



An Alternative to Bureaucratic Impersonality and Emotional Labor: Bounded Emotionality at The Body Shop

Author(s): Joanne Martin, Kathleen Knopoff, Christine Beckman

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 2, Special Issue: Critical Perspectives on Organizational Control (Jun., 1998), pp. 429-469

Published by: [Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393858>

Accessed: 26/04/2012 18:57

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

An Alternative to
Bureaucratic
Impersonality and
Emotional Labor:
Bounded Emotionality at
The Body Shop

Joanne Martin,
Kathleen Knopoff, and
Christine Beckman
Stanford University

Using qualitative data from a large, successful private sector corporation (The Body Shop International), which was managed and staffed by an unusually high proportion of women, this paper questions whether norms of impersonality need be a defining characteristic of large organizations. We also ask whether displays of emotions in organizations need to be managed primarily for instrumental purposes, a form of emotional labor that entails costs for employees. This paper explores the viability of an alternative emotion management approach, "bounded emotionality," which encourages the constrained expression of emotions at work in order to encourage community building and personal well-being in the workplace. We show how bounded emotionality was enacted and explore difficulties in its implementation, including pressures on employees who prefer impersonality and the dangers of a deeper and more intimate form of controlling employees. Results show that rapid firm growth, a limited labor market, and the pressures of a competitive marketplace serve as boundary conditions for the maintenance of bounded emotionality.*

People constantly experience emotions, yet in organizational theory, as in organizational life, the exploration of emotions has been largely deemphasized, marginalized, or ignored. Impersonal criteria for making decisions and restraints on emotional expression at work have long been the hallmarks of bureaucracy (e.g., Weber, 1946, 1981). Recent work has broken this emotional taboo, exploring how certain organizations require the expression of particular emotions at work to maximize organizational productivity, an aspect of job performance that has been labeled emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983). Van Maanen and Kunda (1989) and Turner (1986) have described the displays of enthusiasm and loyalty required in some corporate cultures. Hochschild (1983) and Sutton and his colleagues (e.g., Sutton and Rafaeli, 1988; Sutton, 1991) have explored discrepancies between outward behavior and inward feelings experienced by smiling flight attendants and nasty bill collectors. In contrast, feminist organizational theorists have taken a focus on emotions one step closer to a kind of personal authenticity, arguing that expression of a wider range of emotions at work (labeled bounded emotionality) is desirable, not to enhance productivity but to foster the psychological well-being of organizational members and their families (Mumby and Putnam, 1992; Putnam and Mumby, 1993; Meyerson, 1998).

This paper explores this last, feminist approach to emotional expression in organizations. While these ideas have emerged from the study of small, usually nonprofit organizations, we examine whether bounded emotionality is feasible in the large, for-profit firms that dominate contemporary industrialized societies. We also ask if bounded emotionality in these contexts is desirable, from employees' points of view, or if it is yet another, more intimate and powerful form of organizational control. More generally, as the bureaucratic form proliferates across the industrialized landscape (e.g., DiMaggio and Powell, 1983), these organizations seek to enhance their efficiency and chances for survival through such mechanisms as hierarchy, division of labor, and impersonal, appar-

© 1998 by Cornell University.
0001-8392/98/4302-0429/\$1.00.

•

Portions of the research reported here were supported by the Graduate School of Business, Stanford University and, for Kathy Knopoff, the Cate Muther Fellowship for doctoral research on women entrepreneurs. Exceptionally helpful comments were offered by Debra Meyerson, Robin Ely, and the reviewers and editor of this journal. We give special thanks to Anita Roddick and the employees of The Body Shop International.

ently unemotional, and deindividualized “rule by rules” (Weber, 1946, 1981; Ritzer, 1996). This paper focuses on one of these mechanisms, the management of emotion, and asks whether it is possible for a large organization, struggling to profit and grow in a highly competitive marketplace, to find new ways of incorporating emotional expression into organizational life. In the domain of emotions, is the isomorphism of bureaucracy an iron cage, or is it possible to find ways of doing business differently, on a large scale?

CONTROL IN THREE IDEAL TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS

The process of organizing requires the coordination of employees’ behavior. Because coordination may be imperfect (e.g., because of miscommunication or conflicts of interest), organizational members engage in various control strategies. Perrow (1986: 129–131) distinguished three types of control: (1) direct and fully obtrusive, such as giving orders, surveillance, and rules; (2) bureaucratic and somewhat less obtrusive, such as division of labor and hierarchy; and (3) fully unobtrusive control of the cognitive premises underlying action, in which the employee voluntarily restricts the range of behaviors considered appropriate. We draw on and extend this conceptualization of control to distinguish three ideal types of organizations: traditional bureaucratic, normative, and feminist. Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of each of these ideal types. As ideal types, these categories are theory-derived; actual organizations, including the organization studied in this paper, The Body Shop International, are expected to exhibit a mix of these characteristics.

The traditional bureaucracy described in table 1 is derived from a Weberian model, combining Perrow’s first two, relatively obtrusive forms of control, direct and bureaucratic (e.g., Barnard, 1938; Rushing, 1966; Hall, 1968; Ouchi, 1977; Weed, 1993; Adler and Borys, 1996). Contrary to Weber’s ideal type formulation, the expression of certain emotions (e.g., anger and competitiveness), is often condoned in traditional bureaucracies. The second, normative type of organization is characterized by Perrow’s third, unobtrusive form of control, in which management has shifted limited powers to lower-level employees through such strategies as participative management, team-based production, less specialized division of labor, job rotation, consensual decision making, and an emphasis on cooperation (e.g., Tompkins and Cheney, 1985; Soeters, 1986; Bartunek and Moch, 1991; Eccles and Nohria, 1992; Barker and Tompkins, 1994). Normative organizations rely less on control by formal authorities and more on the internalization of values; control is achieved by employees’ self-policing. Members actively take up management’s or a group’s decision premises and make them their own, seeing their own goals and those of the organization as coinciding (e.g., Ouchi, 1980; Perrow, 1986; Cheney and Tompkins, 1987). As table 1 shows, normative strategies preserve, in a modified fashion, many of the major dimensions of traditional bureaucracies. For example, the verticality of a hierarchy is somewhat flattened, while preserving many of the prerogatives of management’s formal authority, and the division of labor between lower-level employees and top management is largely preserved, while at

Bounded Emotionality

Table 1

Comparison of Traditional Bureaucratic, Normative, and Feminist Types of Organizations			
Dimensions— Degree to which:	Traditional bureaucratic	Normative	Feminist*
Hierarchy is emphasized	High: Hierarchical; authority at the top.	Low: Relatively egalitarian; authority within collective.	Low: Egalitarian; authority dispersed throughout organization.
Division of labor is formal and specialized	High: Formalized; specialized.	Low: Informal; nonspecialized.	Low: Informal; nonspecialized.
Employment is based on expertise	High: Employment based on technical qualifications; previous thorough training in a specialized area; little or no job rotation.	Low: Employment based on skills and knowledge; training on the job; job rotation.	Low: Employment based on commitment to feminist agenda; training on the job; job rotation.
Jobs are segregated by gender	High: Not explicitly addressed, but norm is high segregation by job title; women clustered at bottom.	High: Not explicitly addressed, but norm is high segregation by job title; women clustered at bottom.	Low: Goal is minimal segregation; many feminist organizations all female.
Leadership style is authoritarian	High: Authoritarian leadership emphasized; autocratic.	Moderate-low: Authoritarian leadership de-emphasized; participative.	Low: Authoritarian leadership de-emphasized; participative.
Control is direct	High: Control is direct.	Low: Control unobtrusive, through internalized values.	Low: Control unobtrusive, through internalized values reflecting feminist ideology.
Decision making centralized and concentrated at high levels	High: Centralized decision making at higher levels; decisions final.	Moderate: Consensual decision making within groups; open to renegotiation.	Low: Decentralized decision making; open to renegotiation.
Corporate culture emphasizes competition	High: Competitive culture; status, rewards based on individual achievement.	Moderate: Cooperative culture; fewer status differences; rewards distributed across collective.	Low: Cooperative culture; status differences minimized; rewards somewhat equalized.
Work behavior determined by impersonal rules	High: Impersonal decisions; based on formal rules, applied consistently.	Moderate-low: Group-specific decisions based on group norms rather than formal rules.	Low: Individuated decisions, based on personal relations and formal rules that are open to renegotiation.
Emotion treated as acceptable form of expression	Low: Emotional expression generally discouraged, devalued as irrational.	Moderate: Emotion sometimes expressed, primarily for instrumental purposes.	High: Emotion openly expressed, personal and work related.
Work and private life regarded as separate	High: Private life presumed to be separate from work activity; private adapted to work.	High: Private life presumed to be separate from work activity; private adapted to work.	Low: Private life concerns are primary; work adapted to private rhythms.

* Feminist organizations share some, but not all characteristics of collectivist organizations (e.g., Mansbridge, 1973; Gamson and Levin, 1984; Jackall and Levin, 1984; Rothschild and Whitt, 1986; Whyte and Whyte, 1991).

lower levels, some forms of specialization and direct supervision are reduced or eliminated. In a study particularly relevant to a subset of the data presented in this paper, Barker (1993) traced how teams of employees created a distinctive set of norms that were eventually transformed into formal, standardized rules of behavior.

Researchers disagree about the desirability of normative forms of control. Some praise the harmony, loyalty, and productivity that are seen to issue from value congruence (e.g., Ouchi, 1980; Schein, 1985), while others argue that normative control strategies, in spite of their apparent emphasis on

more egalitarian, participative ways of doing business, are in fact dangerously effective ways of asserting and enforcing managerial control of employees' behavior through cooptation and false consciousness (e.g., Van Maanen and Barley, 1984; Tompkins and Cheney, 1985; Calas and Smircich, 1987; Alvesson and Berg, 1992). Willmott (1993: 541) argued that "under the guise of giving more autonomy to the individual than in organizations governed by bureaucratic rules, corporate culture threatens to promote a new, hypermodern neo-authoritarianism which, potentially, is more insidious and sinister than its bureaucratic predecessor."

Feminist theorists have challenged the assumptions of traditional forms of bureaucracy and proposed a variant of the normative approach. This feminist organizational form is outlined in the right-hand column of table 1. Feminist organizations seek to foster employee well-being, rather than to maximize efficiency or performance. They deemphasize hierarchy, preferring relatively egalitarian modes of organizing and consensual modes of decision making; leadership responsibilities are shared, often on a rotating basis; and specialized divisions of labor are either avoided or circumvented by the use of task rotation and training (e.g., Ferguson, 1984; Iannello, 1992; Eisenstein, 1995; Ferree and P. Martin, 1995). Many of these attributes of feminist organizations are shared by nonfeminist cooperative organizations (e.g., Gamson and Levin, 1984; Jackall and Levin, 1984; Rothschild and Whitt, 1986; Whyte and Whyte, 1991). Feminist organizations, however, rely on a specialized form of unobtrusive control that places unique emphasis on emotional expression and the primacy of private, as opposed to work, concerns.

Feminist Perspectives

Although The Body Shop International exhibits only a small subset of the attributes of a feminist organization, feminist theory elucidates the theoretical implications of our choice of organization for study and provides a critical theoretical context for our focus on bounded emotionality. There are many varieties of feminist theory, ranging from a liberal emphasis on equal opportunity to more radical Marxist or post-structural formulations (for reviews, see Jaggar, 1983; Tong, 1989). These varieties of feminist theory share a commitment to expose and change the patterns of inequality that currently disadvantage women (e.g., Kanter, 1977; Harlan and Weiss, 1982; Reskin and Hartmann, 1986; Acker, 1990; Leidner, 1991; Collinson, Knights, and Collinson, 1990; Marshall, 1984). Feminist theory incorporates a political agenda for change. Because collective change is facilitated by the articulation of a more desirable alternative (Alcoff, 1988: 419; Martin, Scully, and Levitt, 1990), studies of feminist organizations are an important component of feminist research agendas. Feminist organizations, however, are a limited subset of organizations, generally founded for purposes congruent with feminist ideology and with relatively small numbers of employees (e.g., Baker, 1982; Epstein, Russell, and Silvern, 1988; Barnett, 1995; Farrell, 1995; Morgen, 1995; Tom, 1995). Often, feminist organizations are nonprofit and staffed, in part, by volunteer members, for example, battered women's shelters and political action movements. In many of these organizations, all or most members are

Bounded Emotionality

women, but this is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition of being classified as a feminist organization. The prevalence or absence of women members does not determine whether an organization is feminist; what is essential is that the organization exhibit most or all of the characteristics of the feminist organization summarized in table 1 (Ferguson, 1984; Lugones and Spelman, 1987; P. Martin, 1990; Acker, 1990; Ferree and Martin, 1995; Martin and Knopoff, 1998).

In this paper, we draw on a positional version of feminist theory (Alcoff, 1988), according to which the socially constructed viewpoints of those who are not members of a dominant group in society can yield insights that are often inaccessible from other positions. Most organizations, particularly in the private sector, are dominated by men. Positional feminism suggests that if an organization has an unusual prevalence of women, this might make visible some phenomena that would surface less frequently and less obviously in a more conventional, male-dominated setting. Research on segregation by race in schools and by gender in organizations (see Pettigrew and Martin, 1987, for a review) suggests that approximately 15–22 percent minority membership is a minimum prerequisite for systemwide change, e.g., significant numbers of blacks elected to student council, women promoted to high-level positions. Because women are often clustered in lower-status positions, with little formal authority, we believe that in an organizational context, the presence of significant numbers of women in relatively high-status positions would be necessary to overcome the usual conformity pressures placed on a few token, high-ranking women executives. In addition, the support of men who share aspects of feminist ideology would be important. Thus, if an organization had unusually large numbers of women at the upper and middle levels of a hierarchy, and at least 15–22 percent at the highest levels, a different set of emotional norms might emerge. Alternatively, if bureaucratic norms of impersonality and emotional restraint are indeed inescapable elements of any large, hierarchical organization, then simply adding a larger proportion of women (“add women and stir”), even with a substantial proportion in high-ranking positions, is unlikely, by itself, to produce different emotional norms.

