Jon Hess

Dr. Rebecca Meisenbach

DEDICATION

To
Mom and Dad
　　　without whom my dreams would be
　　　　　　　　bounded
　　　　　　　　　unreachable

You've created the space for possibilities…
　　　　　　　　　　…including the one before you

To
My Companion and Guide on this spiritual journey…Emmanuel
To whom I'm joyfully indebted for
　　　　　　　Inspiration
　　　　　　　Endurance
　　　　　　　Hope
　　　　　　　　and a
　　　　　　　Future

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This project introduces the concept of "spiritual labor" as the organizational commodification, codification, and regulation of members' spirituality. Thematic analysis of qualitative interviews from thirty-four parochial boarding school teachers and marketing/recruitment documents illustrated that the spirituality of teachers/staff in a parochial boarding school system is commodified as one of the defining elements such schools have to offer. In addition, the spirituality of teachers/staff was also codified officially in organizational documents such as contracts and personnel handbooks and unofficially in the form of unspoken but identifiable norms and values. Regulation of the spirituality of teachers/staff was enacted formally and informally. Formal regulation included confrontation, termination, and transfer. The informal regulation of spirituality occurred via concertive control of other organizational members.

How members cope with spiritual dissonance was also explored. Dissonance was present when faculty/staff members did not personally believe or privately practice the religious/spiritual doctrines of their sponsoring church yet appeared compliant by word, deed, or continued organizational affiliation. Intensifying the stress of this dissonance was the pressure for faculty/staff to set a good spiritual example and the fear that they would be seen as hypocrites.

Organizational members had a number of strategies for dealing with spiritual dissonance. They might remain silent about their divergence, sensing that speaking out was dangerous and/or futile. They might reframe the boundaries of what could be classified as "spiritual." They might leave the school or transfer to another institution within the system. Finally, they report mentally weighing the benefits of their work with

students and their sense of community with the church as a whole and deciding that the positive aspects outweigh the negative effects of dissonance.

Finally, this study placed parochial boarding schools in the category of total institutions. The all-encompassing 24/7 "lifestyle" illustrated how boarding schools might be seen as total institutions. In addition, the characterization of the participants' experiences of boarding school life as analogous to "living in a fishbowl" illustrated how the panopticon might be enacted in a contemporary organization. How the total institution qualities influenced elements of spiritual labor was illustrated throughout this study as well.

Chapter One: Rationale and Justification

Interest in spirituality is as enduring as recorded history. However, on the heels

of the Enlightenment, spirituality was shut out of the "number, weight, measure"

paradigm that dominated scholarly pursuits (see Munck, 2000). Relegated to the domain

of the "irrational" (see Graber & Johnson, 2001) and emotional (e.g., Bento, 1994; Neck

& Millman, 1998), spirituality took its place among those issues considered private

matters – issues that long orbited outside the domain of traditional organizational studies.

As the exclusionary boundaries of organizational "rationality" give way to the

recognition of a more "bounded rationality" (e.g., Simon, 1997), the space for the study

of issues such as emotion in the workplace has been filled by a body of scholarship

illustrating how the management and control of emotions affects organizations and their

members. Since organizational members' expression of and the organization's control

(or attempted control) of these emotions (e.g., Hochschild, 1983) falls distinctly in the

realm of communication, organizational communication scholars have also contributed to

this widening body of knowledge. Given the inroads of emotion to organizational

studies, it is not surprising, then, that spirituality's impact on organizations and

organizational life has even more recently begun to receive scholarly attention as well –

both the spirituality of organizations (e.g., Lee, 1991; Witmer, 2001) and the spirituality

of organizational members (e.g., Buzzanell, 2001; Rodriguez, 2001).

Of course, these organizational members do not simply abandon either their

emotions or their spirituality at the nebulous threshold between their personal and

organizational lives. In fact, as Hochschild (1983) discussed in *The Managed Heart*,

organizations may mandate, control, regulate, and commodify organizational members' emotions. This emotional labor proves to be the locus for the study of organizational control (e.g., Mumby & Putnam, 1992), of emotional dissonance (e.g., Stenross & Kleinman, 1989), and of the stress, frustration, and job dissatisfaction (e.g., Rutter & Fielding, 1988) related to that dissonance.

Just as the study of emotional labor has proved fruitful, so might the study of spirituality. In this study, I propose that "spiritual labor," the organizational commodification, codification, and regulation of spirituality, can also be examined much as emotional labor has in the past. Particularly salient to organizational communication scholars is the centrality of communication inherent in the three core elements of this "spiritual labor" (codification, regulation, and commodification of member's spirituality).

In addition, just as emotional labor brings the potential of emotional dissonance, so might spiritual labor create spiritual dissonance, suggesting that spiritual labor carries with it effects and consequences for organizations and organizational members alike. Thus, given the increased attention to spirituality in organizations, given the previous fruitful scholarship surrounding emotional labor, and given that emotional labor and the conceptualization of spiritual labor seem analogous, the opportunity is ripe to study what I have termed "spiritual labor." Such a study proves promising in beginning to understand spiritual labor's effects (or potential effects) on organizations and organizational members and provides an opportunity to parse the role that communication plays in the commodification, codification, and regulation of members' spirituality.

Tensions and Contradictions: Parochial Boarding Schools and Spiritual Labor

One of the effects of emotional labor and the emotional dissonance that often attends it are tensions and contradictions. The same might be said of spiritual labor. Contradictions and tensions as an inherent part of organizations can have palpable influences on all types of organizations and their members (e.g., Handy, 1994; Smith & Berg, 1987; Ford & Backoff, 1988; Tretheway & Ashcraft, 2004). As Putnam (1985) points out, contradictions serve as tangible "ruptures in the current social fabric" (p. 153) and drive organizational change – sometimes, perhaps, to the "edge of chaos" (Eisenhardt, 2000, p. 703). Given these effects, contradictions and tensions certainly cannot be ignored in the study of organizations, particularly where the potential "ruptures" in the "social fabric" occur in organizations such as churches and/or schools, which traditionally value stability and continuity (e.g., Crawford, 2005; Parsons & Fuller, 2005). More particularly, within these two broad types of organizations (educational institutions and churches), one unique site promises to embody elements of both – this is the parochial school. It is here that the juxtaposition of churches and the parochial schools they sponsor makes this site of study a promising field for examining the organizational tensions and contradictions emanating from spiritual labor, and it is here that this particular study is situated.

As Heider (1958) posits in his balance theory, human beings find contradictions uncomfortable and seek to avoid or reduce the tensions those contradictions engender; human beings seek internal consistency (balance), and contradictions by their very definition are devoid of consistency. Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance explores the tension that results when cognitions (defined as beliefs, values, or attitudes about one's self, others, and/or the environment) are contradictory to one's behavior. In

an organizational setting, for example, when members are required to sell a product they don't believe in or perform with outward enthusiasm tasks they actually consider excruciatingly boring, a kind of cognitive dissonance presents itself to members. The contradictions engendered by such dissonance lead to tensions for organizational members. It is at the intersection of these types of contradictions and tensions that spiritual labor and the related notion of spiritual dissonance lie.

Thus, not only does spiritual labor carry the same potential for dissonance, tension, and contradictions that emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983) may present to organizational members, but spiritual labor might also be profitably studied in parochial boarding schools, unique sites that blend the organizational characteristics of both churches and schools and which also share qualities of total institutions – qualities that may serve to exacerbate, frame, or create tensions and contradictions that accompany spiritual labor.

Defining "Spiritual Labor"

The introduction of this new concept of spiritual labor first requires that it be carefully conceptualized. Thus, the following sections further explicate the concept of "spiritual labor" and why the development of such a concept is warranted. Finally, I will argue that placing parochial boarding schools within the framework of the total institution serves to illuminate the nature of spiritual labor within these types of organizations.

Spiritual labor is akin to the concept of emotional labor (e.g., Hochschild, 1979, 1983); thus, in the same way that emotional labor can lead to emotional dissonance, so can spiritual labor lead to spiritual dissonance. In emotional labor, members' expressed emotions are codified, commodified, and regulated by the organization, and when these

expressed emotions differ from the actual emotions experienced (see Waldron & Krone, 1991) the result is dissonance in organizational members. In the same manner, spiritual labor carries the same possibility for dissonance and is characterized by the organization's codification, commodification, and regulation of members' spirituality. The term "spirituality" is a reference to a broadly defined belief in a higher power and a valuing of community and relationships (see Chapter Two).

Emotional labor leads to a particular type of dissonance engendered by contradictions – the dissonance created by conflict between the organizational expectations regarding expressed emotions that differ from members' own experienced emotions.[1] In a like manner, when organizational expectations regarding the expression (or suppression) of spirituality differ from members' own personal spirituality, the stage is equally set for spiritual dissonance to occur. The emotional dissonance that organizational members may feel from the mandates of emotional labor and the effects on both members and organizations alike is oft noted in the literature (e.g., Tracy, 2005; Ash, 1984; Pringle, 1988; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Martin, Knopoff, & Beckman, 1989). However, spiritual labor as a corollary concept to emotional labor has not previously been explored from either a management or communication perspective, even though it might be postulated that the dissonance it engenders also carries consequences for organizations and their members alike. In this sense spiritual labor and the dissonance it may engender is a salient concept that this study develops.

Spiritual Labor in Parochial Schools

---

[1] It might be noted here that Hochschild (1983) also discusses organizations that attempt to appropriate *both* experienced *and* expressed emotions. She argues that this type of emotional labor embodies the greatest danger of creating emotional dissonance damaging to the psyche of the organizational members.

Parochial schools offer a promising site to study this concept of "spiritual labor" because these types of organizations can be expected to commodify, codify, and regulate the spirituality of their teachers and staff. How these various aspects of spiritual labor might operate in parochial schools will next be addressed in turn.

Commodification of Spirituality. One of the central missions of parochial schools is to socialize students into the norms, values, and doctrines of the sponsoring church (see Fichter, 1964; Peshkin, 1986; Jackson, Boostrom, & Hansen, 1993) and where the socializing agents (teachers and staff) are expected to embody those elements as well (see Peshkin, 1986; Carr, 2000). This promise of socialization into a particular belief or value system and the institutional pledge to embrace, uphold and promote the sponsoring church's doctrinal tenets is the "commodity" offered by most parochial schools, a commodity for which some find worth paying. While educational institutions have long been considered one of the primary socializing entities embraced by society at large (see Bennett & LeCompte, 1990; Durkheim, 1961), parochial schools are largely expected to take this idea of socialization into a broader arena. Providing an atmosphere where faith (usually a particular brand of faith) and learning are integrated seamlessly together by dedicated and believing faculty and staff is one of the primary qualities that differentiate these educational institutions from their secular siblings (see Sandin, 1992). Unlike public schools which offer free attendance, most parochial schools are expensive (see Harris, 1994; Hays, 1996), a fact which makes it important for them to have a distinct offering above and beyond simply providing the typical education offered free of charge in public schools.

This "commodity" that is being bought and sold may be the promise of better

academics (see Vryhof, 2004). However, typically coupled to this promise of quality

education is the "parochial" nature of the institution, the practice and teaching of certain

spiritual beliefs, values, and/or behaviors. In this sense, parochial schools embrace a

certain brand of spirituality inevitably shaped by their denominational affiliation. The

idea that spirituality may be seen as a commodity – part of a service that is bought and

sold – is a concept that deserves attention within the developing interest regarding

organizational spirituality in general (e.g., Graber & Johnson, 2001; Mitroff & Denton,

1999a; Mitroff & Denton, 1999b). The impact and exact nature of the commodification

of spirituality is unknown, a void that this study of spiritual labor in parochial schools

seeks to address.

Codification and Regulation of Spirituality. In a parochial school, the commodity

of spirituality is largely delivered by the employees of the institution. Teachers in a

parochial school are expected to teach and communicate not only the content of their

particular discipline, but to also embrace the spiritual values, moral codes, and accepted

behaviors of their particular umbrella church organization. In a manner similar to that of

emotional labor then, one might expect that the actions, norms, and behaviors of

parochial school teachers are codified, not only by what is expected as *teachers* in a

school, but as *members* of a church. These values, beliefs, and behaviors are codified in

more or less specificity by the church organization that sponsors the school (see Peshkin,

1986); this codification may be evidenced by the published doctrines, practices, and

expectations of the sponsoring church. In addition, these basic tenets of spirituality are

likely to be operationalized more specifically in personnel handbooks, job descriptions,

contractual expectations, etc. that explicate what constitutes proper and improper conduct on the part of teachers – not only in the realm of the teaching profession, but within the spiritual realm as well.

In this sense, these teachers are undoubtedly expected to be members of their sponsoring church and embrace that church's spiritual tenets not just in name, but in appearance, behavior, and reality as well (see Youniss, Convey, & McClelland, 2000). They are expected to profess and practice their sponsoring church's spiritual values, beliefs, and behavior both inside and outside of the classroom as part of the commodity that makes up parochial education. This profession and practice is regulated both overtly and covertly. As with any type of codified norms, external regulation may occur from peers in the form of concertive control (e.g., Barker, 1999, 1993; Tomkins & Cheney, 1985) or from the organization itself. For example, teachers may lose their jobs when they violate the norms (see Getlin, 2005). Thus, expression and practice of spirituality is not only codified but regulated as well.

The expectation that spirituality would be codified and regulated leads to the possibility of dissonance. For example, the emotional dissonance often engendered by emotional labor may be mirrored in the dissonance between teachers' expressed adherence to all the codified spiritual norms, values, behaviors, and rituals of their church and the practices they actually embrace, or would likely embrace exclusive of their job expectations. Likewise, by their association with the institution as employees, they give the appearance of also agreeing with the mission and spiritual principles embraced and promoted by their organizations. Working in such a system – appearing by association to buy-in to the spirituality of that organization, but not in reality agreeing personally with

those principles – also sets the stage for possible spiritual dissonance. How

organizational members respond to this dissonance and how they negotiate such tensions

and contradictions are promising arenas of study. In this context, the concept of

"spiritual labor" with all its potential similarities and differences to emotional labor, begs

for attention, particularly from communication scholars who are positioned at the nexus

of the tensions and contradictions that such contexts may bring.

Examining Parochial Boarding Schools as Total Institutions

In this study I undertake the examination of the spiritual labor of teachers and

staff who work in parochial schools, more particularly in parochial *boarding* schools.

The boarding school as a total institution adds one more intriguing element to the study

of spiritual labor in particular. Therefore, what follows is a discussion of the concept of

the total institution and its contribution in the framing of spiritual labor in parochial

institutions follows.

The Encompassing Nature of Parochial Boarding Schools

The idea that spiritual labor takes place in organizations that commodify, codify,

and regulate spirituality suggests that these organizations are more encompassing of their

members' lives in the sense that matters of religion, spirituality, and morality are deeply

embedded values (Altman & Taylor, 1973). Instead of clear boundaries between work,

home, or third spaces (e.g., Ashforth, Kreiner, & Fugate, 2000; Kirby, et al., 2003),

members in institutions where spiritual labor is involved may find that the expectations of

their organization are woven into their public and private persona more seamlessly than

in other institutions (see Carr, 2000). For example, teachers in parochial schools who

accept the mission of the school to teach a certain type of spirituality and to socialize

9

their students to be future church members are undoubtedly expected to be members of the sponsoring church not just in name, but in appearance, behavior, and reality as well (see Sullivan, 2001). Because spirituality in the form of deeply-held doctrinal beliefs, moral values, and world-views are not issues that organizational members are likely to easily embrace in one context (i.e., in the classroom) and drop in another (i.e., on the weekends), the idea of spiritual labor more easily embraces the totality of one's life (see Carr, 2000; Peshkin, 1986). These "fuzzy" borders between the personal and private lives of parochial school teachers illustrate the highly encompassing nature of work in parochial schools and the possible locus of tensions and contradictions within these types of organizations.

However, it might be argued that a certain type of parochial school is even more all-embracing – the parochial *boarding* school. Such sites have all the qualities and goals of a parochial school, but added into the organizational mix is the assumption that spiritual expectations in the form of church/school's norms, values, and behavioral norms now extend into the lives of members on a much more encompassing level. Parochial boarding schools' faculty and staff have the responsibility and obligation not only to educate, but also to room, board, and supervise its students in a much more encompassing manner than other types of schools. This supervision includes the regulation of social rules, movement to and from the campus, and interaction with the "outside" world (see McLachlan, 1970; Youniss, Convey, & McLellan, 2000). These qualities endemic to parochial boarding schools are qualities that can and (perhaps should) be compared with the type of organizations known as a total institutions (Goffman, 1962).

The Encompassing Nature of Total Institutions

Goffman (1962) articulated that the basic quality of organizations as total institutions is the fact that they are more encompassing of their members' lives than the norm. In practice, the conceptualization of total institutions has embraced more sinister organizational sites such as asylums (e.g., Denzin, 1968), prisons (e.g., Hepburn & Stratton, 1977), or concentration camps (e.g., Dimsdale, 1974). Nevertheless, Goffman himself suggested that other types of organizations might also share the qualities of a total institution, including monasteries/convents, military organizations, or ships at sea (see Becker, 2003). All of these sites have undergone some scrutiny, but rarely by communication scholars, despite the seemingly obvious conclusion that communication plays an interesting and dynamic element in a total institution – and in fact may actually constitute a central role in the difference between the potential harmful and beneficial qualities that total institutions bring as organizations. A number of sociologists have argued that studying total institutions primarily in organizations such as prisons or asylums serves to narrow the conceptualization of total institutions as purely negative, undesirable organizations and have called for scholars to embrace a more eclectic site selection when studying total institutions (see Becker, 2003; McEwan, 1980). Because parochial boarding schools have many of the qualities of a total institution as conceived by Goffman, they offer one of these neglected sites.

However, the study of parochial boarding schools from the conceptual framework of total institutions offers more than just the promise to broaden the application of Goffman's total institution to a wider variety of organizations; it also would serve as a

framework for an examination of the contradictions and tensions that might be faced by those that undertake spiritual labor. Therefore, the application of a total institution lens to parochial boarding schools promises to illuminate the concept of spiritual labor within organizations that commodify, codify, and regulate the spirituality of its members in a much more encompassing manner than the norm. How the encompassing nature of a total institution affects the teachers/staff who engage in spiritual labor within its bounds, and how these organizational members communicatively negotiate spiritual labor (including the possible attendant dissonance) are areas that promise to expand our conceptualization of any type of total institution that encompass the lives of their members to greater or lesser degrees.

Summary

This study develops the concept of spiritual labor of teachers/staff in parochial boarding schools. Such an undertaking contributes to scholarship in a number of ways. First, it provides an opportunity to explore the dimensions of spiritual labor, to develop its similarities and differences with emotional labor, and to discover how organizations and their members manage spiritual labor. Though this study focuses on spiritual labor in a parochial boarding school, developing this construct also provides a framework for examining spiritual labor in broader contexts and in different types of organizations. Secondly, by using the context of the total institution, this study not only broadens its conceptualization to heretofore less-considered contexts but also serves to illuminate how the qualities of total institutions contribute to spiritual labor. Finally, this study's examination of spiritual dissonance faced by the teachers/staff who engage in spiritual

labor in total institutions allows for a nuanced look at issues of power and control

inherent in the concepts of both spiritual labor and total institutions.

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Research Questions

The following literature review that serves as a foundation for the study of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools requires a journey through several seemingly disparate areas – spirituality, emotional labor, total institutions, and parochial boarding schools.

In light of these exigencies, the subsequent sections will first outline the conceptual dimensions of "spiritual labor" developed in this study. Secondly, because the term "spiritual labor" implies some aspect of spirituality, a review of the terms "religious" and "spirituality" as utilized in previous literature will further help define the boundaries of spiritual labor. Because no literature exists on spiritual labor itself, this literature review will take a tour through the concept of emotional labor and suggest how its theoretical underpinnings might be analogous to spiritual labor.

In this study I center the examination of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools and propose that these educational organizations have qualities of total institutions. In this light, I also include a discussion of the concept of the total institution, how the organizational structure of boarding schools (and particularly *parochial* boarding schools) falls within the total institution framework, and how spiritual labor might operate within the bounds of parochial boarding schools.

Conceptualizing Spiritual Labor

Spiritual labor as conceptualized in this study is characterized by the organizational commodification, codification, and regulation of its members' spiritual

14

values, norms, practices, and world-views. This characterization mirrors that of

emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983) and will be explained more fully below.

The primary characteristics of emotional labor as conceptualized in Hochschild's

(1983) *The Managed Heart* are the commodification, codification, and regulation of

emotions and the dissonance that comes from the contradiction between experienced and

expressed emotions. Yet organizations may commodify and codify more than emotions,

and just as emotional labor may lead to dissonance, so might spiritual labor. In parochial

schools, for example, another type of dissonance would result when members are asked

or required by their sponsoring church and/or school to embrace and communicate certain

spiritual values that these members may not, in fact, hold internally (or may not embrace

to the extent called for by the organization). In contrast, any type of organization,

including parochial schools, may conceivably call for the *suppression* of spiritual beliefs,

behaviors, and moral values that members may internally embrace. Thus, the

commodification, codification, and regulation of spiritual norms, values, behaviors, moral

codes, and world-views may well be labeled a type of "spiritual labor" akin in nature to

the concept of emotional labor.

An example of spiritual labor in this sense might be seen in the 2005 case of the

unmarried Catholic school teacher who was dismissed from her position when she

became pregnant (see Getlin, 2005). The prohibition of pre-marital sex is part of a

codified moral value in the Catholic church as stated in its tenets and doctrines (see

Konstanti & Church, 1996), and the parochial school where the teacher worked required

its employees to uphold tenets of the Catholic doctrine. Thus, because this teacher

worked at a Catholic school, upholding these moral values was part of the organizational

expectations of both church and school. These expectations were codified in the doctrine of the church organization as well as in the parochial school where the teacher was employed (i.e., as outlined in the faculty handbook). Obviously in this case the result of the dissonance between the Catholic church's call for sexual abstention outside of marriage and the woman's actual behavior becomes evident in her pregnancy. Her failure to live up to the spiritual expectations of her church as codified in the view that sex should be reserved for the marriage relationship resulted in this teacher's dismissal from her position. Such an action on the part of the organization illustrates the regulation of these codified values as well. The contradictions and tension for the woman, the school, and the Catholic church are evident in the media coverage of the incident (see Getlin, 2005; Lucadomo, 2005).[2]

What this example illustrates is the nature of spiritual labor – the codification, commodification, and regulation of spiritual norms, values, behaviors, moral codes, and world-views. It also illustrates the need to further conceptualize the concept of "spirituality" implied in the term "spiritual labor," particularly when issues of spirituality and religion come together as they might in a parochial school setting. The next section will explore these issues in depth.

Spirituality in Organizations

In light of this study's examination of spiritual labor, one important line of literature to examine is the relatively recent interest in the concept of "spirituality" as it relates to organizations. A brief tour through this literature reveals the manner in which spirituality has been conceptualized and suggests the potential scope for the study of

---

[2] A confounding factor in this incident is the fact that the Catholic church also prohibits abortion. The fact that this woman in fact upheld *this* particular expectation lends a complexity and irony to this incident.

spiritual labor in organizations, whether these organizations be recognizably "religious" or not.

Spirituality in Organizational Communication Literature.

Organizational communication has not been quick to explore the concept of spirituality in organizations, though an upsurge in management and healthcare literature on the topic has steadily increased over the last decade and a half (see Biberman & Whitty, 2000; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003; Graber & Johnson, 2001; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a). What is clear in an overview of this literature is that the term "spirituality" is applied in a number of ways. Some place spirituality among the many elements responsible for organizational culture, climate, or character (e.g., Lee, 1991; Witmer, 2001). Spirituality has been discussed in light of organizational change (e.g., Bartunek & Moch, 1994), effectiveness (e.g., Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003), and leadership (e.g., Thompson, 2000). A number of organizational communication scholars have called for the concept of spirituality to appropriate a more recognizable role in the field's scholarship (see Rodriguez, 2001). Taking the stance that humans are spiritual beings, Witmer (2001) suggests that organizations are, therefore, a reflection of the spirituality of their members. Using structuration theory (Giddens, 1984) to explain how spirituality is both constituting and constituted by organizations, Witmer examines the spirituality of Alcoholics Anonymous in light of organizational culture. Krone (2001) encourages organizational communication scholars to re-visit issues such as LMX and framing in light of member and organizational spirituality. Buzzanell (2001) suggests that even the idea and meaning of work itself might take on nuances by bringing spirituality into the discussion and that tensions between one's career and one's personal

spirituality have been underexamined. Indeed, as Smith et al. (2006) noted, non-profit

arts managers reframed the worth of their careers in light of spiritual values (i.e., "a

calling," "service," and "sacrifice") rather than more secular standards of extrinsic

rewards such as prestige and material compensation.

Recently *Communication Studies* devoted an entire issue to the role spirituality

might play in organizing with an eye to disrupting the "secular hegemony" (Rodriguez,

2001) that some argue has privileged the discourse of managerial and instrumental foci in

organization communication theory and scholarship (see Buzzanell & Harter, 2006). In

this issue Leeman (2006) noted how the alternate organizing attempts of a housechurch

illustrated how religion/spirituality "transcend, straddle, and encompass all the socially

constructed spheres of human activity" (p. 19), including what makes up the

public/private spheres of human experience (e.g., Habermas, 1991). This piece thus

introduces the difficulty of separating what is public and what is private when exploring

the domain of organizational spirituality.

Another approach to spirituality in organizations included that of Kirby et al.

(2006) who employed a dialectical approach to discuss spiritual tensions of faculty

members in a Jesuit university. The faculty members in this autoethnographic study

struggled with the tensions of both embracing and resisting Jesuit values. Of particular

note to the concept of spiritual labor is the authors' observations that rather than resist,

most faculty members chose to embrace the Jesuit values embodied and promoted by the

university. The authors speculated that those who would resist such values either "do not

join the faculty or move on to other institutions" (p. 95). Other strategies of dealing with

this dialectical tension included that of embracing or resisting these values depending

upon the situation – a strategy they called "reframing." This approach involved reframing both what it meant to be a Jesuit, and whether the Jesuit values espoused by the university were truly "different" spiritually from secular values. The other dialectical tensions explored in this study included 1) the inclusive/exclusive struggles of being part of a Catholic institution interested in preserving Catholic values and identity, while not excluding those of other faiths in the process, and 2) the tensions of proclamation/silence – how publicly or privately to proclaim one's faith. The faculty in this study struggled with how public and open they should be about their own spiritual journey and beliefs, realizing that by their actions and behaviors (i.e., wearing or not wearing a cross necklace) they were communicating aspects of their own spirituality.

Turning from the private lives of faculty in a Jesuit Catholic university to how these types of institutions might go about identifying their spiritual mission, Feldner's (2006) study illustrated some tensions and difficulties that might be associated with that endeavor. One such difficulty is the sense of organizational members that in a Jesuit institution, the mission was seen to be simply part of the organizational culture rather than one more purposefully embraced by the organization. As one participant said, "It's the way people are" (p. 75). Secondly, infusing spirituality into the mission of the institution proved beneficial in the eyes of these organizational members because it provided the type of "meaningful workplace that many say they desire" (p. 77). In other words, the participants in this study *wanted* to work in an organization that both proclaimed its spirituality and infused it into the very purpose and mission of the organization. These participants saw an opportunity to blend their public and private spiritual values – "their spiritual selves with their work selves" (p. 74). Though my study

19

deals with high schools, not universities, this literature informs my endeavor by suggesting that working in an organization that proclaims its spiritual mission can be rather all-encompassing (i.e., blending public and private) and that this result may bring with it certain tensions and contradictions.

Finally, Goodier and Eisenberg (2006) took an ethnographic look at a health-care system's transition to a more spiritual approach to organizing (i.e., love, wholeness, values, purpose). Most salient to my study of spiritual labor is their critical examination of the possibility for concertive control. When an organization replaces (or augments) their more bureaucratic rules and expectations with less explicit values, norms, and shared missions the locus of enforcement changes from management to the concertive control of organizational members working to preserve these shared values, norms, etc. (see Barker, 1999, 1993; Tomkins & Cheney, 1995). Goodier and Eisenberg note that the language and practices of this healthcare organization's move to a more spiritual mission elicited a measure of concertive control. They postulated that the more organizational members identify themselves with an organization, and the more committed they are to preserving its values, the more likely they are to engage in concertive control. Members of the organization in their study proved willing promoters and caretakers of the spiritual principles promoted by the organization itself.

However, aside from these more recent studies in the 2006 journal, *Communication Studies*, this relatively brief survey of the intersection between organizational communication scholarship and spirituality in organizations illustrates that organizational communication scholars have really only just begun to incorporate the concept of spirituality into their scholarship.

The Conceptual Relationship between "Spiritual" and "Religious"

Up to this point in time, I have offered a brief review of spirituality in organizational communication literature. Now I will further discuss how spirituality is to be defined in this study as well as the relationship between the concepts of "religion" and "spirituality."

Though the distinction between the terms "religious" and "spiritual" are sometimes fuzzy (see Garcia-Zamor, 2003), most of the literature on spirituality in organizations makes some effort to define "spirituality" as conceptually distinct from "religious" (see Pratt, 2000 for an exception). Religion is most often defined in relation to an organized sectarian belief system (e.g., Ettore, 1996; Kirkwook, 1994; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a). This definition of "religion" is straightforward, and few generally report difficulties distinguishing between spirituality and religion. Spirituality, on the other hand, proves much more difficult to define. Writes Laabs (1995), "Defining spirituality in the workplace is like capturing an angel – it's ethereal and beautiful, but perplexing" (p. 64). Those who nevertheless try to specifically define spirituality invariably accede to its complexity (see Freshman, 2000; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a; Sass, 2000) but generally agree that spirituality transcends organized religion in some way (e.g., Bineham, 1989; Graber & Johnson, 2001; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a; Yamane, 1992). One of the most systematic treatments of spirituality is provided by Pokora (2000) who suggest four categories of spirituality: *linking* spirituality (linking faith and action), *path* spirituality (specific practices designed to enhance spirituality), *incorporeal* spirituality (that which only includes the "spirit"), and *totalizing* spirituality (assuming that all is spiritual).

Though Pokora's typology might be useful in classifying spirituality, even this typology

illustrates the complexity in trying to actually operationalize or define "spirituality."

Defining Spirituality: Key Constructs

Despite the acknowledged complexity of the term, certain key constructs

consistently emerge in the literature. One of the most common themes among the

conceptualizations of spirituality is the basic idea of being connected with a greater

whole, whether this be seen as nature (e.g., Bullis & Glaser, 1992), a higher being, or

simply as a nebulous higher force (e.g., Frost & Egri, 1994; McCormick, 1994;

Thompson, 2000). For example, Pratt's (2000) study of the Amway corporation

highlighted the spiritual aspects of this organization. One clear example could be found

in the language of their "Credo of Compassionate Capitalism": "We believe every man,

woman, and child is created in God's image" (as quoted on p. 49). This unabashed

stance on God as humanity's creator illustrates a strong and unmistakable spiritual stance

for this organization. Spirituality in organizations may be connected more specifically

with Biblical principles as in the credo above (e.g., Steward & Shoock, 2004), but it can

also be connected with other spiritual traditions, such as the Buddhist Way (e.g., Larkin,

1999) or with the New Age movement (e.g., Nadesan, 1999). Nevertheless, all of these

varied spiritual blueprints still embrace the central idea of some greater power or force in

the human experience.

The other unifying element in the discussion of what constitutes spirituality is the

inclusion of some form of ethics or values that highlight community and relationships

(e.g., Goodpaster, 1994; Kirkwood, 1994; Laabs, 1995; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a;

Pauchant, 2002; Sass, 2000). Once again, Pratt's (2000) ethnographic study of Amway

provides a clear example. The code of ethics for Amway distributors begins with what is termed "The Golden Rule," parroted from the New Testament nearly word for word: "I will always endeavor to do unto others as I would have them do unto me" (p. 51; see also Matthew 7:12). Other examples of this aspect of the spirituality of organizations may not be tied so firmly to Christian Biblical principals but still illustrate the dominant thread regarding relational values that undergird how spirituality is conceptualized in the literature. For example, the strong values with regard to community, family, and service were equated with spirituality in Milliman, et al.'s (2000) study of Southwest airlines. These relationships may be confined to inside the organization itself as when Fine and Buzzanell (2001) argue that the spiritual nature of the servant-leader can radically change the relationship between leaders and those they lead. Studies such as these place organizationally promoted moral/ethical values regarding community, organization, and/or family relationships as marks of spirituality at play.

In sum, though an exact definition and agreement on the term "spirituality" is difficult to come by in the literature, the connection with a greater whole (however defined) as well as the tie to some sort of values, ethics/morals with regard to one's obligations and relationships with others (however broadly or narrowly defined) are both prevalent similarities that extend throughout the literature.

"Spiritual" Labor in Religious Organizations: Religion vs. Spirituality

As noted above, because of this seemingly distinct line between religion and spirituality, proposing to study spiritual labor in a notably *religious* organization may raise the specter of confusing the two. Since this study employs the term *spiritual* labor, but proposes to study it in a *religious* organization (parochial boarding schools), the

following obvious but notable point can be emphasized here: the values embedded in relationship norms and the views of a higher power alluded to above are no less "spiritual" when codified by specific religious organizations as doctrines. Conversely, in religious organizations, spirituality (i.e., deeply held values and beliefs about this higher power and one's responsibilities to others) need not be codified formally as doctrine to constitute spirituality. These two points will be developed below.

     Studying the Spiritual as distinct from the Religious. Even though a clear conceptual distinction between "religious" and "spiritual" seems to permeate the literature, spirituality might be studied in organizations that are tied to specific religious denominations without necessarily devolving into a study of a specific religion per se. For example, Sass's (2000) work illustrates that spiritual norms may be studied in organizations that have clear ties to a specific religion. His study of spirituality in a Catholic nursing home illustrated how spirituality might be emphasized, encouraged, and embraced by a religiously affiliated organization without targeting specific doctrinal issues or focusing on "religion" rather than "spirituality." For example, an accepted and encouraged practice for members of both the largely Catholic management and the largely Protestant labor force included praying with residents, attending organizationally sponsored religious activities for the residents, or frankly talking about end-of-life issues. However, none of these practices and organizational norms was tied into doctrinal codes of a particular religious faith (i.e., neither Protestant nor Catholic). The spirituality of this Catholic religious organization was studied without focusing on the Catholic church, illustrating that spirituality (including spiritual labor) can be examined in organizations with strong religious ties without necessarily confounding spirituality and religion.

Because this study examined spiritual labor in a parochial school setting, this becomes a

salient point.

     Studying the Spirituality of the Religious. A second important point to discuss on

this matter is that though "religion" and "spirituality" carry distinctions, they need not be

mutually exclusive. As Feldner (2006) articulates, "Every religion carries with it a

particular spirituality" (p. 70).

     That formalized and organized religion may be bereft of spiritual vigor has always

been acknowledged. Jesus himself made the point that the highly formalized Pharisaical

sect of Judaism was like a whitewashed tomb that looked pure and clean on the outside

but was full of decay on the inside. "In the same way, on the outside you appear to

people as righteous but on the inside you are full of hypocrisy and wickedness" (Matthew

23:28, NIV). Jesus' statement echoes that of contemporary religious writers who take up

the theme that one may follow the rules of an organized religion and not fully experience

the transcendent spirituality behind those rules – that of a higher power and one's

relationship to others (e.g., Chambers, 1935; Lewis, 1946, 1952; Warren, 2002).

Conversely, these rules and doctrines may also represent spirituality in its most basic

sense. For example, the Biblical New Testament frames the *spiritual* essence of the

Judaic code in the following exchange between Jesus and a teacher of the Judaic law:

> One of the teachers of the law… asked him [Jesus], "Of all the
> commandments, which is the most important?"
>
> "The most important one," answered Jesus, "is this… Love the Lord your God
> with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind and with all
> your strength. And the second is this: Love your neighbor as yourself." (Mark
> 12:28-31, NIV)

In this exchange Jesus articulates the spiritual foundation that underlies the formal

religious Judaic code and implies that the rules (or commandments) are all reflective of

this greater spiritual essence. Note here how Jesus' statement captures the two basic

elements that thread the various definitions regarding spirituality in organizational

literature – the existence of a higher power and one's obligations to others (relationships).

His point here is that one must not lose sight of the spirituality that undergirds and

provides the raison d'etre behind the Judaic code. Thus, to be "religious" in the sense of

adhering to a codified set of beliefs certainly does not automatically mean that one is also

spiritual. However, it also need not be assumed that by studying a religious organization,

one is necessarily studying religion instead of spirituality. Just as one can be *religious*

without being *spiritual*, one can also be *both* spiritual *and* religious. These terms are

neither mutually exclusive nor mutually inclusive by default.

What religion offers that the more generic definition of spirituality may not is to

make opaque the fundamental ontological and epistemological premises upon which

one's spirituality is founded and to create some organizational structure in which

members collectively put into praxis these beliefs.   In this sense, religion is bounded by a

person's adherence in behavior and/or profession to specified and codified doctrines that

make up a particular organized religion. On the other hand, because *spirituality* spreads a

broader conceptual net, it becomes more difficult to bracket in organizations that do not

embrace such recognizable formalized religious doctrine. The study of spiritual labor

eases these issues in that spiritual labor addresses situations when matters of spirituality

are commodified and codified in some manner. In a parochial school setting this

codification may take the form of *doctrinal* expectations of the sponsoring church

organization. Other types of organizations, however, may codify spirituality apart from

religious doctrine, as in the previously noted cases of Amway (Pratt, 2000) and

Southwest airlines (Milliman, et al., 2000). Thus, the study of spirituality, and more specifically of spiritual labor, is applicable to a number of organizations – whether they are identifiably religious or not.

Despite this potentially broad application, parochial boarding schools offer a unique opportunity to introduce the study of spiritual labor. In the first place as mentioned above, religious organizations are more likely to codify and regulate matters of spirituality. In addition, aspects of spirituality are very much part of the organization's mission and to a large degree represent the "commodity" or service offered. Witmer (2001) describes organizations as "spiritually enriched" when members are "enthusiastic and intense in their expression of spirituality, their values, and their organizational goals" (p. 9). On the other end of the continuum, organizations can also be "spiritually deprived"; these are places where spirituality is "relegated to invisibility, where only the bottom-line, 'left-brained'…sorts of things matter" (p. 9). She uses the term "pious" to describe those who are overt and open about their spirituality. This expression of spirituality may be nurtured or suppressed by organizations. For example, Witmer's work with Alcoholics Anonymous takes place in what she terms a "spiritually enriched" organization where the expression of members' spirituality is encouraged and valued. The same might be said of parochial schools. Thus, an organization such as a parochial school offers an arena where the expression of spirituality is likely to be encouraged and where spiritual labor might be more easily identified.

In summary, spiritual labor by implication involves concepts of *spirituality*, a term that broadly encompasses a belief in the existence of a higher power and the importance of one's obligations to a broader community. Though spiritual labor has

broad implications for a number of different types of organizations, this study focuses on the "spiritually enriched" institution represented by parochial boarding schools where spiritual labor is quite likely to be a part of the organizational expectancies of teachers and staff. Therefore, the following research question regarding spiritual labor is addressed in this study:

RQ 1: What is the nature of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools?

Comparing Emotional Labor and Spiritual Labor

The term "spiritual labor" is eponymous with the more well-known and widely studied concept of emotional labor. In fact, the notion that spiritual labor might be linked with emotional labor is hinted at in the spirituality literature. In the sense that spirituality is thought to transcend rational thought, the concept is often placed in the same category as emotions (see Mason, 1994). In some cases, spirituality is seen as being directly connected with one's own emotions (e.g., Bento, 1994; Neck & Millman, 1998). Commenting on spirituality in the workplace, Dehler and Welsh (1994) propose that "spirituality represents a specific form of work feeling" (p. 19). When spiritual matters are somehow subscribed to the same realm as emotional matters, it is not a large leap to compare emotional labor with spiritual labor. As Graber and Johnson (2001) write in their overview of spirituality and healthcare organizations, "In our view, religion and spirituality fell among the personal, irrational and emotional elements that were successfully banished from the organizational setting" (p. 43). They go on to compare Ashforth and Humphrey's (1995) work in the control of emotions to that of the control of religion and spirituality in the workplace. Sass's (2000) study on spirituality in a nursing home setting was directly inspired by a previous study exploring emotional labor in the

same facility. Despite these suggestions that spiritual labor might be profitably examined

in light of the same issues that drive emotional labor no one previous to this study has

formally undertaken such an exploration. The following section, therefore, develops and

discusses the central concepts involved in emotional labor and how these might be

applied to spiritual labor as well.

Emotional Labor

As noted above, spiritual labor as analogous to emotional labor is a concept that

has yet to be formally addressed. This tour through the emotional labor literature,

therefore, will inter-weave a discussion of how spiritual labor might be conceptually

approached as similar to the more well-developed concept of emotional labor, give an

overview of the literature regarding emotional labor, and discus the limitations of the

concept as conceptualized by Hochschild (1983). Based on the foundational elements

suggested by emotional labor, this section of the literature review will conclude with an

examination of the possible positive/negative ramifications of spiritual labor on

organizations and their members.

Emotional Labor Defined. The term emotional labor was first notably coined in

Arlie Hochschild's (1983) book, *The Managed Heart* (see also Hochschild, 1979).

Suggesting that emotions could be as commodified in today's service industry as one's

physical labor was on the factory line, Hochschild examines emotional labor primarily

amongst airline flight attendants and bill collectors. She suggests that emotional labor is

performed through acting (deep and surface) and/or through the genuine expression of

emotions. Though others have claimed a slightly different definition (e.g., Ashforth &

Humphrey, 1993) the bottom-line qualities marking emotional labor are the

commodification and codification of emotions. Implicit in these ideas of

commodification and codification is the regulation of these expectations, either directly

by the organization, or indirectly by the "disciplinary power" referred to by Foucault

(1980, 1984) – including the concertive control of other organizational members (e.g.,

Barker, 1999, 1993; Tompkins & Cheney, 1985).

However, Hochschild does not simply describe emotional labor with a

dispassionate eye. While emotional labor may increase task effectiveness (from the

organization's point of view, anyway), she more vehemently posits that emotional labor

has the potential to create dissonance in organizational members – a dissonance

engendered from the difference between experienced and expressed emotions. More

particularly, this emotional dissonance arises from the disparity between the emotions a

person is required to express and the emotions that a person actually feels. For example,

at the time of Hochschild's study when a rude passenger called the flight attendant "a

nigger bitch" (p. 114, Hochschild, 1984), the flight attendant was required to smile and

treat those passengers as if they were guests in their home or as if they were one of their

own unruly children. These expressed emotions of calmness, caring, and respect

conflicted with the experienced emotions (i.e., anger) of the flight attendant. On the other

hand, bill collectors must *suppress* emotions of pity, empathy, or sympathy in their

interaction with clients (see also Sutton, 1991). From Hochschild's viewpoint, emotional

dissonance is a very real danger accompanying emotional labor. Hochschild argues that

this dissonance between what one feels and what one is required to express/suppress may

come at a cost in that "the worker can become estranged or alienated from an aspect of

self…that is *used* to do the work" (p. 7). In other words, the sense of self-authenticity

embedded deep within the psyche may become confused with the demands of the job. It may become difficult to know when one feels happy in actuality or when one is "performing" as part of the job, when one is being sincere or just putting on a show.

This dissonance between what one really feels and would like to express, as contrasted with what one is required by the expectations of the organization to feel and express, naturally leads to contradictions and tensions for both organizational members and organizations alike. This type of dissonance has been linked to stress, burnout, and job satisfaction (Rutter & Fielding, 1988) as well as psychological difficulties (e.g., King & Emmons, 1990; Parkinson, 1991). In addition, Mumby and Putnam (1992) suggest that when emotions are commodified, they no longer belong to the individual but to the organization – a situation that leaves room for exploitation. As Martin, Knopoff, and Beckman's (1998) study of bounded emotionality in the Body Shop illustrated, the organizational norms encouraging the display of emotions in the workplace ironically led to *less* spontaneity of emotions on the part of some members and resulted in less job satisfaction for many. All of these examples highlight the possible negative outcomes of emotional labor.

In this sense, then, spiritual labor can be seen as the commodification and codification of spirituality in some regulated fashion. Just as emotional labor may lead to dissonance, so might spiritual labor if a member's own spirituality differs from the expectation of the organization. Spiritual dissonance also leads to exploitation, stress, burnout or other types of tensions and contradictions is not yet known but suggested by the parallel construct of emotional labor.

The Commodification and Codification of Emotions. The *commodification* of emotion work is particularly prevalent in the service industries where certain emotional expectations are the commodity that organizations promise to customers and clients (see Albrecht & Zemke, 1985; Czepiel, Solomon, & Suprenant, 1985; Tracy & Tracy, 1998; Wickhroski, 1994). In service industries particularly, the interaction with the customers is to a greater or lesser degree the commodity that is offered. Thus, the friendliness of grocery clerks (Rafaeli, 1989; Tolich, 1993), the smile of waitresses (Mars & Nicod, 1984) the calm demeanor of 911 operators (Shuler & Sypher, 2000) all make up at least part of the commodity (or service) of the organization. A clear example of this principle can be seen in Tracy's (2000) study of cruise ship activities directors who are expected to provide a type of emotional labor to the clients as part of the cruise ship experience. As one crew member stated, "Our job is our personality" (p. 91). Crews were required to be happy, cheerful, and helpful whenever they were with passengers, whether the crew members were officially "on-duty" or not. This emotional labor was part of the commodity, or service, of a cruise ship. The commodification of emotions illustrates one of the central defining characteristics of emotional labor.

The other critical component of emotional labor is the *codification* of expressed emotions (see Tolich, 1993). Codification implies a systematic formalization of rules and norms. In the realm of emotional labor, Hochschild (1983) calls these "feeling rules" (p. 118), but most of the literature on emotional labor utilizes the term "display rules" (see Ekman 1973). In Tracy's (2000) study with cruise ship activity directors, these feeling or display rules for emotion were also carefully codified. Tracy noted that the organization engaged in an elaborate service program for its workers, complete with stickers, posters,

lapel pins, etc. recapping the emotional display rule to be always pleasant and
accommodating. The credo reminded crew members that they were always on stage and
at the beck and call of the customer – making the customer happy was job #1.

Codification implies regulation as well, and in Tracy's study both passengers and
fellow employees joined management in a type of regulatory system that ensured
compliance. For these cruise ship personnel, passengers could and would report
violations of this smile-all-the-time display rule. Even fellow employees would give
suggestions such as, "Our problems should be behind closed doors…You can't walk
down the hall without a smile on your face because you have a tummy ache" (p. 115).
Another example of the codification of emotional display rules is illustrated in the
specific and explicit training given the airline attendants in Hochschild's (1983) work –
"your smile is your biggest asset – use it" (p. 115). The flight attendants were instructed
to be empathetic in all situations. Said one trainer, "Whatever happens, you're supposed
to say, I know just how you feel. Lost your luggage? I know just how you feel. Late for
a connection? I know just how you feel" (p. 111). The emotional labor of the airline
attendants is regulated by supervisors and even fellow employees. The codification of
these rules is explicitly outlined in formal training sessions.

These examples illustrate the explicit codification and regulation of rules and
norms for emotional expression. In the same way, spiritual labor requires the
commodification, codification, and regulation of spirituality. How this commodification,
codification, and regulation might occur more specifically in the parochial boarding
schools of this study is developed in more depth later in this chapter.

Emotion work vs. Emotional labor. Emotion work and emotional labor are often conflated terms, and though they are inter-related they have important distinctions. Emotion work has been generally defined as the management of emotions (e.g., Tolich, 1993; Waldron & Krone, 1991). When James (1989) defines emotional labor as "the labor involved in dealing with other people's feelings" (p. 21), she confounds the term with what is more often called emotion work.

Emotion work, or the task of managing experienced and expressed emotions in an organizational setting, has received much attention. Waldron and Krone (1991) illustrated how both expressing and suppressing emotions changed the quantity of communication between organizational members and influenced the perception of their relationships (i.e., whether they saw each other as friends or simply co-workers). In addition, Fiebig and Kramer's (1998) framework for studying emotion work illustrated that *antecedent* activities (i.e., meetings) influence the nature of both positive and negative experienced/expressed emotions (see also Kruml & Geddes, 2000). As Dougherty and Krone (2002) point out, the ability to deal with others' experienced and expressed emotions in an ethical manner are part of what make up emotional intelligence. However, while emotional labor certainly involves elements of emotion work, two critical components separate these two constructs. Extrapolating from Hochschild's (1983) original conceptualization, emotional labor involves the commodification, codification, and regulation of expressed emotions; emotion work does not.

It might be said that members of organizations always do some sort of emotion work, and embedded in all organizations are unwritten rules and norms regarding emotion work. For example, Kramer and Hess (2002) discussed the general norms

regarding emotion management across a wide range of organizations. Their analysis highlighted the norms of emotion display that included maintaining "professionalism" and displaying positive emotions and negative emotions in appropriate ways, which typically meant masking negative emotions (see also Fiebig & Kramer, 1998; Morgan & Krone, 2001). However, while such restriction may be illustrative of emotion *work*, they would not be considered emotional *labor* unless the display rules were codified by the organization and used specifically as a commodity of that organization.

In the same way, organizations may have unwritten norms regarding the appropriate expression and/or suppression of members' spirituality. However, unless these norms were codified, regulated, and part of the organization's commodity, such examples might be termed spiritual *work* vs. spiritual labor. This study focuses on spiritual labor rather than spiritual work.

Emotional Labor: Limitations, Critiques, and Applications to Spiritual Labor. Many have suggested limitations to Hochschild's (1983) original conceptualization of emotional labor (e.g., Conrad & Witte, 1994; Wouters, 1989). First, emotional labor has often been assumed to include some level of dissonance and self-alienation. However, not all organizational members who engage in emotional labor report such conflict. These include the police detectives of Stenross and Kleinman's (1989) work as well as Disney workers in Van Maanen and Kunda's (1989) study. The reasons why some organizational members experience emotional dissonance in the face of emotional labor while others may not is suggested by a number of scholars. Mitigating effects include the amount of job control or autonomy an organizational member has or desires (Abraham, 2000), as well as the frequency and variety of the required emotional labor (Morris &

Feldman, 1996). Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) postulate that the tension invoked by emotional labor can be mitigated by one's identity with the institution as well as one's own social identity (see also Morris & Feldman, 1996; Tracy & Tracy, 1998). Those who highly identify with an organization, for example, may not experience the dissonance between experienced and expressed emotions because the commodification and codification of these emotions does not conflict with their own beliefs and may actually reinforce their own identities.

In fact, Ashforth and Tomiuk (2000) go so far to say that if one is highly identified with an organization, emotional labor is less likely to create dissonance, even if the expressed emotion does not reflect the member's experienced emotion. Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) also suggest along this line that even if expressed emotions are "faked," this faking can happen in good or bad faith. Those who agree with the norms and values of the institution but whose experienced emotions may not coincide with display rules, would be faking in "good faith." Those who disagree with the institution's norms and values would be faking in "bad faith." Not surprisingly, the dissonance between faking in bad faith might be greater. That "faking" of any kind might be harmful is suggested by Tracy and Tracy's (1998) work with 911 operators. These authors questioned whether faking in good faith was even possible, suggesting that even this type of faking can lead to internalization of expression rules and norms. Others have suggested that faking emotions one does not actually experience may become part of a script that in time serves to dull actual experienced emotions, i.e., the "auto-pilot" referenced by the amusement park ride operators in Van Maanen and Kunda's (1989) work.

However, other research suggests that these scripts may also mitigate dissonance and self-alienation. The scripts that call for detached concern of medical students towards their patients (Lief & Fox, 1963) and the aggressive defense of guilty clients by lawyers (Hirschhorn, 1989) may actually alleviate dissonance by legitimizing display rules that allow members to cope with emotionally difficult situations. The acting out of expected emotional displays may become part of an effortless script that dulls the tensions between one's own experienced emotions and the deep or surface acting that Hochschild (1983) poses as a major cause of dissonance created by emotional labor (see Ashforth & Fried, 1988). Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) also argue that the original presentation of emotional labor in Hochschild's work does not take into consideration that members may genuinely express emotions codified and commodified by the organization; they may actually find emotional labor enjoyable, rewarding, and liberating (e.g., Conrad & Witte, 1994; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Shuler & Sypher, 2000; Tolich, 1993). Not every instance of emotional labor involves acting or faking, and emotional labor need not be conceptualized as inherently and unavoidably damaging to organizational members.

In light of spiritual labor, then, those who agree with the norms, values, doctrinal beliefs, and/or behaviors of their organization may be less likely to experience dissonance in light of the spiritual labor required of them. While dissonance in the realm of emotional labor involves the contradiction between experienced and expressed emotions, the nature and locus of the dissonance associated with spiritual labor remains unexplored. Dissonance in spiritual labor may be the contradiction between how one acts and how one wants to act; it may be that the religious/spiritual reason expressed publicly for an

action or point of view differs from privately held reasons. An outward display of spirituality/religiosity may differ from internally held beliefs. In short, the nature of spiritual dissonance has yet to be explored.

Apart from the dissonance involved in the "faking" of emotions one other note about emotional labor may prove salient to the study of spiritual labor – this is the idea that some organizations may essentially require a seamless integration of experienced and expressed emotions. In other words, genuineness is more valued than faking, even if this faking is done in "good faith." For example, in service industries where emotional labor is the most pronounced, the effective interaction between customer and organizational member does not always simply reside in the appropriate *display* of emotions (i.e., the smile from the waitress or waiter), but through a real sense in the customer's mind that such service is offered in a *genuine* manner (see Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). Says Thompson (1976), "Synthetic compassion can be more offensive than none at all" (p. 115). The paradoxical nature of having to genuinely "fake" emotions is discussed in Hochschild's (1983) work as problematic in that actors may lose a sense of their authentic emotions, resulting in self-alienation. The paradox surely proves problematic for organizations as well whose requirements that organizational members render "genuine" emotional service such as compassion or friendliness are difficult to codify and regulate. How does one regulate genuineness? How would one meaningfully codify genuineness? Yet in the case of spiritual labor, the need for genuineness seems even more important. Any kind of "acting" or "faking," in the religious or spiritual realm, whether in good faith or not, implies a type of hypocrisy. While customers in a service industry may accept a certain amount of emotional labor as part of the organizational

script (i.e., waiters may smile not because they find the customer engaging, but because

tips are on the line), a similar tolerance cannot be assumed in the realm of spiritual labor.

Because the idea of spiritual labor has not yet been explored, the questions of how

organizational members experience spiritual labor, how they talk about it, how they

negotiate tensions or contradictions that may arise, or how their organizations contribute

and/or mitigate the possible positive and negative effects of spiritual labor, are all issues

not well understood; such unexplored territory includes how members negotiate the

dissonance of spiritual labor in their organizational lives and how these strategies hold

both differences and similarities to the strategies employed for coping with the

dissonance that arises with emotional labor. Given this unexplored landscape, the

following research questions are proposed:

RQ 2: What dissonance (if any) does spiritual labor engender?

RQ 3: How do teachers and staff in parochial boarding schools manage

dissonance (if any) that may arise from their spiritual labor?

Total Institutions

As noted in the research questions above, this study's examination of spiritual

labor centers in parochial boarding schools. However, more fully understanding the

nature and implications of spiritual labor in these types of educational institutions first

requires that a number of foundational topics be addressed. The first of these is to

understand how the boarding school in which spiritual labor occurs can be classified as a

total institution. Second, it would be important to illustrate how spiritual labor would be

heightened and highlighted in total institutions, particularly in *parochial* boarding

schools. Finally, understanding spiritual labor in the total institution climate of parochial

boarding schools ultimately requires an examination of how spiritual labor might be enacted by the teachers and staff who must perform it. Thus, the following section of this review begins broadly by outlining the qualities of total institutions in general. The focus then narrows to a discussion of the total institution qualities of parochial boarding schools and finally to how the expectations for teachers and staff in these types of institutions influence the spiritual labor they are expected to undertake.

The Nature of Total Institutions

The term "total institution" was first coined by Erving Goffman (1962) in his ground-breaking study of the patients in the St. Elizabeth's mental health hospital in Washington, D.C. Though his original intent in this ethnographic study was to "learn about the social world of the hospital inmate" (in preface), the first third of his book outlines the general qualities of what he calls "total institutions." While Goffman was investigating an "insane asylum," he argues that a large class of other types of organizations share similar qualities, though they may exist for different purposes. Early in his work, he makes observations about organizations in general and then succinctly summarizes the scope and nature of total institutions:

> Every institution captures something of the time and interest of its members and provides something of a world for them: in brief, every institution has encompassing tendencies. When we review the different institutions in our Western society, we find that some are encompassing to a degree discontinuously greater than the ones next in line. Their encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside and to departure that is often built right into the physical plant, such as locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs, water, forests, or moors. These establishments I am calling *total institutions*, and it is their general characteristics I want to explore. (p. 4)

Here Goffman articulates the primary quality of total institutions as being "all-encompassing." Part of this all-encompassing quality is preserved by the regulation of

communication with those who are not inside members of the institution, often through physical barriers or restrictions.

Goffman's original study spawned a number of consequent sociological examinations of organizations as total institutions. Reviewing the many studies employing Goffman's general concept of the total institution, McEwen (1980) summarizes in a more nuanced way seven dimensions of total institutions in this literature: 1) barriers on social intercourse with the outside, 2) involuntary membership, 3) bureaucratic nature, 4) organizational surveillance of members, 5) social distance in the organizational hierarchy, 6) degree of consensus on organizational goals and practices, and 7) hierarchical authority structures. When deciding what organizations might qualify as total institutions, these seven dimensions should be thought of not as dichotomous categories (i.e., an organization is bureaucratic or it is not), but rather as continuums. Total institutions can be thought of as organizations that tip the scale in these dimensions. As Goffman originally noted, the primarily quality of total institutions is that they encompass the lives of their members more proportionally than other types of organizations, and they do so along the dimensions listed above.

In his original work, Goffman (1962) painted a compelling picture of life in an "asylum" in the 1960's where "inmates" underwent "mortification" practices. Not surprisingly, then, later studies using the concept of the total institution conceptualized these types of organizations as negative places where power, control, and hierarchy were all salient issues. Sociologists have concentrated their study of total institutions in asylums (e.g., Denzin, 1968), prisons (e.g., Hepburn & Stratton, 1977; Tracy, 2004), concentration camps (e.g., Dimsdale, 1974; Robin, 1995), and nursing homes (e.g., Lidz

& Arnold, 1992; Richard, 1986). Given the negatively-charged language and the nature

of organizations that have been characterized as total institutions, it is not surprising that

the term has taken on a negative connotation. It is also not surprising that the concept of

total institutions has been narrowly regulated to comparatively few types of organizations

in our society.

However, as Goffman (1962) points out in his original conceptualization, "*every*

institution has encompassing tendencies" (p. 4, emphasis supplied). Whether

organizations might be studied from a total institution lens may depend less on what *type*

of organization (i.e., a prison, an asylum, etc.) than on the *degree* to which the

organization encompasses the lives of its members. Goffman acknowledges that some

institutions are so encompassing that they clearly distinguish themselves from other

organizations. However, not all organizations that might be noted for their level of

encompassment fall in the same connotative frame as prisons or asylums. In his

theoretical treatment of total institutions, Goffman makes the distinction between those

organizations whose "members" are voluntarily (not prisoners per se), and those who

choose to belong to an organization precisely *because* of what they see as the greater

good promised by its all-encompassing nature (i.e., religious retreats, convents). He

points out that not only might the encompassing quality of a total institution be seen as an

avenue to a greater good, but the isolation imposed can be viewed as necessary for an

important purpose, such as military establishments or ships at sea. One of Goffman's

colleagues, Howard Becker (2003), argues that the tendency to see total institutions

solely in a negative light is more a result of Goffman's language choices (i.e., "inmates,"

"mortification practices," etc.) than his actual broad conceptualization of total

institutions. At the heart of the total institution concept lies the levels of encompassment called for by different types of total institutions – encompassment that need not necessarily be labeled aberrant or negative, but simply "another reading on a dial" (p. 667). Becker and other scholars (e.g., Davies, 1989; McKewan, 1980) have made the case that a wider variety of organizations might profitably be examined from the conceptual lens of total institutions.

Total Institutions and Educational Organizations

That the concept of total institutions might cast a wider net than simply asylums and prisons, is reflected in the sporadic literature centered in sites such as cruise ships (e.g., Tracy, 2000; Weaver, 2005), youth and homeless shelters (e.g., Armaline, 2005; Kivett & Warren, 2002; Stark, 1994), communes (e.g., Bennett, 1971; Roberts & Zablosky, 1973), and monasteries (e.g., Keenan, 2002). In addition, as this study focuses on parochial boarding schools, a closer look at the connection between the qualities of total institutions and educational organizations is warranted.

Aside from sites such as police academies (Conti, 2001) and military training camps (e.g., Zurcher, 1972), other types of educational institutions such as colleges and boarding schools have occasionally been addressed in light of total institutions as well. For example, Shipman (1967) found a number of qualities of the total institution reflected in a teacher-education college. Once again, in Goffman's (1962) conceptualization, the primary element that characterizes what may be called a total institution is the encompassing nature of the organization. In Shipman's study most of the staff and students lived on campus, a fact which sets the stage for organizational expectations to permeate more facets of a person's experience. When one works, sleeps, eats, and

perhaps even plays on the same site, the organization becomes comparatively more

embedded in one's life. Shipman found this to be true in that the expectation for teachers

at this school included the "duty" (p. 430) to interact with students not only in the

classroom but socially as well. At this particular institution, students expected an "all

round performance" (p. 426) from their teachers. The term refers to the concept that the

social engagement of the teachers with the students was as important as academic

considerations. That the duties of teachers at this school included not only the classroom

but the social life of the school as well, expands organizational boundaries and narrows

personal ones. These types of educational institutions mentioned by Shipman thus

become more encompassing than the norm.

