The Church and Management:
Synthesis of a Reorientation Framework for Management Theories Through a Theological Engagement with Management Science

Submitted by

Christina Kheng Li Lin
BSc Hons, MPA, MTS

A thesis submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of Theology
Faculty of Theology and Philosophy

Australian Catholic University

21st August 2017

Statement of Authorship and Sources:

This thesis contains no material that has been extracted in whole or in part from a thesis that I have submitted towards the award of any other degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

Signed:

…….

Christina Kheng Li Lin

21st August 2017

Acknowledgements

I am deeply grateful to my Principal Supervisor, Professor Neil Ormerod, whose expertise, guidance, and encouragement have made all the difference in this whole journey of my doctoral studies. Thanks also to my Co-Supervisor, Associate Professor Rev. Ormond Rush, for his valuable inputs and support. In both Neil and Orm, I have gained not only advice and accompaniment throughout this project, but more importantly, inspiring role models of professionalism, generosity, and dedication to the vocation.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the Jesuits and staff at the East Asian Pastoral Institute (EAPI) and the Jesuit Conference of Asia Pacific (JCAP), especially Fr Arthur Leger SJ and Fr Mark Raper SJ, for their support, understanding, and companionship in mission.

Together with EAPI, I acknowledge and thank the Institute of Missiology (Missio) for its sponsorship of my doctoral studies.

Abbreviations

CCC	Catechism of the Catholic Church
CV	Encyclical Letter On Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth, *Caritas In Veritate*
EG	Apostolic Exhortation on the Proclamation of the Gospel in Today's World, *Evangelii Gaudium*
GS	Pastoral Constitution on the Church and the World Today, *Gaudium et Spes*
ITC	International Theological Commission
LE	Encyclical Letter On Human Work, *Laborem Exercens*
LG	Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*
NLRCM	National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management

Table of Contents

Abstract

This doctoral project is an inter-disciplinary study that brings together theology and management science. Its goal is to synthesize, through an appropriate theological method, a framework to reorientate management theories so as to render them more suitable for management in the Roman Catholic Church, as well as more conducive for human flourishing in all organizations. It is hoped that this project will contribute towards the theological scholarship that is much needed amidst an increasing influence of the managerial culture in both Church and society.

Chapter 1 begins with a survey of pastoral management literature in the Catholic Church, noting the ways in which theories from management science have been applied. The survey reveals that much of the pastoral materials adopt business management ideas in a direct and uncritical manner, leading to conflicts with the Church's values, ecclesiology, and worldview. A key issue highlighted in this thesis is the need for proper methodology in inter-disciplinary work. Based on current debates regarding theological and pastoral engagement with the social sciences, Chapter 1 argues that management theories need to be reoriented with the aid of theology before they can be fruitfully applied in church management. It proposes that a reorientation framework can be synthesized for this purpose, and that the synthesis can aim more broadly at a framework which would reorientate management theories to better promote human flourishing in all types of organizations, without compromising its suitability for church management. In this way, the internal challenge of management in the Church can be turned into an opportunity to collaborate with others towards improving management in society as a whole.

Chapter 2 proceeds with the framework's synthesis by conducting a critical examination of the management field. It analyzes the historical development of the field as well as its current internal debates. The analysis reveals that the main problems in the field include its lack of normative values, its reductionist assumptions about the human person, the organization, and society, its over-optimism about technique, its top-down nature, and its current fragmentation and lack of integration. Although alternative principles for management have been proposed by scholars within the field, Chapter 2 points out that these alternatives lack an adequate account of the human person and society, human flourishing, epistemology, and the religious horizon. The chapter proposes that these gaps can be fruitfully addressed through dialogue with a faith tradition.

To this end, Chapter 3 examines the Second Vatican Council's Pastoral Constitution on the Church and the World Today, *Gaudium et Spes* (hereafter GS), to draw insights and principles for management. After outlining the document's suitability for this project and

establishing principles for its interpretation, the chapter discusses GS's teachings on the human person and society, the nature and purpose of human work, and the Church's vision of human finality. It also examines GS's view of truth and human knowledge, and draws implications for management theories. The analysis reveals that GS's teachings have much to contribute to management science. Nevertheless, like the management field, the document is also not without internal conflicts, nor does it provide a full account of management. Hence, a central argument of this thesis is that resources from the secular sciences and the faith tradition do not function directly as foundations but as data, in the dialogue between both sides. The resolution of this dialogue requires a higher viewpoint that would provide the foundational criteria with which to evaluate resonances and conflicts emerging from the dialogue.

Chapter 4 establishes that this higher viewpoint can be found in intellectual, moral, and religious conversions as expounded by Bernard Lonergan. The chapter points out the suitability of these conversions for management science, and their ability to provide objective and normative foundations for management. It highlights that the implications of intellectual, moral, and religious conversions include adoption of a critical realist stance in management, incorporation of a normative teleology, replacement of the deterministic and empirical approach in management science with a probabilistic and heuristic one, and inclusion of the religious horizon. These implications are then used to evaluate the resonances and conflicts arising from the comparison of management science with the teachings of GS. Based on this evaluation, normative principles for management are identified and consolidated to form the reorientation framework. The chapter also points out how this framework is suitable for management in the Church as well as in all other organizations.

The workings of the reorientation framework are illustrated in Chapter 5 by applying it to two management tools which are frequently recommended in Catholic pastoral management literature: performance management systems, and marketing and customer service strategies. It is shown that the reorientation results in adjustments being made to these tools such that they better align with the nature and mission of the Church, while also facilitating more effective management and human flourishing when applied in all other organizations. The practical viability of the reoriented tool is also pointed out. Thereafter, based on the reorientation framework, a revised topical structure for Catholic pastoral management materials is proposed. Finally, a self-evaluation of this research project is presented, underscoring not only its contribution of the reorientation framework but also its demonstration of a systematic and fruitful inter-disciplinary method.

Chapter 1
What Are They Saying About Church Management?

1.1 Introduction

This doctoral project is an inter-disciplinary study involving a theological engagement with management science. Its goal is to synthesize, through an appropriate theological method, a framework for reorientating secular management theories. In doing so, I hope to contribute a much-needed theological response to an increasing turn towards management in the Roman Catholic Church as well as in many sectors of society. Beginning with a critical examination of how management principles and practices have been applied in the pastoral literature of the Catholic Church, I point out the problems in such application and highlight that a core issue is the need to pay more attention to proper inter-disciplinary methodology. After examining debates regarding theological engagement with the social sciences, I argue for the need to reorientate management theories with the aid of theology, and proceed to synthesize a framework to enable such a reorientation. The method of synthesis comprises critical analyses of the management field and a relevant resource from the Catholic faith tradition on human work and management. Insights from both analyses are brought into a dialectical comparison, out of which normative principles for management are identified by drawing upon the work of Bernard Lonergan on dialectics, conversions, and foundations. These principles are then consolidated into the reorientation framework. It will be seen that the method employed in this synthesis results in a framework that renders management theories not only more suitable for the Church but also more conducive for all organizations in promoting human flourishing.

1.2 Background and significance of this study

Since the mid-2000s, there has been a proliferation of new educational programs, training activities, and pastoral literature on management in the Catholic Church. Around the globe, Catholic theological faculties are teaming up with business schools to offer joint degrees in pastoral management.[1] Besides these academic programs, specialized centers have also been

[1] This trend has been most prominent in the US. For example, Villanova University established a Center for the Study of Church Management in 2004 under its business school, and offers post-graduate and certificate programs. Boston College's School of Theology and Ministry similarly started offering joint degrees in theology, ministry, and management in partnership with the business faculty from 2005. Several other universities in the US have followed suit, while an increasing number of theological schools are adding church management as a concentration in their existing Master's degrees. Elsewhere, the Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth (JDV) Pontifical Institute of Philosophy and Religion in India started the JDV Centre for Pastoral Management about ten years ago and offers a Masters in Pastoral Management Degree. Similarly, the Loyola School of Theology in the Philippines introduced a Masters program specializing in pastoral leadership and management. Most recently, the Pontifical Lateran University in Rome established a School of Pastoral Management and opened its doors for the first intake in 2015, receiving an over-subscribed response. See "Degree Programs Aim for Best Practices in Mission and Management," *National Catholic Reporter*, September 1, 2006; JDV Pontifical Institute of Philosophy and

formed, such as the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management (hereafter NLRCM) in the US, which provides consultancy, resources, and learning opportunities such as annual conferences.[2] In 2017, an International Festival of Creativity in Church Management was held in Rome for the first time, organized jointly by the Pontifical Lateran University and Villanova University.[3] This growth in church management programs is equally matched by an increase in pastoral literature offering advice on how to manage parishes and other church organizations.[4] Observers link the recent interest in management to the growing awareness of financial and governance challenges faced by Catholic Church institutions, from local parishes to the Vatican.[5] There have also been explicit calls around the world advocating that the Church should embrace modern management as a way to "move from decline to growth", regain its "relevance" and update its way of working.[6]

Personally, through my profession as a consultant for church organizations over the past ten years, I have gained a first-hand experience of the challenges faced by those who work in church ministry. Some of these challenges are typically regarded as management-related and include the need to improve governance structures, optimize scarce resources, develop personnel, run programs, evaluate the organization, and realign priorities with changing contexts. To provide training and consultancy in these areas, I had initially drawn upon my prior qualifications in two different disciplines, management and theology. These include a Master of Public Administration from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard

---

Religion, "JDV Centres," accessed January 1, 2017, http://jdv.edu.in/jdv-centers/; Jesuit Asia Pacific Conference, "LST-EAPI Offer New Program in Pastoral Leadership and Management," April 30, 2015, accessed January 1, 2017, http://sjapc.net/content/lst-eapi-offer-new-program-pastoral-leadership-and- management; Chiara Vasarri and Flavia Rotondi, "Pope Francis is Sending His Clergy Off to Management Lessons," *Sydney Morning Herald*, February 26, 2015.

[2] National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management (NLRCM), "Our History", accessed January 30, 2016, https://leadershiproundtable.org/who-we-are/our-history/.

[3] Villanova University School of Business, "International Festival of Creativity in Church Management," accessed May 1, 2017, https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/business/centers/churchmanagement/programs/iccm.html.

[4] Some examples include Paul A. Holmes, ed., *A Pastors' Toolbox: Management Skills for Parish Leadership* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014), Kevin E. McKenna, ed., *A Concise Guide to Catholic Church Management* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2010), and Charles E. Zech, ed., *The Parish Management Handbook* (Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 2003).

[5] See Kristen Hannum, "The Parish that Works," *US Catholic*, July 2011; Alison Damast, "Mastering the Business of Church," *Bloomberg Business*, January 3, 2008; "Pope Francis 'Appoints Management Consultant' to Advise on Reform of Roman Curia," *Catholic Herald*, June 13, 2013.

[6] Martin Teulan, "The Evangelising Diocese," *Australasian Catholic Record* 78, no. 4 (Oct 2001): 421; Frederick W. Gluck, "Crisis Management in the Church," *America*, December 1, 2003. See also Diarmuid Martin, "The Future of the Catholic Church in Ireland," *Archdiocese of Dublin Website*, May 10, 2010, accessed May 25, 2016, http://www.dublindiocese.ie/1052010-the-future-of-the-church-in-ireland/#sthash.qDQoPbzf. dpuf. Archbishop Martin notes that in Ireland, "there are those who think that in today's culture what we need is a sort of efficient 'Catholic Church in Ireland Incorporated', with its own CEO and with management structures administered efficiently from the top right down to the lowest level."

University (US), and graduate degrees in theology from the Australian Catholic University. However, I came to see the need for a proper sub-discipline to be developed—one that brings together management and theology in a more systematic way so that the important task of church management can be undergirded by greater theoretical rigor.

Such rigor has unfortunately been lacking in the available resources on pastoral management in the Catholic Church. Much is imported directly and rather uncritically from the commercial business field. For example, a popular guidebook advocates that parishioners should be treated as "customers" who "consume or utilize services offered by the parish (liturgies, programs, education, events, counselling, and other forms of assistance)," adding that:

> customer satisfaction is achieved by providing customers with quality, convenience and service as *customers define those terms*. Customer *perception* is key. What leaders of an organization believe customers *should* desire is inconsequential (italics in original).[7]

Needless to say, such advice, though well-meaning, run contrary to more theological perspectives of the baptized as fellow disciples and evangelical witnesses of the Church, rather than its "customers". This begs the question of whether a management paradigm is suitable for ecclesial life in the first place. Indeed, similar cautions have been raised against the Church of England's turn to management in the 1990s and in recent years.[8] In the Catholic Church, some scholars have observed that the new pastoral management training programs offer little more than a wholesale import of the business school curriculum.[9]

Given this situation, it is timely that more foundational theological reflection is brought to bear on the important task of church management. Instead of simply importing concepts and tools directly from the secular management field, critical questions need to be raised about the strengths and weaknesses of this field, and its suitability as an aid to church management. How should theology engage with management science, if at all? What method of engagement would help pastoral workers respond to their practical challenges in a faithful and fruitful way? These necessary questions reach into the issue of inter-disciplinary methodology and thus of foundational theology.

---

[7] Larry W. Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality," in McKenna, *Catholic Church Management*, 108. The author goes on to list comfort and convenience as among the "excellent customer services", along with "psychological comfort" which he implies should not be disturbed by even the homily since this would be akin to watching news on television that does not make people feel "pleasant". Ibid., 117-118.

[8] See G. R. Evans and Martyn Percy, eds., *Managing the Church?: Order and Organization in a Secular Age* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); and Barney Thompson, "Church of England Management Courses Overlook God, Say Critics," *Financial Times*, December 18, 2014.

[9] See Michael L. Budde, "The Rational Shepherd: Corporate Practices and the Church," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 21, no. 1 (2008): 106, 114.

1.3 Aims and deliverables of this thesis

This research seeks to contribute a foundational theological reflection on the issue of church management and the engagement with management science in theology and pastoral ministry. Its first aim is to critically evaluate the current literature on pastoral management in the Roman Catholic tradition, with a view to uncover underlying patterns in their adoption of secular management theories, and highlight the resulting problems and concerns. It is ventured that such a systematic analysis from a theological lens will be a new contribution to both the pastoral and theological fields. This analysis is also an urgent one in view of the growing popularity of the pastoral management literature, the movements and networks emerging around them, and the tendency to accept their advice at face value.[10] Moreover, as will be shown in the pastoral literature review, the same patterns with which secular management ideas are adopted are observed in publications from earlier decades as well as in more recent works, thus indicating the persistence of the problem. As such, the analysis and the implications of its findings will be the focus of the first part of this thesis. The second aim of this study is to propose, illustrate, and evaluate an appropriate method for inter-disciplinary engagement of theology with management science. In the light of current debates regarding theological method for approaching the social sciences, it will be argued that management theories need to be reoriented with the aid of theology before they can be applied fruitfully in pastoral ministry. Using the method described later in this chapter, the third and main deliverable of this study is to synthesize a framework that can effect such a reorientation. Besides having immediate practical application in my consultancy work, it is also hoped that this reorientation framework will contribute towards improving pastoral resources in the Catholic Church as well as complement broader efforts to make management science more integrated, effective, and conducive to human flourishing.

1.4 Overview of pastoral management literature in the Catholic Church

Scholars have noted the diversity and ambiguity with which management in general and pastoral management in particular have been defined.[11] For the purpose of this study, I will focus on pastoral management literature that cover administrative aspects of church ministry such as planning, organizational systems and structures, personnel management, leadership,

[10] The wide following that has grown around several pastoral management authors and their works has been noted in Dominic Perri, "Our Growing Edges: Looking to the Future," in *The Francis Effect and Changing Church Culture: Advancing Best Managerial and Leadership Practices*, eds. Michael Brough and Christina Ferguson (Washington DC: NLRCM, 2016), 78.

[11] See Thomas E. Frank, "Leadership and Administration: An Emerging Field in Practical Theology," *International Journal of Practical Theology* 10, no. 1 (2006): 113-118, 120.

finance, fund-raising, program management, and communications. These topics are reflected in the pastoral training programs mentioned above as well as in pastoral guidebooks that deal with the subject of church management as a whole. In such literature, chapter titles typically include "planning", "human resources", "financial controls", "risk management", "time management", "meetings", "evaluating performance", "service quality", and "decision-making".[12] Most of the literature is targeted at parishes, though many also explicitly emphasize their relevance to all types of church organizations. In the Catholic tradition, one of the earliest works of this genre dates back to 1969.[13] However, observers note that it is only within the last ten years or so that the subject of management has gained wider currency in the Catholic Church.[14] Apart from publications that cover a broad sweep of the administrative aspects of church ministry, there are also those which focus on specific topics such as parish pastoral councils and financial stewardship. The topic of leadership is particularly gaining more attention in the wake of a perceived need to improve leadership in the Church.[15] However, the meanings attached to the term "leadership" are often vague and diverse, while debates continue over the relationship between leadership and management. For the purpose of this study, the survey of literature on church management will include those on leadership because similar issues in the appropriation of secular disciplines are observed. Finally, a notable sub-genre in the pastoral literature is one that focuses specifically on the notion of parish revitalisation. Although such works cover parish pastoral life as a whole, they inevitably involve the subject of management, and contain a further set of issues and problems, which shall be discussed below.

In general, pastoral management literature in the Catholic tradition displays some common characteristics. One notable feature is that they are highly prescriptive, action-oriented, simplified, and addressed to an implied reader whose profile is that of a busy pastor seeking quick and concise solutions for practical management problems. The medium of such literature includes not only books but also websites, blogs, newsletters, videos, pastoral magazine articles, and guidelines from various centres of expertise.[16] Marshall McLuhan has

[12] See works cited in Footnote 2.

[13] See Arthur X. Deegan, *The Priest as Manager* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co, 1969), highlighted in Mark F. Fischer, "Pastoral Councils and Parish Management," in Zech, *Parish Management Handbook*, 31.

[14] See Jim Lundholm-Eades, "Changing Church Culture: Institutionalizing Best Managerial and Leadership Practices," in Brough and Ferguson, *The Francis Effect*, 66-67.

[15] For example, see Chris Lowney, *Everyone Leads: How to Revitalize the Catholic Church* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017).

[16] Some examples include NLRCM, "ChurchEpedia: Ideas for Best Practices in Church Management, Finance and Human Resources," accessed May 1, 2016, http://www.theleadershiproundtable.org/churchepedia/default.asp; Villanova University, "Center for Church Management and Business Ethics Newsletter," accessed May 1, 2016, https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/business/centers/churchmanagement/newsletter.html; and

remarked that "the medium is the message".[17] If this is indeed true for the pastoral literature, then the media and literary styles employed would seem to convey the impression that pastoral management can be mastered through brief, simple, and prescriptive instructions that are readily available on demand.

A second dominant feature of the literature is the prevalence of concepts, ideas and practices from the business management discipline. In some cases, this is even explicitly advocated. For example, a widely-noted remark by prominent author Charles Zech is that "the church is not a business. We do, however, have a stewardship responsibility to use our resources as effectively as we possibly can to carry out God's work on earth … Sometimes carrying out that stewardship responsibility requires us to use sound business management practices and tools."[18] Similarly, earlier writers such as William Bausch asserted that "the parish could learn from the corporation" especially in branding and image management, even as he provocatively refers to the business sector as "children of darkness".[19] Writing also in the 1980s, one author highlighted that "this book for the parish intends to borrow heavily from business. There are clear parallels between business and parish in getting things done through people. After all, they're the same people."[20] The generalising tendency of this view and its persistence over more than one generation of pastoral authors warrant closer scrutiny of its underlying assumptions and the ways in which pastoral materials apply ideas from the management field.

1.5 Critical survey of the engagement with management science

An analytical lens employed by Clodovis Boff provides a useful perspective for surveying the pastoral management literature. Boff has observed that engagements with the social sciences in practical theology tend towards either "empiricism", "methodological purism", "theologism", "semantic mix", or "bilingualism", none of which are methodologically adequate.[21] In Catholic pastoral management resources, empiricism, semantic mix, and bilingualism are particularly endemic.

National Association of Church Personnel Administrators, *Personnel Policies And Procedures for Church Organizations* (Alexandria, VA: NACPA, 2006).

[17] Marshall McLuhan, "The Medium is the Message," in *Media and Cultural Studies*, eds. Meenakshi G. Durham and Douglas Kellner (Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, 2005), 107.

[18] Charles E. Zech, "Best Practices in Parish Internal Financial Controls," in Holmes, *Pastor's Toolbox*, 73. See also William J. Byron, "Applying Best Practice from Business to Our Parishes," *The Pastoral Review* 6, no. 1 (2010): 41-42.

[19] William J. Bausch, *The Hands-On Parish: Reflections and Suggestions for Fostering Community* (Mystic, CN: Twenty-Third Publications, 1989), 101.

[20] George M. Williams, *Improving Parish Management: Working Smarter, Not Harder* (Mystic, CN: Twenty-Third Publications, 1983), 6.

[21] Clodovis Boff, *Theology and Praxis: Epistemological Foundations* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987), 20-34.

1.5.1 Empiricism

Boff defines empiricism as an approach in which empirical data, observations, and experiences are simply described without deliberate application of any social science theory. Not surprisingly, this approach in the pastoral literature is displayed by pastor-authors writing from personal experiences, and sharing management practices that had worked for them. Such literature typically contains descriptive accounts, personal stories, and practical advice of a wide variety, often generalised from specific experiences. For example, Paul Peri advocates that parish management is all about "making an emotional connection" with people "in order to be effective," according to his personal experience.[22] Michael White and Tom Corcoran, authors of several books on parish revitalization which have gained a wide following, draw upon their past successes to prescribe a way for growing parish membership by segmenting people in the surrounding community according to their profiles, identifying the targeted segments, and formulating outreach strategies according to the characteristics of each segment.[23]

Boff points out that the problem with the empirical approach is that it often conceals biases which are operating in an unconscious way. This seems to be the case for the above pastor-authors. Peri's remarks resonate with the human relations model of management, a particular school of thought in management studies. Likewise, the recommendation of White and Corcoran reflect the business marketing approach, which is also one among several approaches in management. It can be seen that without explicit and critical appropriation of management theory, the choice of one model or paradigm over another becomes arbitrary and unexamined, along with the suitability and soundness of its underlying assumptions. The resulting recommendations are ultimately skewed by personal biases. In addition to Boff's critique of empiricism, I would add that a further problem is the conflation of the general with the particular, as shown in the tendency to take experience not only at face-value but also as normative. This amounts to naïve realism on the part of the pastor-authors.

1.5.2 Semantic mix

Boff describes semantic mix as an arbitrary combination of pastoral or theological concepts and language with ideas and terms from the secular sciences. In Catholic pastoral management literature, this tendency is common among pastors endeavouring to incorporate

[22] Paul F. Peri, *Catholic Parish Administration: A Handbook* (New York: Paulist Press, 2012), 12.

[23] Michael White and Tom Corcoran, *Rebuilt: The Story of a Catholic Parish* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2013), 71-76.

secular management trends into their writings, as well as among management scholars attempting to adapt their expertise to church ministry. For example, echoing popular management ideas of the early-1990s, pastor-authors Patricia Forster and Thomas Sweetser wrote that "parishioners could work on teams with the leaders to assess 'performance shortfalls,' as they say in management circles" and "clusters of people could form 'communication groups' (another management term) to monitor services in all areas of parish life."[24] More recently, a management scholar writes that "the Church is a value-oriented organization committed to community-building and quality performance."[25] As Boff highlights, such "hybrid discourse" is often uncritical, ambiguous, and subject to arbitrary domination by one of the disciplines.[26] In these examples as in many others, the secular management discipline appears to exert the greater influence. It is also unclear in these statements what is meant by terms such as "performance shortfalls", "communication groups", "value-oriented organization" and "quality performance", as well as what, if any, theological significance they possess.

1.5.3 Bilingualism

Boff defines bilingualism as the approach of placing two distinct systems and languages side-by-side, in the hope that they would complement and mutually inform each other. This approach is also evident in Catholic pastoral management literature. Typically, an introductory chapter or section is devoted to church doctrine while the rest of the material presents secular management practices, some of which even contradict the preceding material on church doctrine. For example, a recent publication on personnel management opens with a chapter by Bishop Donald Wuerl highlighting the principle of co-responsibility and collaboration for the mission of the Church. However, what follows immediately is a chapter by a human resource expert describing typical human resource practices in the business sector, including a "performance management system" using a carrot-and-stick approach to motivate pastoral workers.[27] The religious principles from the previous chapter do not seem to have any bearing on the rest of the book. In some cases, such lack of integration is even displayed by the same

[24] Patricia M. Forster and Thomas P. Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish: Models for the Future*, (Franklin, Wisconsin: Sheed & Ward, 1993), 55.

[25] Brenda Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management", in McKenna, *Concise Guide to Catholic Church Management*, 34.

[26] Boff, *Theology and Praxis*, 28.

[27] Donald W. Wuerl, "Framework of Accountability in the Church," and Daniel Koys, "Human Resource Guidelines for Developing a Performance Management System," in *Best Practices in Catholic Church Ministry Performance Management*, ed. Charles E. Zech (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010), 7-15, 20.

author. For example, despite an introductory section devoted to Catholic social teaching on the dignity of labor, Mary Dantuono subsequently discusses the "at will employment" law in the US, and adds that "the employee can also be fired at the will of the employer at any time (with a few limited exceptions). No reason is necessary."[28] The pastoral management advice thus seems to conflict with the religious teachings. Consequently, the approach of bilingualism is akin to having students of theology simply crossing the campus for management classes in the business school, without any aid in reconciling or even identifying conflicts between the two disciplines. The result is the unfortunate and persistent dichotomy between faith and life.

A common feature of pastoral literature that displays either semantic mix or bilingualism is the lack of rigor in engaging with resources from the faith tradition. Many works display a cursory and uncritical use of Scripture and church teachings. For example, the biblical account of the appointment of deacons in Acts 6:1-7 is frequently cited in the pastoral literature as evidence to support advice about delegation and organizational structure, without any discussion of the possible meanings behind this biblical passage.[29] A more critical exegesis done by Thomas Campbell and Gary Reierson shows that the passage points to a deeper issue about inclusion in the early Christian community.[30] Likewise, the NLRCM provides an online "Assessment Tool for Parish Leadership Relationships, Parish Ministry and Management" which makes reference to the Second Vatican Council's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Lumen Gentium* (hereafter LG).[31] However, this reference only highlights the issue of consultation in the Church, without any thorough consideration of what LG as a whole implies about parish life and parish assessment.[32]

1.5.4 Sociology overcomes theology

[28] Mary A. Dantuono, "Human Resources: The Spine of an Organization," in McKenna, *Catholic Church Management*, 174.

[29] For example, see Williams, *Improving Parish Management*, 31; and Carol M. Holden, Thomas P. Sweetser and Mary B. Vogel, *Recreating the Parish: Reproducible Resources for Pastoral Ministers* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1996), 1.

[30] Thomas C. Campbell and Gary B. Reierson, *The Gift of Administration: Theological Bases for Ministry* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982), 104-115.

[31] NLRCM, "An Assessment Tool for Parish Leadership Relationships, Parish Ministry and Management: To Identify Current Strengths and Potential for Improvement," version 7, last modified August 8, 2008, accessed May 1, 2016, http://www.theleadershiproundtable.org/churchepedia/docs/NLRCMLeadershipRelationshipAssessmentToolv708082008.pdf.

[32] As an example of a more comprehensive analysis and application of LG for the assessment of church organizations, see Christina Kheng, "Evaluating Church Organisations by the Light of *Lumen Gentium*: A Dialogue between Ecclesiology and Management," *Ecclesiology* 11, no. I (2015): 9-33.

Finally, a prevalent tendency among Catholic pastoral management literature is one akin to what Richard Roberts describes as "sociology overcomes theology".[33] In this approach, only the concepts and language of social science are used while theology is silent. For example, in advising on the effective functioning of parish councils, Zech et al. draw solely upon social theories to explain group dynamics and to recommend norms regulating group behaviour.[34] Notably absent is any theological perspective that might have a bearing on this topic, such as a consideration of the parish as a Spirit-led community. In another case, one author offers "marketing" advice for the Church to attract more "customers", making suggestions for "the parish's selected branding styles" as conveyed through its colours, logo, and motto.[35] No mention is made of whether "marketing" is a suitable activity for the Church from a theological standpoint nor whether the living witness of the community might perhaps be its best "branding style." Some authors even go as far as applying what might be considered a hermeneutics of management to Scripture, highlighting, for example, that "Christ focused on the mission, inspired the vision, recruited key personnel, implemented a succession plan, and modelled the corporate culture that he desired. In that final staff meeting, he delegated responsibility to those whom he has recruited, motivated, served, and 'formed' in love. He offered an organizational blueprint for all ages (see John 13-17)."[36] In such an approach, the secular management paradigm fully dominates, providing the lens or framework into which ecclesial life is fitted in as content. While this approach is not unexpected in social science studies of religion, it is somewhat incongruent in pastoral ministry, for which the faith tradition should surely play a more foundational role. In this light, John Milbank is quite justified in cautioning that secular functional perspectives do not merely supplement but in fact tend to replace religious and theological perspectives, thus leading to a secular "redescription" of religious phenomena.[37] I concur that this approach in the pastoral management literature is ultimately reductionist, and eliminates all consideration of divine realities.

---

[33] Richard Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 196.

[34] Charles E. Zech, Mary L. Gautier, Robert J. Miller and Mary E. Bendyna, *Best Practices of Catholic Pastoral and Finance Councils* (Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Press, 2010), 111-143.

[35] Bryan Foster, *Church Marketing Manual for the Digital Age* (Benowa, Queensland: Great Developments, 2011), 29, 38.

[36] "Preface," in McKenna, *Catholic Church Management*, 1.

[37] John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 101-144, at 111.

1.6 Consequences of uncritical appropriation of management science[38]

In summary, much of the current pastoral materials use secular management ideas in a way that is neither critically examined, theologically robust, nor methodologically sound. This problem is compounded by the fact that the pastoral literature tend to be produced by those same institutions running the educational programs. Thus, problems observed in the literature are likely to be manifested in the training programs as well. One consequence of this methodological weakness is the notable contradiction and arbitrariness in the pastoral management advice. For example, whilst some of the literature recommends hiring parishioners for parish staff positions, others caution against it.[39] Similarly, in contrast to one author who suggests fund-raising events such as "auctions", "black-tie galas" and lucky-draws, another warns that these "are about an exchange of money for something ... and often, they are so consummately consumer driven that they almost create a parody of the Church of Christ."[40] One of the most notable contradictions in the literature is the diversity of opinions about what constitutes good pastoral leadership. Whilst one author stresses authenticity, inclusiveness, and being empowering, another advocates "enormous measures of passion, commitment, creativity, self-restraint, wisdom, and courage" while yet another declares that it is all about "building trust, mastering conflict, achieving commitment, embracing accountability and focusing on results."[41] Moreover, the relationship between leadership and management is typically caricatured as a superior-inferior one. For instance, several authors in a publication subtitled, ironically, *Management Skills for Parish Leadership*, assert that pastors should focus on leadership and relegate the task of management to someone else.[42] Theologian Thomas Frank rightly counters that this distinction is arbitrary and misleading, and reflects the inequalities observed in commercial corporations.[43]

---

[38] The findings from this section have been published in Christina Kheng, "The Church and Modern Management: An Unholy Alliance?" *Doctrine and Life* 66, no. 9 (November 2016): 37-51.

[39] See White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 231 and David DeLambo, "The Evolution of Employment Practices Regarding Lay Parish Ministry," in Zech, *Best Practices in Catholic Church Ministry Performance Management*, 35, in contrast with the National Association of Church Personnel Administrators, *Parish Personnel Administration*, 55, cited in Dantuono, "Human Resources," 173.

[40] C. Justin Clements, *Stewardship: A Parish Handbook* (Liguori, Missouri: Liguori Publications, 2000), 100; White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 177.

[41] Jean M. Hiesberger, *Fostering Leadership Skills in Ministry: A Parish Handbook* (Liguori, Missouri: Liguori Publications, 2003). 4-10; Margaret J. Kelly, "Leadership," in McKenna, *Catholic Church Management*, 15; and Patrick Lencioni, "A Guide to Building Teams for Catholic Parishes," accessed May 1, 2017, https://amazingparish.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/catholic-fg.pdf.

[42] See Jim Lundholm-Eades, "A Six-Month Game Plan," and Jack Wall, "Pastoring and Administering a Mission-Driven Church," in Holmes, *Toolbox*, 36, 97.

[43] Frank, "Leadership and Administration," 120.

Beyond contradictions and arbitrariness, a more serious consequence of uncritical appropriation of management science is the imbibing of the "culture of management" in the Church.[44] Several theologians have pointed out the conflicts between this culture and the Christian faith tradition.

1.6.1 Conflicts in values and goals

In his seminal critique of the management field, pastoral theologian Stephen Pattison points out that the field is not a morally-neutral one. Management theories and practices are often value-laden, and reflect underlying assumptions and beliefs that have been shaped largely within a profit-driven business context.[45] The implementation of business management methods not only carries moral consequences but also in turn shapes the moral outlook of those who practice them, including pastoral workers.[46] These observations are borne out by the pastoral literature in the Catholic Church. In *A Concise Guide to Catholic Church Management*, an introductory chapter giving an overview of management offers advice that is tantamount to commodifying the human person. Its author asserts that "[managers] have the following resources available to use for goal accomplishment: human, capital, monetary, information, and time" and adds that "one of the interesting things about managerial resources is that they … can often substitute for one another," whereby "the most frequent consideration for choosing between and among them is cost."[47] Such statements echo the resource-based approach that is widely-accepted in business management but it can be seen that the human person is reduced to a dispensable line-item in the budget, no different from money, information or time. The author of this pastoral work even goes on to list among human resources not only church employees but also boards, parishioners, clients, and community members.[48] In contrast, scholars who have been promoting Catholic social teaching values to the business world write that although "classical economic theory defines capital and labor as substitutes, … this notion of administering to human and machine as equals is abhorrent to the Catholic Church."[49] Other

[44] The term "culture of management" has been used by Josep DiNoia to refer to the business-oriented, secularist, and empirical way of thinking associated with management science. See Josep. A. DiNoia, "Communion and Magisterium: Teaching Authority and the Culture of Grace," *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (October 1993): 404.

[45] Stephen Pattison, *The Faith of the Managers: When Management Becomes Religion* (London: Continuum International Publishing, 1997).

[46] Ibid., 160-161.

[47] Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management," 32-33.

[48] Ibid., 32.

[49] Michael A. Zigarelli, "Catholic Social Teaching and the Employment Relationship: A Model for Managing Human Resources in Accordance with Vatican Doctrine," *Journal of Business Ethics* 12, no. 1 (Jan 1993): 76.

pastoral management materials show a similar tendency of objectifying and manipulating people, offering advice on "optimizing your staff" or motivating people through psychological strategies such as by leveraging on whether they are "achievement-type", "affiliation-type" or "influence-type".[50] It is not hard to see that the latter amounts to controlling people through their emotional hungers.