Traditional sex differences research has produced findings relevant to this argument. For example, women are more likely than men to engage in self-disclosure, express a wider range of emotions, and seek ways to acknowledge the inseparability of work and personal lives without letting work concerns take priority over family needs (e.g., Allen and Hounn, 1976; Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Ely, 1995; Fletcher, 1995). A few researchers attribute such differences to biology, but most argue they are an effect of socially or culturally constructed differences, for example, differential socialization of men and women or differential recruitment and control mechanisms (e.g., Ekman, 1973; Acker and Van Houten, 1974; Zajonc, 1985; Harding, 1993; Kitayama and Markus, 1996). Positional feminism does not assume that women fit the pattern of behavior found in these studies or that men do not. Rather, a positional feminism postulates

that an unusual prevalence of women in an organization might constitute a promising milieu for innovative, self-disclosing emotional management practices to emerge among both men and women. Furthermore, such studies suggest that a woman leader might be somewhat more likely than a man to advocate and support the emergence of such innovative emotional practices.

Focus on Emotions

Traditional bureaucratic, normative, and feminist organizations differ regarding their orientations toward emotional issues (see table 1, last three dimensions of comparison: impersonality, emotional expression, and work-private life). Traditional bureaucratic organizations echo Weber in emphasizing control by impartial and impersonal rules that eschew the personal favoritism that can come with individuating solutions to problems (e.g., Hellriegel and Slocum, 1979). Traditional bureaucracies also attempt to keep the public domain of work and the private domain of personal and family life separate, so that if an employee experiences difficulties balancing work and family demands, responsibility for the problem and the solution lies with the individual employee, not the employing firm.

Critical studies of traditional bureaucracies have noted that although not all interactions are impersonal or unemotional, some emotions, such as anger and competitiveness, are generally condoned in bureaucratic organizations, while others, such as sadness, fear, some forms of sexual attraction, and vulnerability are taboo (e.g., Cockburn, 1983; Burrell, 1984; Stearns and Stearns, 1986; Adler and Adler, 1988; Van Maanen, 1991; Hearn, 1993). Further, different types of emotional expression are condoned in different contexts (e.g., around the coffee pot) at some times and not others (Fineman, 1993). When emotions are displayed for instrumental purposes, this is termed emotional labor. For example, gossiping hairdressers, deferential flight attendants, smiling retail clerks, and nasty bill collectors control their emotional expression to improve productivity, customer satisfaction, efficiency, and even profitability (e.g., Hochschild, 1983; Sutton and Rafaeli, 1988; Rafaeli, 1989; Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989, 1990, 1991; Sutton, 1991).

In some cases, emotional labor is subject to traditional bureaucratic forms of control, for example, when it is carefully monitored by supervisors. Emotional labor can also be monitored by customers, as when passengers ask flight attendants, "Why aren't you smiling?" (Hochschild, 1983: 127). When the need for emotional labor is internalized, it also functions as an unobtrusive normative control, particularly for employees who work outside the purview of supervisors. For example, Mary Kay beauty consultants were told, "You've got to fake it until you make it—that is—act enthusiastic and you will become enthusiastic" (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989: 14). In these latter examples of emotional labor, normative control of expressed and felt emotion breaches the putative public and private divide—in the interest of the organization, not the individual.

Critical studies of emotional labor have decried the personal costs of this commercialization of emotion, particularly when

Bounded Emotionality

what is felt is decoupled from what is expressed (e.g., Willmott, 1993; Fineman, 1996). Hochschild (1983: 20) drew attention to the loss of the ability to recognize private feelings that were not subject to instrumental demands for public emotional display. Flight attendants used the phrase "go robot" to describe the deadened emotional state they sometimes adopted when their private feelings and public behavior were strongly divergent. Van Maanen and Kunda (1989) discussed individual distancing, burnout, and phoniness, while Waldron and Krone (1991) found evidence of suppressed disagreements, reduced upward information flow, and loss of "voice." Despite this awareness of the personal costs of emotional control, an alternative to emotional labor has not been developed within this stream of research.

In contrast, feminist scholars have developed an idealized view of the role of emotions in organizations, unencumbered, for the most part, by concerns about productivity, customer satisfaction, or profitability (e.g., Marshall, 1984; Calas and Smircich, 1989; Hearn et al., 1989; Mills and Tancred, 1992; Wharton and Erickson, 1993; Meyerson, 1998). Feminist theorists dismantle attempts to dichotomize rationality and emotionality, public and private, objectivity and subjectivity, showing how each is inescapably intertwined with its apparent opposite (e.g., Moi, 1985; Flax, 1987; Spivak, 1987; Calas and Smircich, 1992; Ferguson, 1993). Thus, the feminist premise—the personal is political—legitimizes exploration, through self-disclosure, of how aspects of work affect home life, and vice versa (Olsen, 1983; Frug, 1986; Okin, 1989; Bologh, 1990; J. Martin, 1990; Wharton and Erickson, 1993). This refusal to try to dichotomize the public and the private legitimates the expression and exploration of a wider range of emotions at work, including sexual attraction, affection, vulnerability, fear, sadness, and joy, dismantling many barriers between what is felt and what is expressed.

According to these feminist scholars, relatively unbounded emotionality at work should be enacted not for the instrumental gain of the organization (although this may happen) but to enhance the well-being of the individual organizational members (e.g., Hearn and Parkin, 1987; Hearn et al., 1989; Morgen, 1994; Gherardi, 1995). Some argue that work stress, for example, should not be viewed as an individual problem but, rather, as a political, organizational, and community issue that must be approached collectively, even if at some cost to the employing organization (Newton, 1995; Meyerson, 1998). This relatively unbounded feminist approach to emotional expression, we believe, would be difficult to implement in large organizations subject to the efficiency pressures of the competitive marketplace in which both for-profit and nonprofit organizations must operate.

Bounded Emotionality

Putnam and Mumby (1993) offered a modification of the feminist position on these emotional issues. They introduced bounded emotionality as a limited and pragmatic approach to the problem of emotional control in organizations (see Pauchant and Mitroff, 1992, for a different formulation of bounded emotionality). Mumby and Putnam (1992: 471) fo-

cused on work-related emotions, which they defined as “feelings, sensations, and affective responses to organizational situations,” although they acknowledged that such work feelings stem from and affect emotions arising from one’s personal history and home life. Bounded emotionality encourages the expression of a wider range of emotions than is usually condoned in traditional and normative organizations, while stressing the importance of maintaining interpersonally sensitive, variable boundaries between what is felt and what is expressed. At the risk of extending Mumby and Putnam’s (1992: 471) ideas with a specificity they did not intend, bounded emotionality has six defining characteristics: intersubjective limitations, emergent (rather than organizationally ascribed) feelings, tolerance of ambiguity, heterarchy of goals and values, integrated self-identity, and community building.

Intersubjective limitations. Emotional expression in organizations should be bounded, Mumby and Putnam argued, because individuals should constrain emotional expression in order to function effectively in interpersonal relationships in ways that are sensitive to other people’s emotional needs and competencies. In work settings, bounded emotionality should begin with a recognition of another person’s subjectivity, acknowledging potential differences as well as commonalities and working within whatever emotional limitations both individuals bring to the relationship (Mumby and Putnam, 1992: 478; see also Putnam and Mumby, 1993: 51–52; Meyerson, 1998). Such limitations would include an individual’s preferred modes and range of emotional expression. For example, one person might have a hot temper, needing to express anger before calming down, while another might be more restrained and self-contained, preferring public expression of a narrower range of emotions. Intersubjective responsiveness to such individual limitations, or preferred modes of emotional expression, would presumably require as a prerequisite some intimate knowledge of the other obtained through careful observation and voluntary self-disclosure.

Bounded emotionality presents a stark contrast to bounded rationality (e.g., Meyerson, 1998). Emotions are to be bounded voluntarily, to protect interpersonal relationships, while rationality is bounded (e.g., Simon, 1976) because of inevitable human limitations in information processing ability, producing such shortcuts as cognitive heuristics, satisficing, and standard operating procedures. Mumby and Putnam’s formulation of the bounding of emotional expression at work drew on feminist deconstructions of the false dichotomy between rationality and emotionality and delineated ways organizational theory and research has privileged cognitive functioning, leading to a neglect of emotional issues and an overemphasis on cognitive aspects of decision making. To highlight these issues, Mumby and Putnam chose to frame bounded emotionality as a concept of resistance to bounded rationality.

Spontaneously emergent work feelings. The goal of bounded emotionality is to build interpersonal relationships through improved mutual understanding of work-related feelings, to foster community rather than to further the effi-

Bounded Emotionality

ciency or productivity goals of the organization. Work feelings should emerge spontaneously from the performance of tasks; they should not be organizationally ascribed. Several studies show how emergent work feelings can surface in a manner that is not controlled by an organization's management or initiated primarily for the organization's benefit. For example, Morgen (1994, 1995) found that staff in feminist health clinics emphasized self-disclosure and openly discussed work-related and personal feelings.¹ Cohen and Sutton (1998) found that, for their own enjoyment, hair stylists encouraged salon clients to talk about personal matters.

Mumby and Putnam (1992: 479) acknowledged that emotions can sometimes be bounded, both for intersubjective reasons and to serve the organization's instrumental purposes, simultaneously: "Organizations do not need to sacrifice or lose sight of technical efficiency, but they should embed instrumental goals within a larger system of community and inter-relatedness." This means that, in spite of their conceptual distinctiveness, bounded emotionality and emotional labor may be empirically difficult to distinguish. It may be that bounded emotionality will be more situationally variable, as the need to exercise respect for intersubjective limitations may vary depending on the individual and the context, while emotional labor norms (e.g., you should smile) may be more stable. When instrumental concerns foster emotional labor, Mumby and Putnam argued, resulting felt emotions such as anxiety or frustration are to be expected and should, within intersubjective limits, be expressed in accord with bounded emotionality.

Tolerance of ambiguity. Tolerance of ambiguity is an essential component of bounded emotionality because it permits contradictory feelings, positions, and demands to coexist. Given the discussion above regarding the complex mix of feelings likely to emerge in situations in which emotional labor is required, the enactment of bounded emotionality necessarily entails some tolerance of ambiguity, including contradictions and irresolvable tensions (Meyerson, 1998).

Heterarchy of values. A heterarchy of goals and values is the opposite of a hierarchical ordering of value preferences. It suggests that no one set of values, even one that gives organizational priority to profit seeking, should take precedence over all others. Enacting value priorities must, according to bounded emotionality, depend on individual preferences and context.

Integrated self-identity and authenticity. Mumby and Putnam conceptualized self-identity in integrated terms, assuming that a person has a single self that, transcending context, can be known. Without such a concept of self, the idea that bounded emotionality can facilitate the experience of being "authentically oneself" at work would be meaningless. This conceptualization of a unified self supersedes notions of mind-body dualism and, presumably, alienated or fragmented labor.

Community. One purpose of enacting bounded emotionality is to facilitate strong feelings of community among organizational members. Evidence supporting this contention has been found in a series of studies of bounded emotionality in

1

Such an interactional description of bounded emotionality echoes some characteristics of Habermas's (1972) ideal speech situation without guaranteeing its fundamental requirement: the constitution of a public sphere in which people can interact without fear of coercion, a requirement that is difficult to achieve in a bureaucracy subject to the competitive pressure of the marketplace, where employees may fear the loss of their livelihoods (Fraser, 1989).

feminist organizations, including a record company (Lont, 1988), a female weaver's guild (Wyatt, 1988), and dyadic tutoring teams at a university (Nelson, 1988). Studies such as these, of organizations exhibiting norms of bounded emotionality, have all focused on relatively small, usually non-profit organizations.

Exploring the bounds of bounded emotionality. Rather than referring to an integrated self, we argue, drawing on poststructuralism and social psychological research (e.g., Flax, 1990; Kitayama and Markus, 1996), that the self is fragmented, composed of overlapping, nested identities that become activated in a context-specific manner, without assuming clarity or consistency over time. Definitions of the self and the potential for authenticity are important, particularly because this paper addresses questions of diversity in emotional preferences. Mumby and Putnam seemed to advocate bounded emotionality as a singular and more desirable alternative to the usual ways of organizing work, remaining silent about how to treat diversity. This silence raises some questions. How does a group or an organization foster bounded emotionality without creating conformity pressures that undermine or counteract commitment to being sensitive to individual limitations and respecting a heterarchy of values? Some people prefer more impersonality and emotional reserve. If an ideal bounded emotionality is enacted, such differing subjectivities should be recognized, listened to, and treated particularistically, so that multiple patterns of reaction to bounded emotionality are treated as normal and acceptable (Meyerson, 1998). Alternatively, those who differ could simply be pressured to conform to accepted, bounded emotional behavior, suppressing, repressing, or subordinating their subjectivities. This would entail a departure from authenticity, whether one defines this in integrated or fragmented terms. Without enacting respect for those who differ, bounded emotionality may carry the risk of becoming simply a revised claim for conformity, albeit with a different definition of what is desirable. Further, if more women than men have been socialized to prefer emotional expressiveness and self-disclosure, then bounded emotionality may become a claim for conformity to reversed gendered standards of behavior that disproportionately disadvantage men.