If an institution expanded its expectations beyond even the social to the spiritual,

the level of encompassment would increase even further. Spiritual expectations would

likely be called for in educational institutions with distinct religious affiliations. In fact,

sociologist Alan Peshkin (1986) spent a year studying such a school. In his book *God's

Choice*: *The Total World of a Fundamentalist Christian School*, Peshkin eventually

concludes that the Baptist high school in his study could be characterized as a total

institution. Salient to this categorization are nearly all of the seven dimensions of total

institutions outlined by McEwen (1980). In Peshkin's study, the school's closed

environment and its aim to control or influence students' behavior both within the

confines of the school and outside as well, illustrate the encompassing quality of the

organization. For example, students could be expelled if seen attending a movie, even

during the summer. Peshkin argues that the qualities of this institution extends even to

the "mortification practices" proposed by Goffman (1962); these include the idea of

being 'born again,' of putting off old ways and embracing the new, of requiring students

to follow guidelines that encompass dress, behavior, and moral choices. The school's

rigid objectives and hierarchical structure also place this school in the category of a total

institution in Peshkin's eyes. Obviously the Baptist school that Peshkin studied was not a

prison or a mental ward in a hospital, so it did not contain physical "walls" or barriers

that Goffman notes as a quality of total institutions. Peshkin argues that the barriers

outlined by Goffman need not be purely physical but can include mental and theological

barriers as well.

　　　　Peshkin's work (1986) is the most detailed and systematic application of the total

institution lens to a parochial educational organization. His analysis has not gone

undisputed, however. Thiessen (1993) has critiqued Peshkin's application of the term

total institution to the religious school context. First, Thiessen notes the tendency to

apply negative connotations to total institutions, a connotation that Peshkin preserves

even though the vast majority of those he interviewed at the school found the structure

and purpose of the school to be positive and desirable. That Peshkin writes, "Benign

though their total institution may be to Bethanyites [those associated with the school]…

total institutions and absolute Truth are an anathema to me" (p. 276), indicates to

Thiessen the common mistake of lumping all organizations that have the characteristics

of total institutions into one irreducible category – the category in which prisons and the

insane asylum dwell. It is important to note that Thiessen does not dispute the total

institution-like qualities of the school that Peshkin notes in his book. What he objects to

is the assumption that those qualities are necessarily negative, undesirable, or

indefensible; Thiessen would argue that these qualities need not be an "anathema" by

default. In this, Thiessen echoes the criticisms of total institution research by McEwen

(1980) and Becker (2003) delineated earlier in this review who would likely agree that

certain types of educational organizations might profitably be examined from a total

institution lens without placing them connotatively in the same category as prisons and

asylums.

The Role of Communication in Total Institution Research

Despite these objections, Peshkin's (1986) work opens the space for

communication scholars to more fully enter the arena of total institution research.

Peshkin suggests that categorizing parochial schools as organizations carrying qualities of

a total institution requires a broader characterization of what constitutes "barriers to

social intercourse" that Goffman references (p. 4, 1962) In most total institution

literature, these barriers to communication are purely physical (i.e., locked doors, gates,

etc.). However, Peshkin expands this dimension of the total institution by illustrating

how theological and or spiritual matters may serve as barriers or restrictions to members

in organizations. Pratt (2000) also suggests that encapsulation (isolating members from

non-members) can be accomplished not only physically but socially or ideologically as

well. Though Pratt is not writing about total institutions per se but rather about

spirituality in organizations, he refers to institutions that embrace deeply held spiritual

values as "ideological fortresses" (see p. 35). Furthermore, his terminology

("encapsulation") can hardly be distinguished from Goffman's notion of

"encompassment." Pratt employs the extended analogy of the "fortress," explicating how

religious values serve as the 'bricks,' 'walls,' and 'mortar' of a spiritual or ideological

fortress that guards members' sensemaking and disallows alternate views. These metaphors clearly mirror the qualities of the total institution.

By extending Goffman's notion of "barriers of communication" beyond physical entities such as walls, locks, or fences, to include matters such as spirituality and sensemaking, authors such as Pratt and Peshkin are tangentially opening the door for communication scholars to enter more firmly the dialogue regarding total institutions, an arena in which they have largely been silent. Though barriers to communication are a fundamental aspect of total institutions, when these barriers can be seen as ideological, they become socially, rather than physically, constructed. Communication scholars are ideally placed to study this social construction of meaning and thus to understand the communicative process by which ideologically constructed barriers to communication are enacted and negotiated in total institutions such as parochial boarding schools. Thus, when total institutions encompass spiritual dimensions (as in a parochial boarding school), spiritual labor becomes part of the communicative landscape of the organization. Since spiritual labor involves the commodification, codification, and regulation of spiritual values, moral codes, and/or world views, the intersection of control, communication, and spirituality becomes a prime site of study for the communication scholar.

The Intersection of Spiritual Labor and Total Institutions

The idea that qualities of total institutions (particularly barriers to communication and encompassment) might extend beyond merely physical to ideological boundaries, sets the stage for an examination of organizational stances regarding the communication of spirituality. More specifically, when spirituality infuses the organization's very

47

purpose for existence, its mission, as well as its policies and practices – when that all-encompassing spirituality is part of the commodity or service the organization offers – when the expression or suppression of spirituality are codified by an organization – its members can be seen as undertaking spiritual labor. In total institutions, controlling (or attempting to control) members' expressions of spirituality could undoubtedly be one of the all-encompassing aspects of a total institution.

What makes the issue of spirituality and spiritual labor in total institutions even more compelling is the highly personal nature of spirituality – "highly personal" in the sense that it sits at the very core of one's identity. For example, in a 2004 special edition of *Management Communication Quarterly* a number of scholars shared highly personal essays on the place of spirituality in their scholarly and personal lives. Wrote Karen Manz, "I cannot, on a personal level, separate my spirituality from learning. They are so intertwined in how I have explored and known the world that they are in my DNA of being" (Manz et al., 2006, p. 614). All of these authors express the idea that spirituality goes to the core of one's being and contains elements of one's own identity (see also Rodriguez, 2001). Institutions that regulate, control, and/or prescribe its members spirituality are organizations that begin to tip the scale on the "encompassment" dimension that characterize what might be labeled total institutions.

This idea of the controlling element of total institutions is commented on by Tracy (2005), one of the few organizational communication scholars who utilizes the concept of the total institution. Although her piece explores emotional rather than spiritual labor, the previous section of this chapter illustrated that these concepts have much in common. In that light, Tracy in her study of the emotional labor of correctional

officers contends that emotional labor is less about issues of authentic vs. "faked" emotions, but that emotional labor should also be examined more carefully in light of "discourses of power and organizational structures that enable and constrain the construction of identity" (p. 278). When that construction of identity includes spirituality, issues of control become even more encompassing. When concepts such as emotional and/or spiritual labor are examined in light of total institutions whose organizational structures encompass the lives of its members to a great extent, and when spiritual labor is found in settings that encompass the core of members' spiritual identities, the intersection of the concepts of spiritual labor and total institutions will serve to mutually illuminate the other.

These factors highlight the promise of examining spiritual labor in a parochial boarding school – a type of institution that is not only characterized by the total institution aspects suggested above, but also by the total institution qualities embedded in the nature of a *boarding* school. What follows, then, is an examination of boarding schools as total institutions.

Boarding Schools as Total Institutions

As reiterated above, examining spiritual labor within a total institution promises to highlight the nature of such labor. As this study examines spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools, a brief survey of the nature of these schools is first in order.

History of Boarding Schools

The long history of boarding schools in the United States includes names such as Phillips, Exeter, Andover, and St. Paul's. In their early history, these schools were tailored to the elite and served as preparatory schools for Ivy League colleges such as

Yale, Amherst, and Harvard (see McLachlan, 1970; Sizer, 1964). The mission of these elite boarding schools was often articulated as one to educate an "unselfish and virtuous elite for positions of influence and leadership" (p. 5, Hicks, 1996). Yet boarding schools held other missions as well – to pioneer educational reform and to meet the needs of a less wealthy clientele. For example, some of the earliest boarding schools in the United States were formed in the aftermath of the Civil War to serve a more impoverished African-American clientele who lived in remote rural areas, too far away to attend day schools (Durham, 2003).

In more modern times boarding schools occupy a smaller niche in the educational landscape. Even though leaders such as George W. Bush, Albert Gore, Steve Forbes, and John McCain still claim a boarding school education (Smith, 2001), only a minority of students attend such schools. While public schools boast nearly 15 million students, those attending boarding schools number around 40,000 (see Smith, 2001; Townsend, 1989). This type of school may still offer the academically-focused purpose of an elite preparatory school as it did in the past (see Cookson & Persell, 1985), but a number of extant boarding schools address a different audience, as those schools of a military or parochial nature illustrate (see Hays, 1994). So while boarding schools' enrollment and prominence has diminished from the height of earlier years, they continue to fill important educational niches.

Total Institution Qualities of Boarding Schools

The primary quality of boarding schools that distinguish them from other educational institutions is their all-encompassing nature for both teachers and students. That these types of schools encompass the lives of their members more than the norm is

the first indication that boarding schools might be examined as total institutions. Those

few who have applied the total institution framework to boarding schools are remarkably

consistent in their application of Goffman's (1962) outline of the qualities of total

institutions. Both Hays' (1994) examination of Quaker and military academies as well as

Cookson and Persell's (1985) extensive study in elite boarding schools detail how

boarding schools address the totality of members' experience by referencing the same

characteristics of boarding schools ("organizational members" can include both teachers

and students): 1) all activities (i.e., eating, sleeping, playing, studying) occur in the same

place; 2) members engage in these activities together; 3) the rigid schedule for these

activities is tightly controlled; 4) all activities are designed to advance the mission of the

institution. These qualities are iterations of most of the seven dimensions of total

institutions outlined earlier (McEwen, 1980): 1) barriers on social intercourse with the

outside, 2) involuntary membership, 3) bureaucratic nature, 4) organizational surveillance

of members, 5) social distance in the organizational hierarchy, 6) degree of consensus on

organizational goals and practices, 7) hierarchical authority structures. It is not difficult

to conclude that boarding schools embody total institution qualities.

Though the literature that overtly views boarding schools as total institutions does

not differ in marked ways from McEwen's distillation of the seven dimensions of total

institutions, some aspects such as "involuntary membership" and "barriers to social

intercourse" with the outside may not seem to be present in a treatment of boarding

schools as total institutions. For example, attending a boarding school at first glance may

not be seen as an involuntary activity (vs. going to a prison, for example), and with the

level of current technology (i.e., cell phones, Blackberries, the Internet), students in these

schools are not likely to be completely isolated from the outside world. However, on

further examination of the boarding school literature, even the concept of "barriers to

social intercourse" with the outside world might be conceptualized as a part of the nature

of boarding schools. For example, Hays (1994) particularly notes how the physical

layout of the boarding schools she studied provided a "buffer zone" (p. 12) from its

surroundings. These schools may have been located in a remote country setting, had

"walls" of trees surrounding the campus, or swaths of green belts between it and the

surrounding community, for example. Besides physical separators, the description of

boarding schools nearly always contains references to the rules that prohibit or regulate

traveling to and from campus (e.g., Cookson & Persell, 1985; Durham, 2003; Hays,

1994). Boarding schools, which are primarily composed of high-school aged students

(see Boarding School Review, 2005), are not like college campuses where students may

come and go as they please. These regulations undoubtedly lead to some restrictions on

the contact with "the outside world" (see Kashti, 1988). It would be difficult to argue

that this restriction lies on the same location on this continuum as those of a prison or

concentration camp, but it is clear that these restrictions nevertheless set the boarding

school apart from other types of educational institutions.

Boarding schools set themselves apart from other educational institutions in a

number of other ways as well. In response to the question, "How are boarding schools

unique?", the headmaster of Hotchkiss notes that not only are they more expensive than

private schools, but they offer "a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week proposition that

provides a total life experience for kids" (as quoted in Smith, 2001, p. 5). Those who

provide this experience – those who must also be part of this 24/7 experience – include

the teachers and staff who operate the day-to-day activities of the school. Certainly this experience proves more encompassing in nature than non-boarding educational institutions. Goffman (1962) characterized the nature of total institutions as "more encompassing" than the norm, and the "all encompassing" nature of boarding schools for both teachers and student is implicated over and over again in the literature. Notes Kashti (1988), boarding schools have the same objectives as other types of educational institutions but "operate in different dimensions of time and space. These dimensions tend to create a more intensive environment" (p. 352).

Part of this intense environment surely lies at the feet of the "highly prescriptive" and "sedulously organized" (p. 6, Hicks, 1996) nature of boarding schools. The activities of the day are tightly scheduled in most boarding schools – not just in the area of the classroom, but regarding meals, play time, study time, etc. (e.g., Cookson & Persell, 1985; Ediger, 1998; Hays, 1994). Also tightly controlled in many schools are the behavior, dress, physical movement, and even sexuality of its members. Students in Cookson and Persell's study (1985), for example, often noted the "very controlled life," the "too restrictive rules." For these many reasons, the environments of boarding schools are often described as "total" (p. 135, Anderson, 2005), or "intensive" (p. 352, Kashti, 1988). In such ways, boarding schools are stamped with qualities of a total institution.

Parochial Boarding Schools

Perhaps more important to this study than the strict rules guiding schedules, behavior, or dress in boarding schools is the attempt to regulate the inner life of organizational member (see Cookson & Persell, 1985). Surely when institutions of any type attempt to regulate internal values, they become more encompassing than the norm.

Thus, an institution that attempts to encompass the spirituality of its members more firmly moves into the realm of a total institution. When examining parochial boarding schools, then, one must not only keep in mind the total institution nature of the boarding school itself, but add another element – the element of spiritual matters.

In a *parochial* boarding school, spiritual matters become part of the school's mission and emphasis. Though few studies have examined parochial boarding schools, one of these rarities includes Hays' (1994) comparison of six Quaker and six military boarding schools. In the Quaker schools, Hays noted how the moral virtues are "the fabric of school life, and students and teachers are supposed to live by them" (p. 5). The fact that moral, spiritual, and religious values weave their way into the fabric of the already highly encompassing environment of a boarding school illustrates the even more encompassing nature of a *parochial* boarding school.

The Role of Teachers and Staff in Parochial Boarding Schools

Boarding schools, particularly parochial boarding schools, certainly encompass more of the lives of its students than other types of educational institutions. An important corollary up to this point is the idea that they also encompass the lives of teachers and staff in a much more encompassing manner as well. As teachers in boarding schools have been termed the "heart and soul" of the school (Cookson & Persell, 1985, p. 85), it becomes even more important to examine their role, particularly in parochial boarding schools where the mission of implementing school regulations and inculcating spiritual values in students is laid largely at the feet of its teachers (see Carr, 2001; Galetto, 2000; Sandin, 2002).

Teaching at a boarding school is clearly not the same as teaching in another type of educational institution. While the requirements of the classroom and the challenges presented in teaching various disciplines are similar, one of the clear differences lies outside the classroom in the tight integration expected between the lives of teachers and students in a total institution. That teachers are expected to interact to a greater degree with students in boarding schools was intimated in Shipman's (1967) study of a teacher's college discussed previously. For teachers in a boarding school, it is much more difficult to separate school life from private life, since teachers are expected to be involved with students inside and outside of the classroom, on weekends, in the evening recreation period, etc. Many boarding school teachers/staff live on campus or in the dormitories with the students (i.e., girls' and boys' deans). Living in such close quarters serves to blur the boundary between the faculty/staff's public and private lives, making the job even more "all-encompassing" (see Hays, 1994; Shipman, 1967). In fact, Anderson (2005) terms the job of boarding school staff to interact with all aspects of a students' life a "total role" (p. 135); Cookson and Persell (1985) refer to the job as one requiring "total commitment" where "no teacher could claim to be off duty; informal as well as formal obligations [are] continuous" (p. 88). Teaching or working in a boarding school becomes more all-consuming than it might be in other types of educational institutions.

      This all-consuming aspect of teaching in a boarding school is both rewarding and difficult. Cookson and Persell (1985) devote a chapter of their examination of elite boarding schools to the role and function of the teacher. A portion of this chapter is not insignificantly titled "The Road Not Taken," signifying their observation that the teachers in boarding schools could be doing something else, somewhere else, for much greater

pay. Teaching in these institutions is often referred to as not just a job but as a "way of life" (p. 85), an indication of its all-encompassing nature "much like a religious vocation where service gives meaning to life" (p. 85). In parochial boarding schools, this sense of service for the greater good is also one of the marked draws of teaching in these notoriously low-paying positions (see "Parochial school teachers," 1984). Conversely, however, boarding schools' teachers must operate within the all-encompassing and tightly integrated nature of total institutions. One of Cookson and Persell's (1985) teachers characterized the experience of "the confining and demanding seven days per week" as one of the primary negatives of working in a boarding school. Working within a total institution proved to be both rewarding and frustrating for teachers in their study.

The Nature of Spiritual Labor for Parochial Boarding School Staff

In parochial boarding schools, this total commitment asked of its teachers and staff extends to the spiritual life as well. It is expected that those who work in such institutions model the behaviors, lifestyles, and attitudes required or desired of their students (e.g., Youniss, Convey, & McLellan, 2000). In such an environment, all of the components of spiritual labor are in place and each can be clearly highlighted.

This study defines spiritual labor as the commodification, codification, and regulation of spirituality. The intersection of spiritual labor with total institutions, particularly parochial boarding schools, can now be seen in light of the expectations put on the faculty and staff who work there. First, the highly regulatory and encompassing nature of total institutions make the expectations of both students and staff more likely to be explicitly codified (i.e., as rules, written expectation, etc.). In parochial boarding schools where the mission is to infuse students with a particular set of moral codes,

spiritual world views, and values convergent with the sponsoring church's, many of these expectations are likely to be spiritual in nature. Thus, spirituality is likely to be codified and regulated – two of the qualities that characterize spiritual labor.

Secondly, I argue as well that it is precisely the all-encompassing total institution quality that characterizes the *commodity* offered by these parochial boarding schools. Brown (1992) proposes that one of the niches that private schools fill is that of providing a distinctly religious education where spirituality infuses the educational experience. The published educational goal of the Catholic parochial system, for example, is to "interweave reason and faith…bringing forth within what is learnt in school a Christian vision of the world, of life, of culture and of history" ("*The Catholic school on the threshold of the third millennium*," 2005). Public schools simply are prohibited from offering a similar immersive experience in spirituality – particularly that colored by a specific denomination. Public schools do not purposefully "interweave reason and faith" nor is religion or spirituality expected to "infuse" the life-world of a public educational institution. By contrast, in her work with Quaker boarding schools, Hays (1994) notes that the character-building aspect of the schools in her study was as important as the academic preparation they promised. Notably, this term "character-building" was conceptualized in precisely the same dimensions that characterize the notion of spirituality in the organizational literature – that of seeking God (a higher power) and of being ethically responsible to community and relationships. Both the codification and commodification aspects of spiritual labor are present in unique ways in parochial boarding schools.

The enactment of this spiritual labor undertaken on the part of faculty and staff is tied to interaction with students in a total institution environment. This interaction requires that the boundaries between one's personal spirituality and the institution's required spirituality be tightly integrated and enacted in an environment where separating a "private" life from a "public" one is fraught with difficulty. Because faculty and staff are expected to interact with students both in and out of the classroom, because this interaction may occur "24-7" in areas that include eating, recreating, and worshipping, the boarding school life is all encompassing for its staff. In a parochial school these interactions are the means by which spirituality is shared, communicated, and enacted. Therefore, total institutions such as parochial boarding schools are more likely to encompass an individual's spirituality and thus to require spiritual labor from its teachers and staff. In such an organization where spirituality is expected, codified, and monitored, how organizational members manage to see their spirituality as their own and not the organization's is of particular interest. From a communication perspective, this dilemma becomes even more salient when teachers are expected to both enact these spiritual expectations behaviorally and *share* this spirituality with students in an environment where there is little difference between the "on-stage" and "off-stage" aspects of this type of labor alluded. The spiritual labor of teachers in parochial boarding schools proves an excellent place to begin an examination of these issues and leads to the following research questions:

> Research Question 4: How do the total institution qualities of a parochial boarding school shape the spiritual labor expected of teachers and staff?
>
> Research Question 5: How do teachers and staff negotiate the spiritual labor required by parochial boarding schools?

Summary

This study focuses on the spiritual labor of teachers and staff in parochial boarding schools. The total institution nature of these organizations highlights how spiritual labor is enacted and experienced by faculty/staff and frames the nature of the dissonance (or possible dissonance) spiritual labor presents to organizational members. Interspersed throughout this literature review five research questions have been proposed. These are listed together below:

RQ 1: What is the nature of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools?

RQ 2: What dissonance (if any) does this spiritual labor engender?

RQ 3: How do teachers and staff in parochial boarding schools manage dissonance (if any) that may arise from their spiritual labor?

RQ 4: How do the total institution qualities of a parochial boarding school shape the spiritual labor expected of teachers and staff?

RQ 5: How do teachers and staff negotiate the spiritual labor required by parochial boarding schools?

Chapter Three: Methodology and Methods

In this study I examined the spiritual labor of teachers and staff in parochial

boarding schools in order to better understand the nature of this spiritual labor primarily

from organizational members' experience. Given these purposes, I approached this study

from the interpretive paradigm, used phenomenological methodology, and employed

interviewing and document/artifact analysis as the specific methods.

Interpretive Paradigm

From whichever model one chooses to discuss paradigms or epistemes (i.e.,

Anderson, 1996; Burrell & Morgan, 1979; Deetz, 2001; Mumby, 1997), the same

ontological and epistemological assumptions hold true regarding the interpretive stance.

Anderson (1996) places the interpretive paradigm in the category of hermeneutic

empiricism which is concerned with *Verstehen* or understanding (see Weber, 1949). This

type of knowledge comes through intersubjectivity – negotiated meaning mediated

through language and other communicative discourses. Mumby (1997) refers to this

stance as the Discourse of Understanding, a term which captures the epistemological

stance of the interpretive paradigm. Whereas the objective empiricists (situated in a more

functional episteme) seek to measure, explain, and predict, the interpretive approach

seeks to understand, describe, and interpret. The scope of its findings is ideographic

versus nomothetic (see Bryman, 1999; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). In addition, Putnam

(1983) argues that one of the key hallmarks of the interpretive paradigm is "inquiry from

within" (p. 43), meaning that participants' lived experiences and interpretations guide the

quest to discover why and how shared, intersubjective meaning comes to be (see also

Schwandt, 2000). As this study sought to illuminate how organizational members experienced spiritual labor and how they negotiated the dissonance that may emanate from their mandate to provide spiritual labor in a total institution, approaching this task within the interpretive paradigm was warranted.

Another hallmark of the interpretive paradigm is the position of the researcher. "Inquiry from within" calls for the researcher to undertake closer, more sustained contact with participants – to be able to see the world through the participants' eyes (see Bryman, 1999). In the interpretive paradigm, the goal is not necessarily to achieve "objectivity" on the part of the researcher. Rather, inquiry from within calls for an involvement with the participants in the intersubjective construction of knowledge. Anderson (1996) explains this "double hermeneutic" in the sense that the researcher and that being studied are "mutually informing" (p. 119). Analysis in the interpretive paradigm is essentially an interpretation of the participants' interpretation of meaning construction (see also Bohman, Hiley, & Shusterman, 1991). As Lindlof and Taylor (2002) summarize, the interpretive paradigm and research within it recognize that knowledge about socially constructed realities comes from the "interdependence of researcher and researched" (p. 11). Hence, the interpretive paradigm necessitates "inquiry from within." The methodology this type of inquiry called for, as guided by the research questions of this study, will next be addressed.

Phenomenological Methodology

In light of the assumptions attending the interpretive paradigm, phenomenological approaches presented themselves as an appropriate methodological umbrella for this study. Broadly speaking, phenomenology refers to the study of lived experiences and is

the attempt to describe and interpret these lived experiences. As van Manen (1990)

summarizes, "Phenomenology asks the simple question, what is it like to have a certain

experience?" (pp. 44-45). In this context, the concept and study of phenomenology

occupies a number of domains that range from the ethical to the linguistical (e.g.,

Derrida, 1978; Levinas, 1998; Scheler, 1979). Many of these phenomenological domains

are more philosophical in nature, such as the transcendental phenomenology of Husserl

(1970) or the ontological phenomenology championed by Heidegger (1962) (see also

Hegel, 1977; Merleau-Ponty, 1964). The phenomenological approach taken by this study

is more akin to other domains of phenomenology concerned with issues that affect people

in their practical, every-day worlds. These include a "phenomenology of practice" (see

van Manen, 1990) or social phenomenology (e.g., Schutz, 1967) and comprise areas as

diverse as medicine (e.g., Kleiber & Brock, 1995; Kugelmann, 1999; Loos & Bowd,

1997), psychology (e.g., Becker, 1991; Frank, 1978; Leary, et al., 1998), and art (e.g.,

Sheets, 1978). As phenomenological approaches have also been used in education

settings (e.g., Ashworth, 1999; Brown, 1996; van Manen, 1979, 1982, 1986), my study of

spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools engages the phenomenological approach.

More particularly, I methodologically grounded this study in a hermeneutic

phenomenology. This approach to phenomenological studies embraces both descriptive

and interpretive elements. Some such as Silverman (1984) and the more strict adherents

of Husserl's (1970) transcendental phenomenology (e.g., Giorgi, 1985; Landgrebe, 1981)

would argue that phenomenology and hermeneutics are separate domains. For example,

if Husserl's transcendental phenomenology is seen as the illumination of intentionality

revealed in action (i.e., lived experiences), then phenomenological inquiry calls for

simply a description of the "reality" of these lived human experiences. From this point of view, the interpretation of "text" belongs to the hermeneutical camp, while phenomenology requires only description.

However, I hold with van Manen (1990) who argues that "there are no such things as uninterpreted phenomena" (p. 190). From within the ontological frame of the interpretive paradigm, the study of lived experiences cannot escape the interpretive, hermeneutic element. Whether at the hands of the researcher or participants, simply "making sense" of lived experiences is a fundamentally interpretive endeavor. As van Manen points out, phenomenology aims for understanding and seeks for *meaning* in lived experiences. Such a call requires reflective consciousness on the part of both researcher and participants. Embedded in such an endeavor is the essence of interpretation. Furthermore, these lived experiences are interpreted, observed, studied, and commented on through language (written, spoken, enacted, etc.). The lived experiences of phenomenological inquiry must be "captured in language" (p. 180, van Manen, 1990). Because these "texts" are then examined hermeneutically (see Anderson, 1990), this reflective, interpretive, and intersubjective endeavor also captures the nature of hermeneutic phenomenology.

This discussion has already captured many of the eight components of hermeneutic phenomenology explicated by van Manen (1990). A more explicit outline of these characteristics below also serves to illustrate how the study of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools could be approached from this methodological stance.

Phenomenological research is the study of lived experiences (p. 9, van Manen, 1990). The types of questions phenomenology asks include "What is this or that kind of

experience like?" (p. 9). The research questions I posed in this study echoed this type of

inquiry as I explored the experiences of faculty and staff who are required to engage in

spiritual labor amidst the exigencies imposed by the nature of a total institution.

Phenomenological research is the explication of phenomena as they present

themselves to consciousness (p. 9, van Manen, 1990). In this sense, to be conscious of a

lived experience is to reflect upon it. While hermeneutic phenomenology is often defined

simply as "the study of lived experiences," more specifically it calls for some reflection

on these experiences. Parochial boarding school teachers and staff may engage in

spiritual labor on a daily basis; science teachers in these schools, for example, may be

expected to embrace and teach intelligent design or creationism – viewpoints consistent

with a spiritual stance on the nature and character of God in relation to the physical

universe. These classroom interactions are "lived experiences." Yet, until these

experiences are reflected upon, until they are examined retrospectively, they do not fall

under the umbrella of hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry. In this study, my

participants and I intersubjectively and reflectively explored the nature of spiritual labor

in the lived experiences of those faculty/staff members who currently perform or have

performed spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools.

Phenomenological research is the study of essences (p. 10, van Manen, 1990).

This study examined the essence of the spiritual labor of teachers and staff in parochial

boarding schools. As van Manen explains, the essence of some phenomenon is captured

when its description "reawakens or shows us the lived quality and significance of the

experience in a fuller or deeper manner" (p. 10). In other words, I did not intend in this

study to simply ask whether spiritual labor takes place in parochial boarding schools or

how often it happens; rather, this hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry of spiritual labor sought to reflectively illuminate the complexity of this spiritual labor in the lived experiences of parochial boarding schools' teachers and staff.

Phenomenological research is the description of the experiential meanings we live as we live them (p. 11, van Manen, 1990). This statement simply reiterates what hermeneutic phenomenology is not. It is not the quantitative study of variables, frequencies of occurrences, or media-generated agenda setting, for example. It is not the ethnographic study of cultures or the sociological study of certain groups. Rather (as is the case in this dissertation), it is the study of everyday lived experiences.

Phenomenological research is the human scientific study of phenomena. Phenomenological research is a search for what it means to be human (pp. 11-12, van Manen, 1990). To study and understand lived experiences is one means of discerning the boundaries of the "lifeworld" – the world upon which human beings experience and reflect (see Husserl, 1970). Thus, phenomenology is concerned with the *human* rather than the biological or physical sciences. Nevertheless, this mode of inquiry is broadly "scientific" in that it embraces a systematic, explicit, self-critical, and intersubjective approach. Thus, phenomenological research is the study of human beings' lived experiences and what it means to be human outside of biological or physical scientific perspectives.

Phenomenological research is the attentive practice of thoughtfulness. Phenomenological research is a poetizing activity (pp. 12-13, van Manen, 1990). Van Manen suggests that "thoughtfulness" is the word that best captures the essence of phenomenology. Throughout the previous qualities of hermeneutic phenomenology

65

explicated above, one can see the thread of this thoughtfulness – in the reflective nature of this type of inquiry and in the call for a conscious attention to the common, every-day, human nature of lived experiences The thoughtfulness required in phenomenological inquiry is systematic, intersubjective, rich, deep, and inexhaustible.

Thus, exploring spiritual labor in the lives of teachers and staff who operate within the parameters of a total institution such as the parochial boarding school, demands the thoughtfulness called for by hermeneutic phenomenology. This thoughtfulness is the creative force that drives the "poetizing activity" van Manen (1990) describes. Unlike the making of the verse and stanza called for by poetry, "poetizing" instead references the *nature* of poetry, for poetry is not so much an objective, expository report on objective reality, as it is an "incantative, evocative…thinking on original experience" (p. 13). So, too, is the nature of hermeneutic phenomenological research. In a thoughtful evocative manner, I have attempted to capture the lived experiences of my participants who performed spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools.

I attempted in this study of parochial boarding school teachers/staff's spiritual labor to capture a measure of its complexities, contradictions, and lived experiences, and in doing so incorporated these eight elements of the hermeneutic phenomenological methodology.

Methods

To address the five research questions in this study, I employed two methods. The first of these included qualitative interviews. This method phenomenologically addressed the experiences of those who engage in spiritual labor, allowed participants to frame their communicative negotiation of this endeavor, and gave an opportunity to

explore the nature of any dissonance attached to spiritual labor within the context of a total institution. The second method employed thematic document/artifact analysis (i.e., promotional materials, personnel handbooks, marketing strategies, web sites, etc.) primarily to address the specific research question regarding the nature of spiritual labor in parochial school, i.e., how the spirituality of teachers and staff is commodified, codified, and regulated.

The following sections will first delineate the justification and guidelines for the choice of the interview method, give an overview of the organizational structure of the parochial boarding schools and sponsoring church utilized in the study, outline sampling techniques, and discuss my assumptions, positionality, and other ethical obligations within these parameters. Next, the justification and guidelines for gathering the document/artifacts will be delineated. Finally, I will explain the method of analysis for the data generated by the interviews and documents/artifacts.

Qualitative Interviews: Justification

As noted above, phenomenological methodologies are defined as those that examine lived experiences; interpretive interview methods fall under this umbrella. Qualitative interviews also rest on the ontological assumptions of the interpretive paradigm that "reality" is socially constructed, intersubjective, and contextual. Epistemologically, then, research under this paradigm would seek a method such as qualitative interviews that would grant the participants the voice to explore their own lived experiences and would also acknowledge the role of the researcher in this endeavor. In addition, as van Manen (1990) explains, phenomenological research seeks "to construct a possible interpretation of the nature of a certain human experience" (p. 41)

and champions the "conversational" interview (p. 66) as one of the methods appropriate

to this purpose. As I sought in this study to understand the nature of spiritual labor in the

lives of faculty and staff within the bounds of a parochial boarding school, I chose to

interview participants regarding these experiences.

Furthermore, the assumptions of the active interview (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995)

guided the semi-structured interviews utilized in this study. The active interview

approach calls for interviewers to ask probing questions that explore their participants'

stock of knowledge and to expand their "horizons of meaning" (p. 58). In other words,

through the interview process I served to enable the participants to connect narratives and

interpret responses in new or different ways. This type of interview is flexible but is not

without a guiding purpose. My semi-structured interview protocol guided the general

topics of inquiry, but the order, wording, and even use of these guiding questions was

shaped and determined by the nature of my conversation with my participants. Most

importantly, the active interview approach is positioned to "cultivate" (p. 76) the

experiences and meaning-making of the respondents. My role as a researcher was to be

an active participant in this goal as I asked probing questions, followed up seemingly

contradictory statements and/or encouraged participants to reflect on their experiences

with the parameters of spiritual labor as parochial boarding school teachers/staff.

In sum, the interpretive paradigm embraces the phenomenological approach to the

study of participants' lived experiences, and these lived experiences can fruitfully be

explored through utilizing the active interview as an appropriate method of inquiry. This

is why my examination of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools included

qualitative interviews with the teachers and staff who work or have worked in these types of institutions.

The Organizational Structure of the SDA Church and School System

As articulated previously, this study examined the spiritual labor of faculty and staff in parochial boarding schools. More specifically I targeted those who work or have worked within the parochial boarding school system maintained by the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) church. In light of this choice, I will first outline the nature of this school system and then explain the reasons for seeking participants who were currently or who had been employed in boarding schools within this particular denomination. Finally, I will detail my positionality in this system and the ethical considerations influenced by that positionality.

A brief review of the overall structure of the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) church and its educational system suggests that this organization's boarding schools harbor the three criteria for spiritual labor – the commodification, codification, and regulation of organizational members' spirituality. Because this study was the first to develop the concept of spiritual labor in this manner, it was important that these three elements be clearly identified as part of the organizational structure in which my participants were required to perform spiritual labor. Since the mission, accreditation, and funding of the individual boarding schools operated by the SDA church are all influenced by the larger church organization, the larger organized church itself plays a role in the commodification, codification, and regulation of the teachers who work in its schools. Therefore, a brief overview of the overall church organization is offered below.

Seventh-day Adventist Church. The Seventh-day Adventist church has a

worldwide membership of over 14 million with nearly 120,000 churches and companies

("Facts and Figures," 2005). More salient to the study of spiritual labor is the fact that

this particular denomination outlines and publishes its doctrines and beliefs – a form of

codification (e.g., "Fundamental Beliefs," 2006; General Conference, 1988). These

codified beliefs encompass the elements of spirituality detailed earlier in this document –

a belief in a greater power and a form of ethics that highlights community and

relationships. For example, the preface to the volume outlining these beliefs states, "We

have written this exposition of our 27 major beliefs to reveal how Seventh-day Adventists

perceive God" (p. *vii*, General Conference, 1988). Also included in these beliefs are

elements such as "Marriage and Family," "Christian Behavior," and "Ministry" that

encompass community and relationship aspects inherent in the definition of spirituality

explicated earlier. Thus, this church organization can be seen to codify the spirituality of

its members. Teachers and staff who work in the church's school system, are not only

members of the church, but also *employed* by the church itself, a condition which sets the

stage for the study of spiritual labor by those who work in the SDA educational system –

including their boarding schools.

The church's organizational structure is composed of five overall levels: the local

church, the conference level (consisting of a collection of churches), the union level

(consisting of a number of geographically similar conferences), the division (made up of

a collection of unions), and headed overall by what is termed the "General Conference."

For example, the Columbia, Missouri, church is part of a collection of churches that

belong to what is known as the Iowa/Missouri conference. This conference joins other

conferences of middle America to form the Mid-American Union, which is part of the

North American Division of the General Conference.

Seventh-day Adventist Schools. Each level of the church helps to establish and

fund its 6,000+ schools worldwide. Among this number, nearly a thousand elementary

and secondary schools as well as fifteen colleges and universities reside in the United

States and Canada alone (see "Journey to Excellence: Overview," 2004). Among this

collection of educational institutions are included a number of boarding schools for

grades 9-12; in the nomenclature of the church, these are referred to as "academies." In

North America, some 35 of these academies are scattered among 30 different states and

two Canadian provinces. The attendance at these individual boarding schools ranges

from over 500 to just under 50 students ("K-12 Schools," 2005).

In general, elementary schools are established and funded largely at the local

church level. High schools, including boarding schools, are largely overseen and

supported at the conference level, and institutions of higher learning at the union level.

While the unions, conferences, and local churches provide financial support for the

general operating budget of educational institutions under their auspices, it is important to

note that the overall church structure also supports these schools in that the salaries for

their teachers and staff are largely funded from the general funds generated by the tithing

practices of church members at large. Thus, the potential regulation of teachers and

staff's spirituality in the school system can emanate from within local schools as well as

the church structure at large.

In the parochial school system within this church's structure, both the codification

as well as the regulation of spirituality are also situated both locally and within the larger

system. For example, the role of the overall governing body of the General Conference is explained on their website – to provide "support through the world divisions to educational leaders at union/ conference…levels and to teachers in Adventist elementary and secondary schools to ensure that the Adventist philosophy of education and the principles of faith-and-learning are integrated into the life of each institution" ("Mission and Scope," 2005). Articulated here are the expectations of the role teachers and staff play in this mission to infuse spiritual values as part of a holistic educational experience. Because of the value placed on obtaining a SDA Christian education, the overall church has a stake in the spirituality of the teachers in its system and has in place the organizational structure to help codify and regulate this spirituality. In the boarding schools themselves, educational superintendents of the local conferences as well as principals and school boards actually recruit and hire the teacher and staff for their schools. In this sense, codification and regulation inherent in spiritual labor also emanates locally as well.

In addition, both the church as a whole and the individual schools have a role in the commodification, codification, and regulation of spirituality of teachers and staff in the educational system. Regarding commodification, for example, the department overseeing SDA education in the world-wide church clearly articulates ten goals for SDA schools at whatever level. Included in these goals is not only the mission to provide a quality academic education (i.e., "intellectual development," and "communication skills"), but to include spiritual values as well, such as "acceptance of God as Creator and Redeemer," and "affirm a belief in the dignity and worth of others" ("Journey to Excellence: GOALS," 2004). So while the overall church structure not only provides

funding and accreditation for its parochial boarding schools, it also serves to articulate to its general membership the importance of providing this brand of Christian education to its young people – a unique "commodity" that the SDA school system can offer. In addition, each boarding school markets itself to its own constituency. As the cost for attending most academies hovers around $14,000 per year (before scholarships or work-study grants), these schools must convince their constituents that a SDA education is worth the cost. The role that the spirituality of its teachers and staff plays in this commodification is a central element of spiritual labor and is a commodity promoted by both the school and the overall church organization.

This overview of the organization and structure of the Seventh-day Adventist church and its parochial school system illustrates how the elements necessary for spiritual labor (the commodification, codification, and regulation of members' spirituality) are interwoven through the entire organization of church and school. The discussion above also provides the backdrop and rationale for the following dialogue regarding the interviews and document/artifact analysis that make up the specific methods I employed. What follows first is an explanation detailing sampling procedures regarding the participants in my study and a brief overview of their demographic characteristics. I will then discuss my own positionality in this study as well as offer a brief discussion of ethical considerations precipitated by that positionality and the nature of the topic under study here.

Participants

Sampling. Qualitative methods such as interviewing may utilize a variety of sampling techniques: purposive, snowball, maximal variation, etc. (see Lindlof & Taylor,

2002; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). However, because I aimed to develop a specific concept (spiritual labor) in a specific context (parochial boarding schools) from specific people (teachers and staff), two basic types of sampling were employed – purposive and snowball (see Lindlof & Taylor, 2002).

Purposive sampling is appropriate when particular sites or participants are chosen because "there may be good reason to believe that 'what goes on there' is critical to understanding some process or concept" (Schwandt, 1997, p. 128). Since there is "good reason to believe" that spiritual labor is required by teachers and staff in SDA boarding schools, two groups of participants were included: 1) currently employed parochial boarding school teachers, dormitory deans, or other staff members (i.e., campus chaplains) who are expected to maintain consistent interaction with students; 2) those who have been similarly employed in such institutions in the past.

These two groups made up the purposive sample for a number of reasons. First, because the emotional labor literature suggests that certain organizational members respond differently to emotional labor (e.g., Stenross & Kleinman, 1989) and because spiritual labor is modeled upon the constructs of emotional labor, it seemed plausible that organizational members would respond differently to spiritual labor as well. In particular, the emotional labor literature indicates that those who are highly identified with an organization are less likely to fake emotions "in bad faith," and thus less likely to experience dissonance (e.g., Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993). In order to understand these nuances with regards to spiritual labor, part of the purposive sampling of this study also targeted those who had previously worked in parochial boarding schools but no longer do so for whatever reason. I inferred that by no longer being employed by the institution,

and by no longer operating within the all-encompassing confines of a total institution, these participants might offer a different perspective and may have fewer conflicts of interest in sharing possible examples of spiritual dissonance than those who were currently absorbed by the demands of spiritual labor.

Thinking that I may be presented with two different and distinct groups of people in the manner in which they approached spiritual labor and the possible spiritual dissonance attending it, I was careful in the initial recruitment phase to seek equal numbers of former and present faculty/staff and to ensure that each group shared comparative demographic qualities. However, after 26 interviews (13 current/13 previous faculty/staff), I strongly felt I had reached theoretical saturation (see below). At this point, it seemed clear that no substantial differences between these two groups of participants emerged for any of the questions on the interview protocol.

Nevertheless, during the initial analysis of the data, I carefully noted which participants were former staff and which were currently working in SDA boarding schools. The same themes emerged consistently from both groups. Neither group seemed more or less smitten with spiritual dissonance, neither differed in their depiction of the total institution qualities of a boarding school, neither group had substantially different outlooks on the nature of the their spiritual labor (i.e., the commodification, codification, and regulation of their spirituality). At this point I ceased to treat them as two separate groups.

In truth, I was surprised that former staff/faculty did not present a slightly different perspective on spiritual labor than those currently employed in the system. This result might have been different if my criteria for recruiting former staff/faculty had

included the proviso that they had been dismissed, fired, or encouraged by the organization to find another positions, for example. It might have been different if I had specifically sought out those who were bitter, angry, disillusioned, or who were no longer members of the SDA church. But, of course, my only criteria for this group of participants stated that they must have formerly worked in SDA boarding schools – regardless of their reason for leaving or their attitudes regarding their spiritual labor while employed in the system.

As a point of fact, the interview protocol for former faculty/staff included the inquiry as to why they no longer worked in SDA academies. It turned out that some had retired, some moved on to other positions in the church (such as pastors, educational superintendents, or day school teachers), some female faculty had left to raise children, and some left because they could not brook the all-encompassing rigors of boarding school life (see discussion in Chapter Four). However, some of the former faculty/staff in this study had been terminated, and some had left in part because of spiritual dissonance (see Chapter Six). In sum, though I did not overtly seek a wide range of experiences with spiritual labor in the participants who had formerly been faculty/staff in SDA boarding schools, I chanced into that diversity nevertheless. Despite this diversity, in the end, I felt confident that I had one, not two, groups of participants. In this study, I do not make a distinction between former and current faculty/staff in the thematic analysis of the qualitative interviews, though I will occasionally identify some participants as former faculty to give context to their comments.

In addition to the purposive sampling mentioned above, I employed snowball sampling as well. Snowball sampling is the use of referrals by participants to others who

fit the criteria of the study (see Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). I

asked participants in my study to recommend others who might be both willing to

participate in the study and who are currently or have been employed in SDA boarding

schools. These new contacts were asked to recommend others and so on until no more

sampling is necessary due to theoretical saturation, a concept that will next be discussed

in more detail.

   Theoretical Saturation and Demographic Information. When a researcher stops

finding new properties, dimension, or variance (see Strauss & Corbin, 1998), when a

researcher "ceases to be surprised" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 129), the point of

saturation or critical threshold has been reached. When no new information emerges in

the interviews and/or during coding, and when collecting additional data seems

"counterproductive" (p. 136, Strauss & Corbin, 1998), that is the point when the

sampling is seen as adequate (see also Glaser, 1978). As mentioned above, I was

confident that I had reached theoretical saturation by the 26th interview when no new

information, substantially different experiences, or surprising responses to the interview

prompts presented themselves. Despite the strong sense of having reached theoretical

saturation, I continued with the interviews I had already scheduled for a total of 34

participants.

   Twenty of the participants in this study were current faculty members in SDA

boarding schools; former employees totaled 13. One participant was the wife of a current

faculty member who sat in the living room with us early one Sunday morning drinking

her morning beverage. She interjected her observations regarding living on a boarding

school campus. I transcribed and utilized her cogent comments (with her permission and

consent) in Chapter Four's explication of the total institution qualities of boarding school life. Since she was not technically employed by the school, however, I did not utilize her comments in the other chapters about spiritual labor or spiritual dissonance.

Excepting this participant then, the average number of years teaching in SDA boarding schools for those involved in the qualitative interviews ranged from 1 to 37 (*Mean* = 14.3; *SD* = 9.6). Those currently working in SDA academies had been at their current school an average of 10.6 years (*SD* = 10; *Range* = 1-25). The average age of the participants was 48 (*SD* = 11; *Range* = 23-70). In total, 18 males and 16 females participated in the qualitative interview portion of this study.

The Researcher's Positionality

Important to the active interview approach, hermeneutic phenomenological methodology, and the interpretive paradigm itself is the position of the researcher. Therefore, I will next outline my positionality with regards to this study of spiritual labor of teachers and staff in Seventh-day Adventists boarding schools and outline the potential advantages and cautions associated with my place in this study.

As a researcher who is also a member of the SDA church and who has 19 years of experience working in the church's boarding schools, I am uniquely positioned to recognize and understand the nature and qualities of the commodification, codification, and regulation of spirituality as it is filtered through the discourse of this particular church and these particular types of schools. My membership and long association privileges me with an understanding of the cultural morés, language, and norms – a privilege and advantage I would not have were I to study the cultural nuances of other churches and were I not familiar with unique total institution-like qualities of the

boarding school world. Because of my experience in this church and in their boarding

schools, I was privileged to engage in the type of "inquiry from within" called for by the

interpretive paradigm and utilized in the active interview. Moreover, because I employed

the active interview approach (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995), my background knowledge

was an important resource in understanding participants' language, culture, and

experiences (see also Kvale, 1996). As Holstein and Gubrium write, "Background

knowledge of circumstances relevant to the research topic and/or the respondent's

experience can be an invaluable resource for the interviewer" (p. 77). Bounding this

study to Seventh-day Adventist parochial boarding schools allowed the "invaluable

resource" of my experience to enrich this study.

Of course, my positioning in this study may also bring questions of "bias" on the

part of those who might use the language of a more functional paradigmatic approach to

research. However, as articulated previously in regards to the assumptions of the

interpretive paradigm, the researcher can never fully extricate him/herself from the

double hermeneutic that a social construction of knowledge allows. My intimate

experience with what I would now recognize as "spiritual labor" in parochial boarding

schools enabled me to further explore participants' horizons of meaning in the active

interview, to parse their language, to understand their references, and to detect dissonance

emanating from their experiences.

My positionality in this system conceivably could also be seen by some as a

liability in the sense that it also might have served to potentially constrain my analysis

and interpretation to my own experiences, knowledge, and horizons of meaning. In light

of these concerns it is important to note that the very nature of an interpretive inquiry

necessarily involves the presence of the researcher in the act of interpretation, though

researchers must "stand back" enough to give participants their own voice (p. 97, Strauss

& Corbin, 1998). In the analysis chapters particularly (i.e., Chapters Four-Six), I have

consistently attempted to allow the "voice" of my participants be heard by providing

extended quotes in context and allowing themes to emerge from the data.

Ethical Issues and Concerns

My proposition to study the spiritual labor of both current and past SDA boarding

school teachers, and the idea that spiritual labor involves "regulation" aspects that may

affect not only one's current but also one's future employment within the SDA system,

presented come ethical concerns that I was obligated to address. I will briefly outline

these concerns and then share how I attempted to mitigate these.

First, my position as a longtime teacher in SDA boarding schools means that a

number of my participants could be categorized as friends, colleagues, and/or

acquaintances. The fact that I am also employed in a SDA college as I complete this

study means that in many ways I remain a member of the church's educational system. I

also have a large number of contacts, acquaintances, and friends in the SDA educational

system as a whole who might be considered part of the "regulatory" aspect of spiritual

labor – principals, educational superintendents, etc. Thus, participants who shared with

me personal reactions to their spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools, or who offered

anecdotes about others, conceivably put themselves or others at risk when exposing their

divergence or unhappiness with the spiritual beliefs, tenets, mission, or expectations of

the school and/or church. Not only did they potentially risk their or other's reputation by

sharing their experiences and thoughts about spiritual labor, but if their spiritual

dissonance and the reasons for that dissonance were to come to light, their employability in the SDA educational system could conceivably be in jeopardy.

For these reasons I felt an even greater need for discretion and a heightened sense of responsibility to guard the confidentiality of my participants. The measures (both great and small) I undertook to do so are as follows: 1) In the recruitment script (see Appendix B), I tried to outline the nature of the study, and I sent possible participants the interview protocol before I attempted to secure their permission for an interview. In this way participants would hopefully understand the nature of the study and opt out if they wished; 2) As much as possible, given my snowball sampling technique, in the recruitment of participants I did not divulge the names of other academy teachers with whom I had talked, nor did I mention the academies from which my participants came; 3) In the analysis chapters, I have not identified the participants by pseudonym, number, or other indicators to avoid the possibility of tracking individuals throughout this document and extrapolating their identity based on the sum of their contributions. The hope was that by not identifying participants in any systematic manner it would become more difficult to connect speech patterns, references, or other elements of a participant's "voice" with regards to more mundane comments to other more potentially incriminating comments later in the document; 4) In the exemplars themselves, I have altered or eliminated information that may identify individuals or their schools. The altered information appears in brackets ("[…]"). Instead of names or other identifying details, I have put in these brackets more general pieces of information that stand in for potentially identifying information. In addition, I have indicated eliminated information by elongated ellipses ("…."). Pauses or breaks naturally occurring in the speech patterns of

the participants are alternately indicated with regular ellipses ("…"); 5) All my participants gave their informed consent (see Appendix C) which also outlined some of the potential risks and the measures used to ensure confidentiality (i.e., methods for handling tapes etc.).

It is true that many of my participants shared with me highly personal and potentially incriminating revelations. I was honored by their trust and, quite frankly, startled at their honesty and forthrightness – particularly from those who were currently employed as boarding school faculty/staff and thus had more to lose if the information would come to the attention of their employers. Undoubtedly the opportunity to talk about issues that may not be acceptable to voice to colleagues or even to their close friends proved cathartic to some. I sensed that only a couple of my participants prevaricated or dodged difficult questions – though that observation is only speculation, of course. Only one participant exercised his right to abstain from responding to an interview protocol question. On two other occasions, having had second thoughts about their disclosures, my participants asked me not to use information they had just shared with me. I complied by not transcribing these portions of the interviews.

Finally, with regard to the manner in which the material has been presented in this dissertation, I asked the four participants who agreed to complete the member check for this document (see *Verification* section below) if they would also indicate any examples where the identity of the individuals or school might be easily extrapolated from the exemplars of the discussion. I further altered exemplars or found similar or less incriminating examples when these were pointed out to me.

In sum, there was much in my data that needed to be kept confidential. In the reporting of my findings in this dissertation and in my own personal discussion with other SDA educators about this study, I have done my best to assure the confidentiality of my participants. Sharing issues of spirituality related to spiritual labor in a total institution carried with it certain risks for my participants. In this examination of spiritual labor I have attempted as much as possible to address the ethical concerns with regard to my participants and their disclosures.

Interview Protocol

In the examination of spiritual labor through the eyes of parochial boarding school faculty and staff who work or have worked in these total institutions, I employed a semi-structured interview protocol utilizing the active interview approach. To address research questions regarding the nature of spiritual labor and the encompassing nature of parochial schools, participants were asked about their experiences working in a boarding school, their challenges operating within the all-encompassing nature of a total institution, and the spiritual expectations placed upon them (see Appendix A). These interviews lasted between thirty minutes to more than two hours. Most were approximately an hour and a half in length and were conducted wherever the participants said they felt comfortable. Our conversations took place in their personal homes, in their offices, in restaurants, in the school cafeterias or libraries, etc. A number of the interviews were conducted over the phone, allowing faculty/staff from widely different geographical areas to be

represented in this study.[3] Each interview was recorded and transcribed verbatim for

thematic data analysis providing nearly 500 pages of single-spaced data.

Document/Artifact Analysis

        Besides employing qualitative interviews, I also examined documents/artifacts

that pertained to spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools. The value of examining

document/artifacts as a companion to other qualitative methods such as interviewing and

participant observation, for example, is well documented (see Webb, Campbell,

Schwartz, & Sechrest, 1966; Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). Most importantly to the design of

this study, the usefulness of examining documents/artifacts corresponded with the first

research question involving the issue of how parochial schools commodify, codify, and

regulate spiritual labor. For example, Lindlof and Taylor (2002) articulate that the

analysis of documents is particularly crucial in organizations to determine what an

organization "produces" and how it "codifies procedures or policies" (p. 117). What an

organization produces is its commodity, and the question under investigation here was

how parochial boarding schools commodify the spirituality of its teachers and staff. In

addition, I proposed that one of the central characteristics of spiritual labor is the

codification of spirituality for its organizational members, and documents promised to

reveal the nature of this codification. Lindlof and Taylor also detail how documents

"embody social rules" (p. 117) that reflect how organizational members are expected to

behave. In the arena of spiritual labor, then, the documents I examined gave insight into

how spirituality may be regulated (i.e., through rules, procedures, policies, etc.).

---

[3] For confidentiality purposes I have not offered a list of the specific geographical areas of the country from which these participants came nor revealed the boarding schools in which these participants worked or had worked.

The documents analyzed in this study originated from four different sources. The first was portions of the SDA church's Education Department website dedicated to marketing Christian education ("Journey to Excellence: Marketing tools," 2004). The second was a sample of the marketing materials offered by individual boarding schools (including their websites). The third set of documents included the employment/personnel manuals from a sample of unions and conferences which have oversight over various academies. Finally, the participants in the qualitative interviews were asked to provide documents as well. What follows, then, is an outline of the nature of these documents, how they were procured, and how they were analyzed as well.

Documents Revealing the Commodification of Spirituality. First, I examined documents/artifacts that illustrated how the spirituality of teachers and staff is commodified as part of the service (Christian education) offered by SDA boarding schools. As described below, I analyzed relevant documents emanating from both the larger church structure and from the individual boarding schools as well.

"Marketing Tools" website from the umbrella church. Because one of the defining elements of a parochial school is the influence of the sponsoring church, and because the SDA school system as a whole is guided by shared spiritual goals and values articulated by the governing church structure, the first set of documents employed in this study came from the SDA North American Division's Department of Education's project called "Journey to Excellence." This website details the vision, shared values, philosophy, history, and common goals of SDA education. It also offers a clearing house of research on effective education and provides roadmaps for innovation and improvement in SDA schools at all levels (see "Journey to Excellence: Overview" 2005).

Included on this website is a section entitled "Marketing Tools." Because spiritual labor is characterized in part by the commodification of spirituality, this site provided documents illustrating how spirituality (particularly the spirituality of the schools' teachers and staff) is commodified as an important element of a SDA Christian education. Included for analysis were sample television spots, sermons, PowerPoint presentations, and brochures as well as the transcripts from the breakout sessions and featured speakers of a recent seminar (entitled "Marketing our Mission") for SDA educators and marketing personnel ("Journey to Excellence: Summit," 2005). This website provided the first set of documents/artifacts I used to explore the commodification of organizational members' spirituality. In all I procured 40 documents totaling over 170 pages.

Promotional material from individual schools. The documents outlined above provided a glimpse into the marketing strategy of SDA education as a whole. Other documents illustrating how the spirituality of teachers and staff serve as part of the service or commodity of a parochial school include the promotional materials of individual boarding schools themselves. I examined the websites of the 34 North American SDA boarding schools that have a presence on the Internet. On each site I explored every link available from the home page. Since these were pages that potential students and parents would likely to see first, I earmarked them as most relevant to promoting and marketing the school. Relevant pages were converted to PDF documents or saved as HTML files for later viewing and analysis. In total, I analyzed more than 100 pages from these sites.

I also solicited materials from marketing and recruitment directors in each of the largest academies representing the nine unions that comprise the North American Division of the SDA church – unions that represent various geographical areas of North America.[4] I wanted to explore if or how individual boarding schools include the spirituality of its teachers/staff as part of the commodity or service they offer in their own marketing endeavors. If I did not receive a response from the marketing/recruitment director from a particular academy, I approached the next largest boarding school in the union. Because the boarding schools in the various unions vary in size, I was able to access materials from both large and small schools; enrollments ranged from 542 (Forest Lake Academy, Florida, in the Southern Union) to 97 (Mt. Ellis Academy, Montana, in the North Pacific Union). Thus, this sample allowed for possible geographical and size-related diversity regarding the manner in which individual schools market the spirituality of their teachers and staff as part of the commodity or service they offer. All together I received marketing/promotional materials from 11 academies in eight unions representing nine states and one Canadian province.

These materials ranged broadly from promotional DVD/CD's to letters, brochures, calendars, postcards, bookmarks, etc. From one school I even received a T-shirt with the school's marketing slogan, "Decidedly Academic…Distinctly Christian." Several marketing/recruitment directors also sent me their marketing philosophies as well as detailing other marketing strategies (such as campus visitations). All together I received over 75 separate documents or items that illustrated what SDA boarding schools

---

[4] These nine unions include the following: Atlantic Union (e.g., New York, New England), Canadian Union, Columbia Union (e.g., New Jersey, Pennsylvania), Lake Union (e.g., Michigan, Wisconsin), Mid-American Union (e.g., Minnesota, Colorado, Missouri), North Pacific Union (e.g., Washington, Idaho), Pacific Union (e.g., California, Hawaii), Southern Union (e.g., Florida, Georgia, Kentucky), and the Southwestern Union (e.g., Oklahoma, Texas).

might present to parents and students as the "commodity" or service their schools could offer. Later in this chapter I will explicate more fully how the documents were analyzed in light of the commodification aspect of spiritual labor, i.e., how the spirituality of teachers/staff were (or were not) part of the "selling" of SDA Christian education.

Documents Revealing the Codification and Regulation of Spirituality. The previous section outlined what documents I procured to address how spirituality is commodified in parochial boarding schools. The following section will examine the documents I gathered and analyzed to address how spirituality might be codified and regulated in these organizations. The codification of faculty and staff's spirituality in these types of organizations include organizationally mandated expectations that might appear in faculty handbooks/personnel manuals as well as an assortment of documents and/or artifacts that reveal the less obvious disciplinary control exerted by colleagues and other organizational members. How each of these two types of documents was procured is explicated below.

Faculty handbooks/personnel handbooks. Organizational regulations and expectations of all types are often formally codified in documents such as employee handbooks. Whether or not these handbooks are actually read by teachers and staff is of less concern than that these expectations have been codified and that organizational members become aware of these expectations in some way. In addition, such official codification enables organizations to more formally regulate the expectations delineated there if they should so choose, i.e., as a basis for termination (see Euben, 1998; Franke, 1993).

As stated above, the idea that spiritual labor involves the codification of the spiritual expectations organizations require of members implies that these expectations be communicated in some way. I assumed that faculty handbooks and/or personnel manuals would delineate these expectations for faculty/staff employed to work in SDA boarding schools. I soon learned, however, that I was only half correct in this assumption. For example, I discovered early in the data-gathering process that in most academies, functional faculty handbooks were nearly non-existent. When I asked a number of participants if I could see their faculty handbooks I was met with puzzled looks and blank stares. When I changed tactics and began asking administrative secretaries for their school's faculty handbooks, I was met with the same reaction and the typical response, "Well, I think we have one of those around here somewhere." This statement would be followed by several minutes of fruitless searching through shelves and file cabinets. In short, after receiving only one current handbook, I quickly realized that faculty handbooks were not the primary means by which SDA boarding schools officially codify their spiritual expectations.

Instead, I discovered from the qualitative interviews that faculty *do* receive updated employment manuals from Offices of Education in their respective unions or conferences. Thus, I contacted the educational directors of each union requesting these employment manuals. These provided codification of the general spiritual expectations (and other employment issues, such as benefits) for employees in SDA educational institutions supported by their respective union/conferences. In all, I received handbooks from five unions. These documents played most significantly into Chapter Five's discussion of the codification and regulation of faculty/staff's spirituality.