In this light, Alasdair MacIntyre is quite justified in critiquing management to be all about manipulation and a masquerade for social control.[51] Similarly, Roberts notes that adoption of the managerial culture has led to the Church of England's hierarchy extending its power and control. Under such control, all members of the Church are held up to a "performative absolute" determined by an "enforceable mission statement," to which they must demonstrate not only "conformity of mind" but, more disturbingly, conformity of "the soul".[52] Catholic theologian Neil Ormerod rightly stresses that this "reduction of the human person to an object of manipulation is simply not congruent with the Christian vision of human beings, and has no place in the life of the Church."[53] Unfortunately, some of the Catholic pastoral literature not only emphasize control but even demonstrate a combative stance against detractors. One author recommends a particular change management tool from organizational science and highlights that this tool would result in better control, even adding that "this control also has another important function. It ensures that any problem-people will be contained."[54] Those who hold different views are described as having "obstructive plans, malicious intentions, or even malignant designs."[55] Such examples in the pastoral literature illustrate Pattison's observation that the managerial culture emphasizes boundaries and exclusions, among which is the tendency to over-idealize one's own agenda, and demonize competitors or detractors.[56] This surely goes against the Church's Gospel values.

A factor that compounds the conflict in values is that many secular management ideas have acquired a semi-normative quality in contemporary society, and are thus largely unchallenged. For example, pastoral management authors frequently advise that establishing

---

[50] Robert Stagg, "Pastoral Leadership," in Holmes, *Pastor's Toolbox*, 27; Forster and Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish*, 198-199.

[51] Alasdair MacIntyre, *After Virtue* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984), 74-75.

[52] Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*, 165-176, at 177 and 175.

[53] Neil Ormerod, "The Evangelising Diocese: A Response to Martin Teulan," *Australasian Catholic Record* 80, no. 1 (2003): 68.

[54] David Heney, *Motivating Your Parish to Change: Concrete Leadership Strategies for Pastors, Administrators and Lay Leaders* (San Jose, CA: Resource Publications, 1998), 12.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 91-92.

comprehensive internal control systems in church organizations are essential to proving one's integrity and that "checks and balances protect everyone."[57] Though these are common refrains in a contemporary fraud-wary business climate, one needs to question the kind of relationships and community these refrains ultimately shape. Likewise, another author exhorts church organizations to have a "digital strategy" to compete for people's attention in the "digital age" but does not question the very logic of the digital age in the first place, and whether it might be resonant with the logic of the Kingdom of God.[58]

Uncritical adoption of management science in the Church also has the effect of marginalizing theological views of the Church's mission and goals. For example, James Mallon, author of a popular work, *Divine Renovation: From a Maintenance to a Missional Parish,* and its accompanying guide, *Divine Renovation Guidebook,* exhorts parish priests to define their own vision through advice like "as you think about the future of your parish, what kind of parish would it have to be to make you passionate about it? What is the picture of the future that makes your heart beat faster and keeps you up at night, not with worry, but with excitement?"[59] Such advice reflects leader-centric visioning exercises in secular management theories, while neglecting normative principles for a parish's mission in the Church's tradition. In contrast, scripture scholar Donald Senior stresses that the mission of Christ must always form the basis of any ecclesial goal.[60] In addition, the tendency of management theories to over-emphasize task accomplishment also causes the Church's goals to be lost from view. Mark Fischer points out how the application of situational leadership theories from management science causes pastoral workers to focus on task achievement at the expense of deeper religious goals such as spiritual growth and communion, which the tasks were originally meant to serve in the first place.[61]

A further distortion is in terms of the *type* of goals and objectives. Michael Budde highlights that the managerial culture prioritizes growth, productivity, profit, efficiency, and competitiveness as desired ends in themselves, which then gradually become entrenched "affectations".[62] Frank observes that there has been a crossover of the "mentality of success"

---

[57] Michael Brough, "Standards for Excellence," in Holmes, *Toolbox*, 118.

[58] David Bourgeois, *Ministry in the Digital Age: Strategies and Best Practices for a Post-Website World* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013), 9.

[59] James Mallon, *Divine Renovation Guidebook: A Step-by-Step Manual for Transforming Your Parish* (Toronto: Novalis, 2016), 12.

[60] Donald Senior, *The Gift of Administration: New Testament Foundations for the Vocation of Administrative Service* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2016), 45-52.

[61] Mark F. Fischer, "Parish Councils: Why Good Delegators Don't Always Make Good Leaders," *Today's Parish* (March 1997): 27-30.

[62] Budde, "Rational Shepherd," 102.

from the corporate business world into Christian churches, noting that it is a mentality which greatly values quantitative increase in church membership, activities, publicity, and financial investments.[63] This tendency is evident in the Catholic pastoral management literature. For example, White and Corcoran assert that "God's will is growth" and if a church is not growing in numbers, it needs to re-examine its fidelity, change its direction, discern God's will, and re-strategize.[64] The authors seem to give no regard for less tangible goals and values which a church community, such as one coping with severe religious persecution, might be upholding very fruitfully despite its apparent limitation in size. Frank rightly cautions that "larger assemblies of people are not inherently good, however, particularly if the narrative that attracts people (especially a faux-gospel of prosperity and social mobility) has little to do with the narrative of Jesus Christ."[65] Likewise, Ormerod expounds on the multi-dimensional nature of the Church's mission and points out that it cannot be simplistically reduced to a matter of numbers of the converted.[66] To this, Inagrace Dietterich stresses that "it is the active rule and the eschatological mission of God—the Kingdom of God—rather than institutional survival or efficiency or even societal service, which provides the criteria for church management."[67]

Unfortunately, a singular focus on quantitative growth seems to prevail in the pastoral management materials. In a recent work, one author even explicitly applies financial investment logic to parish revitalisation. Citing research which indicates that only 18% of US Catholics are actively engaged in the parish, he exhorts pastors to concentrate all their efforts towards bringing in the next—and somewhat imaginary—18% since "a small outlay can yield a large return" and this will "immediately double the numbers".[68] He adds that "the trick is to stay away from the 'too hard' box."[69] Countering such views, Budde more rightly points out the apparent irrationality of the Divine Shepherd who leaves behind the ninety-nine sheep to pursue the single lost one. He pointedly asks: "does the church redefine 'rationality' in ways consonant with this good and generous Shepherd, or does the rationality of modernity redefine the gospel in ways more conducive to itself?"[70] These observations about values and goals in the pastoral

[63] Frank, "Leadership and Administration," 118.

[64] White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 28.

[65] Frank, "Leadership and Administration," 120.

[66] Ormerod, "Evangelising Diocese," 62-65.

[67] Inagrace T. Dietterich, "A Particular People: Towards a Faithful and Effective Ecclesiology," *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (1993): 365.

[68] William E. Simon, *Great Catholic Parishes: A Living Mosaic - How Four Essential Practices Make Them Thrive* (Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2016), 84.

[69] Ibid., 85.

[70] Budde, "Rational Shepherd," 101.

literature seem to have been overlooked by Robin Gill in his insistence that management theories are merely "techniques and not ideology".[71] Pattison more rightly points out that since management ideas and methods have moral roots and consequences, it is important to recognize them so that they can be "oriented towards human well-being."[72]

1.6.2 Conflicts in ecclesiology

A second set of problems in applying management science directly in church ministry is its conflict with the Catholic Church's ecclesiological tradition. The management field's genesis in the for-profit sector has resulted in a range of constitutive topics that are essentially business-oriented. This same range of topics tends to be mirrored in the church management materials, thus shaping a view of the Church that is more akin to a business enterprise. Reflecting this tendency, the NLRCM provides a "Standards for Excellence" program that promotes a set of best practices for church entities. However, these standards were based on a US code of excellence for secular nonprofit organizations, as the starting point.[73] Such codes are commonly adapted from the corporate business sector. Consequently, the prominent emphasis given to administrative systems and internal controls in the NLRCM standards begs the question of whether, in content and not just in language, they are anchored more to a corporate business paradigm than to ecclesiology.

Earlier in this chapter, the frequent use of a marketing and customer service approach in the pastoral literature has been noted. Theologian Philip Kenneson criticized this tendency in the early 1990s by pointing out that such paradigms erroneously reinforce a producer-consumer relationship in the Church.[74] He adds that they erode and eventually displace more theologically-correct models of the Church as a community of disciples co-responsible for mission. Moreover, the secular management notions of marketing, customer satisfaction, and service quality have the tendency to distort and reduce a person's sense of identity towards that of a consumer, whose demands are to be indulged at all costs. At the same time, the Church's identity is reduced to that of a mere instrument to serve people's felt needs. Furthermore, the adoption of a marketing paradigm wrongly reinforces measurable targets, self-interest, and a competitive relationship between churches.[75] Unfortunately, the marketing paradigm has

[71] Robin Gill, "Values and Church Management," in *Moral Leadership in a Postmodern Age* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 112.

[72] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 3.

[73] Brough, "Standards for Excellence," 114.

[74] Philip D. Kenneson, "Selling (out) the Church in the Marketplace of Desire," *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (Oct 1993): 327.

[75] Ibid., 335-341.

become even more pervasive in recent times. Pastor-author David Heney asserts that "we are competing as well in a religiously pluralistic society … so we need to be organized just as well as a business to succeed."[76] In such a view, the Church is reduced to a commercial business entity that needs to compete for religious consumers. Another author even declares the term "evangelization" to be inter-changeable with "marketing" and recommends that parishes adopt a marketing approach in order "to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objectives."[77] These recommendations continue to reinforce a self-interested and transactional mode of relationships in ecclesial life and beyond. A related problem with the marketing approach is that the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the Catholic Church is often reduced to a somewhat consumeristic notion of "the Sunday Experience".[78] Consequently, the refrain that striving for excellence in "hymns, homilies and hospitality" is key to the perfect Sunday experience is widely repeated in the pastoral literature.[79] However, such a view seems more congenial with the notion of entertainment than with the Eucharistic celebration.

Besides the marketing model, the pastoral literature contain many other examples in which the influence of certain aspects of management thought, such as an overly-legalist and contractual approach to staff and volunteers, causes a distortion in the view of the Church especially in terms of the nature of relationships in the ecclesial community. For instance, recommendations on personnel supervision and evaluation often emphasize formal surveillance, legalistic appraisals, and tight controls.[80] With regard to parishioners, one author echoes the business language and paradigm of shareholder investments by declaring that "the faithful are financial and spiritual investors and entitled to expect that the church will do as it preaches and exercise good stewardship over these gifts."[81] Here, the faithful are reduced to being "investors" (notably, "financial" comes before "spiritual") and the church (presumably the pastor and staff) owes them an "entitled" return on their investment. Another author, in applying popular management ideas about vision, leadership, and communication, advises that a parish priest should "gather people around" him for his vision and "win parishioners over to a particular direction" through his homilies.[82] Pattison has rightly criticized this conventional

[76] Heney, *Motivating Your Parish to Change*, ix.

[77] Clements, *Stewardship*, 125-6.

[78] For example, see Simon, *Great Catholic Parishes*, 124.

[79] See Ibid., 125; and Mallon, *Divine Renovation Guidebook*, 126.

[80] For example, see William J. Jarema, *A Survival Guide for Church Ministers* (New York: Paulist Press, 2011), 112-117.

[81] Justin Green, "Neither Fish Nor Fowl: Performance Evaluation of Deacons," in Zech, *Best Practices in Catholic Church Ministry Performance Management*, 115.

[82] Mallon, *Divine Renovation Guidebook*, 12 and 126.

management approach to goal-setting for being top-down and suppressive of the initiative of organizational members.[83] From the perspective of Catholic ecclesiology, Clare Watkins highlights that more theologically-grounded perspectives of ecclesial life call for meaningful participation, since all are equally responsible for mission and for being channels of the Holy Spirit.[84] Earlier in this chapter, I have also pointed out how descriptions of group dynamics and recommendations for decision-making processes based solely on secular organizational science paradigms are ultimately reductionist in their view of the Church. Joseph DiNoia rightly stresses that although the Church has the visible form of a social community, "the triune God who is its source and focus is understood both to transcend and to encompass the social realities of the community".[85] Hence, "ecclesial structures already embody a 'supernaturalised' level of human existence", a "participation in the divine life of trinitarian communion."[86] This spiritual dimension of the Church's reality is contravened by the reductionist tendency of management science.

With regard to the clergy in particular, a management lens has often been inappropriately applied.[87] In the Church of England, theologian Stephen Pickard has observed that ambiguities in identity and role among members of the episcopate in the Church of England have led to a turn towards the more tangible managerial paradigm. This not only conflicts with the episcopal vow but also postpones real efforts to rediscover the episcopal identity and function.[88] Following Roberts, I would add that the adoption of a managerial paradigm with its "right to rule" exacerbates the problem of clericalism that the Catholic Church is already struggling to address.[89] On the other extreme, some of the pastoral literature advocate that parish priests should be relieved from the "temporal or business side of running a parish", and that such work should be parcelled out to an administrator.[90] Such advice appear to be based solely on objectives such as being "more efficient" and placing "less burden" on priests.[91] However, it

[83] Stephen Pattison, "Some Objections to Aims and Objectives," in *The Challenge of Practical Theology: Selected Essays* (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2007), 96.

[84] Clare Watkins, "The Church as a 'Special' Case: Comments from Ecclesiology Concerning the Management of the Church," *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (1993): 378-382.

[85] DiNoia, "Communion and Magisterium," 405.

[86] Ibid., 404-405.

[87] For example, see Robert Kress, "The Priest-Pastor as CEO," *America*, March 11, 2002.

[88] Stephen Pickard, *Theological Foundations for Collaborative Ministry* (Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009), 182.

[89] Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*, 168. On the problem of clericalism in the Catholic Church, see Francis X. Rocca, "We Don't Need Bishops Who Are Like Corporate Managers, Says Francis," *Catholic Herald*, February 28, 2014.

[90] Charles E. Zech, *Catholic Parishes of the 21st Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 61.

[91] Ibid., 63.

can be argued that administrative work should not be simply removed from priests just because they are not trained and "find little personal satisfaction" in it.[92] Besides the potential conflict with theological and canonical perspectives on the role of parish priests, this resort to a "more efficient" solution postpones the challenging but necessary work of confronting and growing through tensions faced in administration and in working with staff, volunteers, and other people. Hence, a balance between excessive managerialism and total avoidance of administrative work needs to be found.

1.6.3 Conflicts in worldview

A third set of conflicts between the managerial culture and the Church arises from their differing worldviews. In terms of anthropology, Pattison points out management science's fragmented and reductionist view of human beings.[93] Such reductionist perspectives of the human person contradict the theological anthropology of the Catholic faith tradition, which highlights the dignity, complexity, and mystery of the human person. Budde further adds that the managerial culture's assumption of the human person as self-interested, untrustworthy, and endlessly acquisitive, tends to be self-fulling.[94] Yet these assumptions are found in the Catholic pastoral literature. Patrick Lencioni writes that "team members naturally tend to put their own needs (ego, career development, recognition, etc.) ahead of the collective goals of the team when individuals aren't held accountable."[95] This reductionist view of the human person is further reflected in one of his tools for team-building, which simply categorises people according to the simple parameters of a two-by-two matrix.[96] Similarly, White and Corcoran propose a binary way of viewing all persons as either "church people" or "lost people", and apply this as a basis for formulating parish outreach strategies.[97]

Another conflict in worldview is associated with the managerial culture's emphasis on the notion of technique. Ormerod cautions that "a managerial ideology promises" its followers "quick and easy solutions".[98] Likewise, Pattison points out that management science harbors an over-optimism about being able to resolve problems and shape the future by simply applying

---

[92] Ibid., 66.

[93] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 93-94.

[94] Budde, "Rational Shepherd," 104.

[95] Patrick Lencioni, "Overcome Team Dysfunction," accessed May 1, 2017, https://amazingparish.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Overcome-Team-Dysfunction.pdf.

[96] Patrick Lencioni, "A Real Leadership Team: Working Styles," accessed May 1, 2017, https://amazingparish.org/category/conference-videos/.

[97] White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 51 and 67.

[98] Ormerod, "Evangelising Diocese," 69.

the right technique.[99] Whether it is motivating people, getting more resources, or turning an organization around, all it takes is to know which management tool would work for the situation, apply it, and the results seem guaranteed. This stance has been pervasive in the Catholic pastoral literature. In the early 1980s, one author declared unreservedly that "like a lesson from a sports pro, once the best techniques are known, the pitfalls can be avoided, the 'secrets' can be practiced, and the game improved."[100] More recently, Lencioni advocates his "proven model" for parish leadership and describes it as "tried and true methods to achieve organizational health and effective leadership," adding that "the true measure of a great team is that it accomplishes the results it sets out to achieve."[101] Similarly, Heney asserts that leadership principles from religious history "can predict success for our own time" and that good leaders have certain characteristics that "ensure success".[102] He even adds that "fortunately, these traits are clearly recognizable and, best of all, fairly easily learned. The good news is that we can study and learn them and quickly see good results. Jesus spent his ministry teaching the apostles these very ideas."[103]

These unrealistic assumptions about technique, results, and control of outcomes in turn reinforce a paradigm of omnipotence regarding the manager and the exercise of management. One author in the pastoral literature maintains that "any organization, whether a parish, a Church agency, a doctor's office, or a nation, succeeds or fails based on the actions of management" and where there is success, it is because "someone worked hard to bring those components together at just the right moments."[104] Similarly, White and Corcoran declare that "everything rises or falls on leadership."[105] Over-confidence in technique has also led to the pastoral literature adopting the language of "best practices", "excellence", "successful parishes", and promoting the notion of standards and benchmarks.[106] In the early-1990s, pastor-author Patrick Brennan advocated a benchmarking process in which a parish should identify,

[99] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 38.

[100] Williams, *Improving Parish Management*, 6.

[101] Patirck Lencioni, "Our Model," accessed May 1, 2017, https://amazingparish.org/get-started/#blocks; and Lencioni, "Overcome Team Dysfunction," 19.

[102] Heney, *Motivating Your Parish to Change*, ix and 1.

[103] Ibid., 2.

[104] Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management," 28 and 24.

[105] White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 242.

[106] For example, see Paul Wilkes, *Excellent Catholic Parishes: The Guide to Best Places and Practices* (New York: Paulist Press, 2001); Thomas Sweetser, *Successful Parishes: How They Meet the Challenge of Change* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1983).

study, and copy successful aspects of other parishes.[107] More recently, Michael Castrilli offers a "step-by-step" parish procurement process whereby the following of its prescribed steps would "ensure that the right company, individual or product was purchased."[108]

In contrast, theologians and philosophers have weighed in on such over-confidence about technique and control, and its underlying worldview. Pattison describes it as "unproven and unprovable faith assumptions about reality", and cautions against idealized and unrealistic notions of excellence and perfection.[109] He points out that "the implicit 'theology' of management is wildly over-optimistic, narrow, Pelagian and utopian" and "trivializing and unrealistic about the nature and pluriformity of human beings and human endeavour as well as about the chaotic nature of the world."[110] Management theory also tends to have a fragmented approach to reality, as can be seen in Brennan's proposal on benchmarking. It is doubtful whether a parish community can indeed be dissected into distinct aspects, with those apparently successful aspects systematically modelled by another parish. From the faith perspective, Watkins highlights that the limitations of human sinfulness and the presence of divine action render human history more complex than the management field would like to admit.[111] MacIntyre even asserts that the idea of managerial effectiveness is itself a myth, since many events are beyond the control of a manager, and it is often difficult to establish causality.[112] Adding an important perspective from the faith tradition, Mark Chater highlights that Christianity is about the mystery of the cross, whereby suffering and failure are inevitable elements in the journey.[113] These views counter the anthropocentric and temporal stance of management thought, which tends to place a disproportionate emphasis on human ability, and preclude the religious and spiritual horizon. Cautioning against over-reliance on performance benchmarks and standardisation, Roberts further points out that these destroy human reflexivity, critical reflection, individuality, and the sacred.[114]

These perspectives have yet to be taken more fully into account in the pastoral literature. Moreover, the Pelagian and utopian influence of management thought is further exacerbated by

---

[107] Patrick J. Brennan, *Parishes that Excel: Models of Excellence in Education, Ministry, and Evangelization* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 120-121.

[108] Michael J. Castrilli, "Contractor/Vendor Selection Made Simple for Parish Managers," *Villanova Newsletter*, Spring 2016.

[109] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 28, 74-84.

[110] Ibid., 162.

[111] Watkins, "The Church as a 'Special' Case," 380-382.

[112] MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 74-76.

[113] Mark Chater, "Theology and Management," *Modern Believing* 40, no. 4 (1999): 68.

[114] Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*, 177-178.

a rhetoric of crisis that often accompanies the application of management in the Church. For instance, in a prominent article, Frederick Gluck observes that the US Catholic Church is facing "the greatest crisis in its history."[115] Attributing this crisis to a declining relevance of the Church, he goes on to prescribe "the absolute necessity of adopting modern management methods."[116] Similarly, others advocating a more business-style approach to pastoral management typically speak of "these days of increasingly scarce resources and rapid change of the rules of organization and communication", which thus require "transparency and new skills."[117] Without any attempt to unpack these statements and examine their assumptions, it is often hastily advocated that adopting business management practices is the best solution for the Church. Such tendencies are further fuelled by the popularity of what Frank calls the "heroic stories" of evangelical mega-churches led by pioneering pastors, whose narratives are often dominated by the enterprising business-style approach.[118] Catholic pastoral literature aimed at revitalising parish life is particularly influenced by these mega-church models, and often make explicit references to them.[119] In such Catholic pastoral literature, the manifestation of the managerial culture is not so much in terms of explicit technical advice for various administrative aspects of ministry but in terms of an implicit overall approach of 'managing success'. The more subtle but seductive nature of this approach calls for greater caution. Moreover, the rhetoric of crisis in the Catholic pastoral literature should also be met with Pattison's assertion that whilst management thinking tends to focus too much on the future and on remedying the present, there is also a need to pay attention to and appreciate both the present and the past.[120] Most importantly, Archbishop Diarmuid Martin of Dublin highlights that "the Church can benefit from appropriate management structures, but renewal will always be the work of prophets rather than management consultants."[121] The turn to management as the panacea to a perceived crisis in the Church wrongly avoids the necessary challenge of dealing prophetically with deeper pastoral and spiritual issues. Ormerod rightly cautions that when these more difficult questions of cultural values are overlooked in the name of practical exigencies, a community puts itself on the path of what Lonergan calls "the longer cycle of decline."[122]

---

[115] Gluck, "Crisis Management in the Church."

[116] Ibid.

[117] Gulio Carpi, cited in "School of Pastoral Management at the Lateran Pontifical University," *Angenzia Info Salesiana*, November13, 2014.

[118] Frank, "Leadership and Administration," 118.

[119] For example, see White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 25-34; and Mallon, *Divine Renovation Guidebook*, 151, 215.

[120] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 70.

[121] Martin, "The Future of the Catholic Church in Ireland."

[122] Ormerod, "Evangelising Diocese," 69.

Finally, closely associated with the anthropocentric, technical, and temporal focus of the pastoral literature is a tendency towards empiricism, with the consequent emphasis on physical and measurable indicators. The popular secular management tool of "SMART" (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant/realistic, timely) targets is often recommended.[123] Emphasizing empirical evidence in evaluation, one author highlights that "there is no more reliable and effective a tool than performance indicators. They allow you to honestly and accurately say, 'This is how well, or poorly, I'm doing'."[124] Another advocates that "one of the physical manifestations of good management is a highly visible series of graphs somewhere near or within an administrator's desk" and "these graphs should represent the parish's KPIs [key performance indicators]."[125] Invariably, numerical growth in mass attendance is included among such "KPIs".[126] Zech similarly recommends that parish planning must include "developing metrics to quantify parish activities" such as "counting participants" since without such metrics, it would be impossible to know impact, effectiveness, accomplishment, or to allocate resources.[127] Such an empiricist stance is also demonstrated by a management consultant who, when giving a recent update on the reform of the Catholic Church's Roman Curia, reports that "the first balance sheet that was published and provided to the public and the regulators, first ever, was in July of 2014. That's a landmark. It means that these reforms are real."[128] Pattison rightly criticizes the management culture for its pervading principle that only the empirical, measurable, and quantifiable are real and worthwhile.[129] Watkins further points out that in the Church context, management goals are merely partially indicative of the greater eschatological goal, which is neither fully perceivable nor achievable within history.[130] Pope Francis sums it up best by emphasizing that:

> This fruitfulness is often invisible, elusive and unquantifiable … Mission is not like a business transaction or investment, or even a humanitarian activity. It is not a show where we count how many people come as a result of our publicity; it is something much deeper, which escapes all measurement.[131]

---

[123] For example, see Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management," 27.

[124] Brough, "Standards for Excellence," 113.

[125] Larry W. Boone, "Evaluating Parish Performance," in McKenna, *Catholic Church Management*, 147, 154.

[126] Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management," 33.

[127] Zech, *Catholic Parishes of the 21st Century*, 59-60.

[128] Elizabeth McCaul, "From the Vatican to Washington, DC: A Commitment to Best Managerial Practices and Financial Accountability," in Brough and Ferguson, *The Francis Effect*, 33.

[129] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 94-96.

[130] Watkins, "The Church as a 'Special' Case," 380-381.

[131] Pope Francis, *Evangelii Gaudium, Apostolic Exhortation on the Proclamation of the Gospel in Today's World* (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2013), para. 279.

1.7 Factors underpinning the uncritical adoption of management thought

The uncritical adoption of management thought in the pastoral literature over the decades is most likely due in part to the pervasiveness of the management culture in society as a whole. Roberts notes that modern management ideas have become so entrenched in contemporary culture that anyone who rejects them is accused of being against accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness.[132] Budde further observes that the strong influence of management thought stems from "the broader formative processes of capitalism", which constitutes "a larger cultural ecology that shapes desires, affections and dispositions in deep and far-reaching ways."[133] Consequently, business management trends in each milieu have found their way into the pastoral literature, whether deliberately or not. For instance, the ideas from a highly influential work published in the early 1980s, *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies* by Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, were often explicitly promoted by pastoral management authors throughout the 1980s and 1990s.[134] As noted above, the language and notion of "excellence" has prevailed even till now. Authors who do not apply any management theory explicitly, as in the case of those who fall under Boff's category of empiricism, nevertheless reflect contemporary management thinking in their pastoral advice. For example, in a recent work, one pastor-author shares advice from his personal experience of recruiting parish staff, and initially points out that "first and foremost, they have to like and have a caring attitude toward people."[135] However, he adds that "the second thing I look for is work ethic. They have to work hard … a lot of people on our staff put in big hours. They work weekends, they work evenings."[136] It is not hard to recognize in this statement the influence of the so-called "work ethic" of the modern management culture, with its excessive demands on workers, and the consequent lack of work-life balance.

Another reason for the uncritical adoption of management thought in the pastoral literature is the misconception about management science as a means to an end. In the words of one author, "all of the techniques of management are as applicable to the church organization as they are to a business enterprise. Only the objectives differ."[137] However, as shown above,

---

[132] Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*, 172.

[133] Budde, "Rational Shepherd," 106.

[134] Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1982). See Patrick J. Brennan, *Re-Imagining the Parish* (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 76-77; and Robert G. Duch, *Successful Parish Leadership: Nurturing the Animated Parish* (Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 169-175.

[135] Stagg, "Pastoral Leadership," 27.

[136] Ibid.

[137] Williams, *Improving Parish Management*, 2.

this is a mistaken view. Management theories not only distort the Church's ends but also promote means that are contrary to these ends. In fact, more than being just a means to an end, management thought has an inherent mechanism to perpetuate itself. A management expert writing in the pastoral literature advocates that, in order to stay useful, management must continually create new goals once existing goals are achieved, and that "the challenge is to ensure that the new goal is as motivating and important as the one just achieved … to maintain the momentum of success".[138] This raises the question of whether management is merely a means to serve a goal, or whether the goals are at the service of management, to legitimise managers and maintain their power. One is reminded of Roberts' critique of the managerial culture in perpetuating the right to rule.

The misunderstanding about management science as a means to an end is exacerbated by an equally inadequate understanding of ecclesiology. This has also persisted in the pastoral materials over the decades. One author of an earlier work asserted that when it comes to administrative decision-making in the Church, "we are not talking about faith and morals. We are talking about the temporal concern of the Church … We are examining the human institution of the Church, not the divine institution … it is the human side of the Church to which this book addresses itself."[139] More recently, experts at the NLRCM insist that "their mission is to offer only management, not theological advice."[140] However, this dichotomy between church management on the one hand, and theology, faith, and morals on the other hand, betrays a dualistic view of the Church. The Second Vatican Council rightly sought to counter such dualism by emphasizing that "the earthly church" and the "spiritual community" are "not to be thought of as two realities … they form one complex reality comprising a human and a divine element."[141] Watkins highlights the Council's teaching on the nature of the Church as a sacrament and points out that even the Church's management actions, done through pastoral workers, should be sacramental.[142] Echoing this, Dietterich stresses that management practices must "incarnate the distinctive social reality of the Kingdom of God".[143] Likewise, Budde highlights that the Church should be prophetic in its management rather than assume the

[138] Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management," 26.

[139] Duch, *Successful Parish Leadership,* 18, 22-23.

[140] Hannum, "Parishes that Work," 14.

[141] Vatican II Council, *Lumen Gentium, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, par. 8, in *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations. A Completely Revised Translation in Inclusive Language,* ed. A. Flannery (Northport, NY: Costello, 1996), 9. All references to Vatican II documents in this thesis will be based on this translation.

[142] Watkins, "Church as a 'Special' Case," 376-378.

[143] Dietterich, "A Particular People," 365.

world's way of managing.[144] Hence, contrary to the pastoral authors cited above, church management has everything to do with theology, faith, and morals.

1.8 Debates on engagement with the social sciences

Given the conflicts between secular management thought and the Church, should theology and pastoral ministry engage with management science at all? Does the notion of management have a legitimate place within Catholic ecclesiology in the first place? Indeed, the interaction of theology with the social sciences has been a subject of much debate. There are those who univocally reject any such interaction. For them, the uniqueness of the Church as an institution of divine revelation, as well as the radically fallen nature of humans, preclude any legitimate theological reflection that incorporates the secular sciences. Boff has classified this approach as "methodological purism".[145] The position of Karl Barth is typically associated with this view.[146] Taking it further, Milbank espouses an even more denunciating posture against the social sciences, holding that these disciplines seek to curtail religion in their very genesis.[147] With regard to management science in particular, Milbank denies the possibility of "ethical management" because "'management' cannot be ethicised, since the term denotes merely the meaningless but efficient manipulations which are all that is left to do with things once they have been de-sacramentalized."[148] For Milbank, apart from "the logic of ecclesiology", no other basis for human society can be regarded as fully legitimate.[149] Such a stance is classified by Boff as "theologism", whereby theology even takes over the role of the social sciences and supplies all that is needed for social reflection.[150] As for MacIntyre, his critique regarding the myth of managerial control has been noted earlier. In his view, "such expertise does indeed turn out to be one more moral fiction, because the kind of knowledge which would be required to sustain it does not exist."[151]

My position stands in contrast to these views. Theology and pastoral ministry have not been able to do without utilizing the thought-systems and insights from various domains of

---

[144] Budde, "Rational Shepherd," 112-113.

[145] Boff, *Theology and Praxis*, 24.

[146] See Neil Ormerod, *Re-visioning the Church: An Experiment in Systematic-Historical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014), 33; and Watkins, "The Church as a 'Special' Case," 371-373.

[147] Milbank's position has been discussed in several works such as Ormerod, *Re-visioning*, 55-58; and Robin Gill, ed., *Theology and Sociology: A Reader* (London: Cassell, 1996), 429-470.

[148] John Milbank, "Stale Expressions: The Management-Shaped Church," *Studies in Christian Ethics* 21, no. 1 (April 2008): 128.

[149] Ibid., 125.

[150] Boff, *Theology and Praxis,* 26.

[151] MacIntyre, *After Virtue*, 75.

human culture. Robert Doran rightly points out the "one real world" in which both theology and the secular sciences carry out their tasks, such that there is not really a "pure form" of either science.[152] Examples from both theology and management well-illustrate this point. In theology, one need look no further than Scripture and the doctrines of the early church fathers for concepts such as person, family, shepherd, and kingdom, borrowed from philosophy and from social, economic, and political spheres of life. Similarly, in management, concepts such as "charisma" have been traced to religious roots.[153] Echoing this, Karl Rahner observes that "because of the unity of human consciousness, all sciences depend on one another, whether consciously or not."[154] In any case, pastoral workers would not be sufficiently equipped for their responsibilities if their knowledge was limited to the field of theology. Lonergan rightly counters the theologism of Milbank by highlighting that the Church needs "to recognize that theology is not the full science of man, that theology illuminates only certain aspects of human reality, that the church can become a fully conscious process of self-constitution only when theology unites itself with all other relevant branches of human studies."[155] More recently, Francis Schussler Fiorenza highlights the importance of "background theories", including the human sciences, for theological method.[156]

These views align with the official teaching of the Catholic Church. The Second Vatican Council's *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the World Today, Gaudium et Spes* (hereafter GS) acknowledges that

> by the very nature of creation, material being is endowed with its own stability, truth and excellence, its own order and laws … Consequently, methodical research in all branches of knowledge, provided it is carried out in a truly scientific manner and does not override moral laws, can never conflict with the faith, because the things of the world and the things of faith derive from the same God. The humble and persevering investigators of the secrets of nature are being led as it were, by the hand of God, even unawares, for it is God, the conserver of all things, who made them what they are (GS 36) … The Church is not unaware how much it has profited from the history and development of humankind. It profits from the experience of past ages, from the progress of the sciences, and from the riches hidden in various cultures, through which greater light is thrown on human nature and new avenues to truth are opened up (GS 44).

[152] Robert Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 454.

[153] Bent Meier Sørensen et al., "Theology and Organization," *Organization* 19, no. 3 (2012): 275.

[154] Karl Rahner, "Theology," in Karl Rahner, ed., *Sacramentum Mundi* 6 (New York: Herder & Herder, 1970), 234, cited in Gerald O'Collins, *Fundamental Theology* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1982), 13.

[155] Bernard J. F, Lonergan, *Method in Theology* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1972), 364.

[156] Francis Schussler Fiorenza, "Systematic Theology: Task and Methods," in *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Perspectives*, 2nd ed., eds. Francis Schussler Fiorenza and John P. Galvin (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011), 89-91.

More recently, the International Theological Commission (hereafter ITC) of the Catholic Church highlights that

> since ancient times, theology has worked in partnership with philosophy. While this partnership remains fundamental, in modern times further partners for theology have been found … Systematic, fundamental and moral theology have all benefited from an engagement with natural, economic and medical sciences. Practical theology has profited from the encounter with sociology, psychology and pedagogy.[157]

In my view, the field of management studies counts as a legitimate addition to this list of "partners for theology". Contrary to the critique of MacIntyre, Roberts more rightly points out that the social sciences "address the human condition in exploratory and interpretive terms."[158] No doubt managerial effectiveness can never be proven unequivocally but neither can many theories of psychology or pedagogy. As a potentially fruitful partner of theology, the contribution of management science lies in its role of enabling humankind to think more systematically about human work and human organizations, and to take coordinated action towards a goal.