What we have learned about bounded emotionality comes from a limited set of small, often nonprofit organizations. We don't know if it is possible to enact bounded emotionality in one of the large, for-profit organizations that dominate so much of industrialized society. The efficiency and financial pressures of the competitive marketplace, compounded by the pressures toward growth, particularly when a company is publicly owned, would work against the time-consuming, noninstrumental orientation of bounded emotionality. Feminist theory advocates explorations of the intersections of public (work) and private (home) concerns (e.g., Hochschild, 1989), yet because of the pressures of a competitive marketplace, there is always the danger that performance concerns will take precedence over other priorities. Given these tensions, bounded emotionality may be difficult to enact in a large, for-profit organization, creating pressures toward reversion to more familiar forms of emotion management in orga-

Bounded Emotionality

nizations: impersonality or emotional labor, reinforced by traditional bureaucratic or normative control mechanisms. Bounded emotionality would have a better chance of surviving in such a context if facilitating factors were present. Two such factors are the proportion of women in various parts of the organization's hierarchy and the organization's ideology. First, from a positional version of feminism, if more women than men have been socialized to prefer expressing the kinds of emotions and engaging in the kinds of self-disclosure on which bounded emotionality is based, this form of emotional management might be more likely to flourish in an organization that employed a relatively large proportion of women, provided that some of those women held high-level management positions and were willing to influence the development of these kinds of emotional norms. Second, the enactment of bounded emotionality might have a greater chance of success in an organization that has an ideology congruent with some of the fundamental elements of bounded emotionality. Although it is doubtful any organization has deliberately incorporated bounded emotionality into its strategy and goals, an organization might endorse goals or values congruent with some of its attributes. These are the factors we explored in our study of The Body Shop.

METHOD

The Organization and Its Employees

As part of a larger project, we studied a large, for-profit organization that had an unusual prevalence of women employees in the managerial ranks and endorsed an ideology that supports a subset of the elements of bounded emotionality. The Body Shop International, a publicly owned multinational firm in the cosmetics industry, is known for its commitment to using naturally based products, protecting the environment, and promoting various social and political causes. This paper is based on data collected between December 1992 and November 1993; during this interval The Body Shop employed over 6,000 people internationally. At that time there were just under 1,000 retail outlets in 42 countries, with new stores, both franchised and company-owned, opening every two to three days. Between March 1, 1990 and February 28, 1992, total revenues had risen from £208.1 million to £265.4 million (Body Shop memo dated 9/16/92). This, then, is a large and successful private sector organization. Recent growth had been so rapid that current structures, job definitions, employee statistics, and even records of names and telephone numbers were unavailable or seriously out of date. Because rapid change both preceded and extended beyond the period of investigation, this study is an in-depth snapshot of a particular period in the company's life cycle, rather than a longitudinal study.

The Body Shop had recently been split into five separate "companies," with considerable decentralization of policies and control, to counteract perceptions that the company was becoming too large, impersonal, and bureaucratic. The five companies were: The Body Shop International (BSI), which oversaw much of the headquarters work as well as the international shops; Body Shop U.K. (BSUK), which was responsible for the retail shops in the U.K. and internal communica-

Table 2

Summary of the Study Participants and Methods, The Body Shop, December 1992–November 1993*										
Sites		Employees				Methods				
		Esti- mate %	Esti- mated num- ber in area	Number inter- viewed or ob- served	Inter- viewed	Partici- pant obser- vation	Obser- vation	On-site conver- sation	Off-site conver- sation	Archival
Unit of Body Shop	Area studied									
BSI	Board of directors	28	7	3	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Environment	71	7	1	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Workshop: new product development	100	11	10	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Research & development	50	19	19	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Tours	75	18	11	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Other combined areas	77	500	200	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Subtotal		75	562	244						
BSUK	Managing board	0	5	5	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	Retail operations (London)	60	62	15	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Communications	50	15	2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Body Shop television	50	4	3	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Subtotal		54	86	25						
Supply	Managing board	12.5	8	5	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Warehouse	17	90	53	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Human resources	100	8	1	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Product filling line	94	69	62	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Kitchen	40	27	10	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
	Plastics	0	20	30	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Subtotal		40	222	161						
Colourings	Headquarters	85	38	8	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Manufacturing	56†	180	80	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
	Retail									
outlets/ franchise	U.S. Shop #1	100	15	10	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	U.S. Shop #2	85	12	6	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Retail outlets/ company	U.S. Shop #3	90	30	10	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Subtotal	92	57	26						
Subtotal	U.K. Shop #1	75	12	4	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	U.K. Shop #2	100	11	3	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	U.K. Shop #3	80	12	5	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	U.K. Shop #4	75	8	2	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
	U.K. Shop #5	65	32	11	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	U.K. Shop #6	80	12	6	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Subtotal		76	87	31						
Total		66	1232	575						

* This table includes all units studied; it does not include all 6,000 Body Shop employees worldwide or all units of the corporation. The numbers of employees represented in this table are not exact because of the rapid growth of the company over the course of the study. They represent the number of employees at the time each area was studied, according to company records and our own.

† Numbers of employees were unavailable and are approximated here.

tions (such as weekly videos, public relations); Supply Company, which handled both production and distribution; Colourings, which designed and marketed makeup products; and CosTec, which manufactured the makeup line. We studied parts of all five sectors, in the U.S. and England. Table 2

Bounded Emotionality

gives a breakdown of the characteristics of the employees observed and interviewed, as well as the variety of methods used to study the various parts of the company. Most of our data collection time was spent in observation, participant-observation, and informal conversations. Duration of observations ranged from two hours to several weeks (periodically), with greater time spent in observations of and informal conversations with nonmanagerial employees, particularly on shopfloors. As described in more detail in table 3, we conducted in-depth structured interviews with 57 employees, representing all five parts of the firm, including most levels of management; 16 (28 percent) of these interviewees held nonmanagerial positions. Because most of our interactions with nonmanagerial employees involved observation and informal conversations, we have more confidence in our understanding of nonmanagerial perspectives than these structured interview numbers would suggest, but we also have less in-depth material from these levels of The Body Shop than we would like.

Although a detailed description of The Body Shop's formal structure and administrative policies is beyond the scope of this paper, some background will prove useful. Each of the five companies, at the time of the study, had its own board of directors, management structure, and personnel policies. The formal structure of each of the five units seemed, on the surface, to be traditionally bureaucratic, with superior-subordinate relationships, division of labor, and a few unit-specific standardized rules and procedures, most notably group interviews of job applicants, some form of perfor-

Table 3

Summary of Participants Interviewed

Area	Number interviewed	Status level	Gender
Body Shop International			
Board	3	3 Upper mgmt.	2 Female, 1 male
Environment	1	1 Upper mgmt.	1 Male
R & D	2	2 Mgmt.	1 Female, 1 male
Tours	1	1 Mgmt.	1 Female
Other	4	3 Mgmt., 1 clerical	2 Female, 2 male
Body Shop UK			
Retail	1	1 Upper mgmt.	1 Male
Retail operations (London)	2	1 Mgmt., 1 clerical	2 Female
Communications/BSTV	5	3 Mgmt., 2 clerical	2 Female, 3 male
Supply Company			
Board	6	6 Upper mgmt.	6 Male
Warehouse	7	2 Upper mgmt., 1 mgmt., 4 line	2 Female, 5 male
Human resources	1	1 Upper mgmt.	1 Female
Filling	4	1 Upper mgmt., 2 mgmt., 1 line	2 Female, 2 male
Colourings	3	2 Upper mgmt., 1 clerical	3 Female
Body Shop retail outlets			
Shops—franchise U.S.	6	1 Upper mgmt., 2 mgmt., 3 clerks	6 Female
Shops—company U.S.	4	2 mgmt., 2 clerks	3 Female, 1 male
U.K. company shops	7	2 Upper mgmt., 4 mgmt., 1 clerk	6 Female, 1 male
Total	57	20 Upper mgmt., 21 mgmt., 5 clerical, 6 clerks, 5 line	33 Female, 24 male

mance appraisal, and some attempt to standardize rewards, holidays, and vacation policies, etc. It would be misleading, however, to delineate aspects of the formal structure of The Body Shop without also noting (here and in the data that follow) the extent to which these traditional bureaucratic controls were subjected to ridicule, disregarded, outdated, and subverted on a regular basis—by Anita Roddick, the company's founder and chief executive officer in 1993, her husband, Gordon Roddick, the chairman of the board in 1993, and other employees at all levels of the hierarchy in all five companies. Even counting employees was seen by some as bureaucratic; titles, lists, and employee statistics were often viewed as a low priority, so these kinds of information were difficult to find, often out of date, and sometimes in error. For this reason, the numbers in table 2 should be regarded as the best good-faith estimates we could obtain.

At our request, company officials estimated the percentage of women employees during the study period (for the U.K. only, because U.S. offices were growing so rapidly that employee listings were unavailable at the time). Although men held a considerable proportion of the very highest level jobs at The Body Shop, the company was staffed at upper-middle, middle, and lower levels largely by women and served mostly women customers. In addition, in the U.K., of 167 people at the mid- to upper-management levels, 134 (80.2 percent) were women. This was an unusually high percentage of women in relatively high levels of management, compared with national averages in both the U.S. and the U.K. (e.g., Marshall, 1984, 1995; Morrison et al., 1987; Collinson, Knights, and Collinson, 1990). Focusing on the highest levels of management, the retail shops and Colourings were overwhelmingly female, whereas The Body Shop International, the Supply Company, and CosTec were more male-dominated. Of the 24 directors and general managers at Body Shop International, for example, only four were women (16.6 percent), and at Body Shop U.K., the five-member managing board was all men. At the Supply Company, there were eight individuals in a position of general manager or above, and only the manager of human resources was a woman (12.5 percent). In contrast, the U.K. retail shops had 29 mid- to upper-level managerial women (93.5 percent) as compared with two men (6.5 percent). At Colourings, the only general manager was a woman. To put these numbers into perspective, the U.K. has a lower ratio of female-to-male labor force participation than the U.S. (Blau and Ferber, 1986: 320). More detailed breakdowns of the percentages of women in various parts of the corporation are given in table 2. It is rare to find a large multinational corporation in which such a large proportion of female employees hold middle and upper-level managerial positions. But women were not close to a majority at the highest ranks, and in the months the study was conducted, there was a widely shared perception that increasing numbers of men were being hired from outside the company into top executive positions.

Several limitations of our focus merit mention. This is a study of a single organization. The company is similar to many others in its large size, financial solvency, international scope, and rapid growth. We also chose it because of the

Bounded Emotionality

distinctiveness of its ideology and the proportion of women in its managerial ranks. Our goal was to examine an outlier—an unusual corporation—that would help us define the limits of what is organizationally possible given the efficiency pressures of a competitive marketplace. In addition, this is a cross-sectional study, rather than a longitudinal account that would permit us to address questions about the origin and evolution of bounded emotionality.

Participants

We gained entry into this organization through Anita Roddick. The lead investigator approached Ms. Roddick, suggesting an academic study of her organization, in part because it was so rare to find a large, successful, for-profit firm founded, managed, and staffed by such a comparatively large proportion of women. After an exchange of letters, we obtained permission and arranged the study. The implications of the open access and encouragement offered by the founder were welcome, but at first we worried that her endorsement might make it more rather than less difficult for us to establish open, frank communication with employees. These fears were substantially allayed, for reasons described below.

The Body Shop's ways of doing business facilitated development of open communication with study respondents. Employees regularly spoke to each other with frankness, confronted differences of opinion, and challenged authority through both informal arguments and formal mechanisms; for example, a formal rule gave any employee the right to send a "red envelope" of complaint, with the understanding that it would be read and acted upon within 24 hours by a member of the board of directors. Although we were initially skeptical about the extent to which top management would truly encourage dissent, we observed challenging interactions frequently, in relation to Ms. Roddick, other top managers, and among work peers. We were privy to some gossip, backbiting, sarcasm, jokes, and complaints. We also saw instances in which conflict, frankness, and challenges to authority were squelched, silenced, or disregarded. It is our sense that compared with other companies we have studied, The Body Shop employees were unusually frank and open with us, although not entirely so, as we never reached that level of invisibility and acceptance that comes with a long-term ethnographic participant-observation, psychologically deeper clinical approaches, or a deeper, more consistent enactment of feminist methods. Such in-depth approaches might have uncovered interpersonal discomforts and internal emotional defenses that we did not have access to.

We used a variety of qualitative methods, some of which were more detached and traditional, such as observation, while others were more congruent with feminist approaches, such as the in-depth interviews described below. Feminist methodology requires that researchers not conduct themselves, or write, as distanced, objective, neutral, disembodied experts but, rather, that they seek to establish mutual trust and understanding between researchers and study participants (e.g., Oakley, 1981; McRobbie, 1982). We are

white women, as were most of the study participants. According to feminist theory, intimacy, demographic similarity, and subjective rapport with study participants should elicit more honest self-disclosure, an approach that some consider more ethical and more informative (e.g., Laws, 1978; Oakley, 1981) and others see as a manipulative way for researchers to collect better data (Stacey, 1988). Feminist methods allow the participant's experience to come through in her own voice (Laws, 1978), shifting the relationships between the researchers and participants toward mutual understanding (Bernard, 1982; Graham, 1984; McRobbie, 1982) and the prerogative of interpretation and analysis from the researcher to the participant (Graham, 1984). Such an approach evokes a more interactive, personalized, and intense form of talk, in which respondents become conversational partners, capable of structuring and directing the interviews more on their own terms. In accord to these premises, we began each scheduled interview with some information about ourselves, encouraging questions. After promising anonymity, we began with relatively non-threatening questions about the interviewee's career path in the company and current job responsibilities. As soon as possible (we watched for signs of self-disclosure, comfort, and physical ease), we encouraged interviewees to tell stories about specific recent events. The self-structured format of storytelling enables free-flowing narrative and can counter some of the privileging of the researchers' role in generating knowledge (Graham, 1984). To keep the conversation going and deepen our contextual understanding, we used planned, relatively non-directive probes for details (What happened next? Why? Who else was involved?) and then asked for emotional reactions (How did you feel about that? What problems did that cause?). After each specific event history, we probed for the meanings of events and processes, asking study participants for their interpretations (What did that mean to you? What lesson did you draw from that event?). If we had an interpretation, we would check with study participants to see if we had misunderstood or not fully comprehended their viewpoints. During the majority of the interviews, gender issues were raised spontaneously by the employee; when this did not happen, the investigators opened the subject at the end of the interview with a question tailored to the respondent's job and responsibilities.