Participant-provided documents. Documents that illustrate the types of codification and regulation of spirituality representing a less formal, but equally engaging, disciplinary power are more difficult to identify and bracket. To this end, I asked participants to bring to the interview an artifact/document that illustrates how they are expected to behave, believe, and/or conduct themselves as Christians and Seventh-day Adventist faculty members, as well as the consequences (or potential consequences) if staff members did not meet these expectations (see Appendix B for the introduction script requesting these documents). Besides providing documents for analysis, these participant-provided documents also afforded entry points for discussions about spiritual labor in the interviews.

My participants did not provide a plethora of documents, either forgetting to bring something to the interview, not quite understanding what type of document to provide, or simply not having documents that they felt might suffice. In the case of a couple of spur-of-the-moment interviews, I did not press for these types of documents at all. Nevertheless, some participants did provide documents. These included contracts, pages from employment/personnel manual, and faculty meeting minutes. With the exception of the employment contract, I made copies of these documents. Because the participant who provided his employment contract read the pertinent information from that document, I was able to capture the salient passages verbatim in the interview transcription. In cases where participants mentioned documents but weren't able to physically produce them, I pressed for details in the interview itself in an attempt to capture the essence of these documents. In all, I used eight participant-provided

documents in the analysis of the codification and regulation of spiritual labor provided in Chapter Five.

Data Analysis

Once the documents had been procured and the interviews completed and transcribed, I employed a thematic analysis to address the research questions posed in this study regarding the nature of spiritual labor for teachers and staff in the total institution atmosphere of parochial boarding schools. Details of this analysis follow.

Thematic Analysis

The interviews and documents/artifacts were developed and analyzed using the selective or highlighting approach (van Manen, 1990) with the reduction, explanation, and theory steps suggested by Lindlof (1995). To facilitate this process I used the qualitative software QSR N6 (formerly known as NUD*IST). First, however, I read through the transcripts making general notations in the margins regarding possible themes, as well as the emerging properties and dimensions of these themes (e.g., Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Then I coded each of the documents using QSR N6. In this flexible and powerful program, the researcher simply highlights sections of text and assigns the selection a coding label. In addition comments, memos and other notes (see Lindlof & Taylor, 2002) can be appended to whole texts, individual selections, or separate stand-alone documents (such as Word files). Artifacts such as sample television spots or PDF files can also be coded as well. In the case of television spots or promotional DVD's, I transcribed the text for easier coding.

Once this initial analysis was completed, I examined the thematic labels and their contents (called "nodes" in QSR N6) for recurring, strong, or persistent themes (see van

Manen, 1990). I discarded the "nodes" that did not consistently emerge throughout the whole of the data (the strongest themes relating to spiritual labor were identified based on their persistence across participants and documents) and consolidated nodes that had different labels but dealt with the same theme. Once the strongest themes had emerged, I examined the coded texts again to identify any contradictions and/or inconsistencies in the original analyses and made further adjustments to the thematic database. The program QSR N6 easily allows for text to be coded in multiple categories, to be re-coded, or to expand the coding to include more surrounding context, etc. In addition, the program also enables the researcher to return to the original text to check that the coded sections are not analyzed out of context. I utilized each of these functions.

At this point a number of seemingly separate themes (or nodes) had emerged from the data, and I exported these themes into Inspiration, a concept-mapping software tool. With this program I was able to visually map these themes to see how they inter-related and interacted with each other. In the process a number of super-ordinate categories emerged – these categories included themes dealing with 1) the total institution qualities of boarding schools, 2) the nature of spiritual labor in those boarding schools (i.e., commodification, codification, and regulation of faculty/staff spirituality), and 3) themes dealing with spiritual dissonance. I was most delighted to discover that these categories and their attendant themes perfectly aligned with my initial five research questions. Thus, these three over-arching categories became Chapters Four ("The Boarding School as a Total Institution: All-Encompassing Organizational Life in the Eye of the Panopticon"), Five ("The Nature of Spiritual Labor: Codification, Commodification, and Regulation"), and Six ("Facing Spiritual Dissonance: Strategies and Approaches")

respectively. In these individual chapters I will detail more specifically the emergent themes for each overarching topic.

Verification

In qualitative research, the process by which readers, researchers, or even participants can be confident in the interpretation and analysis of the qualitative endeavor is referred to as verification. Cresswell (1997) defines verification as "a process that occurs through the data collection, analysis, and…writing" (p. 194). He goes on to outline eight methods of verification (acknowledging bias, prolonged engagement, rich/thick descriptions, negative case analysis, triangulation, peer review, member checking, and external audits) and recommends that researchers employ at least two of the methods. This study utilized seven of these methods throughout the process of this study.

First, as mentioned earlier, a careful attempt was made to acknowledge the "bias" my position in this study may bring. Second, a negative case analysis was employed in the analysis. A negative case analysis is the process by which the researcher continually refines the analysis in light of disconfirming evidence. In the end, the analysis and interpretation satisfactorily accounts for anomalies and "negative cases." When anomalies and contradictions presented themselves in the data, I did not ignore these but rather accounted for them in the analysis, as will be seen particularly in Chapter Six's discussion of spiritual dissonance. Third, rich/thick descriptions were employed in the thematic analysis. This type of description is important because it allows the reader the details necessary to determine the quality of the analysis. I have attempted to include

both the nature of the rich thick data in the exemplars employed but also to take care to discuss and describe the importance of these examples in the thematic analysis.

In addition to providing rich, thick description, I have employed member checking as a method of verification as well. After I completed the initial analysis, I contacted four participants (two current and two former faculty/staff) asking them to read the analysis checking to see if the interpretation seemed reasonable and captured the essence of the experiences of SDA boarding school teachers, if important points were left out, or if insignificant points were unduly emphasized. The responses from these members did not lead me to change the analysis and interpretation aspects of this study, but led me to implement more measures to insure confidentiality (see "Ethical Issues and Concerns" above). Based on this feedback, for example, I modified the nature of some of the exemplars to further protect confidentiality (i.e., paraphrasing instead of quoting directly). Though at least one asked for changes to be made regarding the identifying details offered in his exemplars, the participants' comments otherwise verified that my analysis "rang true" to their experiences and observations.

Beside the data provided by the qualitative interviews, the documents I analyzed also provided a means of triangulation. As the final method of verification the dissertation process itself provided a type of peer review at the hand of my advisor and a type of external audit made up of my dissertation committee. These seven methods of verification serve to enable readers to feel comfortable and confident in the analyses and interpretations presented here.

Summary

The research methods of qualitative interviews and document/artifact analysis served to address the types of research questions I pursued in this study: What are the total institution qualities of a parochial boarding school that influence the nature of the spiritual labor required in those types of institutions? How is spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools commodified, codified, and regulated? What is the nature of the spiritual dissonance that may arise in the face of spiritual labor? How do organizational members negotiate the dissonance that spiritual labor in a total institution can precipitate? In the next chapters I present the analysis of the documents and qualitative interviews. Chapter Four will outline the total institution qualities of the boarding schools in which these participants work and live. I will deal with this subject first as these qualities influence both the components of spiritual labor (i.e., the commodification, codification, and regulation of organizational members' spirituality) and the strategies that these faculty employ in dealing with their spiritual dissonance. Chapter Five will paint a picture of spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools by illustrating how faculty members' spirituality is commodified, codified, and regulated – sometimes in surprising and complex ways. Finally the analysis section of this document will conclude with Chapter Six's outline of the spiritual dissonance that may attend spiritual labor and the strategies these participants employed to manage, mitigate, or avoid such dissonance.

Chapter Four: Boarding School as Total Institutions – All-Encompassing Organizational

Life in the Eye of the Panopticon

         Goffman (1962) suggested that certain organizations have unique qualities that

qualify them as total institutions. However, the overarching quality of a total institution

in his conceptualization was its all-encompassing nature – more encompassing of its

members than is the norm (see Chapter Two). This study allows an examination of a

contemporary organization, the boarding school, as a total institution. Certainly it seems

intuitive to suggest that boarding schools would be more encompassing than day schools

in regards to students' and teachers' time, movement, and involvement in the total school

program. The added component of a *parochial* boarding school would also suggest that

the institution may be even more encompassing of spiritual and religious matters when

compared with other types of educational institutions. This "all-encompassing"

component should play a factor in the study of spiritual labor in such institutions as well.

         This study holds no surprises in regards to these intuitive assumptions. In the

qualitative interviews from faculty and staff who are presently working in a Seventh-day

Adventist (SDA) boarding school or have been employed in one in the past, some of the

strongest, vivid, and most unmistakable emergent themes involve the all-encompassing,

total-institution-like qualities inherent in boarding school work as a whole and spiritual

labor in general. Because these participants work (or have worked) in a *parochial*

boarding school, part of the encompassing nature of their institutional lives involves the

tight coupling between their own spiritual/religious practices and beliefs and what aspects

of spirituality the organization expects these members to embrace and uphold.

What *did* prove to be surprising in this study, however, was the way in which the total institution qualities of the organization were enacted. Unlike other types of total institutions (i.e., prisons), membership in the boarding schools of this study was and is voluntary – for both teachers and students. To better understand the unique nature of voluntary total institutions as well as the centrality of communication to the total institution process, in the following analysis I will turn to the concept of the panopticon and its disciplinary power within the all-encompassing notion of the total institution (e.g., Bentham, 1781/1995; Foucault, 1977). To begin this chapter's analysis, I will review the notion of the panopticon, its relationship to disciplinary power (including concertive control), and its tie with the concept of the total institution.

The Place of the Panopticon as a Disciplinary Power in Total Institutions

Although the notion of the panopticon as a form of disciplinary power can be attributed to Foucault (1977), the concept of a literal panopticon belongs to Bentham (1787/1995). It should be noted that Bentham's architectural conceptualization of the panopticon was actually a unique and highly efficient design for a new type of prison. Within this design, all of the prisoners' movements were visible to the prison wardens, but though prisoners knew they could be under surveillance at all times, they could not be certain *when* they were being watched. Bentham's panopticon was purely functional in its design in that it promised to reduce the number of staff needed to control and safeguard prisoners; simply the *idea* of being constantly observed would be enough to control their behavior. Bentham's vision was designed to be put to use in the most traditional and recognizable of total institutions – prisons. Thus the panopticon at its very inception was tied to the concept of the total institution.

In this study, the panopticon is enacted in a contemporary organization whose members are not constrained by bars, locks, or wardens, but which serves as a total institution nonetheless. One of the more descriptive themes emerging in this study is the characterization by the participants of the boarding school environment as a "fishbowl" where one always feels under scrutiny. The disciplinary power suggested by the emergent theme, *Living in a Fishbowl*, is strikingly reminiscent of the panopticon referenced in actual practice by Bentham and in the theoretical discussions of disciplinary power undertaken by Foucault.

Particularly of interest to communication scholars concerned with power, resistance, and control as communicatively enacted, enabled, and constructed in organizations is the more symbolic (i.e., more socially constructed) notion of the panopticon developed by Foucault (1977). Foucault saw Bentham's panopticon as a symbol of how disciplinary power operates in modern society to control deviant behavior. Essentially, the panopticon's power stems from the idea that individuals will self-monitor when they feel they are under observation (whether they are or not). Being observed, or the threat of being observed, need not come from a higher member of a hierarchy to be effective (i.e., the prison warden watching prisoners). The threat of observation can come from anywhere, at the hands of anyone (i.e., other prisoners, visitors, etc.). Thus, the normative pressure to conform can also emanate from the visibility a panopticon affords to any member of society who might make normative judgments and apply normative pressure. In an organizational setting, for example, the idea of concertive control (e.g., Barker, 1993) embraces this type of normative power at the hands of other organizational members who can observe/monitor performances and

behaviors. The term 'concertive control' refers to the collective control members exert on each other's behavior. This effort is done 'in concert,' or together – hence the term "concertive" control. In Barker's (1993) study of self-managed teams, for example, members of these teams felt they were under the constant observation of other team members, resulting in pressure to conform to the group's goals and norms. Foucault would undoubtedly point out that concertive control is a modern example of his conceptualization of the disciplinary power afforded by the modern panopticon.

Again, the tie between the concept of the panopticon and a total institution again deserves notice. Foucault's (1977) work, titled "Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison," focuses on the prison systems in France. As noted previously, prisons and total institutions have always been solidly coupled, but Foucault introduces a more philosophical turn on the idea of the panopticon within this frame as he suggests that "disciplinary power" extends beyond prisons into other institutions such as schools. Both the emergent themes of *Working 24/7* and *Living in a Fishbowl* that I will present in the following sections suggest how the disciplinary power of total institutions – including the panopticon – is enacted in a contemporary organization.

It will become abundantly evident later in Chapter Six that in relation to spiritual labor at these institutions, the inherent pressures, rewards, and possible dissonance of work in a parochial boarding school are shaped by these organizations' all-encompassing, total-institution qualities, including the realities of conducting spiritual labor under the ever-watchful eye of what might be characterized as a panopticon. Thus, to fully understand spiritual labor under these conditions (i.e., the codification, regulation, and commodification of teacher/staff spirituality outlined in Chapter Five), it first becomes

necessary to offer a sense of the all-encompassing nature of the work in SDA boarding schools.

Boarding Schools as Total Institutions

When talking about the experience of living and working on a boarding school campus, the participants in this study almost eerily mirrored the language used by Goffman and others who have studied total institutions in other contexts. Recall, for example, that Goffman (1962) makes reference to the "encompassing or total character" (p. 4) of total institutions. He speaks of inmates, isolation, and the controlling elements of such institutions such as barriers to communication and restriction of movement. To my knowledge only one of my participants (a PhD student) was conversant in the literature of the total institution, and with this exception, no participant ever directly referenced "total institutions," nor did I describe or refer to total institutions in the interviews. Yet participants' descriptions of boarding school life, particularly their reactions to what they liked least about working on a boarding school campus, reflect what can be seen as total institution-like characteristics.

Some participants, for example, mentioned the "control factor" relating to both the students and the staff. In the following exemplar, one teacher describes what she likes least about working in a boarding school. She uses the term "supervision" to refer to those times when faculty/staff must be physically present to supervise the activities of students on or off campus (such as recreation periods, weekend activities, etc.). When supervising the campus, faculty/staff may be charged with making sure all students are where they should be (i.e., on the recreation fields during recreation, in their respective dorms at night, etc.). As the following participant talks about this type of supervision

(regulating students' movements), note her use of the term "normal" in the following

exchange:

> Tammy: What do you like least about your work in boarding schools?
>
> Participant: [in a sing-song voice] Supervision! (laughter) Supervision, definitely!
>
> Tammy: Talk to me about why that is so repugnant and unpleasant.
>
> Participant: I don't think everything about supervision is really…normal.
>
> (laughter)
>
> Tammy: Talk to me about that!
>
> Participant: Okay. For instance, school is out, kids are everywhere, but once 6:50 hits, you better walk around [campus] and be sure you know where they [the students] are. (sarcastically) What? You know, five minutes ago they can be here on front campus, but once 6:50 hits, OK, "You go up on the field." What? (laughter) It doesn't make sense! It's not a normal environment. You know, sometimes I would like to stay with kids out on front campus when the weather is nice. You know, let them play Frisbee because a lot of times when you go up on the field, they can't do anything because there is a game going on. They are visiting on campus, you know, throwing a Frisbee, but it's like, "Guess what kids? You need to shift." That's what I don't like. It's not a natural and normal thing. Because in life they are not going to go to a certain spot where there is a game going on to just talk... So that's what I don't like. It's not…normal. I don't know if that's the right word.

This teacher is making a comment about the control of movement of students on a

boarding school campus and revealing that the restrictions and controls are more

encompassing than what they might find "in life." Note the peals of laughter evident in

the passage above indicating that this participant was rather jovial, slightly sarcastic, and

rather lighthearted about this seeming twist on "normality." As it happens, this

participant has been in boarding school work for 20 years, a detail that reveals a measure

of investment in boarding school life despite the trials of supervision. This "supervision"

of students and the governing their movements, for example, was described as "not

normal," yet this participant did not see supervision as something sinister, but simply as a practice not within the norm of "real life."

However, not all participants were as cavalier when talking about the restrictions inherent on a boarding school campus. The following former faculty member represents the most negative view of boarding schools across the spectrum of my participants. She has a rather different view of the rules and restrictions in a boarding school. Unlike the example above, the following exchange was notable for its intensity, depth of feeling, and absence of any jovialness:

> Participant: I don't think [boarding schools are] a healthy environment at all.
>
> Tammy: OK, let's talk about that.
>
> Participant: I just think that anytime you are made to feel like there is one way to believe, and you are not exposed to other ways of thinking – and then on top of that, you put a fear of heaven or a hell – throw that into the mix, you have tremendous guilt issues that shouldn't even need to be mixed in, you know, with young kids that are growing up. And I just think it can be very unhealthy, and I think it causes extraordinary rebellion.
>
> Tammy: And you're saying that you attribute that rebelliousness in part to the environment?
>
> Participant: Right. To the restrictive environment.
>
> Tammy: The restrictive environment being…what?
>
> Participant: Being their [the schools'] genuine effort to have normal controls over teenagers. But it is impossible when you have a boarding situation to have normal controls without being jail-like.

This participant uses the unmistakably harsh language of "jail-like" and numerous times throughout the interview mentions the "unhealthy environment" of boarding schools in general and the school she references in particular. These terms coincide with the "jail-like" nature of many of the types of organizations that have generally dominated the total institution literature. Thus the language used by these participants closely mirrors that used to describe other types of total institutions.

The issues of control noted above strongly imply that boarding schools might be placed in the category of total institutions. It should be noted that the previous discussion largely reflects the controlling, all-encompassing impacts of total institutions on *students'* lives. However, the details offered in the qualitative interviews regarding the all-encompassing nature of boarding schools suggest that faculty and staff must operate within the all-encompassing elements of the total institution as well. That they may do so in conjunction with the demands of spiritual labor sets the stage for the research question asking "How do the total institution qualities of a parochial boarding school shape the spiritual labor expected of teachers and staff?" In this light, I will now turn more specifically to the qualitative interviews' two strong emergent themes regarding these total institution qualities. The first theme involves the nearly all-encompassing time constraints of boarding school work – *Working 24/7*. The second theme, *Living in the Fishbowl*, reflects the close quarters, proximity, and visibility that also characterizes total institutions and captures the effect of the panopticon on organizational members' lives. In the end, these themes will illuminate more fully the total institution-like atmosphere in which these participants' spiritual labor takes place.

Working 24/7

Of course, faculty and staff's movements are not overtly prohibited or monitored as are students' whose whereabouts on campus are strictly supervised (see previous section). However, in a more subtle sense, working at a boarding school *does* constrain faculty/staff's freedom as their duties become all-encompassing with regards to time commitments and responsibilities. The theme *Working 24/7* illustrates the nearly overwhelming investments in time and energy these participants fling into their boarding school work and how the demands of their work encompass the whole of their lives.

A few participants recalled those constraints as particularly memorable in the first years of their boarding school careers. They talk of how surprised they were by the commitment that boarding school work brings as well as how the work encompassed their lives and time.

> Participant: [My first year] I didn't know enough to be frightened because I had never been a part of boarding schools before. (laughter) So I thought it would be an interesting adventure. I did not have the fear and trepidation that I should have had. (laughter)
>
> Tammy: What do you mean that "you should have had"?
>
> Participant: Because it requires – it demands a lot of an individual…

The "demands" this participant refers to are responsibilities that are time-intensive and can, therefore, be restrictive. Note in the following example how one participant uses the term "all-encompassing" in relation to these matters. She is responding to the question asking how and why she became involved in boarding school work:

> Participant: I had no exposure to boarding academies before I got married and I moved to [name of school], and my husband taught while I was still in school. And it was culture shock, and I hated the first year. I hated it.
>
> Tammy: Really? Why?
>
> Participant: Because I never saw my husband. And because I felt like I could never get away from the place. I was from [large metropolitan area] (laughter) And I went to [name of small, rural boarding school], you know, and you couldn't even get to town… Culture shock… Oh, it was… It really took to my third year before I started to really enjoy it.
>
> Tammy: Because you had no background with it?
>
> Participant: I didn't know what to expect. I didn't know how all-encompassing it would be.

For this participant, the all-encompassing nature of the work became evident from the beginning of her tenure as she reports never seeing her husband; living in an isolated area with little opportunity for escape or relief certainly added to the trauma of these first years. Under these conditions, this participant's use of the term "all-encompassing"

becomes particularly notable in light of the fact that this is the primary quality Goffman

(1962) uses to characterize total institutions.

In a similar vein, one participant comments more overtly on the total institution-

like qualities of boarding school life by tellingly revealing her schedule – a schedule that

requires almost total immersion in one's work:

> Tammy: Why a boarding school?
>
> Participant: Because that's what opened up.
>
> Tammy: OK. So you didn't necessarily…
>
> Participant: I didn't have any idea what I was getting into.
>
> (loud and long laughter)
>
> Participant: I was an innocent, naïve soul.
>
> Tammy: What do you mean…I mean, when you say you didn't have any idea what you got into?
>
> Participant: Well, because… boarding academies are total institutions. It is not only a job. It is a lifestyle. And I think a classic moment of that, of my naiveté, was standing in the front office at the interview, and [the administrative secretary] telling me my schedule, which, of course, as you recall, was completely inappropriate. I had the earliest morning class and the latest afternoon class.
>
> Tammy: The earliest morning class being…?
>
> Participant: At 7:15
>
> Tammy: And the latest being…?
>
> Participant: At 4:30 in the afternoon.
>
> Tammy: So you were going from 7:15 to 4:30?
>
> Participant: No. 7:15 to 5:15. Plus, I had rec [to supervise] afterwards. And I can remember [the administrative secretary] telling me that, plus all the supervision, and me going, "You're just trying to be mean to me."
>
> (laughter)
>
> Participant: And then, she's like, "No. I'm the one telling you the truth."   So that was sincerely, like, my introduction to boarding school life – a complete lifestyle in which I probably had…oh…I probably only had about two hours in the afternoon that were my own…. And I think I felt compelled, um… not to go home in between... But wanting to do a good job, it was hard to distinguish between work and home, and so I didn't want to go home because I felt like I was on the job all day from 7:15 to 5:15.

Tellingly, this participant notes the intensity of her time commitments with the comment

"it was hard to distinguish work from home." The details of this former faculty

member's schedule indicate how all-encompassing the time constraints of boarding

school work can be. The 24/7 nature of the work blurs the line between work and home

to the place where "it's not a job; it's a lifestyle." Such a description gives a sense of the

all-encompassing time commitments inherent in boarding school work.

The participant's schedule noted above was not necessarily a-typical. Said one

former faculty, "And looking back… I was running at [name of school] 75-80 hour

weeks." Very often the participants in my study would share what their day had been

like before they sat down to speak with me and in the process giving a sense of their full

schedules. Following are two samples:

> Participant: I left home this morning at 7:25, picked up a student. I'm on
> campus. Lunch hour, I'm usually in the office, um… There's just no time.
> And tonight, it will be ten o'clock before I get home, because of staff meeting.
> And I'm on duty [supervision], too.
> …..
> [note: the following interview began around 6:30 p.m.]
> Participant: Like today… I just got home, I mean, a sum total since 7 o'clock
> this morning [I've had] maybe an hour at home.
>
> Tammy: Wow. All because of academy duties.
>
> Participant: Everything, yeah. Because being vice-principal, attendance
> officer, [teaching]… if I'm not on duty [supervision], I'm on duty…

This talk of the 24/7 nature of the job, the many responsibilities and duties that boarding

school teachers must carry was one of the most prevalent and unmistakable qualities that

participants shared regarding the nature of their organizational lives in a SDA boarding

schools.

The all-encompassing life of a boarding school campus regarding time

commitments also requires faculty and staff to wear many hats outside of their classroom

teaching responsibilities, or their duties as maintenance, food service, health service, or

other support staff responsibilities. On boarding school campuses faculty and staff

members are responsible for monitoring the campus during recreation periods and over

the weekends. They may help supervise students on weekend tours to surrounding

churches and schools with band, chorale, gymnastics, or varsity sports groups. They plan

evening and weekend activities. Because students' lives are centered on campus, various

clubs (i.e., ski clubs), organizations (i.e., National Honor Society, Student Associations),

or Freshman/Sophomore/Junior/Senior classes are quite active, requiring sponsorship and

supervision of these activities. A typical litany of these types of duties and

responsibilities is offered by a current faculty member:

> Tammy: Tell me what you like least about working in a boarding school?
>
> Participant: Supervision.
>
> Tammy: (laughter) You didn't have to ponder that very long.
>
> Participant: No. All the extra things outside the classroom, like supervision on week nights, supervision on the weekends, supervision on big weekends, and also sometimes… it depends on the school, but here at [name of school], being a class sponsor is the most horrendous job in the world.
>
> Tammy: (chuckles) Why is that?
>
> Participant: You might remember as a class sponsor at [name of school], there were certain functions that you had to help work on, etc. But here, when you hit the junior and senior year, it starts on day one and goes all year through – both years. It's just a never-ending, day after day pounding on you of things that you have to do, that you have to get accomplished.

These duties spoken of above move far beyond the classroom commitments normally

undertaken by teachers in educational institutions. In addition to their other duties,

faculty and staff on a boarding school campus are assigned these types of "extra things"

described above. These examples offer a sense of the time commitments demanded by

the boarding school experience.

All of these duties necessitate time commitments that are often spoken of as all-consuming, i.e., "never-ending," "day after day." Participants talked about how "the schedule runs you…it eats your time," about how difficult it could become to find some time that was not somehow connected with school duties, about how "your life is so consumed, every moment is so consumed with the things that have to be done…. You are just busy, busy, busy." The following participant, recently retired from boarding school work, reflects back on the pressures and multiple, all-consuming responsibilities connected with working in a total institution such as a boarding school:

> Tammy: Well, tell me what you like least about working in a boarding school.
>
> Participant: What I like least about working in a boarding school? Hm… I've never really thought too much about that one. What I like least about it is… There's a constant pressure. Time off seems to be less than what you'd have someplace else…. You have all your other obligations and commitments that don't end at 5 o'clock when you go home.
>
> Tammy: For example?
>
> Participant: Duty. Duty. Supervision. And you were on other things. I was ASB [Associated Student Body] leader for several years at [name of school]. I was in charge of Saturday night programming, beside the other. I was class sponsor at different segments of our time. You don't have a whole lot of free time. (laughter) In fact, there isn't hardly any free time. You've got to find it.

Finding this free time is difficult amidst the many duties, busyness, and time-intensive commitments that encompass boarding school teacher/staff members' lives. In a very real sense the 24/7 life of boarding school teachers constrains their ability to separate "free" time from their seemingly 24/7 organizational duties that occupy the greatest space in their lives.

Teachers and staff in other types of educational institutions are undoubtedly busy and harried as well. However, the experiences of the participants in this study indicated that the pressure of commitments, supervision, etc. proves to be greatly above and

beyond the norm – it proves to be more encompassing than the typical educational institution. Several of the participants offered their observations that the time commitments of the boarding school life exceed the norm of other types of organizations in which they had worked.

> Tammy: What would you characterize as being unique about working in a boarding school as opposed to working in other positions you have been in?
>
> Participant: It's more like a lifestyle than a job. (laughter)
>
> Tammy: What do you mean by that?
>
> Participant: Well, when you work, for example, at [name of health organization] – which is what I did before I came here – you go to work at 8 in the morning and you check out at 5 and you are done... Pretty much it's routine hours, and you are done. In boarding school it just goes beyond that. You are on call – you know, the school day doesn't end at 5 in the evening (laughs).

Once again the nature of boarding school work is not thought of as a job where one can go home at "five in the evening," but rather as a more encompassing type of lifestyle. At least from this participant's perspective, the quality of these time commitments exceeds those of other types of organizations – in this case a health-care organization.

The participant above had previously worked in a non-educational setting, but many of the participants made similar comments reflecting the all-consuming nature of boarding school work as being above the norm in comparison to other educational institutions as well. For example, as the following participant talks about her post-boarding school life, she comments on the difference between the time expectations in her present (public) school position.

> Tammy: How is your life different now that you don't work in a boarding school?
>
> Participant: Oh, I have so much more time! When I first started teaching at public school, I did a whole lot of grant writing, which is very time-consuming, and [the other faculty] thought I worked so hard. They had no clue. (laughter)

Tammy: And you didn't think you were working that hard?

Participant: I knew I was working hard, but it wasn't nonstop, 24/7, that you feel in a boarding academy.

Though this participant's colleagues thought she was "working hard" in the time-consuming task of grant writing, they had "no clue" that this participant's seemingly extravagant time commitment paled in comparison to that required in a parochial boarding school – a commitment whose "non-stop, 24/7" nature was all encompassing. Comparing the difference between teaching in a boarding school and teaching in a day school (i.e., one in which both students and faculty go home at the end of a typical day), one participant comments on the type of teachers that inhabit both worlds:

> Boarding school is just a different realm than day school. I believe there are two different types of teachers. There's the day school teacher that loves the classroom, that loves to go in there and teach…they put the time in the classroom and that's their thing, you know, to be the best teacher they can. And that's a day school teacher. They're done at 3:30. They're going to go home; they're going to go spend time with the family. That's a plus.
> Um… a boarding school teacher is… you know what, "I'm here and I have to teach in order to do all this other stuff, you see." (laughter) So it's a different look on teaching. They're good teachers. They're great in the classroom. But they're the kind of person who wants to go canoeing in the lake and take 20 kids with them. They want to do extra stuff. They want to do small groups, or they want to do Bible studies, or they want to do praise bands. And they just get emerged with the kids. And there's a big difference in my book between boarding school teachers and day school teachers. Boarding school teachers are willing to put in 24/7…Boy, for ten months you are 24/7, you know.

This participant clearly dictates what he sees as the differences between the type of teacher who embraces the boarding school over that of day school teachers. The difference revolves around time commitments outside of the classroom. He also reiterates that these time constraints are "24/7," implying that they are certainly more encompassing than the norm. He sees boarding school teachers as being more "emerged" with the students, for example. Many other participants compared SDA day academies

(SDA high schools that do not offer boarding facilities) with SDA boarding schools as

well, consistently noting that even in the arena of parochial schooling, boarding schools

up the ante as far as the amount of effort and time commitment required. This former

boarding school teacher summarizes such sentiments:

> I mean, think about it. You get paid the same as [SDA] day academies, and
> you're doing twice the work because you're doing a 24-7 job, where really, 12
> hours of that is pretty intense, from the time you wake up until the time you
> go to bed. You know, the only peace you get are those eight hours of sleep, or
> seven, or six, or whatever you have that night.

The immersion of faculty and staff in their boarding school duties is "pretty intense" and

all-encompassing due to the 24/7 nature of the job. Such commitments extend beyond

those required in other jobs and educational institutions, highlighting the hallmark of the

total institution qualities of boarding schools.

Working 24/7: Stresses and Strains. As these participants express, the stresses

and strains of "*Working 24/7*" often begin to encompass all areas of their lives. A

number of participants shared the toll that working in a total institution takes on their

families, their health, and their personal lives, illustrating the all-encompassing nature of

the work in this total institution.

It is not surprising that such crushing hours would impact what might be called

one's "personal" life – the life where family, friends, hobbies, and even spirituality

operates outside of one's employing organization. One current faculty member

comments on this impact:

> Participant: I really enjoy teaching here, but I cannot imagine teaching here
> and being married and having children.
>
> Tammy: Why is that?
>
> Participant: It's just a 24/7 job, you know. I mean, that's obviously an
> exaggeration but, I mean, it just takes a lot of time. I mean, I feel bad because
> I don't have enough time to talk to my boyfriend long distance. (laughter)

> Yeah, I don't know if I want to be in boarding academy for the rest of my life. It's a lot of work.
>
> Tammy: Because of the time issues?
>
> Participant: Yes. I mean… I am working 11, 12, 13 hour days every day. And then on supervision weekends I am there for church, and I'm there for vespers and there for, you know, when they [the students] have downtime and stuff. I need to be away from the kids once awhile, and it just feels like I don't have a Sabbath almost, you know. It's hard.

Not only does this participant not have time for her own personal needs (i.e., talking to her boyfriend), but she expresses the difficulty of escaping from her students as well ("it's hard"). Living on campus and being committed to duties and responsibilities outside of what might be considered the regular school day illustrate how the 24/7 nature of boarding school work threatens to encompass one's personal life and further illustrates one of the constraining elements of a total institution.

Besides the difficulty of carving out one's own time while "*Working 24/7*," the all-encompassing quality of boarding school life carries with it other potentially negative consequences as well – primarily the toll it takes on family, marriage, and health. In this sense, the 24/7 time commitments and multiple responsibilities of boarding school life are characterized as "destructive" by the following participant:

> I just think that a boarding school takes a lot out of you. I did a lot of damage to my health. Not only was I teaching six classes and being the librarian, but I was vice principal…. Um.. it was… I was struggling. And of course my teaching was suffering which I wasn't very happy with because I was just winging it by that time because I didn't have time to prepare. You know, the three or four hours of sleep I was getting wasn't very restful because I couldn't shut my mind down. It was very harmful to my health. I'm paying for it now. I have heart problems now. But I do think that we are very, very hard on our boarding school people. You know, we have to wear a lot of hats, and I think it's definitely destructive to families…. And I found it to be destructive to marriages. Now, it doesn't happen all the time, but I felt like it was a huge contributing factor to some of those problems because of that. You know, you just have to do so much and there were so many different hats to wear. I was single, and I barely even had time for myself, and I certainly didn't have time to take care of myself. So had I been married or had I had

children I don't really know how I could have handled that. I think we are
very destructive, and I think that is a real concern.

This participant notes the "destructive" effects of long hours and multiple responsibilities

on her own health. She speculates on the strains the all-encompassing time constraints of

the boarding school places on families and marriages. Commented another participant

who had a family, "[boarding school work] can be all-consuming, and it can be

absolutely very difficult on a family." Certainly, as participants note, seemingly working

24/7 illustrates how the all-encompassing, total-institution quality of a boarding school

environment can be full of stresses and strains.

In these sometimes poignant ways, participants talked about the nearly

overwhelming nature of their expectations as boarding school faculty/staff, the strain it

puts on their family, and the dampening effect it has on any kind of outside life. One

former staff member recalls an incident that illustrates the totality of the boarding school

responsibilities on outside friendships.

> I'll tell you a sad story. And this is probably pretty typical. But I met up with
> an old friend – who we had spent a wonderful weekend with in – she invited
> us to her home... So, you know, I certainly owed her a weekend. I wanted her
> to come [spend time with us]. We met up with her again, and I got out my
> calendar to find that weekend…. Every weekend was black until the end of
> the year! There was no time for her to come when we were free – when we
> were working at [name of boarding school]. And then I got depressed. When
> you just go moment by moment, day by day, you are OK. But when you
> realize you are in that situation… (sigh) I've never seen that friend since.

As this example of the pressing duties incumbent on boarding school faculty/staff attests,

the responsibilities extend beyond the classroom, even into weekends – sometimes so

much so that the restraint on one's time can be depressing and onerous. Ironically, this

participant also notes that she was essentially too busy to know that her life was being

overtaken by duties and responsibilities connected with the school. Once again, these

exemplars illustrate not only the all-encompassing quality of faculty/staff's time commitments, but of the toll these might take on their personal relationships.

This idea that "you just can't get away sometimes" highlights the totalizing and constraining nature of the work in a boarding school. When those who no longer work in a boarding school spoke of how their lives were different, they not surprisingly articulate their new-found "freedom" from the strictures of a boarding school schedule.

> Participant: You are pretty trapped. As I think back, I think many of those days were from 7:30 [a.m.] to 6 or 6:30 [p.m.].
>
> Tammy: Well, tell me how your life is different now that you no longer work in a boarding school.
>
> Participant: I have a lot more time to myself, which is good. A lot more time to myself. And come Thursday night at 5:30, I have complete freedom – until [name of husband] takes me to church that weekend (laughter). So I truly have my own time from Thursday evening to Friday evening – and then many Sabbaths we travel, but again that is by choice... And then every Sunday is all my own, other than this Sunday when I go to a graduation – but again that is my choice. So again I have a lot more freedom.

Note the repetition of the word "choice" in the passage above. Over and over again this former faculty member emphasizes that she now has "choice" in how she spends her time. In many ways, then, "*Working 24/7*" limits faculty/staff's control over their time and dictates the rhythm of their lives. So while students' movements and activities may be formally regulated in a parochial boarding school, faculty and staff also experience this quality of a total institution in the all-consuming and all-encompassing time constraints necessitated by the structure of boarding schools – constraints which often prove to impact families, other personal relationships, and even health. Thus, the theme *Working 24/7* illustrates how the constraining elements of a total institution might be enacted in a contemporary organization.

I will next turn my attention to the entrance of the panopticon into this picture of a total institution, including suggestions of how the inherent disciplinary power of the panopticon (see Foucault, 1977) is enacted in a boarding school. As mentioned previously, Foucault argued that other organizations besides prisons "discipline" members into conformity, and he includes schools in this list. His use of the term 'discipline' in this more modern context refers to the manner in which societal power structures address deviant behavior and attempt to bring that behavior back into the norm. The following emergent theme, entitled *Living in the Fishbowl*, suggests that the disciplinary power Foucault intimated resides in educational institutions can readily be seen in the "fishbowl" atmosphere of these boarding school campuses. Even more central to this study and the unfolding picture of disciplinary power that follows, is the coupling of spirituality to what organizations and their members attempt to discipline or control. Foucault's idea was that the panopticon allows organizations or institutions to exert control over their members in that those who feel they are under observation (whether they are or not) are less likely to "break the rules." Thus, in highlighting the enactment of the panopticon in a parochial boarding school, the following section will begin to establish the implications of a total institution on the "regulation" aspect of spiritual labor.

Living in a Fishbowl

The previous section outlined the 24/7 nature of boarding school work. It gave a sense of the all-encompassing nature of the schedule, duties, and responsibilities that fall to teachers and staff in a boarding school. In this sense, working in a boarding school is an all-encompassing task that transcends what might be considered the norm for similar

educational entities. In addition to *Working 24/7*, a second unmistakable theme arising

from the qualitative interviews also illustrates how the panopticon might be enacted in a

total institution – the idea of being watched or of being on display 24/7. These

participants described this experience as being analogous to "*Living in a Fishbowl*." The

theme reflects the idea that faculty/staff members spend so much time interacting with

students (and other staff) in their job-related duties that they are eminently visible. It

should also be noted that the vast majority of faculty members are required to live in

faculty housing on campus. Thus, whether faculty members are "on-duty" or "off-duty"

they are more easily subject to the scrutiny of both students and fellow staff – they are

seemingly always visible.

This section will further explore the nature and implications of *Living in a*

Fishbowl in light of the disciplinary power the panopticon represents. More specifically,

the following discussion will address how this "fishbowl" enables both students and other

staff to closely monitor and watch behavior and practices of organizational members

whether they are "on-duty" or "off-duty." Just as avoiding the visibility of the

panopticon proves nearly impossible, the difficulties in "escaping" the fishbowl will also

be noted by participants. Given my emphasis in this study to explore the spiritual labor

of faculty/staff in the total institution atmosphere of a parochial boarding school, I will

also elaborate on the implications for the "regulation" component of spiritual labor within

the confines of life in the "Fishbowl" – regulation that echoes the concertive control the

panopticon evokes.

Watching the Inhabitants of the Fishbowl. These participants talked at length

about the primary element of living in a fishbowl that made them uncomfortable – that of

being visible. These comments begin to reflect how the panopticon and the "fishbowl"

mirror each other. One former faculty member gave a specific and vivid example of his

fishbowl experience:

> Tammy: You said you got tired of living in the fishbowl. Would you explain what you mean when you say "fishbowl."
>
> Participant: Um… when I was living out there at [name of school] on the corner there by the cafeteria, everybody would drive by the house and look in to see what we were having for breakfast. (laughter)
>
> Tammy: Seriously?!
>
> Participant: Yes! (laughter) They'd wave to us! We'd be sitting there at the dining room table, and they would just wave to us as they were driving by or walking by… whatever, you know. And, uh, you could be sitting out on your back porch, you know, trying to have a nice evening, and five or six different families would come up and just sit down… (laughter)

Living in an environment where even one's breakfast menu might be public knowledge is

an example of the nature of life in the fishbowl and is illustrative of how one might be

under observation at any time; however, it is not the only example participants gave. A

husband and wife team gave further illustration regarding the literal visibility the close

proximity with the students brings:

> Tammy: Tell me what you think makes for a good boarding school teacher?
>
> 1st Participant: You've got to love the kids. It can't be a job; it has to be a lifestyle that you embrace. You have to enjoy the kids. You have to not mind that they are going to walk by and look in your window.
>
> 2nd Participant: And wave to you. (laughter)
>
> Tammy: In your house?
>
> 1st Participant: Yes.
>
> 2nd Participant: Oh yes. That happens all the time. They walk by, and then they will knock on the door and say, "How are you doing?" and come in and sit down. And you have to not mind that. You have to want to be a part of their lives.

This exemplar is notable in a number of ways. First it re-emphasizes the totalizing nature

of the organization as part of a "lifestyle" and not just a job. Second it further illustrates

how accessible and visible faculty members can be to the students on campus. Finally, it

also illustrates how this visibility is normalized ("you have to not mind"). Those who work on a boarding school campus can expect to be visible and interact with students as part of their organizational experience.

Besides being eminently visible to students, a number of participants also mentioned incidences of what might conceivably be referred to in other contexts as a "Neighborhood Watch" program – the comings and goings at one's house might be noted by the entirety of the campus community as well. The following exchange with a former faculty member was echoed in substance by a number of others with startling similarity:

> Tammy: What else surprised you about boarding school life?
>
> Participant: Ummmm….How much of you is watched.
>
> Tammy: (laughs)
>
> Participant: 24-7 (laughs) a day.
>
> Tammy: You need to talk more about that, I mean as far as…
>
> Participant: Like questions like, "Hey, I saw your light on at 10 o'clock last night."
>
> Tammy: From students or staff or…
>
> Participant: Both…. Or, "I noticed you had people over." That I got several times. I actually get that when I go back to visit, right? People will come up to me, "Oh, I noticed you were visiting. What are you doing here?"

That other staff members would note the time, the number of visitors and the identity of visitors to others' homes reflects how visible one's comings and goings are in such a close community. As Foucault (1977) noted, the power inherent in the panopticon resides in the realization that one can be seen at any time. Simply the fact that these faculty/staff know their comings and goings have been monitored, or might be monitored, by other "watchers" makes them acutely aware that their behaviors may be observed at any time whether or not they are aware of that observation.

This sense of being watched emerged repeatedly in the interviews as participants talked about the nature of working on a boarding school campus. Said one faculty member, "On a boarding campus you feel like you are under a microscope. You feel like a lot of people are watching you, and they are, you know. You're in a glass house." The similar ideas of being in a fishbowl, living under a microscope, or existing in a glass house were all vivid analogies of the close quarters that a boarding school campus requires, and all reflect the visibility afforded by the panopticon. The fact that a number of former faculty and staff members mentioned this type of fishbowl effect as something that they least missed when they left the boarding school environment further highlights how salient this quality of their life proved to be when working on a boarding school campus. A number of former faculty/staff voiced similar sentiments to that of the staff member below:

> Tammy: How is your life different now that you no longer work in a boarding school?
>
> Participant: I'll tell you how life is different. When we left [name of school], I told [my wife], "I no longer wanted to ever live on a boarding school campus again."
>
> Tammy: Really.
>
> Participant: I said, "If I work there, I will not live there." I got tired of the glass house syndrome. People at [name of school] would say, "Oh. We noticed you came in at 11:30 last night. Where were you?" I got tired of that – always being watched and feeling like I was being watched.

The idea of being watched is clearly uncomfortable to this participant ("I no longer wanted to ever live on a boarding school campus again"), but this discomfort does not reside solely in the reality of "being watched." According to this faculty, it also stems from "feeling like I was being watched." As both Bentham (1787/1995) and Foucault (1977) point out, the efficacy of the panopticon lies not so much in whether or not 'inmates' are actually under observation, but the fact that they *think* they are. Being

watched, or feeling like one is being watched, creates an atmosphere where one's

behaviors and practices are potentially always on display. By implication in the realm of

spiritual labor, faculty/staff members' own spiritual/religious choices are visible to both

students and fellow staff members in a much more encompassing manner than might be

the case if organizational members could more easily distance themselves from their

place of employment.

Regarding spiritual labor on a boarding school campus, the spiritual/religious

choices and behaviors of faculty/staff become part of what is made visible in the confines

of the panopticon and are thus subject to the disciplinary power referred to by Foucault

(1977). One former boarding school staff member articulates her experiences in this

regard when she left the "fishbowl" lifestyle:

> Tammy: Describe how your spiritual or religious life is different now that
> you no longer work in an academy.
>
> Participant: Well… we're not in a fishbowl. Not everybody is looking at me.
> I can do whatever I want and go out to eat on Sabbath if I want … I can wear
> my wedding band. I can… Like I said, just do whatever I want. And, um, I
> guess it's nice not having everyone look at you. Everyone… I mean the
> students, the staff members, the parents. People still look at us, you know, but
> not…I can come out of my driveway and know that there's no staff member
> going, "Where's she going?" (laughs) You know. It's nice. I guess what's
> different is that I just have this frame of mind that I can do whatever I want.
> Just do it. (laughs).

The frame of mind that "I can do whatever I want" is not one that is generally held, or

was generally expressed by participants who *currently* live and work on the boarding

school campus. To a great degree, living in the fishbowl with the attendant implications

that one's own spiritual and religious practices are visible to others, carries with it great

implications for the regulation of faculty/staff members' spiritual practices. Foucault saw

the panopticon as a means of exercising disciplinary power and control. In *Discipline &*

Punish (1977), Foucault argued that the panopticon could be used to "alter behavior, to

train or correct individuals" (p. 203). Because of the visibility afforded by life in the
fishbowl to which these participants constantly allude, staff members are not likely to be
able to embrace without notice one set of spiritual practices while "on duty" and another
different set while "off duty." Thus, any deviance from accepted norms, rules, or
practices carries with it the great likelihood of coming to the attention of colleagues,
administration, staff, and/or students.

In much greater length later in this document I will discuss this implication for the
"regulation" component of spiritual labor – particularly the element of concertive control
enabled by the panopticon of the boarding school life. For now, however, the following
exemplars will illustrate the discomfort coupled with the concertive control that attends
living in the fishbowl where one's behavior is always visible and where that behavior
might be perceived as violating expected spiritual norms and practices. Many of the
following examples will illustrate how the simple awareness of being visible serves as a
constant pressure to shape behavior and how living in the panopticon, or fishbowl, serves
to alter or modify that behavior. Before perusing the first exemplar below, however, it
might be helpful to note that the generally accepted practice of Seventh-day Adventists is
to honor the Sabbath (Saturday) in the Jewish tradition, from sundown on Friday to
sundown on Saturday. Most Adventists do not conduct business during the Sabbath
hours (i.e., shopping for groceries). The following participant tells of an incident where
he appeared to violate this norm. He speaks of how easy it is on a boarding school
campus for other people to see when one has "messed up" or to think one has messed up
by what they might observe. In light of Foucault's notion that the panopticon is one of
the primary means by which disciplinary power is enacted, and the enactment of

concertive control as this disciplinary power's driving force, note how the following

participant expresses a type of conforming pressure that emanates from the possibility of

appearing to make the wrong impression regarding his own Sabbath-keeping practices:

> Participant: But when I mess up or something, you know…like come home late on a Friday night from shopping (laughs) even though I just took my wife out to dinner and it [doing the shopping] is a half hour back, and now the sun's down while we drove home, uh, even though I don't feel badly personally about doing that, I come driving on campus after dark, you know, and carry a couple of sacks of groceries in, I feel guilty.
>
> Tammy: Why is that?
>
> Participant: Well, because I've been shopping on Sabbath, you know.
>
> Tammy: But, you haven't been!
>
> Participant: Well, I know that, but it looks that way, see? It's a perception issue. (laughs)
>
> Tammy: A perception by the students? the staff?
>
> Participant: Both. (laughs) Mostly staff. I'll be honest. (laughs) We live in a fishbowl. It's one of the reasons my wife liked living on the house on the far side of campus.
>
> Tammy: Less fish around the bowl?
>
> Participant: That's right. Only one side's got glass on it. (laughs)
>
> Tammy: Oh, that's pretty funny.
>
> Participant: My wife didn't think so. (laughs) It can be extremely unpleasant when… Like I said, it's a perception issue. It's not like we're actually doing anything wrong. It's just that you realize, "Oooh. This could look bad." You know?

This exemplar reflects the implications of being highly visible within the confines of a

total institution. The panopticon exacerbates the spiritual labor required of organizational

members in this context. Not only are faculty and staff more visible to others, but those

'others' – whether faculty, administrations, church officials, students, or other

constituents such as parents – may be more likely and have more opportunity to make

value judgments about the behavior, actions, or choices of those operating within the

fishbowl (i.e., "This could look bad"). The visibility of staff/faculty members makes

them acutely aware of their behavior and how it might be perceived – particularly in the spiritual realm. Thus, they tend to self-monitor more than they otherwise might, a result exhibited in more detail with Chapter Five's discussion of concertive control in the regulation of spiritual labor.

      Living in the Fishbowl: Attempts at Escape. In this study an institution whose mission is not incarceration or mental intervention (i.e., an insane asylums or prison), but an organization which embraces an *educational* mission and a *spiritual* focus, proves to exhibit strong characteristics of a total institution. Enacted within this contemporary total institution is a type of panopticonism that makes visibility one of the key elements of compliance and from which escaping notice is notably difficult. Foucault's statement regarding the panopticon that "visibility is a trap" (p. 200) is even more relevant not only in the sense of the total institution as all-encompassing in a more or less inescapable manner, but in the sense that the panopticon is effective as a form of disciplinary power precisely *because* one can never "hide." This element of the panopticon (its inescapability) is illustrated in these participants' tales of how they made many novel and sometimes futile efforts to "escape" from the fishbowl. The following section will showcase these efforts and their relative futility in order to further illustrate the all-encompassing nature of living and working on a boarding school campus under the microscope of the panopticon.

      The use of the word "escape" on my part is not arbitrary – it is a term used by the participants themselves as illustrated in the following exemplar.

      Tammy: How about the other side of the coin? What did you like the least
      [about working in boarding schools]?
      Participant: Living in a goldfish bowl. (laughter) Yep.
      Tammy: Why do you call it the "goldfish bowl"?

> Participant: Because we were expected to live across the street from campus in the school facilities, and so you were at the beck and call [of students]. You know, everybody sees you when you're working and not working. Everybody knows everything about your life, you know. So we found an escape method. We bought some land four hours away, almost in [name of neighboring state], and escaped there whenever we could.

Such a use of the term "escape" is interesting given that the term 'total institution' most commonly refer to prisons, asylums, or other organizations whose membership is more or less involuntarily. In the example above, this former boarding school teacher tells of actually fleeing the physical location of the boarding school. It might be instructive to note that she and her husband would willingly drive at least four hours from the school into the next state to make their "escape." Such an example is indicative of the attempts to flee the often uncomfortable nature of living in the fishbowl where people see you "when you're working and not working" and where "everybody knows everything about your life." Escaping the visibility afforded by the panopticon requires faculty/staff to remove themselves very far away from campus. As the theme *Working 24/7* illustrated, the overwhelming time commitments and responsibilities attendant on the boarding school teacher makes "escaping" from this total institution remarkably difficult. In the case of what might be thought of as more traditional total institutions, escape might be thwarted by locks, bars, guards, barbed wire, etc. In this study, the participants grappled with none of these restraints, yet the visibility afforded by life in the fishbowl and the seemingly 24/7 time commitments made escape remarkably difficult to achieve, nonetheless. In the more contemporary total institution, therefore, the visibility afforded by the panopticon and the pressure of all-encompassing responsibilities may just as surely serve the same purpose as the locks and bars of old.

While other participants may not have chosen or been able to flee to another state, they often attempted escape by methods as simple as spending their Sabbath attending another church off campus. Ironically, even these attempts often proved less than sufficient, as the following example illustrates.

> Like even on Sabbath, you know, a lot of times they [the faculty] go to [name of off-campus church]. I've been to [name of off-campus church] and seen the boys' dean there. I mean, it's like, "What are you doing here?" [He replies], "Oh, we, [whispers] we've got to get away."

This seemingly simple example belies a much more complex notion of the need to escape and the difficulty of doing so. In the first place, both the boys' dean and this participant are escaping to another church off campus in order to "get away." Ironically, however, they find each other there. Not only do they run into other faculty, but those faculty inquire about their actions "What are you doing here?" Such questions echo those previously shared by participants regarding others' inquiries of their whereabouts (i.e., "Where were you?" etc.). Once again, such examples illustrate how all-encompassing the fishbowl proves to be, how wide-ranging is the scope of the panopticon, and how organizational members make attempts to escape the discomfort of living under the eye of that panopticon.

While these participants report trying to escape the visibility that living in a "fishbowl" entails, given the 24/7 nature of faculty and staff responsibilities, sometimes actually leaving campus is not an option. In such cases, faculty/staff may not be able to physically escape the fishbowl, but they might attempt to "hide." The following faculty member reveals the "tricks" he would use to escape the visibility inherent in living and working on a boarding school campus:

> Participant: It's a 24/7 job. And when you're off, you learn how to hide.
> Tammy: Now, talk to me about that. What do you mean?

Participant: Well, I used to live in the very end house… And we learned tricks on how to close the curtains. We couldn't park our cars any other place, but you just shut everything down. You don't answer the phone. You just try to isolate. If I were to design a boarding school, staff would have their own entrance, and the community wouldn't be anywhere near it.

Tammy: Tell me why.

Participant: Because when they [community members] drive right down through here on Sabbath and go into the church, they look right across the street. They see everything you're doing. Everything you're doing. And that's the part that bugs me.

Tammy: The, uh, being on display for the community?

Participant: Yeah. Because all the windows [of my house] look out right towards [campus] …. I can't even walk all the way around the community and get to my house, because they'd see me.

This faculty member expresses a longing to have his own space, to be able to do something as simple as walk home without being visible to members of the general community who are able to "see everything you're doing." Being tied to the campus by the 24/7 nature of the job makes physically escaping the fishbowl a sometimes difficult process. "Closing the curtains" and not answering the phone are one way to try to be less visible in this type of panopticon atmosphere. As this section illustrates, the nature of the panopticon highlighted in the theme *Living in the Fishbowl* proves difficult to escape.

Ignoring the Fishbowl. This theme illuminates the experiences of some participants who ignored the visibility afforded by "the fishbowl" of their boarding school lives; they neither attempted to escape nor hide from the panopticon and commented on life in a fishbowl and the supposed hardships of living in a total institution in a very different light. Though not a single participant disputed that working in a boarding school makes one more visible, not everybody expressed a concern with those realities.

The fact that the participants did not unanimously report a measure of discomfort with their fishbowl-like existence would not in and of itself be particularly notable apart from the reasons these faculty give for why they assume *others* would find the fishbowl a sometimes uncomfortable place to be. These reasons include the feeling that one need not be concerned about living in a fishbowl if one's actions and behavior were beyond reproach to begin with. In other words, weaving its way through many of the qualitative interviews is the unspoken assumption that the only reason one would not want to be watched would be the possibility of being seen doing something that ought not to be done in the first place. The following former faculty member elaborates:

> Participant: You know, the fishbowl threat never bothered me that much because I am what I am, and if people didn't like it, I wasn't changing…. it never was a problem particularly.

> Tammy: That was a fascinating term you just used. You said, "fishbowl threat." What did you mean by that?

> Participant: Because I heard so many references to living in a fishbowl, and I think we lived as much in a fishbowl at [name of school] as anybody. The only thing, on Sabbath dinners, we would require that [husband's name] would sit with his back to the windows. (laughter)

> Tammy: See no evil? (laughter)

> Participant: See no evil because he would get agitated when he would see things happening [on campus] that shouldn't be. So that was our only thing. But, uh, the fishbowl threat I would say is when people would tell me, "Oh everybody watches what you do, and you have to be careful of this and that." Well, I didn't feel like I lived any differently than I do now in my neighborhood. You need to be who you are.

> Tammy: And so it sounds like some people were threatened by the fishbowl because of the…the danger of getting caught in doing something that would not be approved of?

> Participant: That's what I always assumed, you know. And I felt… well, I should not beat my kids, period, whether anybody is watching or not. (laughter) You know, I shouldn't get drunk on Saturday night regardless. So, it just, uh…. At first I was wary of that [the fishbowl threat] but it didn't ever turn into….I can't remember a time when it was a problem.

Note that this participant does not dispute the visibility aspect of living on a boarding

school campus – both being seen and being able to see – but she heartily disputes the

problematic nature of such visibility because she essentially feels as if she has nothing to

hide. In other words, she expresses the idea that those with a genuine Christian lifestyle

may need to *manage* life in the fishbowl (i.e., turning one's back to the window), but

need not find the lifestyle to be otherwise uncomfortable if there were no discrepancy

between how one "should" act and how one does act.

This idea that one might be tempted to act differently or feel compelled to do so

because of being visible in the fishbowl was disputed by a few others as well. In fact,

one participant seemed nearly appalled at any suggestion that one would need to escape

the fishbowl to have the freedom to act "like oneself."

> Tammy: Describe a time when you behaved differently than you normally
> would have because you work in a boarding academy.
>
> Participant: Whoa… I don't have a hidden life.
>
> Tammy: Well, let's talk about that. What do you mean by that – "a hidden
> life?"
>
> Participant: Well, I think sometimes that you can live in an environment, but
> it's really not who you are. So when you get away from that environment,
> you can live a different life or a different lifestyle…Um… I don't have that.
> What I show the kids is what I truly am. So as far as… if the school wasn't in
> session, I would still be the same.

This participant is inferring that whether or not she lived under the scrutiny afforded by

the panopticon of a boarding school campus or whether she were less visible elsewhere

would make no difference in her life and practices. She brooks no hint of any type of

double standard in her life ("What I show the kids is what I truly am"). The spotlight

afforded on a boarding school campus does not lead either of these participants to change

their behavior; they feel they have nothing to hide These exemplars above illustrate the

position of some participants in this study that true compliance with spiritual expectations would render moot any discomfort with the visibility the panopticon afforded.

These negative cases also speak to the idea of "acting" – of having a "hidden life" – and bring to mind Hochschild's (1983) contention that emotional labor often requires deep and surface acting that may lead to dissonance. In that I am exploring the concept of spiritual labor as a corollary to emotional labor, this concept of "acting" or "being oneself" when "on-stage" becomes significant. The experiences of the participants who did not cringe from the visibility of the panopticon indicate a suturing of their front stage and back stage lives. In fact, they would undoubtedly argue that they do no acting at all. The absence of the need to "act" would suggest diminished chances of dissonance for these organizational members. Yet for others in this study who perform the "acting" that Hochschild references, the all-encompassing nature of boarding school work with regards to time, visibility, and accessibility means that one is always "on-stage" in the fishbowl of the boarding school. Always being on stage would prove particularly problematic if one did not internally agree with the spiritual expectations that are commodified, codified, and regulated by the organization (see Chapter Five); for example, divergence from those expectations would be more readily visible and readily "regulated" when performed in the glare of the panopticon. The pressure of performing on this stage would surely prove to shape organizational members' behavior. Later in this study, I will illustrate how acting out principals that one does not fully embrace indeed proves to set the stage for spiritual dissonance (see Chapter Six).

The Positive Aspects of the Boarding School as a Total Institution

Unquestionably, the vast majority of total institution research in the past has painted such organizations as negative, destructive, or undesirable places. Additionally, with regard to the panopticon, it cannot be ignored that Bentham's (1787/1987) original design was directly tied to the effort of making a more efficient prison. Foucault's (1977) development of what he called "panopticonism" was also situated around the idea of prisons – the prototypical total institution. In a more contemporary vein, aside from Tracey's (2004) work with correctional officers, most scholarship has focused on the "inmates" in total institutions such as prisons. Certainly in a boarding school, the equivalent of "inmates" would be the students who place themselves (or whose parents place them) under the strictures of a boarding school environment. However, my study focuses on the teachers and staff who are employed within the total institution environment, and it focuses on an institution concerned with education and spirituality – a mission which would (for most) be seen as a far cry from literal asylums and prisons. Nevertheless, coupling the spiritual labor of teachers/staff to a total institution seems to associate boarding schools with prisons – directly or indirectly. It would be safe to say that such an association might seem to preclude a discussion of the redeeming and rewarding elements of a total institution. However, it became clear throughout the qualitative interviews that the very total institution elements of a boarding school which might seem to constrain the organizational members of this study also enable them to reap the rewards that the total institution environment also engenders. As Foucault (e.g., 1980, 1984) constantly argued, power both constrains *and* enables. The same might be

said of the total institution in this study as well. It is the surprising 'enabling' qualities of the boarding school that I next turn my attention.

Given the long delineation in the sections above of what makes the boarding school more all-encompassing than other educational institutions with regards to the 24/7 nature and the intense visibility of the panopticon, one question begs to be answered – Why? Why would seemingly sane, intelligent, competent, articulate, and talented people voluntarily place themselves in the constraints of the "fishbowl" for a life that is immersed nearly 24/7 with the activities and responsibilities attendant to the boarding school world? Why might these people accept the spiritual labor expected of them? Why might they be willing to wrestle with the dissonance that may attend the commodification, codification, and regulation of their own spirituality? Why would someone voluntarily choose to work in a total institution under the glare of the panopticon? As one staff member reiterated (with tongue barely in cheek):

> Who in their right mind goes to a place like this? … It's not something that the guy off the street is going to come in and say [said in a sarcastic tone], "Oh sure! I'll work for this kind of money for, you know, 16, 18, 20 hour days. No problem!"

The answer to this question emerges incontrovertibly from the data – the opportunity to interact and build deep, enduring relationships with students. Not a single participant failed to mention this reward in some way; not a single one failed to comment on the joy, or fun, or utterly satisfying opportunity to work with the young people in their charge.