In the ecclesial context, several theologians have rightly affirmed the legitimate place of management. Watkins draws upon the perspectives of Rahner and Dietrich Bonhoeffer to emphasize the sacramental nature of the Church and its embeddedness in human history. Pointing out that this view has been "particularly influential in modern Roman Catholic ecclesiology," and echoing the teachings of Vatican II particularly in LG, she remarks that

> such a position stresses the importance of the empirical Church, making it a subject proper to theology, and, at the same time, makes inescapable the peculiar, 'otherness' of this institution. Not only that, but this otherness is not just to be located in a theological or spiritual realm, but is inextricably bound up in the very humanity of the Church… [Hence] even as a sacrament, the church needs managing.[159]

Similarly, Senior argues against those who deny the Church's institutional dimension, and highlights scriptural bases for the rightful place of administrative functions in ecclesial life, especially in light of the incarnation.[160] Vatican II has also acknowledged that "the church has a visible social structure" and "as such it can be enriched" by contributions to "the development

---

[157] International Theological Commission, *Theology Today: Perspectives, Principles and Criteria* (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2012), par. 81.

[158] Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*, 206.

[159] Clare Watkins, "The Church as a "Special" Case," 376-378. Watkins does not formally define "managing" in this article but associates it with "decision-making processes and governmental practices." See ibid., 369.

[160] Senior, *Gift of Administration*, 1-22.

of the human community on the level of family, culture, economic and social life, and national and international politics" (GS 44).

Resonating with these views, this thesis holds that management is integral to the life and mission of the Church, and that the Church can potentially be "enriched" by contributions from management science. In fact, it can be seen that pastoral resources which have adopted the approaches of either methodological purity or theologism could have been improved by incorporating relevant management theories. For example, in *Making Parish Councils Pastoral*, Fischer draws on documents from the magisterium of the Catholic Church to highlight norms for parish councils.[161] This parish guidebook would have been more beneficial for pastoral workers if practical insights from the management field on consultation, planning, coordinating resources, and facilitating collaboration were incorporated. Similarly, criticism has been levied against those works which provide management advice that have been formulated solely out of Catholic social teaching because such advice tends to be too general, and takes insufficient account of practical realities.[162]

Since theology and pastoral ministry can and should engage with management science, how should they do so? Regarding inter-disciplinary method, Ormerod has observed that many authors not only fail to clarify but even seem unaware of the implicit assumptions they are making.[163] As seen from the pastoral literature and methodological debates surveyed in this chapter, these implicit assumptions are ultimately about revelation, grace, nature, and the interaction of the human and divine elements of the Church. Such assumptions determine the resulting method with which one brings theology and the human sciences together. Echoing this, Watkins cautions that:

> the interdisciplinary theologian needs, then, to invest some energy in sorting out what exactly she is doing in using another discipline. Is it a matter of simple borrowing of terms and ideas? Or is it a matter of wholehearted adoption of another logic and language, in which theology proper, with its revelational and transcendent reference, becomes thoroughly immanent?[164]

This thesis has highlighted that neither "simple borrowing" of tools nor "wholehearted adoption" is appropriate in the approach by theology and pastoral ministry to management science, in view of the latter's conflicts with the faith tradition. The Second Vatican Council

[161] Mark F. Fischer, *Making Parish Councils Pastoral* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2010).

[162] See Robert Kennedy, "What Catholic Social Teaching can Learn from Business," in *Catholic Social Teaching and the Market Economy*, eds., Philip Booth and Samuel Gregg (London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 2007), 182-188.

[163] Ormerod, *Re-visioning*, 29.

[164] Clare Watkins, "Organizing the People of God: Social-Science Theories of Organization in Ecclesiology," *Theological Studies* 52 (1991): 710.

has rightly pointed out that the Church can benefit from "whoever contributes to the development of the human community" provided such contributions are "according to the plan of God" (GS 44). More precisely, the ITC stresses that even though avenues to truth are present in the secular sciences, a theological engagement is needed to "enhance that light and broaden those avenues."[165] This implies a critical evaluation and enhancement of the secular sciences in the light of theology. Yet it is not simply a matter of using a resource from the faith tradition as a normative principle to address gaps and shortcomings in a secular science, or to reorientate aspects of that science which conflict with the faith tradition. Even in the absence of such conflicts, Fiorenza rightly cautions that in using background theories, there is a need to recognize their historical quality. Since a background theory is often tied to culture and context, and thus marked by change, development, and plurality, it cannot be uncritically adopted to play a normative role.[166] The same can be said of resources from the faith tradition. Scripture and the teaching documents of the Church's magisterium, for example, are historically conditioned.

A further challenge is that of plurality. Management science is a particularly diverse field with many competing schools of thought. Ormerod has pointed out a similar situation with sociology, and cautions that without a critical approach in engaging with the secular science, the choice of which model to employ can become an arbitrary and biased one. This problem is exacerbated when the model is then used as normative, as each model can lead to very different and significant consequences.[167] This observation is indeed borne out in Catholic pastoral literature. For instance, in applying management theories on typologies of human organizations to the Church, one author employs a system of categorization comprising "factory", "family", "jungle", and "culture", while another adopts a classification comprising "staff", "team", and "community", and yet another uses a different list comprising "hierarchy", "trough", and "centrality".[168] Each author seems to favor, quite arbitrarily, a particular system of categorization as well as a specific model within that system, and applies it normatively, prescribing detailed management practices for the Church based on that model. As seen in the survey of the pastoral literature, resources from the faith tradition are similarly subject to arbitrary selection and uncritical or biased interpretations. In some cases, the selectivity even

[165] ITC, *Theology Today*, par. 56.

[166] Fiorenza, *Systematic Theology*, 89-91.

[167] Ormerod, *Re-visioning*, 37-42.

[168] Holmes, "Theology of Management," 15-16; James D. Whitehead and Evelyn E. Whitehead, *The Promise of Partnership: Leadership and Ministry in an Adult Church* (New York: Harper Collins, 1991), 51-62; and Robert R. Newsome, *The Ministering Parish: Methods and Procedures for Pastoral Organization* (New York: Paulist Press, 1982), 60-64.

reflects a thinly-veiled agenda. For example, one author advocates the adoption of a contemporary management approach in the Church since, in his view, such an approach is synonymous with empowerment. At the same time, he highlights the emphasis of the Second Vatican Council on participation and collegiality, while leaving out the Council's teaching on the hierarchy. The assertion is then made that these two sources corroborate and point to the need for greater democracy in the Church.[169] The author's selective view of contemporary management as empowering stands in contrast to the views of others such as Roberts, who associate the managerial culture with top-down authority and control. Similarly, the pastoral author's selective use and interpretation of church teachings is evident. Watkins counters such approaches to the faith tradition by stressing that

> before we can combine theories of organization and ecclesiology in a balanced and satisfying way, a good deal of straightforward ecclesiological work must be done. Only after developing our theological understanding of how the people of God is organized and explaining how our ecclesiology works in terms of power, the interaction of human and divine, the place of the individual and small groups—only then can we engage in detailed dialogue with social-science theories of organization.[170]

Other theologians similarly note that the Church's doctrinal heritage needs to be further developed and made more pastorally relevant.[171]

Doran has rightly highlighted that "tradition and situation are not foundations but sources of theology."[172] Elaborating on Doran's point, Ormerod emphasizes that "the tradition and the situation do not of themselves provide the criteria for selection in the process of correlation."[173] The above discussion shows that these statements apply very much to the faith tradition and the secular sciences as well. Resources from either discipline cannot be applied directly as normative criteria, in view of the gaps, shortcomings, historical contingency, and plurality within each discipline. Hence, even though management science needs to be reoriented through theological reflection with the aid of a critical or alternative perspective supplied by the faith tradition, the final criteria for resolution should come not from within either resource but from

---

[169] Louis De Thomasis, *My Father's Business: Creating a New Future for the People of God* (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1984), 43-45.

[170] Watkins, "Organizing the People of God," 708-709. Watkins has demonstrated her own recommended way of proceeding by comprehensively analyzing the relevant documents of Vatican II on lay participation, and then fruitfully integrating and adapting insights from management science to offer suggestions for pastoral practice. See Clare Watkins, "Laity and Communication: Some Implications of Organization Theory for the Ecclesiology of Vatican II" (unpublished PhD Thesis; University of Cambridge, 1990).

[171] For example, see Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*, 213; and Dietterich, "A Particular People," 350.

[172] Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 453.

[173] Neil Ormerod, "Quarrels with the Method of Correlation," *Theological Studies* 57, no. 4 (1996): 712.

the "differentiated … grounds for appropriating and evaluating" both the faith tradition and management science.[174] Otherwise, the problems with arbitrariness, biases, and ambiguity highlighted above will arise. Following Doran, this thesis takes the position that the "grounds" or higher viewpoint which provides the criteria for resolution can be found in intellectual, moral, and religious conversions as expounded by Lonergan.[175] Hence, this thesis will seek to synthesize a reorientation framework for management theories through a dialectic between critical insights from both the management field and the Catholic faith tradition, with intellectual, moral, and religious conversions providing the grounds for resolving the dialectics and identifying normative principles for management.

1.9 From church management to mission

Whilst the genesis of this research has been prompted by inadequacies observed in church management resources, its aim will go further than simply reorientating management theories for use within the ecclesial context. My view is that even as the Church shares in the management challenges faced by others in society, it can discover and offer to humankind a new way of proceeding in management which will better accord with the human good. As pointed out by Pattison, "many individuals in contemporary society have been crushed and oppressed by managerialism and its negative effects. It is not unreasonable to hope that Christian groups might offer them critical support and a vision of something different, even something better, instead of more of the same."[176] Hence, this research aims to contribute towards a way of proceeding in management that is accessible even to those outside the Church, by synthesizing a reorientation framework to render management theories not only better suited for the Church but also more realistic, integrated, and conducive for human flourishing in all organizations. In this way, theological reflection would be brought, as it rightly should, to the service of not just the Church's internal concerns but also its universal mission. Moreover, this wider aim would also enable this project to explore how theology can contribute towards addressing inherent problems within a secular science.

As mentioned earlier, there are existing efforts in promoting alternative management practices by bringing the Church's faith resources, especially Catholic social teaching, to bear.[177] The contribution of my research project is that it goes beyond formulating yet another

[174] Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 454.

[175] Lonergan, *Method*, 235-292.

[176] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 165.

[177] For example, see Helen J. Alford and Michael J. Naughton, *Managing as if Faith Mattered* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001); and Bruno Dyck, "A Proven Way to Incorporate Catholic Social Thought in Business School Curricula: Teaching Two Approaches to Management in the Classroom," *Journal of*

alternative management practice or tool. Rather, it will produce a framework that can be used to reorientate any existing or future management theory. Moreover, this framework will address not just the social and ethical dimension of management, as in the case of works that draw upon Catholic social teaching. Instead, it will holistically attend to a wider and more comprehensive range of problems within management science. This will thus help the management field to be not only more aligned with "moral laws", but also more "truly scientific" (GS 36). In addition, the alternative management practices mooted by scholars in the Catholic social teaching tradition have yet to gain currency in mainstream management because the direct application of doctrines from a particular faith tradition has limited claims on a universal audience. In contrast, this thesis will explore an inter-disciplinary methodology that results in principles for management that are more objective and normative.

1.10 Method of this research and outline of the thesis

The conflicts observed by theologians arising from the application of management thought in the Church point to the need to examine more closely the management field itself so as to better understand its inherent problems. This would throw light on aspects of management science that might require a reorientation, while also ensuring that the integrity of its positive contributions is maintained. Such an analysis will be carried out in Chapter 2. It will consider the nature of the management field, its scope and boundaries, its objectives and underlying philosophies, its main tenets and schools of thought, its contributions to human flourishing, as well as its limitations and weaknesses. To complement critiques of the managerial culture from the perspective of theologians as surveyed above, the analysis in Chapter 2 will focus on the internal debates among management scholars themselves, and the key issues emerging from these debates as well as from the field's historical development. In terms of research resources, certain aspects of such analyses have already been done, mostly prompted by concerns with management education. Hence, this research will tap on these secondary sources as far as possible. The output of Chapter 2 will be an outline of the main tenets of management science and alternative views raised within the field, as well as a tentative reorientation framework based on these internal debates. The value of this output is its potential use by others to bring into dialogue with their own faith traditions and cultures.

The next step in the research is an examination of a resource from the Catholic faith tradition for relevant insights. For this purpose, I have chosen GS from the Second Vatican

Catholic Higher Education 32, no.1 (2013): 145-163. The John A. Ryan Institute for Catholic Social Thought at St Thomas University in the US has been particularly active in this regard. See http://www.stthomas.edu/cathstudies/cst/.

Council. This document is well-suited for this research because the Council, particularly through GS, sought a fresh response of faith to the "signs of the times" (GS 4), including humanity's newfound confidence in shaping history through advances in organization and technology. These are the same advances which propelled the popularity of management science in the 1960s while also giving rise to its controversies. The Council Fathers addressed these controversies by offering the Church's teaching on the human person, human society, human activity, and the role of the Church. Hence, the content of GS is particularly relevant for management. GS also bears the magisterial weight of an ecumenical council and remains foundational to-date in church teachings. It is addressed to a world audience and draws upon not just Catholic doctrine but also human reasoning, experience, and philosophical traditions, thus facilitating dialogue with secular disciplines. I will analyze GS through a triple hermeneutic of text, author, and receiver as outlined by Ormond Rush for interpreting the teachings of Vatican II.[178] Hence, Chapter 3 will examine the document's content and literary features, as well as the background context of its formulation, the underpinning theological and philosophical trends, the conciliar and related deliberations, and the decisions and redactions leading to the final text. At the same time, the analysis will draw upon the clarification and growth of understanding during the course of the document's reception, especially as manifested in the application and further development of GS's teachings in subsequent magisterial documents. Besides this general method, Chapter 3 will pay particular attention to several lines of division in the conciliar debates on GS, since the endeavor to accommodate contrasting views amidst the practical limitations of the conciliar meeting has resulted in the presence of apparently contrary statements in the text, which must be held in dialectical balance. The output of Chapter 3 will be a set of key principles for management based on GS's teachings, noting also the nuances among these principles, arising from the document's internal debates.

In Chapter 4, the main tenets of management science, together with alternative views within the field, will be brought into dialectical comparison with the principles for management from GS. Areas of resonance as well as conflicts will be pointed out. In line with the above discussions on methodology, it will be shown that the conflicts cannot be resolved by simply choosing one side over the other. Instead, the criteria for resolution need to be drawn from a higher viewpoint. To this end, Lonergan's thought on dialectics, conversions, and foundations will be discussed and applied. It will be seen that intellectual, moral, and religious conversions, as expounded by Lonergan, will result in objective norms for management that are more realistic and conducive to human flourishing. With the aid of these norms, a resolution will then

[178] Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004).

be made on the dialectics between management science and GS. The resulting principles will be consolidated into the reorientation framework for management theories.

Chapter 5 will illustrate the workings of this framework by applying it to two management tools that are frequently advocated in Catholic pastoral management literature: performance management systems, and marketing strategies. The reorientations required by the framework will be identified, and the revised management tool will be described. The practical viability of the revised tool for both church management and for organizational management in general will be explored. This will be done by comparing the revised tool with alternative management methods that have been formulated in the light of similar principles, by scholars for management practitioners in the Church as well as in society. Thereafter, the framework will be used to reorientate the topical structure of current Catholic pastoral management materials. Based on this reorientation, the main topics that should inform the pastoral literature and training programs of the Church will be outlined. It will be pointed out that these topics are suitable for management in all other organizations as well. Finally, the chapter will conclude with a review of the inter-disciplinary method adopted in this study, the fruitfulness of its outcome, its limitations, and the areas for further work.

1.11 Conclusion

The increasing attention to management in the Roman Catholic Church presents an opportunity for the Church to examine more deeply its approach to pastoral administration. A survey of existing pastoral materials reveals much uncritical adoption of secular management thought, and widespread manifestation of the managerial culture. This problem can be addressed to some extent by paying attention to methodological issues in theological and pastoral engagements with secular disciplines. Debates on such engagements point to the need to critically appropriate resources from the secular discipline as well as from the faith tradition, and to evaluate them with foundational and normative criteria from a higher viewpoint. To this end, a reorientation framework for management theories will be synthesized using the method described in this chapter. The framework will be made relevant for management not only in the Church but also in all other organizations, thus contributing towards addressing problems with the managerial culture in both Church and society. A closer look at this culture and its originating field will be the next step of the synthesis, and will be undertaken in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 2
Critical Examination of the Management Field

2.1 Introduction

Modern management thought has grown beyond the confines of commerce to become a pervasive influence in all realms of life. An observer of the management field notes that whether in the business, government, or non-profit sector, "today's global elites are shaped by management theory in much the same way that the Victorian elite were shaped by classical culture."[1] Indeed, to be proficient in management concepts such as efficiency, effectiveness, performance, and results has become equated with being competent, progressive, and professional. This chapter goes behind such key concepts in the managerial culture to uncover the underlying foundations of the management field, the critical issues that have emerged from its historical development, and the internal debates that remain unresolved to-date. Through this analysis, the nature and main tenets of management science will be highlighted, along with its strengths and contributions, as well as its current weaknesses and controversies. This will throw light on how management science would need to be reoriented so as to better serve human flourishing and be fruitful for pastoral work in particular. It will be seen that alternative views within the management field provide some indication of how management theories could be reoriented to achieve these objectives while upholding the integrity and strengths of the field. At the same time, it will be pointed out that these alternative views still contain gaps that can be further illuminated through dialogue with a faith tradition.

2.2 Overview of management science

In approaching another discipline, the ITC reiterates that "Catholic theology acknowledges the proper autonomy of other sciences and the professional competence and the striving after knowledge to be found in them", and thus, "Catholic theology should respect the proper coherence of the methods and sciences utilised, but it should also use them in a critical fashion, in light of the faith that is part of the theologian's own identity and motivation."[2] In line with this, the analysis of management science carried out in this chapter seeks to be sensitive to "the striving after knowledge" to be found in the field and respect its "proper coherence" as far as possible. Significantly, a difficulty that confounds this endeavor right from the start is in defining the task of management, the boundaries of the field, and its central object.

[1] John Micklethwait, "Foreword," in Adrian Wooldridge, *Masters of Management: How the Business Gurus and Their Ideas Have Changed the World—For Better and For Worse* (New York: Harper Business, 2011), xviii.

[2] ITC, *Theology Today*, par. 84, 81.

Management scholars acknowledge that there has been no consensus to-date on the definition of management, or a consistent canon of topics that management theories deal with.[3] Nevertheless, contemporary management literature and management school curricula typically comprise topics such as planning, organizational strategy and design, administration and internal controls, finance, human resources, leadership, organizational behavior, operations management, communications, information systems, marketing, innovation, and managing change.[4] The range and content of topics evolve with the times and are shaped by business trends, technological developments, and social, cultural, economic, and political conditions. In the historical analysis of this chapter, it will be seen that different definitions of management are proffered by different schools of thought, depending on the particular emphasis of each school of thought. It will also be seen that some definitions have exerted a more field-shaping influence. For the purpose of this study, management will be broadly defined as the aspect of human work that involves organizing and coordinating people and resources towards a goal. This definition is broad enough to reflect the key traditions in the field while distinguishing it from other disciplines.

Leading management historian Daniel Wren notes that the earliest available writings on management date as far back as the twenty-second century BCE, in the domain of political governance and social organization. Since then, management-related writings have appeared in religious, military, and economic literature but remained incidental to the main concerns of these fields. The earliest known efforts to theorize about management *per se* are traced to the writings of Socrates (470-399 BCE), Plato (437-347 BCE) and Aristotle (384-322 BCE) in their reflections on human work, specialization, organization, supervision, and authority.[5] However, it was not until the industrial revolution of the modern period that management emerged as a field of study in its own right. In particular, a landmark paper was presented at the 1886 meeting of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) by Henry R. Towne, arguing for "the management of works" to be developed as a distinct discipline.[6] This move was partly prompted by observations of widespread inefficiency and disorganization in industrial factories

[3] See Sjoerd Keulena and Ronald Kroezeb, "Introduction: The Era of Management: A Historical Perspective on Twentieth Century Management," *Management & Organizational History* 9, no. 4 (2014): 321-330. The authors even add that "thus, to follow the development of management over time, we do not use a universal or sharply defined definition of management." Ibid., 330.

[4] For example, see leading college texts such as Richard L. Daft, *Management*, 12th ed. (Boston: Cengage Learning, 2016) and Stephen P. Robbins and Mary Coulter, *Management*, 14th ed. (New Jersey: Pearson, 2017).

[5] Daniel A. Wren, *The History of Management Thought* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2005), 13-21.

[6] Henry R. Towne, "The Engineer as an Economist," *Transactions of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers* (1886), 428, cited in Morgen Witzel, *A History of Management Thought* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 82.

at that time. The ASME thus served as the *de facto* platform for considering theories about management. The genesis of the field in an industrial engineering context was to have a profound and lasting influence on the discipline of management.

During that period, seminal works were published by industrial thinkers such as Frederick W. Taylor and Henri Fayol. Their writings provided material for the first business management schools, set up in the US in the late-nineteenth century upon the encouragement and support of industrial leaders.[7] Over the twentieth century, management studies developed with contributions from psychology, behavioral science, sociology, mathematics, systems science, and most of all, economics. To-date, management studies account for the single largest group of tertiary-level degrees awarded each year in many countries.[8] Observers note that the volume of management literature has also grown tremendously in recent decades, along with membership in management academies.[9]

From this brief account, several points about the nature of the management field are noteworthy. First, it can be seen that the purpose of management science, from its very genesis, is performative. The field does not simply seek to give descriptive or explanatory accounts about human work and organizations, but is essentially prescriptive in nature, aiming to impart know-how for the coordination of human activity and resources towards achieving some goal. As highlighted by leading management thinker Peter Drucker, "in the last analysis management is practice. Its essence is not knowing but doing. Its test is not logic but results. Its only authority is performance."[10] Such is the nature of the field, which must be taken into account if one were to evaluate the field according to its own terms. This performative orientation has given rise to a major category in the field known as the management tool. Management scholars explain that "when managers talk about theories that they apply in business, they often use the term 'management tool'. As the phrase suggests, a management tool is a framework, practice, or concept that managers use when they are trying to achieve some result. A management tool … is at heart the expression of a theory."[11] This category is significant because much of the content of church pastoral management literature and training programs take the form of management tools. In relation to this, another important point is that management science has come to be

[7] Wren, *History*, 232-249.

[8] Matthew Stewart, *The Management Myth: Debunking Modern Business Philosophy* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2009), 5; Bill Lee and Catherine Cassell, eds., *Challenges and Controversies in Management Research* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 6; John A. Byrne, "Why the MBA has Become the Most Popular Master's Degree in the U.S.," Fortune Magazine, June 1, 2014.

[9] Rita G. McGrath, "No Longer a Stepchild: How the Management Field Can Come Into its Own," *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 6 (2007): 1365.

[10] Peter F. Drucker, *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974), xiv.

[11] McGrath, "No Longer a Stepchild," 1373-1374.

regarded as relevant not only to industrial engineering or business but also to government, community, cultural, education, and religious institutions. In fact, many management theories and tools are now seen to be applicable even in daily life. For example, the topic of time management, which was originally a concern of only the factory foreman during the early industrial age, is now regarded as a relevant topic for everyone. Consequently, management literature comprises not only scholarly writings that discuss theory in depth, but also popular works offering management advice that is often simplified and generalized for a mass audience. As will be seen later, this has implications on the quality and reliability of material that is subsequently appropriated for church management.

Finally, an important consequence of the performative orientation of management science is that its theories have a high degree of context dependence. As will be seen in the historical analysis, they are shaped by many factors, including:

a. The specific needs or problems to address, in which case the resulting management tool may not be suitable or even necessary in other situations where the same needs and problems are not present;
b. Assumptions about the type of organization for which the tool is targeted. This includes the nature of the organization, its goals, functions, activities, structure, size, system, personnel, culture, and environment;
c. The particular worldview, values, and beliefs of theorists and practitioners, especially the personal biases of theorists as well as reactions or even over-reactions to previous schools of thought;
d. Advances in other disciplines, especially economics, engineering, computing, mathematics, sociology, and psychology; and
e. The prevailing political, economic, social, cultural, and technological conditions, norms, and prerogatives. This includes prominent themes that have captured the attention of people in each milieu, such as productivity, democracy, globalization, and technological change.

All this implies that management tools must be applied with historical and contextual sensitivity. Unfortunately, this imperative is frequently overlooked. For instance, Catholic pastoral management authors typically recommend setting measurable benchmarks for the output and performance of church staff.[12] On the one hand, this is not surprising given that such a practice has become a norm in contemporary human resource management. However, performance benchmarks have not always existed in the world of human work. Initiated mainly

[12] For example, see Koys, "Human Resource Guidelines," 21.

by Taylor during the Scientific Management movement of the late-nineteenth century, benchmarks were meant to address the problem of uneven productivity on the factory floor, and the consequent worker-manager disputes over output and remuneration. The workplace setting was one which comprised standardized, repetitive, and mechanical tasks leading to physical products. The linking of benchmarks to worker reward was also based on a prevailing view of the human person as primarily motivated by personal economic gain.[13] Obviously, such workplace settings and motivational factors are less likely to be observed in the Church and other contexts. Hence, the prescription of performance benchmarks in pastoral management is contextually inappropriate. Not surprisingly, more recent research shows that performance benchmarks do not really produce the intended results in the modern-day workplace.[14]

In summary, management theories and tools can potentially enhance the fruitfulness of human work but they need to be approached critically. To this end, a historical analysis of the management field is helpful in uncovering the background contexts and influences underlying each school of thought, its resulting management tenets and contributions, as well as the controversies that have arisen. This would throw light on where a reorientation of the field might begin.

2.3 Historical analysis and emergent issues

Management historians generally concur on the classification of distinct movements in the management field until the 1960s. After that, there is less consensus on the emerging schools of thought. This reflects the increased diversity of the field in the latter half of the twentieth century as global conditions became more dynamic and a wider variety of contexts, interests, and expertise drove theory development. For the purpose of this analysis, the latter movements from the 1960s have been classified by grouping together those in the same period which are similar in themes and emphases.

2.3.1 The Scientific Management Model[15]

Scientific Management was the first main stream of management thought to emerge in industry and academia. The movement gained traction in the late-nineteenth century

[13] Gordon J. Pearson, *The Rise and Fall of Management: A Brief History of Practice, Theory and Context* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012), 132. Interestingly, Taylor literally went around the factory floor and made chalk markings on the benches of those workers who seemed to be performing well so that others know the expected standard; hence the term "benchmark". See Jim McGrath and Bob Bates, *The Little Book of Big Management Theories and How to Use Them* (London: Pearson, 2013), 192.

[14] See David A. J. Axson, *The Management Mythbuster* (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2012), 169.

[15] There are slight variations in the nomenclature used by management historians for the schools of thought. In this thesis, the name of each model is based on more frequently used terms in the management literature.

particularly through the pioneering work of Taylor in the US. Its foremost objectives were productivity and standardization especially through precision and control. This was achieved by meticulously analyzing job tasks, establishing performance standards, streamlining work processes, promoting specialization, modifying the working environment, using resources more efficiently, and increasing output from workers by motivating them through a carrot-and-stick approach. These strategies resulted in workplace practices which were novel at that time, such as time-and-motion studies, benchmarking, performance incentive schemes, and job specialization. The early industrial engineers held that such measures enabled factory operations to be coordinated in a more systematic and objective way, thus leading to greater productivity and fewer disputes. They further perceived that the systematic analyses, formulation, implementation, and coordination of these measures could constitute a specialized and distinct type of work, which eventually came to be known as management.[16] As Taylor remarked, "the best management is a true science, resting upon clearly defined laws, rules and principles as a foundation."[17] Hence, in the origin of the management field, to manage meant to apply a so-called scientific approach to coordinating work. As will be discussed below, debates continue today over the understanding of science implicit in Taylor's statement and its applicability to management.

Meanwhile, the Scientific Management model prevailed over the twentieth century and has been manifested in new and even more sophisticated sub-fields such as operations management, quality control, and more recently, business analytics. Boosted by advances in computing technologies, these methods typically entail extensive calculations and simulations with large quantities of data, detailed analyses, and statistical modelling, including even the modelling of human behavior. This quantitative and mechanistic approach, with its emphasis on productivity, efficiency, and optimization of resources, has spread beyond industrial manufacturing to other types of business enterprises. It has also spread to the public, social, and even faith-based sectors. In fact, Taylor was of the view that "the fundamental principles of scientific management are applicable to all kinds of human activities, from our simplest individual acts to the work of our great corporations, which call for the most elaborate cooperation."[18] An observer of the management field, Matthew Stewart, quite rightly remarks

[16] Wren gives a detailed account of these developments in Wren, *History*, Chapter 7.

[17] Frederick W. Taylor, *Principles of Scientific Management* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1947), 7, cited in Wren, *History*, 145.

[18] Ibid.

that "Taylor's contribution both to the consulting industry and to society at large occurred at the level not of individual firms and institutions but of culture and ideology."[19]

On the whole, Scientific Management makes a number of positive contributions to the realm of human work. Central to Taylor's thesis on productivity was the notion of best fit between a person's innate abilities and the assigned job. This was accompanied by an underlying work ethic of doing one's best on the job. Such principles are potentially of mutual benefit to both workers and organizations. Moreover, the movement's emphasis on resource optimization, efficiency, and avoidance of wastage, resonate well with present-day concerns over the sustainability of global resources. All in all, Scientific Management guards against a laissez-faire approach to work and promotes practical intelligence. In particular, the specialized field of operations management has enabled many public and non-profit institutions to make important improvements to their operations, such as the reduction of waiting times at hospitals and the minimization of traffic jams. In the Church setting, the topic of time management as mentioned earlier, which stems from this tradition, is included in Catholic pastoral management literature and helps pastoral workers better organize and allocate time for ministry, self and others.[20] Moreover, in Taylor's original theories, the human element was not totally side-lined. A central tenet in his method was the "mental revolution" that managers and workers were called to make by seeing each other to be on the same side, and cooperating to reap greater surplus for both, instead of competing with each other over surplus distribution.[21] Taylor highlighted the human and affective side of making change, and the need to take adequate time for consultation and adaptation. He also emphasized good workplace relations and communication, exhorting managers to listen to and treat workers kindly, with the "touch of human nature and feeling" rather than as "part of the machinery".[22]

Despite these positive contributions, Scientific Management has significant limitations. Management historians note that the theory proved to be too idealistic and naïve about the goodwill and motivations of workers and managers. In practice, issues of power, self-interest and exploitation on both sides inhibited cooperation and productivity. For example, it has been pointed out that Scientific Management tools such as performance targets do not work in

[19] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 315.

[20] See Larry W. Boone, "Time Management," in McKenna, *Concise Guide to Catholic Church Management*, 41-61.

[21] Frederick W. Taylor, quoted in *Hearings Before the Special Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Taylor and Other Systems of Shop Management Under Authority of House Resolution 90* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1912), 1378, cited in Wren, *History*, 146-147.

[22] Frederick W. Taylor, "Scientific Shop Management," in *Trade Unionism and Labor Problems*, ed. John R. Commons (Boston: Ginn, 1921), 184-185, cited in Wren, *History*, 149.

practice because employees eventually learn to outsmart the system towards their personal advantage, leading to sub-optimal outcomes for the organization.[23] It can also be said that the movement's overly-mechanistic approach wrongly overlooks the reality of distractions and human limitations such as family problems, sickness, or even lack of self-confidence, which can get in the way of good intent, talent, potential, and job-fit. At its core, Scientific Management is over-optimistic about human effort and control, having been conceived within a relatively stable and predictable context, and influenced by the growing fascination with science at the time. Ironically, subsequent criticisms have been made regarding the movement's 'scientificness'. For instance, management historians note that the methods used in determining benchmark levels of performance and the commensurate piece-rate wages were ultimately biased and arbitrary.[24] Highlighting that the movement's emphasis on mechanistic and complex calculations has sometimes replaced common sense, more recent critics of Scientific Management have blamed it for the rise of sophisticated but dubious investment products in the banking industry which eventually caused the global financial crisis in 2008.[25]

Historians also acknowledge that the movement is not value-neutral. In Stewart's view, it has served to perpetuate class differences by strengthening the power of elites over workers through the emphasis on control.[26] Moreover, Taylor's original theories were subsequently implemented by others in a distorted way such that the human elements became totally ignored.[27] Thus, Scientific Management had come to be associated with dehumanizing work methods and demeaning treatment of workers. As seen in Chapter 1, its notion of "optimizing your staff" has made its way even to Catholic pastoral management literature.[28] Other scholars note that the movement espouses an anthropology based on Adam Smith's (1723-1790) "Economic Man" which assumes that the human person acts mainly for self-interest and material good.[29] This assumption ignores other human motivations such as social needs and moral values. Most fundamentally, as Stewart rightly observes, by using a 'scientific' and technical solution to address what was actually a more deep-seated issue of workplace relations and attitudes, the Scientific Management movement avoided the need to deal with significant socio-cultural tensions that were caused by the industrial revolution at the time. Important new

[23] Axson, *Management Mythbuster*, 169.

[24] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 47-50.

[25] Daft, *Management*, 55.

[26] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 77.

[27] Wren, *History*, 139-140.

[28] Stagg, "Pastoral Leadership," 27.

[29] Wren, *History*, 269.

norms and social compacts could have been forged regarding workplace relationships and the common good.[30] Unfortunately, this did not happen; and as will be shown later, there still remains today a strong bias towards the scientific approach in responding to challenges in human and communal affairs.

2.3.2 The Human Relations Model

Prior to Scientific Management, the human element and other social concerns in management had already been highlighted by some industrial thinkers in the mid-nineteenth century. However, it was not until the late-1920s that these factors gained greater attention in the management field. A milestone event was the Hawthorne factory study in the US, conducted over 1924-1932 and led by industrial researcher Elton Mayo (1880-1949). The study highlighted psycho-social factors that underpin workers' productivity, and the need for new social bonds to be forged in the industrial workplace. Consequently, it led to a burgeoning of theories on human relations in management, including group dynamics, workplace relationships, and job satisfaction.[31] The movement's growth was further underpinned by the political, economic, and social climate in industrial nations after the Great Depression, which de-emphasized individualism, and stressed solidarity, co-operation, and community. Developments in the fields of psychology, behavioral science, sociology, and anthropology from the 1940s to 1960s also accelerated developments in human factor theories of management. In particular, new insights on human motivation led to a myriad of management tools for improving worker motivation, performance, and job design. Other theorists took a more macro-level view, focusing on resultant group-level outcomes of individual actions, leading to the sub-field of organizational behavior. In addition, the topic of leadership also gained increasing popularity.

On the positive side, the Human Relations model highlights the human aspect of organizational life, and balances the task-focused approach of Scientific Management. Theories about human motivation counter the "Economic Man" perspective and contribute to a more holistic and realistic anthropology. They remind managers to pay attention to "the logic of sentiment" in dealing with people, thus plugging a gap in Scientific Management's blind spot.[32] Several examples of this positive contribution can be seen in Catholic pastoral management literature. For example, echoing Mayo, Helen Doohan exhorts pastoral managers to pay

[30] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 56.

[31] The development of the Human Relations school is traced in Wren, *History*, Chapters 9 and 18. See also Morgan Witzel, *A History of Management Thought* (New York: Routledge, 2012), Chapter 7.