Data Collection

The first and second coauthors collected data from a variety of sources:

1. Archival materials. Prior to and simultaneous with data collection, we studied publications about the company, including *Body and Soul* (Roddick, 1991), numerous magazine and newspaper articles, teaching cases from various business schools, and scholarly writings (e.g., Gaines, 1993; Shrivastava, 1996). We also studied memos and other documents produced by the company, including both publicly and internally distributed materials. Public materials consisted of, for example, press releases, the Green Book (Body Shop version of an annual environmental report), the charter (the written statement of Body Shop values), and information "broad sheets" about products, political causes, and the

Bounded Emotionality

company. Internal materials, obtained from various employees - included employment applications, organizational charts, explanations of employee benefits, internal newsletters, training materials, videos, and internal memos and reports.

2. Observation. Observation took place in office spaces, manufacturing and distribution plants, and on shopfloors. We also attended "values meetings," a recent innovation designed to bring together employees from all levels of the company to discuss a perceived erosion of commitment to the values in the company's charter. (Employees at these meetings were introduced by first name only, not job title, but quotations from these meetings, cited below, came primarily from nonmanagerial employees.) After being introduced to the group or individuals present, the researchers sat as unobtrusively as possible, taking notes and generally sitting off to the side, unless invited to sit with the employees (for example, during a meeting or interview). Our notes focused on what participants said and did, what was not said or done, nonverbal communication, dress, job tasks, and the material conditions of work.

3. Participant observation. One of the researchers worked without payment from The Body Shop as a short-term participant-observer in three different contexts. The first was in the U.S. with 10 new shop assistants in a two-day course given by a company regional trainer. The second was a two-day training workshop on merchandising for nine shop managers and assistant managers at the firm's training center in London. During both courses, the researcher took part in all role-playing exercises, product experimentation and application, written and verbal exercises, lectures, and group exercises. Unlike the U.K. managers, she did not take the merchandising exam for certification. In the third context, the researcher spent one afternoon working in production, filling bottles of Fuzzy Peach Bath Gel. This opportunity allowed her to gain firsthand knowledge of working conditions while observing coworkers' interactions and worker-supervisor relations on the filling line.

4. On-site structured interviews. In both the U.K. and the U.S., we prepared a list of people/job titles whom we wished to interview. We asked to meet employees from a wide range of areas of the company, requesting both high-ranking managers and nonmanagerial employees in each area. No requests were denied, to our knowledge, except by employees who were out of town or, in the case of one regional office, undergoing reorganization. In a few cases a somewhat streamlined interview had to be conducted, due to time pressures. Many interviews concluded with a suggestion that we meet with someone else, which we did whenever possible. As our study proceeded, some employees not on our schedule asked to talk with us, and again we complied whenever possible, in effect using a snowball selection procedure. Some employees were interviewed by two investigators simultaneously; most were interviewed by one or the other, allowing a larger sample. Prior to each interview, we assured study participants (other than Ms. and Mr. Roddick) that we would use pseudonyms, avoid specific job titles, use generic labels for departments, disguise or delete identifying details, and otherwise protect them, to the

best of our ability, from being identifiable in any quotation. We have kept all those promises in the writing of this paper, when quoting informants. Interviews lasted a minimum of an hour, often longer. Particularly informative employees, including Ms. Roddick, some managers, and several shop staff were interviewed more than once. Usually, we interviewed employees one by one, although exceptions did occur, particularly off site and in informal settings.

5. Informal conversations. More informal, less lengthy (less than one hour) conversations with the investigators occurred constantly on site—during tea breaks, in the cafeteria, and while informants were en route to other appointments. These took on a more relaxed, personal tone, although some informants maintained a semiformal attitude. In addition, two investigators spent periods of time in informal conversations with employees in restaurants, pubs, and other social settings. Conversations at these locations were more relaxed and open and often quite lengthy (three hours or more). The informal atmosphere sometimes encouraged informants to discuss topics they were reluctant to discuss during the more formal interactions on company grounds.

6. Lectures and seminars. Investigators attended various lectures and seminars given by Ms. Roddick and other Body Shop employees on visits to business schools and academic conventions in the U.S. These events included guest lectures in MBA courses, public lectures at conventions and at a university, and doctoral student/faculty seminars.

We used this variety of methods and sources not to triangulate, but because these various approaches permit us to address different questions and find different kinds of answers. Inconsistencies across employees, contexts, and research methods were therefore anticipated. For example, we saw contradictions between the practices we could observe and the interpretations of behavior offered in some interviews. When such inconsistencies occurred, we explored these issues in subsequent interviews and observations whenever possible.

We took extensive notes on all interviews, lectures and seminars, and archival material. For off-site and informal conversations, we took no notes during the interactions but, at the end of each session, prepared field notes with as much accuracy as possible, preferring to omit rather than misquote. Each night, or as soon as possible, we transcribed these research notes.

Data Analysis

This data collection effort was part of a larger study of the internal functioning of The Body Shop. We began the data analysis by sorting the more than 400 pages of transcribed notes and documents by abstract, theoretically derived categories: the founders' histories, values, and goals; employees' attitudes about commercial issues, such as profits and stock price; political action campaigns locally and internationally; environmental issues; reactions to traditional bureaucratic policies and procedures, particularly regarding human resources issues; international practices; gender, including sexuality, bodies, beauty, and family issues; and a catch-all

Bounded Emotionality

category focusing on contradictions regarding egalitarianism, hierarchy, and styles of management. We then worked, first separately and then jointly, sorting the data and inductively developing new and subdividing or discarding old categories, as suggested by proponents of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). One of the first new categories to emerge, unanticipated when we planned our study, was the topic of this paper, the management of emotions.

We then discussed the data jointly and in detail, to assure agreement on category assignment. When we were not in full agreement, we maintained broader, more abstract options so as not to narrow the focus prematurely. We then used the full set of new categories to resort the data, creating more distinct subcategories within those that contained the largest amount of data (gender, for example), discussed the newly sorted categories, and resorted again. In the last sorting, we sought to determine if subcultural differences existed between areas of the company, levels of the hierarchy, or other groupings (e.g., men and women).

Decisions about what to include or exclude in our writing were not controlled by Ms. Roddick, who generously agreed to let us write about whatever we found. When we volunteered to send an early draft of this paper, she read it and, keeping her promise, asked us only to make one change: a capital T on The Body Shop. We did, however, engage in a small amount of conscious self-censoring of intimate or personally hurtful material, primarily to protect participant anonymity. Inclusion of any of the data we excluded would not change the results below in any substantial way.

EMOTION AT THE BODY SHOP

Although the origins of a company's emotional management practices cannot be attributed solely, or perhaps even substantially, to a leader's actions or preferences, these can be contributing factors.² For this reason, it is important to include in this account, as a piece of the puzzle, a statement from The Body Shop's founder, Ms. Roddick, on the company's goals and values, which were institutionalized in the form of the company's charter. Focusing on emotional values, Ms. Roddick, (1991: 17) explained:

I am mystified by the fact that the business world is apparently proud to be seen as hard and uncaring and detached from human values . . . the word "love" was as threatening in business as talking about a loss on the balance sheet. Perhaps that is why using words like "love" and "care" is so difficult in today's extraordinarily macho business world. No one seems to know how to put the concept into practice. . . . I think all business practices would improve immeasurably if they were guided by "feminine" principles—qualities like love and care and intuition.

Ms. Roddick's use of the word feminine in conjunction with qualities like love and care signals an attempt to revalue emotionally expressive characteristics, such as caring, stereotypically associated with women. She does not explicitly endorse bounded emotionality, although love and caring are congruent with it. Her language, however, intertwines instrumental objectives with emotional concerns, making it difficult to determine if she is giving priority to emotional labor over bounded emotionality. Because a leader's rhetoric and

2

The origins of an organization's practices regarding the management of emotion are difficult to decipher. Some researchers argue that leaders can control practices, even in such domains as emotion, by articulating goals and values that organizational members will come to share and enact (e.g., Schein, 1985). Other scholars are skeptical of all claims about the power of managerial rhetoric and stress that members will react differently to leaders' value statements—some members "buying in" and others reacting negatively or neutrally. From this point of view, organizational members develop and maintain their own goals, values, and practices with as much independence from managerial priorities as they can manage (e.g., Van Maanen and Barley, 1984; Kunda, 1992). This conflict of views may be overdrawn, as there is evidence that cultural consensus can emerge both from the top down and the bottom up; in addition, it is important to distinguish managerial value rhetoric from employees' values and employees' practices, as these all may differ (see Martin, 1992, for a review).

employees' reality can differ, it is essential to examine how and if these ideas are enacted.

Enacting Bounded Emotionality

Although the company does not explicitly advocate discussing home, family, and friendship concerns at work, Body Shop employees switched easily between task-oriented concerns and the more intimate self-disclosures that provide a basis for bounded emotionality. This shifting, which blurred distinctions between public and private concerns, was evident in observations of employees at all levels of The Body Shop, in the relative privacy of tête à tête and in the more public arenas of meetings, casual conversations among tour guides, or chatter in a manufacturing plant, as is evident in this field note:

A woman [on the bottling line for Fuzzy Peach Gel Shampoo] who seemed relatively senior began telling me that her son had his Ph.D. in computer science. She described how hard he had worked to get it. She seemed very proud of him. She had been at The Body Shop for more than five years, but didn't seem very interested in discussing the company. She talked a bit about the wash-out [of the bottles] and how it was important not to get parts mixed up, but mostly we talked about her son. (Field notes, participant-observation on the bottling line, supply, U.K.)

Although the conversation described above was not deeply intimate or unusual, we regularly heard employees openly discussing a wide range of emotional topics, such as sexual orientation, violence in the home, sadness and joy about work related matters, as well as fears and psychiatric difficulties. Nonverbal communication was affectionate and intimate (although seldom obviously sexual), with hugs, kisses, and touching evident in both public and private settings, to an extent that surprised us. Although we cannot offer verbal quotations of this more intimate, individualized material because of our promises of anonymity, the following quote from a shop clerk suggests that intimacy was a way of life at work for many Body Shop employees: "There's lots of gay men and women in the company. In all the shops we know the ins and outs of each other's personal lives" (Frederick, company shop, U.K.).

Such self-disclosure provides a basis for assessing the subjective state of an individual. The next step in enacting bounded emotionality, according to Putnam and Mumby, is to take that information into account and adjust one's task-related interaction to fit the other's emotional preferences and limitations. At The Body Shop, for example, one employee was having trouble being filmed for a Body Shop video, "He fucked it up half way through, but he was so stressed out, I couldn't ask him to do it again. Really, I thought he would burst into tears" (Ursula, lower management, headquarters, U.K.). Some Body Shop employees described their working relationships in terms that suggested that such interpersonal emotional calibration was a habit. Sally, a middle manager in the marketing division (a pseudonym) in the U.K. showed her understanding of one of her coworkers: "William works in [our group]. He sees things in terms of right and wrong, numbers, prices, quantities. There is no middle ground. Figures are either right or wrong. A staff situation right now, however, has William agonizing.

Bounded Emotionality

Difficult feedback is needed. It will hurt a person. William worries; should he give feedback now, before his vacation? He worries that he wouldn't be there after the feedback, when the pieces will need picking up. William has a high degree of sensitivity for a man." Ms. Roddick, known for her emotional exuberance, also understood the need for inter-subjective sensitivity and sometimes restrained herself with particular employees, much to their relief. For example, at one of the values meetings, employees were discussing the ways Ms. and Mr. Roddick expressed appreciation for particularly good work, ranging from pats on the back to "Bravo-grams," which said simply, "Well done" and were signed by both Roddicks. One participant in the values meeting added, "There are also Bravo sweatshirts. Anita bounded up to me. I was afraid she'd embarrass me. But she never did. She'd give it [the sweatshirt] to you. Brilliant" (Paula, values meeting, headquarters, U.K.).

Another aspect of bounded emotionality involves recognizing a heterarchy of values, by allowing others to have a different set of values, or a different priority of values, than oneself, not giving precedence to either person's view. This is a difficult objective to attain and even more difficult for a researcher to see. We did note, repeatedly, that Body Shop employees of both sexes tended to portray men and women as having stereotypically different emotional preferences and styles of interaction, differences that they tried to be sensitive to: "There are differences between men and women. Women have more emotion; [it's] not just hidden in some corner. Guys use delaying tactics while women say, 'Let's just go for it.' A complete over-balance either way is a problem" (Winston, upper management, headquarters, U.K.).

Strong emphasis was placed, throughout the company, on informal subjective assessments of performance, sometimes supplemented by more formal evaluation procedures. Managers, in particular, were assessed on their emotional competency, which included letting work-related feelings emerge spontaneously. Here, too, sex, or sexual stereotypes, were seen as creating a heterarchy of values and goals in the emotional domain: "I manage an all-female team. I was appraised as keeping well with women's emotions; I use empathy. Women have more tears, sensitivities, PMS [premenstrual syndrome], more personal conflicts" (Tim, middle management, headquarters, U.K.). Other, more individuated or less stereotypical ways of respecting a heterarchy of values reflected sensitivities to differences in job responsibilities, age, and personal circumstances.

According to Mumby and Putnam, these practices of intimate self-disclosure, blurring boundaries between public and private, showing sensitivity to another person's subjective state, allowing work feelings to emerge spontaneously, and respecting a heterarchy of values and goals should allow employees to feel a kind of authenticity at work. Some Body Shop employees reported such feelings:

The Body Shop is nice because I don't feel like I have to fit some kind of mold. At The Body Shop I feel I can be more myself. (Lorie, shop clerk, company shop, U.S.)