Ironically these rewards stem directly from the very total-institution-like qualities that characterized the negative aspects discussed above. The panopticon inherent in the total institution nature of the boarding school serves to both constrain and enable these participants. As one participant articulated:

Isn't that always the way, though, that the things you love and the things you dislike are sometimes the same – the time with the kids and the influence on their lives but the time with the kids and the influence on their lives – it's the same thing.

The constraining elements of life in a total institution have been delineated above. Here I offer the enabling elements of the total institution by introducing the strong emergent theme in this regard – *We Are Family*.

Because the amount of time spent on a boarding school campus in close proximity with students (and staff alike) can be both onerous and confining, as well as intensely rewarding. I will next discuss this rewarding aspect of building "family" relationships; I will illustrate how the participants of this study communicated and framed the rewards and benefits of operating within a total institution. Because the depths of these rewards and the opportunity to reap them are directly tied to the total-institution-like qualities that make up a boarding school – being available 24/7 and living in such close proximity to the students in the fishbowl (i.e., the panopticon) – I will offer a summary of my participants' reasons for enduring the constricting pressure that sometimes attends spiritual labor in a parochial boarding school and how elements of the total institution directly enable the rich and compensating rewards of living and working in such an environment. As will be seen later in Chapter Six's treatment of spiritual dissonance, this theme of "family" will surface again.

We Are Family

Of course, teachers in other types of educational institutions interact with students. These faculty/staff are also presented with the opportunities to build relationships, to relate with students, to perhaps make a difference in their lives. This opportunity is not unique to parochial boarding schools. However, given the all-

encompassing nature of boarding schools as total institutions, these opportunities present themselves at every turn, with a depth and uniqueness that seem to set apart the nature of the relationships that might be built between boarding school students and the faculty/staff. A number of participants who had experience teaching in both day schools and boarding schools noted this difference.

> Well, you know last year in [K-12 day school] I didn't really feel close to my high school students. I felt closer to my elementary kids because they just naturally open up to you. But the high school kids, you know, I didn't have a whole lot of interaction with them. But here I am on supervision once a month and for weekends and then once every two weeks on the weeknights. And I get to see all the kids. Half the graduates last year at [K-12 day school] – I mean they knew who I was – but they didn't know anything about me. But here I feel like I know all the kids because I can sit down and talk to them anytime because they are here. So I really like that. I really liked being able to hang out with the kids. [pause] When I want to, of course. (chuckles)

The major differences noted between this participant's former job and her current job are both the time spent with students and their proximity and availability ("I can sit down and talk to them anytime because they are here"). She says that she gets "to see all the kids," and by implication, they get to see her as well. While this teacher notes at the end of her comments the aside that on a boarding school campus one may be more available and spend more time with students than one might otherwise choose, she is careful to also mention that these characteristics of working at a boarding school set it apart from the norm, enabling faculty members to form closer relationships with students. In this sense the total institution qualities of the boarding school both constrain *and* enable her. They constrain her ability to manage her own time, but the total institutions of a boarding school also enable the interaction that leads to deep and lasting relationships with students.

It is the nature of the 24/7 interaction with students on a campus that more specifically enables the rewarding aspects of total institution life in this context. More particularly, these total institution qualities made possible the creation of special bonds with students that transcend the norm. That these relationships were familial in nature is evidenced by the constant references to family and parenting that pepper participants' explanations regarding the quality of their interaction with their students: "You love these kids. They're like your own kids"; "You build almost a family friendship with a lot of the kids"; "Here you are their parents. I mean, so many kids will call me, like, their mom"; "At a boarding school you get to do some of the parenting…you have a chance to play the parental role in a situation where they are removed away from their parents"; "You almost become like a parent or whatever"; "You are a surrogate parent"; "I want to be their father image here"; "It really was a family in a large sense." The examples could go on and on. Comparing the relationships formed on a boarding school campus with that of a family is illustrative of the depth that exceeds what might be the norm in other types of educational settings. That this possibility of creating strong, almost familial relationships is a product of the total institution qualities of the boarding school is more carefully defined by a former teacher.

> Tammy: Well, tell me what you liked best about your years in a boarding school?
>
> Participant: I liked the fact that I felt like I was really making a difference in the students' lives because I also got to know them at little bit more, a little bit better, and I got to spend more time with them and could have more of a little bit of an influence. And so I got close to a lot of students, and I really felt like I was making a difference in their lives…. For one thing, you are a surrogate parent, and it is surprising how much more revealing they do at odd moments, you know, like rec period, or when you are walking through their study time in the dorm at night. Or on Sundays when they have nothing to entertain them, you get to do things with them. Even Saturday nights, Sabbath afternoon, Saturday nights, Friday night vespers, you know, then afterwards

there is a program… and they just reveal more things to you in those odd moments.

Being a "surrogate parent" and establishing strong relationships with students is here coupled with the many opportunities boarding school faculty/staff have to interact with students – the interactions afforded by the visibility and all-encompassing nature of their work. The opportunities to influence students on more than just an academic level is one of the attractive elements of the boarding school life. When faculty and staff are with students throughout their day, on tours, at evening programs, at afternoon recreation periods, the opportunity exponentially increases to relate with them on a level that exceeds the classroom interaction. The visibility and close proximity to students leads to more chances for interaction. In order to interact, faculty and staff must spend time with students.

That relationships formed by these interactions are rich and deep is clear. That they develop more quickly and are longer-lasting than the norm also prove to be the primary means of satisfaction for boarding school faculty/staff. These relationships result from the time spent with students in close proximity, as attested by the following exemplar:

> Tammy: Tell me what you like best about working in a boarding school.
>
> Participant: I would say the number one thing is you get to know the kids fast and close because you're with them 24/7. I mean you really do. All the other places [I've worked], probably my second year of teaching I would start to, you know, learn about them and get to know them. But here, three months, I mean, you were tight with them. Because I had friends by Christmas time calling me from the West coast….I'm a West coast guy. I've never lived in the Midwest. And they go…
>
> Tammy: (laughs) "What are you doing there?"
>
> Participant: Yeah! And it's boarding academy on top of that?!
>
> Tammy: Uh, huh. Uh, huh. What do you tell them?

> Participant: I tell them I love it. Again, you get to know the kids a lot faster. Um, you become really close to them. And it's a 24/7 job.

That students and staff live in close proximity (i.e., "you were tight with them") and that

teachers are with students "24/7" are both prominently noted in this exemplar. These

qualities facilitate quick and deep relationships – a point also highlighted by this

participant who notes that "you get to know the kids fast and close."

Even those who expressed open disagreement with SDA church beliefs or the

spiritual expectations inherent in aspects of their spiritual labor on such campuses were

unabashed in sharing their delight at having had a chance to work with students so

closely within the total institution-like strictures of the boarding school. One example

from a participant who diverged widely from SDA doctrines and beliefs, represents the

rewards even the disaffected report from their work with students:

> Tammy: Well, what else would you like to add or contribute here?
>
> Participant: Uhm… you know, my two years at [name of boarding school] I look back on with great delight – again, because of the caliber of students that I worked with. Their sincerity, their desire for better things, their willingness to work towards them, their generosity with other people's failings – including our own. I mean, there were the rebels and the angry ones and all of those, but even them, um, you know, there were beautiful things about them. And I think living in a family environment is so much more conducive to allowing change to happen than a day situation.

Even this participant who spoke at length of her struggles with dissonance, the nature of

her spiritual labor, and general disaffection with many of her experiences on a boarding

school campus did not fail to mention the strong relationships that presented themselves

as a result of the total institution qualities of boarding schools. That many boarding

school teachers love their work both in spite of and because of the total institution-like

qualities inherent in a boarding school reflects the rewards they reap from boarding

school work – that of working with students on a much deeper level than other types of

educational institutions.   This enthusiasm is captured in the following exchange:

> Tammy: Tell me what you like best about working in a boarding school.
>
> Participant: I love the interaction and the closeness…. There is a connection on a boarding school campus, you know, long past when school is over. You know, they come to your house, you see them on weekends…. In boarding school, you have them 24/7. You do have a tighter knit.
>
> Tammy: And you like that?
>
> Participant: I love it! I love it. I love teaching. I love teaching!

This love for teaching and the satisfaction that building meaningful, lasting, and deep

relationships with one's students outside of the classroom, comprise the "love" for

boarding school work that these teachers exude, *despite* of and *because* of *Working 24/7*

and *Living in a Fishbowl*. Ironically, the sometimes suffocating, frustrating, and onerous

qualities that coalesce to mark boarding academies as total institutions are the same

qualities that enable the strong, family-like relationships that set boarding schools apart.

Not even the disaffected and the disillusioned failed to note this tangentially in their

conversations with me. That total institutions can *both* constrain *and* enable is clearly

illustrated in these participants' experience.

<div align="center">*Summary*</div>

This chapter has explored the realm of the total institution not as it pertains to a

prison or asylum but to a parochial boarding school. The two primary emergent themes

in this chapter, *Working 24/7* and *Living in a Fishbowl,* illustrate how an educational

organization can embody the qualities of a total institution not only in the involuntary

incarceration of the literal body, but also within the realm of time commitments and

multitudinous responsibilities that encompass the lives of organizational members. As

will be suggested in later chapters that deal with spiritual labor itself, this all-encompassing quality can extend into the spiritual realm as well.

In addition, this analysis revealed how the panopticon as envisioned by both Foucault and Bentham might be enacted in a contemporary organization. Both the literal visibility of living and working "24/7" on a boarding school campus, as well as the knowledge that one's actions and behaviors may be observed at any turn, serve as a means of disciplinary power and lead to the possibility of concertive control. In these ways, the qualities of a total institution serve to constrain organizational members.

However, this study also suggests that while qualities of a total institution might indeed constrain its members, these same qualities also enable the rewarding and fulfilling aspects of working in a boarding school. In this sense the toll on family, health, and personal relationships – the difficulty of "escaping" and finding time for oneself outside the glare of others – is counterbalanced by the strong, often familial, relationships nurtured 24/7 in the "fishbowl" of a boarding school. These deep relationships are enabled in large measure thanks to the all-encompassing nature and high visibility of boarding school life.

While the formal analysis and treatment of boarding schools as total institutions ends here, the discussion detailed this chapter will continue to shape and influence the remaining aspects of this study. Both the analysis of spiritual labor (in Chapter Five) and spiritual dissonance (in Chapter Six) will be influenced by the aspects of the total institution highlighted in this chapter's themes of *Working 24/7*, *Living in the Fishbowl*, and *We Are Family*.

Chapter Five: Elements of Spiritual Labor – Commodification, Codification, and
Regulation of Spirituality

I have characterized spiritual labor as the organizational commodification,

codification, and regulation of members' spirituality. To this end, the first research

question posed in this study asked, "What is the nature of the spiritual labor in parochial

boarding schools?" To address this question I examined the spiritual labor of the

teachers/staff in Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) boarding schools more particularly. In

this chapter I will address this research question by outlining how teachers/staff's

spirituality in the SDA educational system (including its boarding schools) is

commodified, codified, and regulated. Each of these components of spiritual labor will

be addressed in turn, beginning with the issue of commodification.

The Commodification of Spirituality

My intent in this study was not to broadly study the marketing strategy of SDA

education but to examine more specifically how the spirituality of teachers and staff in

this educational system are part of the commodity that these schools market. What will

become evident in the examination of individual boarding schools' marketing strategies

is the almost seamless and taken-for-granted nature of the role that staff members'

spirituality plays in the unique commodity that these parochial schools offer. To

understand how teachers' and staff members' own spirituality becomes commodified as

part of spiritual labor, however, it becomes important to first look more broadly at the

commodity that SDA parochial schools market.

Commodifying Educator's Spirituality: The Church's Overall Approach

The SDA's North American Department of Education's website contains an entire section devoted to marketing Adventist education. The site includes documents ranging from PowerPoint presentations to focus group raw data from a recently commissioned study on why church members do or do not send their children to SDA schools. Also included on this site are brochures, posters, church bulletin inserts, as well as sample TV spots, sermons, and logos. Amidst these marketing strategy documents it is important to establish how the spirituality of teachers and staff is part of the commodity offered by an SDA education.

This tie between the spiritual labor of organizational members and the service (or commodity) offered by SDA schools emerges repeatedly in the marketing documents and materials provided on the North American Division's website entitled "Marketing Tools" ("Journey to Excellence: Marketing Tools," 2006). For example, the site provides access to several articles in *The Journal of Adventist Education* with titles such as "Why have Adventist education?" (Knight, 2005) or "Is Adventist education worth it?" (Dulan, 2004). In both of these articles, the authors lay out a series of answers addressing the questions posed by their article titles. In both articles, the role of teachers as a unique part of this educational system holds a prominent place in that list: "One of the most important [reasons for upholding Adventist education] is *the influence of godly teachers…*" (emphasis in the original; Knight, 2005, p. 9).

Yet, the journal articles are not the only places that the spiritual strength of teachers is highlighted as one of the critical distinctions and linchpins of Adventist education. In one of the sample sermons supplied on this website, the question is posed,

"Why spend money on Adventist education?" The answer? "For Adventist teachers"

(Bock, 2006). In a PowerPoint presentation regarding the marketing of Christian

education, slides include the message, "Get the *right* people in the *right* place. They are

your most valuable asset." Then in a telling sentence, the next slide reads, "We are only

as great as the people who represent us." Teachers and staff in SDA schools largely

represent the commodity that makes SDA Christian education unique. The fact that the

teachers in the SDA school system hold religious and spiritual values consistent with the

Adventist church plays an important role in the marketing of the unique and distinct

service, or commodity, that an Adventist education can offer.

Perhaps no other document so clearly and boldly speaks of teacher and staff's

spirituality as a commodity than does one of the presentations on the Journey to

Excellence's "Marketing Your Mission" website (2006). The presenter (McKenzie,

2006), a marketing and enrollment director at one of the 15 SDA colleges and

universities in North America, boldly colors the presentation with corporate discourse.

He displays a PowerPoint slide with the message that "if we don't embrace our

stakeholders as customers, wooing them and otherwise convincing them that we

understand and are serving their needs…their actions can affect our ability to continue

and to be successful." Presenting the task of marketing SDA education as a service that

"customers" will buy and that "stakeholders" will support illustrates how issues of

spirituality might be framed as a commodity. The presentation goes on to remind the

audience that the law of supply and demand requires that the "stakeholders" and

"customers" of a Christian SDA education be convinced that the commodity being

offered is one that they want and is one that the church, school, and educators in those

schools can deliver. He reiterates why it is important to carefully define and cultivate the

"customers" of a Christian SDA education: "They [the customers] either buy what we're

selling or they don't. And it is our job to make sure they do." Clearly Adventist

education is here presented as a commodity to be bought or sold.

What is the product being offered, or as the presentation asks, "What is it you

have to sell?" Note the prevalence of teacher and staff in the following list that

specifically defines what "product" SDA education has to offer: 1) Your product is your

teachers – and the services they provide; 2) Your product is also your teachers – and the

larger role in the community they play; 3) Your product is your support staff – and the

impressions they make on all your key stakeholders; 4) Your product is your values; 5)

Your product is your academic quality; 5) Your product is the intimacy of your school

family; 7) Your product is your church – and the reputation it represents; 8) Ultimately,

your product is your students.

Note in this list how the first three directly center around the faculty and staff in a

school, and the fourth has to do with values. These are not separate entities. They are

entwined. One can promote the teaching of values as a product, but if the teachers and

staff don't share these values – if they don't embody them in their lives – then the schools

simply would not be able to deliver on their promise of a value-laden education. These

documents note how the "product" offered by a SDA education is filtered through and

delivered by teachers and staff. Education requires educators. By implication, a

Christian education requires Christian educators. As one of the brochures articulated,

"Through the inspired efforts of more than 65,769 Adventist teachers, young lives

experience critical transformation" ("Journey to Excellence: Marketing Tools," 2006).

This "critical transformation" is presented as part of the unique "service" offered by a SDA Christian education. At the nexus of this transformation lies the driving force of Adventist teachers.

The particular PowerPoint presentation discussed above most fully captures the commodification of spirituality in general and the spirituality of teachers and staff by proxy. However, it is by no means a unique document. Others include the corporate language of commodification and marketing with terms such as "Internal Marketing Objectives," "Top Selling Points" (Tucker, 2005), or the message to Adventist teachers that "You are the essence of Adventist education" (Roush, 2006). In short, the promotional and marketing materials made available on the church's education website clearly convey that teachers who embrace Adventism make up a significant element of the distinctive quality, service, or commodity that sets a SDA education apart.

The rhetorical exigency present in the commodification and attendant marketing of a parochial school education is the need to effectively frame the unique differences between parochial schools and public schools (or other types of private schools). In other words, there needs to be a difference between a public and a parochial school education. As many of the marketing documents noted above attest, one of these differences lies in the ability of parochial schools to offer the services of educators who give an equivalent academic education but who also understand and are committed to the spiritual mission of the school. This point is clearly presented in the marketing documents and materials provided by the SDA church's Department of Education. For example, the most recent promotional video available from the Journey to Excellence website (2006), includes 30-minute to 30-second promotional productions for television, video, or DVD. Provided

here are testimonies from students, parents, and educators alike regarding the unique

aspects of a SDA education. Many of their comments highlight the difference between a

parochial and a public school education. The example below illustrate the centrality of

the SDA educator in creating this difference and the promise of relationship-building in

this process. Below I will offer excerpts from a student, a SDA educator, and two parents

respectively:

> "By beholding you become changed, and in a Christian school you are surrounded by Christian influences" (student)
>
> "What I love most about my job is being free to think and talk about spiritual things." (educator)
>
> "The teachers being Christian are not only teaching certain values, but they are modeling those values to my children." (parent)
>
> "The commitment that they [the teachers] bring to spirituality seeps into everything they do. That alone is significant enough for my wife and I to send our kids to an Adventist school." (parent)

In each of the excerpts above, note how the "modeling" of Christian values, the Christian

"influences" with which students are surrounded, and the freedom to bring "spiritual

things" into the task of education are all emphasized. The last parent reiterates the

importance of spirituality that "seeps into everything they do," obliquely referring to the

influence and modeling these educators provide. For this parent anyway, that is the

difference "significant enough" to chose a SDA parochial education over a public one.

Commodifying Spirituality: Participant Buy-In

It is also instructive to note that not only the marketing materials provided by the

larger church structure's educational department but also the participants in this study

often articulated a clear understanding of the unique purpose of SDA education. In the

qualitative interviews, the teachers/staff acknowledged that they, themselves, play a

critical part in this "difference" between a public school education and a parochial school

experience. In the next few paragraphs I will offer the perspectives of these participants as they express their views of how spirituality permeates the school program, how the preservation and promulgation of Christian values and practices of the SDA church underlie boarding schools' mission, and finally how their own spiritual example and influence contribute to the difference between a public and a parochial education.

It is not particularly revelatory to note that spiritual matters would be an important element of parochial schools and would be a salient demarcation between these institutions and public schools. However, for the purposes of examining spiritual labor, it is important to establish that the organizational members of this study, teachers and staff in SDA boarding schools, recognize the spiritual mission of the institution in which they are employed – in other words, that they recognize their spiritual 'labor.' The following staff member provides such an acknowledgement:

> You know, if you're going to be here for spiritual things… that's our number one thing. We may think it's education, but we can get education in the public setting. Our number one thing here is the Christian experience, and that's got to be first and foremost in everything that we do.

This teacher expresses his sense that spiritual matters should trump other considerations. As another staff member articulates:

> Spiritually, decisions on a boarding campus should be number one – what is good spiritually for kids. You know, let's make that decision [about] what is good academically, you know, and what is good for the overall student body. I think that's the three principles you should go by in that order – spiritually, academically, and what's good for the overall program.

Faculty and staff on a boarding school campus clearly understand that spirituality is part of their school's mission and is integral to all aspects of school life, trumping other areas if necessary. For these participants, the spiritual aspect and expectations inherent in their *boarding* school work was similarly oft-expressed. The participants in this study were

well-aware of the commodification of spirituality as part of the parochial school

difference.

Earlier in this chapter I discussed how the marketing literature of the church's

Department of Education highlighted the role of the Christian teacher. The participants

in this study expressed similar sentiments as well, indicating that they understood not

only the centrality of spirituality in their school's mission but their own importance in the

unique service offered by SDA schools in general. Thus, the spirituality of the faculty

and staff at these schools becomes part of the commodity that distinguishes SDA

parochial schools from public schools and makes up one of the three elements of spiritual

labor (regulation and codification being the other two). That faculty/staff both recognize

their role and enact it by unabashedly bringing their spiritual values and focus into the

classroom is illustrated most prominently in the exemplar below involving an incident

where a teacher was questioned about weaving Biblical examples into an English lesson:

> Participant: I had a student say in class once – I was bringing some things in
> from the Bible – "Why are you doing that? This is an English class." I about
> exploded.
>
> Tammy: What did you say to that?
>
> Participant: I about exploded. Because it was something… I was talking
> about literature, and they brought something in about a story in the Bible.
> And I said, "Well, you know, that's the difference between a public school
> and a Christian school." And I said, "I *will* bring the Bible into the class as
> much as I want to. If I want to bring the Bible in every day I will! I don't
> care if it's history, math, science, or whatever!" I was so stunned that the
> student was questioning why I was doing that. So that's the difference
> between public school and private school, you know. I feel like I can openly
> [talk about the Bible] because the Bible has so many awesome examples for
> everything…

The integration of the Bible into the curriculum is decidedly defended by this teacher.

She expresses that not only does she have the freedom to do so, but that weaving

Christian beliefs into education is the distinguishing mark between a public and private

education. Her own personal dedication to doing so is emphasized by nearly "exploding"

when that practice was challenged. That teachers are an integral difference between

public and private schools is an important point, especially as it illustrates how the

commodification of a SDA education involves the expectation that teachers/staff

interweave spiritual components into the educational experience on a boarding campus.

That this spirituality is part of the commodity offered and that this spirituality emanates

from teachers and staff, illustrates the commodification of organizational members'

spirituality.

This emphasis on the integration of the spiritual with all aspects of the school is

just the first layer that makes up the distinct service or commodity of SDA schools. The

second is the socialization of students into the particular brand of spirituality espoused by

the values, standards, and practices of the Seventh-day Adventist church itself. A

recognition of this ancillary purpose of an SDA education is represented by the following

excerpt:

> Participant: The whole purpose of a boarding academy is to promote the
> values of the church. That's why the parents spend all this money and give up
> raising their own child so that this child will have a much better chance of
> ending up with the values of the parents and the church. Because statistically,
> if they attend boarding academies, or Adventist academies, I think they are
> about 50 percent more likely to stay with that particular faith.
>
> Tammy: And you… you are obviously very clear that this is the purpose of a
> boarding school.
>
> Participant: I'm very clear.

Promoting the "values of the church" is here presented as part and parcel of the

commodity offered, i.e., "That's why parents spend all this money." Another participant

offered a rhetorical question along these lines: "Why send your child to a SDA academy,

especially a boarding academy, if there's no difference between that and public school?"

This staff member worries that if the mission of SDA schools in educating students regarding church standards becomes less effective, lost, or diluted that SDA schools would lose their unique purpose. In the light of this study, such a concern goes to the heart of what commodity or service SDA schools offer. While any brand of spirituality distinguishes SDA schools from public institutions, an even more unique commodity offered by such schools is the emphasis on the spiritual and religious beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist church in particular. The implication of this point to the examination of spiritual labor will prove particularly salient in the upcoming discussion of the codification and regulation of SDA boarding school staff/teachers' spirituality where one of the foremost codified spiritual expectation proves to be that faculty/staff be members of the SDA church in "good and regular standing." This point also foreshadows the strong tie that will become evident between church standards/beliefs and issues of *regulation* in the realm of the spiritual labor performed by those who work or have worked in SDA boarding schools.

Academies: The Last Bastions of Conservative Adventism. All schools within the SDA educational system (K-12) could be assumed to share the same ascendancy of the spiritual in their program and the mission of educating students to embrace the beliefs of the SDA church. However, it should also be pointed out that SDA *boarding* schools were perceived by the participants of this study to hold a unique place in the church's large educational system. A surprising theme that emerged from the interviews was the strong sense that SDA boarding schools are the "last bastion" of conservative Adventism. I might note that this particular theme was coded *in vivo*; in other words, "last bastion" was a term actually offered by a participant. Given the argument I am making that

boarding schools are akin to total institutions, it is difficult to ignore the inherent irony

surrounding the use of the word "bastion" – as in a fortress – and the idea that the

preservation of these more conservative values would be part of the commodity that SDA

boarding schools offer.

The actual term "last bastion" was offered by the following participant who also

lists some of the issues in the church that might be seen differently along a conservative-

liberal continuum. In the following passage, he argues that the church's boarding schools

are generally expected to uphold the stance taken by the more conservative end of the

spectrum.

> The boarding school continues to be expected to be the last bastion of
> Adventist standards – the fighting front of all the standards that are going by
> the wayside. And so, what you see is a conservative constituency who will
> give money to a school as long as there are no earrings, no movie attendance,
> no caffeine on campus, no meat, and the dress code is enforced and blah blah
> blah and so on and so forth.

This particular opinion was voiced by a former staff member who now works as a pastor

in an academy church. As such, he undoubtedly has access to the opinions of a larger

constituency regarding the role of the boarding academy, a perspective that boarding

school teachers themselves may not. For example, one long-time teacher said,

"Somebody told me that they thought that boarding schools are the most conservative

part of the Adventist church in terms of lifestyle. That really brought me up short." The

sense that SDA academies were the "last bastion" was not as surprising to others. A

wide-ranging host of participants expressed such observations. One long-time boarding

school principal and current educational superintendent said, "But the boarding school is

still – even though most of them are far from conservative – they are still the most

conservative structure that our church has." Others offered similar sentiments: "I think

the academies are about the strongest thing that holds the church standards yet"; "We [the

faculty] are expected to hold those traditional old-style lines…." Interestingly, one

participant who was also a parent of a student in a SDA boarding school articulates why

he chose to send his own son to an academy. Later in Chapter 6 I will discuss in greater

detail the conservative/liberal elements of SDA beliefs. At this point, I intend simply to

establish that SDA academies are expected to be more conservative in nature. In the

following passage note how this participant references some of the more conservative,

"old-school" aspects of traditional Adventism to be the service or commodity that he

desires his son to experience:

> One of the reasons I sent [my son] here, is because I see boarding academies
> as SDA museums. It is the last museum. He will get Friday night vespers.
> Sabbath church. Saturday night vespers. He'll have worships in the evening.
> Bible class. I mean… it's usually very conservative. And I always think,
> "OK. I'm kind of liberal. Let him see the other side. Let him see
> [Adventism] from a different standpoint."

This parent desires that his son see "a different standpoint" – a more conservative take on

Adventist beliefs. It is in the "SDA museum" of the boarding academy that he hopes his

child will experience the more conservative spectrum of Adventist beliefs. In this sense,

part of the commodity that SDA boarding schools offers is to conserve and present the

more traditional, conservative tenets of the SDA lifestyle and faith.

The sense that part of the commodity of SDA boarding schools is to preserve the

more conservative standards of the church was not as readily evident in the marketing

materials, school websites, or general educational philosophies. However, as can be seen

above, it proved to be a strong and persistent theme in the qualitative interviews. As with

any church organization, one can find in the SDA church both conservative and liberal

stances on a variety of church standards (although it might be noted that my participants

were loathe to use the terms 'conservative' and 'liberal'). Perhaps it is significant to

mention that in the initial coding of the interviews, I somewhat casually and off-handedly

coded the many references to boarding schools as "museums of Adventism" thinking this

was a tangential theme unrelated to issues of spiritual labor. Later in the analysis,

however, it became clear that if SDA boarding schools are expected to be the last stance

for conservative standards, and if teachers/staff were expected to model these standards

as part of their spiritual labor, that teachers and staff in these schools who did not

personally hold similar conservative views on traditional Adventist doctrines, beliefs, and

lifestyle issues might be problematic. Being a more 'liberal' Adventist working in a

school where one is required to be more conservative in one's spiritual views would seem

to set the stage for spiritual dissonance. What surprised me even further, however, was to

discover that spiritual dissonance was not as prevalent as might be warranted by these

contingencies. Later in Chapter Six, I will discuss these surprising revelations regarding

the absence and reframing of spiritual dissonance in the midst of those who worked in the

"last bastions of Adventism."

Commodifying Spirituality in Boarding Schools: Marketing Total Institutions

When one turns away from the marketing strategies and advice of the church

body as a whole to the marketing materials of the individual boarding schools

themselves, the commodification of teacher/staff's spiritual labor takes on a new and

interesting dimension. Up to this point, I have simply described the marketing strategy of

the larger church body and illustrated how the commodity of its teachers and staff's

Adventist beliefs are key elements in the "product" or "service" that is being

commodified, marketed, and "sold" to constituents (i.e., customers and stakeholders). I

have also illustrated how the participants in this study recognized the salience of spirituality as the defining (and marketable) demarcation between public and private education.

While the marketing documents from the church's Department of Education website tend to foreground teachers' spirituality, the actual marketing documents from individual schools commodify the spirituality and Adventism of its teachers and staff in a much more subtle manner. This backgrounding does not minimize the commodification of teacher's spirituality as part of the service SDA schools can offer. Rather, the unique total institution-like qualities of a boarding school become intertwined with teachers' and staff spirituality in a manner that illustrates how the qualities of the boarding school impact the commodification, marketing, and promotion of organizational members' spirituality.

While all teachers/staff in the SDA system as a whole might be characterized as undertaking spiritual labor, not all of these organizational members operate within the unique confines afforded by the total institution qualities of *boarding* academies. Relatedly, while the SDA church as a whole markets and commodifies its brand of Christian education in general, the individual boarding schools themselves must couple to this marketing strategy the service or commodity afforded by the boarding school environment itself. In essence, what sets boarding schools apart are the qualities that characterize them as total institutions – a more totalizing and encompassing experience, making the faculty and staff by their presence and availability integral parts of this commodity. By assumption and by implication their spiritual views and practices are part of this commodity as well. However, as mentioned above the commodification of the

faculty/staff's spirituality receives a much more subtle and nuanced approach from the individual schools' websites and marketing materials than the approach taken by the church organization as a whole. I will give examples below of how the total institution qualities of the boarding school are promoted as factors that lead to more sustained and close contact between students and their teachers which in turn leads to relationships characterized as familial. Strongly coupled to the "family" atmosphere a boarding school provides is the opportunity for faculty/staff to be positive spiritual influences on students. This spiritual influence in a family atmosphere largely comprises how individual boarding schools commodify faculty/staff's spirituality as part of spiritual labor.

Marketing "Working 24/7." The total institution-like qualities of a boarding school include the 24/7 availability to students (see Chapter Four). This element of a boarding school comprises one of its marketable traits as well. One typical school's homepage clearly states the advantages of a boarding school in this light:

> Because of the boarding school environment, teachers are able to educate on more levels than typical classroom relationships. Students and staff interact throughout the day, eating together at meals, playing recreational sports, and worshipping as a group. (Enterprise Academy, 2006)

Because faculty are so much part of the school program, the spiritual "labor" that they perform is more than teaching classes or even being dedicated and caring. Their labor is so integrated with the spiritual mission of the school that it extends beyond the classroom to eating, playing, and worshipping as a campus community. That this type of statement would present itself front and center on a school's homepage indicates that it marks one of the commodities or services promoted by the school.

What is also commodified is the integration of faculty members' spirituality, influence, and example into the everyday life of a boarding school. The 24/7 nature of

work in a SDA academy noted earlier in Chapter Four is also commodified as a quality

that sets boarding schools apart from a public education and that provides for more

spiritual interaction between faculty and students. For example, one marketing document

included "Frequently Asked Questions" which highlight this emphasis on the

accessibility of faculty on a boarding school campus:

> **How are PFA teachers different from public school teachers?**
>
> Teachers at PFA give unusual amounts of their time and energy to the
> development of the students. They offer tutorial sessions, trips to the
> mall/hairdresser, or just home-cooked meals during the week or on weekends,
> to name a few services. Public school teachers that provide this kind of care
> and attention are rare. PFA teachers also demonstrate their spirituality
> through their lesson plans across the curriculum. ("About the Faculty/Staff,"
> 2006)

Not only does this marketing/recruitment document highlight the extra attentions of the

staff and faculty, but it also remarks that these occur on "weekends" and out of the

classroom. What is also notable about this example is the statement that faculty/staff at

this school will "demonstrate" their spirituality in the classroom as well. As a

recruitment letter also stated, "Our teachers are committed to the mission of Kingsway

and are always willing to help any student both in and out of the classroom" (Bussey,

2006). The promise presented in these recruitment documents is that in or out of the

classroom faculty will be accessible and intricately involved with the campus community.

Other examples abound of this expectation that faculty/staff's lives be intertwined

with their students. Another marketing brochure touted student testimonials about the

school, including the quote from a student, "Teachers help even when they're not

teaching" (Georgia Cumberland Academy, 2006). A testimonial prominently featured on

a web page highlights the time investment of faculty and staff that makes up part of the

attractive commodity that boarding schools have to offer:

> My years at Broadview Academy were three of the best years of my life. I think back on my Christian teachers that not only prepared me to do well in college and medical school, but also spent countless hours with me on choir/band trips, Christmas plays, Week of Prayer, Backpacking/Canoe trips… ("Alumns speak up," 2006).

Here presented as a highlight of the boarding school life are the interactions with "Christian teachers" both academically and spiritually. The many interactions mentioned above all involve activities outside the classroom off-campus. Other testimonials in marketing materials such as DVD productions include the typical line from this student narrator: "Because students and faculty play together at rec and live and work together on campus, the relationships between faculty and students are pretty cool…. The Rio faculty know that working here is not a job but a whole life commitment" (Rio Lindo, 2006). These words eerily reflect the descriptions offered by the faculty in Chapter Four when describing their all-encompassing work on a boarding school campus (i.e., "it's not just a job; it's a lifestyle"). What these examples indicate regarding the commodification of faculty/staff's spirituality is that individual schools highlight the total institution qualities of boarding school life, including the implicit promise that the spirituality of faculty/staff will be evident in and out of the classroom, during the weekdays and on the weekends. The 24/7 nature of the interaction with students during which faculty/staff's spirituality is enacted comprises part of the commodification aspect of spiritual labor in these parochial boarding schools.

Marketing "Family." One can hardly visit schools' web pages or read through marketing/recruitment materials without stumbling on the word "family." Witness the following samples:

> "Milo Adventist Academy is a school family." (website home page, Milo Adventist Academy, 2006)

"We extend an invitation for you to become an active member of the Hawaiian Mission Academy family." (website home page, Hawaiian Mission Academy, 2006)

"Union Springs Academy is so much like a family." (student testimonial on website, Union Springs Academy, 2006

"The sense of family between students and teachers is something we treasure." (recruitment letter, Yingling, 2006)

"Each staff member is given opportunity to advise a small group of students in regards to their grades and other campus-life problems. They will also be their campus 'family.'" (student handbook, Mount Ellis Academy, 2006).

"I like the family atmosphere you get here." (student testimonial on promotional DVD, Rio Lindo Adventist Academy, 2006)

"I love how MBA fits you right into their family. That's really how you feel at MBA – like you're all family." (student testimonial in calendar/bulletin, Monterey Bay Academy, 2005).

The notion of "family" lends more of an all-encompassing and involved aspect to the relationships formed on campus. Ideally families have respect and care for one another; they provide safe haven; they build relationships with one another. For faculty and staff, being part of a campus community so often marketed as "family" brings certain obligations and expectations to interact with students and mentor the whole person on a more encompassing level than simple academic pursuits.

The close association afforded by and necessary to the "family" atmosphere provided by a boarding school campus is closely coupled with the possibility and efficacy of faculty/staff's influence. This influence is spiritual in nature and is one of the commodities or services that sets parochial schools apart. Thus, intertwined in the spiritual labor of these faculty/staff is the privilege and necessity of associating with students amidst the hope of influencing them spiritually. Touted on one school's website, for example, was the following information about the girls' dean:

[She] has enjoyed the special opportunity to be closely associated with the girls in their "home away from home." "My goal is to help students learn to

love and live for Christ" [quote from dean]. (Great Lakes Adventist Academy, 2006).

Not only is the total-institution quality of 'close association' noted here, but it is coupled to the "home away from home" that these boarding schools market as a unique commodity they can offer. In the example above, linked with this close association is the dean's "goal" to assist students' spiritual journeys. An institution where the lives of students and faculty are more intertwined in a "family" sense comprises one of the defining aspects of boarding schools and is a quality commodified in the marketing/recruitment materials of individual schools. That such proximity would afford more opportunities to influence students spiritually is a corollary "service" that sets boarding schools apart from other types of educational institutions.

The promise of a family relationship between students and staff most explicitly highlights the spiritual labor commodified in the marketing strategies outlined above. The close proximity and availability of staff creates strong, family-like relationships and the opportunity to interact with students in spiritual arenas as well. Coupled, then, with the promise of "family" is also the strong possibility that faculty/staff will have an opportunity to influence students' spiritual experiences just as family members may ideally be expected to have more care and concern for each other on deeper levels than they might with others. In this light, spiritual influence (or the possibility of it) is prominently highlighted in the commodification of faculty/staff's spirituality on the part of individual schools. The implicit expectation remains that these organizational members will embrace and promote the spiritual values of SDA Christians more particularly. Their spiritual labor includes the assumption that they will influence students positively in this brand of spirituality and have more opportunities to do so in the

availability and visibility provided on a *boarding* school campus. These assumptions are

promoted, emphasized, and commodified by individual boarding schools in their

marketing and promotional materials.

The *desire* of teachers to be positive spiritual influences is commodified as well.

For example, on one school's website mentioned above teachers and staff offer small

blurbs next to their pictures. Consistently these messages contain phrases such as the

following:

> "I greatly enjoy the opportunity to work at GLAA, and I pray that each
> student I come in contact with that God can touch them through me."
>
> "I want the students to see Jesus in me and to help them develop a love for
> Him."
>
> "My goal for the students is to help lead them to Jesus." (Greater Lakes
> Adventist Academy, 2006)

The desire of and hope for a positive effect on students run through these examples. On

another school's website, a page touts the teacher of the year who says, "Being a positive

influence in a young person's life is very rewarding. It's why I do what I do" (Monterey

Bay, 2006). The idea that faculty willingly buy-in to their spiritual mission also marks an

aspect of the commodification of their spirituality.

Not only do these websites illustrate how the desire of teachers/staff to be positive

role models is communicated to stakeholders (or potential "customers"), but in the

promotional material schools provide prospective students and their parents, students'

testimonies regarding the efficacy of the faculty/staff's influence are featured as well. In

one promotional brochure, for example, the following student quote is highlighted: "I

know at Kingsway we meet amazing people, and these friendships, along with the staff's

influence and encouragement to become good Christian leaders, help us grow spiritually

as well as academically" ("Experience Life: Kingsway college," 2006). Said another

student on a promotional video, "Before I came here, I hated God. But when I got here, I looked at the students and faculty and became a better Christian because of it" (Rio Lindo Adventist Academy, 2006). That teachers are willing to offer their spiritual influence, and that this influence has efficacy in regards to students, is marketed and promoted as part of the unique commodity or service that can be offered by a parochial boarding school.

Not only does the desire to be a good influence and the realization that one *has* an influence on students appear in the promotional/marketing strategies of individual schools, but it was reflected in the qualitative interviews as well. A sample of many such examples follows:

> "You had to set a very, um, almost a pedestal example."

> "The main difference [between boarding schools and day schools] is that you feel like you have to be an example."

> "I had the privilege of being a good example, of being a friend [to students]."

> "I wanted to be a good example."

> "[The spiritual expectations are] just to be an example of what a Christian life should be…"

> "We are supposed to be examples, you know, like good Christian living examples."

> "And I also tried to be an example for the kids."

> "I think in the boarding academies you can really have an influence. You really, really do."

These comments illustrate a mixture of both the privilege and responsibility that the opportunity to be a spiritual example engendered in my participants. These examples all combine to illustrate that faculty/staff's opportunity to set a good spiritual example is part of not only the recognized *commodity* offered by the boarding school experience but by those who provide this commodity – the faculty and staff. This aspect of spiritual labor is both expected and desired on the part of the organization and the faculty/staff themselves.

Commodification of Spirituality: Summary

Schools do not exist apart from educators. Furthermore, schools for which spirituality is foundational and which exist in great measure to offer an environment that espouses, teaches, and inculcates the unique belief system of a particular religion do not exist without educators to provide for such an experience. The mission of a parochial school and the part the spirituality of its teachers play are inextricably enmeshed. To a great degree the spiritual qualities and focus of teachers in a parochial school and the expectation that their spirituality should somehow be communicated and/or visible distinguish it from a public school. To an equal degree a school's mission of socializing and educating students into the belief system of a church also implies that the teachers and staff in those schools hold, practice, and value those unique beliefs themselves. This explanation of the "commodification" aspect of faculty/staff's spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools has illustrated that these implicit expectations and assumptions are commodified both in a larger system-wide level (i.e., by the church) and by the individual schools themselves; the spirituality of teachers/staff in Adventist boarding schools is clearly part of the commodity of a SDA education. The marketing and promotional strategies of the individual boarding schools themselves couple the spiritual influence of teachers with the close quarters a boarding school can offer; these close quarters allow for the demonstration, modeling, and mentoring of faculty and staff members' spirituality. That faculty/staff would build relationships with students and thus positively influence them spiritually is the foundational expectation inherent in the spiritual labor of those who work in SDA boarding schools.

More particularly, the church's boarding schools are seen to be the "last bastions" of more conservative Adventist beliefs. By implication, then, faculty/staff's influence and the spirituality displayed in the close familial confines of the boarding school should reflect not only a Christian, but a relatively conservative Adventist belief system. How these more particular beliefs and expectations are codified and communicated to teachers/staff makes up the discussion of the next element of spiritual labor – the codification of organizational members' spirituality.

<p style="text-align:center;">*The Codification of Spirituality*</p>

The term "codification" implies a systematic formalization of rules, expectations, and/or norms, and I began this study expecting that the spiritual expectations for teachers and staff in the SDA educational system would be formally codified in documents such as faculty handbooks and employment manuals. These documents, I assumed, would be sufficient to illustrate the nature of the codification in regards to spiritual labor. However, the concept of codification with regard to employees' spirituality proved immensely more complex and nuanced than I had anticipated. In these following sections devoted to the codification of faculty/staff's spirituality, I parse these complexities by explicating the "official" and "unofficial" codification of organizationally-mandated spiritual expectations required in spiritual labor. First, I will outline the official organizational means used to codify the nature of faculty and staff's spiritual labor as evidenced in documents requested from schools, conferences, and unions within the SDA educational system as well as the documents provided to me by the participants in this study.

What also strongly emerged from the qualitative interviews in particular, however, were more salient issues of "unofficial" codification of norms and practices related to spiritual and religious issues. These unofficial expectations ("unofficial" because they are not formally documented) proved to influence the nature of organizational members' spiritual labor. Because the "unofficial" methods of codification directly affect how the spirituality of faculty/staff is regulated, I will convey the nature, scope, and assumptions that fashion participants' experiences of spiritual labor in a parochial boarding school setting.

"Official" Codification of Spirituality: Conditions of Employment

That the spirituality of staff and faculty who work in any SDA educational institution is codified from an official organizational standpoint most clearly illustrated in the official educational policies printed and distributed to employees (see "General Education Policies," 2006). However, what I unexpectedly discovered was that this codification rarely, if ever, emanates from the actual school itself, but rather is handed down from the conference or union levels. For example, for this study I first proposed to examine faculty handbooks at a number of schools with the idea that the spiritual expectations of teachers/staff would be articulated in these documents. However, these handbooks, when in existence at all, were outdated, in disarray, and/or out of use. Not a single participant referred to a faculty handbook when I asked how staff members knew the religious/spiritual expectations of boarding school teachers.

What the participants *did* refer to, what the administrative secretaries occasionally gave me when I asked for a copy of the "faculty handbook," and what at least one participant showed me, were the employment policies printed by the respective Office of

Education in the various unions and conferences. In regards to the spiritual and religious expectations of employees of the SDA church these documents outline circumstances for which employees might be terminated. These include non-spiritual issues such as "insufficient enrollment," for example (e.g., Mid-American Union Conference, 2005). However, some requirements might be seen as more spiritual in nature – "social and moral problems," for example. The handbooks also included the following proviso under the "Reasons for Termination" heading: "Employee fails to provide a positive Christian role model and to uphold the doctrines and the generally accepted standards of the Seventh-day Adventist church." In reality, these documents differ very little from union to union or conference to conference; they all generally reiterate the policies articulated by the North American Division of Education's K-12 policies ("Adventist Education," 2006). Thus, the official, contractual spiritual issues are codified and distributed by entities higher than the individual schools themselves in the SDA church's educational hierarchy.

The nature of this codification of teacher and staff spirituality carries implications in the study of spiritual labor in this system's boarding schools in a number of ways. Because the official codification of expectations emanates from the church entity as a whole (versus individual schools), teachers/staff in these total institutions are not on their own "island" with regards to their spiritual and religious expectations – they are part of a larger, global church body and educational system whose official expectations for teachers and staff remain generally the same throughout the school system, regardless of size or location.

The K-12 Educational policies of the SDA church's Education Department are officially codified in a document that includes a statement of philosophy, mission, and objectives for SDA education; included as well are a list of ten goals for the curriculum in SDA schools, an outline of how the SDA school is an "Integral Part of the SDA Church" ("General Educational Policies," 2006), description of the non-discrimination policy, and the "Nondiscrimination Exception." The latter statement reads such:

> For SDA's the exercise of religion includes the right to operate educational institutions that are distinctively SDA. The creation and maintenance of such institutions require that they be staffed only by those individuals who are in complete harmony with the beliefs and practices of the Church. Hence, in the employment of personnel for its educational institutions, one of the occupational qualifications for any position is that the individual must be a SDA, committed to the program of the Church. ("General Educational Policies," 2006)

Not only does this document elsewhere specifically require that "educational employees be "active members of the SDA Church, in regular standing" but they must also be "committed to the program of the Church." Note that a simple membership on the books must be coupled with an outwardly observable "active" involvement, and that outward compliance with behavioral stances is also coupled with inward expectations of "commitment." The codified employment policies, therefore, require not only outward compliance with "beliefs and practices," but an inward compliance as well. Those who teach in the educational system of the SDA church are expected to be in "complete harmony" with the spiritual principals and doctrines in appearance and reality. The expectation of "deep acting" that Hochschild (1983) references with regard to emotional labor is trumped by the expectation that teachers and staff in the SDA educational system will do no "acting" at all. For these teachers, there should be no 'on-stage' or 'off-stage.' This caveat will enter more fully into the discussion in Chapter Six regarding the nature

of dissonance that might be associated with spiritual labor of teachers/staff on a parochial

boarding school campus. For now, however, it will suffice to note this official

codification not only of organizational members' practices and behaviors but of their

actual spiritual commitment as well.

This idea of the integration of the spiritual expectations into the whole of one's

life is spelled out elsewhere in the educational policies guiding the SDA school system.

"Inasmuch as the personal life and the professional identity of an individual are

inseparable, all employees are expected to conform to the standards of conduct that are in

harmony with SDA principles" ("Educational Policies," 2006). Significantly, the

"personal" and the "professional" are indistinguishable here. With regards to the spiritual

labor of faculty/staff in the total institution structure of a boarding school, this

requirement takes on particular significance. Recall the pressure explicated in Chapter

Four of operating 24/7 under the panopticon (i.e., the "fishbowl"), or how staff would

comment about always being "on duty." In a total institution such as a boarding school,

very little room exists for a difference between the 'personal' and 'professional' because

of the access to and interaction with those who live together on campus – both students

and staff. As one participant articulated earlier, "I don't have a hidden life" – meaning

that her personal and professional lives were indistinguishable on a boarding school

campus. Such seamlessness includes the idea that the spirituality of organizational

members would not be compartmentalized into what one does and believes while at work

and what one does and believes in one's private life. The document quoted above

illustrates as well that these "standards of conduct" both personally and professionally be

in "harmony with SDA principles." That teachers and staff in the SDA educational

system not only practice but believe in the religious and spiritual stances of the SDA

church is a concept that is officially codified.

Union and conference personnel handbooks outline the educational policies of the

North American Division referenced above, but these are not the only means by which

spiritual expectations are codified. One participant showed me his employment contract

which explicitly stated that a condition of employment included being a tithe-paying

member of the church. By way of brief explanation, the SDA church holds that the

giving of "tithe" (usually 10% of one's income) is done in recognition that one's material

possession are granted in stewardship – that all ultimately belongs to God. The practice

is based on certain Biblical principles and examples (i.e., Malachi 3:10, Genesis 14:20).

One condition of employment in the SDA church as a whole, and in its education

institutions by implication, is the codified regulation that teachers/staff pay a faithful

tithe. As one participant said, "You sign that paper that says you will tithe." That tithe-

paying is both a condition of employment as well as a personal spiritual issue was

articulated by a participant who spoke of this particular codified requirement in light of

his experience as a former boarding school administrator:

> For instance, tithing. I think that is the standard that some people have
> difficulty with because they see it as a personal issue, and the church sees it as
> a wider [issue]. It's not just a financial issue. It is a spiritual issue. And
> some people see that as, you know, a private concern. And I try to respect
> that, but at the same time I believe that because it is a spiritual issue, it calls
> for commitment that is probably no place else in our church, except church
> employees... Yes, on the outside of that, in the employment realm, there is a
> thing that says because the Lord has blessed you, you need to return your
> tithe. But when it becomes an employment issue then it becomes a standard
> that says this is our expectation, and people struggle with that. It is
> contractual to uphold what is seen as a church standard.

As this participant acknowledges, some employees resent this particular codification of

what he characterizes as a spiritual issue, but he also unapologetically re-affirms the

expectation that those who work for the church pay tithe as part of a clearly codified expectation of church employment. That the contract may serve as the official organizational codification of certain elements of spirituality in issues such as tithing is noted above but also extends to other issues as well, some more vaguely defined: "Your contract and everything says that you have to be, you know, a member [of the SDA church] in good standing." These types of codified spiritual expectations may appear in a number of official organizational documents – including contracts.

Ironically, though participants expressed knowledge of officially codified requirements, few acknowledged actually *reading* these types of documents, as the following exchange illustrates:

> Participant: There are certain instances that are definitely written into the contract. Um… like going to church. Down at [previous school], basically our contract said that we would be members of the [local] SDA church. And I think, but I'm not positive, I don't remember seeing that in last year's contract, but I didn't really read it when I signed it. (laughs)
>
> Tammy: You mean your contract at [present school]?
>
> Participant: Yeah, here at [present school]. I don't remember reading that little detail. But I know that the employment handbook says that I'm supposed to be a member in good standing with the church.

This participant reveals that church membership and adherence to the religious and spiritual beliefs of the SDA church are all clearly understood codified requirements of employment in both his contract and the official employment handbook, yet he admits not even reading his contract. Another participant outlines the codified spiritual requirements of working in the SDA educational system, but more subtly hints that he has not actually read the documents:

> Tammy: My question is how are faculty members expected to behave, believe, conduct themselves as Christian Seventh-day Adventists faculty members on a boarding school campus?

Participant: Um… well, to uphold the principles of the Bible and the… and the beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist church, to live them. Now, that's a very general answer to your question. We are… um… academy teachers are to be examples of what any member of the SDA church should be. The same standard you would expect of your pastor.

Tammy: How do faculty members know what those expectations are?

Participant: Some are quite well stated—you will or you will not.

Tammy: They are stated where and how?

Participant: Um… well, I believe the policy of the conference that you'll be a member of the local church and be in regular standing at that church, um…. which includes attendance and Adventist lifestyle standards. It's stated in the policy when you're hired that you'll be a tithe payer.

Tammy: Ok. That's actually in the contract?

Participant: I believe so. It's definitely in the policy that you're *supposed* to read and understand. (chuckles)

As with the previous example, this participant did not hesitate when outlining what was

generally required of SDA educators, but he does not actually profess to have personally

read the material. Many participants could not even pinpoint *others* who had read the

employment manuals where the official codification of spiritual expectations might be

found. Admitted one:

Participant: I think if you read the handbook for teaching staff and employees from any conference, it is all in there [the spiritual expectations of the job]. I don't know how many teachers sit down and read that.

Tammy: Have you read it?

Participant: No, I have not. (laughter)

One participant who actually brought the employment manual to the interview also

admitted to not ever glancing through the document and added, "You just let me know if

any faculty have read this cover to cover."

In sum, whether faculty/staff have actually read the documents codifying their

religious and spiritual expectations, the examples above illustrate that they have a general

awareness that the expectations for the job (including the spiritual expectations) are

codified in documents such as contracts and employment manuals.

The Ambiguity Behind Codified Spiritual Expectations

The idea that the official codification of religious and spiritual expectations

emanates from the parent organization rather than the local school itself also proves to be

one of the difficulties for faculty and staff members. First, while the spiritual

expectations of organizational members are, indeed, officially codified, these

expectations are often not codified at very deep levels of specificity. While contracts and

employment handbooks may mandate specific spiritual practices (i.e., tithing) and

occasionally specify lifestyle standards (i.e., no wedding rings), in general the codified

spiritual expectations for employees can be summarized in the following line found in all

the Educational Policies – that one be a member of the SDA church "in good and regular

standing" (e.g., "Adventist Education," 2006). This basic requirement was often echoed

in the qualitative interviews as well:

> Tammy: Let me ask you what an academy teacher can or shouldn't do or believe as a SDA boarding school teacher?
>
> Participant: (pause) Hm… I don't know that I know how to answer that. I mean you've got the pat answer, the expected answer – a good and regular standing member of the Adventist church. That's about the extent of it. Now, what that means, I don't know.

The "pat" and "expected" answer given here captures the essence of the codified

expectation that appears in the SDA educational employment handbooks and policy

manuals quoted above. Yet this participant acknowledges that what this means in actual

practice may be less obvious ("what that means, I don't know").

What on the surface seems like clear codification of spirituality in the rather

general requirement that teachers and staff be practicing members of the SDA church, in

170

practice and belief becomes rather fluid on the continuum of conservative and liberal

interpretations of basic spiritual principles and practices held by the church. The SDA

church is undoubtedly like any other religious organization in that its members hold

sometimes widely divergent views on particular issues in what might be characterized as

liberal and conservative camps. The official codification of spiritual beliefs and practices

available in official documents such as contracts and employment handbooks may or may

not delineate these particularities, as the following participant attests:

> So there are some contracts that spell out those things [spiritual expectations
> of employment], whether it's tithing or whether it's beliefs in creation,
> whether it's the Sabbath. There are some [education] codes that do that. And
> there are some conferences that would spell that out a little bit further.
> Because you know from being on a boarding school campus that Sabbath
> keeping is very wide-ranging… the idea of how Sabbath should be kept. And
> what you do corporately and what you do individually… and those are issues
> that become very difficult to handle. So you try to put the basics down, and
> then there has to be some leeway for individuals.

As this participant implicitly acknowledges, the "leeway" given to individuals in how to

put into practice the codified mandate that one be a member of the SDA church in "good

and regular standing" varies from region to region. For example, while all employees in

SDA schools would be expected to believe in the Sabbath as a member of the church,

what "Sabbath keeping" practices might be seen as appropriate or inappropriate would

vary on a conservative/liberal continuum. That these specific expectations may or may

not be officially codified is a reality implicated in the exemplar above.

So while the spiritual expectations for SDA teachers are generally codified in

union and conference personnel handbooks, the more specific operationalized

interpretations of what it means to be a SDA in "good and regular standing" often varies

from school to school and region to region. Because this official codification is so

general, I will discuss these more specific expectations in a separate category below – the

"unofficial" means of codifying the expectations accompanying spiritual labor. When

organizations have spiritual expectations and norms, but when these are only

ambiguously communicated in official documents (yet remain organizationally held

expectations, nonetheless), faculty/staff must somehow come to know these expectations

in order for "spiritual labor" to take place. How these more specific expectations are

communicated unofficially is the topic of the following section.

"Unofficial" Codification of Spiritual Expectations

Unlike the official codification noted above, "unofficial" codification does not

necessarily involve actual written documents such as contracts or employment manuals,

but may include other less tangible means of communicating religious or spiritual

expectations to faculty/staff. I will first outline how specific religious and spiritual

expectations differ from region to region in the SDA educational system, then explain

how these expectations are communicated and/or learned through employment

interviews. Finally, I will explore the unspoken assumptions behind the possible reason

that specific religious and spiritual expectation are not unequivocally codified and go on

to briefly foreshadow how these assumptions impact the "regulation" aspect of spiritual

labor in a parochial boarding school.

"Unofficial" Codification of Spiritual Expectations: When in Rome…. When

examining the spiritual labor of faculty and staff in SDA boarding schools, the

codification of spiritual and religious expectations in different schools and areas of the

country becomes salient. Consistently codified in all the umbrella church, conference,

and union employment standards is the expectation that employees be members of the

SDA church in "good and regular standing." However, what constitutes "good and

regular standing" may differ from country to country, region to region, conference to

conference, and school to school. For example, in one conference a more conservative

stance might be taken on the issue of jewelry, with wedding rings placed in that category.

In another area of the country, (i.e., the West coast), no mention at all is made of jewelry

in any context whatsoever.

A fascinating example of these regional and cultural differences was offered by a

participant who spent some time preaching in Australia and New Zealand. I will quote

him at length as he talks about cultural differences regarding how a Seventh-day

Adventists around the world might view issues such as swearing, wearing wedding rings,

or meat eating.

> Participant: [It was] just fascinating to see the differences in culture and
> what's considered, uh… acceptable and what's considered taboo.
>
> Tammy: Can you give me an example?
>
> Participant: I can give you a lot of examples. (laughter) Uh… [in Australia]
> they are a lot more secular in their lifestyles in the way they do things. Um…
> their culture has a general overall acceptance with words like "hell" and
> "damn." They're no big deal. So, when you're sitting with the conference
> youth director, and you say, "You know, why didn't you rescue me from that
> guy who was driving me nuts?" He says, "Why the hell should I? He's a
> damn, fucking loon." And I go, "You can say those words down here?" And
> he says, "What? Loon?" (long, loud laughter) "No. 'Damn' and 'hell'." He
> says, "Why the hell not?"
>
> Tammy: (laughter)
>
> Participant: Little old ladies down there… "How are you doing?" "I'm doing
> fine. It's just been so damn cold."
>
> Tammy: (laughter)   It's just one of those filler words. Just a regular old
> adjective.
>
> Participant: Yeah.
>
> ...
>
> Participant: In New Zealand at Christmas time, you know, we ran into all
> kinds of those things. American potlucks are getting a lot more like their
> potlucks down there now, but, at [New Zealand] potlucks, they had two full

tables. One with veggie stuff and one with meat. And the veggie was a lot smaller table. (laughter)

Tammy: Probably less popular, huh? (laughter)

Participant: Oh, yeah. Of course, you've got the New Zealand lamb and everything else down there. You know, it was just no big deal.

Tammy: Is there anything that's a bigger deal to them than it is to us?

Participant: Um… Yeah, we had that discussion. What was it? It was something I thought was really interesting….They are absolutely unbelieving that we would have any kind of discussion over wedding bands. They are just appalled that we would have any kind of a discussion over wedding bands.

Tammy: A non-issue, huh?

Participant: Not only a non-issue, [wedding rings are] a sign and symbol of virtue. So any Adventist minister not wearing one that's married should be kicked out of the ministry.

Tammy: It *is* an issue! Just a different…

Participant: Just the other side of it.

Tammy: Fascinating.

Participant: You know, I wore a wedding band the whole time I was down there, and I usually do when I travel now. But, um, you know, I wore one and the topic came up. "Well, we're glad to see you wear a wedding band." I said, "Really?! What's the deal? Why is that?" "Well, we were in America and we noticed a lot pastors who don't." I said, "Well, in America, it's still an issue of spirituality, and people judge your spirituality based on it." "You're kidding?!" So we had a long discussion on the wedding band... It's a symbol of virtue and, uh, for any Christian man who would want to take his wedding band off without good reason … when they find out you're married, [they look at you with] almost with an aghast look. "I can't believe that! Are you trying to hit on the girls here while you're away from your wife or what?!" Um… and so the Adventists in Australia… that's kind of the way they looked at it. And they've had guys down there come down from America without wedding bands, and they're thinking "Oh, they're away from their country, and they're going to try and play the field?!"

Tammy: I see. They're just sending… they're sending a totally different message…

Participant: Without ever intending to.

What this extended exemplar illustrates is the extensive differences that might exist within the SDA church regarding certain practices and principles. For example, vegetarian dishes are not the only ones available at many potlucks, though many Seventh-

day Adventists strictly embrace the vegetarian lifestyle. Almost polar opposites exist

between the way some Adventists in Australia and those in the U.S. view the spiritual

issues surrounding the wearing of wedding rings. Other differences exist even within the

U.S. regarding such issues as swearing, with some taking a much more conservative

view. Commented one participant on the topic:

> Participant: I grew up very, very conservative. Like I don't even think… To me, "shut up" is a bad word. I grew up with that being like the f-word.
>
> Tammy: OK, wow.
>
> Participant: That's how conservative I grew up, you know. And so the kids know that in my room… you've probably heard them say, "No negative s-words." (laughter)

This participant characterizes her stance as "very conservative," illustrating sometimes

widely divergent opinion on what some might consider spiritual issues. However, while

it is true that some Seventh-day Adventists do not characterize swearing as a *spiritual*

issue, others disagree. When I asked another one of my participants to give me an

example of a spiritual issue regarding faculty members' expectations, she began with a

few general suggestions but quickly narrowed her response to make a comment on

swearing.