[32] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 139.

attention to the "social contracts within the workplace," balancing "concern for productivity" with more people-oriented approaches from the management field that enhance "fulfillment, growth, and quality" of work life for church personnel.[33]

However, on the negative side, critics have pointed out that the human dimension, if over-emphasized, can unwittingly prevent an organization from seeing other important factors that affect organizational effectiveness. These include work processes, internal structures, organizational strategy, and external environments. In fact, Mayo's research has been discredited by his critics for being colored by his personal bias for sociological lenses, ignoring other elements of the organization.[34] A second limitation is that although human factor theories in management highlight the qualitative and non-material aspects of human motivation such as the need for fulfilment and social relations, they often stop short of fully considering the spontaneous, transcendent and spiritual dimension of the human being. Instead, everything is reduced to a matter of psychology. As a result, the movement has its own blind spot. It is over-optimistic about the ability of the social sciences to predict and shape human behavior. In both theory formulation and implementation, the Human Relations model eventually fell into the same trap as Scientific Management in its assumption about precision, predictability, and control. Observers note that even recent theories which seek to address the relatively new topic of workplace spirituality do so in a mechanistic way, often resulting in manipulative prescriptions.[35] A persistent trend is thus becoming evident in management history. The field tends to place the theorist and the manager over and above those who are managed. Whether it is the people-focused Human Relations model or the task-focused Scientific Management model, the overriding prerogative is that of increasing productivity and profit through the control of humans as a resource. Hence, advances in human factor theories about organizational culture, job satisfaction, and human motivation are turned into tools for achieving managers' goals. This tendency then spreads to other non-business sectors when these tools are uncritically applied. For example, as seen in Chapter 1, some church management authors recommend getting people to perform better by strategically leveraging on whether they are "achievement-type", "affiliation-type" or "influence-type".[36]

2.3.3 The General Administration Model

[33] Helen Doohan, *The Minister of God: Effective and Fulfilled* (New York: Alba House, 1986), 52-54.

[34] Wren, *History*, 368-373.

[35] See Margaret Benefiel, "Irreconcilable Foes? The Discourse of Spirituality and the Discourse of Organizational Science," *Organization* 10, no. 2 (May 2003): 383; and Peter Case, Robert French and Peter Simpson, "From *Theoria* to Theory: Leadership Without Contemplation," *Organization* 19, no. 3 (2012): 356.

[36] Forster and Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish*, 198-199.

With the growth of large industrial organizations, a more broad-based view of management gradually arose. Fayol is commonly regarded as the pioneer of a comprehensive theory of management, with his publication *Industrial and General Administration* in 1916. This work describes management from a general organizational viewpoint, offering fourteen principles on planning, organization structure, authority, accountability, and people management. Although earlier industrialists such as Daniel McCallum (1815-1878) and Henry Poor (1812-1905) had done prior work on organizational-level views of management, these works were regarded as unique to their respective industries. In contrast, Fayol positioned his theories, which were wholly-formulated from personal experience, as a general treatise on management *per se*. Asserting that "be it a case of commerce, industry, politics, religion, war, or philanthropy, in every concern there is a management function to be performed," he promoted his work as generic principles for management in all types of organizations.[37] For Fayol, management was defined as planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. This is still the most widely-used definition of the functions of management today.[38]

Since Fayol's work was not translated into English till the mid-twentieth century, it was only then that his General Administration view of management gained wider traction. By then, institutions had become the dominant organizing principle of developed societies, whether in public services, commerce, or social life. It had also become generally acknowledged that management was a distinct function within institutions, requiring full-time personnel with the requisite skills. This regard for management was partly bolstered by growing admiration around the world for the economic and military successes of the US, which were seen to be underpinned by its application of management principles. Besides Fayol, the work of Alfred Chandler also made an important contribution in reinforcing the General Administration approach. Whilst Fayol provided an overview of the tasks of organizational management and key principles for these tasks, it was Chandler who asserted the high degree of influence inherent in the management role, and the powerful impact of those who occupy this role. His publications *Strategy and Structure* (1962) and *The Visible Hand* (1977) were highly influential and greatly raised optimism about managerial impact. Echoing the sentiment of that period, Drucker stridently declared that "it is managers and management that make institutions perform" and

[37] Henri Fayol, *General and Industrial Management*, trans. Constance Storrs (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1949), 15, cited in Wren, *History*, 215.

[38] For example, this definition is used in college management textbooks (see Daft, *Management*, 7) as well as in general references such as Charles Wankel, "Management," in *Encyclopaedia of Business in Today's World* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009), 1051-1053.

that "the emergence of management may be the pivotal event of our time, far more important than all the events that make the headlines."[39]

A significant development in relation to the General Administration model is that by the 1960s, large business conglomerates had become a key feature of industrial economies. Management theorists began to encourage large firms to set up entire departments focusing just on management, where functions highlighted by the General Administration model such as planning, coordinating, monitoring, and resource allocation were centrally located. This led to what has been commonly called the multi-divisional form (or "M-form") of the modern corporation, in which diverse lines of business are segregated into organizational divisions, and overseen by a central office. Management historians observe that this trend marked the beginning of an increasing isolation of the management function from the rest of the organization and from realities on the ground.[40]

Today, the General Administration model continues to manifest itself in all types of organizations. For example, the concept of the M-form's central office is reflected in Catholic pastoral management literature that speaks of the "parish business office".[41] Similarly, echoing Fayol's definition of management, as well as Chandler's and Drucker's high regard for management influence, pastoral management authors typically state that management in church organizations comprises "planning, organizing, influencing and controlling" and that "any organization, whether a parish, a Church agency, a doctor's office, or a nation, succeeds or fails based on the actions of management."[42] On the positive side, the General Administration model, with its organizational-level view of management, complements the Scientific Management and Human Relations models. Whilst these two earlier models focus at the micro-level on production processes, including the actions of workers, the General Administration model focuses on management methods that help people to coordinate their work across the organization and achieve common goals. As an example in Catholic pastoral literature, Zech applies the model's organizing principles to parishes, and makes recommendations for parish planning, goal-setting, organizational structure, and job division.[43] However, the General Administration model's main flaw lies in its over-optimism about management influence and control—a theme which, as highlighted above, is clearly emerging as a controversial issue in

[39] Drucker, *Management*, x, 10.

[40] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 183-186, 191.

[41] Maria Mendoza, "Getting Started: The Parish Business Office," in Holmes, *Pastor's Toolbox*, Chapter 4.

[42] Brenda Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management," in McKenna, *Catholic Church Management*, 28, 24. See also Zech, *Catholic Parishes of the 21st Century*, 59.

[43] Zech, *Catholic Parishes of the 21st Century*, 60-62.

the management field. A reorientation would take into account whether such control is realistic or even desirable. Another significant weakness is that the M-form structure distances managers from the rest of the organization and its stakeholders as well as the wider environment. This limits their effectiveness and their connectedness to the interests of all.

2.3.4 The Systems Model

Up to the 1960s, management theories had largely espoused a static and isolated view of the organization. Subsequently, advances made earlier in the natural sciences regarding biological systems eventually prompted a shift in management towards systems thinking, in which organizations were viewed as dynamic, open and interactive systems. This view was underpinned by increasing attention to fluidity and change in wider society during the 1960s. The Systems model resonates with the work of an earlier organizational theorist Chester Barnard (1886-1961) who had proved to be ahead of his time. Barnard postulated that internally, the organization was a social system in which persons and groups were constantly in mutual interaction and influence, causing constant change. An organization also exerted influence on its external environment and was in turn subject to influences from outside. Barnard and subsequent thinkers in this movement promoted management theories that dealt with internal and external interactions and communications, organizational life cycles, organizational learning, and adaptation to environmental changes.[44] The sub-field of organization theory also emerged, integrating the informal and fluid human behavior perspective in organizations with the more formal and structured general administration view.

From these trends, it can be seen that management thought was becoming increasingly sophisticated. The Systems model contributed an important dimension to management science through theories that were more robust, realistic, and took greater account of participation. For example, a Catholic pastoral management guidebook recommends using the lens of a "system" to analyze the parish whereby people interact and organize themselves, shaping the structures from bottom up.[45] More importantly, the systems view renders management science more germane to the inter-dependent bonds that link human persons with one another, with the wider community, and with the environment. The acknowledgement and encouragement of these bonds is an important precursor to a consideration of the common good. The drawback of the Systems model, however, is that it underestimates the presence of hierarchical structures, divisions, or silos that often limit interaction. It is also presumptuous about the possibility of

[44] Wren, *History*, 448-450.

[45] Forster and Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish*, 84-85.

mapping out interactions among people and tracing these interactions definitively to the observed outcomes.

Along with systems thinking, the fluid and dynamic worldview of the 1960s also gave birth to Contingency Theory, which highlighted the tension between the universal and the particular. Through Contingency Theory, management theorists began to caution that the right response in management depended on each particular circumstance and that management solutions were highly dependent on the context.[46] It is noteworthy that the industrial management thinkers of the eighteenth to mid-nineteenth century had originally thought this way. They emphasized that their management knowledge was industry-specific and not applicable in other settings.[47] Even Fayol, who formulated a general administration theory, stressed the principle of proportion, whereby management practices such as centralization should be implemented to a degree proportionate to the particular context. He encouraged the exercise of discretion on the part of managers, based on their practical wisdom and experience.[48] Yet, as will be seen in the subsequent sections, the notion of contingency has become sidelined from mainstream management theory despite its resurgence in the 1960s.

2.3.5 The Strategy Model

Over the same period, the Strategy model also emerged as a major movement in the management field, and has exerted a strong influence to-date. Like the General Administration model, this approach was a response to the needs of large business conglomerates with diverse lines of business. Faced with such scale, complexity, and diversity, the central management units of these conglomerates started to look for more formulaic tools and techniques to allocate resources among various divisions and to make other important decisions. The Strategy model offered solutions that eventually evolved into sophisticated forecasting and evaluations of costs, revenues, and anticipated profits from alternative investments and management decisions. This strong analytical bias was further fueled by a growing number of management theorists and business schools at the time, who supplied both the tools and the graduates needed for such work.[49] Moreover, competitive and challenging economic conditions also pressured firms to seek more control in charting their directions and ensuring continued growth. Management theorists began to emphasize strategic management, management by objectives, and strategic

[46] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 148-149.

[47] Wren, *History*, 75.

[48] Ibid., 215-216.

[49] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 187-189.

planning. Each offered a slew of new management tools for the formulation and implementation of business strategy.

When economic conditions became even more difficult in the late-1970s, business firms increasingly focused on the narrower concerns of boosting short-term profitability, ensuring survival, and fending off the threat of corporate take-overs. At the same time, liberal capitalism strengthened in the late-1970s, partly as a response to communism and powerful labor unions. Capital owners actively sought to ensure that corporate managers would pursue the singular goal of maximizing shareholder value, often associated with the firm's stock price index as the sole indicator. The quintessential economist of this milieu, Milton Friedman, argued against the social responsibility of private corporations, and exhorted business managers to keep their focus on shareholder profits.[50] Thus, over the late-1970s to 1980s, the goal of management greatly narrowed in both theory and practice. Prominent management theorist Henry Mintzberg astutely observes that whilst The Business Roundtable, an association of chief executive officers of major US corporations, stressed the need to uphold the interests of all constituents in its 1981 statement, its more recent statement from 1997 simply states that management is primarily responsible for the interest of the firm's shareholders.[51]

This narrower interest often translates into hard-nosed decisions on personnel and budget cut-backs, divestments, and mergers. Strategy tools became all about making quick financial gains for major shareholders and senior executives. Management theories in this era assumed a "deal-making mentality" that disregarded the impacts on employees, customers, society, and the environment.[52] They were in turn exacerbated by the increasing isolation of top management under the M-form model. To make matters worse, management theorists came up with even further simplified decision tools as a way to deal with the overwhelming volume and complexity of information in a firm's diverse business activities. These tools often focused on short-term, quantifiable, and mainly financial indicators.[53] The result was that important decisions were made with over-simplified assumptions, and in a mechanistic, self-interested way by an elite few within the ivory tower of the central office, causing profound repercussions on all levels of

[50] Milton Friedman, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits," *The New York Times Magazine*, September 13, 1970. Friedman and his contemporaries were in part reacting against what they saw as the evils of communism. However, their reductionist view of the goal of the firm has prevailed long after communism was no longer seen as a threat.

[51] Henry Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2005), 153-154.

[52] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 196.

[53] The famous two-dimensional "Market Share vs Market Growth" matrix popularized by the Boston Consulting Group has become the icon of this move towards overly-simplified management models. Critics note that such models leave no room for more nuanced and intangible factors that inevitably exist in the real world of business. See Wooldridge, *Masters of Management*, 63.

society. These experiences sowed the seeds of a gradual disillusionment with management and with management theory.

Today, the legacy of the Strategy model remains strong in many sectors, including the Church. For example, strategic planning, frequently renamed "pastoral planning", is often a key topic in church management literature, and practiced in many dioceses, parishes, and organizations. Moreover, the Strategy model's emphases on measurement and on using 'dashboards' of quantitative, concise sets of indicators for monitoring organizational performance have also found their way into Catholic pastoral management literature. A case in point is the recommendation of "Key Performance Indicators" as mentioned in Chapter 1.[54] On the positive side, the Strategy model highlights the importance of intentional forward planning, direction-setting, and alignment of organizational goals, personnel, resources, structure, and activities along the chosen direction. It also calls attention to the need for some form of monitoring and evaluation to keep an organization along its desired course. On the negative side, the competitive economic context behind this approach has resulted in several distortions to what might otherwise have been a valuable movement. These distortions include a zero-sum view of society, and an emphasis on competition and self-interest rather than value-sharing and the common good. Such distortions are reflected in pastoral literature emphasizing church growth by winning over more members. Some pastoral authors even speak of "competitors".[55] Illustrating the influential reach of the Strategy model's over-emphasis on financial value, models of cost-benefit calculations are seen even in management theories for non-profit organizations, thus reducing decision-making to a matter of net tangible gains rather than the mission.[56] Chapter 1 of this thesis has also highlighted the example of a Catholic pastoral management text which echoes the notion of shareholder interest and the highly controversial Agency Theory by saying that "the faithful are financial and spiritual investors and entitled to expect that the church will do as it preaches and exercise good stewardship over these gifts."[57]

An additional problem of the Strategy model is that it reinforces a reductionist view of the organization as a mere portfolio of financial and other measurable indicators. Overly-simplistic models are also used for business and industry analyses. Critics point out that all these abstract and reductionist tools neither align with reality nor respect the multi-dimensional

[54] Boone, "Evaluating Parish Performance," 147.

[55] Lencioni, "Guide to Building Teams for Catholic Parishes," 15.

[56] For example, see Robert E. Gruber and Mary Mohr, "Strategic Management for Multiprogram Nonprofit Organizations," *California Management Review* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1982): 16-17.

[57] Green, "Neither Fish Nor Fowl," 115. Agency Theory was popularized by the Strategy model, and emphasizes a principal-agent perspective for the relationship between capital owners and managers. It advocates incentive schemes such as stock options to ensure that managers act in the interest of investors.

nature of human organizations and societies, nor connect to the real concerns of stakeholders on the ground. Hence, not surprisingly, there is scant evidence of the effectiveness of Strategy model tools to-date.[58] Echoing MacIntyre, Stewart points out the difficulty of ascertaining cause and effect links between management actions and results; thus the limitations of using a dashboard of metrics like the stock price index as a shorthand indicator for management effectiveness.[59] Yet, extensive calculations and important decisions are often made through these simplified tools, giving an illusion of control, and making the task of management appear to be more manageable as well as more important. Significantly, the Strategy model contradicts important aspects of management that have been emphasized by preceding movements. These include Taylor's focus on actual productivity on the shopfloor, and surplus maximization for both employer *and* worker. It also contradicts the Human Relations model's focus on human needs, as well as the General Administration model's holistic view of management as being concerned with the whole enterprise rather than just the shareholders or a few abstract financial indicators, and the Systems model's emphasis on the complex and inter-dependent relationships within and surrounding the organization. In the Strategy movement, the development of management thought was showing itself to be increasingly distanced from social interests, and increasingly fragmented, reactionary, and lacking in historical dialectics.

2.3.6 The Customer Service, Marketing, and Innovation Model

Over the 1980s, business firms especially in the US were further challenged by competition from new economies such as Japan. In response, some management theorists advocated business methods adopted by these new economies, and re-emphasized the scientific approach especially with regard to productivity improvement and quality management. Others turned the opposite direction by emphasizing the 'soft' factors of customer service and organizational culture. The iconic publication representing this latter movement was *In Search of Excellence* by Peters and Waterman. Countering the allegedly inhuman approach of the Strategy model, the new movement's focus on customer service sought to re-insert the human touch back into management by emphasizing relationships, passion, creativity, flexibility, and teamwork to deliver quality products and services to customers. As Chapter 1 of this thesis has highlighted, the language of excellence and customer service so captured people's imagination that even Catholic pastoral literature at that time were widely quoting Peters and Waterman,

[58] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 192.

[59] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 54.

exhorting pastors to build "excellent parishes" that exceed "customer satisfaction".[60] With this movement, management was all about creating an organizational culture that aligned every person and every activity towards "delighting" the customer.[61]

Towards the turn of the millennium, advances in technology intensified competition even further. Business firms had to develop new products and services even more quickly to keep pace with fast-changing technologies. The management field responded with a wave of theories on innovation. This time, the central theme was radical transformation and disruptive change. Theories from this movement advocated creativity, thinking out-of-the-box, destroying organizational silos, maintaining flexible and flat organizational structures, empowering employees, tolerating mistakes, encouraging experimentation, and creating new market demand where it previously did not exist. The resounding mantra was that in a time of rapid change and radically new technologies, organizations needed to reinvent themselves or perish. The work of contemporary management theorists such as Clayton Christensen and John Kotter are representative of this movement.[62]

On the positive side, the Customer Service, Marketing, and Innovation model has reminded organizations to pay attention to the people they serve and to respond well to their needs. It also emphasizes the importance of reading the signs of the times, being innovative, flexible, and thus staying relevant. On the shadow side, the sole focus on the customer becomes a distortion when taken to the extreme. Giving customers or the market such power, all for the underlying objective of organizational survival and profit, calls to question the mission of the organization, the balance of interests among stakeholders, and the common good. It also reinforces a narrow view of the human person as a consumer whose needs and wants must be constantly served by others and satisfied by new products. At the same time, there is no consideration of values with regard to what customers desire. As discussed in Chapter 1, these problems are manifested in the Catholic pastoral literature when the customer service and marketing perspective is adopted uncritically. As for innovation and change management, critics caution against the manipulative nature of these theories, as well as their over-emphasis

[60] Brennan, *Parishes that Excel*, 119.

[61] Boone, "Parish and Service Quality," 110.

[62] See Clayton M. Christensen, *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail* (Boston: Harvard Business Review Press, 1997); John P. Kotter, *Leading Change* (Boston: Harvard Business Review Press, 1996). The innovation and change management movement is sometimes regarded as distinct from the marketing and customer service movement. In this thesis, both movements are placed together because of their common emphasis on creativity, flexibility, transformation of organizational cultures, empowerment of employees, responsiveness to the market, and customer satisfaction.

on the process of change rather than the ultimate goal or direction of change. Some critics have also questioned the assumption that change is inevitable, ubiquitous, and desirable.[63]

2.3.7 The Social Responsibility Model

Finally, management historians identify social responsibility as a movement that is gaining more attention in recent times. Prior to the industrial revolution, the provision of basic worker welfare and benefits was already a common practice.[64] Management historian Gordan Pearson emphasizes that one of the early challenges which managers in the industrial revolution saw for themselves was not merely maximizing shareholder wealth but balancing the distribution of surplus between owners, workers, and the firm's capital fund for long-term development.[65] Several early management thinkers highlighted the issue of workplace justice and social responsibility. One of the most notable was Robert Owen (1771-1858) who established social communities of solidarity in the new urban industrial setting, and is widely regarded as a pioneer in championing worker welfare. Other prominent thinkers who promoted and explored questions of ethics and justice in management included Mary Parker Follett (1868-1933), Whiting Williams (1878-1975), and Oliver Sheldon (1894-1951). In a significant work, Sheldon stated that the "science of industrial management" should promote "communal well-being", raise "the general ethical standard and conception of social justice", and serve "the highest moral sanction of the community as a whole."[66] In the academic sphere, the initial aims of management education also included serving the wider good of society.[67] Continuing this tradition, the Academy of Management formed in 1941 by management scholars included social objectives in its manifesto, and gave emphasis to the interests of the public and labor in addition to capital.[68] Even up to the 1960s, Drucker stressed that the purview of management includes social impacts and responsibilities.[69]

However, with the rise of liberal capitalism in the latter half of the twentieth century, the priority of social justice diminished from view, along with worker welfare and corporate ethics.

---

[63] Glenn Morgan and André Spicer, "Critical Approaches to Organizational Change," in *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, eds. Mats Alvesson, Todd Bridgman and Hugh Willmott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), Chapter 12.

[64] Wren, *History*, 186-187.

[65] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 59.

[66] Oliver Sheldon, *The Philosophy of Management* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1923), 284, cited in Wren, *History*, 254.

[67] Wren, *History*, 226-227.

[68] Wren, *History*, 349.

[69] Drucker, *Management*, 40.

This led to widening inequality and corruption, with their social and political repercussions. In response, the subject of business ethics was formally introduced into management education during the 1970s.[70] Management thinker Archie Carroll provided an influential paradigm for business ethics studies through his writings in 1979, highlighting that the business firm had a range of responsibilities to meet— not just economic ones but also legal, ethical, and philanthropic ones.[71] Yet observers note that ethics and social responsibility remain a marginal topic in business schools, and have not made much impact on mainstream management thought. The approach business ethics studies also tends to be superficial, impractical, and non-committal, leaving students and managers without any normative moral compass, and none the wiser in making business management more ethical.[72] Even worse, some note that business ethics education pays scant attention to underlying systems of injustices, focusing only procedural matters and thus making managers feel absolved from responsibility once they have taken the prescribed steps.[73] Nevertheless, at the turn of the millennium, the ethical debate in management once again resurfaced, this time prompted by high-profile corporate scandals, rising global inequality, and ecological degradation. Business firms have also become more aware of legal and other negative impacts on the bottom-line from social negligence. As a result, there has been a resurgence of calls to emphasize social responsibility and ethics in management practice and education.[74]

On the whole, this fledgling movement has helped to put ethics, morals, and values into the agenda of management. However, though many of the theories underscore the importance of social and environmental concerns, most of them still frame the argument in terms of how it is ultimately good for business. Hence, the recommended practices do not always serve the long-term good of the poor and vulnerable, or of the environment and wider society. Observers are particularly critical of the Corporate Social Responsibility movement, pointing out that its catch-phrase "doing well by doing good" exposes its underlying aim of business profitability.[75] In any case, the ethical turn has yet to gain traction in mainstream management theory. It has also not dealt squarely with the issue of moral values, nor facilitated a common vision of the

[70] Norman E. Bowie, *Business Ethics in the 21st Century* (New York: Springer, 2013), 209-210.

[71] Wren, *History*, 481.

[72] Pearson, *Rise and Fall of Management*, 231-233.

[73] Mats Alvesson and Hugh Willmott, *Making Sense of Management: A Critical Introduction* (London: Sage Publications, 2012), 29.

[74] For example, see Paul S. Adler, "Corporate Scandals: It's Time for Reflection in Business Schools," *Academy of Management Executive* 16, no. 3 (2002): 148-149.

[75] Denise Baden and Malcolm Higgs, "Challenging the Perceived Wisdom of Management Theories and Practice," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14, no. 4 (December 2015): 543.

human good. In this regard, Wren identifies a key challenge to be "who defines what is ethically or socially responsible behaviour."[76]

2.3.8 Summary: Contributions and controversies

From this diachronic analysis, it can be seen that each successive school of thought in the development of management science has served to highlight pertinent aspects about human work and its coordination. The positive contributions of each movement, when considered together, present a set of tenets with which to approach the multidimensional task of management in a holistic and effective way. The contrasting emphases of the models also assist in maintaining a dialectical balance in management. However, the historical examination has also shown that distortions exist within each school, particularly when its aims and assumptions are taken to the extreme. In addition, management tools are significantly shaped by the business objectives, contexts, concerns, and dominant background theories of the particular era from which they arise. The personal biases and underlying paradigms of theorists also play a major role. Each tool should thus be applied in a historically-critical way, as pointed out earlier. At the same time, some common threads run through the history of management science, and are reinforced by each successive movement. These threads are of a more controversial nature, and include an over-optimistic assumption about control, an emphasis on quantification, an over-simplification of reality, a reductionist view of the human person, an instrumental treatment of people, especially workers, and a lack of regard for the common good. Present debates within the management field call attention to prevailing weaknesses in the field as a result of these accumulated and unresolved controversies.

2.4 Reorientations called for by current debates within the management field

Management scholars have noted that criticism of the current body of management theories as well as of management academia and educational institutions have been rising.[77] The following examination of contemporary debates in the field highlights the state of the questions to-date, and the reorientations called for. These debates coalesce around five main themes: first, the question of values in the means and ends of management; second, assumptions about the human person and society; third, the false promise of technique and a limited vision

[76] Wren, *History*, 481.

[77] McGrath, "No Longer a Stepchild," 1367-1368. See also Rakesh Khurana, *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as a Profession* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007); Sumantra Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices," *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 4, no. 1 (2005): 75-91.

of science; fourth, the top-down nature of management theory; and fifth, fragmentation of the field and the lack of a foundational paradigm.

2.4.1 The question of values in the means and ends of management

Many of the controversies surrounding management theories can be ultimately traced to the question of values. A recurrent debate in the field is whether values should be explicitly considered in management theories, and if so, what these values should be. In particular, the dominant view of management as merely a means towards any end is increasingly being challenged. Many in the field are calling for a re-examination of both the means and ends in management, pointing out that much of management theorizing has been built upon a liberal-capitalist ideology. Hence, the means and ends in management which have come to be accepted as normative for organizational life are not value-neutral, and carry the implicit values of the liberal-capitalist school of economics. What then are some of these values?

In terms of the ends of management, the maximization of shareholder wealth still dominates the purpose and goals implicit in management theories today.[78] Though this goal has been present since the beginning of management science, it was emphasized to the exclusion of all other goals particularly by the Strategy model and its liberal capitalist underpinnings. Consequently, most tools offered by the management field are formulated on the basis that the interest of capital owners is valued more highly than everything else. As a result, the common good, including the well-being of all people and the integrity of the environment, is subjugated to shareholder profit. Countering this, scholars have used the distinction between terminal and instrumental values, highlighted by psychologist Milton Rokeach, to point out that prioritizing shareholder wealth above all else is a conflation of means and ends even for the capital owners.[79] This is because shareholder wealth, or money in general and whatever it buys, is only instrumental to the ultimate goal of total human well-being, which is compromised even for the capital owners when other things such as social and environmental goods are destroyed in the process of profit maximization. Shareholder wealth should thus be regarded as just one of several instrumental values which can potentially contribute to the terminal value of the common good. Charles Handy, a prominent opponent of shareholder profit as the purpose of business, stresses that

> to turn shareholders' needs into a purpose is to be guilty of a logical confusion, to mistake a necessary condition for a sufficient one ... The purpose of a business is

[78] Baden and Higgs, "Challenging the Perceived Wisdom of Management Theories and Practice," 536-552.

[79] Ibid., 543.

> not to make a profit, full stop. It is to make a profit so that the business can do something more or better.[80]

On the surface, this does not seem consequential for non-business sectors where there are no shareholders to speak of. However, the problem is that this prerogative of shareholder profit subsequently forms the basis for formulating the means of management, many of which are then adopted uncritically by the other sectors. A conflict of values thus occurs in several respects. Firstly, as highlighted in the example under the Strategy model, extensive tools for cost-benefit calculations are developed even for non-profit organizations. When adopted uncritically, decision-making can easily become dominated by financial and material considerations rather than the mission of the organization, which is often intangible and hence more easily marginalized from view.

Secondly and more insidiously, maximizing shareholder profits inevitably require fulfilling certain intermediate goals which frequently end up being pursued as ends in themselves, resulting in a further conflation of means and ends. For instance, in mainstream management theory, there is an unquestioned assumption that growth, particularly in tangible ways, or at the very least, organizational survival, is always desirable. This then forms the basis of planning tools as well as tools for all other aspects of organizational work such as strategy, marketing, finance, and human resource. In fact, the very existence of some of these sub-topics stem from the goal of shareholder profit maximization itself. The use of the resulting tools reinforces attention to measurable growth, once again distracting an organization from its real mission. As highlighted in Chapter 1, theologians have noted how this bias towards quantitative growth has been uncritically assimilated in pastoral advice for both Catholic and Protestant churches. Ironically, some observers have pointed out the futility of targeting growth and survival as ends in themselves, given that research has shown that the majority of business corporations do not remain in existence over the long term.[81]

Another intermediate goal which has become an end in itself is efficiency. Critics note the fixation with efficiency in the management field, with some even coining the term "efficiencyism" to describe an over-idealization of efficiency above all other considerations.[82] They point out that this ironically leads to sub-optimal outcomes for people and for the organization itself. Yet aiming for efficiency has become so normalized in modern culture that

---

[80] Charles Handy, "What's A Business For?" *Harvard Business Review* 80, no. 12 (2002): 51.

[81] See Phil Rosenzweig, *The Halo Effect and the Eight Other Business Delusions that Deceive Managers* (New York: Free Press, 2007), 83-105.

[82] Stephan Schaefer and Christopher Wickert, "The Efficiency Paradox in Organization and Management Theory," *Academy of Management Proceedings*, no. 1 (2015): 10958.

not to do so would seem wrong. Chapter 1 has shown how efficiency has become a primary consideration for pastoral management decisions, including how priests should choose which functions to focus on.[83] Another ideal is that of measurement, including the tendency to ascribe measurable value to all aspects of life. Organizational tasks are quantified in terms of man-hours, time is measured in dollars and cents, physical assets are assessed according to their market value, people's worth is reduced to their monetized value-add to the organization, and programs and departments are evaluated according to measurable outputs and results. This tendency for measurement has its roots in Scientific Management, but was strongly reinforced by the Strategy model, as noted in the above historical survey. Even when social and ecological objectives are promoted in private enterprise, these objectives tend to be translated into monetary values, and implemented or evaluated through reductionist and quantifiable indicators. The result is a reductionist view of the human person, the organization, human work, and the earth's resources, as well as a further marginalization of intangible but no less important values in life. As noted, many church management authors mirror this tendency, such as through their promotion of measurable indicators. Stewart points out that the singular pursuit of abstract quantitative indicators often turns out to be counter-productive because it distracts from what really matters to the organization. This happens when measurable indicators and other tools, which are but imperfect models of reality, replace genuine discernment, common sense, critical thinking, responding to concrete contexts, and being faithful to the mission of the organization.[84]

In short, the underlying goal of management tools have been disproportionately orientated towards the interest of capital owners rather than the worker, the common good, the environment, or the poor. Hence, it is no surprise that when it comes to the means of management, problems in values and ethics are rife. Management theories about cost-cutting, organizational restructuring, performance management, resource utilization, and competitive strategies often perpetuate an instrumentalist view of the human person and the created world. As a result, the well-being and dignity of workers, consumers, the wider community, and the environment is compromised. Even when consumer satisfaction is a priority, critics have raised ethical questions over marketing techniques that psychologically manipulate consumers by stoking envy, anxiety, and false aspirations.[85] There is also scant discussion of values with regard to consumer demand, and the types of goods and services that are produced.

[83] See Zech, *Catholic Parishes of the 21st Century*, 63.

[84] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 54.

[85] Alvesson and Willmott, *Making Sense of Management*, 17.

Some observers are of the view that this situation will persist because business schools continue to be funded by corporations with liberal-capitalist ideologies.[86] From a critical-social perspective, other scholars point out that the portrayal of management as a neutral science serves to legitimize current management tools and endow them with an authoritative and normative status, thus enabling the existing inequalities to continue.[87] Power and class divisions aside, scholars such as management historian Morgan Witzel observe that throughout its history, management studies have been mostly short-sighted and reactionary, hardly going beyond the immediate practical needs that managers face in each milieu.[88] Philosophical issues such as values thus remain unexplored. Similarly, leadership scholar Barbara Kellerman criticizes the myopia among leadership and management theorists, who often fail to explore and address deeper, longer-term, and underlying issues and problems which concern society as a whole. She notes that the theories have become too narrow in their concerns, focusing only on immediate individual and organizational goals, thus leading to "insular leadership" and "bounded awareness".[89]

Another reason for the marginalization of values is that management scholarship has been preoccupied with establishing its own academic credibility, and modelling itself after the natural sciences and the core disciplines underlying the management field, such as mathematics, economics, psychology, and sociology. This has resulted in a preference for a more technical approach which emphasizes the empirical, measurable, and predictable. There is no room for ambiguous and intangible factors such as human values and ethics, or for longer-term considerations and uncertainties such as social and environmental impacts. Instead, the singular goal of maximizing shareholder value conveniently enables straight-cut formulas and precise calculations. In his prominent critique of management academia, Sumantra Ghoshal decries this "pretense of knowledge" in management scholarship, and the resulting deterioration of values in management.[90] Other scholars have highlighted research findings which show that current business school education has actually increased materialistic and self-seeking behavior in students.[91]

---

[86] See Jeffrey Pfeffer, "Why Do Bad Management Theories Persist? A Comment on Ghoshal," *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 1 (Mar 2005): 96-100.

[87] See Alvesson and Willmott, *Making Sense of Management,* 30-31,37; Stewart, *Management Myth,* 77.

[88] Witzel, *History,* 4.

[89] Barbara Kellerman, *The End of Leadership* (New York: Harper Business, 2012), 191.

[90] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 77.

[91] Pfeffer, "Why Do Bad Management Theories Persist?" 97.

In response to these problems, the sub-field of Critical Management Studies (CMS) arose during the 1990s, with the aim of addressing ethical issues especially in relation to power imbalances in management theories.[92] Other scholars, such as those who have formed the Humanistic Management Network, call for an explicit commitment to the common good and social responsibility in mainstream management.[93] Resonating with this, Mintzberg counters Friedman by highlighting that economic and social factors are deeply intertwined in the real world. Since economic decisions have social consequences, managers inevitably make social choices when they opt for one course of action over another in the pursuit of profit.[94] In fact, Drucker notes that organizations have become such a pervasive part of social life that the management of these organizations cannot afford to ignore human and social needs.[95] Similarly, Ghoshal points out that no social theory can be values-free because humans are not values-free.[96] He adds that "a good theory is one that both explains, as well or better than any alternative explanation and, at the same time, induces (as far as we can determine) behaviours and actions of people that lead to better economic, social, and moral outcomes, for them and for society."[97] On the education side, Ghoshal also asserts that "management academia should have an influence in building a better world for the future … [and] reinstitute ethical or moral concerns in the practice of management."[98] Significantly, a group of leading figures in the management field, who had gathered in 2008 to reflect on the field's future directions, agreed that the top priority was to ensure "that the work of management serves a higher purpose … and focus on the achievement of socially significant and noble goals", and uphold the common good.[99]

This begs the question of what these social goals should be. In this regard, Clifford Geertz helpfully distinguishes between thick and thin accounts of ethical values. Whilst thin accounts speak broadly of the human or social good, and the processes to discern and attain them, thick accounts venture into concrete descriptions of what exactly the human and social good

[92] See Alvesson et al., *Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, Chapter 1.

[93] Humanistic Management Network, "About Humanistic Management," accessed June 10, 2016, http://www.humanetwork.org/index.php/en/about-us/about-humanistic-management.

[94] Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs*, 151.

[95] Drucker, *Management,* 35.

[96] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 83.