Emotion is not frowned on. People have no separate work personality. You are accepted as who you are. A "normal" corporate culture requires that you put on the personality of the company while you are at work. Not here. There are negatives [associated with this]; it makes management more difficult. There is no instant obedience. People debate, then agree about what needs to be done. There are also positive [effects]; people own the decision. Emotional work is sometimes a negative. There are always compromises. It would be bad not to have it, though. (Winston, upper management, headquarters, U.K.)

It is difficult to discern from such remarks whether these feelings of authenticity are, as Mumby and Putnam asserted, reinforcing a sense of an integrated self. The prevalence of sex stereotyping suggests that it may be difficult to express some aspects of a fragmented self, particularly those aspects that contradict existing sex stereotypes. Taken as a whole, the data presented above suggest that many but not all elements of bounded emotionality were enacted at The Body Shop.

Co-existence of Emotional Labor and Bounded Emotionality

The presence of bounded emotionality does not mean that emotional labor was eschewed at The Body Shop. As suggested by many of the quotes above, as well as the theorizing of Mumby and Putnam, at The Body Shop, emotion was frequently managed for instrumental purposes, although whether such instrumentality took priority was often difficult to decipher. For example, shop staff were well trained to hide emotions that might impede a sale, using emotional labor techniques similar to those in previous studies of cashiers, flight attendants, and bill collectors:

A customer wanted to buy two identical baskets of Body Shop products. Two similar baskets had already been made up, but they were not exactly the same; the washcloths were different colors. Karen said, "OK, I'll make you one exactly the same." As Karen turned away from the customer, she rolled her eyes and smiled at the observing researcher. (Field notes, observation in franchise shop, U.S.)

Although this behavior could indicate bounded emotionality if the shop clerk were worried that the customer might find it difficult to deal with the clerk's feelings about the extra work being required, the researcher observing this incident was assured, in a subsequent conversation, that the clerk was simply feeling impatient with the customer's demands.

The emotionally charged atmosphere of The Body Shop, combined with the firm's attempt to avoid bureaucratic modes of operation, caused severe confusion. In this ambiguous environment, employees had to show extreme forms of emotion, positive and negative, to complete essential tasks. As one manager told us, "It's amazing because there are loads of things that stink. It's not a sharp organization. You can't get things done easily. You don't just make a proposal. You have to pitch it—be emotional and argue it. There aren't clear channels and structure" (Martha, upper management, franchise and company shops, U.K.).

Emotional, as well as financial rewards were used to express personal appreciation for work well done. Emotional rewards at The Body Shop were not just verbal; they were

Bounded Emotionality

also physical: "Rewards are not just money. You can't bribe people. You'll lose it all. [People need] strokes, cuddles, hello, little things" (Diane, values meeting, headquarters, U.K.).

Emotional labor at The Body Shop was used to further the firm's political and environmental objectives, as well as its productivity-related concerns. For example, Ms. Roddick (1991: 170–171) explained how she used emotions to encourage employees to join in the company's various community and political action projects:

Whenever we wanted to persuade our staff to support a particular project we always tried to break their hearts. At the next franchise holders' meeting we put on a real tear-jerking audio-visual presentation, with wonderful slides of the children against a background of Willie Nelson's version of "Bridge over Troubled Water." And to enable members of staff to experience what we had experienced, the next edition of "Talking Shop," the monthly video distributed throughout The Body Shop organization, was devoted to Boys' Town and what we could do there. The response was a joy. Everyone wanted to get involved in raising money and sponsoring boys, and from that moment onwards the International Boys' Town Trust more or less became an integral part of The Body Shop's extended family.

Ms. Roddick also encouraged employees to use emotional expression for more conventional instrumental purposes: "Sally doesn't support women much. But she's the one who breaks down in tears with frustration. She can cry so easily. I told her it has to be used. I said, 'Here, cry at this point in the . . . meeting' " (Ms. Roddick, interview, researcher's house, November 17, 1993). Thus, Ms. Roddick and other Body Shop employees frequently and self-consciously used emotion management techniques for instrumental organizational purposes. This combination of emotional labor and bounded emotionality created a close knit, intimate community in which employees were deeply involved with each other and passionately committed to their work.

Impediments to the Implementation of Bounded Emotionality

Several factors made it difficult to enact bounded emotionality consistently at The Body Shop. Some of these factors stemmed from corporate policies, such as pursuing rapid international expansion, while others were environmental causes, such as characteristics of the labor market. Other difficulties stemmed from employees' internal states and preferences, which, in turn, were affected by their home circumstances.

Effects of growth. Expanding into 42 countries in a short time created enormous logistical problems that strained the company's ability to enact bounded emotionality. This can be seen in a conversation among employees at a values meeting in the U.K. headquarters:

"We have no time to meet. The department is run by phone and deadlines."

"You can find time."

"We don't have time. We don't."

"Individuals are islands, sidetracked because we're so busy. Sad."

"This is a normal effect of quick growth."

"In the old days, we were moving just as fast."

"Everyone had the same pressure then."
"And cared for each other more."
"Where do the franchisees fit in?"
"Who are they?" (*Laughter*)
"We have to include them as part of the family."

The company's commitment to avoiding bureaucratic red tape exacerbated the confusion caused by growth. New hires proliferated, jobs were changed, and office and desks were shuffled. Emotional sensitivity to another's emotional needs or work feelings required, at the very least, a knowledge of who people were and what they were supposed to be doing. This crucial information sometimes was hard to find. "[We need] pictures and names in departments. They would help us know who people are. Now we're so big we don't know the people in our own department" (Lisa, values meeting, headquarters, U.K.). Sometimes the open expression of emotion, in the midst of all this ambiguity, was clearly insensitive to employees' emotional need, as one employee reported: "I got called a fucking dick head the other day. I don't know people anymore. There's less friendliness. I'm scared that I know less than half the people. We need a system to build social introductions to know people—not just a voice on the phone, but a person" (Chris, values meeting, headquarters, U.K.). Under such conditions, face-to-face interactions among all or even many employees were impossible and knowledge of the subjectivities of others was scarce, as so many of the others were now strangers. The lack of interpersonal closeness due to the company's growth made it more difficult to follow through on commitment to the company's espoused values of caring and nurturance, creating instead conditions that fostered impersonality.

Time and financial pressures, caused in part by growth, began to erode many of the company's social rituals, which had provided occasions for building and enjoying a sense of community within the company. These events were important to the employees not only for their symbolic value but also as a way to renew connections with other employees not seen on a daily basis, as can be seen in the following discussion at a values meeting in the U.K. headquarters:

"It's a shame that company day was canceled due to money, but if directors want to be close to average workers, they shouldn't cancel these things."

"First thing we're knocked on the head when there are cuts."

"There's a rumor that the Xmas party will be canceled; it's bad for morale."

"Are social events important to our company?"

"They would be better if people mixed up and do not stay with their own group."

"We tried it both ways; staying with people you know is best. People change places anyway."

"Can I be mouthy again? Again on the friendliness issue. By doing it [socializing] by department we stay separate."

"It's easier to manage that way."

Although it is an achievement to enact the goal of bounded emotionality, even partially, in a large, for-profit organization, it is clear that The Body Shop's rapid growth placed strains on its ability to do so.

Limitations of the labor market. These problems were exacerbated by the influx of new hires. Growth created a

Bounded Emotionality

need to expand the managerial staff at the headquarters in Littlehampton, on the coast of southern England. There was a shortage of qualified candidates with the requisite managerial-level retailing experience who lived within commuting distance. Experienced female managers were said to be especially hard to find. And, given that employment at The Body Shop entailed showing evidence of prior deep commitment to the company's political, community, and environmental agendas, the local labor market had been exhausted. Some of the new hires, especially at the managerial level, were criticized as lacking some of the political commitments, gender sensitivity, and emotional management skills of the "old guard" employees. When some employees complained about a growing lack of community at The Body Shop, they attributed it not to a lack of time or to the pressure of work to be done, nor to growth per se but, rather, to the influx of high-ranking men hired from more traditional retailing organizations:

Now more senior males have been brought in [from the outside] and it is more male macho, more "go get it." Some individuals and some of these outside hires do not have empathy. [In contrast] take George [an old guard employee]. Janet says, "He's an honorary female." As the company has grown, gender comes in. Men haven't got the feminine instinct that the company was founded on. They are brought up through the company by osmosis. Caring and sharing are expressed physically in the company. People give a hug and a kiss. This is anathema for certain individuals; they tend to be those who were brought in during the last couple of years. (Tim, middle management, headquarters, U.K.)

Dealing with emotional diversity. Those Body Shop employees who found intimate self-disclosure and emotional expressiveness at work to be comfortable and desirable were often unsympathetic when other employees, such as some new hires, had different emotional preferences. For example, in response to an observation about managers at other companies, who avoided getting really personal or emotional at work, Sally objected: "That's a cop out. It's like refusing to love if you've been hurt once. Don't let anyone get too close? This is crazy. If good friends can and do work together, tough stuff comes up. It's something we can handle" (Sally, middle management, marketing division, U.K.). Those who had difficulty complying with demands for emotional openness encountered verbal hints or informal requests for conformity; threats of punishment for refusing to comply were usually latent, such as the tacit threat of withdrawn warmth and friendliness. There were also a few formal bureaucratic procedures that encouraged compliance. For example, part of the job application process at The Body Shop was a group interview by a panel of current employees who sought evidence of the applicant's commitment to Body Shop values and its political agendas. Morris was a Body Shop manager who had suggested that one of his acquaintances be interviewed for a managerial job. According to Morris, the panel members interviewing his acquaintance had asked, "If The Body Shop doesn't offer you a job, would you take a job elsewhere if you didn't know the company's policies on human rights and the environment?" When the applicant answered affirmatively, the panelists rejected him, in part, according to Morris, because they thought that if he

were really committed to The Body Shop values, he would not accept a job anywhere without investigating the company's policies in these key areas. But Morris knew that his friend was too emotionally reserved to reveal that he would accept the other job because he needed money badly to support his wife and child. The child had a severe disability and needed constant, expensive care.

Weber's emphasis on unemotional impersonality in bureaucracies is premised on a deindividualized "rule by rules." In the case of the rejected job applicant, his apparently unemotional preference for impersonality was caused by intense emotions about his son and his desire to keep these feelings private. The panelists, in contrast, chose to apply their deindividualized rules regarding the paramount importance of any applicant's political commitments, so that self-disclosure about this intimate problem became an essential prerequisite for Morris's friend becoming a Body Shop employee. Morris's friend's silence was congruent with his individual emotional limitations, but he was not hired. Emotional diversity entails a contradiction for bounded emotionality. If compliance pressures are used to support bounded emotionality, by sanctioning or excluding those uncomfortable with its tenets, this process contradicts bounded emotionality by requiring acts of intolerance that fail to recognize as legitimate the emotional preferences of people with differing subjectivities and values.

Resistance. Some Body Shop employees enacted bounded emotionality yet simultaneously expressed some limited discomfort with it. For example, some expressed impatience with the time required to respond to the needs of others:

At an afternoon meeting in Supply, a male warehouse packer complained passionately about PZP's [peak zone pallets].³ His manager responded, "Don't get emotional; let's just deal with it." (Mike, warehouse manager, supply, U.K.)

Sometimes there is too much talk about emotion. Right now [I wish I could say], "Let's get on with it," but I don't. Usually people use their boss as a confidant. They aren't constrained by [the lack of privacy in an office with] open space and desks. (Tim, middle management, headquarters, U.K.)

Sometimes employees questioned whether intense emotional expression was authentic: "A supervisor apologized for a mistake and his supervisor responded, 'Don't get over-contrite'" (Field notes, observation, supply, U.K.). Other employees expressed discomfort with emotional practices by joking about them. At an afternoon coordination meeting, one man's complaint was countered with an unsympathetic, "I'm an emotional man here; I'm welling up," as the speaker pretended to wipe an imaginary tear from his eye. These signs of resistance were observed most frequently among men, both nonmanagerial employees and high-ranking managers.

Attempts to separate public and private. The company's emotional practices, including its advocacy of merging personal and working life, met with some opposition from the families of some Body Shop employees. Theresa, a middle manager in U.K. retail operations, told us, "And my Mom said, 'Don't let [The Body Shop job] change your character.'" Jeff, a manager of a company shop in the U.K., had a similar

3

Peak zone pallets containing high-turn-over products are more readily accessible in the warehouse than pallets holding other products.

Bounded Emotionality

reaction: "When I started work [at The Body Shop] my brother said, 'Don't bring your leftist vegetarian bullshit home.' " An employee's home situation may have important implications for how work life should be structured, and vice versa, but it is difficult to enact the slogan "the personal is political" when members of a family have differing opinions about what is personally and politically desirable and when some members want to separate home and work concerns.

Stress at work. Whenever private emotional concerns are mixed with an organization's instrumental objectives, there is a danger—particularly in a firm struggling to survive in a highly competitive market—that instrumental concerns will take priority over an individual's personal or family needs. Rhonda, a manager of a franchise shop in the U.S., permitted shop staff to engage in personal talk and phone calls during the day, but stressed that personal talk must take place in a separate emotional zone, away from customers, so it would not interfere with selling: "When you're on the floor, you're at work. It's important to be there for each other. You can talk, but not on the shop floor. If you've had a hard day discuss it in the back [of the shop], off the shop floor."

Signs of physical and emotional stress were evident at The Body Shop, particularly in some parts of the headquarters, where claims of being understaffed and overworked were common. Bonnie, a secretary who had a temporary position at the company's U.K. headquarters, expressed it this way:

This is the hardest temping assignment I've ever had. I am looking forward to my next assignment. The phones never stop ringing and I am expected keep track of too many things. The job is not delineated enough; it's unclear to me from moment to moment what I am to be doing. I would never work here as a regular employee. People are too hyper and stressed out. The hours they work are much too long. I have become more sullen and moody from working here. The people are nice, but the pace is too crazy.