> How you keep the Sabbath. What you believe about Jesus. And, I mean, I know that's a nebulous topic. What you do with swearing. And I know that some people would say that that's a cultural thing. I see it as different than jewelry, for example, because it's kind of in your mind.

A Seventh-day Adventist in Australia would think nothing of using words like "damn"

and "hell" while others like the participant above would consider such practices an

indictment of one's spirituality. What these examples serve to illustrate is that within the

SDA church resides a sometimes wide continuum of what it might mean to be a SDA in

"good and regular standing." It also points out that some issues might be classified as

spiritual in nature by some and unrelated to spirituality by others.

Certain religious/spiritual expectations such as being a baptized member of the SDA church or practicing tithing are consistently codified throughout the SDA educational system regardless of the country, union, conference, or school. However, other expectations vary from school to school – often on "conservative-liberal" lines. Said one administrator, "But, typically, you know, schools have reputation that they are more open or more conservative or more liberal…" Another non-administrator echoed this observation:

> I think every school is different in that realm [i.e., spiritual expectations].
> Here we are considered a very conservative school, and so you just have to
> kind of understand what school you're at and what is allowed and what is not.

To just "kind of understand" is a much more nebulous proposition for teachers and staff faced with spiritual labor than if expectations were explicitly codified. That anyone working in a SDA boarding school might be expected to be a practicing SDA "in good and regular standing," that schools differ in what this requirement might look like in practice, and that it would be important for faculty/staff to attend to these differences is taken up by this former academy Bible teacher:

> Tammy: You said that faculty members are expected to live and uphold
> Adventist lifestyle standards, and I'm curious to know if that's always clear
> what those standards are, because – at least my observation, and I could be
> wrong – is that those standards are not always the same from school to school.

> Participant: Right. From community to community. Um… there are areas
> where theatre attendance is an absolute taboo and other areas where the elder
> might ask a group to come together and go watch the Da Vinci Code. Those
> are quite extremes. But, yeah, that does vary, and I think that a person needs
> to be aware of what the standards of their community are.

That these differences exist but that they are not necessarily formally written down or codified is also echoed by the following long-time academy teacher who has taught at a number of boarding academies in different areas of the country:

> I knew that in [name of conference] that I shouldn't put on a wedding ring. That was not in writing, but it was understood – that you'd better not do it or you might not have a job. And, um, going to the theatres to see movies used to be a no-no. Here at [name of school in a different conference] it is no big deal. Sometimes I think it depends on the school…Here we have probably three or four staff members who wear wedding rings.

Clearly these comments illustrate that schools differ in what might be considered spiritual or religious expectations in regards to what is acceptable/unacceptable for faculty and staff members to do or believe. That these variations are influenced by the conservative/liberal predilections of individual schools, conferences, or unions is also strongly illustrated in the previous exemplars.

How, then, do organizational members know what is expected of them in regards to these spiritual and religious expectations that may not be codified in official documents such as contracts or employment handbook? How do they come to know the specific expectations that might vary from school to school? The participants in this study mentioned one major means that served to communicate regional expectations –the employment interview. Therefore, I will briefly explicate how these expectations were communicated in the employment interviews of my participants. I will then develop a strong theme emerging from the qualitative interviews regarding the "unofficial" codification of spiritual expectations – this theme, *Like Knowing that the Sky is Blue*, will reveal that the sometimes unclear codification of spiritual and religious expectations emerges from an assumption that just being a SDA affords sufficient knowledge in and of itself.

"Unofficial" Codification: Conveying Expectations in the Interview Process. Though documents such as contracts or employment manuals may not always contain specific codification of spiritual/religious practices and behaviors, these expectations are

often conveyed more explicitly in other ways such as the interview process. The

following exchange illustrates:

> Tammy: Well, one of the things I'm looking at is how boarding teachers
> know what standards they are expected to uphold.
>
> Participant: When we were here, they sat us down for our interview and went
> over those.
>
> Tammy: And what did they go over?
>
> Participant: That we weren't to wear any type of jewelry, including wedding
> rings. We couldn't go to movies. Obviously couldn't drink or smoke.

The specific expectations conveyed in this interview went beyond the more general

official codified statement that one be a SDA in "good and regular standing." The

enjoinder that attending movies or wearing wedding rings would be prohibited at this

school reflects a more conservative stances on these issues than some practicing Seventh-

day Adventists would hold. However, it might be instructive to bring to mind the

observation that boarding academies are considered by many to be the "last bastion" of

conservative Adventism. That such conservative requirements would somehow be

communicated to potential boarding school teachers is not, therefore, surprising.

A second participant reinforces the role of the interview in relaying specific

expectations This participant had just returned from interviewing at another SDA

boarding school, and he shared a broad spectrum of the types of expectations that were

specifically relayed to him at that time.

> Participant: I went back to [name of state] and interviewed at that job at
> [name of school]. And they do – they are very specific about who they want
> to hire there. They are more conservative in their views than we are here.
>
> Tammy: So are they much more upfront and specific in what they expect
> from their staff?
>
> Participant: Yes. For example, I wear a wedding ring here. I wouldn't be
> able to wear my wedding ring there. When we go out to eat on tour, I go to
> Taco Bell and get my Burrito Supreme with meat in it. They would want me
> to not to do that there. I am drinking a cup of coffee as we speak—(laughter)

– that would not go there. I would not be able to go get a Coke on tour. I would need to drink a root beer. They don't allow the drums at all in any music, in praise music, or at any time – which I would love to have the same thing here, but [name of colleague] and I don't agree on that one, and so that's a constant battle. Um… they don't even allow a bass guitar when they do amateur hour and stuff like that. The kids cannot use the drums, they cannot use a bass when they perform. And, you know, they asked those questions, and they wanted to know [where I stood]. And there's a part of that [school's conservative stance] that I buy.

This example illustrates how specific expectations may be conveyed in the interview process. Also worthy of mention here is the observation that this participant did not necessarily agree with or practice all of the lifestyle expectations conveyed to him (i.e., use of caffeine, meat-eating, etc.), which places the information gained in the interview process in a particularly important light with relation to future discussions of possible dissonance attached to spiritual labor. If faculty/staff knowingly agree to work in a school where these expectations may not align with their own personal practices, how do they manage the potential dissonance? That question will be addressed in Chapter Six, but the topic is mentioned here to highlight the significance of the unofficial codification of expectations afforded by the interview process. Though faculty and staff may not actually read the organization's documents codifying spiritual and religious expectations, and though those expectations may be fraught with ambiguity, these expectations are often communicated to faculty/staff through other processes such as employment interviews.

Not only does the exemplar above illustrate how the interview process serves to convey spiritual/religious expectations, but it also represents how different schools might more specifically codify the general expectation that its faculty/staff be SDA Christians. Because these expectations vary from school to school, the interview process is even more important as it serves to convey what those expectations are and whether the school

holds a more conservative or liberal stance on these issues. In the following example, the

interview process proved instructive to the prospective faculty member in an unusual

manner. The following exchange occurred when discussing the issue of this participant's

struggle with whether to wear her wedding ring while a staff member on boarding school

campuses. It may be helpful to note that in some more conservative enclaves of the

church wearing a wedding ring might be considered a violation of the enjoinder that

Seventh-day Adventists be a modest and simple people who do not wear jewelry.

> Tammy: Did you wear your wedding band at [name of school]?
>
> Participant: Yeah. As a matter of fact, I was a little nervous about that. And…(laughs)… what happened was, um, uh….[name of husband] and I both have wedding bands, or rings. And, when we went for the interview, we wondered what we should do. We kept them on. We wanted them to know that we wore them. And, um… and here's the funny part. We're having our interview, and of course we're both observant people. And, um…. oh, and then we met the principal and everything. And as soon as we're done with the interview, you know, we come out and we whisper to each other, "He's wearing a wedding ring." (laughter)
>
> Tammy: Oh, you both noticed it!
>
> Participant: Yes. The principal is wearing his and the president [of the conference] is wearing his. And we're like, wow! This is a different conference.
>
> Tammy: So that's how you knew that this is going to be ok?
>
> Participant: Yes. So yeah… so it's just funny how everybody is different and different schools are different.

Whether or not wedding rings would be considered a spiritual issue that would be

regulated by the potential employer was an issue that initially remained unknown to this

participant. Her story reveals not only how these types of issues differ from place to

place, but also how faculty and staff members must often learn of these expectations

through unofficial channels – in this case, through observing the norms of those who

gave the interview. Thanks to the interview process, the stance of a school regarding the

conservative or liberal nature of general church standards can be communicated

(purposefully or tangentially) to those who might perform spiritual labor in various

schools.

The interview process thus serves as a means by which employees come to

understand what may not be officially codified in organizational documents. Yet the

process also allows the organization to assess not only the spirituality of potential

employees in general, but also potential employees' conservative or liberal stances on

spiritual issues. To illustrate, witness the following faculty member's recollection of the

interview process.

> Tammy: My question for you is how do you know what is expected of you
> religiously and spiritually as a staff member?
>
> Participant: Probably be the interviewing process that I went through in [two
> schools].
>
> Tammy: Talk about that a little bit.
>
> Participant: I met with the board at [name of school], and they asked me all
> kinds of personal questions as well as my belief system…. When I [went to a
> different school], however, I met with the personnel committee for the
> conference office, and I went through a very intense – a little over an hour
> maybe – grilling about what I believe.
>
> Tammy: Did they ask you about personal and spiritual beliefs?
>
> Interview: Yes. Daily devotions, where I was at with God. Yeah, very
> specific.

Extrapolating from the examples above, it is not difficult to determine that these

interviews are doubtless used to determine if potential faculty/staff members meet some

level of unwritten spiritual/religious expectations. Of the documents I examined, none of

the officially codified expectations regarding employees' spirituality listed the need to

have "daily devotions," for example. None of them indicated whether the school,

conference, or union would classify themselves as leaning towards the conservative or

liberal end of the SDA continuum. Yet, what the following experience related by a

young staff member illustrates is that the interview process is used to determine the

conservative expectation some schools may embrace.

> I mentioned [in the interview process] I was not conservative, and they totally
> freaked out. They called me later and said, "Are you really not conservative
> or what?" And I was like, why does that really matter, you know? So I mean,
> I believe in all the doctrines and everything and… anyway it's a little crazy.
> But you know, being from [name of city], I mean there are a whole gamut of
> people up there. There are conservative people, and there are not so
> conservative people, and they all live together, and it's great. And here it's
> like everybody is conservative. You know, no jewelry, no swimming on
> Sabbath, you know, yeah…

Clearly this participant knew from the interview process that the school in which she was

eventually employed was very conservative – far more conservative than she would

characterize herself (at other places in our conversation she talks about wearing her

jewelry off campus, for example). It also seems clear from this exemplar that the

school's officials knew she was not as conservative as they might prefer. Thus, the

interview process serves as a means on the part of both the organization and the potential

employee to discover and communicate stances on certain SDA lifestyle standards.

"Unofficial" Codification: Just Like Knowing that the Sky is Blue. In my quest to

investigate the nature of spiritual labor for organizational members in parochial boarding

schools, I explored the three attendant major components: the commodification,

codification, and regulation of faculty/staff's spirituality. Of these three elements my

participants were most often stymied regarding questions about codification. It was not

that spiritual and religious expectations related to their work as academy teachers/staff

were not codified in some official manner (i.e., in contracts, conference/union

employment handbooks, etc.). Many participants themselves reported clear knowledge

of contractual elements related to their spirituality. A number of others established that

these were conveyed to them via the interview process. Certain norms and expectations

clearly exist apart from official documentation and are very much in play, though they might differ in nature from school to school or administration to administration.

The question on the interview protocol about what faculty/staff were expected to do or believe in the spiritual and religious realm and how they came to know these expectations was often met with blank stares and long pauses. At first I thought this response may be due to the nature of the question; I thought perhaps it was vague, misleading or confusing. Yet I continued to ask it as part of my interview protocol. When the time came to analyze the whole of the qualitative interviews, a strong and persistent theme unexpectedly emerged from this question and the attendant responses; I have titled this theme *Just Like Knowing that the Sky is Blue*. My participants simply felt that the spiritual and religious expectations were so obvious and so intrinsically and inherently part of their ministry as boarding school teachers that no one need officially codify these for them. Just like one need not be told that the sky is blue, no one need tell them what was so patently obvious about the spiritual and religious expectations associated with being a SDA teacher in a SDA school. In this section, I will present how participants communicated the essence of this theme, particularly those who were raised in the SDA church. I will then share how the actual codification of religious and spiritual expectations proved problematic for the organization in some cases. Finally, I will offer some brief observations as to the implication this theme has regarding the spiritual labor of SDA boarding school teachers.

The fact that teachers/staff are expected to be Seventh-day Adventists in "good and regular standing" implies that they will believe and practice the tenets and doctrines of the church. These are "codified" in the sense that they are laid out in a book titled

Seventh-day Adventists believe... A Biblical exposition of 27 fundamental doctrines (General Conference, 2005).[5] However, it should be noted that Seventh-day Adventists are loathe to call these 27 Fundamental Beliefs their official "creed" as noted in the forward of the book: "We have not written this book to serve as a creed – a statement of beliefs set in theological concrete. Adventists have but one creed: 'The Bible, and the Bible alone'" (p. *vii*). Nevertheless, these beliefs are part of the baptismal vows, are outlined on the church's website "Fundamental Beliefs" (2005), and are noted in the SDA Department of Education's mission statement ("Mission and Scope," 2005). In other words, the 27 fundamental beliefs are well codified in documents familiar to church members. It is not surprising that a church organization whose large educational system is built on the spiritual principles espoused in these beliefs would require that its employees be Seventh-day Adventists who embrace these tenets.[6] In essence, this requirement is the first, almost unrecognizable, codification aspect of spiritual labor – almost unrecognizable in that church membership and adherence to the accepted doctrines and beliefs of the church are so much a part of the general assumption about what is expected regarding the nature of organizational members' spirituality that the expectation nearly goes unremarked.

The idea that the spiritual and religious expectations of SDA boarding school teachers would need to be overtly communicated or might be further codified beyond an inherent knowledge of the SDA church's belief system mystified my participants. Again

---

[5] At the 2005 General Conference session held in St. Louis, one other fundamental belief was added to this list for a total of 28 fundamental beliefs. See "Fundamental Beliefs" from http://www.adventist.org/beliefs/fundamental/index.html.

[6] Institutions of higher education in the SDA system do not always require their faculty to be Seventh-day Adventists.

note the need for a clarifying question in the following exchange with the participant who

provided the in vivo title of this section's theme:

> Tammy: Now, one of the questions I have on my interview protocol, is to describe the religious and spiritual expectations of academy teachers.
>
> Participant: Are you asking me to define the beliefs of the church?
>
> Tammy: Well, maybe not. Maybe I'm asking you… are you saying that staff are expected to hold those beliefs?
>
> Participant: Yes, they really are. Yes, they are.
>
> Tammy: OK. And how do you *know* those are the expectations?
>
> Participant: [pause] You know, I'm trying to remember if we ever signed a contract stating that we should believe this. But I don't remember that we did, because I would have been really uncomfortable about that. I don't believe that we did. But it was just, um, the same thing as knowing that the sky is blue.
>
> Tammy: OK, so it's just something that everybody kind of knows?
>
> Participant: Yes.

This participant seems to be asking me if I really want her to describe the beliefs of the

church as she assumes I already know these; she establishes that SDA boarding school

teachers automatically know these expectations because these are the same that would be

called for by the doctrines and tenets of the SDA church to which they belong – "It's an

unwritten thing. It's something you know." As another participant articulated, "Um… I

knew what the Seventh-day Adventist lifestyle was. I think anyone that is hired is a

Seventh-day Adventist… we are unique because we know what those standards are."

That my questions about what might be expected spiritually and religiously of

SDA boarding school teachers was often confusing to my participants is further

illustrated in the following examples. However, note how the confusion stems from the

seemingly obvious expectation that teachers and staff would have internalized SDA

beliefs in such a way that they need not be codified. This progression can be observed in

the following extended exchange:

185

Tammy: What would you say that faculty members in a Seventh-day Adventist boarding school are expected to believe religiously or spiritually? What does it take to work here?

Participant: I think we have our own… Seventh-day Adventists have their own value system, guidelines that they live by. If they were to come to our school, I feel they need to abide by it.

Tammy: The faculty?

Participant: Oh, are you talking about the faculty or the students?

Tammy: The faculty.

Participant: Oh, what would I tell an adult?

Tammy: Yes, someone who didn't know anything about boarding schools, what are the expectations for faculty and staff…

Participant. On a Seventh-day Adventist boarding school?

Tammy: In order to work here, what would be the expectations religiously and spiritually?

Participant: I think someone as much as possible should incorporate the Bible in the classroom. You know, I think it would be great to pray in the classroom. um… You know, draw as much as you can from the Bible in the classroom because that is the standard that we live by. Whereas in public schools, you know, you can't say anything like that. I think your life has to reflect your religious beliefs because that is sometimes more important than praying in the classroom.

Tammy: So how do staff members know that these are the things expected of them?

Participant: Okay, are we talking about new Seventh-day Adventist staff members, or non SDA's?

Tammy: No, just staff members who come to work at a boarding school. How do they know?

Participant: They don't.

Tammy: They don't?

Participant: They don't.

Tammy: Okay, let's explore this a little bit.

Participant: Nobody told me.

Tammy: Well, how did you find out then?

Participant: How did I come to that point? Actually, no one told me. And I think when I first started teaching, no one told me, you know, that this is a Seventh-day Adventist boarding school. They just assumed because you are a

Seventh-day Adventist that your life would reflect the life of a Seventh-day Adventist.

The twists and turns of the exchange above are interesting to parse. This participant at first thinks I am asking about the religious/spiritual expectations of students, even though my question clearly asks about faculty. Then the participant asks if I am talking about Adventists or non-Adventists – apparently because there might be a different answer for each. My whole question seems so incomprehensible that this participant keeps trying to make sense of it. One can almost imagine the mental gymnastics – 'Is she talking about students? Is she asking about non-Adventists? Why would she ask that question in the first place?' The implication in her answer is that just as no one need tell her she was working in a SDA school, no one need *tell* her what the spiritual expectations of working in that institution would be – such expectations need not be codified by her school because just *being* a SDA implicitly afforded that knowledge. Such responses were common, very much like one might imagine the results of asking an adult, "What color is the sky?" It is easy to envision that in this situation there would be a pause, a quick glance to make sure one heard the question correctly, some mental processing as to why another seemingly intelligent and sentient adult would find need to ask such an obvious question, and then in a slow measured tone, with a slight lilting of the voice up at the end of the word, would come the answer, "Blue." Imagine such a scenario in the following exchange:

> Tammy: My next question is what are the religion and spiritual expectations for faculty members on a boarding school campus?
>
> Interview: Um… well…. to uphold the principles of the Bible and the… and the beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist church, to live them. Now, that's a very general answer to your question. We are… um… academy teachers are to be examples of what any member of the SDA church should be. The same standard you would expect of your pastor.….

> Tammy: (chuckles) The way you kind of actually answered my question was like kind of, "Well, duh."
>
> Participant: Yeah! (chuckles)

As this participant and I had actually worked together in a boarding school, we had a previous relationship. Hence, I felt comfortable asking him if I had picked up correctly on his non-verbal response to my question. Because his reply to my question mirrored the scenario I posed earlier regarding asking an adult the color of the sky, I inferred by the nature of his response that the question seemed obvious.

These participants offer tautological responses to my inquiries in the line of "I know because I know" or "I know what the expectations are for a SDA teacher because I am a Seventh-day Adventist." In the realm of spiritual labor then, expecting that teachers in the SDA system be members "in good and regular standing" implies that these teachers have a deep and intuitive understanding of these expectations which need not be explicitly codified further by the school because they are all ready well-known by virtue of church membership alone.

That these expectations are tied to the codified 27 fundamental belief of the church (doctrines which might be considered "codified" in the sense that they are published by the official church body) is illustrated by the following exemplar:

> Tammy: Talk about teachers and staff as far as their own personal spiritual and religious practices and beliefs and what are they expected to do or believe as staff members in a Seventh-day Adventist boarding school.
>
> Participant: We are expected to believe in and follow the 27 doctrines. I guess, fit inside that mold and emulate that mold. It's something that I've always grown up with so it's so instilled in me that I'm not sure how to answer. I've not been asked that question before, so it's like, "Oh!" Say that question again.
>
> Tammy: What are staff members expected to do and believe spiritually? What is expected of them?

> Participant: To really believe in and follow the guidelines set by the church…
>
> Tammy: You seem pretty clear on what was expected. You acted like it was such an obvious question.
>
> Participant: No, not really. I don't think I've really been asked that before, but it's like having been raised in the church… it's just what I do.

Again, one can see that clarification is needed for this participant regarding the question ("Say that question again"), though her response was virtually the same the first time as the second. However, this participant also notes that "it's just what I do," implying that belief in these doctrines and tenets is deeply ingrained – so much so that even the idea that spiritual expectations would be codified by their school seems strange, indeed, to many of these participants.

"Unofficial Codification": Unto the Third and Fourth Generation. Essentially, the issue of codification when it comes to spiritual labor is the process by which organizational members come to know what is spiritually mandated by their organizations. The use of the term "codification" also implies that these expectations are organizationally acknowledged and communicated in some fashion. What the sections above illustrate is that in the case of spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools, expectations are, indeed, codified to greater or lesser degree of specificity, but faculty/staff in boarding schools seem to recognize their general spiritual expectations because they are part of the SDA church. Moreover, these participants were aware of the general mandate that they be Seventh-day Adventists in good and regular standing. However, they were mystified when I asked them *how* the organization conveyed this expectation and *what* it meant (specifically) to be a Seventh-day Adventist. The theme *Like Knowing the Sky is Blue* reflects the response that, "I know because I know." When pressed even further – when asked to think about a question many had never been asked

(i.e., "*how* do you know what you know?") – participants reveal that they 'know what they know' regarding spiritual expectations because that knowledge has been passed on to them from generation to generation. This emergent theme, *Unto the Third and Fourth Generation*, will serve to illustrate *how* participants come to know "the sky is blue" with regards to the spiritual expectations embedded in the spiritual labor they perform.

Put very simply, many participants knew what was expected of them in light of SDA beliefs not only because they were members of the church but because they had *grown up* as Seventh-day Adventists. When asked *how* one came to know what the spiritual expectations were of SDA boarding school teachers, these typical responses would follow:

> Well, I've never had an administrator set me down and tell me. Um… I didn't learn it in college. So, I guess I can't answer that… I mean, I… I grew up… I'm 50, and I grew up… I've been in the church basically all my life. So it's part of… it's just kind of a way of life.
>
> …
>
> I don't know because you're talking to a fourth, fifth generation Adventist, and it's just…known. This is what you do. This is what you're going to do. This is how it is.

When some participants like the ones above said that they just didn't know how one comes to discover the spiritual expectations inherent in their jobs, I pressed them a bit. Here is an example of such an exchange:

> Tammy: Well, are you suggesting that these expectations are just things that people should know when they get into the work?
>
> Participant: Oh…this is very hard because, see, I am a sixth generation Adventist. So it is so ingrained in me. OK, I'm trying to think – what if I was going to a Catholic school where I don't have any frame of reference? I would take it upon myself to look at their handbook or any rule that a student was expected to abide by. I certainly would assume that I'm supposed to do the same thing. And if they are not supposed to drink alcohol, I would assume I'm not supposed to drink alcohol. Is that fair?

This participant struggles mightily to guess how someone who didn't already know the

expectations would otherwise come to discover them. She suggests that perhaps they

would go to some officially codified format such as a student handbook. She struggles to

answer my question. Her example is strained, and she recognizes this fact (i.e., "Is that

fair?"). As a sixth generation SDA, she simply cannot relate to one who might not come

into a position not already having a firm grasp on what Seventh-day Adventists believe.

As many reiterated, "[these are] standards I've held all my life." Said one participant

regarding the spiritual expectations for those who work in boarding schools:

> Some of those things [spiritual expectations], though, I think are a matter of
> whether you're raised an Adventist, or at least strong in Adventism. You just
> take for granted that these [faculty/staff] know. They know what the
> standards are. They know what the lifestyle is, you know.

Knowing what standards are expected of them as teachers/staff members in a SDA school

seems for many people to be like knowing the sky is blue. Growing up SDA contributes

to this ingrained knowledge that one of the aspects of spiritual labor as Adventist

educators is to have adopted the beliefs, doctrines, and lifestyle standards of the SDA

church as these are passed on from generation to generation. From these participants it

seems clear that spiritual expectations might be codified via personnel handbooks,

contracts, interviews or employment manuals, but these types of codification are less

salient than what they already know in the heart – just like knowing that the sky is blue.

Codification of Spirituality: Observations and Summary

Thus far it is clear that those performing spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools

are required to believe and uphold the doctrines and tenets of the SDA church

(somewhere on the conservative/liberal line appropriate to the individual school), that this

requirement is codified (officially and unofficially), that these Seventh-day Adventist

beliefs themselves are also codified, and that it is assumed faculty/staff will know and have internalized these beliefs and practices by virtue of their church membership. As one participant shared, "I hate to say it, but I don't think we ever really get any doctrinal lessons, so to speak, on what they [school administrators] expect of us because they seem to expect us to be, you know, tried and true old-time Adventists." Thus, the spiritual expectations that make up one element of the spiritual labor of teachers/staff in SDA boarding school are inextricably bound to the spiritual and religious tenets of their church. That these requirements are to participants like background noise is also apparent. For many it has not even entered their minds that such requirements would need to be codified by their schools at all; it is *Like Knowing the Sky is Blue*.

As will become apparent in the next chapter regarding spiritual dissonance of organizational members, not all so seamlessly accept the beliefs and practices of their SDA upbringing. Not all will agree on what it means to be a SDA in "good and regular standing," and some will voice surprisingly divergent views from the published 27 fundamental beliefs of the SDA church. To assume that because faculty and staff members teach in a SDA boarding school, they therefore personally embrace the 27 fundamental doctrines of the SDA church, is an assumption that proves tenuous at best. As one participant offered: "…both the administration of the school and the staff of a school, make assumptions sometimes towards what they think is OK or what they think is acceptable, and a lot of it is not spelled out and clarified."

Where will these observations fit with this study of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools? The implications of the "codification" element of spiritual labor outlined above are layered and nuanced and bring up a number of questions. First, if

teachers knowingly accept employment in an institution that does not align with their own personal religious/spiritual beliefs and practices, how do they manage the dissonance that would seem inevitable? How do teachers/staff relate to the delicacies of signing an official contract that includes spiritual practices with which they do not personally agree (i.e., tithing)? If certain spiritual and religious expectations are just assumed, how do organizations and their members regulate divergence or non-conformity? These are only a sample of the issues that the "codification" element of spiritual labor presents, many of which will begin to be addressed in the following section regarding the "regulation" component of spiritual labor.

The Regulation of Spiritual Labor

The idea that the spirituality of organizational members would be commodified and codified are two of the three linchpins of spiritual labor. The third and final element that defines spiritual labor is the concept of regulation – a concept which is coupled with the notion of codification. If rules and regulations, norms and expected practices, are codified either in official documents and/or within the culture and climate of communities, the fact that these would be regulated in some fashion becomes important in the study of spiritual labor. If codified expectations are not accompanied by some sort of accountability, then these codified spiritual expectations become more like suggestions rather than "rules," the term "labor" would hardly seem appropriate, and there would be little incentive for organizational members to act in a manner that might create dissonance for them. Hence, in this next section I will give some attention to this notion of "regulation" within the context of teachers/staff who engage in spiritual labor within the total institution context of the parochial boarding school. Primarily utilizing the qualitative interviews, with an occasional reference to employment handouts and

193

participant-provided documents, I will outline both formal and informal aspects of the regulation of spiritual labor in the context of faculty/staff in SDA academies.

A strong and consistent theme throughout the interview data was the acknowledgment that violations of spiritual expectations might bring very real consequences or repercussions. When talking about what happens to those organizational members who violate the spiritual/religious expectations of their work, participants would talk about "getting busted," or offer comments such as, "I did not like my paycheck being tied to my spirituality." Some of these regulatory mechanisms were enacted and pursued by the organization itself in a more formal process. This type of formal regulation might involve the confrontation of members who did not meet the spiritual expectations incumbent upon them. Not surprisingly, egregious violations may result in the loss of employment or transfer to another school within the system. These processes will be addressed in the themes titled *Confrontation* and *Movin' Out/Movin' On*. Other regulatory mechanisms, however, were more informal in nature. The regulation of spiritual labor often emanated not from official organizational channels, but from other organizational members in a form of concertive control. The theme *Intervention* will develop this mode of informal regulation. Finally, after outlining both formal and informal means of regulating spiritual labor, I will briefly note the relationship between "deep acting" and the codification and regulation of spiritual labor.

Regulation of Spiritual Labor: Confrontation

The participants in this study revealed strong perceptions of what happens to those who violate the spiritual expectations incumbent upon boarding school faculty/staff. The first of these is the notion of confrontation – direct communication

between principals, superintendents, or conference officials and those organizational

members who may be violating spiritual expectations.

Confrontation often serves as a "reminder" of organizationally expected spiritual

expectations. The participant below concisely summarizes this "confrontation" aspect of

the regulation of spiritual labor. He is responding to the interview question designed to

explore the repercussions for those who violate codified expectations:

> Um, generally the administration will approach them [faculty/staff] and say,
> "Were you not aware of such and such?" And they will say, "No." And they [the
> administration] will say, "Well, now you are aware of it. Get in line." And they
> [faculty/staff] generally do. And it just involves a gentle slap on the fingers and
> communicating in more fuller detail what is expected.

The codification aspect of spiritual labor discussed earlier revealed that some

expectations for faculty/staff are often vague due to the assumption that members already

know what spiritual practices and behaviors Seventh-day Adventists would embrace.

This participant reflects what is often the first step in the regulation process of spiritual

labor and that is reminding employees what the standards are in the first place. After this

clarification process, organizational members are enabled to "get in line" with those

expectations.

A particular example mentioned numerous times with regard to this initial

regulation through confrontation/communication was the mention of the consequences

for employees who violate the codified expectation that church employees pay tithe:

> If somebody is out of line then hopefully a principal or administration will come
> and talk to the individual. I know what happened with [name of colleague] and
> not paying tithe. Not that he wasn't paying tithe, but that he wasn't reporting it.
> And they talked to me because I was kind of in the same boat.

This participant was "talked to" because she did not pay tithe – a codified expectation of

church employees such as herself. By coincidence, the colleague she references was also

a participant in my study. He gives more details into the incident alluded to above. By

way of background information, during the time of these faculty members' tenure in the

SDA educational system, the church asked all of its employees (including boarding

school teachers) to report the exact amount of their tithe. In and of itself, this practice

can be seen as obvious, overt regulation, and the resentment it created was still palpable

many years after the practice was discontinued. In any case, the colleague referred to

above tells his side of the story. The following vignette reveals how faculty members

who violated codified spiritual practices or beliefs (in this case a formally codified one in

tithe paying) would be first confronted.

> Participant: Remember the form we used to have to fill out at the end of each year to show how much tithe we had turned in?
>
> Tammy: Yes, yes I do.
>
> Participant: Every time I got that, I wrote on it in big letters, across the whole page,"10%", folded it up and sent it in. (laughter) And [the conference treasurer] came to my office one day and said, "I need to talk to you about your form." And he takes it out… (chuckles)…
>
> Tammy: He had it with him?
>
> Participant: He had it with him. And he said, "What we want you to do is fill out each month what you turned in."
>
> Participant: [The conference treasurer] talked to me more than that one year. I would say at least twice if not three times he talked to me about it. Every year consistently that's all I would write on [the form], "10%," fold it up and send it in.

This participant was "talked to" numerous times in the course of his tenure at the school

in an attempt to encourage him to comply with the expectation that he report to the

church the amount of his tithe. During the course of these conversations it is apparent

that the conference treasurer felt he needed to enlighten this participant not only on the

issue (paying tithe) but the need to cooperate with the regulatory mechanism in place for

ensuring compliance (i.e., the form to be filled out every year).

The tithing expectation is clearly codified to organizational members. However,

in the codification section of this chapter, I illustrated how informal norms and

expectations are sometimes difficult to parse because they change from school to school

and location to location. Whether or not these are initially known to faculty does not

mean violations are not regulated, as the following example will illustrate. By way of

explanation, this faculty had just joined the SDA church when he began his work at this

particular boarding school, so he was unaware of some of the Adventist norms regarding

dietary principles such as vegetarianism. He tells the story of inadvertently violating this

expectation and the regulatory consequences of his actions:

> Some [expectations] you are not aware of. For instance, when I first started
> working at [name of academy]… of course, I wasn't completely vegetarian. I
> didn't know a whole lot about all of it, and I can remember going out with some
> young people [on a school activity], and afterwards they wanted to have
> something to eat. So we went to a fast food place, and they [the students] wanted
> to know if they could get fish sandwiches. I had a fish sandwich. Well, when
> they got back to the academy, of course, they blew it right away. "Mr. [name of
> participant] let us eat fish sandwiches!" The next day the principal called me up
> to the office and said, "We don't eat meat when we go out on activities."

This participant violated the school policy regarding vegetarianism both by allowing

students to buy meat and by eating it himself. Though I found no codified policy that

required faculty members to be practicing vegetarians, SDA boarding school cafeterias

do not serve meat in recognition of vegetarianism as part of a healthy lifestyle; for the

SDA church a healthy lifestyle is often tied to spirituality in that the body is seen as the

"temple of God" (I Corinthians 6:19; see also General Conference, 2005). Not all

Seventh-day Adventists are vegetarians, nor would all place health issues so firmly in the

spiritual realm. In this light the example above illustrates how the church's boarding

schools hold a more conservative stance on health principals such as vegetarianism. The

particular school referenced in the exemplar above held norms requiring faculty to

practice vegetarianism when they were with the students. Those who did not do so

(publicly at least) found that such a lapse might be regulated; in this case, the participant

was "called into the office." As one former administrator revealed with regards to dealing with faculty who do not comply with spiritual expectations, "When you begin to hear of those issues I think you have to confront the teacher. And as long as they publicly, um, perform, then there's probably not a lot you can do about that."

Regulation of the practices of teachers/staff on a boarding school campus often begins with "confrontation" – a confrontation that need not be combative (as the connotative sense of the word might suggest). Confrontation can also serve to communicate expectations to those who might be unaware and to serve notice that non-compliance or uncooperativeness may carry further consequences, i.e., to put one's employment in jeopardy, an aspect of regulation that I will next develop.

Movin' Out and Movin' On: Termination. The term "Movin' Out" refers to the termination (or threatened termination) of employment due to the violation of spiritual expectations while *Movin' On* captures the idea of transfer to another institution. Both of these themes illustrate how the regulatory mechanism of spiritual labor may manifest itself – particularly if confrontation does not prove effective. In the following section, I will first focus on the *Movin' Out* portion of this theme.

The idea that regulation includes terminating employment seemed perfectly clear to the participants in this study, even to those who willfully admitted that they may not be in line with all of the spiritual expectations accompanying their work at the school. The following participant outlines a few of the areas where she and the organized SDA church would clearly differ. She then articulates the consequences she perceives would eventually have fallen her way:

> Participant: I don't think I would have left [the academy] if it weren't for the living circumstances. The school might have gotten rid of me eventually, but I

didn't feel the need to leave them because I was pretty frank with the kids about where I stood on things and the way I approached issues they had.

Tammy: Which was different from the school's official stands it sounds like.

Participant: Yes.

Tammy: All right. So you were really open with the students in the fact that you disagreed with some of the policies of the school?

Participant: Yes. And not only with the policies of the school itself, but perhaps with, uh – since it was a church institution – perhaps with the approach of the church itself – the spirituality.

Tammy: Wow.

Participant: Yeah, I probably would have got fired sooner or later. …. So, as you can see, I probably do not fit the Adventist mold very closely in something as fundamental as, um, the authority of the Bible because I think we define what we are going to use and what we are not.

Tammy: So, are you saying, then, that there are certain things that you were so, probably, far away from what would be the traditional center…

Participant: Yes.

Tammy: …that that would have been your demise, eventually?

Participant: I think so, yeah.

Tammy: Hmmm. Because you would have shared those with people, or…

Participant: Uh, I'm not real good at biting my tongue all the time. I think I probably would have said something to [name of colleague] or to somebody else in my moment of frustration.

It might be interesting to note that this teacher left boarding school work of her own

volition due to circumstances unrelated to her basic disagreements with some of the

spiritual philosophies and expectations inherent in SDA boarding school work. As she

reiterated a bit later in the interview, "They [the school] might have gotten rid of me, but

I wouldn't, probably, have seen the necessity of getting rid of them." Despite this rather

amicable and voluntary parting between her and the school, it is eminently clear that she

was aware of the regulation aspect of violating the spiritual expectations that accompany

such a job ("I would have gotten fired sooner or later"). It is also clear that this

regulation aspect of her spiritual labor was an ever-present element (i.e., "sooner or

later," "eventually," etc.) and that rising frustration or moments of indiscretion might

have prompted enough notice to trigger regulatory intervention on the organization's part.

This understanding that being fired was one of the possible consequences for

violating the codified expectations of spiritual labor was often spoken in the abstract –

this is what *might* happen *if* expectations were violated.

> Tammy: You know, you said that if people knew where you stood [on spiritual matters] that you would have been fired.
>
> Participant: Oh, in a minute!

The specter of regulation also served to regulate faculty members' behavior in practice.

In these more conservative enclaves, wearing a wedding ring may have regulatory

consequences – consequences and potential controversy that the following participant

sees fit to avoid:

> Participant: I knew that in [name of conference] that I shouldn't put on a wedding ring. That was not in writing, but it was understood – that you'd better not do it or you might not have a job.

Later in the interview in response to what he might do or how he might behave

differently in his spiritual/religious life if/when he wasn't on a boarding school campus,

this participant continues the thought:

> Participant: When I go to the North American Division [education] convention I won't put it on. No need. Only when we were on vacation a long ways away from the school would we put on the wedding rings...
>
> Tammy. And what were the reasons why?
>
> Participant: Perceptions that that would be – perceptions on my part and the little bit I picked up here and there, that that would be frowned upon by the conference and the administration and that it might endanger my job.

The very perception of potential regulation with regards to violated expectations serves to

alter this participant's behavior when he associates with other Adventist educators or

when he is on the job itself. Because the nature of boarding school work is all-

encompassing (see Chapter Four), he must go "a long ways away from the school" before

he dares violate these standards. Such an example serves to illustrate not only that

faculty/staff have strong perceptions of the regulatory consequences of violating spiritual

expectations (i.e., "it might endanger my job"), but that they often alter their behavior as

a result of this regulation.

Altering their behavior may include not speaking publicly about their beliefs or

simply trying to avoid situations where their actions would potentially endanger their

employment status. In the following exchange I follow up a conversation about why this

former faculty member assiduously avoided teaching the "Sabbath School" lesson (i.e., a

"Sunday school" equivalent):

> Tammy: Would you have been able to teach the Sabbath School lesson if they
> had something in there you didn't believe?
>
> Participant: No, because it would always lead to something that would be a
> problem.
>
> Tammy: Why would that be a problem?
>
> Participant: Because I wouldn't want to be fired.
>
> (loud laughter)
>
> Tammy: You are like, duh!

What is barely under the surface in the conversation above is the idea that this former

faculty's divergent thinking regarding spiritual issues held by the formal church was

dangerous to her employment status should that divergence become known. To keep

from encountering the regulatory aspects of spiritual labor, this staff member simply

keeps quiet. As another participant stated

> Well, even if another teacher has a differing spiritual belief… maybe, oh, heaven
> forbid, the state of the dead, or whatever, you know…. Usually, they're bright
> enough to keep that to themselves, because they want to keep the job, see?

Keeping quiet reduces the chances that others will know that expectations have been

violated and thus the chances that regulation of those violations will take place. One

faculty member noted the "fear" that might attend the regulatory process in the following

exchange:

> Tammy: Apparently from what it sounds like that there are certain spiritual and religious expectations for staff members. What happens to those who violate those expectations?
>
> Participant: I think it is a process. I've not experienced the process but in my mind what is set in place is that you would be talked to by the principal, or your boss, and the principal and your boss might talk and then it might go to the board, and you would have to make decisions based on that. You would either have to comply or they would let you go.
>
> Tammy: Have you ever known anybody who has gone through that process?
>
> Participant: No. I think there is a certain…undercurrent of…I want to say fear, but I'm not sure it is fear…at that process. Though you would actually probably resign before you got to that point. And I have seen *that* happen.

The "fear" or discomfort with the process outlined above illustrates how unpleasant the

regulation aspect of spiritual labor can be for organizational members. As a former

principal noted:

> I have had situations when I've talked with someone, and they have voluntarily chosen to resign rather than face – if you want to use that term – the "inquiry process." I would always give the employee that opportunity, you know, to share that this is an issue with them, and if they want to go through the process, depending on the issue and where they are with that… Or I would have to tell them I think this can be a rough road, but you're welcome to do that. You are going to go one way or the other.

The "going one way or another" refers to either complying or moving to another place of

employment. This moving out can be "voluntary" in the form of resigning, or non-

compliance can result in involuntary termination of employment. Such a process is

unpleasant whichever choice one makes. These examples illustrate the powerful and

sometimes uncomfortable nature of the regulatory aspects of spiritual labor, that the

effect of its regulatory nature includes molding behavior and practices, and that the

consequences of violating spiritual expectations may change what organizational

members do or do not talk about regarding their own spiritual values.

Lest the regulation aspect of violating spiritual expectations be seen only as one that faculty/staff imagine *might* happen, it would be instructive to also share incidences where employees were terminated in practice. One participant offered the following example of a faculty/staff member who violated clearly stated expectations:

> Participant: There was one fellow who, um… I believe you would consider this in the area of some spiritual guidelines. Um… when it came to videos viewed in his home…. It became known that, um…. He had two kids in academy, and they would invite their friends up on Saturday night to stay over. And they would watch R-rated movies. And so he was asked to stop that, and, uh, one of the things that happens just about everywhere, when somebody crosses the line, you've got to make a rule that applies to everybody. So the policy of the school became – no videos would be shown in your home to any student, other than your own family members.

> Tammy: No videos at all?

> Participant: No videos at all would be shown to any student. If you had kids in your home – and as you well know, kids come to your home, they are invited to your home for one thing or another – um, no videos, period, would be shown. And so, towards the end of the year, it came to the attention of the staff again – and I was part of the executive committee which were the ultimate directors of the school and all that took place – it came to our attention that the faculty member was ignoring that, and that videos continued to be shown. And another issue came up about the same time, and he was told that he better start looking for another job. He could continue until the end of the year.

Extrapolating from the details of this story, the showing of R-rated movies did not appear to be of particular concern to the staff member who continued this practice despite the codified rule outlawing such practice. Though not initially codified as part of the faculty's job expectations, the fact that the school saw fit to make a rule regarding faculty behavior in this manner clearly indicated the expectation that showing movies (particularly R-rated ones) was not a practice condoned by the school. Largely as a result of ignoring these expectations, this faculty member was counseled to "start looking for another job." That ignoring codified expectations has consequences regarding the "regulation" of spiritual labor is illustrated in these examples.

Movin' Out and Movin' On: Transfer

The violation of codified expectations result in termination of employment, but violations may also involve the possibility of being transferred to another school. In reality, simply terminating employment or not renewing a contract is the response of last resort. More commonly, part of the regulation process is to "move people on."

This practice essentially involves faculty and staff voluntarily finding employment in another SDA boarding academy or day school. However, the "voluntary" nature of *Movin' On* is often influenced by the organization's encouragement to find another place of employment in order to avoid possible termination. One staff member explains this regulatory action in response to the question regarding the consequences for those who violate the spiritual and religious expectations of the school:

> Participant: Professionally a lot of times they'll be moved on.
>
> Tammy: What does that mean?
>
> Participant: That means they'll not be hired here, but if another [SDA] school wants to pick them up, they [the administrators] will give them a good recommendation.

Given the fact that schools in different regions may differ in how conservative or liberal they choose to approach certain standards of the church, the practice of moving people on to another school rather than completely terminating employment from the church and its educational system offers a twist on the regulation aspect of spiritual labor – organizational members are often able to stay in the "system" and try to find a niche where their own behaviors and practices meet the approbation of those who regulate the spiritual expectations involved in spiritual labor. One former principal shares his own personal approach to regulation that includes initial confrontation and ends with this idea of "moving on":

> Tammy. So what would you do as an administrator if you had faculty or staff members who were not meeting those expectations that you just laid out?

> Participant . Probably talk with them number one…. And share the principles that have…that I have seen successful in school situations, in school life, and a spiritual growth of a campus…. If I felt that what was happening by a staff member was detrimental, then I would have to approach them and share with them, "You know, from my comfort zone, and our constituency's comfort zone, taking into consideration board feelings, input, etc., it might be [you] have to choose a different location."

It is not untypical for faculty and staff to move from boarding school to boarding school within the Adventist system (i.e., "to choose a different location"). Not all move to a different SDA institution for regulatory reasons, but the issue of regulation of spiritual labor means that some will be encouraged to find another school that better matches their own personal spiritual practices and beliefs within the strictures of the SDA church. That the "moving on" may not always be a strictly voluntary activity has already been established but is further emphasized by the following comment by a staff member who did not always completely comply with the tithing requirement of his job:

> This is the first conference that sent me a letter asking "Are you paying tithe?" and, "Sign this piece of paper [that says you are paying tithe]." I've never heard of anyone being fired for not tithing, but they [the administration] will use that as an excuse to say, "You need to move on."

The "they" referred to in the comment above encompasses the organizational hierarchy responsible for determining employment – a combination of the board, principal, and educational superintendent. It is clear that terminating employment is an unpleasant activity for all. "Moving people on" serves to mitigate the ugliness that may accompany outright termination, avoids the airing of the faculty member's deviance, and allows schools to move or pass along organizational members who do not meet officially or unofficially codified expectations. That faculty member themselves take advantage of

the practice of "moving on" will become evident in Chapter Six regarding strategies used to manage the dissonance that may attend spiritual labor in a boarding school setting.

It should not go unremarked, however, that faculty/staff members who deviate from codified spiritual or religious expectations may not be confronted with the formal regulatory measures of *Movin' Out/Movin' On*. There may be far-reaching repercussions, nevertheless. Two examples will illustrate. The first picks up the story told earlier of the participant who refused to comply with regulatory mechanism designed to determine if employees were paying tithe. Recall that he simply wrote "10%" on the form rather than report the actual amount of tithe paid. Though he was repeatedly confronted, his position was not terminated, and he does not report that he "moved on" in response to this non-compliance. However, he does feel strongly that his refusal to comply with this codified expectation carried repercussions for his career in the church system as a whole. When asked about these repercussions he replies,

> I believe that when I once again turned in applications [to be a pastor] and sent in a résumé applying for a position back in the conference, that the two positions that the conference knew I took exception with them on – women's ordination and filling out that tithe form – caused my résumé to be ignored.

Whether these repercussions were true is less important than he perceived them to be so. That the SDA educational system is integrally tied to a broad church organization implies that reputations can ripple throughout the system. The repercussions of not aligning with spiritual/religious expectations can impact employment in other tangential ways as illustrated by the following example regarding a faculty member who was ostensibly not re-hired for other reasons (i.e., low enrollment), but whose previous actions influenced that decision:

> Tammy: What happens to staff member who don't meet expectations in the religious or spiritual realm?

Participant: What do I see happening to them? Do they get fired, or what?

Tammy: Your perspective.

Participant: My perspective? We had an individual who was released of his [job]…. we didn't have enough students. He was released of his job because his job could be absorbed by others. Because he was, uh, known for showing movies that were, like, "Men in Black" and things that were, like…. OK? Which made people think that this guy isn't the kind of spiritual leader we wanted on our campus. So when the time came when they had to make a cut, it formed some direction.

Tammy: He wasn't directly fired because of those things?

Participant: No. But they played a part in his…uh…ability to be able to stay on when the crunch time came.

As indicated above, one of the unexpected consequences of not aligning with the expectations of the particular campus on which one works is the failure to be seen as a "spiritual leader." Since the commodification of spirituality in a boarding school includes the promise that faculty will be spiritual leaders, that they will interact with students and hopefully influence them to make spiritual choices consistent with the worldview of the SDA church, perceived deviance from that leadership role is seen to be detrimental to the school. While such behavior may not be directly confronted, the examples above serve to illustrate that regulation might occur behind the scenes. Though one may not be confronted, may not have employment terminated, or may not be transferred to another school, deviation from spiritual expectations can, nevertheless, carry potential consequences for those who perform spiritual labor in SDA boarding schools.

Formal Regulation of Spirituality: Summary

The formal regulation of spiritual/religious expectations associated with spiritual labor include being confronted by administration either to clarify or communicate vague expectations or to serve as the equivalent of firing a warning shot across the bow – a

warning shot that presages further regulatory actions such as *Movin' Out,* i.e., terminating

employment, or just *Movin' On*, i.e., finding employment at another school, conference,

or union. This process paints a picture of one mode of regulation – the formal type in

which the organization itself clearly orchestrates the regulatory mechanisms, whether by

confrontation or termination/change of employment. Ending the discussion of the

regulation aspect of spiritual labor here, however, would be misleading – it would ignore

another aspect of control that serves to regulate organizational members. This is the

more concertive control that emanates not from the upper levels of the organization's

hierarchy but from other organizational members themselves. It is to this aspect of

"informal" regulation that I now turn my attention.

"Informal" Regulation of Spiritual Labor

The term "Regulation" captures the sense of the effort to preserve norms, rules,

expectations, etc. Regulation in this sense may come in the form of officially sanctioned

processes administered by principals, educational superintendents, school boards, etc.

However, this section is devoted to another aspect of regulating spiritual labor – that is

the unofficial, concertive control at the hands of organizational members. When an

organization replaces (or augments) their more formally codified expectations with less

explicit values and norms, the locus of enforcement changes from 'management' to the

concertive control of organizational members working to preserve these shared values,

norms, etc. (see Barker, 1999; Tomkins & Cheney, 1995). What emerged in this study is

the place these other organizational members played in the regulation of spiritual labor.

Because SDA schools (including boarding academies) are part of a larger church

organization, and because individual schools are tied by geographical location and

monetary support to a certain constituency (i.e., conferences, unions, etc.), the range of

who could be considered organizational members greatly expands beyond those residing

on the campus itself. Not only administration and conference/union officials, but also

parents, students, other faculty, and local SDA church members in general may play a

part in the regulation of those who work in the SDA educational system.

The many stories of "Intervention" on the part of "unofficial" sources emerging

from the qualitative interviews illustrate this eponymous theme. I will share a

representative sample of these incidents below to illustrate the wide-ranging nature of this

type of informal regulation or concertive control at the hands of church members,

parents, other staff, and general on-lookers. These examples will serve to illustrate that

the regulation of organizational members' spiritual labor occurs far beyond what might

be considered official organizational channels.

Informal Regulation of Spirituality: Intervention. The choice of the term

"Intervention" to capture the nature of the informal regulation of spiritual labor refers to

the influence that other organizational members wield to bring pressure for compliance to

spiritual expectations. It also captures the sense that in many cases "intervention" is

often initiated to preserve not only organizational norms, but the spiritual well-being of

other colleagues and/or the students themselves. In the following section, I will illustrate

how organizational members practice "intervention" in a variety of ways.

The first of the incidences illustrates how informal regulation might occur at the

hands of church members. It is important to note that faculty/staff members are almost

always required to be members of their local academy church. Since boarding school

staff are in charge of students 24/7, they also have a part in providing the weekend

spiritual programming at the academy church. Thus, for most of the faculty/staff their

job descriptions include being involved in the campus church in some way, i.e.,

organizing "Sabbath school" programming, teaching the "Sabbath school" lesson,

providing music, etc. However, most academy churches are also an amalgamation of

students and local community members; thus, local church members are also privy to the

spiritual programming and teaching provided by boarding school staff. The following

participant tells of an incident where his expressed spiritual view did not align with what

many of these local members expected from an academy teacher. The excerpt below

begins with the exchange that led him to tell this story:

> Tammy: How do faculty members know what's expected of them as far as their own personal religious or spiritual practices and beliefs?
>
> Participant: I think that's a vague thing… You know, I don't think [administrators] even say what is expected of them. I think that's a vague area….We don't have a session where all the new teachers go and say this is expected of you. I think it's an unwritten thing. It's something you know.
>
> Tammy: So how do they find out?
>
> Participant: How did I find out?
>
> Tammy: Yeah.
>
> Participant: Criticism. (laughter). Basically. Criticism from other teachers. (laughter)
>
> Tammy: Tell me about that.
>
> Participant: Well, I enjoy teaching Sabbath school classes. Ok. I'm teaching a Sabbath school class over in the church. And when I get up and say, "You know what? I can hardly wait for the day when all religion dies so we can focus on Jesus and not our religion." And that was something I probably should not have said in the realm of older folks where, you know, [they say], "Wait a minute. You're not an Adventist?!" [I say],"I *am* an Adventist." (laughs) I'm true to the Adventist system. I love being a Christian, but sometimes we get so wrapped up into what's right and wrong that we lose focus on Jesus Christ. So you learn really quick.
>
> Tammy: So what happened when you made that statement?
>
> Participant: Oh, oh… I have some hate mail, and some people questioned whether I should be up front teaching.

> Tammy: People actually sent you mail?
>
> Participant: Oh yeah. Oh yeah.
>
> Tammy: What did it say?
>
> Participant: Oh, it just said, "We were concerned about the comments you made in Sabbath school when you were teaching the Sabbath school lesson." And they weren't mean. It wasn't really hate mail. It was, you know, "We are concerned about your soul" type deal. And (laughs) I kind of had to chuckle. So I'm careful. You know, there are some things people are ready for, and some things people are not. And one big lesson that I have had to learn was, you know, what are people ready for? (laughter)…. And you learn. And you learn. In a boarding school you are immersed from day one you are there. And boy, it's sink or swim.

This story is notable in a number of ways. First, it illustrates that when this participant's spiritual stance was perceived to deviate from that of an "Adventist's," there was an immediate response not from the administration, but from church members. Their great concern was that this person was "not an Adventist." As noted in the codification section of this chapter, being a church member in good and regular standing is one of the unassailable spiritual expectations of staff/faculty in the SDA educational system. That this faculty member would appear to violate this basic requirement brings an immediate response. Though this participant backs away from the phrase later in the interview, he initially uses the term "hate mail" to indicate the strong nature of the reaction afforded by church members. Furthermore, the feedback implies members' concern that this faculty's views may disqualify him from being "up front teaching" and fulfilling the important spiritual leadership role faculty/staff are expected to hold. From the church members' viewpoint, if this faculty member did not hold an "Adventist" view on basic spiritual matters, his alternate stance would disqualify him from holding such a leadership position. This fear and the perceived concern that this participant's "soul" was in danger, prompted *intervention* on the part of the church members. The result was that this faculty member is now more "careful." He notes that faculty/staff on a boarding

school campus are "immersed from day one" which provides a steep learning curve ("you

learn"). This "learning" process about what is or is not acceptable at the hands of other

organizational members is representative of a type of concertive control that makes up

part of the regulation aspect of spiritual labor.

Not only church members, but friends and colleagues may also be the source of

intervention in the face of apparent deviation from expected norms, policies, and

practices, as the following exemplar illustrates:

> A friend at [name of school], a real good friend, came to me one day, and he says,
> "I'm really concerned for you and the kind of music you like to listen to. And I
> have a book here; it's an excellent book that will explain to you the scriptural
> principles of music. And I want you to read it so you can have an understanding
> of what my concern for you is."

The "concern" expressed in this intervention delved directly into the harm that this

participant's musical tastes were perceived to have on his spiritual life. The fact that this

participant was encouraged to discover "scriptural principles" that would alter or reform

his musical listening habits indicates that his tastes in music were matters of spiritual

concern to his friend. The colleague who attempted to intervene in this case, hoped to

make a change in this teacher's practices and habits. He attempted to address what he

would consider to be spiritually inappropriate behaviors and choices for another faculty

member. That even one's musical tastes be open to such scrutiny on a boarding school

campus illustrates the nature of this type of concertive control involved in the spiritual

labor of faculty/staff.

This particular type of regulation appeared often in my participants' stories of

"life in the fishbowl" (see Chapter Four). On a boarding school campus, faculty/staff are

expected to be positive spiritual role models for their students – students with whom they

live in relative proximity and with whom they often interact. However, faculty and staff

also live in close proximity to one another – a situation that allows for a great deal of

potential concertive control and regulation of one's spiritual/religious habits and practices

at the hands of colleagues. Often this pressure serves to change spiritual and religious

practices as illustrated in the following exchange:

> Participant: Back when we lived [elsewhere], we didn't think anything about
> taking the four-wheeler out Sabbath afternoon or stuff like that. But here on
> campus, we tried to avoid that. And, uh, we got a basketball hoop out in front of
> the house. And when [name of son] was growing up, we tried to dissuade him
> from using it Sabbath afternoon. (laughs).… And we would not have even
> worried about it if we had been, like I say, out on the farm or something. Uh, it's
> just some exercise for him to do. It's not like he had a full-blown game going or
> anything like that, you know. But, you know, you draw fire from the neighbors
> and it's… it's kind of scary.

> Tammy: Now, when you say you "draw fire from the neighbors," what do you
> mean?

> Participant: Oh, just little innuendos like, "Oh… so that's what kept me awake
> Sabbath afternoon." (laughs) And things like that, you know. I shouldn't say
> "fire." "Righteous indignation." I don't know what you'd want to call that.
> Yeah, you hear little asides, little comments; then you realize, "Oh, that's not
> within their comfort zone!

> Tammy: Oh, I see. That's how you kind of find those things out?

> Participant: Oh, yeah. You know, you find out all kinds of little tidbits that way.
> Major things, they just come talk to you. Yeah. They just come and speak their
> peace…. But the bottom line is, when you come from a conservative
> environment, perception is nine-tenths of the law, basically, and the perception is,
> that's inappropriate, so you don't do that.

This incident illustrates differing views on what it means to honor the Sabbath. Seventh-

day Adventists consider the Sabbath to be a special day – to be set apart from the normal

routine of the other six days of the week. Again, on a liberal-conservative continuum

what "keeping the Sabbath" means in practice differs among church members. The more

conservative might avoid the types of activities (including playing basketball) one might

do during the week. The more liberal would be less restrictive in what activities would

be deemed appropriate. The neighbors of this participant above subtly communicated

that playing basketball on the Sabbath was outside of their "comfort zone" in the sense

that they did not consider this an appropriate activity for the Sabbath day. That this

participant's son might engage in such an activity on Sabbath and that this activity took

place on a school campus where it was seen and noticed by others (including students)

and would be seen as legitimate reasons for *intervention*.

As indicated above, the concertive control surrounding spiritual labor on a

boarding school campus appears in comments, innuendos, and the occasional outright

confrontation ("they just come and talk to you"). The *intervention* in the example above

is seen as necessary not because someone is playing basketball in this participant's front

yard with the noise disturbing a Sabbath nap, but because it is considered an

"inappropriate" activity to engage in on the Sabbath day. Such comments and

"interventions" actually serve to change a behavior that the participant above would

otherwise think nothing of doing. That this type of regulation lies under the surface until

expectations are violated is corroborated by other participants as well. The following

illustrates these difficulties for those who work under the conditions of a total institution

such as a boarding school. The following participant is responding to the question of

how faculty/staff come to discover the spiritual expectations on their campuses:

> Participant: Because of the close proximity that everybody works together in and the fact that you are together more than just as a job – you live here, you work here – there are just a lot of little things that are kind of in the background, and I find those frustrating – especially when you do realize what's going on and you are innocently doing one thing, and… (chuckles)
>
> Tammy: Well, that's interesting. So how do you come to find out these things then?
>
> Participant: Usually by making a mistake! (laughter) Somebody is offended by something.
>
> Tammy: I see. And you didn't know until that moment? (laughter)
>
> Participant: (laughter) Exactly!

Certainly in any organization, unwritten norms and expectations are brought to light in this trial and error fashion, by making "mistakes." But in an atmosphere where these issues have connotations involving spirituality, the stakes become higher. It is one thing to violate norms about who gets to use the copy machine, for example, but it is another matter entirely when organizational members violate norms that might be perceived to be barometers of spirituality or spiritual competence. On a boarding school campus where everyone is together "more than just as a job," these issues revolve around much deeper types of expectations, and the impact of regulation by colleagues, friends, and other staff members can sometimes be irritating, offensive, or "frustrating."

This frustration at informal regulation in the form of concertive control by fellow staff members bubbled to the surface on a number of occasions. The following incident was told to me by a faculty member who was finishing her first year on a boarding school campus she characterized as "conservative." She admitted she did not personally hold similar conservative views on many issues, including that of wearing jewelry. The conversation below begins with my question regarding her reaction to working on a campus where her views did not always align with the school's. In the course of our interaction, she relates an example where fellow faculty members *intervened* on her behalf when she apparently forgot to remove her earrings while on campus:

> Tammy: How do you feel about working at a school where those types of expectations are not really things that you may believe in? I mean, what is that like?
>
> Participant: Well, a lot of it is not really that big of a deal. A lot of it is just like, you know, whatever. I can live without that. But sometimes it gets ridiculous, you know. If I put my earrings on in the morning, and I am out walking the dog, faculty members will stop me and say, "Shouldn't you take those [earrings] out?"
>
> Tammy: They do?
>
> Participant: Yes.

Tammy: How you feel about that?