[97] Sumantra Ghoshal and Peter Moran, "Towards a Good Theory of Management," in *Sumantra Ghoshal on Management: A Force for Good*, eds., Julian Birkinshaw and Gita Piramal (London: Prentice Hall, 2005), 25.

[98] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 87.

[99] Gary Hamel, "Moon Shots for Management," *Harvard Business Review* (February 2009): 92.

comprise.[100] I agree with Bernard Williams who argues that when it comes to providing guidance for action, moral discourse needs to occur at the level of thick descriptions.[101] As noted above, the lack of more definitive moral values in the content of business ethics education has impeded it from making any impact. A recent and more positive development is that although much of the advocacy among scholars for social responsibility in management has remained at the thin level, some attempts towards a thick description of the social good are emerging. For example, CMS scholars highlight social justice in terms of balanced power relations, inclusiveness, participation, democracy, eco-sustainability, self-determination, and autonomy with responsibility.[102] Other scholars such as Denise Baden and Malcolm Higgs draw upon multicultural perspectives to propose that social and ecological well-being include ecological integrity, sustainability, food security, self-sufficiency, gainful employment, satisfaction from work, fair working conditions, work-life balance, social inclusion, and upholding the common good which incorporates the interests of all stakeholders from both the long-term and short-term perspective.[103] They also highlight spirituality and the need for "holistic integration of mind, body and soul."[104] On the notion of human dignity, Michael Pirson and Claus Dierksmeier emphasize the "intrinsic, inherent, unconditional, and universal value to human life that needs to be protected" as well as "an ability to establish a sense of self-worth and self-respect that needs to be promoted."[105] At a more global level, the Master of Business Administration (MBA) Oath stresses human rights, human dignity, and sustainability for future generations, and rejects discrimination, exploitation, unfair competition, and corruption.[106] Echoing this, the United Nations Principles for Responsible Management Education advocate sustainable development, inclusiveness, protection of the earth, and special attention to those suffering from poverty, corruption, and systematic human rights abuses.[107] These same desired

[100] Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture," in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973): 3-30.

[101] See Bernard Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 140-142.

[102] Alvesson and Willmott, *Making Sense of Management*, 26.

[103] Baden and Higgs, "Challenging the Perceived Wisdom of Management Theories and Practice," 536-552.

[104] Ibid., 550.

[105] Michael A. Pirson and Claus Dierksmeier, "Reconnecting Management Theory and Social Welfare: A Humanistic Perspective," *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings* (2014), accessed June 10, 2016, doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2014.11.

[106] MBA Oath, "MBA Oath: Responsible Value Creation," accessed February 20, 2016, http://mbaoath.org/about/the-mba-oath/.

[107] United Nations, "United Nations Principles for Responsible Management Education," accessed February 20, 2016, http://www.unprme.org/about-prme/the-six-principles.php.

ends are found in the United Nations Global Compact for business, which additionally promotes the freedom of association, and rejects forced or child labor.[108]

In summary, these counter-efforts to incorporate values in management represent a growing dialectic within the management field. For scholars promoting socio-ecological responsibility in management, a reorientation of management science would entail more explicit articulation of terminal values, and the application of these values towards a reformulation of management theories and tools. It can be seen that such an articulation of terminal values will necessarily touch on the issue of teleology. This points to where a theological engagement, which brings to bear the resources of a faith tradition, might play a fruitful role.

2.4.2 Assumptions about the human person and society

Since management science has developed for the most part within the commercial business domain, its assumptions about the human person and society are greatly shaped by economic paradigms, particularly those innate to liberal capitalism. Current debates among management scholars are now challenging these assumptions. Ghoshal rejects the pessimistic "ideology-based gloomy vision" of the human person, which is enshrined in much of management theory.[109] As seen in the above historical survey, this vision has its roots in the *Homo Economicus* (Economic Man) of Adam Smith and assumes human beings to be essentially self-interested, untrustworthy, materialistic, and always seeking to maximize their own utility even at the expense of others. Accordingly, management tools are frequently aimed at institutionalizing control in organizations so as to curb opportunistic behavior. Chapter 1 has highlighted many examples of such tools in Catholic pastoral management literature, including performance appraisals, team management, and internal control systems. To redress this problem in management science, Ghoshal advocates for more positive anthropologies that focus on the intrinsic strengths, goodness, and virtues of human persons.[110] Likewise Ian Mitroff calls for the "mean-spirited" and "narrowest" assumptions about human beings to be replaced by greater recognition of altruism and other higher motivations.[111]

Another reductionist anthropological view harbored by management theories is that of human beings as consumers. This has been etched into management science particularly by the

[108] United Nations, "United Nations Global Compact," accessed February 20, 2016, https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/mission/principles.

[109] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 84.

[110] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 85-6.

[111] Ian I. Mitroff, "An Open Letter to the Deans and the Faculties of American Business Schools," *Journal of Business Ethics* 54, no. 2 (2004): 185.

Customer Service, Marketing, and Innovation model, and underpinned once again by liberal capitalism. Consumption has become such a dominant aspect of people's view of life that even faith is seen in terms of "consuming religion".[112] As noted in Chapter 1, Catholic pastoral literature has unfortunately reinforced this view, such as by issuing exhortations to treat parishioners as "customers" who "consume or utilize services offered by the parish."[113] Mintzberg criticizes similar tendencies in management tools for government and public services. Remarking that the use of a consumer paradigm "demeans" government and civil society, he proposes the more suitable paradigm of "citizens" rather than "consumers".[114] It can be similarly said that the use of the consumer paradigm in Catholic pastoral literature demeans Christianity and the Church too.

Besides anthropological assumptions, the economic foundation of management science has also shaped the view of social relationships in management. For instance, management tools are largely based on the assumption that the relationship between organizations and between people is essentially a competitive one. This paradigm is reflected even in management tools for non-commercial institutions such as social and non-profit organizations.[115] As a result, a competitive stance is adopted even when it is not called for, thus distracting an organization from its real mission. It also inhibits co-operation and sharing, which might be more fruitful even for business firms. As pointed out earlier, this competitive tendency is observed in Catholic pastoral management literature as well, with one pastor-author asserting that "we are competing as well in a religiously pluralistic society … so we need to be organized just as well as a business to succeed."[116] Again, it is the Strategy model which has reinforced the notion of competition. Scholars note that management tools from this movement draw much from military thought and language, adopting the lens of warfare to analyze and address business concerns.[117] In fact, Stewart observes that before the 1960s, the word 'strategy' had been associated only with the military, and was alien to the business sector.[118]

---

[112] See Vincent J. Miller, *Consuming Religion: Christian Faith and Practice in a Consumer Culture* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2003).

[113] Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality,"108.

[114] Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs*, 158.

[115] For example, see I.C. MacMillan, "Competitive Strategies for Not-for-Profit Agencies," *Advances in Strategic Management* 1 (1983): 61-82; and Sharon Olster, *Strategic Management for Nonprofit Organizations: Theory and Cases* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 29-45. In Olster's work, a strategic framework devised by prominent management scholar Michael Porter for enhancing business competitiveness is applied to the non-profit industry.

[116] Heney, *Motivating Your Parish to Change*, ix.

[117] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 152-153.

[118] Ibid.

Another dominant view of social relationships in management theory that has been shaped by economics is that of the buyer-seller (or consumer-producer) paradigm. This views relations among people and organizations as essentially transactional, self-interested, and materialistic. The paradigm has come to shape the identity of organizations so much that the task of producing and selling a product or service in response to the demands of customers or buyers often forms the sole raison d'être of an organization, and the axis around which everything else evolves. In a major college textbook on organization theory, despite being written for all types of organizations, author Richard Daft states that "what still matters most for an organization to remain successful is producing results for customers—having a product or service that people want and getting it to them quickly at a competitive price."[119] It is not difficult to see this instrumental view of the organization echoed in the words of a pastoral management author who applies this to the Church and writes that "the institutional church … is in the business of providing a service to people, both Catholics and others in need."[120] What is noteworthy is that, as with the paradigm of competition, the buyer-seller paradigm is not only at odds with ecclesiology but more fundamentally, distorts relations in society as a whole. The multi-dimensional nature of social relationships is reduced to a singular view that focuses on self-serving transactions. Thus, problems faced in the application of management tools in the Church have deeper roots in the inherent problems within management science itself. This once again highlights the need to reorientate the secular disciplines for the benefit of wider society and not just for the Church.

In fact, resonating with Pattison's and Budde's observations, Ghoshal and other scholars point out that what is particularly problematic is that unlike the natural sciences, assumptions embedded in the human sciences tend to be self-fulfilling because people start to believe what is practiced.[121] Given that management research tends to be positivist, a vicious cycle thus results. Ghoshal further emphasizes that the problem is not only in the content of these assumptions but more seriously, in the fact that they are deeply embedded and unexamined. He aptly recalls the observation of John Maynard Keynes that "practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences are usually the slaves of some

[119] Richard L. Daft, *Organization Theory and Design* (Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning, 2013), 6.

[120] Forster and Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish,* 56.

[121] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 84-85. See also Fabrizio Ferraro and Jeffrey Pfeffer, "Economics Language and Assumptions: How Theories can Become Self-fulfilling," *Academy of Management Review* 30, no. 1 (2005): 8–24.

defunct economist. It is ideas, not vested interests, which are dangerous for good or evil."[122] Likewise, Peter Franklin points out the "concealed ontologies" in many management tools.[123] In this light, the empiricist approach adopted in some of the Catholic pastoral management literature is particularly problematic because of its unconscious influence by the prevailing managerial culture, with the controversial values and paradigms.

2.4.3 False promise of technique, and limited vision of science

The third broad area of debate within the management field pertains to its overly-technical approach, and the resulting lack of relevance and effectiveness in concrete practice. Scholars observe that throughout its history, the management field has tended to adopt a deterministic stance which makes exaggerated truth claims about the promise of success from generalized, formulaic, and sometimes over-simplified techniques.[124] A commentary promoting a recent publication well-exemplifies this tendency. The reviewer highlights that the publication's authors provide

> a practical guide for successfully planning and implementing a reorg (reorganization) in five steps—demystifying and accelerating the process at the same time. Based on their twenty-five years of combined experience managing reorgs … the authors distill what they … have been practicing as an 'art' into a 'science' that executives can replicate in companies or business units large or small. It isn't rocket science and it isn't bogged down by a lot of organizational theory: the five steps give people a simple, logical process to follow, making it easier for everyone—both the leaders and the employees who ultimately determine a reorg's success or failure—to commit themselves to and succeed in the new organization.[125]

Noting that management has been reduced to the "mindless application of techniques," Mintzberg cuttingly points out that "a technique might be defined as something that can be used in place of a brain."[126] Another prominent critic of the management field, Adrian Wooldridge, calls out its overly-technical and deterministic approach to complex problems as an "illusion".[127] Similarly, in sharp contrast to the reviewer cited above, Phil Rosenzweig points out that the management field obscures a "basic truth" that success is often "shaped in part by

---

[122] John M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1953), 306, cited in Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 75.

[123] Peter Franklin, "Problematics in Management Theory and Practice," *Strategic Change Journal* 13, no. 7 (November 2004): 393.

[124] See Wooldridge, *Masters of Management*, 70.

[125] Harvard Business Review, "Reorg: How to Get it Right," accessed February 10, 2017, https://hbr.org/product/ reorg-how-to-get-it-right/10072-HBK-ENG.

[126] Mintzberg, *Managers not MBAs*, 39.

[127] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management*, 70.

factors outside our control"; yet many management theories continue to "give rise to the especially grievous notion that business success follows predictably from implementing a few key steps."[128] Despite these criticisms, a deterministic and over-confident reliance on technique continues to prevail in mainstream management and is also evident in Catholic pastoral management literature, as seen in Chapter 1.

Prominent management scholar Gary Hamel has declared that "the machinery of management … amounts to one of humanity's greatest inventions" and this machinery includes tools like "variance analysis, capital budgeting, project management, pay for performance, strategic planning, and the like."[129] Ironically, the management field has no shortage of writings pointing out that these very tools and other common management techniques do not really work. For example, Stewart investigates the genesis of Scientific Management to show that its methods were fraught with arbitrariness, and that despite claims to be scientific, the results were never really proven.[130] Similarly, James Hoopes probes the Human Relations model and shows that tools promising worker empowerment, personal fulfilment, and cultural change are really false promises in the harsh reality of workplace dynamics and financial priorities.[131] Others have pointed out the limitations of strategic planning, performance targets, and other common management tools.[132]

Besides the lack of rigor in theory formulation, the harboring of unrealistic assumptions, and the tendency to over-generalize from specific contexts, scholars have also exposed the biases behind much of management research. In a prominent work, Rosenzweig points out a common error known as the "Halo Effect".[133] Companies doing well in terms of some popular and tangible measure like profitability are inferred by researchers to also have visionary leadership, good teamwork, and healthy employee relations—intangible factors which are difficult to evaluate objectively. When these same companies experience a downturn in profitability, they are then criticized for lack of visionary leadership, teamwork, and healthy employee relations when in fact, nothing within the organization has really changed; only the perception of researchers and outside observers, a perception colored by over-emphasis on the

[128] Phil Rosenzweig, "The Halo Effect and Other Managerial Delusions," *The McKinsey Quarterly*, Issue 1 (February 2007), accessed February 20, 2016, http://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/the-halo-effect-and-other-managerial-delusions.

[129] Gary Hamel, *The Future of Management* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2007), 6.

[130] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 47-50.

[131] James Hoopes, *False Prophets* (New York : Basic Books, 2007), Chapters 5-6.

[132] See Henry Mintzberg, *Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning* (New York: Free Press, 1994); and Axson, *Management Mythbuster*.

[133] Rosenzweig, *Halo Effect*, Chapter 4, at 50.

quantifiable. Other biases in theory formulation which perpetuate inequalities in gender, culture, and social status have been pointed out by CMS and other scholars.[134] Not surprisingly, such biased research produce theories that do not really work in practice, as noted above.

A telling survey of business school alumni reveals that it is not the techniques learnt in management education which graduates find useful in their jobs, but intangible gains such as networks and relationships cultivated at business school.[135] In any case, specific techniques become quickly outdated. Daft notes that "management ideas life cycles have been growing shorter as the pace of change has increased."[136] Stewart even suggests that ultimately, there is no such thing as universal and scientific laws of management.[137] Yet, the deterministic and overly-technical approach is likely to prevail in the field. One reason arises from the demand side. Kellerman highlights the rising number of busy executives looking for quick-fixes to their management problems, and the corresponding increase in popular leadership literature packaged in a brief, over-generalized, and simplistic way. She cautions that such literature reinforces the dubious view that one can be an effective leader by mastering the simple material and doing so within a short time.[138] Notably, the same approach is adopted by some Catholic pastoral literature for challenges in ministry that require anything but straight forward solutions.[139] It can also be seen that solutions offered by management literature tend to be driven by what people want to hear. For example, amidst the gloomy economic conditions of the 1980s and the prevailing mechanistic, ruthless approach of the Strategy model, Peters and Waterman boldly asserted that it is people who mattered most. With a refreshingly new literary style that was as people-friendly as its content, the publication resonated with a wide audience. However, observers note that the authors' somewhat simplistic prescriptions for success were soon contradicted by the failure of their model companies.[140]

A more significant issue is that highlighted by Stewart who points out that people tend to cope with uncertain and challenging times by seeking refuge in fail-safe, simple, and seemingly objective solutions. For instance, conflicts during the industrial revolution were really about

---

[134] See Alvesson, et al., *Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, Chapter 1; and Stewart, *Management Myth*, 97-121.

[135] Alvesson and Willmott, *Making Sense of Management*, 218.

[136] Richard L. Daft, *Management*, 11th ed. (Mason, OH: South Western Cengage Learning, 2014), 56.

[137] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 52.

[138] Kellerman, *End of Leadership*, 168. A typical example is Nicholas Bate, *Instant MBA: Think, Perform and Earn Like a Top Business-School Graduate* (Oxford: Infinite Ideas, 2008).

[139] A case in point is James Mallon, *Divine Renovation Guidebook: A Step-by-Step Manual for Transforming Your Parish* (Toronto: Novalis, 2016).

[140] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management*, 103-104.

deeper socio-cultural issues of rights and responsibilities, and required sincere dialogue to forge new social compacts. Instead, Taylor's movement approached these conflicts with a so-called scientific and technical solution. Stewart adds that "this confusion of facts and values—or, more generally, the attempt to find pseudotechnical solutions to moral and political problems—is the most consequential error in Taylor's work and is the cardinal sin of management theory to the present."[141] This once again highlights the problems caused by not dealing adequately with the question of values. As Stewart notes, management tools can dangerously become a fantasy of human control, an idolatry of technique, and a utopian, ideological flight from social, moral, and political conflict, complexities, and responsibility.[142] This view resonates with Pattison's observation that although many management tools lack sufficient evidence of effectiveness, they are still widely adopted because they afford a sense of control.[143]

Unfortunately these tendencies on the demand side are exacerbated by the fact that on the supply side, the production of management theory is itself a major profit-driven industry. Estimating that the US market for business management literature is worth about US$750 million a year, Wooldridge remarks that "it is impossible to think of any other academic discipline that can match management theory's success in building an industry around itself."[144] This inevitably compromises the academic rigor of management theory. Observers note the proliferation of "snake-oil peddlers" dishing out best-selling management advice to the mass market, devoid of all theoretical rigor.[145] Wooldridge cautions that in such management tools, "generalizations are built on rickety foundations. Blueprints are applied without proper testing."[146] As one industry commentator remarks, "management theory remains a porous industry in which serious thinkers rub shoulder to shoulder with products of the university of life."[147] Even outright fraud is not uncommon, such as in cases whereby book sales are manipulated so that its idea appears to be a best-seller, thus stimulating greater interest and adoption whilst also increasing the author's prominence and financial gain.[148] Wooldridge calls

[141] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 56.

[142] Ibid., 74-79.

[143] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 28-34.

[144] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management,* 4-5. Added to this estimated revenue should be the significant sums spent on executive training and on management consultants, many of whom also occupy a significant space in the generation of new theories.

[145] Axson, *Management Mythbuster*, 33.

[146] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management,* 9.

[147] John Micklethwait, "Foreword," in ibid., xvi.

[148] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management,* 29-30.

out the "faddish" tendency of management theory formulation and reception.[149] Prominent new tools quickly gain a wide following but subsequently lose steam as reality sets in during their implementation, or when newer trends supersede them. Similarly, management methods based on successful corporations and personalities who rise in fame are promoted. When these same entities fail, further new theories are then proffered on why they failed, thus sparking another wave of publication sales.[150] It can be said that such incidences highlight the herd mentality and lack of objectivity that often characterize the reception of management theories. This exacerbates the problem of their prescriptive and deterministic nature.

At the other end of the spectrum, as already highlighted by Ghoshal, the pursuit of academic credibility and prestige among management scholars has also resulted in a preference for the empirical, technical, and conventional, all for the sake of establishing management as a science, though with a very limited vision of science.[151] Some have also remarked that the technical approach has been preferred simply because it is "easier", since it does not require dealing with "complex social and human factors."[152] Internal critics point out that this tendency has made management scholarship increasingly impractical and irrelevant to the field, as well as lacking in radically new insights.[153] In fact, Rita McGrath estimates that currently, only about 50% of academic work is actually used by practitioners.[154]

It can be said that the social sciences and thus the management field commit a double error by trying to imitate the physical and natural sciences. First, the physical and natural sciences have their own blind-spots because of their positivist and empiricist stance. Such a stance assumes a totality of the observable, and thus perpetuates a self-deception about comprehensiveness, objectivity, precision, and control. This self-illusory tendency is exhibited by management science when it adopts the approach of the physical sciences. For instance, Taylor declared that management is "a true science" with "laws as exact, and as clearly defined … as the fundamental principles of engineering."[155] He also asserts that "the same principles

[149] Ibid., 17.

[150] Ibid., 48, 17.

[151] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 77, 75.

[152] Warren G. Bennis and James O'Toole, "How Business Schools Lost Their Way," *Harvard Business Review* 83, no. 5 (May 2005): 99. This view is echoed in Rosabeth M. Kanter, "What Theories Do Audiences Want? Exploring the Demand Side," *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 1 (March 2005): 93-95.

[153] See Bennis and O'Toole, "How Business Schools Lost Their Way," 98-100; and Mats Alvesson and Jörgen Sandberg, "Has Management Studies Lost Its Way? Ideas for More Imaginative and Innovative Research," *Journal of Management Studies* 50, no.1 (January 2013): 128-152.

[154] McGrath, "No Longer a Stepchild," 1372.

[155] Taylor, "Shop Management" in *Scientific Management* (New York: Harper Brothers, 1947), 18, cited in Stewart, *Management Myth*, 36.

can be applied with equal force to all social activities: to the management of our homes; the management of our farms; the management of the business of our tradesmen, large and small; of our churches, our philanthropic institutions, our universities, and our governmental departments."[156] However, this self-proclaimed sufficiency, exactness, and comprehensiveness of Scientific Management have been disproved by the subsequent emergence of many other management schools of thought, illuminating important dimensions of management that the scientific school has overlooked.

In addition, as seen in the historical survey, the pioneers of Scientific Management did not seem to be aware of the highly biased nature of their so-called scientific method, ranging from the observation of laborers at work, to the setting of output benchmarks and piece-rate salaries.[157] Thus, the presumption of objectivity and analytical rigor, as well as over-confidence in empirical method, masks hidden prejudices. This tendency is continued among management researchers today such as in the Halo Effect described by Rosenzweig. Likewise, Catholic pastoral management authors display the same tendency when they advocate apparently scientific approaches such as identifying best practices, and benchmarking with successful parishes. The authors seem unaware of their own biases about the criteria for success, and about the factors that contribute to the observed outcomes. As pointed out by Warren Bennis and James O'Toole, "however reassuring the halo of science, it can also lull us into a false sense of confidence that we are making objective decisions."[158]

At a more fundamental level, the social sciences should not even be modelling themselves upon the physical sciences because human society has its own nature and characteristics. For instance, Ghoshal points out that whilst causal and functional perspectives can be adopted in the natural inorganic and organic sciences respectively, theories in the human and social sciences deal with the "intentional"; hence they cannot be deterministic because human intentions can never be fully predicted, calculated, or evaluated.[159] For Mintzberg, the elimination of uncertainty from management theory is erroneous because "the practice of management is characterized by its ambiguity"; it is about working among people, dealing with the vagaries of human nature as well as with the "intractable problems" and "complicated connections" that frequently characterize real life.[160] Hence, management is not just a science

[156] Taylor, "Principles of Scientific Management" in *Scientific Management*, 8, cited in Stewart, *Management Myth*, 36.

[157] Stewart, *Management Myth*, 47-50.

[158] Bennis and O'Toole, "How Business Schools Lost Their Way," 100.

[159] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 77-78.

[160] Mintzberg, *Managers not MBAs*, 13.

but also a "craft" which entails skill and experience, as well as an "art" which requires intuition, imagination, creativity, and inspiration.[161] Similarly, Bennis and O'Toole highlight the centrality of practical wisdom in management, rather than technical knowledge, pointing out that "most issues facing business leaders are, in the final analysis, questions of judgment. What looks like a straightforward financial decision … often has implications for marketing, sales, manufacturing, and morale that can't be shoehorned into an equation."[162] Mintzberg further asserts that management skills are not as portable as other people-related skills such as teaching. An outsider with generic management skills cannot be simply inserted into an organization to manage it effectively because management requires familiarity with the specific people, nature, circumstances, and work of the organization.[163]

All in all, a limited vision of what it means to be scientific has led management theorists to ignore ambiguity and non-measurables, with the ironic consequence of moving further away from the reality which they originally sought to model in a scientific way. Critics note that this drive to minimize uncertainty has even led to the adoption of rather impractical assumptions into some theories, thus rendering them totally ineffective.[164] More seriously, a prevailing narrative about increasing complexity in the contemporary world has fed the urge for even more sophisticated methods of analyses and control. For instance, a leading management consulting firm asserts that since the world is becoming more complex, "management will go from art to science" and even more sophisticated analytics will be needed by organizations.[165] As some CMS scholars have noted, the irony is that measures taken to exert control over nature and people have resulted in making the world an even more complex and threatening place, further exacerbating the uncertainty that the management field seeks to overcome. A vicious cycle thus results.[166]

Given all these factors, is there any point in having management theories at all? Scholars still see a place for management theories, provided a more tentative and probabilistic approach is adopted in their formulation and application, balancing practical wisdom and theoretical rigor. McGrath urges that management scholars need to "create better theories of action" and

---

[161] Ibid., 1.

[162] Bennis and O'Toole, "How Business Schools Lost Their Way," 99.

[163] Mintzberg, *Managers not MBAs*, 12.

[164] Wolfgang Pindur, Sandra E. Rogers and Pan Suk Kim, "The History of Management: A Global Perspective," *Journal of Management History* 1, no. 1 (1995): 69.

[165] Ian Davis and Elizabeth Stephenson, "Ten Trends to Watch in 2006," *The McKinsey Quarterly*, January 27, 2006, accessed February 20, 2016, http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com.

[166] Christopher Grey, "Towards a Critique of Managerialism: The Contribution of Simone Weil," *Journal of Management Studies* 33, no.5 (September 1996): 604-605.

are well-trained to do so.[167] Supporting the case for management science, Nick Bloom et al. show research evidence that major management theories are still fruitful in practice.[168] Further, although Mintzberg emphasizes the centrality of experience for efficacy in management, he also stresses that theories are still needed to facilitate reflection and learning from experience. As simplified mental models of reality, theories provide the frameworks to aid our thinking and to help us categorize our experiences. At the same time, techniques have to be modified to suit specific situations.[169] Resonating with this, Wooldridge maintains that general lessons can still be learnt from specific organizations, provided they are modified to suit other organizations, and fine-tuned over time.[170]

All this highlights the need to recover the reflexivity, responsibility, and critical thinking that had been surrendered in favor of technique. Wooldridge observes that whereas in the past, "theory was a guide to practice; today, theory is increasingly in the driver's seat."[171] Likewise, David Axson criticizes the tendency of "management communism", which describes the herd mentality of people in uncritically following the latest management tools.[172] Mintzberg stresses that management theory and education have to help people become more mindful and discerning. Management theories should describe how a technique works, in what kinds of situations, and when it might not work; and managers have to decide for themselves whether, when, and especially how to use a technique.[173]

In summary, a conflict exists between the deterministic, technical, and empirical approach of mainstream management science on the one hand, and the call made by internal critics for a more probabilistic and reflexive approach on the other hand, which takes into account qualitative variables, contextual realities, ambiguity, and the limits of human control. For scholars holding this alternative view, the management field needs to be reoriented such that management theories and tools are formulated, expressed, and applied in a more heuristic, tentative, and contextual manner. They must promote practical wisdom, as well as facilitate greater attention to the socio-cultural and other deeper issues that may underlie certain management problems. As in the case of terminal values and assumptions about the human

[167] McGrath, "No Longer a Stepchild," 1371.

[168] Nicholas Bloom, Raffaella Sadun and John Van Reenen, "Does Management Really Work? How Three Essential Practices Can Address Even the Most Complex Global Problems," *Harvard Business Review* 90, no. 11 (November 2012): 77-82.

[169] Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs*, 249, 39.

[170] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management*, 413.

[171] Ibid., 51.

[172] Axson, *Management Mythbuster*, 10.

[173] Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs*, 398-403.

person and society, this internal debate within the management field about its empirical and deterministic approach has also revealed that conflicts in worldview are encountered not only by the Church in applying management theory, but also by others in society wherever the managerial culture is adopted. Hence, the issues raised in this debate highlight another area where theology could make a potential contribution by providing insights on teleology, epistemology, human freedom, and control.

2.4.4 Top-down nature of management theory

Whether technique or practical wisdom is emphasized, another point of contention in the management field evolves around the idea of the 'visible hand' of management, and its emphasis on the role and influence of the manager. As seen in the historical survey, this idea has been made prominent particularly by the General Administration model. Chapter 1 has highlighted how an omnipotent view of the manager is also manifested in Catholic pastoral literature. For example, one author asserts that "any organization, whether a parish, a Church agency, a doctor's office, or a nation, succeeds or fails based on the actions of management" and where there is success, it is because "someone worked hard to bring those components together at just the right moments."[174] Similarly, others maintain that "everything rises or falls on leadership."[175]

In contrast, Mintzberg rejects the paradigm of the manager as protagonist and heroic leader with power and control over all things and people.[176] Likewise Kellerman points out that leadership theories place too much emphasis on the person of the leader and his or her actions. Observing that in reality, followers influence outcomes to a significant extent, she stresses that leadership theories should not be simply focused on the leader but on a more realistic dynamic involving leaders, followers, and the context.[177] Stewart similarly highlights that management success is often the result of communal action as well as environmental factors such as social stability, laws, and culture.[178] Foreshadowing these views, the early theorist Mary Parker Follett had astutely observed that "I have seen an executive feel a little self-important over a decision he had made, when that decision had really come to him ready-made. An executive decision is a moment in a process. The growth of a decision, the accumulation of authority, not the final

[174] Massetti, "Fundamentals of Management," 28 and 24.

[175] White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 242.

[176] Mintzberg, *Managers not MBAs*, Chapter 4.

[177] Kellerman, *End of Leadership*, 23, 95.

[178] Stewart, Management Myth, 277, 297-298.

step, is what we need most to study."[179] These alternative views highlight that management is a dynamic, developmental, and communal process rather than a single instantaneous action of an omnipotent individual.

Touching on the ethical dimension, some observers note that on the whole, management science tends to place the theorist and the manager over and above other human beings and the world. Walter Kiechel admits that since its early days, the management field has been the domain of the "educated managerial cadre" that "looked down on the typical worker as a lesser being, one to be manipulated in service of higher purposes."[180] In fact, CMS scholars point out the injustice inherent in using management knowledge to exert power and control over others, especially by framing it as an objective science.[181] Some observers note that beyond the more obvious scientific management approach, alternative soft approaches are just as manipulative and controlling, if not more. For example, Hoopes points out that the notion of culture, which originated in the field of anthropology, was subsequently adopted in business management during the 1980s so that organizational culture could be exploited as a way to influence employees towards a desired end.[182] Similarly, management theories about empowerment, corporate vision, core values, teamwork, and other seemingly people-centered approaches give a false impression of autonomy for workers, while actually enabling the leader to exert influence more subtly and thus more strongly.[183] In effect, these soft approaches are no less top-down. Other scholars note that tools for change management likewise amount to manipulating employees to go along with management prerogatives.[184]

Some have highlighted that even the apparently objective area of management accounting has a totalizing and unjust influence on people, making them "governable" objects through the discipline and control exerted by target-setting, monitoring, and reporting systems.[185] This echoes Roberts' caution about the managerial culture promoting the right to rule.[186] In this regard, Christopher Grey notes the reflections of philosopher Simone Weil on management,

---

[179] Mary P. Follett, "The Illusion of Final Authority." in *Freedom and Coordination* (London: Pitmans, 1949), 1, cited in Lyndall Urwick, "Management in Perspective: The Tactics of Jungle Warfare," *Academy of Management Journal* (December 1963): 326.

[180] Walter Kiechel, "The Management Century. Spotlight: HBR at 90: How Management Changed the World," *Harvard Business Review* 90, no. 11 (November 2012): 66.

[181] Alvesson and Willmott, *Making Sense of Management*, Chapter 1.

[182] Hoopes, *False Prophets*, 269-270.

[183] Ibid.

[184] Alvesson and Willmott, *Making Sense of Management*, 34.

[185] Mahmoud Ezzamel and Keith Robson, "Accounting" in Alvesson et al., *Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, 478.

[186] Roberts, *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*, 173-179.

and highlights that all these forms of control would be viewed by her as "oppression".[187] Management tools become an instrument of power to control others and even the self through self-improvement practices. Grey points out that Weil would have regarded such "instrumental rationality" as an injustice towards self and others.[188] Chapter 1 has shown how this tendency is also manifested in Catholic pastoral literature such as through performance targets. Hoopes further highlights that one particular danger of the top-down nature of management theory is that it gives managers an illusion of a moral high ground, believing that they are always right when they conceive the desired future for the organization, and exercise their authority in the name of this desired outcome. Such an illusion is a slippery slope towards rationalizing self-serving and unethical behavior.[189] It can be said that the recurring incidences of corporate scandals involving top management personnel continue to attest to this. As highlighted in Chapter 1, Pattison has similarly called out the tendency of managers to over-idealize their own agenda.[190]

As a reorientation, some scholars argue for a more bottom-up approach in the theory and practice of management, whereby group members take responsibility for shaping the model of leadership through collective and critical self-reflection.[191] This resonates with Follett's view that "the managing ability of all employees is a great untapped source of social wealth."[192] Similarly, Grey points out Weil's preferred approach of theorizing, which "allowed individuals to make their own science through a practical encounter with lived reality."[193] Highlighting the limitations of generalized theories, Franklin encourages managers and their teams to engage in joint reflection on their shared experiences, and to formulate methods that suit their own particular contexts.[194] Hence, for these scholars, the development, application, and content of management theories and tools should be more participatory, dynamic, and dialogical. Here, a theological engagement could also be of service in terms of bringing to bear principles from the faith tradition about participation, subsidiarity, and the communal nature of human work.

2.4.5 Fragmentation of the management field and lack of a foundational paradigm

[187] Grey, "Towards a Critique of Managerialism," 597.

[188] Ibid., 604.

[189] Hoopes, *False Prophets* 264-265, 277.

[190] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 91-92.

[191] For example, see Alvesson and Willmott, *Making Sense of Management*, 26, 218.

[192] Mary P. Follet, *Dynamic Administration* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942), 228, cited in Hoopes, *False Prophets*, 119.

[193] Grey, "Towards a Critique of Managerialism," 600.

[194] Franklin, "Problematics in Management Theory and Practice," 395-396.

Finally, there has been much debate in the management field over its current state of fragmentation, and the resulting contradictions among management tools. For example, theories advocating excellent customer service conflict with those advocating work-life balance, since the former often require workers to go beyond the call of duty. Similarly, theories about strategic planning emphasize commitment to long-term plans whilst those on innovation and creativity stress flexibility, change, and capitalizing on unexpected opportunities. These contradictions serve as a sounding bell against taking management tools at face value. In fact, the fragmentation of the field is sometimes exploited by users of management tools to pick and choose whatever suits their agenda, be it a call for more democratic governance, greater accountability, or better welfare benefits. As seen in Chapter 1, this tendency has been observed in some Catholic pastoral management literature.

Mintzberg criticizes the dividedness and silos in the management field, and its lack of approaching real-life management problems in an integrated, holistic way.[195] Some scholars attribute this to the increasing segmentation of management scholarship according to underlying core disciplines such as economics, psychology, and sociology, in the bid to be more scientifically rigorous.[196] Others observe that the functional specializations which have developed within the management field, such as finance, human resource, and marketing, employ such different systems of thought and language that any interaction or dialogue would be difficult.[197] Still others blame the fragmentation on the competitive nature of the field, which does not foster collaboration and integration. As Kellerman notes, there are "too many competing experts offering too many competing pedagogies, most of which are based neither on empirical evidence nor on a well-established theoretical tradition" and "nor have we reached consensus on what could be considered a core leadership curriculum."[198]

As a result, there is a tendency to formulate or reinvent piecemeal theories without any dialectics and integration with historical or contemporary management thought. Such fragmentation has sometimes led to dire consequences. Management historians observe that one of the most high-profile failures from a lack of integration of management theories was the case of organizational re-engineering in the 1990s. To help organizations cut costs and compete more nimbly in the market, the re-engineering theory advocated radical job slashing and organizational streamlining through greater use of technology. Thousands of jobs were lost as

[195] Mintzberg, *Managers not MBAs*, 37.