Although we heard similar complaints throughout the company, the problems of stress were particularly visible among the tour guides who scheduled and delivered tours of the headquarters. Their feet hurt, their necks ached, the phones were ringing off the hook, visitors were clamoring for attention, and everyone was very busy. Several tour guides talked openly about the physical and emotional effects of work stress. One told us: "I was on the phone 22 hours between Monday morning and Wednesday night. Betty [a new employee] told another Body Shop employee to piss off, and she's only been here [a very short time]." Another reported, "Nadine is the third person to hurt her foot. You get tired and fall over—just not concentrating." Some employees felt that working very long hours, rather than demands for emotional expressiveness and self-disclosure, made their personal and work lives merge, to the detriment of the former. This problem was evident in some shops, as well as in headquarters and some other working sites. For example:

I have no personal life. . . . Each of [these particular] shops is evacuated two times a week due to terrorist threats. Each time this happens I get phone calls. It's hard on marriage. There's no way I could do my job with a child. . . . To do this you need a partner who understands. The quality of life is ridiculous. At 4 A.M. I'm up north;

at 11 P.M. I come home, but then I have two more hours of work to do at home. I work like a maniac during the week. On Saturday I watch [Body Shop videos] at home and go through the postal. I put aside one hour for the post. Sunday I do my weekly report. I try to ignore it and keep clear, but I live with a dread of the phone because I'm always on call. . . . When I'm in Littlehampton [headquarters] I can't get over their hours. It seems more relaxed. I resent it a bit. (Martha, upper management, franchise and company shops, U.K.)

Recognizing that job demands affect home life, The Body Shop was one of the few U.K. companies to provide on-site childcare. Although the facility was beautiful, no child could attend more than 42 hours a week, far short of the long hours many headquarters employees worked. Further, childcare provisions of any kind were available only at the headquarters, excluding the employees who worked in the shops throughout the world and elsewhere in the company's scattered offices. Employees with children who worked outside headquarters were stressed by balancing childcare needs on their own.⁴

The company's concern about stress was sufficiently strong that the headquarters provided (anonymous) counseling for those employees who wished to take advantage of this resource. As noted in Meyerson's (1994) analysis of the work stress literature, however helpful such a counselor may be, the implicit message is that the work stress is an abnormal response that must be controlled, with the blame for the problem and the responsibility for fixing it resting primarily with the individual experiencing the stress. Such an analysis overstates the case in The Body Shop example, as the company took the initiative to relieve the organizational sources of stress, offering paid leave to some employees and reallocating work and working hours for others. Allocation of these sources of help was facilitated by the company's norms of emotional openness and self-disclosure:

People know if you are sick [from stress] or depressed from nervous exhaustion. Someone is off the team now from stress and depression. The reaction was "Take whatever time you need to re-evaluate your life." [Question: "Is she paid?"] Of course. Another company might say, "If you can't take the heat get out of the kitchen." We [at The Body Shop] have a full-time counselor for us overworked people. (Tim, middle management, headquarters, U.K.)

Ms. Roddick openly and repeatedly discussed, with evident worry, signs of stress among Body Shop employees. She was particularly concerned about the disturbing number of female employees who reported violence at home. Whereas the employees generally attributed their stress to long hours of work, Ms. Roddick stressed that the company had provided an exciting, aesthetically pleasing, and emotionally supportive environment that empowered employees, and in this, most of them agreed. Ms. Roddick believed that the empowerment of female employees—economically and personally—upset the balance of power at home:

The company talks about the body, having relaxed forms of interaction. [People are] frisky, touch, hug, kiss. Women are so excited by their work. They have an emotional support system. They are valued. They have new ways of communicating. The company counselor says that employees' worst problem is domestic violence. Littlehampton is a working class town, where there are few college

4

Recently, The Body Shop has moved to rectify this situation for some shops and offices, using vouchers and other means of making childcare more accessible and affordable.

Bounded Emotionality

degrees. The men aren't prepared for the changes their wives go through after working for us. After a full day of being valued and listened to at work, they want to be valued and listened to at home. I don't know what to do about it. What is never said: do women really need a domestic relationship? (Ms. Roddick, interview, researcher's house, November 17, 1993)

Whether caused by overwork or a discrepancy between an exciting, empowering work environment and a more mundane, less empowered home life, both male and female employees of The Body Shop sometimes reported considerable emotional and physical work stress. Although The Body Shop emphasized integrating emotional concerns into the working environment, in ways that were unusual and went beyond the usual "act nice" or "act tough" demands of instrumental emotional display, their version of bounded emotionality provided little protection from the experience of aversive emotional stress on the job.

Loss of Bounded Emotionality: Work Feelings Become Norms

So far, this description has presented The Body Shop's approach to emotionality at work in unitary terms, but we also found some variation across different parts of the company. For example, a marketing division (a pseudonym) had evolved a distinctive approach to managing emotion. This division had been geographically and structurally separate for some time and was managed and staffed almost exclusively by women. Although it was not clear whether this division's distinctive approach to emotion had its origins in geographical and structural isolation or the preferences of its employees, at the time our study was conducted, all levels of employees at the division articulated and enforced compliance with a clearly defined set of emotional norms that offered a complex mixture of some elements of bounded emotionality and a preponderance of emotional labor.

Defining the norms. In this section we rely heavily on quotations from Moira, an upper-level manager, because she was exceptionally articulate regarding the marketing division's emotional norms and especially active in reinforcing them. When asked about her management style, Moira said she tried to keep a balance, illustrating that balance by drawing a continuum. She labeled the left end of the continuum "insensitive" and wrote under it: "Management is all about getting a task done." She labeled the other end of the continuum "hypersensitive" and described it as "Out of balance. Highly strung. Like when a person feels it is easier to write a memo than discuss a problem face to face." Moira then labeled the center of the continuum "sensitive." She said, "We talk about it openly. We need to be sensitive to each other's moods." This statement retains bounded emotionality's sensitivity to intersubjective limitations, but quotations below suggest that spontaneous emergence of context-specific, personally authentic work feelings were not encouraged. Instead, emotional "face work" was required. Employees were encouraged to express particular emotions and suppress others in all work contexts, no matter how they were privately feeling. These expectations were explicitly articulated and repeatedly communicated, using feedback

and catchy slogans, so they would be internalized by division employees. As Moira told us:

In front of a crowd, we put on a different face in front of people from The Body Shop [headquarters] and [other parts of the company]: everything's cool. We don't like an atmosphere of chaos and aggression and stress. . . . [The division] is perceived as laid back, casual, laughing. Here's why we do it. If a person is frowning or gets no exercise, they feel sluggish and depressed. If a person is laughing, it gets adrenaline going. So: act cheerful. I've never worked with such busy, contented people. We have time for people. We enjoying doing things.

This emphasis on enacting approved emotional behavior included clear expectations for nonverbal as well as verbal emotional expression. Moira described her reaction to a new hire: "Technically, she's the best in the business. In meetings I counted the times she didn't respond when I made eye contact and smiled. If she were my new staff member, right after the meeting I would ask, 'Is anything wrong?' The vibes you give off are important. A smile is endearing. People feel snubbed if you don't smile." Morale in the division appeared to be quite high, in accord with bounded emotionality's emphasis on community. In both public and quite private contexts, employees expressed enthusiasm about working in the division. They were, with very few exceptions, apparently happy with and proud of their division's distinctive norms, considering the emotional face work required to be worth the effort. For example, Tina, a clerical employee said, "It seems relaxed at the [division], but we try hard to make it that way. I am a professional. We all are. Professionals get it done without being frazzled and bothered. I love it here. It is always so friendly." This then was a part of the company with distinctive emotional norms: appearing laid back, being cheerful, and smiling. These norms were apparently enforced to foster employee well-being and productivity.

Treatment of emotional diversity in the division. In spite of an appearance of looking "laid back," marketing division employees took pride in how hard they worked—harder, they claimed, than the rest of The Body Shop. This demanding work ethic entailed a self-conscious component of emotional labor. Those who did not abide by the emotional norms of the marketing division were pressured to reform. In describing reactions to emotionally nonconforming employees, division members revealed contradictions and stress:

One manager at [the marketing division] let her stress level spill over to other people. Most of us are stressed. We are very stressed. . . . We stamp out a person who becomes turbulent because it makes the atmosphere turbulent. We give such a person serious counseling, focusing on why she behaves this way. We must apply the rule to old as well as new people: it's not just doing the job; it's how you do the job. This stressed woman affected her whole team. Team members asked, "Can I see my manager today or will she be in a bad mood?" She had extreme highs. She gave people flowers for their desks, praise. She was extravagant with words—over the top. Then she had black lows. No one could cope. Kathy had to be confrontational. We must cut off problems early and see warning bells. (Sally, middle management, marketing division, U.K.)

Bounded Emotionality

Tina, a clerical employee, also emphasized the norms: "John worked at another company, where he was a project manager. People there lied, cheated, banged on desks to get what they wanted. After two or three weeks at [the division], John learned that is not how we achieve results here." Inappropriate gender-related behavior was also quickly punished, as Moira reported: "We hired a guy from a traditional company. He tried a bit of inappropriate behavior [demeaning to women]. The women just ripped him, took the mickey out of him—not with heavy confrontation. Here we never say, directly and seriously, 'I was really offended.' It's not done that way. Any problem should be dealt with at the time, lightheartedly." When division employees failed to conform to any of these emotional norms, they were asked to change their behavior, as above, or encouraged to leave. Sally, a middle manager in the division, related the story of one man hired at the division: "He had a bad attitude. He thought it was easy [to fit in]. He arrived the first day in shorts. He seemed to have the attitude, 'Aren't you glad I'm here? Don't you all love me?' You earn the right to be liked. You don't just get it automatically. He left in two weeks."

Division employees were judged by the extent to which they engaged in specified emotional displays. Some of these displays were congruent with bounded emotionality, for example, an off-again, on-again emphasis on intersubjective sensitivity and a strong sense of community. Other elements of bounded emotionality, particularly the spontaneous expression of personally authentic work feelings and a respect for a heterarchy of values (as illustrated by treatment of emotional nonconformists), were enacted inconsistently and rarely in this division. This, then, was a division in which traditional bureaucratic (e.g., firing) and normative mechanisms of control (e.g., negative feedback about inappropriate emotional behavior) were freely used to ensure compliance with clearly defined emotional norms. Although the patterns of behavior found in the marketing division could be found elsewhere in The Body Shop, these patterns were more firmly codified and compliance more strictly enforced by superiors in the marketing division, making the distinctiveness of this division a question of degree. In this division, forced compliance with emotional norms eroded a subset of the components of bounded emotionality and began to take on more of the overtones of emotional labor in contexts in which the two approaches to emotional expression were in conflict.

CONCLUSION

Enacting Bounded Emotionality

We found considerable evidence of the enactment of bounded emotionality. The employees of The Body Shop frequently discussed intimate personal issues with coworkers. Work feelings emerged spontaneously, often with no apparent instrumental motivation. Sensitivity to the emotional limitations of coworkers tempered the expression of these emotions, as did respect for a heterarchy of values. Ambiguity, primarily caused by the firm's disdain for standardized bureaucratic procedures, was tolerated, if not enjoyed, and ensuing feelings of frustration were freely expressed. Employ-

ees often expressed delight at the extent they felt they could "be themselves at work," reflecting a sense of personal authenticity, although we could not determine from our data whether this reflected an integrated or fragmented self. Although morale varied across individuals, across time, and across parts of the organization, most employees shared a strong sense of being part of The Body Shop community. Thus, we found all six of the elements of bounded emotionality enacted regularly in a large, for-profit organization. This approach to the management of emotion, then, is not too idealistic for implementation in a highly competitive, large-scale business context.

Conformity Pressures

This enactment of bounded emotionality, however, fell short of the ideal Putnam and Mumby described. Sometimes employees failed to listen to each other's emotional concerns or expressed impatience with emotional needs, thereby eroding mutual understanding and perhaps, to some extent, undermining the company's well-developed sense of community. Such shortfalls, we believe, are inevitable in any interpersonal context and are especially likely to occur in a task-oriented context, such as a corporation. Of greater theoretical interest are the ways in which success in enacting bounded emotionality carried the seeds of its own erosion, in that pressure to conform to the ideals of bounded emotionality paradoxically undermined some of its premises. Such pressures to conform came from Anita Roddick, in her role as leader of the company, from the encapsulation of bounded emotionality in formalized rules and procedures, and from informal pressures from other employees to conform. Ms. Roddick repeatedly and persuasively articulated values, such as caring, sharing, and love, that were congruent with bounded emotionality. These values were enacted by employees in emergent, informal practices: one intimate self-disclosure encouraged another, in a form of reciprocity, and hugs and kisses were common ways of saying hello, thank you, and good-bye. In spite of articulated distaste for standardized bureaucratic procedures, some formal practices institutionalized elements of bounded emotionality. For example, job applicants were screened for value homogeneity in group interviews, performance appraisals included assessments of a manager's demonstrated ability to express emotional empathy and sensitivity within a sex-stereotypical hierarchy of values, and company-sponsored social events fostered community building. As a package, this mix of leadership, informal emergent practices, and formal bureaucratic mechanisms of control encouraged conformity with bounded emotionality norms.

Although bounded emotionality requires respect for individuals whose values differ, employees who preferred more restrained forms of emotion management were sometimes pressured to display more open emotionality. Sometimes these conformity pressures were relatively subtle (e.g., gentle jokes), but in other cases, the pressures were enforced by formal procedures. It was difficult for Body Shop employees to find a balance between commitment to a form of bounded emotionality and the needs of some employees who preferred more emotional distance. These conformity

Bounded Emotionality

demands present a dilemma that is perhaps inherent in bounded emotionality: How can a variety of emotional preferences be honored in a heterarchy of values, without eroding bounded emotionality itself?