Participant: I'm like give me a break…

The fact that one is likely to meet other faculty members while out walking the dog is

indicative of the close proximity in which they live. Even engaging in an activity where

no students are involved (and thus cannot be 'unduly influenced' by an ear-ring-wearing

faculty member), other community members felt the need to comment on the lapse

("Shouldn't you take those out?"). The *intervention* on the part of fellow staff serves to

regulate behavior; this participant later reports being careful about remembering to take

off her earrings while on campus. The intervention also serves as a source of irritation

("give me a break"). In sum, these exemplars represent the informal regulatory

mechanism of *intervention* on the part of other staff members and colleagues on a

boarding school campus.

The final example of regulation of faculty/staff's spiritual practices comes at the

hands of those who may not actually live on campus but who definitely have an interest

in the "commodity" afforded by the spirituality of faculty/staff. These are the parents of

students at the school. Two examples will illustrate the nature of this informal regulation.

In the first incident, a teacher tells of what happened when he was "caught" engaging in a

Civil War re-enactment on the Sabbath – an activity that some might question as an

appropriate Sabbath activity:

> The [local paper] happened to snap a picture one Sabbath when I was in a re-
> enactment in [name of city]. I was on the first page. And when [the principal]
> got a phone call, and [the educational superintendent] got a phone call, I got
> called into the principal's office…. I told [the principal], "All right. On Sabbath I
> want to go, but I'll be a civilian or something. Is that all right?" [The principal
> said, "Yeah, that's OK." But, you know, some parent had gotten ticked off about
> it.

This example provides an amalgamation of both official and unofficial regulation of spiritual labor. The parents who saw this participant's picture in the paper obviously felt that such an activity on the Sabbath was inappropriate and that some sort of intervention needed to occur. Because this Civil War re-enactor was an academy teacher whose job responsibilities called for him to model a certain type of conservative Adventism to students in his sphere of influence, some intervention was thought necessary. The fact parents at this school would be prompted to intervene by setting in motion official regulatory processes indicates a heightened level of concern about this seeming deviation from expectations regarding the Sabbath-keeping practices of boarding school faculty and staff. In this case, the participant was "confronted," and he voluntarily changed his behavior due to this intervention. That he did not change his *beliefs* about the appropriateness of the activity prompts the observation that acting in a way that does not entirely align with one's own feelings or beliefs sets the stage for dissonance. This particular by-product of the regulation of spiritual labor will be developed more fully in Chapter Six. However, this participant's experience serves as one example of the informal regulation by parents of faculty/staff's spirituality.

The second and last exemplar paints another picture of how parents' intervention can set in motion informal regulation of spiritual beliefs regarding what faculty might share with or teach to students. A former boarding school teacher who now works as a pastor, related an incident where he was asked to engage in some intervention at the urging of parents:

> Participant: I had a parent, just a couple weeks ago really upset about a teacher at [name of school] and a bulletin board. I said, "OK, I'll go look at it." So I went, and it was gone. So I chatted with that teacher a little bit and was on my way. Well, then I get a phone call from the dad. "So you didn't get to see the bulletin

board, huh? I hear it was down." I said, "Yes, it was down. I didn't see it."
"Well, do you know he's teaching in his class that people are born homosexual
and that God deals with them different? And as long as they have a relationship
with just one person that God understands that?" Hmmm. And I said, "Really?
Are you sure about that?" And he says, "Well, I'm not going to go ask him
because if he says 'yes,' I will deck him."

Tammy: Oh, wow!

Participant: And he would. (laughter) And so I went and talked to the teacher.
And that's exactly what he was teaching. And I suddenly am struggling with 'is
this OK or is this a major violation of a theology?' …. [And] he will hear some
more because I'm not satisfied that it is something he should continue teaching.

As with the previous example, parents' disgruntlement with a teacher's actions prompt

them to put into place some regulatory mechanisms. In this case, it was the local church

pastor. The father's rather intense reaction to the teacher's views on homosexuality also

prompted this participant to enact some measure of intervention. The participant shares

that he, himself, will likely continue to intervene with the teacher, particularly if that

faculty member's stance is a "violation of theology." Such intervention on the part of

parents and other members of the Adventist community illustrate that the informal

regulatory aspect of the spiritual labor of teachers and staff emanates from a wide variety

of sources. In some cases this intervention may trigger the formal channels of the

organization itself; in other instances the concertive control of organizational members

serve as a means of intervention. In whatever form, the regulation of organizational

members' spirituality comprises an important component of spiritual labor.

Performing Spiritual Labor: Deep Acting

Before concluding this discussion, it will be instructive to also note the

implications of the regulations aspect of spiritual labor to the upcoming discussion of

spiritual dissonance in Chapter Six. "Deep acting" is the term Hochschild (1983) uses in

the emotional labor literature to refer to cases where members *appear* to fully assimilate

and embrace the emotional display rules mandated by their organization. Hochschild postulates that this performance of emotions not in fact experienced by organizational members is a major cause of emotional dissonance.

In this study of spiritual labor, the many examples offered above illustrate that the lingering threat of regulation may in some cases serve to change actual behavior when faculty/staff are mandated to profess and practice principles which they themselves do not personally hold; in this sense they offer a performance that reflects spiritual expectations that they may or may not actually embrace. That boarding schools are total institutions in which faculty/staff might always be under the gaze of the panopticon ("we are kind of under the microscope") puts some pressure on faculty to always be "on stage." When their "acting" on this stage does not match their own personal beliefs, then the way is clear for dissonance to enter the picture.

The issue of the codification and regulation of spirituality in organizational members suggests some interesting dilemmas for organizations in the realm of 'performing' spiritual labor. From an administrative standpoint, outward compliance is all that can be regulated, but in matters of spirituality, inward compliance would be most desirable. One of the few administrators I interviewed bears out this difficulty in the following exchange regarding the expectation that employees of the church be required to pay tithe:

> Participant: I think there are expectations and no matter what your belief or commitment is, [tithe-paying] is the expectation. And whether you believe it or not is not the issue. It is a standard of employment, and so the expectations are there.
>
> Tammy: Ok. So as administrator, with your administrator hat on, you care that they [faculty/staff] practice tithing so that their behavior is within the expectations of the church and school standards. Do you want them also to *believe* in tithing as well?

Participant: Absolutely. That is to me where it becomes difficult for me as an administrator. I can say, you know, this is the level that you have to meet. But how we get our teaching staff to actually believe it and practice that in a way that shows that they have a belief, is, uh… it is a difficult place for me to be. And it's something that I learned later and experienced later than I should have in my administrative experience. But if I can't do that, then let's bring somebody in on the pastoral side that is able to reach that from a spiritual depth that maybe I didn't have or I didn't understand how that worked. We can help [faculty/staff] believe [in tithing] rather than go to the place where we separate employment because it's not there.

Tammy: I see. Would you separate employment – we'll stay with tithing since that's a really good example – if someone practiced tithing but didn't truly *believe* in tithing?

Participant: I don't think it's an option then for an administrator to terminate them on that basis because they are meeting the letter of the law, or the contract…. And if someone chooses not to believe it… in my opinion, it'll probably come out in other ways and may eventually create an issue where they choose to terminate themselves, or it goes beyond that. Because I think what happens is that people then begin to question the Adventist church and the system and ask questions even of their students that they shouldn't be asking.

Tammy: How would you handle things that some people would characterize as more peripheral issues? For example, we have a standard that there's no jewelry on most of our boarding school campuses, but what if a faculty member goes home and whether on holiday or when they're at the mall or whatever, they're wearing their jewelry, but when they're on campus they don't?

Participant: Well, I guess I'm one that would not handle a double standard well. With students, you know, they are not employed. So when they get in that car and they want to put the bling on, then that's one thing. But if it is an employee… whether they are at their classroom or whether they are at the mall, they have an expectation as Adventist employees.

In the above exchange, this participant contradicts himself in a revealing way. He first articulates that whether people "believe it nor not" is not the issue with the tithing expectation. He acknowledges that he can persuade his teaching staff to outwardly meet that expectation. However, he also admits that in reality, he would like his staff to *believe* in tithing – a task beyond his ken as an administrator and one for which he would have to solicit the service of a pastor to speak more deeply to underlying spiritual issues. Rather than regulate non-compliance with termination (i.e., "separating employment"),

he prefers that his staff truly embrace the underlying spiritual foundations of the tithing principle. Yet, in the next breath, he admits that regulation can only be tied to outward compliance. On the other hand again, this participant expresses that the absence of true commitment in this arena is symptomatic of spiritual laxity in other areas that will eventually make its way public and possibly influence the belief system of students as well. So from an administrative perspective conflicting attitudes surface here – outward compliance to spiritual expectations is not enough; inward compliance is required. BUT inward compliance can't be regulated. BUT the lack of inward compliance indicates possible undesirable stances in other aspects of spirituality that *can* and *must* be regulated. In other words, outward compliance is all that can be reasonably regulated, but inward compliance is what is truly desired. Said this same participant later in the interview, "I think rarely do [faculty/staff] change their beliefs just because somebody says you have to do it this way. They may conform, but they rarely change their belief system." Organizations can't regulate actual spirituality, only the appearance of it.

Nevertheless, employment manuals illustrate how full buy-in to the spiritual expectations of the church is a codified expectation for academy faculty/staff. "Personnel have the personal responsibility to consistently and *wholeheartedly* practice the teachings of the Seventh-day Adventist Church" (emphasis supplied; Mid-American Union Conference: Education code, 2006). This codified expectation is that organizational members who "act" (i.e., who by all appearances are compliant) must engage in "deep acting" – they must appear to truly embrace the spiritual tenets, beliefs, and behavioral codes of the church.

Yet, for those who must appear to comply, not only outwardly but inwardly as well, the stage is set for "deep acting" to avoid issues of regulation. Offered one participant along this line,

> I didn't like my paycheck being tied to my spirituality. Here [at this school] is an interesting difference because ironically I thought I was moving to a more conservative place, but I actually moved to a more liberal conference where you can be who you are.

No longer does this participant feel as if he needed to "act" in a manner not consistent with his internal beliefs ("you can be who you are"). Acting as one's true self proves more difficult with the regulating elements of spiritual labor at play, and even more difficult when that spiritual labor must be played out in the total institution context of a boarding school where in a sense one is always 'on stage.'

One of my participants who held far different spiritual values than those codified and regulated by the school in which she worked actually used the language of the theater to describe how she avoided this "acting" in the face of codified and regulated expectations that ran counter to her own spiritual beliefs. As frequently seems to be the case with qualitative interviews, participants often made their most interesting comments and observations after the tape had been turned off. In this case, the interview seemed to have terminated, the tape was off, and yet our friendly "off-the-record" conversation eventually returned to my question about how this participant had managed for so long to work in a system whose spiritual beliefs she did not embrace. How did she avoid regulation? She replied that she was careful to give the *appearance* of compliance. As one of her former colleagues I can attest that while we worked together I never had any clue that she personally deviated so far from the spiritual beliefs of the church. I told her so and commented that she must be a good "actress." She immediately replied with a

sharp, "No!" Surprised by her reaction, I asked if she would let me continue to tape our

conversation and capture her response to my comment. Here is what followed:

> Participant: No. Because I refuse to go to the play.
>
> Tammy: What do you mean by that?
>
> Participant: I meant that anytime there was an issue that I was in real disagreement with, I just backed right away and made sure I wasn't there.
>
> Tammy: I see. So you wouldn't have to do the acting?
>
> Participant: That's right.

The compelling nature of this response is set amidst the issues of regulation outlined in

this chapter. This participant refuses to "do the acting" and absents herself from any

situation where her inward beliefs might make themselves manifest. Rather than engage

in any "acting," she avoids situations where she may be in danger of regulation.

What is suggested by these observations is that organizations which commodify,

codify, and regulate their members' spirituality cannot guarantee or require that the

spiritual labor they receive emanates from a genuine embracing of spiritual expectations,

even if those expectations are clearly codified by the organization, i.e., "Personnel have

the personal responsibility to consistently and *wholeheartedly* practice the teachings of

the Seventh-day Adventist Church" (emphasis supplied; Mid-American Union

Conference: Education code, 2006). No participant articulated this principle better than

the following:

> Participant: I think, Tammy, it is very difficult to take a principle or an emotion or a value and institutionalize it. I think it's impossible.
>
> Tammy: Doesn't that present us with a bit of a dilemma as an organized church?
>
> Participant: It does.
>
> Tammy: What do we do about that?
>
> Participant: Well, I think organizations are necessary… like definitions of words are necessary simply so we can use them, right? Otherwise we'd all be inventing our own definitions, and then we couldn't talk to each other. So in a certain sense, the human experience requires a certain amount of structure and orderliness

> and I think there is a category of people who have to have that just to survive. But I think in truthfulness and in reality that every person has to internalize whatever it is that they are going to live by and what their concept of God is and so on. Regardless of what the institution institutionalizes, everybody is going to be at a slightly different place – within, or without, or on the borderlines of the limits that a church draws.

As this former faculty member points out, the organization's regulation of spiritual labor cannot include the regulation of what members choose to internalize. "I think it is impossible." Organizations can only regulate the "performance" of spiritual labor. Yet as Chapter Six will point out, in the realm of spirituality pretending to be what one is not carries great implications in the arena of spiritual dissonance.

Regulation of Spirituality: Summary

The informal mode of regulation is coupled with that afforded by the more official channels such as administrators or church officials. Deviating from codified expectations can lead to an initial confrontation designed to inform or remind organizational members of certain expectations. Non-compliance may result in terminating employment or transfer to another school. In some cases latent repercussions for not complying with expectations may include loss of employment opportunities in other areas connected with the church. Informal regulatory channels include a form of concertive control in the pressures by other organizational members to preserve norms and spiritual expectations.

Both types of regulation, the formal and informal, often lead to some outward change of behavior or practice on the part of faculty and staff. This performance of spiritual expectations without full internal buy-in leaves open the door for the possibility of dissonance to creep in to the spiritual labor of those who work on SDA boarding campuses. It is this concept of dissonance, including the intensification that these modes

224

of regulation impose on that potential dissonance, that will comprise the following

chapter.

Chapter Six: Facing Spiritual Dissonance: Strategies and Approaches

In this study I have proposed that spiritual labor is a concept that might be examined in light of emotional labor. Instead of the commodification, codification, and regulation of *emotions* by an organization, spiritual labor involves these same parameters with regard to the *spirituality* of organizational members. Hochschild (1983) largely develops the concept of emotional labor in *The Managed Heart*, a large portion of which is devoted to the potential consequences of emotional labor, including stress, burnout, and job dissatisfaction (see also Rutter & Fielding, 1988). At the heart of these sometimes debilitating consequences of emotional labor is the presence of emotional dissonance caused by the difference between organizational members' experienced emotions and the expressed emotions mandated by the organization. When one is required to unfailingly smile at and be polite with rude customers while internally seething with anger, emotional dissonance is the result.

With regard to spiritual/religious matters, when organizational members outwardly conform or seem to agree with beliefs and/or practices that they don't in fact personally embrace, the potential for spiritual dissonance presents itself. Finally, when members' personal spiritual views and practices do not align with those embraced and expected by the organization, spiritual dissonance also becomes a distinct possibility. When members simply by their association with a particular organization could be assumed to not only represent that organization, but embrace its values as well, their internal deviance from those values sets the stage for dissonance. For example, a pastor in a particular church could reasonably be expected by the organization and its attendant

members to personally hold the spiritual beliefs of the church simply by virtue of his/her pastoral position. However, pastoring in a denomination (and thus seeming to buy in to that institution's values) while being personally undevoted to its tenets would likely cause spiritual dissonance.

Dissonance in whatever form (emotional, cognitive, spiritual) is uncomfortable (see Heider, 1958), and human beings sometimes go to great lengths to diminish, dismiss, or deny this dissonance. Though spiritual labor and the dissonance that may attend it has not previously been examined, it stands to reason that dissonance might well be a part of spiritual labor. This study bears out that assumption. In this chapter I examine the issue of dissonance with regard to spiritual labor of Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) boarding school teachers. In previous chapters I have thus far established the nature of the commodification, codification, and regulation of the spiritual labor of the faculty and staff in these institutions. I have also illustrated the all-encompassing nature of working in a total institution such as parochial boarding schools. It is in this chapter that all of these issues begin to interweave as I examine spiritual dissonance in this context.

I will approach this fascinating and complex topic of spiritual dissonance in the following manner: First, I will establish the nature of the spiritual dissonance associated with the spiritual labor of my participants. Second, I will outline the effects of this dissonance on organizational members. Third, I will provide a thematic analysis of the strategies used to deal with, mitigate, or avoid spiritual dissonance (i.e., *Silence, Reframing Spiritual Boundaries, Moving On,* and *Weighing the Benefits*)

Examples of Spiritual Dissonance: From Peripheral to Core Values

In this study the root of spiritual dissonance emanated from personal divergence from the spiritual expectations of their organizations. However, the nature of this divergence varied on a continuum; on one hand, spiritual dissonance results from personal divergence in practice or belief from what might be seen as more peripheral spiritual expectations. On the other hand, some spiritual dissonance will come at the hands of divergence from central, foundational values and spiritual stances of the SDA church.

To facilitate the future discussion of these peripheral and core values it may be first helpful to briefly outline what differentiates these two types of values. Peripheral values refer to those SDA beliefs and standards that are not universally practiced by church members. These types of values would not necessarily preclude one from being identified as a SDA. For example, some Adventists are vegetarians. Some are not. Some wear jewelry; some do not. These are not issues that would preclude one from church membership. On the other hand, core values are those that comprise issues more central to the codified and accepted doctrinal beliefs of the church (see Fundamental Beliefs, 2005). For example, Adventists believe in honoring the literal seventh day (Saturday) as their day of worship and rest. To not believe in the seventh-day Sabbath or its value would be to place oneself outside the boundaries of the belief structure of the Seventh-day Adventist church.

As explicated in Chapter Five's treatment of the codification of spirituality, for those teaching in the SDA educational system (including boarding school teachers/staff) the basic requirement for all teachers at all schools in this system is captured in the phrase

"be a member of the SDA church in good and regular standing" ("General education policies," 2006). However, equally clear is the idea that norms for certain peripheral values such as movie attendance, jewelry (including wearing wedding rings), or vegetarianism vary from school to school and region to region along what might be termed a conservative-liberal continuum (see Chapter Five). When my participants spoke of being out of alignment with either "official" or "unofficial" norms or practices, they often brought up these types of issues. Nevertheless, it would be worth noting that not all of the divergence regarding SDA beliefs fell into these more peripheral categories. Of the 34 participants in this study, five voiced significant divergence from core SDA beliefs. By sharing samples of both this deep divergence and the disagreement with more peripheral issues intimated above, my intention is to establish that even in the all-encompassing total-institution setting of SDA boarding schools (which are also considered the "Last Bastions" of conservative ideals – see Chapter Five), faculty/staff do not always align with the codified, regulated, and commodified expectations that make up their spiritual labor. This point is a salient one as non-alignment is the necessary condition for the possibility of dissonance in the first place. I will begin by outlining from the qualitative interviews the divergence from what might be considered more peripheral values connected with the SDA church.

Divergence from Peripheral Values

In many cases, the participants in this study embraced the core values of their church but disagreed with the conservative and/or liberal stances of their school regarding certain spiritual/religious expectations. Some examples of this non-alignment that led to spiritual dissonance revolve around more peripheral issues such as wearing jewelry,

229

attending movies, or practicing vegetarianism. For example, in the SDA church a more

conservative stance on the issue of jewelry might discourage even the wearing of

wedding rings; at the other end of the continuum, the wearing of any type of jewelry

would be acceptable. In general, lifestyle issues such as what one eats, drinks, or wears

might be classified as issues more peripheral when compared to more explicitly codified

church doctrines such as the meaning, purpose, and value of the seventh-day Sabbath, for

example (see Fundamental Beliefs, 2005). As alluded to in the codification section of

Chapter Five, the individual boarding schools' stances on many of these lifestyle issues

vary from school to school and region to region on this conservative-liberal continuum.

In general, this conservative—liberal continuum can be characterized along the lines of

restrictive—less restrictive guidelines. For example, a more conservative view of

wearing jewelry would include wedding rings as jewelry; thus, the more conservative

would not wear even a wedding ring. At the more liberal end of the spectrum, jewelry

would be a non-issue – the wearing of wedding rings, earrings, etc. would go

unremarked.

The following participant gives a survey of those types of issues that might vary

on a conservative—liberal continuum and reveals how her personal practices differ from

the school's expectation. In answer to my question regarding spiritual expectations of

faculty/staff in SDA boarding schools, she begins by outlining her perspective of the

spiritual expectations of the institution in which she worked. Note her characterization of

the school's stance as more conservative than her own:

> Participant: Yeah, that they [faculty/staff] will uphold the beliefs and practices of
> the Adventist church. And I think, at least at this particular boarding school, in a
> very conservative manner.
>
> Tammy: Oh, Ok. Can you give me an example?

Participant: Ummm…. Do not eat out on Sabbath. Do not, um, go to movies. You know, be at church every week. Um…. participate in Bible studies. Um… keep the Sabbath from Friday night to Saturday night extremely fully. And I say that with the utmost respect for it, but "extremely" as in, you know, you're going to not watch TV, not do anything that might cause somebody else to stumble or fall, or that might look bad on you. Um… do not… For instance, I had, oh, a [large] house there [on campus], but because I was single, could not have single guy friends of my age, or people I were dating stay over there with me. I needed to find another place for them to stay.

Tammy: Was this different from what you would practice were you not working at a boarding school?

Participant: Yes.

Tammy: Can you give me some examples of that?

Participant: Um… I grew up going out to eat on Sabbath. I have no problem with that. I go to movies. Um… I've had guys stay over at my house. Um… (laughs) I've probably done everything that I just explained to you just the opposite.

What is not evident in this excerpt from the interview is the fact that during the course of her employment, this former faculty member abided by this litany of expectations – expectations she did not personally embrace, which she had violated in the past, and which she would continue to violate after she left boarding school work. She notes the conservative strictures upheld by the school were different from her upbringing and practices. In this sense, her personal spiritual beliefs and practices did not align with the school's. This exemplar serves as an example of how non-alignment of personal and organizationally expected beliefs may manifest themselves not on the level of core beliefs, but more on a conservative—liberal continuum of behaviors.

The participant above is an example of one who personally embraced a more liberal stance than what her school required and expected. However, many other examples of dissonance also emanated from those faculty who strongly felt that their *schools* embraced an approach to Adventist ideals that was too liberal for their tastes. That schools take a more liberal approach to some SDA principles than some might be

personally comfortable with makes a few faculty/staff question whether they could

manage to work in an environment where their personal ideals do not match the ideals

espoused by the institution. Shared one participant about why working in a day school

might not be tolerable for him:

> Participant: The rest of those [Adventist] beliefs [in a boarding school] are pretty much old school and that's another reason why I would find it rougher to do teaching in a day school is because things are a little more lax. You know, dress codes and all those traditional rules and regulations that I'm familiar with. It's out of my comfort zone so to speak, when they're not enforcing the traditional standards of Adventism and, uh, the traditional society beliefs of the church.
>
> Tammy: So, you're saying you'd have difficulty working in a school that didn't?
>
> Participant: Mentally, yeah.

The acknowledgment that experiencing mental difficulty with a situation where one's

personal beliefs do not fit well with those espoused and expected by an organization is

evident in this example. For this participant, the thought of working in a school

characterized as "lax" would be "difficult" and undoubtedly lead to spiritual dissonance.

He recognizes that he could only "mentally" be comfortable in a school which required

and embraced the "old school" values. These are not the deeper core values that will be

articulated in the next section, but those that deal with "dress codes" or "traditional

rules."

Divergence from Core Values

While the issues above might be classified as more peripheral to the belief system

of the SDA church, a number of participants revealed deep divisions between their own

beliefs and those organizationally codified/regulated spiritual expectations that might be

considered nonnegotiable core values and beliefs. To understand the depth of the

divergence from SDA beliefs that will be revealed in the following exemplars, it is first

important to make a few notes about some of the fundamental beliefs of the SDA church.

The church accepts the Bible "as their only creed" ("Fundamental Beliefs," 2005). From

the Bible, then, emerge beliefs so fundamental that they make up the name of the church,

i.e., a literal belief in the seventh day – Saturday – as the day of worship (i.e., "Seventh-

day"), and a belief in the literal coming of Christ back to the earth (i.e., "Adventist").

The history of the founding of the church in the 1800's illustrates the importance of the

Bible in the church's belief formation – "the Bible and the Bible only" (p. 205, White,

2005; see also Schwartz & Greenleaf, 2000). To say that one does not believe in the

Bible as the arbiter of "Truth" would be, therefore, a statement that places one very far

from the center of the SDA church. Yet, this particular divergence was noted by several

of my participants. For example, when I first approached a participant about an interview

and presented him with the recruitment script, he eagerly agreed to an interview. In a

particularly cogent and sharply written e-mail prior to this interview, he outlined the

depths of his divergence. With his permission I will paraphrase and quote part of that

correspondence as an example of significant non-alignment with some of the most basic

tenets of the SDA church.

He begins by stating that he states that he no longer thinks Sabbath (keeping) is a

big deal and that he has his doubts about the veracity of the Creation and Flood accounts

in the book of Genesis.

> I have seen, touched, examined and studied way too much to believe everything
> in the fossil record PLUS all living things existed together and were created in six
> magical days. I have never seen any evidence of a world-wide flood and cringe at
> the ridiculous logic used by 'creation scientists.' Most of their arguments could
> be shot down by any sharp 8th grader.

He also believes that perhaps many of the early stories in the Bible are 'cultural myths.'

"I have thoroughly studied how we got the Bible, and it was not some magical process.

Men picked and chose what to include." He admits an admiration for Taoism and a

growing respect for the Roman Catholic Church, which he describes as "the mother of all Christianity and the maker of the Bible." In conclusion he says, "All honest seekers of truth are agnostics. I guess I am a Seventh-day Catholic who believes in the Force!!!!" This impassioned, slightly sarcastic exposé of how his personal beliefs differ from that of the mainstream church conveys the depth of this participant's divergence; from issues ranging from the Sabbath to creation, he playfully places the term "heretic" on himself and jokingly states, "Get the kindling and the Bic lighters, boys, we're gonna have a good old-fashioned heretic burning tonight!!!" It should be noted that this participant has a long career of boarding school work – and is planning to continue his spiritual labor in the face of deep spiritual dissonance. This participant's divergence from many central SDA beliefs illustrates the type of spiritual dissonance experienced by those who face the spiritual labor required in a parochial boarding school setting while disagreeing with some of the core spiritual tenets of their organizations.

This participant was not alone, however. I also interviewed former boarding school teachers who expressed similar levels of divergence. One such example is noted in the exchange below when I asked a participant about her use of the word "divergent" in relation to her spiritual beliefs:

> Tammy: So, when you say "divergent," what do you mean? How were your spiritual beliefs different from the school's?
>
> Participant: Well, you may just disqualify me if I really answer that.
>
> Tammy: Really? Why would I do that?
>
> Participant: Because there are really not a lot of similarities.
>
> Tammy: Oh, so in almost every way you were different.
>
> Participant: That's right.
>
> Tammy: Now, do you characterize yourself as a Seventh-day Adventist?

> Participant: I'm a cultural Adventist. And I've kind of jokingly told some of my close friends, I'm a closet non-Adventist. (laughter)

This participant expresses that she differed from the beliefs of the Adventist church in almost every way. Interestingly, she also noted elsewhere in the interview that she had been born and raised an Adventist and spent 17 years working in boarding schools – many of them happy and fulfilling years. Nevertheless, she freely admitted to me that her personal spiritual beliefs did not align very closely with the church's. Later in the interview she spoke of "not being a good fit:"

> Participant: I don't have a lot of memory of very many staff members having big [spiritual] disagreements and disputing big issues. I think a lot of staff members were pretty much what the church wanted to them to be. They were a good fit.
>
> Tammy: Did you think you were a good fit?
>
> Participant: No. No. Never.
>
> Tammy: Because?
>
> Participant: Because I didn't share the beliefs. At least I didn't share enough of the beliefs to be a good fit.

This participant expresses the feeling that the majority of SDA boarding school teachers "were pretty much what the church wanted them to be." In other words, she feels that most were in line with the codified and commodified expectations of the spiritual labor required of the job. However, her personal belief system differed in almost every way from the majority of her colleagues – so much so that she, herself, noted the depth of that divergence. She characterized herself as not being "a good fit." These examples illustrate the most extreme level of non-alignment between faculty/staff's personal beliefs and the generally accepted beliefs of the SDA church for which they work. These participants as a whole illustrate that the poor fit between what an organization might or might not expect in members' practices and beliefs (whether too liberal or too

conservative) allows for the conditions where dissonance might become part of the landscape for SDA boarding school teachers and staff.

Negative Effects of Spiritual Dissonance

Dissonance, or the inability to deal with dissonance, can have marked effects on organizational members. Hochschild (1983) points out that the stress associated with emotional dissonance can lead to frustration, burn out, and psychological stress. Dissonance is uncomfortable, and spiritual dissonance is no exception. Like those who experience emotional dissonance, the participants in my study report that anger, frustration, and depression often come closely on the heels of spiritual dissonance as well.

It is not surprising to note that those who experienced spiritual dissonance due to their personal divergence from the church's core values were much more vocal, vivid, and passionate about the negative effects of their spiritual dissonance. In some cases, participants report incidents of how others react when spiritual dissonance simply becomes intolerable:

> So that's why you see people fall by the wayside at boarding academies, because they can't…. they can't cognitively come to some peace in themselves between what the school's asking them to do and who they really are. I knew someone [a former faculty member] who had problems with the church, and when she could no longer believe in the practices that she had to uphold, she had to leave.

As this example highlights, the dissonance engendered by the clash between the differing expectations afforded by the school and the personal beliefs of faculty/members often proves to be too much to handle, particularly when that divergence involves the issue of who people "really are," an indication that these issues speak to core values. In the face of this spiritual dissonance, some "fall by the wayside" or feel compelled to escape the dissonance by leaving boarding school work altogether.

The reports regarding the sometimes debilitating effects of spiritual dissonance are not limited to second-hand accounts, however. Participants often reveal personal stress, anger, or even depression related to dealing with dissonance. Comments include such phrases "it's been difficult for me," "I'm sick of it," etc. One participant uses vivid language and strong imagery as he talked about his many years working in SDA boarding schools when he fundamentally disagreed with many of the principals adhered to by the SDA church. This is the same participant whose e-mail I quoted above revealing his great divergence from some foundational Adventist beliefs. He speaks poignantly about the effects of wrestling with spiritual dissonance that springs from the chasm between his own spiritual beliefs and those espoused by his organization:

> I've been on a long journey, yeah. It's been a big journey.… Sometimes it was hell on earth for me. It felt as if my brain was being ripped in half, you know…. I guess there's always the danger of using too much… too much reason and logic and eventually destroying faith if you are not careful. And so it's been a dangerous, sometimes uncomfortable balancing act for me. And it can plunge you into periods of depression – spiritual depression. Which I have experienced. So, that would be the one caution I would give.

As this participant talks about a "hell on earth," about feeling as if his brain was being "ripped in half," about occasionally plunging into depression, it is difficult to ignore the uncomfortable and sometimes damaging effects that spiritual dissonance can have on organizational members. As this participant illustrates, the journey through spiritual dissonance is often "long" and "dangerous." The depth of his divergence from core values of the church undoubtedly influences the nature of this journey through spiritual dissonance.

That the effects of spiritual dissonance are particularly acute for those who diverge most widely from core spiritual values will be illustrated in a final example. In one of the most poignant moments of my qualitative interview experience, I spoke to a

former faculty member who admitted to being quite divergent from the core spiritual and

religious expectations required of SDA boarding school teachers. For most of the

interview, she spoke of this divergence in a most matter-of-fact manner. On a seemingly

unrelated tangent, I asked if she would send her children to a SDA boarding academy,

and she felt she would do so if they wouldn't have to live in the dormitory but could

commute to school every day. Given her admitted divergence from conservative

Adventist beliefs in general (and many core Adventist beliefs in particular) this answer

surprised me, and I asked a series of follow-up questions that led to an unexpected and

saddening revelation of the cost that spiritual dissonance might bring. The essence of the

exchange follows:

> Tammy: Now this is all speculation, of course, but if you were still teaching in a boarding school, would you send [your children] to that school if they didn't have to live in the dorm?
>
> Participant: Yes. Yes.
>
> Tammy: Ok. Even though that school is… purposely promoting beliefs that you, yourself, do not believe?
>
> Participant: Well, you're really getting into a rough area, because my husband is a much more traditional Adventist than I am. And I have spent my married life respecting that… [pause]… And I'm pretty sick of it.
>
> Tammy: So, not only are you… this is not just about having to work in a school where you don't believe…
>
> Participant: It's my personal life as well. [She begins weeping]. I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

The stress that this participant had been concealing regarding the effect of living for so

long a dual life in the arena of her own personal beliefs (the ones she personally believed

versus the ones she enacted for her family) broke through the surface, and I stopped the

tape until she regained her composure and indicated her willingness to continue with the

interview. I share this particular example to highlight the toll that spiritual dissonance

can play in ways that may run painfully deep. In the all-encompassing boarding school

life where one's job is married to one's lifestyle, separating dissonance that might be experienced at work from one's personal life proves remarkably difficult. Spiritual dissonance is not something to be trifled with, as these participants' stories illustrate; it carries with it the possibility of frustration, anger, depression, and stress. As the next section will discuss, the pressures attending spiritual dissonance might be further exacerbated by the expectations inherent in the spiritual labor of faculty and staff.

Intensifying Spiritual Dissonance

As the previous section illustrated, spiritual dissonance can be uncomfortable. Compounding this discomfort are two intensifying elements: the pressure of setting a good example and the fear of being a hypocrite (or being seen a one). I will illustrate the nature of these intensifying elements in the following sections.

Intensifying Spiritual Dissonance: The Pressure of Setting a Good Example

Compounding the effects of spiritual dissonance can be the intensifying pressure on a parochial boarding school campus to be a role model and set a good example. As will be seen in the following examples, this pressure extends to modeling both core and peripheral values of the church. Expectations that faculty/staff set a good spiritual example and be positive spiritual mentors and role-models are part of the commodity or service offered as part of the spiritual labor in a parochial school. That faculty/staff recognize this role and are conscious that their own influence is part of their role as academy staff was born out in both the qualitative interviews, on many of the academy websites, and in the promotional material (see Chapter Five). This realization impacts faculty/staff's spiritual dissonance in that when they alter their behavior so that they

might be seen as good examples, they often find themselves acting in a manner that does not necessarily match their personal belief system.

Ironically, this expectation on the part of the organization and desire on the part of the participants to set a good example for students is also often qualified by the idea that one's influence or example only has efficacy when personal and professed beliefs/actions coincide. As this participant articulates, living according to what one believes is a critical element in having an effective influence and being a positive example:

> There is a gamut of interpretations [about spiritual expectations] between conservative and liberal, you know. And so I feel that students are going to see that, and as long as they don't see hypocrisy from an individual… you know, students are going to see the gamut. And that's a matter of personal conviction, you know, but they need to see that you live according to what you believe.

This participant suggests that adherence to codified standards is actually not as important as the alignment of personal convictions and outward practices. "Living according to what one believes" is a critical element when interacting with students on a spiritual plane; conversely living a "double standard" is counter-productive to one's ability to influence students positively. Commented another staff member:

> And we are kind of under the microscope with the kids. To a large degree the greatest influence we have on them and the greatest witness to them is how we live our lives and how we interact with them. And so we have to be careful what we do…

"Living one's life" on a boarding school campus involves being "under the microscope." The analogy suggests intense scrutinization, and as Chapter Four's survey of the total-institution qualities of a boarding school illustrated, faculty/staff members' lives are nearly always visible in light of the panopticon. The implication is that deviations between what one does and what one believes would always be in danger of discovery and thus damage the potential spiritual influence faculty/staff might wield. Ironically, however, the disciplinary power of the panopticon in boarding school life (see Chapter

Four) is not focused on whether faculty/staff behaviors and beliefs align, as much as on whether or not faculty/staff meet the codified expectations of the organization. Powerful as the panopticon may be, it cannot illuminate persons' inner values – only their outward actions.

This possibility of scrutiny ironically causes faculty and staff to alter their behavior and practices to be in line with the spiritual expectations of the school, even though their own personal feelings about the issue differ considerably. By wanting to be a "good example" to students, they are careful to alter their behavior to align with the organization's spiritual expectations. Such choices ironically counter the point expressed by participants in the previous paragraph that one's influence is powerful only if one lives what one believes; altering one's behavior to avoid setting a "bad example" creates spiritual dissonance if that behavior does not reflect internally held values. An example of one such area where this phenomenon emerged in the qualitative interviews involved the issue of movie attendance. In the Adventist church only the more conservative Adventists would condemn movie attendance, but keep in mind that academies are considered the "last bastion" of conservative Adventism. Hence the following participant's response to his own movie-going predilections:

> I could conscientiously go to a movie or theater and even take some students to a good movie. I've chosen not to because of my example. I'm not critical of other teachers who do that, but I personally have chosen not to do that for the reason of the influence that it might have.

Not going to movies is a choice this participant makes not on any moral ground ("I could conscientiously go to a movie"), but on the chance that his choices would be a poor example to students ("for the reason of the influence it might have"). Such an attitude is

241

also reflected in the following participant's explanation of why she chose not to attend

movies while a faculty member in a SDA boarding school:

> I would not want to, no matter what school I was in, set what I would call a "bad example" for them [the students]. So I guess my philosophy while working at a boarding school is – I may think that going out to eat [on Sabbath], or going to movies is OK. However, I want my students to come to that realization through their own practices and own thoughts about it, and not just use me as an excuse. Like, "Well, [name of participant] does it, so I should be able to do it."

These teachers obviously give some thought to the influence their actions might have on

their students. They realize that on a boarding school campus they are under scrutiny

more than the norm. They are careful to act in a way that seems to be in line with the

spiritual expectations held by their organizations, even though this compliance means

upholding tenets they might not personally embrace. Thus, the desire to set a good

example in an environment where one's behaviors are easily scrutinized may serve to

intensify the possibility of spiritual dissonance.

Wanting to positively influence students remains a fundamental goal of these

boarding school faculty/staff. "Setting a good example" is often seen as modeling the

spiritual practices and behaviors advocated by the organization. Yet in order to meet the

pressure of setting a "good example" in this manner, faculty/staff often modify or change

their behaviors from what they might otherwise practice were they not under the gaze of

the panopticon. On the other hand, the faculty/staff acknowledge that "being who you

are" is the secret to spiritually influencing students. Such contradictions and tensions

only serve to intensify spiritual dissonance. In the next section, I will illustrate the subtle

nature of the guilt and the struggle against the specter of hypocrisy that spiritual

dissonance presented to the boarding school teachers/staff in this study.

Intensifying Spiritual Dissonance: "Am I a Hypocrite?"

"Hypocrisy" is defined by Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (1994) as "feigning to be what one is not; *esp*: the false assumption of an appearance of virtue or religion" (p. 571). Other sources define the term as "an expression of agreement that is not supported by real conviction" *(*WordNet, 2003). As these definitions illustrate, "hypocrisy" is nearly synonymous with the conditions that serve as precursors for dissonance. In this study, the struggle between what one feels the organization expects and what one actually does led many of these participants to wrestle with what might be seen as hypocrisy on their part. As noted above, participants were particularly concerned that they not communicate a double-standard to their students and thus lessen their influence on those students or prove to be a bad example to them. Being a hypocrite or being seen as one was of great concern to these participants. Merely the suggestions of hypocrisy served to intensify spiritual dissonance. What follows is an example of this struggle as one teacher reflects on what it is like to strive to be a positive influence on a boarding school campus where one is always under scrutiny. As this participant shares his "struggle," note how his dissonance was intensified by several questions revolving around the issue of hypocrisy.

> I think you're under a microscope. You're kind of cautious of things you do. I guess for example…. I wear a wedding ring and I haven't always worn a wedding ring. And on our 25th anniversary our kids got together and gave us wedding rings. So I'm torn. Will somebody take this wrong, you know? So I struggled with that just a little bit, and I said, "You know what, this was a gift from my kids, you know, and I'm just going to wear it. People can come in and talk to me." We have a rule, no jewelry on campus. You know, you need to tell the [students], "You need to take that necklace off" or "You need to take that bracelet off," so here I am wearing a wedding ring. I just have to console myself and say a wedding ring is much different. So… yeah, you struggle with those issues, you know. Is it a double standard? Is it not a double standard? And you're so transparent on a boarding school campus that you really have to understand that.

This participant struggles with a number of questions. Is he providing a double-standard for students by wearing his ring? When he has to enforce the no jewelry rule on campus (and in the process by proxy or appearance endorse that rule) does his wedding ring send contradictory messages to students? He clearly understands that living under a "microscope" makes one more "transparent," thus indicating an understanding that his choice of wearing his wedding ring is not an entirely private one. Essentially, being a SDA teacher or staff member on a SDA boarding school campus implies that one is in line with the standards the school and church have set in place. Knowingly and willingly violating one of these expectations while in such a position suggests that in this participant's mind the possibility of hypocrisy or a "double-standard" exists. This "struggle" illustrates how spiritual dissonance might be intensified when faced with even the hint of hypocrisy.

The struggle with feelings of possible hypocrisy also underlie the following story told by a faculty member who shares how his own personal view regarding drinking alcoholic beverages differs from the church. It might be noted that abstaining from alcohol is a clearly stated expectation in employment handbooks (see "Employment manual," 2005). He shares below his thoughts about buying the occasional bottle of peach chardonnay in a grocery store frequented by other Adventists:

> I had to be really careful because a lot of Adventists would shop at those places and you'd kind of have to look both ways and rush to the counter and just make sure you got through so nobody saw that you had one bottle of this peach chardonnay that you just had to get around Thanksgiving! (laughter) Now that's one of those things that, you know, I don't…you wonder… and I don't know if I was a hypocrite, and that's something that's weighed on my mind – am I a hypocrite? Because I am in the system, yet I don't believe all of the system, you know? So there has been a lot of rationalization going on in my mind, you know, that I've kind of had to reach compromises psychologically.

This participant struggles with the fact that his own actions and his beliefs about alcohol differ from the church (which promotes total abstention). First, he intimates that "one little bottle" of peach chardonnay every Thanksgiving is not a big issue. But interestingly what immediately follow this bit of justification are the genuine questions about whether his actions constitute hypocrisy. He wonders if his identification with "the system" (i.e., the Adventist church and its institutions such as boarding schools), coupled with the gap between what he believes personally and what the system espouses constitutes hypocrisy. To avoid this hypocrisy and its attendant guilt he has had to "reach compromises psychologically." The struggle with what might be seen as hypocrisy, and guilt from that hypocrisy, may serve to intensify the spiritual dissonance associated with spiritual labor of boarding academy staff/faculty.

Summary

Spiritual dissonance is uncomfortable. Like other types of dissonance (i.e., emotional dissonance), it brings with it the possibility of stress, frustration, and depression. However, spiritual dissonance also uniquely carries the possibility of guilt from the specter of hypocrisy. The prospect exists of appearing hypocritical to those who could observe and witness the difference between what one ostensibly believes given one's affiliation with the Adventist church as a teacher in a SDA school and the actual beliefs or practices one displayed. These observers include the students to whom faculty report wanting to be good examples. The influence that faculty members hope to have or are seen to have might be compromised whether they are seen to live a double-standard, or whether they are seen to espouse practices not sanctioned by the church or school. One of the possible intensifying elements of spiritual dissonance, then, is that of guilt

over not being a good example to students, of harming one's positive influence, or of seeming to be hypocritical. The desire and expectation to be a good example, and the coupling of guilt to the issue of living a "double standard," intensify the spiritual dissonance that may accompany spiritual labor

Strategies for Dealing with Spiritual Dissonance

Up to this point I have established that SDA boarding school teachers and staff face many possibilities for dissonance in their spiritual labor, and I have outlined the effects that such dissonance may carry into the lives of these organizational members. These effects may include depression, anger, frustration, and guilt – all of which are tremendously uncomfortable. As Heider (1958) argued, human beings will attempt to avoid and/or cope with dissonance in their lives. This examination of spiritual dissonance offers that faculty/staff who engage in spiritual labor are no different in this regard. Thus, in order to address Research Question #3 – How do teachers and staff manage the dissonance (if any) that may arise from their spiritual labor? – I will now turn my attention to the strategies of approaching, managing, or avoiding dissonance that emerged from the qualitative interviews. These various strategies clearly fell into four major themes which I have entitled, *Silence, Reframing Spiritual Boundaries, Moving On*, and *Weighing the Benefits*. I will begin with the prevalent notion that faculty and staff deal with the specter or reality of spiritual dissonance by doing nothing at all. Their silence, and the reasons for it, are captured in the first theme below.

Strategies for Dealing with Dissonance: Silence

In this section I will illustrate that one of the means of approaching spiritual dissonance is to basically do nothing about it, to keep silent about the constitutive

elements that make up this dissonance. In the words of one participant, "I would say that as far as when it comes to religious and spiritual matters…if they [faculty/staff] disagree [with spiritual/religious expectations], they keep it to themselves." At first glance, this response is surprising given the human drive to manage or avoid dissonance. Yet, it will become clear in the following section that faculty/staff members faced with the opportunity of avoiding spiritual dissonance by clearly communicating their beliefs and openly practicing what they truly embrace, very often choose to keep silent. I will illustrate that not confronting the dissonance outright stems from a number of reasons: the feeling of futility that the organization will come into more alignment with one's personal beliefs, the fear of "regulation" for acknowledging non-alignment, and the avoidance of the appearance of hypocrisy. Whatever the source of dissonance, participants' silence in the face of disagreement with organizational expectations or spiritual views ironically serves to intensify their spiritual dissonance.

Keeping one's true spiritual views out of the very public eye of boarding campus life and seeming by all outward appearances to embrace and practice the spiritual expectations of the church and school allow one to appear compliant. In an educational system so fully integrated with a specific church that clearly markets the SDA Christian worldview of its faculty and staff as one of the defining aspects of its commodity, simply choosing to teach in this system seems to communicate one's buy-in with the SDA church and its beliefs by proxy. That some faculty and staff choose such employment without fully internalizing these beliefs, that this choice would engender spiritual dissonance, and that such dissonance could be swept away by more openly living a life and professing beliefs in line with one's own spiritual views, leads to an obvious

question. Why would faculty/staff keep silent? Why do they consistently report "biting their tongues" when it came to their own personal beliefs? The response of the participants indicates two major reasons – fear of regulation and a sense of futility in speaking up. As I illustrate these reasons below, I will correspondingly provide examples of faculty/staff's use of silence in a variety of contexts dealing with spiritual dissonance.

Reasons for Silence: Fear of Regulation. In Chapter Five I outlined how the regulatory element of spiritual labor takes two forms which I termed "formal" and "informal" regulation. Formal regulation occurs through organizationally sanctioned processes or channels. It may first involve confronting offending members about the issue in question and then either moving the offending member on to another position or possibly terminating employment. Informal regulation refers to the concertive control that other organizational members exert to bring them in line with what may be unwritten rules or vaguely codified, norms, and expectations. Both of these types of regulation come to play in the reason behind some faculty/staff's choice to keep silent in the face of their own disagreement with the spiritual practices and beliefs they were expected to embrace.

The fear of overt regulation in the sense of jeopardizing employment was often cited as a reason for not publicizing disagreements on spiritual matters, "[If] another teacher has a differing spiritual belief… maybe, oh, heaven forbid, the state of the dead, or whatever, you know…. Usually, they're bright enough to keep that to themselves, because they want to keep the job, see?" The fear of losing one's job would prompt someone who doesn't believe in the Adventist view on "the state of the dead" (what happens to people when they die – the subject of one of the 27 fundamental beliefs of the

SDA church) to "keep that to themselves." Another faculty member relates an incident in

which he fundamentally disagreed with the spiritual direction of the school:

> Participant: It's better not to say anything about [spiritual disagreements].
>
> Tammy: Really? I'd like for you to talk about why that is.
>
> Participant: I had a principal once, he says, "If you want to continue working here, take care of your business and don't worry about anybody else's." So, I have sort of used that as my guideline since then.

Voicing disagreement with the school's spiritual direction, choices, or expectations is

openly communicating that one's own personal views do not align. That act would at

least address the dissonance inherent in appearing to agree with what one does not really

embrace. However, as the participant above indicates, communicating this non-

alignment might be seen as inappropriate ("take care of your business") and inherently

risky ("If you want to continue working here"). Said another participant about a time

when he vehemently disagreed with what was preached in the academy church:

> And they [speakers] would go off on this stuff, and I knew that what they were saying was not right. I knew that doctrinally what I had seen in the Bible and read about in the Bible and a history of this or that, they were wrong. But I had to bite my lip because if I had said something, it would have been controversial and it could have come back and got me.

This participant knows "in his heart" that what was being taught from the pulpit was

"wrong," but he refused to intervene or reveal his personal beliefs because of the

controversy it would make, a controversy inherent in the divergence of his beliefs with

those being preached in the church. This controversy spars "fear" of regulation as the

sharing of his true beliefs and feelings "could have come back and got me." Later in the

interview, this same participant reveals his struggle with keeping quiet and the fear of

"getting in trouble" as the ultimate deciding factor in his decision to keep silent about his

own beliefs:

> That's how I had to deal with [spiritual disagreements], yeah. Especially when it was in a big open forum…. If it was in Sabbath school and I was in the middle of church where there is 150 people there or whatever, I would have to bite my tongue, and I can feel my heart rate go up, and my neck started to get hot, and then I'd say, "Oh, just shut up, you'll get in trouble."

This incident indicates that though sharing one's own personal beliefs might alleviate the discomfort associated with spiritual dissonance, it is often seen as too risky to openly declare oneself. Silence proves to be the safer option.

Such a choice is not always an easy one. One former faculty member expressed that she often struggled to prevent herself from expressing her disagreement with the general spiritual attitudes and assumptions embraced by the school in which she worked. When I asked her for a specific example, she replied with a laugh, "Every faculty meeting." Later, she talked more about how despite the danger that her deviance from fundamental SDA beliefs might have posed to her employment, she struggled with the constant need to bite her tongue:

> Participant: You know, I think of myself as a very spiritual person but not as a very religious one. And sooner or later I think we [she and the school] would have come in conflict over that.
>
> Tammy: What's your speculation here?
>
> Participant: Um… for example, let's take the authority of the Bible. That is a pretty fundamental to Adventism and certainly to Adventist education. I strongly feel that Adventists as well as most Protestants pick and choose what they would like to use from the Bible to reinforce their tenants or 21 beliefs – 27, sorry. (laughter)
>
> Tammy: Got rid of 6! (laughter)
>
> … (continued discussion of other areas of divergence) …
>
> Participant: So as you can see, I probably do not fit the Adventist mold very closely in something as fundamental as, um, the authority of the Bible because I think we define what we are going to use and what we are not.
>
> Tammy: So, are you saying, then, that there are certain things that you were so, probably, far away from what would be the traditional center…
>
> Participant: Yes.
>
> Tammy: That that would have been your demise, eventually?

> Participant: I think so, yeah.
>
> Tammy: Hmmm. Because you would have shared those with people, or…
>
> Participant: Uh, I'm not real good at biting my tongue all the time. I think I probably would have said something to somebody in my moment of frustration.

As this participant discloses her own personal disagreements with spiritual issues fundamental to both Adventism in general and Adventist education in particular, she not only reveals her frustrations and struggles with keeping these views quiet ("I'm not real good at biting my tongue all the time"), but she also recognizes that the revelation of her beliefs would have triggered some sort of regulation – would have been a source of conflict that might have led to her demise as an employee. Keeping silent about fundamental spiritual differences is difficult; speaking up is dangerous. This danger in the face of possible repercussions from the organization serves to quiet disagreements and allows spiritual dissonance to remain underground and unreconciled.

These examples illustrate how the specter of formal regulation (i.e., losing one's job) plays into the decision to keep silence. However, this approach of keeping silent in the face of dissonance would not be complete without mentioning the influence of less formal regulation from colleagues or other organizational members. Though this type of regulation did not play as prominent a role in why participants chose to be silent about their divergent spiritual beliefs, it emerged occasionally nonetheless. One former faculty member intimated at the nature of this subtle pressure below as she talks about how she felt she had more "freedom" to express her views once she left the boarding school lifestyle:

> Tammy: So, you said you had more emotional and spiritual freedom.
>
> Participant: Right.
>
> Tammy: How do you have more spiritual freedom?

> Participant: You don't really have a chance to talk about your views thoroughly when you are all required to conform.
>
> Tammy: So you had no one to talk to then, no one to share these things with?
>
> Participant: You know, we had a few close friends, but even close friends get really nervous and upset, usually, if you are very divergent from them.

Not being able to talk to even close friends about areas of spiritual divergence implies that other organizational members might discourage such views. As this participant articulates, when working in a total institution environment where all are "required to conform" and where divergence creates "nervousness," such a scenario would certainly discourage the expression of alternate spiritual views and beliefs.

The example above subtly indicates possible types of informal regulation, but I will offer below a more extended example of what might be termed attempts at concertive control. The following faculty member is sharing why he no longer makes public his divergent thinking about tithing and drinking wine:

> Participant: I've had to eat crow many times because people have sucked me into talking about stuff –
>
> Tammy: "People" meaning?
>
> Participant: Colleagues I've worked with. And then they'll come up with, "Well, what do you think about wine?" And I'll start talking to them about it. And they'll go, "So you think Christ could have been an alcoholic." And I said, "That's not what I'm saying." [They say,] "Why would He make something evil?" But they jump from what I'm saying to "He's getting people plastered" …. It's not what I'm saying…. Um hum… And with staff, [tithing] is one [issue] we don't talk about.
>
> Tammy: You don't talk about it. But [the disagreement] is there it sounds like.
>
> Participant: Oh yeah. It's there. It's an irritant to people who are faithful… and I don't want to say that they're just blindly doing whatever… but if I'm an irritant to them, you know, [they say] "Why don't you just get in line with this?" You have to keep your mouth shut I've found. [You] say something… you know it's not true, and you go ahead and say it… I don't know how to put it… If I disagree on something, I'm just going to be quiet and move on, because you really don't want to know what I believe at this point.
>
> Tammy: Because it causes too much dissension?
>
> Participant: Right. Right. And I'm really not about stirring up…whatever.

Unlike the previous examples related to official regulation issues, this participant talks about the cost of dealing with his fellow colleagues when it comes to making known his own personal stances on tithing and drinking wine, stances that differ from more conservative Adventist views. In the first place, his colleagues appear to inflate the level of his divergence, seeming to imply that he is placing Christ in the same category as alcoholics when (as he reveals elsewhere in the interview) he was simply sharing his belief that Biblical characters drank fermented wine rather than just grape juice. This point would address the Adventist church's stance that drinking all types of alcohol is best avoided; after all, if Christ drank wine, and if he is to be the spiritual example for Christians, drinking wine would hardly seem an egregious spiritual flaw. His colleagues' reframing of this point into the realm of alcoholism and "getting plastered" realigns this issue into a more serious spiritual realm. That his colleagues would try to dissuade or reframe his arguments to be in line with a more traditional Adventist stance on drinking wine is a subtle form of concertive control. A not-so-subtle attempt is their question about why he doesn't "just get in line" with the tithing issue (he reveals in this interview that he objects to being required to pay tithe, believing the mandate to be the equivalent of "union dues"). As a result, he has simply made the vow to "be quiet and move on." His experience illustrates the type of subtle concertive control and pressure that would convince organizational members to maintain silence about their divergent views. They would rather deal with the possible dissonance than face colleagues' pressure to come more "in line" with the expected spiritual norms and practices.

In essence, then, the decision to face the spiritual dissonance inherent in silently holding one set of beliefs while being a willing participant in an organization that

espouses different spiritual views stems in part from a reluctance to face either the formal

or informal regulatory mechanisms that may attend the revelation of divergence from the

beliefs one "should" hold as a SDA educator. The decision surrounding whether or not to

keep silent is representative of the inherent struggle in living with dissonance of any kind

– including spiritual dissonance.

 Reasons for Silence: "An Exercise in Futility." Besides the threat of regulation,

silence in the face of dissonance is also the choice of organizational members because of

strong feelings that communicating their divergence, disagreement, or discomfort is

essentially an exercise in futility. As one faculty put it,

> I'm not going to go around and tell people that I believe the world might be 4 ½
> billion years old, or that dinosaurs lived 100 million years ago or whatever. What
> good does it do, you know? I believe it, and I keep my mouth shut, and I go on
> with life, you know?

This participant's belief in a more evolutionary timetable for the age of the world would

likely raise eyebrows amongst administrative staff and many colleagues alike if known,

but his sense is that sharing his personal stance on issues of the earth's origins and dating

that differ from the church's would be a futile activity ("what good does it do?"). As a

result he keeps silent about his beliefs in this arena. Another former faculty member talks

about her deep disagreement with being required to be a tithe-payer as part of her job

expectations. She has just mentioned a former colleague who quit his job rather than

accede to this expectation:

> Tammy: Now, *you* did not choose to quit over this.
>
> Participant: I did not choose to quit. I just got mad.
>
> Tammy: Did you talk to people, talk to the administration or the conference?
>
> Participant: Uhm… some. But I knew where that was going to go, and I knew
> what kind of power… If I raised a big fuss, I'm going to lose anyway. So I just
> tried to stay low.

Both of these participants chose to "lay low" rather than openly divulge their disagreements. Not only does the participant above hint at the regulatory "power" that might attend her protestations, but she recognizes the futility of airing her own views ("I'm going to lose anyway"). These examples illustrate the feeling that actually sharing one's own personal beliefs is an exercise in futility, accomplishing nothing but potential trouble.

The futility that these participants sense they would meet is borne out by those who *did* occasionally speak up. Participants often report the feeling that their views were not valued or attended to by their colleagues or by the organization as a whole. One participant tells of a time when she "didn't bite [her] tongue." During one faculty meeting she could no longer keep silent her strong disagreement with the music faculty's approach to the spiritual danger of "rock and roll," particularly the notion of "the devil's use of the rock beat in every form." She relates that she "finally stood up" and spoke her mind on the issue. She reports the reaction:

> Everyone looked at me fairly blankly. One [teacher] backed me up….But I think we were pretty much outnumbered and speaking a foreign language, and everybody just said, "Oh really?" And went right on with what they were doing.

This participant's sharing of her own beliefs on music – beliefs that differed from those in charge of music on campus – did not meet with any formal censure or informal pressure from colleagues. What it *was* met with was a deafening silence – blank stares and a lack of response. The pressure of silently sitting and listening to the promulgation of what she did not believe finally prompts her to act. However, her actions did not appear to even begin to change the general consensus on the matter in question. As another participant said about his frustrations working in a school that he felt did not

255

properly emphasize the spiritual value of community service, "That was very frustrating. I had to fuss about that for a while. It didn't do any good."

Meeting divergent opinions or ideas with silence is an organizationally effective means of dampening the expression of divergent opinions. As these participants acknowledged, they often respond to their spiritual dissonance with silence because they perceive that speaking out is a futile endeavor. In an odd twist, speaking out simply brings a type of silence from the organization; participants feel that their views do not seem to be acknowledged or valued. One staff member expresses this sense of futility that his school does not uphold the same standards he embraces:

> Participant: [The school has] standards, yes. But we don't have that high standard like we used to. And that… yes… that bothers me. Because you don't… you speak up about it, and it just drifts by the wayside. And I know different higher-up leaders, well, they'll just kind of overlook it.
>
> Tammy: Really. That's interesting. So, do you speak up in faculty meeting?
>
> Participant: Sometimes.
>
> Tammy: (laughter) You say that with a sigh!
>
> Participant: Yeah. Yeah. And it sometimes… it don't pay because you know it's not going to… you know deep down it's not going to work, what you say.

This participant's reference to the lowering of "standards" points to his discomfort that the school no longer embraces certain stances on issues that are still important to him – going to movies, wearing wedding rings, and choosing vegetarianism. These are all traditional Adventist life-style standards that he practices assiduously in his personal life. That the school in which he works no longer values what he considers important on a spiritual plane "bothers" him, but his efforts to communicate his own views – views which he sees as a more spiritual approach to these issues – are met with futility. Speaking one's mind does not serve to substantially alter the spiritual/religious issues that a school chooses to embrace or discard – issues that by virtue of association with the

school, organizational members are also expected to support. Not surprisingly, these

participants espouse silence in the face of their spiritual dissonance because they sense

that speaking up would not only be dangerous, but futile.

     Summary. Faced with the spiritual dissonance of either practicing or professing in

the religious/spiritual realm that to which one does not personally ascribe, these

participants often chose to meet that dissonance with silence. They chose to keep their

divergent personal convictions to themselves, both because of the specter of formal or

informal regulation as well as the conviction, often borne out of experience, that their

profession of divergent spiritual beliefs would simply be futile. Bringing divergence into

the open would affect no real change and leave one vulnerable to regulation of those

divergent beliefs. Ironically, by doing so, these faculty members largely preserve the

elementary conditions for spiritual dissonance. By their outward appearance they seem

to be in line with the organization in which they have chosen employment, but inwardly

they disagree with many of the fundamental spiritual beliefs, approaches, and

expectations that their organization embraces.

Strategies for Dealing with Spiritual Dissonance: Reframing Spiritual Boundaries

     In this next theme I will illustrate one of the most prevalent and interesting

strategies participants revealed when faced with dissonance – participants simply refused

to categorize these organizationally mandated issues as spiritual in nature. In doing so,

the fact that they comply with what they often did not believe, or that they may practice

one set of behaviors on-campus and another off-campus, did not present these

participants with spiritual dissonance. After all, if issues are not seen as spiritual in

nature, there is no spiritual dissonance to be had in these instances. In some cases,

participants *did* acknowledge the spiritual nature of the beliefs and/or practices with which they disagreed, but simply negated the possibility of spiritual dissonance by reframing their divergence as part of job expectations along the line of dress code requirements. I will illustrate how using the reframing strategies explicated above leads in some cases to both outright defiance of these expectation as well as a split between on-campus and off-campus practices and behaviors. I will begin by outlining below how these issues emerged from the qualitative interviews by first providing examples of the general nature of this reframing and then explicating more particularly how individuals reframed specific issues.