[196] Jeffrey Pfeffer, "A Modest Proposal: How We Might Change the Process and Product of Managerial Research," *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 6 (2007): 1334-1345.

[197] Wren, *History*, 401-403.

[198] Kellerman, *End of Leadership*, 174.

a result of its implementation, and the organizations found themselves unable to function.[199] This school of thought is now seen to be a failure because of its disregard for other factors such as organizational culture, human motivation, and workplace relationships. As a result of narrow vision, the plugging of one gap ignores and even creates others, thus reflecting the myopic and impractical way in which management theory is often formulated and applied.

Some scholars envisage that this problem can be overcome with a foundational paradigm from which theories can be built. Such a paradigm would function like a meta-theory for management, that could shape and direct specific principles and practices. Inspired by the meta-theories in economics, management thinkers anticipated as early as the 1960s that a paradigm or general theory would soon emerge to integrate the various schools of thought in the management field.[200] It can be said that this vision was not an implausible one, since each school of thought adds useful perspectives to management as a whole. Together they can potentially form what Doran calls the "dialectic of contraries", whereby fruitful results are reaped when their poles of emphases are maintained in creative tension.[201] For instance, the task-orientation of Scientific Management and the people-orientation of the Human Relations model offer complementary perspectives to management, and both are a counterpart to the macro-level view of the General Administration model. In turn, the relatively static view of the General Administration model is balanced by the dynamic perspective of the Systems model. Moreover, the Strategy model and the Customer Service, Marketing, and Innovation model help organizations progress towards a deliberate direction in response to changing contexts, while the Social Responsibility model serves as a compass for direction-setting.

In 1961, Harold Koontz highlighted this complementary diversity in the "Management Theory Jungle", and believed that it was possible to integrate the schools of thought into a coherent framework.[202] Yet to-date, Woolridge remarks that the management field remains an "immature discipline" which "lacks rules of debate", and that aspirations for a widely-accepted

---

[199] Axson, *Masters of Management*, 30-31; Kiechel, "Management Century," 73-74.

[200] For example, see William C. Frederick, "The Next Development in Management Science: A General Theory," *Academy of Management Journal* 6, no. 3 (September 1963): 212-219.

[201] Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 68. Doran observes that some contrary ideas are not necessarily mutually exclusive. A both/and approach can be adopted towards them, rather than an either/or approach, so that each idea contributes towards a better understanding of the whole when the "tension of opposites is preserved in creative equilibrium". Doran distinguishes this from other sets of contrary ideas that are necessarily mutually exclusive, such that only an either/or approach is possible in deciding between them. He denotes this latter situation as a "dialectic of contradictories". In contrast to this latter dialectic, opposite points in the "dialectic of contraries" provide complementary views. See Ibid.

[202] Harold Koontz, "The Management Theory Jungle," *The Journal of the Academy of Management* 4, no. 3 (December 1961): 174-188.

general theory of management or an overall framework have yet to be fulfilled.[203] Agreeing, Jeffrey Pfeffer postulates that the main reason for this is that the field values diversity. As a result, its various institutions have organized themselves to preserve egalitarianism and to ensure a variety of perspectives.[204] Pfeffer nevertheless argues that the absence of a foundational paradigm impedes knowledge development and thus prevents the field from maturing. It also perpetuates the current problem of fragmentation and contradictions in the field. For some scholars, a foundational paradigm or general theory of management is not only necessary but should also be more inclusive of non-business sectors. Mintzberg points out that the management field is currently not adapted adequately to public and non-profit organizations, which are fundamentally different from business firms. For instance, whilst financial surpluses are an indication of success in the business sector, surpluses in government actually imply under-delivering on public services relative to the taxes raised.[205] For public and non-profit organizations, it is also noteworthy that increased demand or need for a service does not come with the commensurate ability or willingness to pay for such service, unlike in the case of the business sector. Hence, fund-raising rather than marketing would be a key concern.

This begs the question of what topics the management field would comprise if it was made more applicable to all sectors. What would be the broad themes and functions of management? These questions need to be answered in the development of a general paradigm. To this end, a theological engagement, which opens up more philosophical considerations and broader horizons, can be of help in constructing a foundational paradigm for management and integrating the various fragments. In fact, some scholars within the management field have recognized the need to examine and reconstruct the philosophical underpinnings of management science, through engagement with other disciplines such as anthropology, political science, philosophy, theology, literature, and other subjects in the humanities. They advocate that these disciplines should play a more prominent role in management education and theory formulation.[206] This is not only because of the embedded assumptions and concealed ontologies in management theories, but more fundamentally because management is an integral aspect of all human work and human affairs. Conversely, the human person and human relationships are significant factors in every aspect of management. As Michael Cafferky notes, "managerial work ranges far beyond the technical level … [and] delves into the larger questions of life at

[203] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management*, 22.

[204] Jeffrey Pfeffer, "Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependent Variable," *Academy of Management Review* 18, no. 4 (1993): 599–620.

[205] Mintzberg, *Managers not MBAs*, 157-160.

[206] See Hamel, "Moon Shots for Management," 93; Mitroff, "An Open Letter," 186-188; Bennis and O'Toole, "How Business Schools Lost Their Way," 104; Stewart, *Management Myth*, 293.

work related to relationships, values, significance, and meaning."[207] Thus, management science has an inescapable and profound link with human life and human meaning. This fact, together with the alternative views of scholars noted here, indicate much potential for theologians to contribute to management science, and to find dialogue partners within the management field.

2.5 A tentative reorientation framework based on the critical issues raised

The above analysis sheds light on key points with which one might construct a tentative framework for reorienting management theories. If the stance proposed by the alternative critical views against mainstream management science were adopted, the framework would comprise the following reorientation principles:

2.5.1 Social responsibility

The goal of management should serve the greater good of society. Management theories should be redirected towards the objective of the common good, including the material, social, intellectual, psychological, and spiritual progress of all peoples. Management methods should promote human dignity, solidarity, and sustainability of the earth's resources.

2.5.2 Anthropological assumptions

Management theories should be reoriented such that reductionist and negative assumptions of the human person are replaced by a more holistic and balanced view, recognizing human beings' spontaneity, virtues, and capacity to transcend self-interest. Competitive and transactional paradigms for social relationships in management theory should also be replaced by a more collaborative view.

2.5.3 Probabilistic approach and reflexivity

Management tools should espouse a more probabilistic and heuristic approach rather than a deterministic one. They should recognize the limitations of control, the complexity of management practice, and the limitations of generalizing from particular experiences. They should also encourage reflexivity, flexibility, contextual sensitivity, and be applied in a historical-critical way.

[207] Michael E. Cafferky, *Management: A Faith-Based Perspective* (New Jersey: Pearson, 2012), xv.

2.5.4 Qualitative factors

The empirical approach in management theories, with its emphasis on quantification and measurement, should be replaced by one which recognizes qualitative and intangible aspects of human work, which do not lend themselves readily to technical solutions. Management theories must also facilitate discernment on deeper social and cultural issues where needed.

2.5.5 Participation

The top-down nature of management theories should be replaced by a more participative, dynamic, and dialogical one, recognizing the role of human interactions at all levels, as well as the role of contexts and events, in shaping management outcomes.

2.5.6 Integration

Management theories should recognize the inter-dependence of the various aspects of management, and facilitate linkages among these aspects, rather than focus on a particular dimension of management in an isolated way. In addition, these linkages can be guided by a foundational paradigm for management.

2.6 Remaining gaps

This tentative reorientation framework based on alternative and critical views within the management field has the potential to make management theories more ethical and reliable. Nevertheless, it still contains the following gaps, limitations, and room for improvement. First, although there are existing efforts in the management field to formulate a thick account of terminal values for the means and ends of management, what insights might a faith tradition contribute, especially given that the belief systems of individuals and communities often influence their sense of values? More specifically, what does the Catholic faith tradition say about the goal and meaning of human life and human society? Second, debates within the management field have pointed out shortcomings in the existing paradigms for the human person and society more than they have offered alternative and compelling visions. How might a faith tradition fill this gap? Can resources from Catholic doctrine contribute a richer, holistic, and more comprehensive view of the human person and human society? Can they shed light on the dignity of the human person and the ideals that should guide the relationships of human beings with one another and with the natural world? With regard to human spontaneity, how can we better understand vice and virtue, human intentionality, and human limitations? Third, what are the potentialities and boundaries of human knowledge? What philosophical underpinnings can guide the formulation of a foundational paradigm and general theory of

management? How does the Catholic faith tradition view human knowledge, human work, and the human sciences?

Beyond these questions which relate to the specific aspects of management science that might require a reorientation, a more fundamental question needs to be asked—namely, how does one decide whether it is the mainstream perspective in management science, or the alternative view that should hold sway? Can a faith tradition assist in this decision? Can it do so without imposing its religious stance on those outside the tradition? Just as important, is there coherence among the faith tradition's own resources or are there also internal debates as in the case of management science?

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has traced the historical development of the management field, and examined its current debates to identify critical issues within the field. It has pointed out that conflicts in the application of management theory in the Church as discussed in Chapter 1 are not unique to the Church alone. Each area of conflict can be traced to an underlying problem within the management field itself, and which affects the wider society. There is thus much potential for dialogue and collaboration to redress the problems of management science for the benefit of all. To this end, this chapter has shown that on one hand, there are positive contributions from the various schools of thought in management. Together they highlight the essential aspects and principles of coordinating human work. On the other hand, there are also unresolved controversies that have prompted alternative critical views within the management field. These views enable a tentative reorientation framework to be constructed. Yet, as highlighted above, some gaps remain, thus indicating that reasoning within a secular discipline can only go so far. It is at this point that a religious faith tradition might prove helpful in terms of providing further perspectives to the issues at hand. The next chapter thus examines a relevant resource from the Catholic faith tradition, the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes*, to see what insights it can bring to the reorientation of management theories. This would throw further light on the questions raised above.

CHAPTER 3
Gaudium et Spes: Insights for Management

3.1 Introduction

The *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, Gaudium et Spes* (hereafter GS), was written at a time when the popularity of management science was reaching new heights. Bolstered by flourishing industrial economies, technological advancements, and global connectivity, a new optimism emerged about humankind's ability to achieve ambitious goals, coordinate complex tasks, and shape the future. It was at this time, the 1960s, that the Second Vatican Council was convoked. Gathered in the aula of St Peter's Basilica, the Council Fathers noted these "signs of the times" (GS 4) and evaluated them in the light of faith. A major outcome of their reflections was the promulgation of GS, a document which still speaks poignantly to the challenges of the world today. This chapter examines GS to discover the insights that it can contribute to management. It will highlight the document's relevance and suitability for this research, and then present the method of analysis, pointing out particular features of GS that have a bearing on its interpretation. Thereafter, the key teachings of GS with regard to the human person and society, the nature of human work, terminal values of human activity, and the potentialities and limits of human knowledge and ability will be discussed. It will be seen that rich insights for the reorientation of management theories can be gained from GS. At the same time, it will also be pointed out that GS's teachings are not without internal conflicts nor limitations and gaps. It will be argued that a more foundational viewpoint, to be developed in Chapter 4, will be needed to bring insights from the management field as well as the pastoral constitution's valuable teachings to bear on management.

3.2 Background of GS and suitability for this research

The Second Vatican Council marked a milestone in the Church's reflection on its nature, life, and mission in the world. The Council's teachings are still regarded today as "a sure compass by which to take our bearings in the century now beginning."[1] Among the sixteen documents of Vatican II, GS deals most directly and comprehensively with the topic of human beings' nature, activities, and destiny. It offers insights on "the ultimate meaning of human activity in the universe" (GS 11), and is most relevant to the current debates in management. Conciliar theologian Charles Moeller, who was closely involved in the drafting of GS, had

[1] Pope John Paul II, *Apostolic Constitution on the Publication of the Catechism of the Catholic Church Prepared Following the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Fidei Depositum* (Vatican City: Vatican City Press, 1992), par. 2, cited in Pope Benedict XVI, *Porta Fidei, Apostolic Letter for the Indiction of the Year of Faith* (Vatican City: Vatican City Press, 2011), par. 5. *Porta Fidei* was issued in conjunction with the 50th Anniversary of the opening of Vatican II.

remarked that the pastoral constitution provided guidance "for the true progress of culture."[2] More recently, contemporary conciliar commentator Norman Tanner notes that GS's authority, relevance, and freshness have not diminished.[3] In fact, scholars highlight that GS is even more pertinent today given the acceleration of globalization, technological advancement, secularization, and inequality in the world.[4]

Nevertheless, the pastoral constitution is not without its limitations. It has been criticized for being overly-optimistic about modernity and earthly progress, without sufficiently incorporating a theology of sin and the cross, or adequately acknowledging the dissimilarities between the temporal realm and the eschaton. Another major criticism is its lack of consistency and coherence, as evident in the contrary stances observed throughout the text. In fact, GS is widely seen as a compromise document. Other criticisms include a lack of doctrinal precision, a Euro-centric perspective, and an ambivalent stance against war and communism.[5] To this could be added a charge from some scholars that the Council itself did not adequately model what it preached about the benefits of lay contribution and expertise from the secular disciplines.[6]

In defense of GS, the above charge of over-optimism must be seen relative to the "Catholic catastrophism" prevailing at that time.[7] There had been a *de facto* tendency in the Church to assume a more antagonistic and calamitous view of modernity and the world. Any departure from this negative stance would have likely prompted strong reactions. In this regard, Vatican II signified a turning point in the Church's view, adopting a more pastoral approach towards the world. In any case, the method of interpreting GS as presented below will highlight ways in which its apparently over-optimistic statements can be held in dialectical balance with more cautious statements that are also present in the text. Further, it will be argued that the co-existence of contrary stances in GS is actually advantageous.

---

[2] Charles Moeller, "Man, the Church and Society," in *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, ed. John H. Miller (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966), 419.

[3] Norman Tanner, *The Church and the World: Gaudium et Spes, Inter Mirifica* (New York: Paulist Press, 2005), 63, 69.

[4] For example, see Massimo Faggioli, "The Battle over *Gaudium et Spes* Then and Now: Dialogue with the Modern World after Vatican II," *Origins* 42, no. 34 (January 31, 2013): 550.

[5] An overview of the criticisms and debates over GS, including their developments to-date, is given by Faggioli in ibid., 545-548.

[6] See Mark G. McGrath, "The Constitution on the Church in the Modern World," in Miller, *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, 407-408.

[7] Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Significance of Vatican Council II for Ecclesiology," in *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.*, ed. Peter C. Phan (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), 71.

As a resource for theology, GS carries the magisterial weight of an ecumenical council, and is regarded as one of the four pillars of the documents of Vatican II. In fact, the Council Fathers had recognized GS's doctrinal significance more and more over the course of the conciliar meetings, and voted overwhelmingly in the final session to accord it the status of a constitution.[8] Moreover, GS was finalized towards the end of the conciliar meeting and thus reaped the benefits of a maturing council. Commentators note that the Council Fathers, having gotten used to a more collegial approach, participated actively in debates on GS at the third and fourth sessions, especially in contributing perspectives from the Third World, and thus making GS more contextually and pastorally relevant.[9] This partly counters the charge that the document is too Euro-centric. More lay persons and experts were also included subsequently in the drafting process. and their positive contributions have been noted.[10]

The Council Fathers intended GS to be a pastoral document addressed to a general world audience. It brings the richness of Scripture and the early church fathers to bear on "humanity's deeper questionings" (GS 10) amidst the challenges of the current times. Moreover, as moral theologian David Hollenbach points out, GS's inclusive theology of creation, its philosophical arguments, natural law reasoning, and reflection on human experience enable non-Christian readers to relate to it.[11] These features enhance GS's value for this inter-disciplinary study. As a literary work, GS no doubt has its imperfections. The need to use a less technical literary style in view of its pastoral objective compromised the doctrinal precision of its language. Some incoherence also resulted from having multiple groups of authors working concurrently under time pressure. Nevertheless, key points in GS's content have stood the test of time. In the Catechism of the Catholic Church (hereafter CCC), references to GS rank second highest in frequency among the Vatican II documents, after LG.[12] In the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church (hereafter *Compendium*), published 40 years after Vatican II, GS is the second-most frequently quoted magisterial document, after the CCC.[13]

---

[8] Charles Moeller, "Preface and Introduction," in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Volume V*, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler (New York: Herder & Herder, 1969), 79.

[9] See Tanner, *The Church and the World*, 29. In terms of representation, Vatican II had an unprecedented number of attendees, including more than two thousand bishops from a hundred and sixteen countries around the world. A summary of these statistical and other background information on the meeting can be found in John W. O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 15–36.

[10] See Norman Tanner, "The Church in the World," in *History of Vatican II, Vol. IV*, eds. Giuseppe Alberigo and Joseph A. Komonchak (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003), 280.

[11] David Hollenbach, "Commentary on *Gaudium et Spes*," in *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations*, ed. Kenneth R. Himes (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005), 273.

[12] See "Index of Citations, VII," in *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1994), 722-727.

[13] See Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, "Index of References," in *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church* (Washington DC: USCCB Publishing, 2005), 263-281. In fact, the whole introduction in the

As an alternative to GS, it might be argued that other social teaching documents of the Catholic Church, such as the *Encyclical Letter On Human Work, Laborem Exercens* (hereafter LE) and the *Encyclical Letter On Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth, Caritas In Veritate* (hereafter CV) would be more directly relevant to management. However, the questions raised by debates in the management field, as discussed in the previous chapter, point to more fundamental issues beyond social ethics. These issues involve deeper philosophical considerations related to anthropology, epistemology, truth, and culture, which are dealt with more directly by GS. Hence, the pastoral constitution is an apt resource for responding to the problems in management science at their roots by addressing their embedded assumptions. In fact, subsequent social encyclicals such as LE and CV draw significantly from GS for their pastoral applications. In his analysis of methodology and history in Catholic social teaching, Charles Curran remarks that GS remains "the most systematic treatment of the foundations of Catholic social teaching" to-date and serves as "the standard approach" for subsequent social encyclicals.[14]

3.3 Method of this analysis

3.3.1 Research questions

This analysis is guided by the following questions raised in the previous chapter. First, what might be a more holistic view of the human person, in contrast to the reductionist anthropologies espoused in the management field? What insights can GS provide on the nature of the human person and human society, human potentialities and limitations, as well as human virtue and the problem of evil? Second, what account can GS give about the nature and purpose of human work? Third, what does GS offer in terms of a thick description of terminal values? Fourth, what is GS's perspective with regard to truth, human knowledge, epistemology, and the interaction between theology and the secular sciences?

3.3.2 General method of interpreting GS

Compendium on "An Integral and Solidary Humanism" mirrors GS closely in both content and language. Ibid., par. 1-19.

[14] Charles E. Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching, 1891-present: A Historical, Theological, and Ethical Analysis* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2002), 131, 36. The features of GS that justify this claim will be highlighted in the following methodological discussion.

The overall approach in analyzing GS will be based on the triple hermeneutic of text, author, and receiver, as outlined by Ormond Rush for interpreting the teachings of Vatican II.[15] The analysis will examine the document's content and literary features, as well as its intra-textual and inter-textual relations. It will also consider the background context of its formulation, the underpinning theological and philosophical trends, the conciliar agenda, the relevant deliberations, significant redactions, and the key decisions leading to the final document. At the same time, the analysis will look to the clarification, application, development, and debates of GS in its reception especially in subsequent documents of the Church's magisterium, and in the works of relevant scholars. Apart from this general method, the following features of GS have additional implications for its interpretation.

3.3.3 Internal dialectics

One of the salient characteristics of GS is that contrary perspectives seem to be juxtaposed in the text. For example, whilst some statements convey a positive view of human progress in history, others speak of social breakdowns and injustices. This mixed view of the modern world is particularly acute in the document's introductory section of GS 4-10. Similarly, articles such as GS 15-17 contain statements that highlight humans' innate ability to achieve material, intellectual, and spiritual advancement but also stress their fundamental dependence on God, without clearly explaining how these two opposing views are to be reconciled. Elsewhere, the text associates earthly progress with salvation history (GS 34, 38-40, 43) while also highlighting that human progress is not to be equated with the Kingdom of God (GS 39). Another apparent juxtaposition is the pastoral constitution's application of Christology, which, for some commentators, appears to be abruptly appended at the end of each chapter in Part I, giving the impression of being either superfluous or overriding the prior discussion. Critics particularly point out that the statement in GS 12 on humans' creation in the image of God leaves many questions unanswered, especially regarding humanity's need for salvation. The reader is left to synthesize the whole picture in retrospect after picking up points from the rest of Chapter 1, including the Christological article at the end of the chapter.[16]

Before discussing the specific reasons for these apparent contradictions, a general point must be made that conciliar documents are typically not without imperfections. Their final form is frequently shaped not only by a diversity of theological viewpoints but also by dynamic and

[15] Ormond Rush, *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles* (New York: Paulist Press, 2004).

[16] See Joseph Ratzinger, "The Dignity of the Human Person," in Vorgrimler, *Commentary*, 119-120; and Brandon Peterson, "Critical Voices: The Reactions of Rahner and Ratzinger to 'Schema XIII' (*Gaudium et Spes*)," *Modern Theology* 31, no. 1 (Jan 2015).

political processes of persuading, countering, coalition-building, compromising, and even influencing through procedural maneuvers.[17] Commentators rightly point out that the resultant output sometimes does not present a unitary theological stance but contains varied and even contrary perspectives so as to satisfy different constituencies.[18] This was certainly the case in Vatican II. Significantly, this feature of the Council resonates with a major organizational theory which had been formulated to explain a crucial international event that was occurring at the very same time of the first conciliar session: the Cuban missile crisis. This theory states that outcomes of events should be seen as the result of not only unitary and well-defined intentions, objectives, and rational decisions, but also of complex and dynamic webs of political moves and multi-party interactions, as well as organizational routines and their unintended consequences.[19] Of course, in the light of faith, the role of the Holy Spirit must also be acknowledged.

Specifically for GS, this complex interaction of human, systemic, serendipitous, and spiritual factors is not just a tangential issue but strikes at the heart of some of its debates. One key set of conflicts in the document's formulation pertains to the split within the progressive majority at the Council. This internal division had been latent at first in view of a more dominant conflict with the conservatives. After largely succeeding in overcoming the latter, the progressive split came to the fore towards the later part of the Council, especially in debates on GS, thus revealing two opposing groups. This partly explains the apparent inconsistencies observed in the document. The position of each side is best explained by their representative proponents. For Marie-Dominique Chenu:

> It is not simply for pedagogical reasons, and to gain an audience among non-Christians, that each chapter begins by observing the human condition in order then to move on to Christ … More profoundly, however, this progressive method is the expression of a theology whose object is, not to "deduce" a Christian anthropology from Christology, but to discern "the signs of the times" in the concrete reality of history … to discern in man today, in the great webs of historical progress, … obediential potencies, … ways of being open, more or less consciously, to the Word of God [and] landmarks in the realization of the economy of salvation.[20]

---

[17] For example, the actions of some of the Council participants, as described in Tanner, "The Church in the World," 274-276, could be regarded as attempts to influence the outcome of GS through procedural manoeuvring.

[18] David L. Schindler, "Christology and the Imago Dei: Interpreting *Gaudium et Spes*," *Communio* 23 (Spring 1996): 157.

[19] Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: Longman, 1999).

[20] Letter from Marie-Dominique Chenu to Monsignor P. Haubtmann, 2 October 1965, as quoted in Giovanni Turbanti, "La Redazione della Constituzione Pastorale '*Gaudium et Spes*,'" Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, 406, cited in Joseph A. Komonchak, "The Redaction and Reception of *Gaudium et Spes*: Tensions within the Majority at Vatican II," 5, accessed May 1, 2016, https://jakomonchak.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/jak-views-of-gaudium-et-spes.pdf.

Thus for Chenu, human nature possesses and demonstrates an intrinsic capacity for goodness as it is created in and guided by God's Word. Grace does not replace but completes nature, not as an extrinsic "scaffolding … built on top of nature" but as a full flowering, just as the Christ event is the culmination of historical progress towards the Kingdom of God.[21] Contesting this approach, Joseph Ratzinger argues that:

> the starting point should be Christ, the second Adam, from whom alone the Christian picture of man can be correctly developed … the only realistic picture must start from the actual Christian creed which, precisely as a confession of faith, can and must manifest its own intelligibility and rationality."[22]

For Ratzinger and those of similar leaning, human reasoning is weakened by sin and limited by historical conditioning. Moreover, the message of the Gospel with its emphasis on the cross and eschaton is contrary to and beyond the world's thinking. Hence the Church's doctrine is the preferred starting point.

There have been various ways of denoting each side. They are often associated with the French and German schools of theology respectively but this is certainly not the defining line. For example, Henri de Lubac and Karl Rahner are prominent exceptions. Moreover, as Joseph Komonchak rightly points out, it is not simply a matter of optimists versus pessimists, nor an anthropological versus eschatological viewpoint. Rather, the differences stem from a set of emphases which aligns more with either the Thomistic or Augustinian schools of thought respectively, while not totally denying elements of the other.[23] I agree with Komonchak's view and will employ his terminology when referring to the two sides of the progressives. In summary, for the Thomists, the earthly, historical realm possesses its own integrity undergirded by divine logic. Contemplating this realm leads human persons progressively to discover divine truths. For the Augustinians, the Christian Gospel is a kerygmatic contrast to a world impaired by sin, and thus provides the salvific starting point.

This conflict between the Thomists and Augustinians was not the only one affecting GS. Even at the final stages of the conciliar sessions, the conservative minority still made significant attempts to assert its view and even to block the document's passage.[24] There were also others like Italian theologian Giuseppe Dossetti who fought for a bolder prophetic stance especially

---

[21] Ibid., 7.

[22] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 120.

[23] Joseph A. Komonchak, "Augustine, Aquinas or the Gospel *sine glossa*? Divisions Over *Gaudium et Spes*," in *Unfinished Journey: The Church 40 Years after Vatican II. Essays for John Wilkins*, ed. Austen Ivereigh (London: Continuum, 2003), 108.

[24] See Tanner, "The Church in the World," 274-276, as mentioned in the above footnote on procedural manoeuvring.

with regard to the issue of war.[25] In addition, the Council had to grapple with two prevalent and opposing cultural forces at that time: liberal individualism and totalitarianism. Bishops from communist countries were vocal in advocating for a strong condemnation of communism and its suppression of religion. On the other hand, not a few members of the Council were critical of the draft texts of GS for their liberal capitalist leanings. In trying to avoid the extremes of liberal individualism and totalitarian collectivism, tensions between the personal and social good were not always clearly resolved in the final document. On top of all this, other factors such as segregated drafting committees, time pressure, and fatigue towards the end of the sessions prevented more comprehensive dialogue, integration, and fine-tuning of GS. All this resulted in a text that was neither perfect in theological synthesis nor communicative coherence. Nevertheless, Walter Kasper rightly clarifies that councils provide a "frame of reference," after which the theological work of synthesizing, elucidating, developing, and communicating is carried out in the course of reception.[26] In the case of GS, the Thomists prevailed on the whole for several reasons. These included the Council Fathers' desire for a pastoral approach, as well as pre-emptive moves by the Thomists in the final session to hold counsel with their opposition and prevent a stalemate.[27] Nevertheless, the Augustinians have also managed to make their mark on the final text.

Given such a background, how should the pastoral constitution be interpreted? In my view, the debates between the Thomists and Augustinians can actually be seen as an advantage for GS because each side has important strengths that compensate for the other's weaknesses. The Augustinians advocate starting only from Christian doctrine for theological and pastoral reflection. However, doctrinal statements are themselves subject to arbitrary selection, conflicting interpretations, imperfect formulation, and on-going development. On their own, they are unable to provide a direct answer to people's existential concerns. The Thomist approach begins with these concerns and also accords with the Council's own acknowledgement that elements of truth and grace are found outside the Catholic Church's visible confines (LG 8). Yet, reading the signs of the times in the world requires Christian doctrine as an evaluative guide right from the start, as GS 4 states. Otherwise, the interpretation of these signs risks being infected by the same biases that are dominant in the prevailing culture, such as the over-optimism about human initiative during the time of the Council. When these cultural biases take over, the Christian community would fail to make a critical discernment

[25] Komonchak, "Augustine, Aquinas or the Gospel *sine glossa*?" 111-112.

[26] Walter Kasper, *Theology and Church* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), 158.

[27] Charles Moeller, "History of the Constitution," in Vorgrimler, *Commentary*, 59-61.

and give prophetic witness. Hence, both the Thomist and Augustinian approaches need to be held in complementary balance.

A dialogue between both sides of the progressives would have had the potential to bear much fruit on GS. However, given the practical constraints at Vatican II, this dialogue lacked sufficient time and opportunity to mature. François Houtart, a member of the drafting team, attests that polarities and dualism kept surfacing throughout the preparatory period, so much so that the resultant theology especially of the doctrinal Part I "is only a starting point."[28] Over the ensuing fifty years of the Council's reception, commentators note that these conflicts remain unresolved.[29] The guideline for Catholic theology recently issued by the ITC has affirmed the importance of paying attention to history and the secular sciences, citing GS 44. It highlights that "the painstaking work to establish profitable links with other disciplines, sciences and cultures so as to enhance that light and broaden those avenues is the particular task of theologians."[30] The choice of the words "enhance" and "broaden" hints of the Thomist view of grace perfecting nature. Yet the ITC document gives primary emphasis to Scripture, Tradition, and the faith community. Quite strikingly, paragraphs on theologians' dialogue with the world are placed within the section on the theologians' communion with the Church. The ITC document does not explicitly declare which approach is best but highlights the advantage of plurality, as long as the norms for Catholic theology are observed. The sources emphasized in these norms—Scripture, the early apostolic tradition, the magisterium, the *sensus fidelium*, signs of the times, culture, and the secular sciences—indicate that the various approaches must be used in balance. In fact, the document stresses the importance of dialogue among the plurality of approaches.[31]

In this research, both Thomist and Augustinian perspectives will be held in mutual dialogue with each other in the interpretation of GS. As mentioned, their complementary views provide the elements for a more complete synthesis. For example, if GS 12 and 13, attributed to each side respectively, are read as a single article, a fuller and more nuanced picture is formed regarding humans' condition as image of God at creation. Similarly, a more realistic view of the world is obtained when both optimistic and pessimistic perspectives in GS 4-10 are held

[28] Abbe François Houtart, "Suggestions for Doctrinal Development," in Miller, *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal*, 546.

[29] Faggioli, "The Battle over *Gaudium et Spes,"* 549.

[30] ITC, *Theology Today*, par. 56.

[31] See ibid., par. 20-58, 74-85.

together in dialectical balance.[32] Hence, in this research, apparently paradoxical statements will be considered together so that more comprehensive insights can be gained.

3.3.4 Historical consciousness and contingency

One point of agreement among the progressives was the need to shift away from the static, classicist approach to theology that had prevailed before Vatican II. Rather than re-emphasize doctrinal formulas that were quite inadequate to meet the complex challenges of the times, the Council Fathers recognized that the Church needed to go back to the root sources of the faith and adapt them to contemporary situations. *Ressourcement* and *aggiornamento* became the hallmarks of Vatican II. This new sense of historical consciousness, which had already been emerging within theological circles, is evident in the Council's documents, especially GS. The pastoral constitution recognizes "a dynamic and more evolutionary concept of nature" (GS 5) and that the Church needed to regularly discern the "signs of the times" (GS 4, 11). Moreover, progress in the sciences "demand new scrutiny by theologians" just as doctrine has to be constantly brought into contact with prevailing cultures so as to be communicated effectively in each milieu (GS 62). The faithful are encouraged to understand "their contemporaries" and integrate new discoveries with the faith so that their moral life may "keep abreast" with modern society and be well-discerned (GS 62).

On this theme of historical-critical discernment, commentators highlight the influence of moral theologians such as Josef Fuchs and Bernard Häring. Fuchs himself had undergone a paradigm shift in acknowledging humans' capability of right reasoning from experience, and that their "first duty is not to fulfill an imposed concrete order, but rather to project and discover such an order of human self-realization" through a process of "human, rational, evaluative reflection within human reality as a whole."[33] Likewise Häring's work on human freedom, responsibility, and especially conscience, had a significant impact on GS.[34] At a more foundational level, the contributions of John Henry Newman on the development of doctrine, followed by others such as Yves Congar and Karl Rahner, were also central.[35]

---

[32] Some of the key additions advocated by the Augustinians in response to earlier drafts of the text which had been dominated by the more optimistic Thomist view of the world, especially in GS's introduction, are noted in Peterson, "Critical Voices," 10.

[33] Josef Fuchs, *Christian Ethics in a Secular Arena* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1984), 119; and *Moral Demands and Personal Obligations* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1993), 120; cited in Chet Mitchell Jechura, "A Grammar of the Natural Law: A Celebration of Josef Fuchs and His Legacy for Natural Law Renewal," *The Heythrop Journal* 56, no. 4 (2015): 566.

[34] James F. Keenan, "Vatican II and Theological Ethics," *Theological Studies* 74 (2013): 169-174.

[35] Maureen Sullivan, *The Road to Vatican II: Key Changes in Theology* (New York: Paulist Press, 2007), 56-57.

These relatively new approaches proved to be helpful to a Council that was keenly aware of the public's high expectations for the meeting to address pressing world issues at the time. The Council Fathers acknowledged the contingent and shifting nature of such political and socio-economic issues, their own lack of expertise in them, and the impossibility of providing specific directives. Yet there was the imperative to make clear and precise conciliar pronouncements. The final solution was to distinguish between statements of a doctrinal and more permanent nature on the one hand, and statements of pastoral applications on the other hand, which are subject to change and adaptation in specific contexts. The important footnote to GS's Preface points out the document's division into two parts while stressing its "organic unity". Pastoral applications, it states, are not absent from the more doctrinal Part I and neither are doctrinal statements absent from the pastoral discussion of Part II. Nevertheless, contextual adaptation is needed when applying the content, especially in Part II. Signifying a break from the past, the Council explicitly recognizes development and contingency, encouraging proper moral reasoning within each context. This is reiterated in GS 91 at the document's conclusion. Terms such as "contingent", "changing circumstances" and the like, appearing as early as in Footnote 1 of the title, are evident throughout the document. Moreover, in GS 46, an explicit endorsement of human experience, together with the Gospel as sources of moral reflection has not escaped the notice of moral theologians, who see this as a profound change in the Church's official stance.[36]

Modelling this approach and in contrast to the preparatory texts drafted before the conciliar meetings, GS itself does not merely repeat moral doctrinal statements but instead looks at the issues of the day, evaluates them, and offers a response in the light of the Gospel. Houtart highlights that this approach reveals GS's "method of thinking" and resonates with the "observe, judge and act" process in Catholic social action.[37] This way of proceeding forms the bulk of the text. Such a genre of reasoning aloud, so to speak, means that in interpreting GS, individual points cannot be taken in isolation. Rather, there is a need to follow the whole argument, understand the underlying principles, and apply them to the present context. This will be the approach taken in this analysis. Moreover, the illustrative applications in Part II will be used to elucidate the doctrinal teachings in Part I.