Co-existence of Bounded Emotionality and Emotional Labor

Bounded emotionality did not displace more conventional forms of emotion management at The Body Shop. Employees also freely and frequently engaged in emotional labor, for example, smiling to increase productivity or using tears to help get a task completed. In addition, even apparently noninstrumental behavior at The Body Shop may have indirectly served instrumental organizational purposes, for example, by increasing loyalty and commitment to the firm or by reinforcing the sense that this was a uniquely desirable place to work. In addition, it is likely that feelings of authenticity created productivity benefits for the company because of reactions such as, "I can do my best work when I can be myself." Although the bounded emotionality model draws a conceptual distinction between instrumental emotional labor and noninstrumental work feelings, in practice it is virtually impossible to maintain such separation, particularly in a high-commitment organization like The Body Shop, where many employees expressed a deep satisfaction with their work and saw congruence between their values and those of the company. Mumby and Putnam drew attention to the possibility of such congruence, and in most parts of The Body Shop we found that emotional labor and bounded emotionality were indeed hard to separate.

Emotional labor was seen most clearly in the marketing division, where emotional norms were defined with unusual explicitness; employees were required to seem relaxed, cheerful, and happy, even when they felt otherwise, to get work done in a more efficient, less turbulent fashion. These norms were enforced with a variety of direct and unobtrusive controls. Finding a part of an organization that differs from the rest is not unexpected; organizational culture research, for example, has generally found differentiation and fragmentation, rather than uniformity, across various parts of an organization (e.g., Frost et al., 1991; Alvesson and Berg, 1992; Kunda, 1992; Martin, 1992). This division's emphasis on emotional labor shows how informal self-policing of innovative practices can evolve and be replaced by formal rules and procedures (Barker, 1993). Although emotional labor was easy to see in the marketing division, it was also evident, to a lesser extent, throughout The Body Shop, intertwined with evidence of bounded emotionality.

Bounded Emotionality: A More Dangerous Form of Control?

The Body Shop represents a mixture of the three ideal types of organization described in table 1 above. Its mixture of bounded emotionality and emotional labor is enacted primarily, but not exclusively, through normative self-policing, although some traditional bureaucratic means of control are also evident, particularly in the marketing division. Although The Body Shop did not exhibit most of the characteristics of a feminist organization, it did de-emphasize impersonality,

encourage the open expression of emotion, and acknowledge the inseparability of "private" and work concerns; bounded emotionality did sometimes take precedence over emotional labor when needs conflicted. In these ways, The Body Shop represents an innovative mix of all three of these ideal types of organization, offering a distinctive way for large corporations to manage emotions at work. Because this firm is, to a large extent, successful in enacting bounded emotionality, it provides an opportunity to question the desirability of this approach to managing emotions: Is bounded emotionality a better way of doing business, from employees' points of view, or is it a more effective, more invasive, and therefore potentially more dangerous control mechanism? Answers to this question represent a matter of opinion, and opinions will differ.

Those advocating the pro-bounded-emotionality position would echo Mumby and Putnam's enthusiasm for the advantages of personal authenticity at work. Generally, most Body Shop employees appreciated the chance to be themselves at work, to share their personal joys and sadnesses, and to join in a community with others who shared their political and communitarian convictions, as well as intimate knowledge of their personal lives and emotional ups and downs. To the extent that The Body Shop did not provide a perfect working environment, it was, in the eyes of most of the employees we studied, better than the available alternatives, where the same conflicts of interest between employee and employer might surface, often in a more alienating or exploitative form. In accord with a pro-bounded emotionality position, when conflicts between individual and organizational interests did occur, the emotional and physical needs of employees were often given priority, as when stressed employees were given paid leave or tasks were left incomplete to spare an employee emotional turmoil.

Those advocating the anti-bounded-emotionality position would note that when organizational commitments to profit making conflicted with individual interests or other organizational interests that had been democratically chosen by employees, work often took precedence over personal concerns. For example, tour guides experienced physical as well as emotional work stress (their necks and feet ached), and some shop staff worked such long hours that their physical needs for sleep and relaxation and their emotional needs for family life were not met. When work encroached on family and personal time, The Body Shop did not seek to reduce chronic long hours; instead, it provided formal mechanisms to alleviate the resulting stress, including private counseling and childcare, in effect blaming the individual's coping abilities for problems caused by the organization (Meyerson, 1994). From this perspective, bounded emotionality can be interpreted as emotional exploitation.

There is no conclusive empirical means of disconfirming or supporting one of these interpretations at the expense of the other. As the authors of this paper, we differ in our opinions. One of us worries that while most people at The Body Shop sincerely believed in the company's espoused values, the rhetoric may have been stronger than the implementation. According to this coauthor, sometimes the leftist politi-

Bounded Emotionality

cal, environmental, and humanitarian rhetoric (such as stated commitments to elements of bounded emotionality) seemed to be used primarily to sell cosmetics for a profit, living up to promises only when such promises did not conflict with commercial objectives. From this perspective, the physical and emotional signs of employee stress, outlined above, are convincing evidence of a lack of good faith. The other two coauthors of this paper take these signs of stress very seriously and see them as an area meriting serious ameliorative action but nevertheless believe that this company was trying hard to enact its ideals, including bounded emotionality. These two coauthors found The Body Shop to be like Ivory soap—certainly not perfect, but “98 percent pure.” Although our estimates of the purity of the company’s motives varied, all three of us thought the company deserved credit for its efforts to do business differently within the constraints of a highly competitive industry. In contrast to most large, for-profit organizations, The Body Shop was attempting to move, and to a substantial extent succeeded, toward a form of bounded emotionality, one that, perhaps inevitably, co-existed with conventional forms of emotional labor.

Obstacles to Implementing Bounded Emotionality

Several factors threatened The Body Shop’s ability to continue implementing bounded emotionality. The organization’s increased size had detrimental effects because it increased both the amount of work and the number of employees who did not know each other or each other’s job responsibilities. The company’s growth also made it more difficult to hire and retain a demographically and ideologically homogeneous group of employees from the local labor market. Many job applicants with the requisite retailing experience came from more traditional organizations, lacked an intense commitment to The Body Shop’s political agenda, and were uncomfortable with the emotional expressiveness required by bounded emotionality. In addition, most of these job applicants were men, making it more difficult to maintain the company’s commitment to providing opportunities for managerial positions to women. Further, many of The Body Shop’s long-term employees, who had been hired when they were young and single, were now married and anticipating caring for children or aging parents. The goals and attributes of an aging workforce didn’t mesh easily with the company’s predilection for extremely long working hours and high-pressure performance. Many of the long-term employees were women, a fact that exacerbated these anticipated difficulties, because so much of the dependent care within the family would be done by women. Such difficulties were intensified by the fact that The Body Shop was subject to the pressures of a highly competitive marketplace. The Body Shop’s financial success and public stock offering created demands for rapid growth, and that growth exacerbated the effects of local labor market limitations. The Body Shop was in danger of losing its distinctiveness and becoming imprisoned, with so many other formerly innovative organizations, in the iron cage of bureaucracy, with its traditional and normative emphases on impersonality and emotional labor.

Despite the obstacles, however, the company had so far managed to maintain two distinguishing features that may

have facilitated the continued implementation of bounded emotionality: a relatively high proportion of women employees, some with high-level managerial positions, and a relatively strong ideological commitment to finding ways of doing business differently. The presence of one or both of these factors may be key to resisting bureaucratic isomorphism, at least in the domain of bounded emotionality. In large for-profit organizations would the presence of a high proportion of women, with a significant minority at the highest ranks, be enough to sustain bounded emotionality? Or would ideology alone suffice, perhaps in the firms that have joined the Social Venture Network, a network of organizations with ideologies similar in some ways to that of The Body Shop? Or, because so many women do not seek to do business differently, must both factors be present? If studies addressing questions such as these could show that bureaucratic isomorphism is less pervasive than we thought, or need not be as pervasive as it is, they would make an important contribution to organizational theory and practice.

Intersections of Feminist and Critical Theories

Feminist theory is a form of critical theory in that it shares a commitment to radical change that would dramatically improve the well-being of ("emancipate") people in disadvantaged positions. To an unfortunate and unnecessary extent, however, feminist theory and critical theory have tended to develop separately, often not drawing on each other's ideas when intersections of concern have occurred. There are, of course, important differences between these theoretical traditions. For example, feminist scholars focus primarily on sex and gender as sources of disadvantage, while Marxist versions of critical theory tend to emphasize class, particularly the concerns of male blue-collar workers.⁵ This paper is an attempt to explore an intersection between these two traditions of inquiry, drawing on their similarities and differences and, we hope, contributing to both.

Feminist and critical scholars in organizational studies have focused on critiques of business operations—most in large for-profit corporations; exploration of viable alternative forms has been largely restricted to small (often nonprofit) organizations. In part, these limitations have occurred because organizational studies is an empirically based social science and, as such, is inherently conservative in its focus on how things have been done, rather than on how things could be done. In such a context, it is particularly important for feminist and critical scholars to study outlier organizations that are struggling to escape the iron cage of conventional bureaucratic practices, on a large scale, in a for-profit environment. Outlier organizations expose the limits of the possible in the contemporary, industrialized economy. This study focused on such an outlier—a large, for-profit firm that had successfully implemented at least one feminist practice, bounded emotionality. The practice was enthusiastically received by many employees, who saw advantages (personal authenticity, greater exploration of home/work influences, commitment) that feminist organizational theorists had predicted. Critical theory helped us be critical, reframing the practice as a form of normative control, revealing disadvantages (conformity pressures, difficulties experienced by dis-

5

Unlike other varieties of feminist theory, socialist-feminist and feminist-socialist scholars (the order of the adjectives reflects the primacy given to class or gender concerns) work from Marxist roots and draw extensively on critical theory (Jaggar, 1983).

Bounded Emotionality

senters, discomfort), as well as the possibilities of exploitation and bad-faith use of leftist corporate rhetoric. This paper, then, illustrates what can be learned from drawing on both theoretical traditions simultaneously in a study of an organization struggling to be different. To restate what can be learned in more general terms, many of the disadvantaged are women, yet critical theorists often do not explore needs and interests unique to women. In addition, feminist theory might offer a useful counterbalance to critical theory's critical emphasis by suggesting a set of organizational innovations (such as altered time management practices and emotional management strategies) that might be beneficial to many women and, perhaps, many men. Even if such innovations were primarily helpful to one sex, they would still be worthwhile to study. To the extent that conflicts of interest between the sexes do exist, critical theories with Marxist roots are well situated to offer insights. Thus, only by assessing both the positive and negative impacts of changes, from the viewpoints of both men and women, can feminist and critical theorists jointly hope to contribute to radical change that emancipates both sexes, not just one.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan**
1990 "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations." *Gender and Society*, 4: 139-158.
- Acker, Joan, and Donald R. Van Houten**
1974 "Differential recruitment and control: The sex structuring of organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19: 152-163.
- Adler, Patricia A., and Peter Adler**
1988 "Intense loyalty in organizations: A case study of college athletics." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33: 401-417.
- Adler, Paul S., and Bryan Borys**
1996 "Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 61-89.
- Alcoff, Linda**
1988 "Cultural feminism versus poststructuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory." *Signs*, 13: 405-436.
- Allen, Jon G., and Dorothy Markiewicz Haccoun**
1976 "Sex differences in emotionality: A multidimensional approach." *Human Relations*, 29: 711-722.
- Alvesson, Mats, and Per Olaf Berg**
1992 *Corporate Culture and Organizational Symbolism*. New York: de Gruyter.
- Baker, Andrea J.**
1982 "The problem of authority in radical movement groups: A case study of lesbian-feminist organization." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 18: 323-341.
- Barker, James R.**
1993 "Tightening the iron cage: Concertive control in self-managing teams." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38: 408-437.
- Barker, James, and Phillip Tompkins**
1994 "Identification in the self-managing organization: Characteristics of target and tenure." *Human Communication Research*, 21: 223-240.
- Barnard, Chester I.**
1938 *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barnett, Bernice McNair**
1995 "Black women's collectivist movement organization: Their struggles during the 'doldrums'." In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations*: 199-219. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Bartunek, Jean M., and Michael K. Moch**
1991 "Multiple constituencies and the quality of working life intervention at FoodCom." In Peter J. Frost, Larry F. Moore, Meryl Reis Louis, Craig C. Lundberg, and Joanne Martin (eds.), *Reframing Organizational Culture*: 104-114. Newbury Park: CA: Sage.
- Bernard, Jessie**
1982 *The Future of Marriage*, 2d ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Blau, Francine D., and Marianne A. Ferber**
1986 *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bologh, Rosalyn Wallach**
1990 *Love or Greatness: Max Weber and Masculine Thinking: A Feminist Inquiry*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Burrell, Gibson**
1984 "Sex and organizational analysis." *Organization Studies*, 5: 97-118.
- Calas, Marta, and Linda Smircich**
1987 "Post-culture: Is the organizational culture literature dominant but dead?" Paper presented at the International Conference on Organizational Symbolism and Corporate Culture, Milan, Italy.