Reframing Spiritual Boundaries: Not a Big Issue. That participants recognized on some level they were reframing issues became apparent on a number of occasions in the qualitative interviews. Speaking of disagreeing with spiritual issues in this manner one participant articulated, "I have a choice to make. Do I… do I say, 'Ok. This is something I can't live with and find another job'? Or do I say, 'OK. We're going to redefine these boundaries…'?" The "boundaries" referred to here are essentially the boundaries that mark off what cannot be spiritually compromised (deep, core values), with those issues that one can "live with" (more peripheral issues). The following participant details in more depth this type of reframing. In this example, a distinction is made between the religious and the spiritual:

> Tammy: You said basically that you are a spiritual person, not necessarily a religious one. Could you articulate for me what you see as the difference?
>
> Participant: Yes. I believe religion is the rituals and the format that these rituals take in a prescribed manner of worship and theology, and that's why religion has names. They are kind of like clubs, you know. If you're going to belong to this club, you have to do this, this, and this – otherwise, you are not one of us. And spirituality has to do with, I believe, with a deep searching for God and the meaning of existence…. I think there were faculty members who, um, truly were

not practicing the lifestyle that was being preached. At least this is my understanding from students, and I have no way, so I'm not going to use names, but I was told of faculty members who drank beer and served it at home to students who were there, and were considered to be a little bit alcoholic, on the alcoholic side of things…. But, I think there were others like me who dissented with the… um, I don't even know how to put it – but the ways that, um, the structure and the regulations that were used by the school to enforce spirituality but who truly desired to have a spiritual impact on students and to help them mold their spirituality. Um… I don't know how other people handled that. I think for myself, I said, "The reason I'm angry about those things is because I don't think they are important. And if they are not important, why do I let them bother me?"

Tammy: Was that an effective strategy?

Participant: Yeah, I think so. (chuckles)

This faculty member carefully distinguished between what she saw as the "prescribed" nature of religion and spirituality's "deep" searching for the very "essence of existence." She mentions cases where the beliefs and practices of organizational members did not align with the spiritual expectations of the school. However, this participant goes on to distinguish the nature of her divergence as deeper than those who deviated from lifestyle expectation such as drinking. Later in the exemplar she notes her own disagreement with the school's prescription of spirituality, their "structure" and "regulation." However, the level of her dissension simply lies in the characterization of what she would call religious issues – being part of a club or a culture – rather than true spiritual matters. Admitting that the divergence between her own outlook on spirituality and the school's made her "angry," she also reveals her strategy for dealing with this potential dissonance – she tells herself that the issues the school considers spiritual are really "unimportant" matters in her mind. They are unimportant because she feels they do not reflect matters of true spiritual importance. This reframing serves as her strategy for dealing with potential dissonance; she has carefully defined the boundaries of what might be characterized as spiritual. Those issues that fall outside this demarcation are much less problematic.

259

That these participants reframed some codified expectations outside of the spiritual realm is clear. That by doing so they managed their spiritual dissonance will also be revealed in the examples below. I will illustrate the nature of this reframing of spiritual boundaries by offering a sample of the numerous examples shared by my participants, beginning with the issue of jewelry. Some sections of the exemplars below may sound familiar as I have already quoted portions of them in Chapters Four and Five. The first such example comes from a faculty member who struggled with the decision to wear his wedding ring, which in some SDA enclaves would be considered inappropriate for church employees.

> I wear a wedding ring and I haven't always worn a wedding ring…. So I'm torn. Will somebody take this wrong, you know? …. So I struggled with that just a little bit, and I said…. I'm just going to wear it…. We have a rule, no jewelry on campus. You know, you need to tell the kids, "You need to take that necklace off" or "You need to take that bracelet off," so here I am wearing a wedding ring. I just have to console myself and say a wedding ring is much different.

This faculty member struggles most with his decision to wear a wedding ring on a campus that prohibits jewelry as part of the spiritual view that "true beauty does not consist of outward adornment" (see "Fundamental Beliefs," 2005). He "consoles" himself in this dilemma by reframing the wedding ring issue as "something different." For this faculty member, wearing a wedding ring falls outside of the spiritual/religious principles prohibiting jewelry on campus. This reframing of the issue enables him to reconcile the struggle of what may be seen as a double standard (see Chapter Five).

Reframing the issue of jewelry as a matter not related to spirituality is a common example of how faculty/staff move from what some would characterize as spiritual issues to something classified as "no big deal." Said one faculty member about the jewelry issue in general, "I don't see this as a spiritual issue, but it's certainly a church standard."

The fact that it is a "church standard" certainly places it in the realm of the expectations

afforded to those who work for the church. But many, many participants did not see this

church standard as a spiritual one. Said another participant regarding wearing a wedding

ring, "I had a wedding ring, but I didn't wear it unless I was away from the academy.

And I don't care – the wedding ring is not a huge issue with me….it wasn't a point where

I would quit and go some place else." The following participant relates how she

approaches her campus's conservative views on many issues – a conservative stance that

in the area of jewelry she does not begin to share.

> Tammy: How do you feel about working at a school where those types of expectations are not really things that you may believe in? I mean, what is that like?
>
> Participant: Well, a lot of it is not really that big of a deal. A lot of it is just like, you know, whatever. I can live without that. But sometimes it gets ridiculous, you know. If I put my earrings on in the morning and I am out walking the dog, faculty members will stop me and say, "Shouldn't you take those out?"
>
> Tammy: They do?
>
> Participant: Yes.
>
> Tammy: How do you feel about that?
>
> Participant: I'm like give me a break. It's not a big issue for me. Why is it for you? I just don't understand why that is a spiritual issue. So anyway, I don't know… it's livable.
>
> Tammy: OK. It's livable just barely, or no problem.
>
> Participant: Not really a big problem. I mean, you know, whatever. I try and hold up to those standards when I am on campus, and that's cool, and so it's not really a big thing for me.

This participant does not see wearing earrings as a spiritual issue, and she doesn't

understand how others might either. Nevertheless, the "no jewelry" requirement set out

by her conservative school is "not that big of a deal." As with the former participant who

didn't wear his wedding ring at the academy, she tries not to wear her earrings on

campus, and since the issue is set out of the boundary of what might be considered a

spiritual issue, her compliance with a standard that she does not believe proves more irritating than deeply problematic.

The issue of jewelry provided many examples in this realm, but it was not the only area where issues were reframed out of the spiritual arena. As the following participant reveals, sometimes this strategy is a direct result of the struggles with feelings of possible hypocrisy (see Chapter Five) – hypocrisy which leads directly to spiritual dissonance. The following example deals with a faculty member who revealed that drinking a little wine now and then is something he has done and would do more of if not a faculty member of a SDA boarding school. In the following extension of this exemplar he details further how he "compromises psychologically" with his beliefs about drinking wine in light of the strong stand against the use of alcohol of any kind embraced by the SDA church:

> Participant: Now [drinking wine] is one of those things that, you know… you wonder. And I don't know if I was a hypocrite, and that's something that's weighed on my mind – am I a hypocrite? Because I am in the system yet I don't believe all of the system, you know. So there has been a lot of rationalization going on in my mind, you know, that I've kind of had to reach compromises psychologically.
>
> Tammy: How do you reach that compromise? I mean, what is that compromise? Because you have asked yourself that question – am I being a hypocrite? What conclusion have you come to?
>
> Participant: Um… I've come to the conclusion… I've actually had peace with that for the last couple of years. And I think that solution is that I know and I am absolutely convinced – for instance, the wine situation – that Jesus drank wine. You don't have hundreds of thousands of acres of vineyards in the Middle East there and drank grape juice because it ain't going to happen. There was no refrigeration. So everybody there drank wine, and I think Jesus drank wine. Um… and so consequently I'm like… you know, I think from the standpoint of salvation and actual Christian beliefs wine is actually not an issue with God.

The psychological compromise here is to place wine outside of "salvation" and "Christian beliefs" and thus make it an issue that falls beyond the bounds of spiritual

hypocrisy (and thus spiritual dissonance). From the view of Christianity, if drinking wine

is not an issue with God, if Christ himself drank wine, the prohibition of it cannot be

spiritual either. Drinking wine may be an issue with the church (and thus the school as a

model of church standards), but it is not an issue with God. Thus this participant's

occasional sampling of wine, though a breach of the church and school's expectations for

their teachers, is not actually a true spiritual violation in his mind.

The fact that this participant has to think through these potential labyrinths of

dissonance – that it has taken a number of years to have "peace" on this topic – illustrates

the nature of spiritual dissonance in these areas. For example, when I asked some

participants about the fact that they did not privately practice some of the SDA standards

upheld and advocated by the school, the following exchange between myself and a

husband and wife team served to illustrate that reframing issues out of the realm of

spirituality is not always as easy as it may seem:

> Tammy: Well, you know, what does one do if one doesn't agree with let's say
> vegetarianism is a lifestyle that should be practiced by Adventists, but in a school
> where they don't serve meat in the cafeteria. And you're telling me [faculty] take
> [students] home and cook meat for them…
>
> 1st Participant: We weren't vegetarian when we met. We never had meat at our
> house. When we went out to eat and no one else was with us, we might get
> chicken.
>
> 2nd Participant: Part of my way of thinking was what was maybe ok for me to do,
> the school has said that we're not doing it…. therefore I'm not going to let [the
> kids] see me doing it either. Not that I'm hiding it.
>
> Tammy: I see. So it's something you might do or practice away from the school
> or away from the students, like in the privacy of your own home. Is that what
> you're saying?
>
> 2nd Participant: Um hm. Well, and some people might call it hypocritical, and I
> suppose you could. I don't look at it that way. It's a matter of, you know… since
> we're talking about vegetarianism…. it's not a sin to eat meat. It's just not the
> best lifestyle for you. And I look at it more like it's a health choice based on
> counsel that we have, versus a religious choice or a religious doctrine or
> philosophy. And I think that's kind of how the Adventist church has gone, with

that and a lot of other things. The problem is that once people have gotten over the fact that it's not a religious… not a matter of morality or a religious doctrine, anything goes, you know.

Even though these participants personally eat meat, they are reluctant to let the students see them do so because "the school has said we're not doing it." In a somewhat contradictory manner, the first participant maintains that they don't let students see them eating meat, but they are not "hiding" the practice, even though they only ate meat when "no one else was with us." The second participant seems to recognize this contradiction and acknowledges that some might call "hypocritical" this seeming adherence to a standard not in actuality kept. How this dilemma is answered (a dilemma fraught with the possibilities of spiritual dissonance) is to immediately establish that the issue is not about "religious choice" or "doctrine" – it is not a "sin." Thus, by taking the issue out of both the spiritual and religious domains the possibility of hypocrisy or dissonance is addressed. Yet, as the last statement in the exemplar suggests, the matter is not so clear-cut as it sounds, hinting that the simple reframing of issues out of the realm of morality and spirituality is fraught with the potential consequence that all things might be thus reframed. From an organizational view, particularly those such as parochial boarding schools, the individual versus corporate framing of what expectations fall in the "spiritual" realm and which do not would make the codification, commodification, and regulation of members' spirituality a difficult proposition, indeed.

Reframing Spiritual Boundaries: Just a Job Requirement. While issues are reframed out of the realm of spirituality in general, spiritual expectations might also more specifically be reframed as simple job requirements that one fulfills on campus but that can easily be ignored off-campus when one is "off the clock." Many were quite explicit in this reframing, as was this former faculty member.

Participant: So, you know, there were certain things that I committed to the job side, right? Because they were part of the job. But my personal belief on them completely differed.

Tammy: Were those issues that were religious or spiritual? That someone would label religious or spiritual?

Participant: Well, I think… (small laugh)… I think some Adventists would label them religious or spiritual…whether I go to movies or not.

Tammy: Ok. But yet you talked about it as if "That's no big deal to me."

Participant: Because, I…yeah… and I think that (laughs)… that may be the problem you find with me, is that I believe, and have always believed, that when you sign on that dotted line for whatever job you sign on, you sign up for the expectations of that job. If I'm going to sign my contract… I don't think you should sign up and then complain about it. If you're going to sign up for the position, you're going to sign up for the whole position. So for me it wasn't a matter of whether I was irritated about it…. Did sometimes I want to go see a movie and couldn't? Yeah, because there was only like one movie theater in town, and I didn't want to have to see my students there. Did I go see movies when I was at home? Yes, because I felt I was off the clock. And what I mean by home is visiting my parents because I think you're on the clock 24 hours in a boarding academy. So in order to be off the clock, for me, it was almost like I needed to go home or visit my family or go somewhere else and visit. And that's ok. But, I think, um…. I think that when you sign up for the contract, you sign up for those things. So for me, I was fine with that. I thought some of their rules were silly, but I was happy to support them. And I supported them to the hilt… So if you don't agree with it, there are always other options. To leave. To do something else. And that's how I felt…. So, while I was there, I kept whatever codes they wanted me to keep, and now I just do what I want to do, what I feel is right. So, it's uh…not anything that I feel I've rebelled or I'm upset, it's just I am who I am. And at work, I am who I need to be at work. And at home, I am who I need to be.

This participant does not struggle with the fact that she keeps the school's "codes"

differently off-campus than on-campus (for example, she didn't go to the local movie

theater because her students might see her). The fact that she is "who she needs to be at

work" enables her to eliminate the hypocrisy and double-standard leading to spiritual

dissonance. In other words, by separating organizational expectations from her personal

life she can consistently support the school's standards as part of the contractual

agreement she signed. In this way, she reports that she is able to uphold standards she

does not wholeheartedly believe. What the organization or some of its members might

see as spiritual expectations, she reframes as simple job requirements.

The exemplar above represents one of the many examples of participants setting

different boundaries for what might be characterized as spiritual issues and what might be

seen as job requirements. To further illustrate, an example follows regarding the issue of

wedding rings:

> We [he and his wife] wear wedding rings now. And at that point, to me [the
> prohibition of rings] was just a matter of a dress code. That's your dress code? I
> can deal with it, you know…. I don't look at it as a point of faith or a religious
> conviction one way or the other, you know. And so when they asked us…
> actually, we were told in college, "You're not going to be able to wear your
> wedding rings if you go up there [to the academy]." And I said, "Well, that's fine
> with me. That's not an issue."

This particular framing places issues such as the wearing of wedding rings as "no big

deal" in the sense that such an expectation can be seen as simply part of a job

requirement – not as a spiritual issue. The fact that wearing wedding rings is not a

spiritual issue in his mind makes his own personal practice of wearing a ring just a matter

of adhering to a simple job requirement analogous to a dress code – one that can be

ignored off the job without spiritual dissonance or hypocrisy.

That other faculty members approach spiritual/religious expectations along this

line is corroborated by the following current staff member.

> Well, I think some faculty members are supportive of [religious and spiritual
> rules] because they have chosen to work here and have just said, "I am part of the
> team." It's kind of like when you go work somewhere and they tell you you have
> to wear, you know, a pink shirt and blue pants (chuckles) – you do it because
> you're part of that group.

Being part of a "group," going along to be part of a team, to avoid controversy, to

practice behaviors one does not like or even agree with, are all alluded to here. By

implication, ignoring an organization's pink shirt and blue pants dress code when off the

job could hardly be seen as a matter of hypocrisy and would hardly lead to dissonance of any kind. Firmly framing spiritual expectations into a more innocuous category of simple job expectations that one goes along with as part of a job rather than part of spiritual belief system is a powerful and effective means of dealing with spiritual dissonance.

These examples above illustrate the reframing strategies that virtually precluded the discomfort of spiritual dissonance for many of these participants. Whether faculty/staff reframed expectations their organizations might count as spiritual into "silly" or "arbitrary" categories or as issues that were 'no big deal,' whether they saw them as matters of dress code or job requirements that one could in good conscience follow while 'on the clock' and disregard when off-duty, such strategies enabled faculty/staff to mitigate or even deny spiritual dissonance.

Repercussions of Reframing Spiritual Boundaries: Defiance On-campus and Off-campus. The practice of reframing spiritual boundaries also impacted the nature of participants' resistance to codified spiritual expectations. This resistance included outright defiance of codified rules and expectations. More particularly, the strategy of reframing spiritual expectations allowed the possibility for faculty/staff to openly defy these expectations or lead separate on-campus/off-campus lives while dodging the possibility of spiritual dissonance.

The confounding factor regarding spiritual dissonance in the context of the boarding school is the all-encompassing nature of the boarding school life. Not only in the close proximity afforded by living on campus but also by the large amounts of time spent interacting with both students and faculty, boarding school teachers/staff have more difficulty than most in clearly separating work with home (see Chapter Four). Practicing

divergent beliefs is not an uncommon occurrence reported in these qualitative interviews, but while outright defiance of expectations was reported, more told of waiting until they were off-campus before violating these expectations. In the next few paragraphs I will afford a sense of this type of defiance and reveal the on campus/off campus life some faculty lead.

Outright defiance of spiritual expectations occurs in large measure because of the reframing of issues as not spiritual or not important. One participant gave an account of such overt defiance by another faculty member he knew:

> A fellow, a friend of mine….when he was at academy and early on in their marriage, would have kids over and watch R-rated movies with them. Well, that's contrary to the policy of the school. But he thought it was ridiculous. So he would have them over and watch R-rated movies.

Thinking the policy of the school was "ridiculous" rather than a spiritual principle was the justification given for this example of outright defiance of a school policy. Another example comes from a faculty member who talks about herself and others who ignored the expectation about not frequenting the movie theater.

> Participant: Now, if you're going to talk about the less important things of, you know… The church really discouraged going to movies. And so staff members, if they were going to go, they would go somewhere where they would not be seen.
>
> Tammy: But they would still go?
>
> Participant: Sure. Some of them would still go. I was very careful.

A number of other faculty/staff made similar comments about theater attendance such as, "the only time we went to a movie theater was when we were on vacation a long way away from the Academy." In the exemplar quoted above, however, note how this participant characterizes the expectation that staff/faculty members not attend movies as one of the "less important things." She comments that she was "very careful" when she defied these expectations, again intimating that the regulation of spiritual labor attended

those who may choose to overtly defy these types of expectations. Despite the possibility

of regulation, outright defiance of spiritual/religious expectations occurs, nevertheless.

Despite these participants' defiance of expectations which their organizations

might characterize in the spiritual realm, most faculty/staff were careful not to openly

defy *on campus* – particularly in front of the students. As one participant said, "Some of

them [faculty/staff] will follow things [rules and expectations] here and then do their own

thing outside when they are isolated from the students." As another faculty member

mentioned regarding the movie-attendance issue, "If I really wanted to see a movie really

bad, I would get in the car and drive a couple of hours away. That's not a huge issue."

Many other Adventists would consider movie attendance as a more peripheral issue

falling outside of the spiritual realm. Only the most conservative SDA might still view

the issue as a spiritual matter. Nevertheless, because academies are the "last bastion of

conservative Adventism" (see Chapter Five), movie attendance is something that

faculty/staff often do not openly defy unless they are off campus and out of the

panopticon's eye.

Participants may also defy core SDA beliefs. For example, the following

participant expresses outright disagreement with one of the more accepted principles of

the SDA church surrounding the idea of clean/unclean meats as explicated in the Biblical

book of Leviticus. Included on the "unclean" list is pork. He tells about his own

personal practices and beliefs that run contrary to the dietary guidelines offered in the

Bible but also is careful to share how he does not wish to cause "controversy" in his

students' minds:

> I eat sausage. I don't think the clean and the clean and unclean [meat] business
> has… I think that's the stupidest doctrine the Adventist church has because it is

> clearly out of the old Mosaic law… so I ignore it. But I don't go out and buy bacon every week. If I'm on a trip and I feel like an egg McMuffin, well I get one. And then I probably won't eat any "unclean meat" for another four months, you know, six months. So I don't think that's necessarily being a hypocrite…. When I'm around the kids, I try to avoid doing [anything controversial]…I'll just say, "take the sausage off" or whatever because I don't want to create a controversy in their minds. But I also don't want to put myself into an uncomfortable position where I later have to defend my actions. There were times when I sat with kids and they had bacon on their hamburger or whatever, and I never made a big deal about it. But as far as actually eating ham or bacon or whatever in front of the kids, um, no, I haven't ever done that.

This participant openly characterizes one of the church's dietary principles as "the stupidest doctrine" of the church, and in his own practices he clearly eats sausage and bacon without compunction. Yet, within the bounds of his influence, when around students, he is not so open with his practices for two reasons: 1) he does not want to cause "controversy" in their minds, and 2) he does not want to have to "defend his actions" (i.e., the "regulation" aspect of spiritual labor). The first reason illustrates the desire to avoid setting a bad example for students by diverging from the beliefs faculty/staff would be expected to embrace as loyal member of the SDA church. Secondly, diverging from commonly accepted Adventist standards in both belief and practice is seen to bring with it regulatory consequences (i.e., having to "defend" one's actions).

What is evident in these examples is that some faculty/staff members may appear to embrace the spiritual expectation, beliefs, and behaviors required of them, but often practice differently when those associated with the school are not privy to that behavior. The combination of the reframing of spiritual expectations as trivial, peripheral, or job-related, the regulation component of spiritual labor, and the all-encompassing, "fishbowl" aspect of the boarding school existence seems to encourage participants to practice their

270

divergent lifestyle issues off-campus – or at least out of the glare of the panopticon where others might see them. Summarized the following participant:

> If they [other faculty members] don't agree with [the principle] they might be supportive to your face about it, or to the administration about it…. I haven't seen any outright actions, you know, to where it's publicly, uh… rules haven't been followed as far as spiritual rules. But I do see that we take it in our home or when we have the kids with us in our homes or when we're out, one thing or another, that it's not… it's not honored as a school policy. I've even seen it openly ridiculed, "Well, we're not on campus, so we can do this and this and this." "I don't agree with that policy, so we're not going to worry about that."

This participant reports his opinion of how others handle spiritual issues and expectations they do not agree with. These faculty members operate with two faces – one on-campus in front of those that might regulate such behavior (i.e., the administration), and another "in their home" or off-campus – a scenario that might lead to dissonance. One participant shared how he handles the fact that his Sabbath-keeping standards differ from those promoted by the school:

> Participant: Does my family do stuff differently [on Sabbath]? Sure. Do I know what cities I can go into and maybe on Sabbath we can have something to eat and not worry someone is going to see me?
>
> Tammy: Is [name of closest city] one of those?
>
> Participant: Yeah…. Certain places in [name of city]. But, you know, I really do not have a problem with [eating out on Sabbath].

Going out to eat on the Sabbath is one of the Sabbath-keeping practices that would be seen as inappropriate in some areas and more acceptable in others. This faculty member was teaching in a section of the country that took a more conservative stance on this practice. Hence, he has figured out where he can go where no one can see him practice the Sabbath in a way in which he is accustomed. Note how this participant like many others characterizes his divergent practices as an unimportant issue ("I really do not have a problem with it"). Reframing issues out of the spiritual arena allows these participants

271

to hold two different standards – one off campus and one on campus – without facing

overwhelming dissonance.

I will offer a final example illustrating participants' careful managing of

behaviors that might be seen as unacceptable by practicing different behavioral standards

on and off campus. The following example returns to the issue of wearing jewelry:

> Participant: I do wear a ring. I wore it then [when teaching in the academy], I just took it off every time I came to school, and put it back on every time I left.
>
> Tammy: (laughter) When you left campus?
>
> Participant: When I left campus because, you know, I would go home on the weekends. So I had to remember to do that.
>
> Tammy: Did you ever forget when you came back on?
>
> Participant: (chuckles) Yes, but not for too long. I was pretty good about catching that.

This particular former faculty member actually had two homes – one on campus and a

separate home in another town. Because faculty are required to live on campus, this

former faculty member maintained a home on campus as well as the other home that he

owned previous to taking employment in the boarding school. Thus, the reference to

"going home" on the weekends refers to leaving the actual premises of the school when

no on-campus responsibilities presented themselves. The change in behavior between

wearing a ring and not wearing a ring was clearly demarcated by entering the campus

environs.

That these faculty/staff practice one set of behaviors on campus and another off

campus sets the stage for spiritual dissonance. However, the reframing of these issues as

not falling in the spiritual realm allows participants to practice two different lifestyle

choices without seeming to wrestle with irreconcilable hypocrisy or spiritual dissonance.

Nonetheless, because their actions may be regulated and because the panopticon on the

boarding school campus makes their behaviors visible to others (and thus may give the *appearance* of hypocrisy), they often go off-campus and practice what their organizations may otherwise regulate. In this way the reframing of spiritual issues proves a potent strategy to mitigate, deny, or diminish the possibility of spiritual dissonance in the face of the spiritual labor of boarding school faculty/staff who do not fully embrace the spiritual and religious expectations incumbent upon them.

Strategies for Dealing with Dissonance: Moving On

One of the most clear-cut strategies for dealing with spiritual dissonance was simply to eliminate that dissonance by moving on to another school, union, or conference that better matched one's own personal spiritual beliefs. Rarely did these participants talk about themselves or others who left the SDA education system altogether – or who left *because* of spiritual dissonance. Said one participant in response to how faculty/staff respond to spiritual rules/expectations that they don't really believe in or agree with, "Some leave teaching at that academy. And that doesn't happen that often at [name of her school]."

Nevertheless, even if moving on did not emerge as the strategy of choice when dealing with spiritual dissonance, it is clear from examples provided in the qualitative interviews that the faculty/staff in SDA boarding schools manage spiritual dissonance by removing themselves (or consider removing themselves) from the institution where such dissonance occurs. The incidents related below were all shared in response to the interview question asking how faculty members in general responded to spiritual rules/expectations that they did not follow or personally agree with regarding their work in a SDA boarding academy. One faculty member tells of a colleague who quit rather than pay tithe to the church as required:

> There was another member on the staff who was complete opposite of me spiritually. He was so conservative. And I realized at this point that he was taking his tithe money for his own personal religious purposes and not turning it into the church because he thought he had better plans for it…. It [taking tithe in that manner] would not have been very acceptable to the conference. And he chose to quit rather than stay on.

Whether this person left church employment completely or whether he moved on to another school or conference where his views on tithe would have been less divergent is not clear. However, the incident illustrates how some faculty/staff members refuse to put themselves in a position where spiritual dissonance might arise – they refuse to reframe, keep silent, or defy the expectations with which they disagree. Instead they just move on.

As one faculty summarized:

> I think that's what a lot of people do [when faced with spiritual issues they personally disagree with]. They may come up with some issues that they don't really agree with, but typically since they teach here, they either don't push them or they kind of mitigate them or modify them so they fit. Otherwise they typically find their own way out. They say, "I can't work here because it's not strict enough," or whatever, and they go looking for some self-supporting[7] place or something like that.

As this participant articulates, faculty may be silent (i.e., not "push the issue"), may reframe the issue (i.e., "modify them so they fit") or may move on to a type of institution that better aligns with their own personal spiritual views.

Even if the participants in this study would not or could not share incidences where they or others had quit their jobs instead of acquiescing to spiritual expectations with which they didn't agree, they often reported that *"Moving On"* was an option they personally had considered or would consider. The following participant had experienced strong objections to how a fellow staff member was treated. He felt that the policy of the

---

[7] This participant's reference to "some self-supporting place" refers to Adventists schools which are not funded by the church, conference, or union. They are typically much more conservative regarding Adventist beliefs than the typical SDA academy.

administration with regards to certain personnel decisions was "not Christian." The issue

in his mind was very much a spiritual one, relating to one's obligations and relationships

with others (see Chapter Two): "I don't think you should do that – I don't care if the

other person is a Seventh day Adventist or an atheist, you just don't do that to another

human being." As he struggled about whether he wanted to work in a school where he

felt so uncomfortable and even angry about the current policy he shared the following:

> So [the principal] has made a decision and I have to either come to grips with it
> and live with it or I have to go someplace else….Oh… if it gets to the place where
> we [he and his wife] don't agree with the standards of the school or how the
> school's operating or whatever we will go someplace else. We can do that. We
> don't really want to, but we can….But it has been really difficult …. It is really
> why I interviewed at another school. It has been very difficult for me.

This participant reiterates a number of times the "difficult" nature of this situation as he

wrestles with whether he can continue to be associated with an institution he feels has so

egregiously violated Christian principles on how to treat "other human beings." He

clearly acknowledges that moving on is a choice he has considered.

The ability to move on is seen by others as a viable option when faced with

untenable spiritual choices in the face of spiritual dissonance. While the example above

dealt with the general Christian principal of treating others in a fair and decent manner,

the following revolves around a spiritual/religious principle more particular to the SDA

church and a spiritual expectation of those who work in the church's educational system.

This is the principle of tithing, an issue that has been mentioned a number of times up to

this point. The following exchange occurred with a participant who unabashedly

revealed that he did not necessarily believe in the principle of tithing. However, the

expectation that church employees be faithful tithe-payers also involves sometimes

275

rigorous regulatory mechanisms. The excerpt below begins with a comment on this process.

> Participant: You see [teachers] and pastors are given an audited sheet, I've been told, of here's your income and here's your tithe…. it's not matching up to the 10%.
>
> Tammy: Oh! So someone actually keeps track of that. Have you ever had that?
>
> Participant: I've never had that. But I'll tell you what, if it ever happened, I'd probably move on to the next school. Find another conference, union, or whatever.
>
> Tammy: So that's something you couldn't live with?
>
> Participant: No.

Being required to be a tithe-payer is something that this participant simply could not "live with." He was not alone on this issue. Another participant who had equally strong feelings about being required to pay tithe reports saying to the conference treasurer, "You don't have to understand my position, but either respect it or I'll find a new job somewhere else." As a point of fact, this participants *did* move to a school in a different union to a great degree because of his fundamental disagreement with the tithing requirement with which he so disagreed. As a whole, these participants would not reframe the issue, keep silent, or defy the spiritual expectations. They would simply move on.

I have illustrated that *Moving On* is a strategy that faculty/staff occasionally employ or consider employing. It is also interesting to note that very often my participants suggested that this was a strategy that *others* should utilize in the face of divergent thinking. In other words, many felt that those who diverged personally from the spiritual beliefs and expectation embraced by the school and church should simply remove themselves from their jobs.

And to be bitter and complain about them [spiritual expectations], like some people did at our boarding academy, I think it's just ridiculous because I think you're an agent in this. So if you don't agree with it, there are always other options. To leave. To do something else. And that's how I felt.

Note that in the list of "other options" this participant does not include any of the other strategies delineated in this chapter, i.e., reframing, keeping silent, defying or ignoring those expectations off campus. Instead, she feels they should simply leave and "do something else."

The idea that faculty/staff should come into their jobs both knowing and embracing the spiritual/religious tenets of the church was a strong feeling among many.

I knew what the Seventh-day Adventist lifestyle was. I think anyone that is hired is a Seventh-day Adventist… We are unique because we know what those standards are. And my personal feeling was that if I didn't want to abide by them, then I shouldn't be there [at the boarding school].

This participant is even stronger in her feeling that those who don't embody and embrace the "SDA lifestyle" should not just leave, but never even have taken the job as a SDA educator in the first place. What the final example that follows illustrates in addition is the recognition that simply abiding by SDA "standards" might differ in practice from school to school, conference to conference, or union to union. He champions the importance of matching one's own personal beliefs with those held by the school in which one works. As the excerpt begins, he is talking about issues "in the religious realm":

You know, you really have to understand and choose wisely what your core beliefs are and will this school fit my beliefs as Adventist or as a Christian? And then what you do is you go from there. Can I teach at that school and hold on to my values? And I believe every boarding school is different in that realm. Um… and when those values change, when your school goes a different direction and they are no longer copasetic to your values, then you need to be looking at something else.

The "need to look at something else" when one's own spiritual values do not match up with the school's again reflects the recognition so many participants expressed that *Moving On* was a critical and sometimes necessary element of dealing with the often uncomfortable spiritual dissonance that may arise when one's own practices and beliefs do not align with the school's or church's.

"Moving On": Summary

The theme of *Moving On* illustrates one of the methods participants employ for avoiding or dealing with spiritual dissonance in the face of the spiritual labor required of them. The examples above represented incidences where faculty/staff in SDA boarding schools voluntarily left their jobs or where they contemplated doing so in the face of spiritual disagreements related to their employment. In addition, I have illustrated that *Moving On* was a choice many participants felt *others* should make if confronted by the types of spiritual disagreements that precipitate spiritual dissonance. By removing themselves from the arena in which spiritual dissonance might occur, faculty/staff in SDA boarding schools thus eliminate even the possibility of spiritual dissonance that might accompany spiritual labor in the boarding school context.

In sum, I have so far outlined in this chapter how faculty/staff in boarding school campuses respond to, mitigate, deny, or manage the spiritual dissonance that may accompany spiritual labor in a parochial boarding school – *Silence, Reframing Spiritual Boundaries,* and *Moving On.* I will next explicate the final theme for managing spiritual dissonance that emerged from the qualitative interviews – *Weighing the Benefits*.

Strategies for Dealing with Dissonance: Weighing the Benefits

The final method of dealing with the spiritual dissonance in the face of spiritual labor in an SDA boarding school revolves around the question of "Why?" Why work in

a total institution where the close proximity of the "fishbowl" and intensive time involvement makes one's actions and behaviors eminently noticeable and the ability to separate work and private lives notably difficult? Why teach in an institution where one is expected to believe and practice what one may not in fact embrace? Why be a faculty member in a parochial school whose sponsoring church is one with which you do not share major doctrinal tenets? Why willingly operate in an arena where spiritual dissonance is a very real possibility or reality? The answer to these questions comprised the most unmistakable theme in these qualitative interviews – for the students and the relationship that can be built with them, both for what one can give and what one can receive (see also Chapter Four). Those participants who personally deviated in either core values or peripheral issues from the spiritual expectations accompanying their work as teachers/staff in a SDA institution, those who reported no dissonance whatsoever, and those who employed the strategies heretofore discussed in this chapter for dealing with dissonance – each and every one – reported that what they loved best about their boarding school life was the relationships they built with students and the ministry they felt they could offer. In many cases, when these participants could not mitigate, abate, or avoid spiritual dissonance, this benefit alone made the discomfort of that dissonance worthwhile. Secondly, a number of participants also revealed that while they might experience spiritual dissonance as a result of deep disagreements with the church's core beliefs, their sense of belonging and community to their church "family" trumped the discomforts of that dissonance. I will illustrate below each of these elements involved in *Weighing the Benefits* of spiritual labor and boarding school life against the possibility or reality of spiritual dissonance.

Weighing the Benefits: The Students. That spiritual labor would occur within the

confines of the total institution setting of a boarding school makes spiritual dissonance

even more onerous, but these negatives are weighed in the balance with the close,

positive relationships built with students. As one participant said in answer to the

question, "What's the best thing about working in a boarding school" – "Oh, it's working

with the young people. Otherwise, why be here, you know? There's lots of other things

to do." More specifically, faculty members delight in what they see as their ministry of

providing a positive influence in students' lives. As one former faculty reiterated,

> When I was in boarding school, there was a whole lot more to my job than just
> going to my class and teaching the class and that was to help shape young people
> and their thinking and everything else. And doing it out of love for the kids, you
> know.

Faculty members' willingness and dedication to helping "shape" young people is part of

the commodity offered by SDA educational institutions (see Chapter 5) and this

"shaping" is expected to involve spiritual and religious issues as well. To be Seventh-

day Adventists in good and regular standing and to be willing supporters of the church

and its spiritual world-view thus becomes one of the foundational expectations of those

who engage in spiritual labor in these institutions. Not fully living up to the requirements

of being a church member "in good and regular standing" or not agreeing with the

spiritual direction and decisions of the school and administration sets the stage for

spiritual dissonance. In spite of these exigencies, even those who reported experiencing

spiritual dissonance reiterate their focus on benefiting the students as their primary goal:

> I can't control what goes on in the administrative office. I don't have that power
> or that ability, and that's not why I was put here. And after I turned that over in
> my mind a while, I felt a peace that I experienced when I first when into
> [academy work]. It's not my business at this point…. Just… because it would
> make me grumpy and unbearable here at work sometimes, and I knew that. And,

and after that, I realized that… just get back to what I first focused on, which was
to be [here] with these kids, teach them, do my job.

The effects of dissonance are here obvious – being "grumpy" and "unbearable." But this

participant instead focuses on what he sees as his purpose for being in that institution in

the first place – to influence the students for the better.

However, not only do faculty members weigh spiritual dissonance against their

mission of helping students, they also consistently note how satisfying their relationships

are with students and how the rewards of these relationships make up for much of the

discomfort dissonance affords. When asked directly about the issue of her spiritual

dissonance ("What is it like to work for the church when deep down inside you don't

share all of those beliefs?"), the following faculty member unhesitantly responds:

> Well, it sounds like it could be really awful, but your life is so consumed, every
> moment is so consumed with the things that have to be done…. And…and it's
> such a fulfilling job, because the kids have so many genuine needs that you can
> often fill on the spot – you know, needs of all kinds because they have no parents
> there. And it's fun. It's fun to fill their needs; it's fun to relate to them…. And
> those kids that I formed relationships with are now some of my very best friends.

Not only does this former faculty member outline the satisfaction in meeting the needs of

her students, she notes that part of being able to meet those needs is the direct result of

being "consumed" by the time constraints of the job and being able to help students "on

the spot." In large measure because of the close proximity of boarding school life,

spiritual dissonance becomes difficult to hide or escape. In spite of that fact, the rewards

afforded by these close relationships even in the direct face of spiritual dissonance are

pronounced and oft noted by these participants.

Particularly worth revealing is the response of those participants in this study who

openly confessed to dissonance and who remarked on their deep divergence from many

of the spiritual expectations inherent in their spiritual labor as boarding school teachers.

Without exception each of them mentions "weighing in the balance" the benefits of

working with students despite sometimes being awash in spiritual dissonance. As one

said, "I think the relationship with the kids is by far the very best thing. I love the kids. I

love teenagers because I think teenagers are the best people on the planet. (laughter)

That's the real bright spot for me. They [the students] really showed me a lot of love."

Weighing in the balance the love of students (and for students) against working in an

institution which expects certain spiritual beliefs and practices one does not embrace is

most completely articulated by the following faculty member who first comments upon

her strategies for dealing with spiritual dissonance. She then goes on to share how she

has weighed the positive benefits against these rewards and has come out satisfied:

> Participant: I think I'm not the kind of person who goes about this [dealing with spiritual dissonance] in a rebellious, flaunting kind of way, although there were a couple of faculty meetings when I might have stepped over the line. But generally speaking I think they realized that I was trying to have a positive influence on the kids' lives.
>
> Tammy: How did you cognitively deal with the idea that you are working for a church that… that it sounds like you felt marginalized you and in a school whose spirituality maybe did not dovetail with what you personally held?
>
> Participant: I think what saved it for me was the students themselves…. I love working with kids, and I think these kids were more… um… [pause] They were there for a purpose, you know. Their spiritual commitment was real. It was a reward to me.
>
> Tammy: So that made all the rest of it worthwhile?
>
> Participant: Yes, because that is why you were there. You are there to work for the kids, and when they are responding and growing in such a beautiful way, it's certainly worth being there. The other was just… you know, everywhere you go or whatever work you do there is going to be annoyances. And I guess I just saw those things as annoyances.

"Those things" referred to in the last line above are the spiritual expectations, religious

beliefs and spiritual approach of the organization with which this participant confesses

she disagrees – sometimes on very deep levels. Yet in the end she sees these as

"annoyances" in comparison to the rich rewards of working with students. She

recognizes that amidst sometimes uncomfortable spiritual dissonance, she is not always

successful in mitigating that dissonance – not always good at "biting her tongue" – but

she, like other participants in this study, weighed the dissonance in the balance and found

the relationships with students and the opportunity to impact their lives (and to be

impacted in turn) often made the spiritual dissonance "a mere annoyance." The

relationships that are built in the all-encompassing total institution atmosphere of a

boarding school seem to dissipate, or at least mitigate, the effects of spiritual dissonance

reported by these participants.

   Weighing the Benefits: The Church Family. The relationships mentioned above

are also notable in that they are often referred to as being familial in nature. Not only is

the boarding school referred to as a family by these participants (see Chapters Four and

Five), but the overarching church is also referred to as a family. Significantly, because

the school's spiritual mission is so intertwined with the spiritual worldview of the church

as a whole, dealing with spiritual dissonance is not as simple as finding another job

elsewhere in the SDA educational system. The strategy of *Moving On* illustrated earlier

in this chapter does not always address the core roots of dissonance since even with

another job, basic disagreements with the church are still in place. Yet as participants

pointed out, these disagreements happen within a church "family." The concept of the

church as a "family" makes simply walking away from a job in which one experiences

spiritual dissonance not such a clear-cut decision when weighed against the benefits that

belonging to both a close school community and a far-reaching church "family" can bring

– even if one has disagreements within those communities. When I asked one participant

why she remained an Adventist, let alone a boarding school teacher within that system

given her disagreement with many of the foundational tenets of the church, she replied:

> You know, when you grow up as an Adventist, it is a whole culture. It really is a
> whole culture. It is like being on an island by yourselves almost.… You grow up
> doing the same kinds of things, and they grow to have meaning to you. Tradition.
> And, your friends, you know, that you meet in your Adventist institutions are
> spread all over the U.S., and they're everywhere you go. You can't go anywhere
> on vacation without finding people you love. And that's a wonderful thing.

This particular participant expressed elsewhere in the interview that she does not

internalize most of the beliefs of the Adventist church, calling herself a "closet non-

Adventist." Nevertheless, she sees herself at home with the cultural, traditional, and

relational aspects of the church, though she fundamentally disagrees with their

spiritual/religious doctrines. Against the backdrop of the spiritual dissonance she

expressed earlier in this chapter is juxtaposed the "wonderful thing" it is to be part of this

community. Once again, weighed against the discomfort of spiritual dissonance are the

deep relationships formed not only in the boarding school atmosphere, but in the network

of the church organization as a whole. These are not easily abandoned.

This section entitled *Weighing the Benefits* began with a basic question – Why did

a number of these participants seem so tolerant of deep spiritual dissonance? One of the

answers comes from the idea that they see themselves as part of a larger system that

forms their religious or spiritual family. The following participant coupled the family

metaphor of the church with the reward of working with students in the following

exchange:

> Tammy: That's very interesting to me that you so obviously expressed that you
> felt frustrated with the [SDA] church as a whole. And there is some irony that
> you were working for that church.
>
> Participant: (laughs) Isn't that true? You know.…I expressed some of this
> [disagreement and unhappiness with the church] to one of my professors. And he
> said, "Why would you stay with a church who behaved in such an abusive

284

> manner?" I mean, that was his viewpoint. And there was another Adventist lady in there, and we looked at each other, and we said, "Well, maybe it is abusive, but it is our family." And I think in some ways that's probably the truth.

This participant expresses why she continues to identify with a church organization that brings her great frustration. Working in a SDA boarding school carries the assumption that one identify with the church. One may leave boarding school work and still be part of this church, but one cannot renounce church affiliation and still be employed in a SDA educational institution. Thus, being part of the church and working in one of the church's educational institutions are inextricably intertwined. This participant above clearly articulates what keeps her in the church and what enables her, in part, to manage the spiritual dissonance that comes with working for that church – this is the sense of family. Walking away from a difficult situation – such as a job that potentially surrounds one with spiritual dissonance – is not easy within the context of this family metaphor. Weighed in the balance, then, spiritual dissonance is often tolerated given the compensating relationships inherent in the boarding school atmosphere and church organization

Summary

This chapter has dealt with Research Questions two and three: "What dissonance (if any) does spiritual labor engender?" and "How do teachers and staff manage dissonance (if any) that may arise from their spiritual labor?" I have illustrated that spiritual dissonance can occur in the face of spiritual labor when faculty/staff's personal beliefs and behaviors deviate from those which the organization embraces and/or mandates. Spiritual labor can often be uncomfortable for organizational members and is intensified by the pressure to be a good example to students and the fear that one be seen as a hypocrite.

I have also outlined the various strategies the participants in this study employed to avoid, mitigate, or reframe that dissonance. Participant may simply choose silence and keep their deviance as quiet as possible to avoid the appearance or reality of hypocrisy and to escape the regulation aspect of spiritual labor that may accompany such deviance. Some simply move on to another position more conducive to their own personal belief system.

The most common and complex method of dealing with or avoiding spiritual dissonance is to reframe organizational expectations out of the spiritual realm so that practicing different lifestyle habits on campus and others off campus (or out of the "fishbowl") is not a form of hypocrisy fostering spiritual dissonance. Rather, what the organization might place within spiritual boundaries, participants simply consider as issues on par with dress code or other such job-related matters that are not spiritual in nature. Those that overtly ignore or defy expectations can do so with little danger of spiritual dissonance if those expectations are framed as "no big deal" or as trivial issues not related to spirituality. As these participants' experiences reveal, spiritual dissonance lurks within the bounds of spiritual labor. What is also clear, however, is that this spiritual dissonance certainly does not run roughshod over or devastate the corresponding joy and pleasure of the strong relationships that counterbalance the potential negative aspects of faculty/staff's spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools.

Chapter Seven: Discussion, Implications, Limitations, & Conclusion

In the previous chapters I have explored three broad areas: parochial boarding schools as total institutions, the three elements of spiritual labor (commodification, codification, and regulation), and the issue of spiritual dissonance. In this chapter I will discuss the previous analysis in relation to the five research questions I earlier proposed, make connections with the literature, outline limitations as well as implications of this study, and offer suggestions for further scholarship relative to spiritual labor.

The Three Elements of Spiritual Labor

The first research question asked, "What is the nature of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools?" In Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) boarding schools, all three elements of spiritual labor (the commodification, codification, and regulation of the spirituality of teachers/staff) presented themselves both in the qualitative interviews and the documents I analyzed for this study. I will summarize and discuss each of these three elements of spiritual labor in turn.

Commodification of Spirituality

Both the larger SDA church structure and the individual boarding schools themselves commodified the spirituality of their teachers/staff. The overall church body overtly tied the spirituality of its educational personnel to the unique commodity, or service, that sets apart a SDA parochial education. Teachers are seen as responsible for more than just the learning of math, English, Spanish, or history, for example; their job is painted as a ministry. In this sense, the work of teachers expands beyond the academic into the spiritual. The individual academies marketed teacher/staff spirituality more

287

subtly as part of the "family" atmosphere a boarding school can provide. Implicit in this

marketing strategy is the sense that such close interaction affords faculty/staff an

opportunity to be spiritual mentors and examples to students. Thus the church as a whole

more obviously commodified the spirituality of its teachers/staff. The individual

boarding schools in this system commodified that spirituality more subtly.

The more implicit nature of the individual schools' marketing (i.e.,

commodification) of its teacher/staff's spirituality is not surprising given the rhetorical

exigencies inherent in commodifying the promise of strong academics immersed in an

overtly spiritual atmosphere. Comparing the ways in which schools market academics

and how they market teachers/staff's spirituality helps to understand why the marketing

of that spirituality may not always be obvious. First, in a parochial school the

expectation of some level of *spiritual* as well as *academic* competence on the part of its

teachers still remains. In the academic realm competency is marked by accreditations,

degrees, certificates, etc. (unlike some private school systems, SDA schools undergo an

extensive accreditation process, and teachers are required to be credentialed). Schools

might overtly market their students' test scores or the number or type of electives they

offer (i.e., rock-climbing, instrument ensembles, auto body repair, etc.), but in the

academic realm what schools commodify is an overall quality academic educational

experience, assuring parents that sending their students to a Seventh-day Adventist school

does not preclude academic rigor and excellence. Are teachers central to this commodity

of excellent education? Yes. Do schools overtly market the competencies of these

teachers? Only rarely. One school, for example, mentions on its website the number of

staff who have master's degrees (see Auburn Adventist Academy, 2006), but in general

the academic competence of teachers is relatively assumed. By comparison, the same

may be said for teacher/staff's spiritual competence as well.

Teachers and staff in parochial SDA schools are, therefore, expected to embody

and embrace a certain quality of spirituality in their own lives. Their ministry of

educating students in not only the academic disciplines but in matters of spirituality as

well carries certain assumptions of "spiritual competence." As intimated above, just as a

school would be unlikely to market academic excellence by flashing messages saying in

essence, "Yes! Our English teacher actually knows about English. H/she is competent!"

schools would be just as reluctant to highlight the spirituality of teachers and staff in such

a manner – "Yes! Our teachers are Seventh-day Adventist Christians. They actually hold

the values they will be teaching your children. We promise!" So while the

commodification of teachers/staff's spirituality was often subtle, that spirituality

nevertheless served as a core foundation for the unique commodity offered by a SDA

parochial education. In light of the overall concept of spiritual labor and its further study,

these observations are an indication that spirituality of organizational members may be

commodified with more or less subtlety. This recognition should not be overlooked

when examining the commodification element of spiritual labor in other types of

organizations as well.

Codification of Spirituality

Like the commodification of spirituality, the SDA parochial school system also

codifies spiritual expectations for teachers/staff with more or less specificity and more or

less formality. Personnel manuals and contracts serve as examples of formal

codification. Informally, spiritual expectations might often be communicated through

interviews. Others such as parents, fellow church members, or colleagues communicate

norms and expectations to teachers and staff members. What makes this informal

codification more complex is the assumption that being a Seventh-day Adventists in

"good and regular standing ("Personnel Handbook," 2005) constitutes the baseline of

spiritual expectations for those who work in SDA schools. Furthermore, learning to be a

SDA in "good and regular standing" is thought to be the natural result of church

membership and/or growing up in a SDA home. Thus, spiritual expectations are not

expected to be specifically codified by the organization. The emergent theme in the

analysis of this informal codification, *Like Knowing that the Sky is Blue*, illustrated that

SDA boarding school teachers often do not recognize, remember, or attend to the official

codification of spiritual expectations by their organization; in these participants' minds,

the painfully obvious answer to what is expected of them spiritually is that they be SDA

Christians, something they see as second nature. These finding strongly infer that those

who engage in spiritual labor may or may not be able to articulate the codified

expectations of their organization. Instead, these may be deeply embedded in members'

own belief systems.

Yet the organization (both the school and the church) in this study *did* formally

codify spiritual expectations. As mentioned above, in some cases members reported an

awareness of organizational expectations by reading contracts or employment manuals or

by being informed in the interview process. The vast majority of participants, however,

indicated that knowing they were expected/required to be Seventh-day Adventist and

knowing the general spiritual beliefs of the church was second-nature to them – like

knowing that the sky is blue. If pressed, they knew that "the sky was blue" because that

was what they had learned growing up. In the same manner, my participants did not feel

they needed to be instructed in the beliefs of the church – they did not need the

organization to codify expectations because these participants were SDA by profession,

belief, and birth, even unto the third and fourth generations. Such a process might be

compared to the "organizational osmosis" suggested by Gibson and Papa (2000). In that

case, the expectations, norms, and values of the organization were not learned at the

hands of the organization itself, but could be attributed to the anticipatory socialization

afforded by living with family members who were invested in the organization by virtue

of long-time church membership – often over generations. In the same way, those who

grew up SDA – sometimes as third, fourth, or even sixth generation Adventists –

assumed that they understood the spiritual expectations inherent in being a SDA "in good

and regular standing," the primary officially codified requirement attendant on

faculty/staff's spiritual labor. Though organizations may codify spiritual expectations

more or less formally, deeply embedded norms and values may serve as members'

primary guide to interpreting these expectations. What should be kept in mind in future

examinations of spiritual labor, therefore, are these more nuanced means by which

members may come to understand and discover the expectations, norms, and values

incumbent on the spiritual labor required by their organizations.

Regulation of Spirituality

As the experiences of these participants further revealed, the assumptions about

what it means to be a SDA "in good and regular standing" differ from school to school

and region to region, more or less on a conservative—liberal continuum. Such an

observation is significant in that faculty may in fact personally differ from the more

conservative or liberal stance officially or unofficially codified by their individual boarding schools. This exigency complicates the regulatory aspects of spiritual labor from an organizational stance – organizations are caught in an uncomfortable contradiction. By codifying and regulating spiritual expectations too formally, they may offend and irritate their members. By not codifying and regulating those spiritual expectations, they run the risk that members will not live up to the standards or will not know what those standards are. Nevertheless, in this study the regulatory process revealed that the first step organizations take (or administrators in that organizations employ) is often to more explicitly communicate expectations. This initial attempt to bring organizational members into line may be followed by further regulatory steps such as terminating employment or asking/encouraging the faculty/staff members to move to another location.

Issues of Informal Regulation and Concertive Control

Further examination of the concertive control inherent in the informal regulation of spiritual expectations is warranted. When faculty/staff in SDA boarding schools are expected to uphold certain spiritual standards, and when spiritual labor occurs in an all-encompassing total institution environment, a type of concertive control mechanism for the regulation of spiritual labor is in place. In particular, when the spiritual labor of faculty/staff occurs within the "fishbowl" of close proximity inherent on boarding school campuses, a type of panopticon effect presents itself where organizational members may always be under scrutiny (or think they are) and may, therefore, always be eligible for "intervention" at the hands of the large circle of stakeholders whose presence is difficult to escape.

In this study, the theme of *Intervention* captured the essence of the concertive control and informal regulatory mechanism that molds the spiritual labor of faculty and staff on SDA boarding campuses. While some looked upon the informal regulation of others' spiritual actions, behaviors, or beliefs as simple meddling, this analysis would be far too simplistic in and of itself. Organizational members who *intervene* often appear to be motivated by a concern for the spiritual welfare of the school community as a whole and the "offending" individuals themselves. In other words, the concertive control itself may be motivated by spiritual concerns. In sum, then, the close proximity of the boarding school leads to the visibility that makes one's action open for scrutiny and regulation; the spiritual practices and beliefs of faculty and staff on boarding school campuses can be closely monitored or regulated within this contemporary example of the panopticon. In this way we see enacted the disciplinary power Foucault (1977) argued follows a more modern societal use of the principles of the panopticon. What this study illustrated was that failure to live up to the formal or informal expectations brings some sort of notice in the panopticon and often some sort of intervention on the part of others in the form of concertive control.

These elements of concertive control (or the possibility of such) have already been alluded to in the spirituality literature. For example, Goodier and Eisenberg's (2006) examination of spiritual approaches to organizing noted that concertive control of spiritual norms, rules, and values was more prevalent in the absence of bureaucratic attempts at control. In addition, they observed that the more organizational members identified with an organization, the more likely they were to attempt to preserve that organization's spiritual values and norms via measures of concertive control. As my

study illustrated, most faculty/staff in SDA boarding schools are highly dedicated to their

jobs (i.e., "it's not a job – it's a lifestyle"), including the spiritual mission of their schools

– even to the point of enduring the discomfort engendered by living in the glare of the

panopticon and the other total institution qualities of their boarding school lives. Given

these conditions, the presence of concertive control with regard to spiritual labor should

not be surprising. Within the realm of spiritual labor, then, elements of concertive

control may well serve a critical role in the part organizations and their members play in

regulating spiritual expectations.

What might also be noted within the bounds of this study is that the based on the

codified regulation for employment (e.g., Personnel Handbook, 2005) SDA schools are

careful to hire faculty and staff whose spirituality they assume does not *have to be*

regulated because their beliefs, behavior, and practices so seamlessly integrate with the

mission of SDA education and with the spiritual stances and practices held by the church

body as a whole. Of course as the following section will reiterate, such seamless

integration might be wished for (and perhaps even assumed) by the organization, but it is

not always the case – a fact which leaves room for spiritual dissonance to enter the

picture of spiritual labor.

Spiritual Dissonance and Spiritual Labor

Research question two asked, "What dissonance (if any) does spiritual labor

engender?" This question was worded to allow for the possibility that the participants in

this study would not experience dissonance. Indeed, many of them report none.

Contributing to this dearth is no doubt the point noted above that part of the conditions

for employment include the stipulation that organizational members "wholeheartedly"

(e.g., Mid-America Education Code, 2006) buy in to the spiritual mission of the school.

These organizational members are less likely to experience dissonance. Such a

conclusion is intimated in the emotional labor work which has pointed out that emotional

labor does not *always* lead to stress, burnout, or emotional dissonance (e.g., Stenross &

Kleinman, 1989). Therefore, the corresponding finding in this study that dissonance is

not a part of spiritual labor by default is not surprising, but remains significant,

nonetheless. Those who work in parochial boarding schools undoubtedly do so for

reasons that transcend material and monetary compensation (see Cookson & Persell,

1985). That these organizational members to some extent self-selected the organizations

where their spiritual labor occurs suggests that the absence of dissonance should not

necessarily be surprising. Other literature supports this conclusion as well. For example,

the experience of the participants in Feldman's (2006) examination of how a Jesuit

organization might go about infusing spirituality into its mission and practices may not

differ from the participants who underwent spiritual labor in the present study. In

Feldman's work, many organizational members reported that they embraced a more

spiritually focused organization because that focus made their work more meaningful and

because they welcomed the opportunity to integrate their spiritual selves into their

workplace lives. Thus, as Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) postulated with emotional

dissonance, those who highly identify with an organization are less likely to experience

dissonance (see also Ashforth & Tomiuk, 2000; Morris & Feldman, 1996; Tracy &

Tracy, 1998). The meaningful rewards accompanying the opportunity to interweave their

faith in their work lives as well as the high integration in and identification with the SDA

church (and by proxy its educational institutions) are factors that would minimize

potential dissonance in the spiritual labor of the participants in this study.

Yet, despite the fact that many participants did not report spiritual dissonance, for

a significant number of others it was an unmistakable part of their spiritual labor. On

some level this dissonance emanated from more peripheral spiritual issues On other

levels, however, some also reported being quite divergent from core, centrist Adventist

doctrines. Not surprisingly, dissonance emerging from these more central spiritual

matters proved particularly likely to provoke the anger, frustration, or stress often

associated with dissonance. Whatever the cause, these participants engaged in various

strategies to manage this dissonance (or potential dissonance). The strategies that

emerged in this study address the next research question discussed below.

Strategies for Managing Spiritual Dissonance

The third research question of this study further addressed the response to

dissonance: "How do teachers and staff manage dissonance that may arise from their

spiritual labor?" The strategies as revealed in the qualitative interviews took a number of

forms: *Silence, Reframing Spiritual Boundaries, Movin' On,* and *Weighing the Benefits*.

The theme, *Silence*, showed that the strategy of "biting one's tongue" about the

divergence from codified expectations leading to spiritual dissonance is strongly tied to

the threat of regulation. Those who experience spiritual dissonance, or whose divergence

from codified beliefs threatens to spark dissonance, do not want that dissonance to be

known – at least not to the "authorities." The irony remains that in an institution whose

whole reason for existence centers in the spiritual domain, it becomes difficult to discuss

personal differences in the perception, expectation, framing, or implementation of

appropriate and acceptable spiritual norms. Some of this difficulty extends from the formal regulation that might accompany speaking out. Some emanates from issues of concertive control. I will discuss both of these more completely later in this chapter when I address this study's implications for further critical scholarship.

Keeping silent in the face of dissonance was not the only strategy of note employed by participants. The idea expressed by some participants with regard to the theme *Movin' On* that *others* should "move on" if unable to embrace and endorse SDA beliefs in general and the conservative/liberal approach to those beliefs taken by the school in particular, illustrates why many chose to remain silent regarding their own spiritual misalignment with organizational expectations. In the face of spiritual labor, the suppression of communication about divergent thinking with regards to spiritual matters both creates the space for spiritual dissonance and closes one of the means by which to mitigate it. By not sharing or making known one's own personal stance on spiritual matters, one implicitly appears to agree with the organization's stance – a scenario ripe for the creation of dissonance. Given the uncomfortable and potentially debilitating effects of dissonance, those who examine spiritual labor in the future should not ignore this silencing and suppression of alterative spiritual stances.

Movin' On was one of many means participants employed to manage the dissonance that might attend spiritual labor. The powerful strategy of *Reframing Spiritual Boundaries* eliminated or mitigated the spiritual dissonance of these participants by separating organizational expectations from the truly spiritual realm. Inherent ironies and contradictions manifest themselves in this approach – particularly the framing of organizational expectations not as spiritual matters but as simple job requirements (in line

with dress code issues, for example). The irony of this particular type of reframing rests on the total institution nature of boarding school work. Recall that so encompassing is life on a boarding school campus that the participants in this study frequently commented that "it's not just a job – it's a lifestyle." Characterizing an organization's spiritual expectations as simply what one does on the job allows for a dissonance-free space in which organizational members might freely practice widely divergent behaviors and uphold different belief systems on and off the job. However, a *lifestyle* is more encompassing by nature than a *job*. Conversely, when a particular job and all of its attendant expectations (including the spiritual) are characterized as a *lifestyle*, this integration of public and private lives seems to belie the easy ability to believe in different spiritual worldviews or to practice one set of behaviors on the job and others off the job.

Characterizing boarding school work as a *lifestyle* while similarly characterizing certain spiritual expectations as what one does on the *job* is inherently contradictory. When expectations are framed by the organization as *spiritual* in nature, the contradictions and complexities increase. Spiritual matters are not necessarily issues that are amenable to easy public/private compartmentalization – spiritual beliefs and spirituality as a whole are not easily switched on and off. In this study, holding a certain spiritual philosophy at work and practicing one's spirituality differently outside of organizational boundaries seemed to tread into or very near the realm of hypocrisy (or the appearance thereof). Nevertheless, by completely separating the two realms (work/home) and/or by not categorizing organizational expectations in the spiritual arena, these participants seemed quite successful at avoiding or managing spiritual dissonance.