3.3.5 Development and inter-textual dialogue

[36] See Joseph A. Selling, "*Gaudium et Spes*: A Manifesto for Contemporary Moral Theology," in *Vatican II and its Legacy*, eds. M. Lamberigts and L. Kenis (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 151.

[37] Houtart, "Suggestions for Doctrinal Development," 546.

Attesting to the novelty of the pastoral constitution, many commentators regard its teachings as just a seed, an "embryo" and an "incipient emergence."[38] Relatively new areas include reflections about culture, plurality, dialogue, and the emphasis on the poor. Even GS's teaching on anthropology had been regarded by Moeller as requiring further elaboration.[39] On the issue of the poor, Hollenbach highlights that GS's teaching has catalyzed and has in turn been developed more fully by the liberation theology movement, as well as by subsequent Catholic social teaching on the preferential option for the poor.[40] Other topics have also evolved quite significantly in the ensuing decades. For example, the concept of integral ecology in the *Encyclical Letter on Care for Our Common Home, Laudato Si* arguably represents a more developed theology of creation compared with GS's emphasis on humans' domination of the natural world.[41] Hence, inter-textual dialogue with subsequent church teachings is important in interpreting GS, especially where these teachings have developed GS's budding points more fully.

At the same time, since GS was finalized at the end of the Council meeting, there was assumed within it much of the conciliar pronouncements that have been debated, resolved, and elaborated in earlier documents. For instance, the groundwork that led to the affirmation of freedom of conscience, change, development of doctrine, participation, and respect for local cultures had been laid out especially in debates on the *Declaration on Religious Freedom, Dignitatis Humanae*, the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Sacrosanctum Concilium*, LG, and other conciliar documents.[42] In particular, the Preface of GS alludes to the teachings that have already been established in LG, especially with regard to "the mystery of the church" (GS 2). Hence, inter-textual dialogue with the relevant documents of Vatican II, especially LG, is important for the interpretation of GS. Just as important are the relevant magisterial documents preceding GS, especially those which "have dealt at length with Christian teaching on human society," as noted in GS 23.

3.3.6 Christological focus

A significant point in the interpretation of GS is its Christological key. The Council Fathers' repeated desire for a Christological foundation of anthropology has been widely

[38] Houtart, "Suggestions for Doctrinal Development," 549; Hollenbach, "Commentary on GS," 285.

[39] Moeller, "History," 71.

[40] Hollenbach, "Commentary on GS," 285.

[41] See Pope Francis, *Encyclical Letter on Care for Our Common Home, Laudato Si* (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2015), Chapter 4.

[42] See John W. O'Malley, "Vatican II Revisited as Reconciliation: The Francis Factor," in *The Legacy of Vatican II*, eds. Massimo Faggioli and Andrea Vicini (New York: Paulist Press, 2015), 6-16.

noted.[43] Kasper observes that Christology inevitably took on a central role after the Council made a breakthrough in earlier debates to adopt the perspective of salvation history for both its *ad intra* and *ad extra* agendas.[44] The text of GS itself makes clear the centrality of Christology, proclaiming that "it is only in the mystery of the Word made flesh that the mystery of humanity truly becomes clear" since Christ "fully reveals humanity to itself and brings to light its very high calling" and "he who is the 'image of the invisible God' (Col. 1:15), is himself the perfect man" (GS 22). In line with the overall Thomistic approach which the final version of GS has retained, the structure of each chapter in the doctrinal Part I displays a graduated pedagogy in which existential questions posed at the beginning of the chapter gradually culminate in a Christological answer at the end of the chapter. Given this ascent, the key teaching of each chapter is to be found in the Christological passage, which does not displace earlier points in the chapter that involve philosophical, biblical, and empirical reflections but more fully enlightens them. In this regard, Kasper provides a useful way of interpreting GS in that Christology "presupposes, surpasses and perfects" anthropology.[45]

3.3.7 Pastoral orientation

Finally, another point of general agreement within the Council was its pastoral orientation and the intention for GS to address humanity at large. Tanner points out that it was unprecedented and even controversial for an ecumenical council to reflect on world issues to such an extent and address a general audience.[46] Its content and genre were thus novel at the time. The proposal to even have a document on the Church in the world emerged only after the start of the conciliar meeting, and met with opposition throughout the process. The initial drafts of the text were sometimes incoherent in the mix of both doctrinal and everyday language. However, successive redactions endeavored to address criticisms of the overly-technical sections. The document finally emerged with a tone and language that aimed to appeal to the general masses. In particular, John O'Malley highlights the use of "epideictic orations" in the documents of Vatican II, and points out that this rhetorical style serves to motivate and galvanize people towards higher ideals.[47] In terms of interpretation, this means that many of the

[43] Luis Ladaria, "Humanity in the Light of Christ in the Second Vatican Council," in *Vatican II Assessment and Perspectives: 25 Years After*, ed. Rene Latourelle (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 390.

[44] Kasper, *Theology and Church*, 132.

[45] Ibid., 82.

[46] Tanner, *The Church and the World*, 9.

[47] John W. O'Malley, "Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?" *Theological Studies* 67, no. 1 (March 2006): 23-26.

statements in GS cannot be accorded the same technical and analytical scrutiny that one would give to the more meticulously-crafted decrees of previous ecumenical councils or even the other constitutions of Vatican II. Instead, much of the text in GS should be interpreted in a general sense, with its overall message used as the reference point to clarify any ambiguity.

Applying these principles, the following sections discuss the teachings of GS that have a bearing on the discipline of management.

3.4 The human person and human society

As seen in Chapter 2 of this thesis, the human person is a significant factor in management theory and practice, whether as manager, worker, consumer, shareholder, or theorist. Yet, the management field lacks critical reflection on the ontology of the human person, and works only from simplistic assumptions about the human being as "Economic Man", factor of production, or omnipotent manager. As some of the management field's internal critics have pointed out, such assumptions need to be called into question because they are reductionist and distorted. To this end, GS has much to contribute.

Commentators note that during the time of the Council, the subject of anthropology had been gaining increased attention especially among social scientists who sought to recover a more integrated view of the human person, and shed light on humans' essential nature.[48] Given Vatican II's pastoral focus, anthropology was seen as the common ground with which to dialogue with the world. Thus, GS contains the first and most comprehensive attempt by an ecumenical council to set out a theological anthropology, as a topic in itself. Contemporary moral theologians still regard GS's anthropology as the main standard for Catholic moral theology today, both in terms of its method and content.[49] Yet this was the very issue which aroused much debate between the Thomists and Augustinians. Nevertheless, as asserted above, it can be seen that their contrasting perspectives, when held in dialectical balance, actually help to make the teachings of GS more complete. The *Compendium* adopts the main conclusions of GS's anthropology but replaces GS's Thomistic methodology with a more Augustinian approach that starts from salvation history, proceeds through Christology, and then moves on to the human person.[50] This complementary perspective helps in the interpretation of GS. Thus, the main points of GS's rich and multi-faceted anthropology are elaborated in the following sections.

---

[48] Walter Kasper, "The Theological Anthropology of *Gaudium et Spes*," *Communio* 23 (1996): 130-131.

[49] Besides Curran as already mentioned, see also Selling, "*Gaudium et Spes*," 152-153.

[50] See *Compendium*, par. 20-48 and 108-151.

3.4.1 Primacy of God and divine foundation of humanity

With pastoral sensitivity, GS gives voice to "the most fundamental of all questions" that confronts society at a time of unprecedented change: "What is humanity? … What is the purpose of these achievements? … What happens after this earthly life is ended?" (GS 10). To these questions, the Council Fathers respond in no uncertain terms that "the center and the purpose of the whole of human history is to be found in its Lord and Master" (GS 10). Indeed, GS's anthropology is premised on the primacy of God in humanity's very existence, sustenance, and final goal. GS highlights, especially in Chapter 1 of the doctrinal Part I, that the human person is created and redeemed by God, and called to loving union with God together with all creation for eternity. This call includes participation in the divine work of creation and redemption. Scholars note that at the Council debate many Fathers called for more attention to humans' relationship with God, the transcendent value of human life, and the God-given source of human dignity.[51] Hence in GS, human persons are predominantly portrayed in relation to God their creator and ultimate goal. A key motif in GS's anthropology is that of the *Imago Dei*, which implies a fundamental orientation in human beings towards loving union with God.[52] In the text itself, the first mention of humans created in God's image is immediately followed by the statement that they are "able to know and love" their Creator (GS 12). GS 21 reiterates that human beings have been "placed in the world by God" and called to "intimacy with God and to share in God's happiness". Significantly, the conclusion of Part I sums up GS's declaration that "the Lord is the goal of human history, the focal point of the desires of history and civilization, the center of humanity, the joy of all hearts, and the fulfilment of all aspirations" (GS 45).

Hence, GS's anthropology contrasts with the "new kind of humanism" (GS 7) that is reflected in secular disciplines at that time such as management science, which display an over-confidence in humanity's self-sufficiency and deny any place for the divine. Whilst GS acknowledges the legitimacy of these secular disciplines, it stresses that God is the first principle of the world and that "without a creator there can be no creature … [and] once God is forgotten, the creature itself is left in darkness" (GS 36). Hence, the Church's task is to remind people of God as their "final destiny", "the meaning of their own existence, the innermost truth about themselves" (GS 41). Significantly, the original text used for the first main debate on GS, which occurred at the third conciliar session, did not contain the section on atheism. However,

[51] Tanner, "The Church in the World," 304.

[52] This interpretation of the *Imago Dei* has been put forth by Ratzinger in "Dignity of the Human Person," 121-122. I concur with his view as it is consistent with the overall message of GS.

many Fathers, especially those from the communist regimes, made interventions on this topic, stressing its urgency.[53] Hence the final document devotes three articles to address atheism, declaring unequivocally that "if people exist, it is because God has created them through love, and through love continues to keep them in existence. They cannot live fully in the truth unless they freely acknowledge that love and entrust themselves to their creator" (GS 19). In short, God's creation and redemption of the world, and humanity's call to eternal union with God, constitute the grand narrative in GS that gives meaning to the human person, human society, human activity, and the Church's role in the world. This overall message of GS serves as the reference for interpreting its individual parts.

3.4.2 Human dignity

Based on the divine foundation of humanity and God's love for each person, GS stresses the fundamental dignity of every human person, which is brought to full light by Christ's incarnation and redemption. As mentioned above, GS 12 establishes humanity's "dignity and vocation" by highlighting God's creation of human beings with an innate capacity for loving union with God, and with the mandate to rule over creation for God's glory. After elaborating on the nature of human persons and the indispensable place of God in their lives, the pastoral constitution fully elucidates its message on human dignity in the culminating Christological article. GS 22 reveals that Christ, by assuming human nature in all respects except sin, raises human nature, including every aspect of ordinary life, "to a dignity beyond compare" and unites himself with every person (GS 22). In fact, the human person's immeasurable value is validated by the fact that no less than "the Son of God 'loved me and gave himself for me' (Gal 2:20)" despite humans' sinfulness (GS 22). For this reason, every person possesses an inviolable dignity, whether "an elderly person abandoned by everyone, a foreign worker who suffers the injustice of being despised", or any other marginalized person with whom Christ especially identifies (GS 27).

Scholars note that the doctrine on the dignity of humans arising from their creation in the image of God had been a long-standing tradition in Catholic theology and was in fact already included in the preparatory conciliar draft on the social order.[54] However, as can be seen from the final text of GS, it is through the adoption of a Christological perspective that the truth of human dignity is conveyed with greater clarity and force. Mindful of the pastoral constitution's wider audience, the Council Fathers also highlight the inclusion of all persons, including non-

[53] See ibid., 143.

[54] See Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching*, 131-132; and Moeller, "History," 6.

Christians, in the paschal mystery (GS 22). This is consonant with earlier declarations in LG on the various ways in which all humanity is linked to the People of God (LG 14-16). Moreover, by pointing to the divine source of human dignity, GS provides a solid basis for the fundamental equality of all persons. It explicitly stresses this "basic equality" (GS 29) in Chapter 2 on the human community in Part I. Curran rightly notes that this principle of human dignity and equality based on God's gratuitous gift contrasts with modern society's evaluation of human worth. In the latter, dignity is often seen as having to be earned through achievement or social status, thus leading to inequality and wide differences in the perceived value of each person.[55]

These teachings of GS contrast with mainstream management science which tends to view humanity as either "the absolute measure of all things, or debase it to the point of despair" (GS 12). As seen in Chapter 2 of this thesis, management science often absolutizes the priority of shareholders and consumers, while neglecting the well-being of workers and other stakeholders. In addition, GS's emphasis on the fundamental equality of all persons counters the management field's norm of valuing people differently, depending on their tangible contribution to the organization. A reorientation of management theory according to GS would require that the dignity and well-being of all persons must be attended to. Moreover, GS's teaching on the primacy of God implies that the divine horizon should be kept in view, especially in assumptions about human nature, human activity, and the human good. Implications for management will be further explored in the relevant sections below.

3.4.3 Human's social nature

A key aspect of GS's anthropology is the intrinsic social nature of human beings. Although the text deals with the human person and the human community in separate chapters, earlier drafts had these sections together. Subsequently, the individual and communal dimensions were separated so as to elaborate more specifically on each one.[56] GS 12 retains a key statement on the social nature of humans, highlighting that "God did not create men and women as solitary beings" but "by their innermost nature men and women are social beings; and if they do not enter into relationships with others they can neither live nor develop their gifts." This core principle is elaborated in Chapter 2 of Part I, which opens with GS 24 emphasizing the oneness of humanity's origin, and the divine desire that all may be one. The culminating Christological article of the chapter, GS 32, further elucidates the "communitarian character" of God's covenant, "perfected and fulfilled" in Christ especially through the social

[55] Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching*, 132.

[56] Moeller, "History of the Constitution," 51.

orientation of Christ's life, teachings, and saving act. In GS, the model most clearly favored for the communitarian character of humankind is the family. Besides GS 12 which alludes to spousal companionship as the primer of human communion, various motifs of the family are frequently used to describe the ideal condition for humanity. Most notably, the opening line of GS 24 introduces the doctrinal teaching of Chapter 2 by presenting God as a "parent" who desires that all "should form one family and deal with each other as brothers and sisters." This is paired by the closing line of Chapter 2 which anticipates the final consummation of humanity as "the family beloved with God and of Christ their brother" (GS 32). GS's preference for the family model resonates with its core principle that being-in-community is fundamental to human reality right from birth.

On a practical level, the most important implication of this teaching is that humans find their ultimate fulfilment through loving one another in mutual service. GS 24 highlights that love of God and neighbor are inseparable and constitute the greatest commandment. It then points out the "certain similarity" in the unity within the Trinity and among humankind. Noting this as a revelation of Christ surpassing "human reason", it stresses that human beings "can fully discover their true selves only in sincere self-giving." Accordingly, Chapter 2 of Part I elaborates on moral norms for social life, especially in solidarity with the least. Although this theme of human solidarity is not new in the Church's teachings, GS's placing of it within a theological anthropology provides a fresh paradigm with which to address humanity's challenges. For instance, Otto Semmelroth notes the use of "another self" in GS 27 to highlight the ontological oneness of the human community—our solidarity is a reality that precedes our neighborly actions rather than a result of it.[57] This means that social solutions should not merely accord with practical intelligence and be measured only in terms of effectiveness and efficiency; more importantly, they should uphold and promote humankind's solidarity and intrinsic fraternity. In fact, some Council Fathers criticized earlier drafts of GS for not adequately emphasizing that poverty was addressed not merely by aid but by solidarity among all peoples.[58] Thus, the final text advocates the strengthening of social bonds and even favors a communal way of working. Commentators note that GS's frequent affirmation of groups and associations is striking.[59]

[57] Otto Semmelroth, "The Community of Mankind," in Vorgrimler, *Commentary*, 172.

[58] Tanner, "The Church in the World," 290.

[59] For example, see Oswald von Nell-Breuning, "Socio-Economic Life," in Vorgrimler, *Commentary*, 295. In GS, the positive role of various types of social organizations and associations is highlighted in GS 25, 30, 31 and throughout the pastoral applications of Part II.

As seen in Chapter 2 of this thesis, the Systems model of management science recognizes the inter-connectivity of society, but is nevertheless orientated towards leveraging on this inter-connectivity for the self-serving goals of an organization. In contrast, GS acknowledges such "mutual interdependence between people", which necessitates pragmatic co-operation, but distinguishes these transactional relations from true "communion" (GS 23). GS's teachings imply that solidarity, community building, collaboration, mutual concern, and meaningful partnerships should be promoted in management not just out of practical necessity but as desirable ends in themselves, in line with the social nature of humanity's origin and goal. Echoing Kasper, Hollenbach points out GS's positive contribution in "confirming, healing, and fulfilling on a higher level" the precepts of secular social ethics and practical wisdom.[60] Moreover, GS's principle of human solidarity, centered on respect for the dignity of each person, counters the oppressive totalitarianism of collectivist societies, as well as the individualistic and self-sufficient tendency of liberalist cultures. Applications of this balanced view are seen throughout Part II such as in GS 65 and GS 75 which deal with economic and political life respectively. Achieving this balance between the individual and collective is relevant for management as well.

3.4.4 Human interiority, freedom, and unity of physical and spiritual dimensions

In contrast to the management and scientific fields which tend to focus on the corporeality of human nature, GS highlights the reality of humans' interiority and spirituality. It points out that humans "rise above" the rest of the material and biological world because of their capacity for introspection, self-awareness, and the exercise of human will (GS 14). This capacity points to the existence of human interiority or the "heart", which is the locus of humans' intimate encounter with God (GS 14). In the depths of their introspection, humans become aware of the reality of their "spiritual and immortal soul" (GS 14). Emphasizing this point, Ratzinger, as Pope Benedict XVI, criticizes contemporary society and the sciences for reducing everything in the interior life to merely a matter of psychology or neuroscience. Referring to GS 14, he asserts in CV that "the development of individuals and peoples depends partly on the resolution of problems of a spiritual nature" and that "there cannot be holistic development and universal common good unless people's spiritual and moral welfare is taken into account, considered in their totality as body and soul."[61] In relation to this, Curran observes that while prior Catholic social teaching encyclicals usually deal at length with external actions before concluding with

[60] Hollenbach, "Commentary on GS," 274.

[61] Pope Benedict XVI, *Caritas in Veritate, Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth* (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2009), par. 76.

the interior attitudinal change required, GS places more emphasis on the pre-requisite interior conversion and internal dispositions for any outward change.[62] Thus, the document highlights that social progress "will be realized only if" people foster "moral and social virtues" (GS 30). Similarly, authentic unity depends on "a union of hearts and minds" (GS 42) while socio-economic reform requires "a change of mentality and of attitude" (GS 63). Likewise, a humane political order depends on "an inward sense of justice" (GS 73). Conversely, social disorders originate from "selfishness and pride" in the hearts of people (GS 25) just as international divisions arise from "envy", "selfish passions" and other causes "at a deeper level" (GS 83). GS 27 points out that injustices against others "poison civilization" and "debase the perpetrators more than the victims." As for Christians, they are reminded of the beatitudes, especially the spirit of poverty, in their socio-economic life so that moral and spiritual values triumph material ones (GS 72). Hence, GS's emphasis on the interior, spiritual, and transcendent aspect of human nature counters the reductionist tendency of management science in putting forward explanations of and prescriptions for human actions based on "merely physical or social causes" (GS 14). The anthropology of GS contrasts with the materialistic, consumeristic, and empirical assumptions about the human person in mainstream management theories. As Chapter 1 of this thesis has shown, these assumptions have become uncritically imported into Catholic pastoral management literature when such literature applies management science directly, emphasizing material rewards, measurable outcomes, and external actions, while ignoring the interior realm of human meaning and values.

In relation to humans' interiority, GS also points out the freedom and relative autonomy that God has given to humans to make decisions and exercise their own will so as to ultimately find their way to God (GS 17). In this light, the apex of human autonomy is freedom of religion. Although such freedom had not been viewed positively by official magisterial teaching in the time right up to the Council, Tanner observes that a prior debate on *Dignitatis Humanae* was instrumental in opening up a renewed appreciation for human freedom and conscience during the conciliar meeting.[63] As mentioned earlier, the work of moral theologians such as Fuchs and Häring had also been influential. Hence, GS stresses the innate capacities of humans such as intellect, wisdom, and conscience (GS 15-16) to discern and choose what better accords with goodness and truth. The assertion of the primacy of conscience in GS 16 is particularly significant, and scholars note that this marks a change in the magisterium's approach to

[62] Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching*, 46.

[63] Tanner, *The Church and the World*, 46.

morality.[64] GS equally stresses that "deep within" humans' conscience is "a law inscribed by God" which "they must obey" (GS 16). Hence, humans' true freedom lies not in doing "anything they like" (GS 17) but in turning "towards what is good", especially in serving God who alone "can satisfy the deepest cravings of the human heart" (GS 41). Despite his other criticisms of GS 17, Ratzinger commends the article for this point, adding that it helps counter contemporary people's tendency to over-value an individualistic brand of freedom on the one hand, while blindly submitting to the dictates of modern science on the other hand.[65] In contrast, GS emphasizes the right use of human freedom and conscience in the choosing of what is truly good, and this principle is elucidated throughout the pastoral applications of Part II.

What all this means for management science is that the reality of human interiority, freedom, and conscience calls for a rejection of the deterministic approach in mainstream management theories, which tend to apply mechanistic calculations and predictions to human actions and decisions. As critics within the management field have pointed out, theories in the human and social sciences deal with the "intentional" and thus should not be deterministic because human intentions can never be fully predicted, calculated, or evaluated.[66] Moreover, the divine gift of human freedom is in conflict with management methods that involve coercion and manipulation of people. It also contrasts with the top-down tendency of mainstream management, which sets the theorist and manager over and above others, with an emphasis on control. GS's teachings imply that management should acknowledge human spontaneity and freedom, cultivate human interiority and conscience, as well as promote participation and responsibility. Moreover, the uncritical use of management technique and blind submission to market forces or to the prevailing managerial culture, as demonstrated in some of the Catholic pastoral management literature, must be replaced by the exercise of human freedom and conscience, and intentional and responsible choice.

It should be noted that even as GS highlights the interior, spiritual, and transcendent aspects of human nature, it also seeks to dispel a dualistic view of the human person by emphasizing the unity of body and soul, humanity's corporeality and spirituality. Commentators note that redressing the dichotomized view of the human person—a view which was prevalent among many in the Church—was something the Council Fathers were keen to do. Thus, paragraphs dealing with each aspect of the human person in GS 14, which were originally drafted as separate articles, were deliberately merged into one article in the redaction

[64] See Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching*, 75.

[65] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 139.

[66] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 77-78.

process so as to emphasize their unity.[67] The *Compendium* elaborates that neither "spiritualism" nor "materialism" does justice to the human person because spirit and matter "are not two natures united, but rather their union forms a single nature."[68] Quite significantly for management science, GS 56 points out that cultural development, including specializations in the different branches of knowledge, must "develop the whole human person harmoniously and integrally." This once again counters the reductionist assumptions and fragmented approach of mainstream management theories.

3.4.5 The limitations of control, the problem of evil, and humans' dynamic nature

Even as GS highlights humans' God-given freedom and relative autonomy, it also points out the limitations of humans' ability to control events. Though advances in history may be "products of people's intelligence and creativity", these advances also "recoil upon them, upon their judgements and desires" (GS 4). In particular, the reality of death confronts human beings with the ultimate limit of their control. As GS 18 points out, "all the helps made available by technology, however useful they may be, cannot set their anguished minds at rest" for humans are unable to attain for themselves their "heartfelt longing" for eternal life. Highlighting this statement, Ratzinger remarks that "all planning and calculation comes up against the limit set by what cannot be planned."[69] This resonates with the critical voices within the management field which call out the field's over-confidence in technique and control—an over-confidence which, as seen earlier, has influenced Catholic pastoral management literature.

GS goes further by highlighting an even more fundamental limitation—one which lies within the human heart, such that "they often do the very thing they hate and do not do what they want" (GS 10). Humans are "divided interiorly" as a result of serving "the creature rather than the creator", having been "enticed by the evil one" (GS 13). Thus, even as *Imago Dei*, humans are not free from sin. They are "drawn towards what is wrong and are sunk in many evils" (GS 13). In line with the ecclesiological humility shown by LG, GS 43 also acknowledges the sinfulness and weaknesses of the Church's members. Moreover, besides the sin of the individual, GS highlights that human sinfulness manifests itself on the social and structural plane (GS 25, 37). Scholars note that this marks the beginning of increased attention to the social dimension of morality in the Catholic social tradition.[70]

---

[67] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 126-127.

[68] *Compendium*, par. 129.

[69] Ibid., 140.

[70] See Dennis M. Doyle, *The Church Emerging from Vatican II: A Popular Approach to Contemporary Catholicism* (Mystic, CN: Twenty-Third Publications, 2002), 281.

In GS, the reality of human sinfulness and its implications have been made more evident in the final text due to the intervention of the Augustinians, in response to what they saw as the Thomists' overly-optimistic view of the human propensity for good.[71] In fact, expressions of dissatisfaction by the Augustinians continue even after GS's promulgation. Ratzinger highlights his criticisms of GS 15-17, even calling GS 17 "one of the least satisfactory in the whole document," containing a standpoint that is "for the Christian, quite simply an unreal one."[72] The Augustinians would have preferred a starting point which acknowledges the sinfulness of humans to the extent that the exercise of freedom to choose the good is so fundamentally inhibited that only the saving act of Christ liberates people from this bondage to sin.[73] Ratzinger further remarks that in GS 15, the deliberate intent "to keep the natural and supernatural orders separate" results in its concluding with a rather sudden and extrinsic statement on the role of the Holy Spirit in human wisdom.[74]

This begs the question of whether humans are predominantly inclined towards good or evil. Does GS resonate more with the "ideology-based gloomy vision" of the human person in mainstream management theory, with its emphasis on human self-interest, or with the alternative view espoused by those such as Ghoshal which stresses human virtue, goodness, and altruism?[75] As seen above, this major line of division between the Thomists and Augustinians was not satisfactorily resolved even in the final text of GS. However, it can be argued that their opposing stances, when held in dialectical tension, present a dynamic view of the human person which is perhaps more comprehensive and realistic than that espoused by either side alone. Read as a whole, GS conveys a view of the human person not as static beings oriented to either good or evil in a fixed way, but as beings on-the-way, dynamic and developing. GS 13 observes that both individual and social life are a dramatic struggle "between good and evil, between light and darkness". Both positive and negative aspects of human actions are acknowledged in GS's introduction and throughout the document. In fact, GS 39 highlights that all creation, including the human person, comes to perfection only at the end of time. Meanwhile, though "the form of this world [is] distorted by sin, … it is here that the body of a new human family grows" (GS 39). In line with this, Ratzinger rightly proposes that Christ, as "the perfect man" (GS 22), is the model for human persons to strive towards in an on-going way. The *Imago Dei* is to be understood "less as a static endowment than as the dynamism of a

[71] As mentioned, some of the key Augustinian redactions are pointed out in Peterson, "Critical Voices," 10.

[72] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 136-137.

[73] Ibid., 137-139.

[74] Ibid., 133-134.

[75] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 84.

promise located above man."[76] Notably, the motif of a journey occurs throughout GS and resonates with the historical consciousness of Vatican II. The very first paragraph of GS presents the image of the Church on "pilgrimage towards the Father's kingdom" (GS 1). This is mirrored in the closing article of Part I which reiterates humankind's "earthly pilgrimage" and "journey toward the consummation of history" (GS 45). Even the Church "needs the maturing influence of centuries of past experience" and thus its members are exhorted to ceaseless "purification and renewal" (GS 43).

Hence, the human person, created with a propensity for loving union with God, is also given the freedom to either follow or oppose it, thus struggling between good and evil during the course of earthly life. The Thomists' optimistic view that "the human mind is … broadening its mastery over time" (GS 5) must be balanced by the Augustinians' caution that "the discoveries of the human mind is not automatically something intrinsically more humane."[77] Thus, human persons and humanity proceed through a nonlinear journey of progress, decline, failure, and redemption. This view has been developed further in subsequent scholarship on GS. For example, Luigi Rulla et al. point out that GS contributes a vision of the human person as fundamentally dialectical. Following the pastoral constitution's exhortation to dialogue with the secular disciplines, the authors employ behavioral and psychological sciences to elucidate this dialectical nature of the human psyche.[78] All this implies that management theories cannot be solely based on a one-sided view of the human person, whether optimistic or pessimistic. Rather, the complex, spontaneous, and dynamic nature of human beings must be recognized. Management science needs to take into account the problem of evil, as well as humans' capacity for self-transcendence, neither of which lend themselves to mechanistic prediction and control. This once again counters any deterministic approach in the formulation and application of management tools. Moreover, the possibility of both good and evil in the human person also highlights the need for management theory and practice to promote the good, and to enhance the probability of positive human development and social flourishing rather than decline.

3.4.6 Divine action in the human person

Finally, a key theme in GS's anthropology is the abiding presence of divine assistance acting in the human person. The text frequently attributes humans' good intent and action to the animating role of the Holy Spirit and to Christ.[79] It is also the Holy Spirit which enables

[76] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 121.

[77] Ibid., 133.

[78] Luigi M. Rulla, Franco Imoda and Joyce Ridick, "Anthropology of the Christian Vocation: Conciliar and Post Conciliar Aspects," in Latourelle, *Vatican II Assessment and Perspectives*, 402-459.

[79] For example, see GS 22, 26, 38, 41 and 45.

humans to know the divine plan (GS 15). Michael Lawler et al. note that the role of the Spirit in animating humankind is a prominent principle in GS.[80] The pastoral constitution also acknowledges humans' inability to overcome evil and reach their goal without the saving help of Christ's paschal mystery.[81] It is "only by the help of God's grace that people can properly orientate their actions towards God" (GS 17). Ratzinger highlights a deliberate change made to GS 22 with regard to the association of non-Christians with the paschal mystery, such that the more active and somewhat Pelagian phrase of "conforming themselves" was rightly replaced by the more passive phrase of "being made partners."[82] Yet GS stresses that human freedom is not negated by divine action in the human person but is in fact purified and strengthened. GS 41 highlights that the Gospel "scrupulously respects" human conscience and freedom, and that the economy of salvation does not cancel but in fact reinforces human autonomy. Nevertheless, the primacy of God is the last word in GS, as seen in its concluding statement which highlights "him who by the power at work within us is able to do far more abundantly than all that we ask or think" (GS 93).

This has profound implications for management. Not only should the goal of management be directed towards God's purpose but the methods of management must somehow promote human co-operation with the indwelling spirit of God. Moreover, the deterministic approach to management theory is proven inappropriate once again because the divine-human interaction can never be pinned down to precise calculations and predictions. In this regard, perhaps a religious horizon might enlighten the following words of John F. Kennedy on management and decision-making, written after his critical role as US President in averting the Cuban missile crisis while the Council Fathers were in the midst of the first session of Vatican II:

> The essence of ultimate decision remains impenetrable to the observer—often, indeed, to the decider himself … There will always be the dark and tangled stretches in the decision-making process—mysterious even to those who may be most intimately involved.[83]

3.4.7 Summary

It can be seen that the anthropology of GS has much to contribute to the assumptions about the human person in management. GS's anthropology is premised upon the divine

[80] Michael G. Lawler, Todd A. Salzman and Eileen Burke-Sullivan, *The Church in the Modern World: Gaudium et Spes Then and Now* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014), 55.

[81] For example, see GS 13, 22 and 37.

[82] Ratzinger, "The Dignity of the Human Person," 162-163.

[83] John F. Kennedy, "Foreword," in Theodore Sorensen, *Decision-making in the White House: The Olive Branch and the Arrows* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), cited in Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*, xi.

initiative in creating, sustaining, and redeeming humankind, calling it to loving union with God in eternity. This confers upon all human persons an inviolable dignity and fundamental equality. It also highlights the intrinsic social nature of the human person in the divine design, and the centrality of human solidarity which finds its best expression in mutual self-giving. GS stresses human interiority, freedom, responsibility, and the unity of the human person's corporeal and spiritual dimensions. At the same time, it acknowledges human limitations and the dynamic inclination of humans to both good and evil. Nevertheless, its overriding message is one of hope because of the abiding presence of God animating the human heart and mind, facilitating human co-operation. These principles in GS's anthropology resonate more with the alternative view among management scholars who reject the reductionist, materialist, and instrumental views of the human person which have been espoused in mainstream management theory. GS also aligns with the alternative view in its rejection of management science's transactional and self-interested paradigm for social relations. In addition, both GS and the alternative voices within the management field resonate in their opposition to the deterministic, top-down approach to theory formulation and application, and the over-confidence in technique and control in mainstream management science. Significantly, GS's theological anthropology not only rejects these controversial assumptions in mainstream management but more importantly, provides an alternative vision that is more deeply-rooted, comprehensive, and systematically-related than that offered by the management field's internal critics. As the pastoral constitution itself declares, "there is no human law so well fitted to safeguard personal dignity and human freedom as is the Gospel which Christ entrusted to the church" (GS 41). In this light, GS's anthropology presents a truly new humanism, not based on over-confidence in human ability as is the tendency in the management field, but on the divine foundation and affirmation of the human person.

3.5 The nature and purpose of human activity

"Vanity of vanities! All is vanity. What do people gain from all the toil at which they toil under the sun?" (Eccl 1:2-3, NRSV) The Council Fathers astutely observed that despite immense achievements, humanity is still asking the same "worrying" question today: "What is the meaning and value of this feverish activity?" (GS 33) The answer conveyed unequivocally in the pastoral constitution is that human activity on earth is a participation in the divine work of creation and redemption, and that such participation is integral to human beings' nature and vocation.

3.5.1 The dignity of human labor

In the beginning of Chapter 1 on the human person in Part I of GS, the divine mandate for humanity to exercise mastery over the world and order all things towards God is highlighted in the motif of the *Imago Dei*, following immediately upon the statement on human's capacity for knowing and loving God (GS 12). Significantly, the motif and its associated mandate are reiterated in the beginning of Chapter 3 on human activity. GS 34 points out that "created in God's image", humans are "commanded to conquer the earth … in justice and holiness." Even their ordinary "daily work", when it is "of service to the community," are no less than "a prolongation of the work of the creator" and a "fulfilment in history of the divine plan" (GS 34). Quite strikingly, an area of work that is most common in human life—that of bringing up a family—is elevated to a "special" association "with [God's] own creative work" (GS 50). Similarly, people can be "partners in the work of bringing God's creation to perfection" through their ordinary livelihood activities (GS 67).

Once again, GS's Christology fully elucidates the pastoral constitution's teachings about human work. First, human endeavor to continue Christ's work of transforming the world towards the Kingdom of God is explicitly commanded by Christ (GS 32, 38), echoing the divine mandate at creation. However, what is additionally pointed out by GS's Christology is that Christ is united with every person in the incarnation, and through his own working "with human hands", further affirms the dignity of ordinary human work (GS 22, 67). In his commentary on this article, Ratzinger highlights that the human labor of Jesus reveals that "man's being is not that of a pure essence"; rather, "he only attains his reality by his activity".[84] In other words, in God's design, human work is integral to being fully human. Moreover, as seen earlier, humanity is not left alone to carry out its tasks. GS points out that Christ remains actively "at work in human hearts by the power of his Spirit," animating and strengthening them in their vocation (GS 38). This is well-illustrated in GS 48 with regard to the demands of married life. Elsewhere, GS highlights the working of God's Spirit even in secular society.[85] Hence, earthly labor is not just a mandate from God but also a locus of the sacred divine-human contact. In this regard, the crowning glory of the dignity of human work is brought out by GS when it proclaims that human labor is no less than a participation in the supreme paschal mystery and redemptive work of Christ (GS 22, 38). Even non-Christians are elevated in some way to being "partners …in the paschal mystery" (GS 22). Moreover, human labor has a lasting significance even in the

[84] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 160.