- 1989 "Using the f-word: Feminist theories and the social consequences of organizational research." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington, DC.
- 1992 "Re-writing gender into organization theorizing: Directions from feminist perspectives." In M. Reed and M. Hughes (eds.), *Re-thinking Organizations: New Directions in Organizational Research and Analysis*: 227-253. London: Sage.
- Cheney, George, and Phillip Tompkins**
1987 "Coming to terms with organizational identification and commitment." *Central States Speech Journal*, 38: 1-15.
- Cockburn, Cynthia**
1983 *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto Press.
- Cohen, Randi C., and Robert I. Sutton**
1998 "Clients as a source of enjoyment on the job: How hair stylists shape demeanor and personal disclosures." In J. A. Wagner (ed.), *Advances in Qualitative Organization Research*, 1: 1-32. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Collinson, David L., David Knights, and Margaret Collinson**
1990 *Managing to Discriminate*. New York: Routledge.
- DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell**
1983 "The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields." *American Sociological Review*, 48: 147-160.
- Eagly, Alice H., and Blair T. Johnson**
1990 "Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis." *Psychological Bulletin*, 108: 233-256.
- Eccles, Robert G., and Nitin Nohria**
1992 *Beyond the Hype: Rediscovering the Essence of Management*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Eisenstein, Hester**
1995 "The Australian femocratic experiment: A feminist case for bureaucracy." In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations*: 69-83. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ekman, Paul**
1973 "Cross cultural studies of facial expression." In Paul Ekman (ed.), *Darwin and Facial Expression: A Century of Research in Review*: 169-222. New York: Academic Press.
- Ely, Robin J.**
1995 "The power of demography: Women's social constructions of gender identity at work." *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 589-634.
- Epstein, Sara R., Glenda Russell, and Louise Silvern**
1988 "Structure and ideology of shelters for battered women." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 16: 345-367.
- Farrell, Amy**
1995 "Like a tarantula on a banana boat: *Ms. Magazine*, 1972-1989." In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations*: 53-68. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferguson, Kathy E.**
1984 *The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
1993 *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Patricia Yancey Martin (eds.)**
1995 *Feminist Organizations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fineman, Stephen**
1993 "Emotions as organizational arenas?" In Stephen Fineman (ed.), *Emotions in Organizations*: 9-35. London: Sage.
1996 "Emotion and organizing." In Stewart Clegg (ed.), *Handbook of Organization Studies*: 543-564. London: Sage.
- Flax, Jane**
1987 "Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory." *Signs*, 12: 621-643.
1990 *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fletcher, Joyce K.**
1995 "Radically transforming work for the 21st century: A feminist reconstruction of 'real' work." *Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*: 448-452.
- Fraser, Nancy**
1989 *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frost, Peter J., Larry F. Moore, Meryl Reis Louis, Craig C. Lundberg, and Joanne Martin (eds.)**
1991 *Reframing Organizational Culture*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Frug, Mary Joe**
1986 "The ideology of bureaucracy in American law." *Harvard Law Review*, 97: 1276-1388.
- Gaines, Jeannie**
1993 "You don't necessarily have to be charismatic. . . ." An interview with Anita Roddick and reflections on charismatic processes in the Body Shop International." *Leadership Quarterly*, 4: 347-359.
- Gamson, Z., and H. Levin**
1984 "Obstacles to survival for democratic workplaces." In Robert Jackall and Henry Levin (eds.), *Worker Cooperatives In America*: 219-245. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gherardi, Silvia**
1995 *Gender, Symbolism and Organizational Cultures*. London: Sage.
- Glaser, Barney, and Anselm Strauss**
1967 *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Graham, Hillary**
1984 "Surveying through stories." In Colin Bell and Helen Roberts (eds.), *Social Researching: Politics, Problems, Practice*: 104-124. London: Routledge.
- Habermas, Jurgen**
1972 *Knowledge and Human Interests*. J. Shapiro, trans. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hall, Richard H.**
1968 "Professionalization and bureaucratization." *American Sociological Review*, 33: 92-104.
- Harding, Sandra**
1993 "Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is 'strong objectivity'?" In Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter (eds.), *Feminist Epistemologies*: 49-82. New York: Routledge.

Bounded Emotionality

- Harlan, A., and C. Weiss**
1982 "Sex differences in factors affecting managerial career advancement." In Phyllis Ann Wallace (ed.), *Women in the Workplace*: 59–100. Boston: Auburn House.
- Hearn, Jeff**
1993 "Emotive subjects: Organizational men, organizational masculinities and the (de)construction of 'emotions'." In Stephen Fineman (ed.), *Emotion in Organizations*: 142–167. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hearn, Jeff, and Wendy Parkin**
1987 'Sex' at 'Work': The Power and Paradox of Organization Sexuality. New York: St. Martin's.
- Hearn, Jeff, Deborah L. Sheppard, Peta Tancred-Sheriff, and Gibson Burrell (eds.)**
1989 *The Sexuality of Organization*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hellriegel, Don, and John Slocum**
1979 *Organizational Behavior*. St. Paul: West.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell**
1983 *The Managed Heart: The Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
1989 *The Second Shift*. New York: Avon Books.
- Iannello, Kathleen P.**
1992 *Decisions Without Hierarchy*. New York: Routledge.
- Jackall, Robert, and Henry Levin (eds.)**
1984 *Worker Cooperatives in America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jaggar, Andrea**
1983 *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld.
- Kanter, Rosabeth**
1977 *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Anchor Press.
- Kitayama, Shinobu, and Hazel Rose Markus (eds.)**
1996 *Emotion and Culture: Empirical Studies of Mutual Influence*. Hyattsville, MD: American Psychological Association.
- Kunda, Gideon**
1992 *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-tech Corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Laws, Judith Long**
1978 "Feminism and patriarchy: Competing ways of doing social science." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- Leidner, Robin**
1991 "Serving hamburgers and selling insurance: Gender, work, and identity in interactive service jobs." *Gender and Society*, 5: 154–177.
- Lont, C.**
1988 "Redwood Records: Principles and profit in women's music." In Barbara Bate and Anita Taylor (eds.), *Women Communicating: Studies of Women's Talk*: 233–250. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lugones, Maria, and Elisabeth Spelman**
1987 "Competition, compassion and community: Models for a feminist ethos." In Valerie Miner and Helen Longino (eds.), *Competition: A Feminist Taboo?*: 169–198. New York: Feminist Press.
- Mansbridge, Jane**
1973 "Time, emotion and inequality: Three problems of participatory groups." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 9: 351–368.
- Marshall, Judi**
1984 *Women Managers: Travelers in a Male World*. New York: Wiley.
1995 *Women Managers Moving On*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, Joanne**
1990 "Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations." *Organization Science*, 1: 339–359.
1992 *Cultures in Organizations: Three Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, Joanne, and Kathleen Knopoff**
1998 "The gendered implications of apparently gender-neutral theory: Re-reading Weber." In E. Freeman and A. Larson (eds.), *Business Ethics and Women's Studies*, vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press (forthcoming).
- Martin, Joanne, Maureen Scully, and Barbara Levitt**
1990 "Injustice and the legitimization of revolution: Damning the past, excusing the present, and neglecting the future." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59: 281–290.
- Martin, Patricia Yancey**
1990 "Rethinking feminist organizations." *Gender and Society*, 4: 182–206.
- McRobbie, Angela**
1982 "The politics of feminist research: Between talk, text, and action." *Feminist Review*, 12: 46–57.
- Meyerson, Debra E.**
1994 "Interpretations of stress in institutions: The cultural production of ambiguity and burn-out." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39: 628–653.
1998 "Feeling stressed and burned out: A feminist reading and re-visioning of stressed-based emotions within medicine and organizational science." *Organization Science*, 9: 103–118.
- Mills, Albert J., and Peta Tancred (eds.)**
1992 *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moi, Toril**
1985 *Sexual/Textual Politics*. London: Methuen.
- Morgen, Sandra**
1994 "Personalizing personnel decisions in feminist organizational theory and practice." *Human Relations*, 47: 665–683.
1995 "'It was the best of times, it was the worst of times': Emotional discourse in the work cultures of feminist health clinics." In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations*: 234–247. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Morrison, Ann M., Randall P. White, Ellen Van Velsor, and the Center For Creative Leadership**
1987 *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach the Top of America's Largest Corporations?* Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Mumby, Dennis K., and Linda L. Putnam**
1992 "The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded rationality." *Academy of Management Review*, 17: 465–485.
- Nelson, M.**
1988 "Women's ways: Interactive patterns in predominantly female research teams." In Barbara Bate and Anita Taylor (eds.), *Women Communicating: Studies of Women's Talk*: 199–232. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Newton, Tim**
1995 *'Managing' Stress: Emotion and Power at Work*. London: Sage.
- Oakley, Ann**
1981 "Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms." In Helen Roberts (ed.), *Doing Feminist Research*. London: Routledge.
- Okin, Susan Moller**
1989 *Justice, Gender and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Olsen, F.**
1983 "The family and the market: A study of ideology and legal reform." *Harvard Law Review*, 96: 1497-1578.
- Ouchi, William**
1977 "The relationship between organizational structure and organizational control." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22: 95-113.
1980 "Markets, bureaucracies, and clans." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25: 129-141.
- Pauchant, Thierry C., and Ian Mitroff**
1992 *Transforming the Crisis-Prone Organization: Preventing Individual, Organizational, and Environmental Tragedies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Perrow, Charles**
1986 *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*, 3rd ed. New York: Random House.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., and Joanne Martin**
1987 "Shaping the organizational context for black American inclusion." *Journal of Social Issues*, 43: 41-78.
- Putnam, Linda L., and Dennis K. Mumby**
1993 "Organizations, emotion and the myth of rationality." In Stephen Fineman (ed.), *Emotion in Organizations*: 36-57. London: Sage.
- Rafaeli, Anat**
1989 "When cashiers meet customers: An analysis of the role of supermarket cashiers." *Academy of Management Journal*, 32: 245-273.
- Rafaeli, Anat, and Robert I. Sutton**
1989 "The expression of emotion in organizational life." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 11: 1-42. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- 1990 "Busy stores and demanding customers: How do they affect the display of positive emotion?" *Academy of Management Journal*, 33: 623-637.
- 1991 "Emotional contrast strategies as means of social influence: Lessons from criminal interrogators and bill collectors." *Academy of Management Journal*, 34: 749-775.
- Reskin, Barbara F., and Heidi R. Hartmann (eds.)**
1986 *Women's Work, Men's Work: Sex Segregation on the Job*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Ritzer, George**
1996 *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Roddick, Anita**
1991 *Body and Soul*. New York: Crown.
- Rothschild, Joyce, and Alan Whitt**
1986 *The Cooperative Workplace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rushing, William A.**
1966 "Organizational rules and surveillance: Propositions in comparative organizational analysis." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10: 423-443.
- Schein, Edgar H.**
1985 *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shrivastava, Paul**
1996 *Greening Business: Profiting the Corporation and the Environment*. Cincinnati, OH: Thompson Executive Press.
- Simon, Herbert Alexander**
1976 *Administrative Behavior*, 3d ed. New York: Free Press.
- Soeters, Joseph L.**
1986 "Excellent companies as social movements." *Journal of Management Studies*, 23: 299-312.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakrovorty**
1987 *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Methuen.
- Stacey, Judith**
1988 "Can there be a feminist ethnography?" *Women's Studies International Forum*, 11: 21-27.
- Stearns, Carol Zisowitz, and Peter N. Stearns**
1986 *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sutton, Robert I.**
1991 "Maintaining norms about expressed emotions: The case of bill collectors." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36: 245-268.
- Sutton, Robert I., and Anat Rafaeli**
1988 "Untangling the relationship between displayed emotions and organizational sales: The case of convenience stores." *Academy of Management Journal*, 31: 461-487.
- Tom, Allison**
1995 "Children of our culture? Class, power and learning in a feminist bank." In Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin (eds.), *Feminist Organizations*: 165-179. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Tompkins, Phillip K., and George Cheney**
1985 "Communication and unobtrusive control in contemporary organization." In Robert D. McPhee and Phillips K. Tompkins (eds.), *Organizational Communication: Traditional Themes and New Directions*: 179-210. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tong, Rosemarie**
1989 *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Turner, Barry A.**
1986 "Sociological aspects of organizational symbolism." *Organization Studies*, 7: 101-115.
- Van Maanen, John**
1991 "The smile factory: Work at Disneyland." In Peter J. Frost, Larry F. Moore, Meryl Reis Louis, Craig C. Lundberg, and Joanne Martin (eds.), *Reframing Organizational Culture*: 58-76. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Maanen, John, and Stephen R. Barley**
1984 "Occupational communities: Culture and control in organizations." In Barry M. Staw and L. L. Cummings (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 6: 287-366. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bounded Emotionality

Van Maanen, John, and Gideon Kunda

- 1989 "Real feelings: Emotional expression and organizational culture." In L. L. Cummings and B. M. Staw (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 11: 43–103. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Waldron, Vincent, and Kathleen Krone

- 1991 "The experience and expression of emotion in the workplace: A study of a corrections organization." *Management Communication Quarterly*, 4: 287–309.

Weber, Max

- 1946 "Bureaucracy." In Hans H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds. and trans.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*: 196–244. New York: Oxford University Press.

- 1981 "Bureaucracy." In Oscar Grusky and George A. Miller (eds.), *The Sociology of Organizations: Basic Studies*: 7–36. New York: Free Press.

Weed, Frank J.

- 1993 "The MADD Queen: Charisma and the founder of Mothers Against Drunk Driving." *Leadership Quarterly*, 4: 329–346.

Wharton, Amy S., and Rebecca J. Erickson

- 1993 "Managing emotions on the job and at home: Understanding the consequences of multiple emotional roles." *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 457–486.

Whyte, William, and Kathleen

Whyte

- 1991 *Making Mondragon*, 2d ed. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Willmott, Hugh

- 1993 "Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations." *Journal of Management Studies*, 30: 515–552.

Wyatt, N.

- 1988 "Shared leadership in the Weavers Guild." In Barbara Bate and Anita Taylor (eds.), *Women Communicating: Studies of Women's Talk*: 147–175. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zajonc, Robert B.

- 1985 "Emotion and facial efferece: An ignored theory reclaimed." *Science*, April 5: 15–21.