Hypocrisy, "Acting," and Spiritual Dissonance

One unique quality of spiritual dissonance that sets it apart from the emotional dissonance sometimes accompanying emotional labor is the concept of hypocrisy or attendant guilt that may accompany spiritual dissonance and the strategies employed for managing it. In regard to emotional labor, Hochschild (1983) refers to the display of emotions one does not in actuality experience as a form of "acting." In this study, participants also talked about "playing a part," "performing," or of refusing to "go to the play." Interestingly, the etymological underpinnings of the term "hypocrite" hails from the Latin *hypocrisies* meaning "play acting" and the Greek *hupokrisis* similarly signifying "to play a part, pretend" (American Heritage Dictionary, 2000). The tie between the acting metaphor used by Hochschild in regards to emotional labor and the sense of hypocrisy that may shadow the dissonance associated with spiritual labor are eerily similar. Despite the similar idea of "acting" in both emotional and spiritual labor, acting's consequences and implications differ when the spotlight turns to issues of spiritual dissonance. While one might possibly be labeled a "hypocrite" for expressing emotions one does not in actuality feel, any sense of hypocrisy in spiritual matters carries with it more intense consequences.

For example, some participants in this study struggled with the sense of hypocrisy and guilt that sometimes haunted the specter of spiritual dissonance. This guilt and sense of hypocrisy was often exacerbated by the panopticon of boarding school campus life and the concept that part of the service or commodity offered by boarding schools is the positive spiritual influence and role modeling of teachers/staff. The idea of failing to provide a good role model (by the organization's definition) to those students that might

be watching one's lifestyle choices plays a part in the potential guilt involved with either

practicing one set of lifestyle choices on campus and a different set off campus, or of

failing to actually embrace the tenets of the school and church which one represents by

virtue of employment. Ironically, even those who did not personally practice or value

some of the church's beliefs or lifestyle standards were still remarkably cautious about

communicating and modeling that divergence to students. The faculty/staff in this study

recognized that they were to be the standard for SDA beliefs as promoted by school and

church. They did not want students to make divergent choices from those standards

based on the example of those who were to be their spiritual mentors. Yet, giving the

appearance of modeling and embracing standards, practices, and behaviors they

themselves did not personally hold made many of the faculty/staff in this study ask

themselves if they were treading in the realm of hypocrisy. Either being a "bad" example

(by organizational standards) or appearing to be living a double standard opens the door

to uncomfortable feelings of hypocrisy and guilt.

From an administrative standpoint, outward compliance or even "acting" is all

that can be organizationally regulated, but in matters of spirituality, inward compliance

would be most desirable. Unlike emotional labor, spiritual labor implies more than just

"acting" spiritual – especially the surface acting Hochschild (1983) references. Faking

spirituality, even in "good faith" (see Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993), counters the

commodity promised by the SDA educational system that its teachers/staff not just

outwardly model a SDA Christian lifestyle, but embrace it in reality as well. The church

and school do not market or recruit teachers/staff who simply agree to *act* a part. They

want individuals who *live* the part. Whether or not organizational members are "acting,"

whether or not they are doing so in "good faith," are matters not easily codified or regulated by organizations.

Hypocrisy and spirituality are not easy bedfellows; in fact, by implication they contradict one another. That the spiritual dissonance attending spiritual labor might carry with it the miasma of hypocrisy makes this type of dissonance potentially more destructive to the quality of one's spirituality than emotional dissonance may pose to emotions by comparison. Organizational members who wrestle with the possible sense of hypocrisy and/or guilt attendant upon their spiritual dissonance would by inference go to great lengths to mitigate or eliminate this dissonance, as illustrated by the myriad strategies for dealing with dissonance revealed in this study. In further studies regarding spiritual labor in other types of organizations not so closely tied to a religious entity, it would be instructive to note what factor the issues of hypocrisy and guilt play.

<center>*Spiritual Labor in a Total Institution*</center>

The fourth research question brought the influence of total institutions into the picture of spiritual labor. The question read, "How do the total institution qualities of a parochial boarding school shape the spiritual labor expected of teachers and staff?" Some of these influences have already been noted above as they weave their way most particularly into the commodification and regulation of spiritual labor as the 24/7, "fishbowl" atmosphere of a boarding school makes faculty/staff more available and more visible.

The availability of teachers/staff is trumpeted repeatedly in marketing the boarding school experience. This marketing includes the idea that living in close proximity within a "family" atmosphere allows a heightened opportunity for spiritual

influence and modeling. Within this environment, the faculty/staff on a boarding school campus are held to high accountability standards regarding spiritual expectations. This accountability (i.e., regulation) of divergent beliefs and practices is more easily accomplished in the constant visibility of the panopticon evidenced in the boarding school as a total institution.

Additionally, in the area of spiritual dissonance within the bounds of a total institution, one's lifestyle is difficult to separate from one's job; furthermore, that lifestyle is expected to embody spiritual expectations set up by the organization. Any disagreements with those expectations – any differences in how faculty/staff would conduct their lifestyle in the spiritual arena from that expected by the school/church – would surely manifest themselves sooner or later in the "fishbowl" of boarding school life. Operating within a total institution involves the organizational regulation of one's lifestyle and implies the possibility of a more obtrusive organizational presence in members' total lives. What is also significant in this regard with relation to spiritual labor in a total institution is that within these confines, divergent beliefs are exponentially more difficult to "hide." On a campus where life is compared to "living in a fishbowl," those who do not personally embrace the spiritual beliefs and practices expected of them are faced with difficult choices. Do they profess and practice what they truly believe and endanger their employment (i.e., the "regulation" aspect of spiritual labor), or do they hide, couch, or obfuscate their divergent spiritual beliefs and face the dissonance and/or sense of hypocrisy such a course presents?

In the total institution, then, facing the need to "act" in order to give the appearance of meeting spiritual expectations and avoiding regulation is surely an

exhaustive process and would likely affect the stress level and job satisfaction of organizational members. Because the close proximity afforded by life on a boarding school campus leads to the likelihood that one's actions might always be under scrutiny, because not aligning with spiritual expectations brings the possibility of regulation, and because faculty/staff wish to be a "good example" to students, those who perform spiritual labor often do not engage in practices they would otherwise undertake (i.e., go to movies); on the other hand, they might practice or profess what they otherwise normally wouldn't (i.e., paying tithe). This discrepancy between what participants believed and what they actually practiced in the spiritual/religious realm opened the door for the spiritual dissonance discussed earlier– dissonance that is intensified by the close quarters, availability, and proximity that characterizes the experiences of teachers/staff on a boarding school campus.

The all-consuming and all-encompassing aspects of living and working in a boarding school proved both rewarding and difficult for my participants – an observation noted in other boarding school literature as well (e.g., Cookson & Persell, 1985). Emerging unmistakably in this study, however, was the joy, delight, and satisfaction inherent in the close relationships formed with students and staff alike – relationships made possible by the same all-encompassing qualities that mark boarding schools as total institutions. This intensely rewarding by-product of the all-encompassing total institution atmosphere dovetails with the contention of some scholars (i.e., Becker, 2003; Davies, 1989; McKewan, 1980; Thiessen, 1993) that the examination of total institutions need not assume that these types of organizations are always negative or harmful by default and/or design. This study illustrates how organizational members enmeshed in the all-

encompassing aspects of a total institution may actually reap great rewards even amidst the strictures, control, and possible spiritual dissonance attendant upon spiritual labor in such organizations.

The spiritual labor called for by working in parochial educational institutions is exacerbated by the complexities that performing such labor in a total institution implies – a lifestyle that seems all-encompassing of one's time, that makes one nearly always "visible" in a type of modern panopticon, and that also fosters deep relationships with the very students one is charged with mentoring spiritually in light of the particular "Truth" promulgated by the sponsoring church organization. Under the exigencies explicated in this section, the currents of total institution life proved to significantly influence the experiences of these faculty/staff who performed spiritual labor on SDA boarding school campuses.

<div align="center">

The Importance of "Family"

</div>

The rewarding aspects of working in a boarding school alluded to above also largely address the fifth research question: How do teachers and staff negotiate the spiritual labor required by parochial boarding schools? The answer involves the issue of the rewarding relationships formed with both students and staff – relationships often described as familial in nature. The term "family" implies a type of relationship that goes beyond the norm, and talk of these types of relationships permeated nearly every aspect of this study. For example, in this examination of spiritual labor in the total institution of the boarding school, participants noted the strong bonds with students forged by living, working, and playing with them. The nature of boarding school work is exhausting and all-encompassing; it occurs within the panopticon. Yet the total institution aspects of

boarding schools also allow multiple opportunities to interact with, influence, and build relationships with students. That this interaction between faculty and staff created a "family" atmosphere was also spotlighted in Chapter Five's analysis of the commodification of teacher/staff's spirituality. Schools not only tout the spiritual atmosphere of the campus and its Christian teachers but emphasize how living on a boarding school campus affords many more opportunities for the spirituality of its teachers/staff to "rub off" on students in a close family setting.

Finally, the spiritual dissonance sometimes generated in the face of spiritual labor was often weighed against the strong bonds these participants reported forming with their students. Despite irritations and even deep spiritual dissonance, the overwhelming majority of the organizational members in this study accepted and embraced their spiritual labor in a boarding school as a privilege – the privilege of interacting with, influencing, and building strong bonds with the students whom they served. Faculty/staff saw their work as a ministry and a calling. As a whole, they welcomed the opportunity to infuse their spirituality into their work lives. What remains to be seen in future examinations of spiritual labor in other types of organizations is whether members will respond similarly and manage their spiritual labor in the same manner.

Emotional Labor and Spiritual Labor Compared

Since the whole premise of spiritual labor in this study was predicated on the concept of emotional labor, it would be instructive at this point to further compare the two concepts, both their similarities and differences.

First, both emotional labor and spiritual labor are similar in that they embody the same three elements of commodification, codification, and regulation; in one case these

elements deal with members' emotions and in the other with their spirituality. Both

create the space for the possibility of a type of dissonance to arise. Both might be subject

to many of the same critiques, such as that by Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) that

emotional labor need not always be detrimental to organizational members (see also

Conrad & Witte, 1994; Kruml & Geddes, 2000; Shuler & Sypher, 2000; Tolich, 1993).

In the same way, this study illustrated that spiritual labor may bring with it certain

palpable rewards along with all of its uncomfortable possibilities. As also noted in an

earlier discussion, both emotional labor and spiritual labor may involve "acting." In the

case of emotional labor, this acting involves expressing emotions one does not experience

– in the case of spiritual labor expressing (by words, actions, or organizational affiliation)

adherence to a type of spirituality one does not personally embrace.

In many ways, then, spiritual labor and emotional labor are similar in nature.

However, they also differ in important and significant ways. First, as suggested earlier,

hypocrisy is more tightly coupled with spiritual labor than with emotional labor. In this

light, issues of guilt are more intertwined with spiritual dissonance than with emotional

dissonance. In the realm of emotional labor, dissonance stems from the "acting"

referenced above – being required to express emotions one does not experience

(Hochschild, 1983). In spiritual labor, the dissonance is more nuanced in that the

"expression" and "experience" of spirituality is not as easily defined or observed. The

dissonance associated with emotional labor lacks the confounding factors of core belief

systems and values that come to play in spiritual dissonance.

The total institution nature of the environment in which these participants worked

also highlights some of the differences. For example, in the all-encompassing 24/7

"fishbowl" of the boarding school there remains little space for those wrestling with potential dissonance to communicate their struggles without some threat of regulation. Regarding emotional labor in a total institution, in Tracy's (2004) work with correctional officers these organizational members could go home and "vent" to their families, but within the panopticon afforded in a boarding school, "public" and "private" are very difficult to separate. When one lives and works and plays with one's colleagues, it is difficult to talk about dissonance when expected to uphold a certain spiritual standard in an environment where one is always on display. In essence, then, it may be more difficult to communicate about the dissonance associated with spiritual labor than it is to share the vagaries of emotional dissonance.

Second, the rhetorical and socially constructed elements surrounding the definition of 'spirituality' is perhaps one of the more interesting differences between emotional labor and spiritual labor. I am not suggesting that emotions lie completely outside the bounds of what might be socially constructed (i.e., whether crying in the boardroom shows weakness or empathy is a socially constructed assessment). However, my observation that elements of spirituality might be framed (and reframed) along a conservative—liberal continuum sets the socially constructed nature of spirituality apart from that of emotions. For example, I found no "conservative" or "liberal" debate in the emotional labor literature – no discussion reflecting the stance that the codified regulations regarding emotional labor should be more or less "conservative" or "liberal." In this study's examination of spiritual labor, however, discussions regarding "liberal" and "conservative" interpretations of spiritual matters were common. In fact, what could

be defined as *spiritual* was contested territory as well, with some participants simply

refusing to place certain organizational requirements in the realm of spirituality at all.

In this study I noted that issues falling along a conservative—liberal continuum

were characterized by the restrictive—less restrictive nature of their implementation (i.e.,

a conservative view on the issue of jewelry as completely avoiding it versus the less

restrictive liberal view making no prohibitions on the wearing of jewelry). While

emotional display rules required in emotional labor might be characterized along a

restrictive—less constrictive continuum, these do not so comfortably fall into the same

connotative realm as do the idea of a conservative—liberal divide, a divide often fraught

with competing ontological premises.

In this sense the rhetoric surrounding spiritual labor is undoubtedly more

influenced by sometimes contentious notions of what is "proper," what is "spiritual," and

what is important enough to commodify, codify, and regulate as such. Spiritual labor

may thus become much more politicized and carry more rhetorical exigencies for

organizations and their members who must communicatively negotiate the labyrinth of

what might be regarded as "spiritual." As organizations and their members construct,

transform, and define the elements that make up "spirituality," communication scholars

are uniquely positioned to study these processes.

Implications and Suggestions for Further Study

In the course of the discussion above, I have already alluded to a number of

implications and suggestions for future study relative to each specific research question.

Here, I will elaborate on other more global possibilities that the concept of spiritual labor

offers to communication scholars in general and critical organizational communication scholars in particular.

First, the concept of spiritual labor could be extended into other types of organizations characterized as more secular in nature; spiritual labor need not be confined to religiously affiliated organizations. The study of *spiritual* labor can encompass not only codified doctrines, values, and norms tied to an organized *religion*, but may also include spiritual stances that may not be religiously affiliated. This idea that spiritual labor can be examined in other types of organizations is an important one as more organizations and institutions than just parochial boarding schools call for spiritual labor from their members. For example, this study offered a definition of spirituality as a belief in the existence of a higher power and the importance of one's obligations to a broader community. Within this light what might be seen as more secular or "neutral" organizations are not immune to mandating spirituality in subtle and seldom-marked ways. Thus, communication scholars have an opportunity to study the manifestations of spiritual labor in a number of different types of organizations – secular as well as parochial. That organizations in the spirit of neutrality may subtly (or not so subtly) prohibit or deny the expression of spirituality, that organizations may require certain norms, ethics, and behaviors that differ from organizational members' own spiritual values, are all broadly matters of a *spiritual* nature. In this sense, the study of spiritual labor transcends the parochial boarding school or religiously affiliated institution to include a broader range of organizations.

For critical scholars in particular, such heretofore unexplored worlds of so-called spiritually "neutral" organizations hold much promise for revealing deeply embedded

elements of regulation, codification, and even commodification of organizational

members' spiritual stances.

The intersection of spiritual labor and total institutions in particular holds other

tempting possibilities for the critical scholar. For example, this study illustrated how the

panopticon was enacted in a contemporary organization. Foucault's (1977) work on

panopticonism suggests that the concept of the panopticon might have further sway in a

broader array of organizations. He writes

> Whenever one is dealing with a multiplicity of individuals on whom a task or a
> particular form of behaviour must be imposed, the panoptic schema may be used.
> It is – necessary modifications apart – applicable to all establishments
> whatsoever… In each of its applications, it makes possible to perfect the exercise
> of power. (pages 205-206)

Foucault is here suggesting a wider use of the panopticon than had previously been

considered. In this study, since spiritual labor involves the imposition of certain

tasks/behaviors reflecting *spiritual* expectations, the panopticon and spiritual labor

promise to mutually inform each other. How the panopticon operates in other types of

institutions would promise to illuminate the "laboratory of power" (Foucault, 1977, p.

204) that follows the presence of the panopticon in organizations of all kinds.

Also of interest to the critical scholar would be the concertive control and

strategic ambiguity in the codification and regulation of spiritual norms. As my study

suggested, sometimes the codification of spiritual expectation rests on local norms, often

unspoken but clearly identifiable and articulated by organizational members. The "deep

structure" assumptions, strategic ambiguities, and hegemonic ideals of spirituality

interwoven with spiritual labor are issues that beckon the critical scholar. In addition, the

regulation of organizational members' spirituality undoubtedly goes beyond official 'due

process' to involve all the unexamined and unspoken assumptions, deeply held values, and unarticulated organizational cultural norms inherent in concertive control.

Understanding how organizational members resist the demands of spiritual labor also calls for the lens a critical scholar might provide, and this study suggests many possibilities in this arena. For example, in the area of spiritual dissonance (Chapter Six) I dealt primarily with what I termed "strategies for coping." That these strategies might be examined from a critical lens is suggested by Clair's (1998) work. In her book, *Organizing Silence*, she gives a thoughtful discussion to how resistance, hegemony, and control might be broadened and reconceptualized with relation primarily to sexual harassment. Many of these concepts might be applied to the ideas of spiritual labor and spiritual dissonance presented in this study. For example, Clair highlights Aptheker's (1989) idea that we might view "any form of coping and surviving" as a form of resistance (p. 153, Clair, 1989). Thus, in light of spiritual labor, coping strategies such as *Movin' On* or *Reframing Spiritual Boundaries* might be conceptualized as resistance to the disciplinary power, regulation, and concertive control that follow spiritual labor.

Even more interesting might be a more nuanced treatment of the theme, *Silence*. From Clair's perspective, the idea of "silence" in the face of spiritual dissonance might be seen as resistance. Silence might be seen as means by which one may create the space for non-compliance without triggering the interference of regulatory mechanisms. She encourages scholars to take another look at "silence" and "to step into the world of possibilities where silence is turned into a cacophony of resistance" (p. 69). To conceptualize as *resistance* strategies what I have framed in this study as the *coping* mechanisms of those who engage in spiritual labor would undoubtedly focus a more

critical eye on the concept of spiritual labor. A more systematic study of resistance

would enrich our understanding of both spiritual labor and resistance on the part of

organizational members.

Finally, what might be the practical implications of this study? First, this work

suggests that organizations which require spiritual labor may need to wrestle with several

important questions related to the possible consequences and/or outcomes of the

commodification, codification, and regulation of their members' spirituality. How do

organizations (particularly secular ones) go about communicating spiritual expectations?

How do they decide how and when to require or suppress expressions of organizational

members' spirituality (in words, deed, and/or behavior)? How do organizations codify

spiritual expectations without promoting certain *religious* stances (assuming this

separation is important to the organization)? How do organizations negotiate the difficult

and seemingly paradoxical task of *requiring* genuine spirituality? How might

organizations prepare members for potential dissonance that may arise in their members?

How do organizations mandate (i.e., codify) and enforce (i.e., regulate) matters of

spirituality without offending, irritating, or alienating their members? All of these

questions address the practical implications that this study might suggest for

organizations that require spiritual labor.

However, the practical implications of this study's purvey of spiritual labor are

not relegated solely to organizations themselves. Those who actually perform spiritual

labor in whatever setting are faced with very real and tangible issues as well. For

example, this study illustrated how these participants managed spiritual labor, but it did

not systematically explore the effectiveness of the strategies and approaches, a practical

matter at its heart. Another question that might be asked includes whether organizational

members actually recognize their spiritual labor (especially when they are "deep acting").

Again, the tie between these issues and the practical matters of job satisfaction, burnout,

tenure, etc. are all suggested in this study. The preceding survey of the practical

implications suggested by this study imply that these are all questions that previously

may have been ignored but could be profitably addressed for organizations that require,

and members that perform, spiritual labor.

Limitations

Though this study illustrates the important implications and the promise

associated with the study of spiritual labor, it carries limitations as well. Set within the

confines of parochial boarding schools, this study provided for a relatively obvious view

of spiritual labor in a total institution. However, the fact remains that parochial boarding

schools are not common types of organizations. Thus, one of the limitations of this study

centers on the transferability of the findings here to other institutions where spiritual

labor occurs. For example, the confidence that organizational members negotiate

spiritual labor in similar ways as those participants in this study will have to be more

firmly established by future studies.

In addition, the participants in this study were relatively self-selected. Not only

would those who voluntarily chose to work for the SDA church be more likely to buy-in

to the general beliefs and mission of the church, but faculty/staff who may have

experienced more intense spiritual dissonance or been more negative towards their

spiritual labor in general may conceivably choose to abstain from participating in this

study given the potential consequences of voicing dissent. No one I approached told me

outright that they would rather not be interviewed, but some of those I contacted wanted to postpone until they were less busy (the majority of the interviews happened in May, the last month of school for many). By the time these potential participants where available for an interview, I had already reached theoretical saturation and did not pursue their participation even though they had initially agreed to an interview. Thus, it is difficult to determine who might have refused to speak to me due to the nature of the topic. Altogether, two of the 45 people I contacted did not respond in any manner to later requests for specific interview appointments perhaps preferring not to discuss spiritual labor, boarding school life, or spiritual dissonance. While these instances were very few in number, I cannot guarantee that the participants in this snowball sample represented the most negative view of spiritual labor in parochial boarding schools. If that is the case, then the connotative view of spiritual labor and total institutions presented in this study would possibly need to take a slightly more negative slant.

Another limitation centers around the demographic makeup of my participants. For example, the overall mean age was 48, indicating that new and inexperienced faculty/staff may be under-represented. The average number of years teaching in boarding schools was also relatively high at 14 (though the range of 1 to 37 indicates a broad spectrum). In many ways, then, these participants as a whole had been involved in spiritual labor for a number of years – indicating some measure of buy-in or acceptance of this element inherent in their boarding school work. Exploring the experiences of those with less tenure in the system would surely be instructive.

Finally, this study made little provision for the perspective of those who must administer the formal regulation aspects of spiritual labor – i.e., principals, educational

superintendents, board members, etc. The voice of those who decide what and how spiritual expectations would be commodified, codified, and/or regulated were not heard here. Using a corporate analogy, this study is relatively silent on "management's" perspective regarding spiritual labor. This lack would need to be addressed in the future to obtain a more complete and nuanced understanding of how spiritual labor operates in organizations and how it comes to affect organizational life.

Conclusion

In this study I examined three broad areas: total institutions, spiritual labor, and spiritual dissonance. Here I introduced the concept of spiritual labor as the commodification, codification, and regulation of organizational members' spirituality, explored the phenomena of spiritual dissonance, and suggested that the concept of the total institution – its "all-encompassing" qualities and the influence of the modern-day panopticon – might be extended to organizations such as boarding schools. As such, this study contributes to both the burgeoning literature on spirituality in organizations in general, offers a framework for examining and understanding how organizations might communicate, regulate, and control spirituality in organizational members, and suggests that organizational members utilize a variety of strategies to minimize, eliminate, and/or manage spiritual dissonance. As the place of spirituality in organizational studies begins to be acknowledged as a legitimate endeavor, the concept of spiritual labor in that pursuit should be recognized as well. By setting this study in what might be characterized as a total institution I also suggest that the concept of total institutions and the panopticon can be extended beyond the narrow idea of institutions that physically encompass organizational members' lives to those that demand spiritual adherence as well.

Of course, the attempt of organizations to manage, shape, and control their members' spirituality is as old as recorded history. The spiritual element of what it means to be human – how one lives, works, believes, and worships – holds an important place in the lives of countless organizational members. In the end, however, this study was not about esoteric ideas of spirituality. It was about an organization that struggled to communicate and regulate the spiritual expectations of its members – about the challenges of commodifying the ethereal quality of spirituality. More than anything, this study was about the lives of extremely dedicated individuals who worked within an institution that required much of them – in time, effort, and spiritual compliance. Nevertheless, these were given generously and freely within the uncomfortable confines of the total institution atmosphere of a boarding school and offered within the glare of the panopticon. Yet even given such constraints, these participants were not prisoners within an ideology, religion, or institution. They freely embraced or did not embrace the tenets of their church; they freely remained in or left boarding school work; they freely accepted or rejected the constraints imposed by spiritual labor. Within these choices, they complied, they resisted, they reframed, and they struggled with the responsibilities and spiritual mandates of their work, but none failed to acknowledge the tremendous rewards set within their spiritual labor on a boarding school campus – the relationships with students was valuable coin, indeed. Thus, spiritual labor comes with one hand full of possible dissonance and frustration, but in the other hand it brings the possibility of great reward and satisfaction. Such are the complexities spiritual labor offers.

REFERENCES

About the Faculty/Staff. (2006). Frequently Asked Questions about Pine Forge
Academy. Retrieved May, 2006 from http://www.pineforgeacademy.org/faq.html

Abraham, R. (2000). The role of job control as a moderator of emotional dissonance and
emotional intelligence-outcome relationships. *Journal of Psychology, 134*, 169-
184.

"Adventist Education: General Education Policies". (2006). Retrieved June, 2006, from
http://www.nadeducation.org/dynamic.html?wspID=300&wscID=146

Albrecht, K., & Zemke, R. (1985). *Service America! Doing business in the new
economy*. Homewood, IL: Dow-Jones Irvin.

Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). *Social penetration: The development of interpersonal
relationships*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Alums speak up. (2006). Retrieved April 13, 2006, from
www.broadviewacademy.org/alums_speak_up.html

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. (2000). New York: Houghton
Mifflin Company.

Anderson, E. (2005). *Residential and boarding education and care for young people*.
New York: Routledge.

Anderson, J. A. (1996). *Communication theory: Epistemological foundations*. New York:
Guilford Press.

Armaline, W. T. (2005). "Kids Need Structure": Negotiating rules, power, and social
control in an emergency youth shelter. *American Behavioral Scientist, 48*, 1124-
1148.

Ash, M. K. (1984). *Mary Kay on people management*. New York: Warner Books.

Ashcraft, K. L., & Tretheway, A. (2004). Developing tension: An agenda for applied
research on the organization of irrationality. *Journal of Applied Communication
Research, 32*, 171-181.

Ashforth, B., & Fried, Y. (1988). The mindlessness of organizational behaviors. *Human
Relations, 41*, 305-329.

Ashforth, B., & Humphrey, R. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: The influence of
identity. *Academy of Management Journal, 18*, 88-115.

Ashforth, B., Kreiner, G., & Fugate, M. (2000). All in a day's work: Boundaries and
micro role transitions. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 472-491.

Ashforth, B., & Tomiuk, M. (2000). Emotional labour and authenticity: Views from service agents. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations* (2nd ed., pp. 184-203). London: Sage.

Ashworth, P. (1999). 'Bracketing' in phenomenology: Renouncing assumptions about student cheating. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*, 707-722.

Auburn Adventist Academy: Home page. (2006). Retrieved June, 2006 from http://www.auburn.org/

Barker, J. R. (1993). Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 38*, 408-437.

Barker, J. R. (1999). *The discipline of teamwork: Participation and concertive control*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bartunek, J., & Moch, M. (1994). Third-order organizational change and the Western mystical tradition. *Journal of Organizational Management Change, 7*, 24-41.

Becker, C. S. (1991). A phenomenology of friendship families. *The Humanistic Psychologist, 19*(2), 170-184.

Becker, H. S. (2003). The politics of presentation: Goffman and total institutions. *Symbolic Interaction, 26*, 659-669.

Bennett, J. W. (1971). Communal brethren of the Great Plains. In S. E. Wallace (Ed.), *Total Institutions* (pp. 154-164). (unknown): Aldine Publishing Company.

Bennett, K. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1990). *How schools work*. New York: Longman.

Bentham, J. (1995). *The Panopticon Writings* (M. Bozovic, Ed.). London: Verso. (Original work published in 1787)

Bento, R. (1994). When the show must go on: Disenfranchised grief in organizations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(6), 35-44.

Biberman, J., & Whitty, M. (1997). A postmodern spiritual future for work. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 10*(2), 130-138.

Biernacki, P., & Waldorf, D. (1981). Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological Methods and Research, 10*(2), 141-163.

Bineham, J. (1989). Consensus theory and religious belief. *Communication Studies, 40*, 141-155.

Boarding School Review. (2006). Retrieved March 20, 2006 from http://www.boardingschoolreview.com

Bock, K. (2006). "Fit for a King." Sermon outline retrieved May, 2006 from http://www.nadeducation.org/dynamic/files/1203.doc

Bohman, J. F., Hiley, D. R., & Shusterman, R. (1991). Introduction: The interpretive turn. In D. R. Hiley, J. F. Bohman & R. Shusterman (Eds.), *The interpretive turn: Philosophy, science, culture* (pp. 1-14). Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Brown, B. (1992). Why governments run schools. *Economics of Education Review, 11*, 287-300.

Brown, T. (1996). The phenomenology of the mathematics classroom. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 31*, 115-150.

Bryman, A. (1999). The debate about quantitative and qualitative research. In A. Bryman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research* (Vol. 1, pp. 35-69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bullis, C., & Glaser, H. (1992). Bureaucratic discourse and the goddess: Towards an ecofeminist critique and rearticulation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 5*(2), 50-60.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis: Elements of the sociology of corporate life*. Aldershot, England: Arena.

Bussey, G. (Personal Communication, June, 2006). Recruiting letter for Kingsway College, Oshawa, Ontario.

Buzzanell, P. (2001). Spirituality-centered career theory and practice. In A. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Essays on communication & spirituality: Contributions to a new discourse on communication* (pp. 47-71). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Buzzanell, P., & Harter, L. (2006). (De)centering and (re)envisioning the secular hegemony of organizational communication theory and research. *Communication Studies, 57*, 1-3.

Cancian, F. (1960). *Political and religious organizations*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Carr, K. (2000). Leadership given to the religious mission of Catholic schools. In J. Youniss, J. J. Convey & J. A. McLellan (Eds.), *The Catholic character of Catholic schools* (pp. 62-82). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

"*The Catholic school on the threshold of the third millennium*". (2005). Retrieved March 20, 2005 from http://wwwl.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/ccatheduc/documents/rc_con_ ccatheduc_doc_27041998_school2000_en.html

Chambers, O. (1935). *My utmost for His highest*. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co.

Clair, R. P. (1993). The bureaucratization, commodification, and privatization of sexual harassment through institutional discourse: A study of Big Ten universities. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 7, 123-157.

Clair, R. P. (1998). Organizing silence: A world of possibilities. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Conrad, C., & Witte, K. (1994). Is emotional expression repression oppression? Myths of organizational affective regulation. In *Communication Yearbook* (Vol. 17, pp. 417-428).

Conti, N. (2002). Ceremonial degradation of a doctoral candidate: An essay on the social situation of graduate student ethnographers and other inmates. *American Sociologist, 32*(4), 89-97.

Cookson, P., & Persell, C. H. (1985). *Preparing for power: America's elite boarding schools*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Crawford, T. W. (2005). Stability and change on the American religious landscape: A centrographic analysis of major U.S. religious groups. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, *22*(2), 51-88.

Cresswell, J. W. (2003). Standards of quality and verification. In J. W. Cresswell (Ed.), *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed., pp. 193-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Czepiel, J., Solomon, M., & Suprenant, C. (1985). *The service encounter: Managing employee interaction in service businesses*. Lexington, MA: Lexington.

Davies, C. (1989). Goffman's concept of the total institution: Criticisms and revisions. *Human Studies, 12*, 77-95.

Deetz, S. (2001). Conceptual foundations. In F. M. Jablin & L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 3-46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dehler, G., & Welsh, M. (1994). Spirituality and organizational transformation: Implications for the new management paradigm. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(6), 17-26.

Denzin, N. (1968). Collective behavior in total institutions: The case of the mental hospital and of the prison. *Sociological Problems, 15*, 363-365.

Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dimsdale, J. (1974). The coping behavior of Nazi concentration camp survivors. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 131*, 792-797.

Dougherty, D., & Krone, K. J. (2002). Emotional Intelligence as organizational communication: An examination of the construct. *Communication Yearbook*, *26*, 202-229.

Durham, J. (2003). The other side of the story: The world of African-American academies in the South after the Civil War. *The Negro Educational Review, 54*(1-2), 3-16.

Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education: A study in the theory and application of the sociology of education*. New York: The Free Press.

Ediger, M. (1998). Improvement of scheduling in a boarding school. *Education, 119*(1), 53-59.

Educating for Eternity: Our Mission. (2006). Highland View Academy, retrieved April, 2006 from http://www.highlandviewacademy.com/

Eisenhardt, K. (2000). Paradoxes, spirals, ambivalence: The new language of change and pluralism. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 703-705.

Ekman, P. (1973). Cross-culture studies of facial expression. In P. Ekman (Ed.), *Darwin and facial expressions: A century of research in review* (pp. 169-222). New York: Academic Press.

Enterprise Academy: Homepage. (2006). Retrieved April 14, 2006, from http://easchool.org

Ettore, B. (1996). Religion in the workplace: Implications for managers. *Management Review, 85*(12), 15-18.

Euben, D. (1998). The faculty handbook as a contract: Is it enforceable? *Academe, 84*(5), 87.

"Experience Life: Kingsway college." (2006). [Brochure].

Facts and figures. (2005). Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.adventist.org/world_church/facts_and_figures/index.html.en

Feldner, S. B. (2006). Living our mission: A study of university mission building. *Communication Studies, 57*, 67-85.

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford: University Press.

Fichter, J. H. (1964). *Parochial school: A sociological study*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Fiebig, G., & Kramer, M. (1998). A framework for the study of emotions in organizational contexts. *Management Communication Quarterly, 11*, 536-572.

Fine, M., & Buzzanell, P. (2001). Walking the high wire: Leadership, theorizing, daily acts, and tensions. In P. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational and managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 128-156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ford, J., & Backoff, R. (1988). Organizational change in and out of dualities and paradox. In R. Quinn & K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and writings, 1972-1977*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1984). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 51-75). New York: Pantheon Books.

Frank, A. W. I. (1978). Anxiety aroused by the dying: A phenomenological inquiry. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 9*, 99-113.

Franke, A. H. (1993). Enforcement of faculty handbooks in the courts. *Academe, 79*(4), 64.

Freshman, B. (2000). An exploratory analysis of definitions and applications of spirituality in the workplace. In J. Biberman & M. Whitty (Eds.), *Work and spirit: A reader of new spiritual paradigms for organizations* (pp. 41-53). Scranton: The University of Scranton Press.

Frost, P. J., & Egri, C. P. (1994). The shamanistic perspective on organizational change and development. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 7*(1), 7-23.

"Fundamental Beliefs". (2005). Retrieved March 28, 2005, from http://www.adventist.org/beliefs/fundamental/index.html

Galetto, P. (2000). Religious knowledge and belief of lay religion teachers in Catholic elementary schools. In J. Youniss, J. J. Convey & J. A. McLellan (Eds.), *The character of Catholic schools* (pp. 124-141). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Garcia-Zamor, J. C. (2003). Workplace spirituality and organizational performance. *Public Administration Review, 63*, 355-363.

General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists. (2005). *Seventh-day Adventists believe...: A Biblical exposition of 27 fundamental doctrines*. Hagerstown, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Georgia Cumberland Academy. (2006). *To know, to love, to serve*. [Brochure].

Getlin, J. (2005, November 26). Pregnant and unwed, teacher fights church. *Los Angeles Times,* p. 12.

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

Gibson, M. K., & Papa, M. J. (2000). The mud, the blood, and the beer guys: Organizational osmosis in blue-collar work groups. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 28*, 68-88.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giorgi, A. (1985). *Phenomenology and psychological research*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Glaser, B. (1978). *Theoretical sensitivity*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Goffman, E. (1962). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Golway, T. (1999). The parish school. *America, 181*(9), 6.

Goodier, B. C., & Eisenberg, E. (2006). Seeking the spirit: Communication and the (re)development of a "spiritual" organization. *Communication Studies, 57*, 47-65.

Goodpaster, K. (1994). Work, spirituality, and the moral point of view. *International Journal of Value-Based Management, 7*, 49-62.

Graber, D., & Johnson, J. (2001). Spirituality and healthcare organizations. *Journal of Healthcare Management, 46*(1), 39-44.

Great Lakes Adventist Academy: Staff. (2006). Retrieved March 22, 2006, from www.glaa.net/StaffDetails.aspx?StaffId=2&ContentId=2

Habermas, J. (1991 (1961)). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Handy, C. (1995). *The age of paradox*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Harris, J. C. (1994). Can U.S. Catholics pay for their schools? *America, 170,* 22-25.

Hawaiian Mission Academy: Home page. (2006). Retrieved April 12, 2006, from www.hma4u.org

Hays, C. (1996, September 15). Choate on the cheap: Prep schools woo the middle class. *New York Times,* pp. 1-3.

Hays, K. (1994). *Practicing virtue: Moral traditions at Quaker and military boarding schools*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hegel, G. (1977). *The phenomenology of the mind*. New York: Irvington.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. New York: Harper and Row.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

Hepburn, J. R., & Stratton, J. R. (1977). Total institutions and inmate self-esteem. *British Journal of Criminology, 17*, 237-250.

Hicks, D. (1996). The strange fate of the American boarding school. *The American Scholar, 65*, 523-535.

Highland View Academy: Home page. Retrieved May 13, 2006, from www.highlandviewacademy.com

Hirschhorn, L. (1989). Professionals, authority, and group life: A case study of a law firm. *Human Resource Management, 28*, 235-252.

Hochschild, A. R. (1979). Emotion work, feelings rules and social structure. *American Journal of Sociology, 85*, 551-575.

Hochschild, A. R. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feelings*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Husserl, E. (1970). *The idea of phenomenology*. The Hague: Maritnus Nijhoff.

Jackson, P., Boostrom, R., & Hansen, D. (1993). *The moral life of schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

James, N. (1989). Emotional labour: Skill and work in the social regulation of feelings. *Sociological Review, 37*, 15-42.

"Journey to Excellence: GOALS for curriculum in Seventh-day Adventist schools". (2005). Retrieved March 8, 2005, from http://www.journeytoexcellence.org/purpose/goals/

"Journey to Excellence: Marketing Tools". (2006). Retrieved August 7, 2006, from http://www.nadeducation.org/category.html?wscID=140

"Journey to Excellence: Overview". (2005). Retrieved March 5, 2005, from http://www.journeytoexcellence.org/

"Journey to Excellence: Videos" (Panorama Productions). (2006). Retrieved August, 2006, from http://www.panoramaproductions.net/j2e.html

"Journey to Excellence: Summit". (2005). Retrieved March 6, 2005, from
    http://www.nadeducation.org/dynamic.html?wspID=256

"K-12 Schools". (2005). Retrieved March 5, 2005, from
    http://www.nadeducation.org/k12/schools.html

Kashti, Y. (1988). Boarding schools and changes in society and culture: Perspectives
    derived from a comparative case study research. *Comparative Education, 24*, 351-
    363.

Keenan, W. J. F. (2002). Twenty-first-century monasticism and religious life: Just
    another new millennium. *Religion, 32*(1), 13-27.

King, L. A., & Emmons, R. A. (1990). Conflict over emotional expression: Psychological
    and physical correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 864-
    877.

Kirby, E., Golden, A., Medved, C., Jorgenson, J., & Buzzanell, P. (2003). An
    organizational communication challenge to the discourse of work and family
    research: From problematics to empowerment. *Communication Yearbook, 27*, 1-
    43.

Kirby, E. L., McBride, C., Shuler, S., Birkholt, M., Danileson, M. A., & Pawlowski, D.
    (2005). The Jesuit difference (?): Narratives of negotiating spiritual values and
    secular practices. *Communication Studies, 57*, 87-105.

Kirkwood, W. (1994). Studying communication about spirituality and the spiritual
    consequences of communication. *Journal of Communication and Religion, 17*(1),
    13-26.

Kivett, D. D., & Warren, C. A. B. (2002). Social control in a group home for delinquent
    boys. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 31*(1), 3-33.

Kleiber, D. A., & Brock, S. C. (1995). The relevance of leisure in an illness experience:
    Realities of spinal cord injury. *Journal of Leisure Research, 27*(3), 283-300.

Knight, G. (2005). Why have Adventist education? *Journal of Adventist Education,
    67*(5), 6-9.

Konstanti, D., & Church, C. (1996). *Catechism of the Catholic church*. Mahwah, NJ:
    Danlist Press.

Kramer, M., & Hess, J. (2002). Communication rules for the display of emotions in
    organizational settings. *Management Communication Quarterly, 16*, 66-80.

Krone, K. J. (2001). Reframing organizational communication. In A. Rodriguez (Ed.),
    *Essays on communication & spirituality: Contributions to a new discourse on
    communication* (pp. 21-35). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

325

Kruml, S., & Geddes, D. (2000). Exploring emotional labor. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 8-49.

Kugelmann, R. (1999). Complaining about chronic pain. *Social Science & Medicine, 49*(12), 16-63.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Laabs, J. (1995). Balancing spirituality and work. *Personnel Journal, 74*(9), 60-76.

Laabs, J. (2000). Mixing business with passion. *Workforce, 79*(3), 80-86.

Landgrebe, L. (1981). *The phenomenology of Edmund Husserl*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Larkin, G. A. (1999). *Building a business the Buddhist way: A practitioner's guidebook*. Berkeley, CA.: Celestial Arts.

Leary, M. R., Springer, C., Negel, L., Ansell, E., & Evans, K. (1998). The cause, phenomenology, and consequences of hurt feelings. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74*, 1225-1238.

Lee, M. (1991). Spirituality in organisations: Empowerment and purpose. *Management Education and Development, 22*, 221-226.

Leeman, M. A. (2006). A house divided against itself cannot stand: Problematizing public and private in organized religion. *Communication Studies, 57*, 5-23.

Levinas, E. (1998). *Discovering existence with Husserl* (R. A. Cohen & M. B. Smith, Trans.). Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Lewis, C. S. (1946). *The great divorce*. New York: Macmillan.

Lewis, C. S. (1952). *Mere Christianity*. New York: Macmillan.

Lidz, C. W. (1992). *The erosion of autonomy in long-term care*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lief, H. I., & Fox, R. C. (1963). Training for 'detached concern' in medical students. In H. I. Lief, V. F. Lief & N. R. Lief (Eds.), *The psychological basis of medical practice* (pp. 12-35). New York: Harper and Row.

Lindlof, L. (1995). Qualitative communication research methods. In *Current Communication: An advanced text series* (Vol. 3). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative Communication Research Methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Loos, C., & Bowd, A. (1997). Caregivers of persons with Alzheimer's disease: Some neglected implications. *Death Studies, 21*, 501-515.

Lucadamo, K. (November 22, 2005). Pregnant - and fired! Unwed Pre-K teacher files bias suit vs. Queens Catholic school. *Daily News,* p. 3.

Manz, C., Manz, K., Marx, R., & Neck, C. (2004). Spiritual beliefs and scholarship. *Management Communication Quarterly, 17*, 611-620.

Mars, G., & Nicod, M. (1984). *The world of waiters*. London: Allen and Unwin.

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

Mason, E. (1994). Symbolism in managerial decision making: Manipulation or inspiration? *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(6), 27-34.

McCormick, D. (1994). Spirituality and management. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(6), 5-8.

McEwen, C. (1980). Continuities in the study of total and non-total institutions. *Annual Review of Sociology, 6*, 143-185.

McKenzie, R. (2005). *Marketing our Mission*. Retrieved May, 2006, from http://www.nadeducation.org/dynamic.html?wspID=256

McLachlan, J. (1970). *American boarding schools: A historical study*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *The primacy of perception*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. (10th ed.)(1994). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.

Mid-American Union Conference: Employment Manual. (2005). Mid-American Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists.

Milliman, J., Ferguson, J., Trickett, D., & Condemi, B. (2000). Spirit and community at Southwest Airlines: An investigation of a spiritual values-based mode. In J. Biberman & M. Whitty (Eds.), *Work and spirit: A reader of new spiritual paradigms for organizations* (pp. 263-279). Scranton: The University of Scranton Press.

Milo Adventist Academy: Home page. (2006) Retrieved April 2006, 2006 from http://www.miloacademy.org/

Mission and Scope. (2005). March 6, 2005, from http://education.gc.adventist.org/

Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). *A spiritual audit of corporate America: A hard look at spirituality, religion, and values in the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mitroff, I. I., & Denton, E. A. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review, 40*(4), 83-92.

Monterey Bay Academy. (2005). 2005-2006 school bulletin and calendar.

Monterey Bay Academy: Alumni weekend. (2006). Retrieved March 22, 2006, from www.montereybayacademy.org/news/news.html

Morgan, J., & Krone, K. J. (2001). Bending the rules of "professional" display: Emotional improvisation in caregiver performances. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 29*, 317-340.

Morris, J., & Feldman, D. (1996). The dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of emotional labor. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 986-1010.

Mount Ellis Academy. (2006). Handbook and calendar.

Mumby, D. (1997). Modernism, postmodernism, and communication studies: A rereading of an ongoing debate. *Communication Theory, 7*, 1-28.

Mumby, D., & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded rationality. *Academy of Management Review, 17*, 465-486.

Munck, T. (2000). *The enlightenment: A comparative social history 1721-1794*. London: Arnold.

Nadesan, M. H. (1999). The Discourses of New Age corporate spiritualism and evangelical capitalism, *Management Communication Quarterly, 13*, 3-42.

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

Parkinson, B. (1991). Emotional stylists: Strategies of expressive management among trainee hairdressers. *Cognition and Emotion, 5*, 419-434.

"Parochial school teachers." (1984). *U.S. Catholic, 49*(9), 30-36.

Parsons, C., & Fidler, B. (2005). A new theory of educational change as punctuated equilibrium: The case of the internationalisation of higher education institutions. *53*(4), 447-465.

Pauchant, T. C. (2002). *Ethics and spirituality at work: Hopes and pitfalls of the search for meaning in organizations*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Personnel Handbook: SDA Department of Education (2005). Silver Spring, MD: General Conference of SDA.

Peshkin, A. (1986). *God's choice: The total world of a fundamentalist Christian school*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pokora, R. (2001). Implications of conceptualizations of spirituality for organizational communication. In A. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Essays on communication & spirituality: Contributions to a new discourse on communication* (pp. 131-135). Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Pratt, M. G., & Doucet, L. (2000). Ambivalent feelings in organizational relationships. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organization* (pp. 204-226). London: Sage.

Pringle, R. (1988). *Secretaries talk*. London: Verso.

Putnam, L. L. (1985). Contradictions and paradoxes in organizations. In L. Thayer (Ed.), *Organization communication: Emerging perspectives* (Vol. 1). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Putnam, L. L. (1983). The interpretive perspective: An alternative to functionalism. In L. L. Putnam & M. E. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 173-194). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Rafaeli, A. (1989). When cashiers meet customers: An analysis of the role of supermarket cashiers. *Academy of Management Review, 32*, 245-373.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. (1987). Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Journal, 12*, 23-37.

Richard, M. P. (1986). Goffman revisited: Relatives vs. administrators in nursing homes. *Qualitative Sociology, 9*, 321.

Rio Lindo Adventist Academy. (2006). [Promotional DVD].

Roberts, R., & Zablocki, B. (1973). On communes. *Contemporary Sociology, 2*, 351-359.

Robin, R. (1995). *The barbed-wire college: Reeducating German POWs in the United States during World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rodriguez, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Essays on communication & spirituality: Contributions to a new discourse on communication*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Rousch, D. (2005). *Marketing: Ideas that work - Small schools*. PowerPoint presentation retrieved May, 2006, from "Journey to Excellence: Summit," http://www.nadeducation.org/dynamic.html?wspID=256

Rutter, D., & Fielding, P. (1988). Sources of occupational stress: An examination of British prison officers. *Work & Stress, 2*, 291-299.

Sandin, R. (1992). To those who teach at Christian colleges. In D. Guthrie & R. Noftziger (Eds.), *Agendas for church-related colleges and universities* (Vol. 79, pp. 43-54). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sass, J. (2000). Characterizing organizational spirituality: An organizational communication culture approach. *Communication Studies, 51*, 195-217.

Scheler, M. (1979). *The nature of sympathy* (P. Heath, Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Schutz, A. (1967). *The phenomenology of the social world*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Schwandt, T. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 189-213). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, R. W., & Greenleaf, F. (2000). *Light bearers: A history of the Seventh-day Adventist church*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press.

Shaver, P., Schwartz, J., Kirson, D., & O'Connor, C. (1987). Emotion knowledge: Further exploration of a prototype approach. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology, 52*, 1061-1086.

Sheets, M. (1978). Phenomenology: An approach to dance. In M. H. Nadel & C. G. Nadel (Eds.), *The dance experience: Readings in dance appreciation* (pp. 33-48). New York: Praeger.

Shipman, M., (1967). Education and college culture. *British Journal of Sociology, 18*, 425.

Shuler, S., & Sypher, B. D. (2000). Seeking emotional labor: When managing the heart enhances the work experience. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 50-89.

Silverman, H. (1984). Phenomenology: From hermeneutics to deconstruction. *Research in Phenomenology, 14*, 19-34.

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations* (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.

Sizer, T. (1964). *The age of the academies*. New York: Columbia University.

Smith, S. (May 14, 2001). Outstanding boarding schools. *U.S. News and World Report, 130*.

Smith, J. M., Arendt, C., Lahman, J. B., Settle, G. N., & Duff, A. (2006). Framing the work of art: Spirituality and career discourse in the nonprofit arts sector. *Communication Studies, 57*, 25-46.

Smith, K. K., & Berg, C. (1988). *Paradoxes of group life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stark, L. R. (1994). The shelter as `total institution'. *American Behavioral Scientist, 37*, 553-563.

Stenross, G., & Kleinman, S. (1989). The highs and lows of emotional labor: Detectives' encounters with criminals and victims. *Journal of contemporary Ethnography, 17*, 436-452.

Steward, D., & Shook, R. L. (2004). *Doing business by the Good Book: 52 lessons on success straight from the Bible* (1st ed.). New York: Hyperion.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sullivan, J. (2001). *Catholic education: Distinctive and inclusive*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sutton, R. (1991). Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*, 245-268.

Thiessen, E. J. (1993). *Teaching for commitment: Liberal education, indoctrination, and Christian nurture*. Montreal: Buffalo

Thompson, C. M. (2000). *The congruent life: Following the inward path to fulfilling work and inspired leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Thompson, V. (1976). *Bureaucracy and the modern world*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Tolich, M. (1993). Emotions and customer service: Supermarket clerks' performance of customer service. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 22*, 361-381.

Tompkins, P., & Cheney, G. (1985). Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organizations. In R. D. McPhee & P. Tompkins (Eds.), *Organizational communication: Traditional themes and new directions* (pp. 179-210). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Townsend, K. (1989). *The boarding school guide: Facts and figures on 231 leading schools throughout the United States*. Athens, GA: Agee Publishers.

Tracy, S. J. (2000). Becoming a character for commerce. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 90-129.

Tracy, S. J. (2004). The construction of correctional officers: Layers of emotionality behind bars. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*, 509-533.

Tracy, S. J. (2005). Locking up emotion: Moving beyond dissonance for understanding emotion labor discomfort. *Communication Monographs, 72*, 261-283.

Tracy, S. J., & Tracy, K. (1998). Emotional labor at 911: A case study and theoretical critique. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26*, 390-411.

Tretheway, A., & Ashcraft, K. (2004). Practicing disorganization: The development of applied perspectives on living with tension. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 32*, 81-88.

Tucker, D. (2005). *Marketing Adventist Education in North America*. PowerPoint presentation retrieved May, 2006, from "Journey to Excellence: Summit," http://www.nadeducation.org/dynamic.html?wspID=256

Union Springs Academy. (2006). *Why USA?*. Retrieved April 13, 2006, from www.unionsprings.org/whyusa.php

Van Maanen, J. (1983). Reclaiming qualitative methods for organizational research: A preface. In J. Van Maanen (Ed.), *Qualitative methodology* (pp. 9-18). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Van Maanen, J., & Kunda, G. (1989). "Real feelings": Emotional expression and organizational culture. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (pp. 43-103). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Inc.

van Manen, M. (1979). The Utrecht school: An experiment in educational theorizing. *Interchange, 10*(1), 48-66.

van Manen, M. (1982). Phenomenological pedagogy. *Curriculum Inquiry, 12*, 283-299.

van Manen, M. (1986). *The tone of teaching*. Richmond Hill, Ontario: Scholastic.

van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experiences*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Vision for today and tomorrow: Master plan.. Mt. Pisgah Academy. (2006). Retrieved April, 2006 from http://www.mpa.candler.nc.us/about/Master%20Plan.pdf

Vryhof, S. (2004). *Between memory and vision: The case for faith-based schooling*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Waldron, V. R., & Krone, K. J. (1991). The experience and expression of emotion in the workplace. *Management Communication Quarterly, 4*, 287-309.

Warren, R. (2002). *The purpose-driven life: What on earth am I here for?* Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Weaver, A. (2005). Spaces of containment and revenue capture: ˜Super-Sized" cruise ships as mobile tourism enclaves. *7*(2), 165-184.

Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R. D., & Sechrest, L. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures: Nonreactive research in the social sciences*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Weber, M. (1949). *The methodology of the social sciences*. New York: Free Press.

White, E. (2005). *The Great Controversy*. Nampa, ID: Pacific Press.

Wichroski, M. A. (1994). The secretary: Invisible labor in the workworld of women. *Human Organization, 53*, 33-41.

Witmer, D. (2001). The co-construction of self and organization: Evoking organizational spirituality. In A. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Essays on communication & spirituality: Contributions to a new discourse on communication* (pp. 1-19). Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

WordNet. (2003). Princeton University. Retrieved June, 2006 from http://wordnet.princeton.edu/

Wouters, C. (1989). The sociology of emotions and flight attendants: Hochschild's managed heart. *Theory, Culture, and Society, 6*, 95-123.

Yamane, D. (1998). Spirituality. In W. H. Swatos (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of religion and society* (pp. 492). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Yingling, J. (2006). Recruitment letter. Rio Lindo Adventist Academy.

Youniss, J., Convey, J. J., & McLellan, J. A. (2000). *The Catholic character of Catholic schools*. Notre Dame, IN.: University of Notre Dame Press.

Zurcher, L. (1972). The naval recruit training center: A study of role assimilation in a total institution. In C. Bryant (Ed.), *The social dimensions of work* (pp. 298-312). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Interview Protocol (currently employed teachers and staff)

1. Tell me how and why you became an academy teacher.

2. What do you like best about your work in an academy? What do you like least?

3. Within the realm of religious or spiritual matters, describe what faculty members can/cannot, should/should not do or believe as teachers/staff in SDA boarding schools. (How do you know what's accepted or what's prohibited as far as faculty members' own personal spiritual beliefs and practices go? How are you expected to behave, believe, and/or conduct yourself as a Christian and Seventh-day Adventist faculty member?)

    o Explain how you know this to be so.

    o Explain what happens to those who violate these expectations.

4. Describe a time when you have felt the most stress, frustration, anger, or discouragement about religious or spiritual matters connected with your job as an academy teacher/staff member.

5. Describe how your spiritual or religious life or practices would be different if you did not work at an academy.

    o Describe a time when you behaved differently than you normally would have because you work in an academy.

6. Talk about a time when you disagreed with the school, administration, or your colleagues about a spiritual or religious matter.

    o What did you do? What did you want to do? Who did you talk to?

7. Describe how faculty members in general respond to spiritual or religious rules or expectations they don't really agree with, don't really want to follow themselves, and/or don't want to enforce with the students.

   o How does the church, administration, conference, or even other colleagues react? How do you, personally, respond?

Demographic Information:

Age_____   Biological Sex_____

# of years academy teaching_____   # of years at current school_____

Subject(s) taught/Position held _____

Appendix A (cont.)

Interview Protocol (previously employed teachers and staff)

1. Tell me how and why you became an academy teacher.

2. What did you like best about your work in an academy? What did you like least?

   Talk about why you no longer work at a boarding school.

3. Within the realm of religious or spiritual matters, describe what faculty members

   can and cannot, should and should not do or believe as teachers/staff in Seventh-

   day Adventist boarding schools.

   o   Explain how you knew this to be so.

   o   Explain what happened to those who violated these expectations.

4. Describe a time when you felt the most stress, frustration, anger, or

   discouragement about religious or spiritual matters connected with your job as an

   academy teacher/staff member.

5. Describe how your spiritual or religious life is different now that you no longer

   work in an academy.

   o   How do you behave differently now than you did as an academy teacher

       or staff member.

6. Talk about a time when you disagreed with the school, administration, or your

   colleagues about a spiritual or religious matter.

   o   What did you do? What did you want to do? Who did you talk to?

7. Describe how faculty members in general responded to spiritual or religious rules

   or expectations they didn't really agree with, didn't really want to follow

   themselves, and/or didn't want to enforce with the students.

o How did the church, administration, conference, or even other colleagues

react? How did you, personally, respond?

Demographic Information:

Age_____   Biological Sex_____

# of years academy teaching_____

Subject(s) taught/Position held _____

Appendix B

Scripts: Introduction to Participants

(currently employed teachers/staff)

Hi. My name is Tammy McGuire and I am a doctoral student in the Department of

Communication at the University of Missouri-Columbia. _____ suggested that I contact

you about a study that I am conducting about how academy teachers and staff come to

know about and manage the spiritual and religious expectations of their work. You

would be asked to participate in one open ended interview lasting between 1-2 hours,

depending on how much you have to say. In addition, I would ask that you bring with

you to the interview any type of document (formal or informal) that illustrates any or all

of the following: 1) how you are expected to behave, believe, and/or conduct yourself as

a Christian and Seventh-day Adventist faculty member; 2) what happens (or might

happen) if staff members do not embrace these qualities.

In the course of the interview it is possible that we may talk about matters that are personal

and that you may not normally share with administration or other colleagues, so there is

some risk to you if your confidentiality is breached. However, steps will be taken to

protect your confidentiality such as: personal/organizational identifying information will

be eliminated from the transcripts, documents, and any reporting of the data; audio tapes

and documents will be kept in a locked area, etc. Given these conditions, would you be

willing to participate in this study?

Scripts: Introduction to Participants

(previously employed teachers/staff)

Hi. My name is Tammy McGuire and I am a doctoral student in the Department of

Communication at the University of Missouri-Columbia. _____ suggested that I contact

you about a study that I am conducting about how academy teachers and staff come to

know about and manage the spiritual and religious expectations of their work. You

would be asked to participate in one open ended interview lasting between 1-2 hours,

depending on how much you have to say.

In the course of the interview it is possible that we may talk about matters that are personal,

that you may not normally have shared with administration or other colleagues, and that

you may not regularly discuss with others, so there is some risk to you if your

confidentiality is breached. However, steps will be taken to protect your confidentiality

such as: personal/organizational identifying information will be eliminated from the

transcripts, documents, and any reporting of the data; audio tapes and documents will be

kept in a locked area, etc. Given these conditions, would you be willing to participate in

this study?

Appendix C

Consent Form

Project Title: Spiritual labor of parochial boarding school teachers and staff
Researcher: Tammy McGuire is a doctoral candidate in the Department of
Communication at the University of Missouri-Columbia.
Purpose: I will be conducting a study using interviews to look at how you interpret
and respond to the spiritual and religious expectations of your job as an
academy teacher/staff member. You must be employed or have been
employed at a Seventh-day Adventist boarding academy.
Time: The study should take between 40 minutes and 1 ½ hours, depending on
how much you have to say. Interviews will be audio taped.
Voluntary: Your participation is voluntary. You may quit at any time and you may
refuse to answer any question.
Risk: There is minimal risk involved with the study. However, it is possible that
you may reveal personal information that could affect your reputation
and/or employability should confidentiality be breached.
Benefits: The results of this study may help organizations and organizational
members understand the nature and impact of spiritual expectations in the
workplace.
Confidential: Neither your identity or the identity of your institution will be revealed in
transcripts, written documents, or verbal presentations of the data. The
following steps will be taken to protect your identity and confidentiality.
1. Consent forms will be separated from the data
2. Personal/organizational identifying information will be
eliminated from the transcripts, documents, and any reporting
of the data
3. You can refuse to answer any question asked.
4. Audio tapes and documents will be kept in a locked area.
Questions: If you have any questions about your rights, contact Campus IRB:
Office of Research
483 McReynolds Hall
Columbia MO 65211
(573) 882-9585

If you have any questions about this study, feel free to contact:
Tammy McGuire
Doctoral Candidate, Department of Communication
University of Missouri – Columbia
tsmkr7@mizzou.edu

_____   _____
Signature   Date
(signature indicates that you understand and agree to the conditions mentioned above)

VITA

Tammy McGuire was born and raised in Colorado and spent her younger years tramping through the San Juan mountains near her home. From there she went far afield to Lincoln, Nebraska for her bachelor's degree in Language Arts Education, taking off a year to teach conversational English in Costa Rica. She graduated summa cum laude from Union College in 1984. The next 19 years were occupied teaching high school English in parochial boarding schools. During one of her many contented years in Washington state she pursued her M.A. in English from Eastern Washington University, finishing in 1998. In the interim she authored several correspondence courses (for Griggs University) in American Literature, British Literature, and Intermediate English and found time to travel with student groups to such far-flung places as Nepal, Borneo, and Papua New Guinea. She finally severed her ties with high school English to pursue her PhD in communication at the University of Missouri-Columbia (2006). While there, she developed an interest in organizational communication, particularly the contradictions and tensions found in paradoxes and dialectal tensions. She is now an assistant professor in the communication department at Pacific Union College, a small liberal arts school beautifully situated on a mountain overlooking California's Napa Valley. Her life goal now is to convince her students to love theory and research as much as she does.