[85] For example, see GS 22, 41 and especially GS 36.

eschatological realm. As GS 39 points out, "the fruits of our nature and our enterprise" continue beyond the temporal horizon. Meanwhile on earth, GS points out that work "is for the benefit of human beings, proceeding from them as it does. When they work, not only do they transform matter and society, they also perfect themselves. They learn, develop their faculties, emerging from and transcending themselves" (GS 35). Work enables people to make a living, contribute to the community, and express their personality (GS 67, 71). These points highlight the subjective dimension of human activity and the important role of work in upholding and developing the dignity of the person.

The strong affirmation of human activity in the text of GS resonates with the observation that "nearly all the fathers emphatically wanted the bases of a theology of earthly values to be worked out. The real focus of many of their speeches was the question of the ultimate meaning and value of earthly activity, and its relation to the Kingdom of God."[86] Hence Vatican II reversed the "false dualism between a merely natural order and the supernatural goal."[87] Tanner notes that the conservative minority at the Council had protested against the Church speaking to such worldly concerns as ordinary human activity.[88] However, the pastoral inclination of the majority was reflected in the first speech at GS's debate, made by Cardinal Achille Liénart, stressing that "it is very important that in the schema we immediately situate ourselves at the natural level and tell the world how we properly recognize the dignity of human beings, how we wholly approve of their legitimate ambitions … inasmuch as these conform to the intention of God, who gave to his rational creatures full government of this created world."[89] Thus the Council endeavored to offer "a doctrine on man" which spoke especially to the ordinary aspects of human life.[90] It can be seen that the motifs of "daily work" (GS 34), "daily activity" (GS 40) and "the ordinary circumstances of daily life" (GS 38) are noticeable throughout the text, especially in Chapter 3. A prior version even lists common occupations such as mother, farmer, baker, and office-worker but these were eventually deleted for the sake of brevity.[91]

In summary, GS greatly raises the intrinsic goodness and dignity of earthly human labor by highlighting not only its practical value but more importantly, its religious, salvific, and eschatological significance. Christians are especially cautioned against the false dualism between faith and temporal activity, and are exhorted "to impress the divine law on the affairs

[86] Alfons Auer, "Man's Activity Throughout the World," in Vorgrimler, *Commentary*, 196.

[87] Ibid.

[88] Tanner, "The Church in the World," 286.

[89] Speech by Cardinal Achille Liénart, cited in ibid., 285.

[90] Moeller, "Man, the Church and Society," 414.

[91] Auer, "Man's Activity Throughout the World," 188.

of the earthly city" (GS 43). In this regard, commentators note that the Council Fathers were not just concerned with the 'what' of Christian doctrine but the 'how' of Christianity. Edward Schillebeeckx remarks that "the episcopate—the great majority—is preoccupied with the question of how the Christian truth ought to be done … [and] that Christianity is not pure ideology, a doctrinal system, but is an 'event' in which the history of salvation is accomplished."[92] Underscoring this central message, the concluding article of GS cites Matthew 7:21 and emphasizes that the Christian Gospel of love requires all to "courageously set to work" and demonstrate "an active love, in word and in deed" (GS 93).

These teachings of GS resonate with management science in affirming the significance and value of earthly activity and human enterprise. Once again echoing Kasper, it can also be said that GS affirms, completes, and purifies the secular view of work. GS's teachings imply that the dignity of human labor and the dignity of the worker must always be respected in management theory and practice. Moreover, the fundamental equality in the value of all types of work must be recognized. This contrasts with management science's tendency to treat workers instrumentally, and to attribute different values to different types of jobs and personnel. Moreover, GS's teaching on work as a partnership in the divine enterprise and as integral to the nature and goal of humanity implies that every person has a vocation, right, and responsibility to meaningful work and personal development. Management theory needs to ensure fruitful participation, proper job design, and on-going development of workers. In fact, GS 67 specifically addresses these imperatives and will be discussed in detail below.

3.5.2 Moral and religious direction of human activity

Implicit in GS's statements about the value of human work is its moral direction. In the text, the ontological goodness of human labor is frequently associated with the underlying direction and goal of such labor. As seen above, when GS 34 points out the divine significance of human work, it does not fail to clarify that this refers to work that is "of service to the community". Likewise, GS 35 emphasizes that "the norm for human activity" is "to harmonize with the authentic interests of the human race, in accordance with God's will and design, and to enable people as individuals and as members of society to pursue and fulfil their total vocation." In the ground-breaking section on culture, the Council acknowledges the newfound ability of humans to shape society, while also stressing the prerogative to "build a better world in truth and justice" so that there can be a "new humanism" based on mutual responsibility

[92] Edward Schillebeeckx, "The Third Session of Vatican II," *DO-C*, no. 172A, cited in Tanner, "The Church in the World," 328.

towards fellow human beings (GS 55). Most notably, by associating human activity with the paschal mystery, GS 38 highlights "the new commandment of love" which "must be exercised above all in the ordinary circumstances of daily life". Applying this, GS 67 points out that through work, people can "associate with others as their brothers and sisters, and serve them; they can exercise genuine charity and be partners in the work of bringing God's creation to perfection." In line with its teaching on the fundamentally social nature of the human person, GS stresses that the epitome of human activity lies in self-giving for one another in the example of Christ who died "for us" (GS 38). Consequently, a recurrent message in both doctrinal and pastoral application sections of GS is the social responsibility of everyone to seek the good of each person, uphold the common good in society, and build a better world. Conversely, GS acknowledges the existence of "human activity infected by sin" and thus implies that not all human labor is to be applauded, especially those "endangered by pride and inordinate self-love" (GS 37). Notably, an earlier draft of GS 11 had simply associated the signs of the times *per se* with the will of God, thus somewhat revealing an overly-optimistic view of world events and human activity. In response to strong protests by the Augustinians, this was amended to state that the Church discerns, more specifically, the "true signs" of God's presence and purpose in current earthly affairs (GS 11).[93] Quite significantly for management, GS 64 stresses that economic activity is to be carried out through "techniques and methods belonging to the moral order, so that God's design for humanity may be carried out."

Complementing the moral imperative, GS also elaborates on the religious goal of human work. GS 34 points out that the ultimate aim of human endeavor is to bring all the universe to the praise of God even in the here and now. GS 57 highlights that the finality of cultural development is that ultimately, "the human spirit, freed from the bondage of material things, can be more easily drawn to the worship and contemplation of the creator." Elaborating on these points, Ratzinger typifies the Augustinian view in his assertion that service of God cannot simply be equated to secular service, when this explicit worship of God is absent.[94] Others such as Rahner espouse a broader view of relationship with the divine, which, as Rahner suggests, can be manifested in transcendental and less explicit ways.[95] Although this debate remains unresolved, what is clear in GS is the emphasis that "over and above" all else, people are "called as daughters and sons to intimacy with God and to share in God's happiness" (GS 21). The

[93] Ratzinger, "The Dignity of the Human Person," 115.

[94] Ibid., 122.

[95] This perspective of Rahner has been discussed in relation to the teachings of Vatican II in Doyle, *The Church Emerging From Vatican II*, 261-262. For Rahner's original work, see Karl Rahner, *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*, trans. by William V. Dych (New York: Crossroad, 2000). See especially Chapter 2.

primacy of God as the foundation and goal of humanity is the overriding message of GS, even as the document leaves room for various expressions of this divine orientation, since "the gifts of the Spirit are manifold" (GS 38). These teachings of GS have fundamental implications for the goal of management, as well as the question of values in the means and ends of management. These implications will be explored in detail below in the discussion on GS's thick description of terminal values.

3.5.3 Eschatological horizon, the cross, and resurrection

Another key point in GS's teaching on the nature and purpose of human work is that humanity's goal is fully attained only after the passing away of the temporal realm in the end-times, when all things are re-established in Christ.[96] The pastoral constitution cautions that "we must be careful to distinguish earthly progress clearly from the increase of the kingdom of Christ" which always retains its transcendent character (GS 39). Attributed to the intervention of the Augustinians, it is significant that this point is made in the concluding paragraphs of Chapter 3 on human activity (GS 38-39) and of Part 1 as a whole (GS 45). Reiterating this teaching, the *Compendium* highlights the "eschatological relativity" of human work, explaining that "any purely intra-worldly ideology of progress [is] contrary to the integral truth of the human person and to God's plan in history."[97] This perspective has helped to balance an over-emphasis on earthly progress in the earlier drafts of GS.

The final text also does not hesitate to point out the suffering that awaits those who participate in the work of Christ, especially through GS 22 and GS 38, since human labor is a sharing in the paschal mystery. Significantly, in the report from the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops convoked in 1985 to review the progress of Vatican II's reception, the "theology of the cross" was the very first point highlighted in the section on GS.[98] Perhaps addressing criticisms as mentioned earlier in this chapter that the pastoral constitution lacked sufficient emphasis on the cross, the 1985 document stresses "the value, the importance and the centrality of the cross of Jesus Christ" as a source of enlightenment for "the present-day difficulties".[99] Together with GS, this serves as a reminder of the challenges and difficulties that are inevitable in human

[96] This is particularly highlighted in GS 38, 39 and 45.

[97] *Compendium*, par. 48.

[98] Synod of Bishops, "The Final Report of the 1985 Extraordinary Synod of Bishops," *Origins* 15 (December 19, 1985): par. D2.

[99] Ibid.

work, while pointing out their deeper, salvific meaning. In this regard, the 1985 document highlights "the realism of Christian hope."[100]

Finally, the message of resurrection is a significant one in GS. GS 39 and 45, which conclude the chapter on human activity and the whole of Part I respectively, give particular emphasis to Christ's final victory in the end-times. Meanwhile GS 22 assures readers that the spirit of the risen Christ abides with and supports those who follow Christ while on earth. Through Christ's passion, the way of reconciliation and freedom from sin is opened, and "the entire person is inwardly renewed, even to the 'redemption of the body' (Rom 8:23)" (GS 22). Similarly, GS 38 points out Christ's Lordship and authority in his resurrection, powerfully animating and enabling humanity to work towards its goals. The Council Fathers stress that the expectation of the eternal kingdom must not weaken but rather stimulate the work on earth to cultivate the conditions aligned to it, adding that the progress which foreshadows the new human family indeed begins here on earth (GS 39). These realities of the cross and resurrection in human labor has been reiterated in LE. Citing GS, it highlights that human work "is inevitably linked with toil" and is a sharing in the work of Christ crucified.[101] At the same time, there is "a glimmer of new life, of the new good" promised through Christ's resurrection, a privileged glimpse into that in-breaking of the new heaven and earth even now, as highlighted in GS 39, brought about precisely through the toil of work.[102]

In summary, the eschatological finality of human work and its historical exigency must both be kept in creative tension, just as the dual symbols of cross and resurrection are stressed by GS. This has important implications for management. The reality of the eschatological horizon and the cross counters the tendency of management science and of some Catholic pastoral management literature to emphasize immediate and measurable results based on worldly criteria. It also counters unrealistic expectations of complete success and perfection within the temporal realm, and the view that failure, suffering, and imperfection are anomalies in earthly life, fully resolvable given the right set of techniques and conditions. Yet GS does not promote passive cynicism. The promise of resurrection calls for a pro-active approach in striving for "earthly progress", since "the expectation of a new earth should spur us on" (GS 39). GS also admits of some visible indicators of progress "foreshadowing" the age to come, which can profitably guide human work within history (GS 39). Moreover, GS's dual symbols of the cross and resurrection imply that management theory and practice should not aim

[100] Ibid.

[101] Pope John Paul II, *Encyclical Letter on Human Work, Laborem Exercens* (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 1981), par. 27.

[102] Ibid.

primarily at providing quick and easy solutions which avoid the challenge of dealing with deeper problems, especially those that touch on moral and socio-cultural issues. Rather, the message of GS gives the encouragement to confront these challenges and persevere in them.

3.5.4 Affirmation of management

Since GS promotes the goal of "the better ordering of human society" (GS 39), it advocates having proper organization, structures, systems, and institutions to achieve this goal. Chapter 2 on the human community in Part I speaks favorably of "public and private organizations", "social laws and directives", and "norms of social conduct" insofar as they facilitate the common good (GS 30). It stresses that such norms must be respected by individuals and organizations in society. In the pastoral application sections, the necessity of appropriate structures, good organization, effective systems, and legitimate authority in economic life (GS 65, 67, 68) and political life (GS 74, 75) are also advocated. Moreover, even as the pastoral constitution stresses the fundamental equality of all persons, it also gives due regard for the proper division of roles (GS 68), specialization and collaboration (GS 57), and complementary diversity of vocations (GS 38). Significantly, GS 88 points out that "the spirit of charity does not forbid, but on the contrary commands that charitable activity be carried out in a careful and orderly manner." This emphasis on formal coordination and proper organization is very prominent throughout the second part of Chapter 5 on the international community in Part II. Hence, far from dispensing with the need for management, which is the coordination and ordering of human activity and resources towards a goal, it can be said that the Council Fathers' theological view of human work affirms it even more. In fact, GS 68 specifically recognizes the role of "management" and the importance of "necessary executive unity," which can be regarded as the unity of action among all parties, which the function of management helps to achieve.[103]

GS also stresses the need to maximize effectiveness and productivity in human work. GS 64 highlights that economic fruitfulness requires technical progress, the spirit of enterprise, creativity, adaptation, and "all serious efforts of people" (GS 64). The pastoral constitution is clearly concerned about optimizing productivity in agriculture, industry, and even investments, especially for the sake of the needy (GS 66, 70, 87). Its emphasis on the importance of being "truly proficient" (GS 43), skillful and properly trained (GS 66, 72, 88) is evident. Indeed, the

[103] Von Nell-Breuning points out that the function of the entrepreneur or manager had not been overlooked by the Council but time constraints and lack of supporting references inhibited a more detailed treatment. See Nell-Breuning, "Socio-Economic Life," 299. Nevertheless, as seen here, some points on the role of management can still be gathered from the final text.

theology of human work in GS cannot be accused of tolerating mediocrity or denying the practical intelligence required to achieve its lofty ends. Here again, management plays an essential role in enhancing productivity, cultivating resources, and promoting human enterprise. In this light, it can be said that even the Scientific Management model has some resonance with GS's emphasis on the intrinsic order of the temporal realm with its own "stability, truth and excellence, its own order and laws" which must be gradually deciphered, put to use, and regulated (GS 36).

Arguably, the affirmation of management as implied by GS's teachings is a result of the Thomists having a greater influence on the document's theology of hope. No doubt the theme of hope resonates with both Thomists and Augustinians. It is the main message of GS, as evident in the document's Latin title, and borne out in the text's emphasis on the divine economy of salvation. Very aptly, the word "hope" is also prominent in the beginning and conclusion of the whole text (GS 1, 93). However, the main implication of hope in GS can be seen to align more with the Thomists' stance, which calls for turning towards the temporal order, and striving for earthly progress as a foreshadow of the Kingdom of God, as stressed in GS 39.[104] This contrasts with the Augustinian view of what hope implies. Jürgen Moltmann notes that in the *Encyclical Letter on Christian Hope, Spes Salvi,* promulgated by Ratzinger as Pope Benedict XVI, hope turns one's sight more towards the afterlife rather than the temporal order, and seems to be limited only to believers rather than the world at large.[105] Moltmann highlights that this view contrasts with the one in GS. For the reorientation of management theory, it might be advantageous to hold both Thomist and Augustinian perspectives in complementary balance. This would affirm the importance of the management discipline, whilst also caution against over-valuing earthly progress and measurable results, as GS itself has highlighted.

3.5.5 The nature of organizations and the principle of communion

Finally, an ontology of the organization can be deduced from GS's theology of human work. It can be seen that GS promotes a view of organizations that centers on human persons, participation, and communion. GS 68 points out that "it is persons who associate together in business enterprises, people who are free and autonomous, who have been created in the image of God." The article immediately highlights that this implies "the active participation of everybody in administration," acknowledging the legitimate diversity and complementarity of

[104] This view of hope in GS is elaborated in Francine Cardman, "History and Hope: Retrieving *Gaudium et Spes* for the Church and the World," in *Hope: Promise, Possibility and Fulfillment,* eds. Richard Lennan and Nancy Pineda-Madrid (New York: Paulist Press, 2013), 224-239.

[105] Jürgen Moltmann, "Horizons of Hope," *The Christian Century*, May 20, 2009.

roles. Commenting on GS 68, Oswald von Nell-Breuning points out the drafters' desire to emphasize the organization as a community of all persons in collaboration, rather than as a faceless legal and accounting entity, or only an enterprise centered around the owner.[106] Moreover, the reference to the *Encyclical on the Reconstruction of the Social Order, Quadragesimo Anno* (hereafter QA) in GS 68 highlights the social dimension of work. QA 69 stresses that for human effort to be productive, there is a need for "a truly social and organic body", a proper "social and juridical order", as well as the cooperation and mutual completion of inter-dependent roles whereby "mind, material things and work combine" to form "a single whole,"[107] LE develops this theme further by pointing out that "it is characteristic of work that it first and foremost unites people. In this consists its social power: the power to build a community. In the final analysis, both those who work and those who manage the means of production or who own them must in some way be united in this community" (LE 20). Even if it is pragmatic inter-dependence that brings people together in an organization, "their union remains a constructive factor of social order and solidarity, and it is impossible to ignore it" (LE 20).[108] Foreshadowing this teaching, GS 67 highlights work as a means by which people "associate with others as their brothers and sisters." This perspective on human work and organizations reinforces GS's teaching on the fundamental social nature of the human person. It calls for management theory to promote communion, solidarity, participation, and collaboration in organizations, rather than competition, individualism, and the violation of human dignity. It also contrasts with mainstream management theories' instrumental and reductionist view of organizations as entities that can be simply dispensed with, downsized, bought and sold, or re-structured to suit shareholders' interests or customers' demands. As seen earlier, the use of a producer-consumer paradigm for the Church in some of the Catholic pastoral management literature reflects this instrumental view. In GS's teachings, the organization has intrinsic value and meaning as a human community, and is a catalyst of human solidarity.

3.6 Thick description of terminal values

[106] Oswald von Nell-Breuning, "Socio-Economic Life," in Vorgrimler, *Commentary*, 298-299.

[107] Pius XI, *Encyclical on Reconstruction of the Social Order, Quadragesimo Anno,* (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 1931), par. 69.

[108] This view of the organization as a community of human persons is elaborated in Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *The Vocation of the Business Leader* (Rome: Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2014), par. 57-59. Michael Naughton, who played a significant role in the drafting of this document, discusses the communal character of the organization in detail in Michael Naughton, "The Corporation as a Community of Work: Understanding the Firm Within the Catholic Social Tradition," *Ave Maria Law Review* 4 (2006): 33-76.

In Chapter 2 of this thesis, it was noted that alternative voices in the management field have called for greater socio-ecological responsibility in the means and ends of management. There have also been efforts within the field to articulate a thick description of ethical values that can guide management theory and practice. It was pointed out that a faith tradition, with its focus on human teleology, could complement these efforts. Not surprisingly, GS has much to offer in this regard. As seen above, GS reveals that humankind has an ultimately religious and eschatological finality. Human beings are called to loving union with God, one another, and all creation in eternal life. Meanwhile on earth, GS articulates concrete ideals and conditions that serve as visible indicators of progress towards this goal.

3.6.1 Personalist principle and descriptions of the human good

Foremost in GS's thick description of the ethical good is the total well-being of the human person. As GS 35 asserts, "human activity is for the benefit of human beings." Likewise GS 25 points out that the human person is "the beginning, the subject and the object of every social organization," and GS 26 stresses the "sublime dignity of human persons, who stand above all things and whose rights and duties are universal and inviolable." Applying this view, GS 64 stresses that "the ultimate and basic purpose of economic production does not consist merely in the increase of goods produced, nor in profit nor prestige; economic production is meant to be at the service of humanity in its totality." This principle is often described in Catholic social teaching as "personalism" or the personalist principle.[109] Thomas Massaro points out that the personalist principle has been subsequently promoted especially by the teachings of Pope John Paul II. In particular, LE 15 emphasizes respect for "the priority of labour" and "personal values" whether in private or socialist enterprises, such that the worker is not "just a cog in a huge machine moved from above" or "a mere production instrument" but "a true subject of work with an initiative of his own". This accords with GS's view on the dignity of the human person. As explained succinctly by Massaro, "personalism is at its most helpful when it guides our attempts to balance the extremes of a radical individualism … and collectivism."[110] Conciliar commentators note that the personalist principle was something the Council Fathers were keen to emphasize.[111]

In relation to this, GS spares no effort in detailing what constitutes the good of the person, spelling it out particularly in GS 26 on the common good. Here, a striking point is the holistic

[109] Thomas Massaro, *Living Justice: Catholic Social Teaching in Action* (Franklin, WI: Sheed & Ward, 2000), 207. See also *Compendium*, Chapter 3, Part I, par. 105-107.

[110] Ibid., 208.

[111] Auer, "Man's Activity Throughout the World," 190.

view of the human good in GS, emphasizing all dimensions of the person: "food, clothing, housing, the right freely to choose their state of life and set up a family, the right to education, work, to their good name, to respect, to proper knowledge, the right to act according to the dictates of conscience and to safeguard their privacy, and rightful freedom, including freedom of religion." GS 64 summarizes this in terms of "people's material needs and the requirements of their intellectual, moral, spiritual, and religious life." These teachings elucidate the practical implications of human dignity, and are in line with the emphasis in GS 14 on the totality of the human person. In the pastoral applications of Part II, such a holistic view of the human good serves as the principle for the development of culture (GS 53, 61), the economy (GS 64, 67), and international aid (GS 84, 86).

What is most helpful for dialogue with the management field is that throughout GS, each dimension of the human good is further dealt with in detail. First, the Council Fathers show a clear concern for people's material needs such as food and shelter, and hence the importance of livelihood and employment security (GS 26, 67, 71, 87). To achieve this more effectively for all peoples especially the poor, GS urges practical intelligence in agricultural, industrial, and economic advancement and organization (63, 66, 69, 87). Second, in line with humans' social nature, GS stresses that the well-being of the person is intimately linked with a healthy family life (GS 47). It urges those in authority to safeguard the welfare of families and "promote domestic prosperity" (GS 52). Economic activities should provide for the family on "the material, social, cultural and spiritual level" whilst also ensuring that "domestic life" and the cultivation of the family are not compromised (GS 67). Extending beyond the family, GS also points out that belonging in a community is an essential human need that must be upheld, since "life in society is not something accessory" but there are "social ties necessary for humanity's development" which, besides the family, also include the "political community" (GS 25). In this vein, GS promotes the right of persons to form associations whether in civic, economic, or political life (GS 42, 68, 73). At the same time, it emphasizes that such "socialization" must be accompanied by "personalization"—the formation of "truly personal relationships" (GS 6). As highlighted earlier, this social aspect of the human good finds its apex in self-giving love for another (GS 24), in line with the true vocation of the human person.

In terms of the intellectual, cultural, and moral good, GS elaborates on the importance of exercising human freedom, intentionality, and responsibility, as well as personal development and self-expression. Participation is to be promoted as a means for self-determination and the defense of the interests of one's family. As mentioned earlier, GS 68 calls for an active sharing by all in the administration of an enterprise. Von Nell-Breuning points out that although some detractors tried to play down the extent of worker participation in management during GS's

drafting, the final text unequivocally establishes the Council Fathers' view in favor of participation, including workers having "a say in decision-making" even at the macro level of socio-economic policy, since this affects "the future of the employees and their children" (GS 68).[112] Von Nell-Breuning highlights that this passage has become "the locus classicus for co-determination, responsibility-sharing, co-partnership, [and] workers' participation."[113] Participation in work should also enable workers "to develop their talents and their personalities" (GS 67). Even private property is ultimately meant to "contribute to self-expression and provide people with the opportunity of exercising a role in the society and in the economy" (GS 71), thus fulfilling the human vocation. Part II of GS reiterates this responsibility of participation in socio-economic (GS 65, 69) and public life (GS 75). In fact, participation also extends to shaping the culture of one's community and milieu (GS 53, 60).

To this end, the good of the human person not only includes the absence of hindrances to freedom such as "extreme destitution" or "overindulgence" (GS 31) but also growth in intellect, including the removal of "the curse of ignorance", and access to "cultural benefits" especially basic education (GS 60). GS highlights the importance of forming the mind and understanding, of growing in one's own culture, and developing one's own "talent and traditions" (GS 86). It also stresses the need for learning "the true scale of values" (GS 61), forming the conscience (GS 16, 43, 87), and cultivating the full range of human faculties, including "the faculties of wonder, of understanding, of contemplation, of forming personal judgments and cultivating a religious, moral and social sense" (GS 59). Such development "is more precious than any kind of wealth that can be amassed" (GS 35). GS calls attention to those who are deprived of these opportunities for intellectual and cultural development and are thus unable to participate meaningfully in society (GS 60). In particular, the Council Fathers noted the severity of illiteracy especially in regions such as Latin America.[114] Hence, the exercise of human freedom and cultural formation go hand in hand.

All these aspects of the human good culminate in the ultimate good of having a meaningful spiritual and religious life, enabled by religious freedom. As discussed earlier, GS signifies a shift from the prior approach of the Church by stressing that this freedom must be respected (GS 73). Yet the document also points out that it is ultimately a freedom to find God who is the final goal of humankind. Hence, a vibrant and authentic spiritual life through intimate relationship with God is the apex of the good of the human person. Based on GS's theological

[112] Von Nell-Breuning, "Socio-Economic Life," 298-304.

[113] Ibid., 302.

[114] Tanner, "The Church in the World," 314.

anthropology as discussed earlier, this does not translate into an abstract other-worldly spirituality which withdraws from the temporal realm, but into a life of "sincere self-giving" for others, in the likeness of the Trinity; thus would human beings "fully discover their true selves" and come towards their "very same end, namely God himself" (GS 24).

Citing Matthew 4:4, the pastoral constitution cautions that socio-economic solutions should not be at the expense of people's "spiritual nature and advancement" (GS 86). In this regard, moral theologians point out that Catholic social teaching traditionally espouses a "hierarchy of goods" such that material goods, though important, are nevertheless surpassed in value by spiritual goods and other non-material values such as personal development and relationships.[115] Indeed, some of the Council Fathers called for explicit mention of the hierarchy of values, favoring supernatural over material goods.[116] Even bishops from less developed countries at that time, such as India, emphasized that mere material aid to the poor was not as crucial as "emotional integration, a sense of unity and equality among all people"; and that "psychological help is required more than physical and material, help that comes from and goes to the heart."[117] Resonating with these views, GS frequently portrays material well-being as a means to higher ends such as freedom, autonomy, and social responsibility (GS 31, 71). In particular, GS 35 highlights that humans' growth through efforts to "perfect themselves … learn, develop their faculties, emerging from and transcending themselves … is more precious than any kind of wealth that can be amassed." It further points out that "technical progress is of less value than advances towards greater justice, wider kinship and a more humane social environment." Similarly, other articles such as GS 23 point out that human co-operation and fellowship are not manifested best in technical progress but in meaningful relationships which respect "the full spiritual dignity" of the person. The *Compendium* cites GS and reiterates its hierarchy of goods, highlighting that "standards of living and greater economic productivity are not the only valid indicators for measuring the total fulfilment of the human person in this life, and they are of even less value when considering the life to come."[118]

In GS, the Council Fathers showed their awareness that "many people, especially in economically advanced areas, seem to be dominated by economics; almost all of their personal and social lives are permeated with a kind of economic mentality" whether in a totalitarian or capitalist context (GS 63). Chapter 2 of this thesis has pointed out how such an economic

[115] Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching*, 131.

[116] Tanner, "The Church in the World," 315.

[117] Ibid., 304.

[118] *Compendium*, par. 544.

mentality has permeated mainstream management science, which has come to focus on shareholder wealth maximization as the sole value in management. It was also seen that some Catholic pastoral management literature similarly reflect this economic mentality in their bias towards measurable growth. In contrast, the above discussion has revealed GS's rich and comprehensive exposition of the human good, which goes much more beyond the material. GS's teachings align with the alternative voices within the management field, while also helpfully augmenting their efforts to articulate thick descriptions of the human good. In particular, GS's hierarchical ordering of human values provides a useful framework to guide management theory and practice.

3.6.2 Implications for society and descriptions of the social good

GS's principles on the human good have implications for society as a whole, and these provide further guideposts for social responsibility in management. A central idea in GS is the common good which is defined as "the sum total of social conditions which allow people, either as groups or as individuals, to reach their fulfilment more fully and more easily" (GS 26). Upholding the common good flows naturally from GS's theological principle on the dignity of every human person. Scholars note that GS's definition of the common good remains foundational for Catholic social teaching to-date.[119] It is cited in the *Compendium* and in several magisterial documents, including more recent ones such as *Laudato Si*.[120] Although the common good is not a new concept in Catholic social teaching, a notable perspective that the Council stresses is its increasingly universal dimension. GS highlights that the common good is now involving "the whole human race" (GS 26) whereby "obligations transcend particular groups and gradually extend to the whole world" (GS 30). As discussed earlier, one reason for GS's frequent remarks on universality was the newfound sense of global inter-connectedness felt by society at large, and which had not escaped the attention of the Council Fathers. Undoubtedly, the participation of bishops from around the world made this universality a very tangible reality in the council hall. Hollenbach points out that the Fathers were keenly cognizant of the inter-dependence and "socialization" among different cultures and groups of people, whose interactions were occurring at a more complex and global scale.[121] Hence, GS recognizes that since "nowadays efficiency of action and the need for dialogue call for concerted effort", international organizations that foster a sense of worldwide solidarity and responsibility are

[119] Selling, "*Gaudium et Spes*," 156.

[120] See *Compendium,* par. 164 and *Laudato Si*, par. 156.

[121] Hollenbach, "Commentary on GS," 279.

needed (GS 90). In addition, wealthier nations have the responsibility to take care of poorer ones (GS 85-86). Notably, GS 70, in speaking on investments and the use of resources, points out the inter-generational dimension of the common good, thus complementing and extending the notion of universality.

In GS, upholding the common good implies a society which is marked by justice, charity, equity, solidarity, and peace. Reiterating the stance of the *Encyclical on Establishing Universal Peace in Truth, Pacem in Terris* that peace is not merely the absence of war, the Council Fathers stress that peace is "the effect of righteousness" wherein "people's welfare is safeguarded and people freely and in a spirit of mutual trust share with one another the riches of their minds and their talents" (GS 78). Complementing this, GS 74 stresses the need for subsidiarity so that persons and groups at the grassroots level can develop and contribute to wider society. Likewise, GS 31 advocates suitable systems to enable "the largest possible number" of people to participate. For management theory, all this implies that the means and ends of management must promote trust, mutual enrichment, solidarity, participation, subsidiarity, equity, and "the deliberate practice of fraternal love" which "goes beyond what justice can ensure" (GS 78). As a sacrament of the eschatological reign of God, the Church is to model these ideals through its unity and charity (GS 32, 42, 92). Likewise, the Christian family should manifest the social ideals of love, mutual support, and fruitfulness (GS 48).

In GS's description of the social good, it can be seen that special attention is given to the poor. Indeed, inequality and poverty were prominent global concerns at the time, and many of the Fathers' speeches focused on these issues. Consequently, GS's introductory statement associates the Church especially with "those who are poor or afflicted" (GS 1) and sets the tone for the whole document. The scandal of poverty is frequently noted in GS's observation of the signs of the times (GS 4, 9, 63). In Part II, the needs of the poor are especially emphasized in Chapters 3 and 5 on the socio-economic and international orders respectively. GS 29 in the doctrinal chapter on the human community establishes the "basic equality between all" and urges the eradication of discrimination and of excessive socio-economic inequalities. This call is reiterated frequently in the pastoral section on socio-economic life (GS 63, 64, 66) and also emphasized with regard to "cultural benefits" (GS 60), and the rights of all people, especially minorities, in civic life (GS 73). In the council hall, several Fathers called for a strong condemnation of racial, class, gender, and other forms of discrimination.[122] In this regard, Von Nell-Breuning points out that equality in GS does not simply imply uniformity but equity,

[122] Ibid., 305-306.

fairness, and non-discrimination.[123] Commentators note that the plight of the poor had gained increasing attention at the Council through a confluence of several factors. These included Pope John XXIII's widely-noted pre-conciliar message expressing the desire that the Church be identified with the poor. There were also presentations by various experts about the situation of the poor at the conciliar sessions. Most of all, an informal "Church of the Poor" coalition was formed during the Council. This coalition planned and made interventions during and between conciliar meetings, in order to draw attention to the injustices against the poor as well as the widening socio-economic disparities in the world, and the exigency of the Council's response to these issues.[124] As a result, preferential option for the poor is a notable theme in GS and remains a key tenet in the Church's teaching today.

Just as the good of the individual human person extends beyond material needs, likewise the good of a society and "true and full humanity" requires cultural development (GS 53). This includes development of customs, institutions, arts and sciences, "styles of living and scales of values" (GS 53), as well as respect for the rich diversity of spiritual traditions (GS 53, 58, 86), literary and artistic heritage (GS 62), "traditional wisdom" (GS 56), and "each people's native characteristics" (GS 56). The Council Fathers caution against the erosion of these cultural goods by the tides of globalization and technological advancement (GS 56), and even unwittingly by external aid (GS 66, 86). Such intangible goods are integral to human flourishing and lead humanity towards "truth, goodness and beauty" (GS 57). Cultural development ultimately "humanizes social life" (GS 53). Conciliar commentators note interventions along these lines from bishops around the world, including one from a Vietnamese bishop who called for more respect for the "personality" and "spiritual values" of Asia in relation to human solidarity.[125]

With regard to the well-being of workers, GS stoutly defends the priority of human labor and denounces any treatment of workers as "mere instruments of production" (GS 66). The Council Fathers call for the assurance of employment security, adequate wages, proper adaptation of work to the circumstances of the person, opportunities for workers to apply their talents, sufficient time for rest and personal development, appropriate training, and the right to unionize (GS 66-68). At the same time, GS stresses the duty of each person to work faithfully (GS 67). In addition, the vulnerable situation of migrant workers and those who are ill, elderly,

[123] Von Nell-Breuning, "Socio-Economic Life," 293.

[124] See Tanner, "The Church in the World," Vol. IV, 289. See also Vol. II, 200-203 and Vol. III, 164-165. Tanner remarks that although the internal cohesion of the Church of the Poor group had weakened considerably by the third conciliar session, its members made significant interventions personally during debates on GS. See ibid., Vol. IV, 382. In any case, the group's concerted efforts in earlier sessions had successfully raised the Council's sensitivity towards the poor.

[125] Tanner, "The Church in the World," 325.

or adversely affected by economic restructuring warrant special attention (GS 66). GS decries all forms of exploitation, oppressive servitude, poor working conditions, and suppression of initiative and participation especially of rural laborers (GS 71).

Lastly, GS's contribution to a thick description of the social good extends to the whole created order. A key principle in the pastoral constitution with regard to the earth's resources is the universal destination of goods. Drawing from the Church's social teaching tradition, the Council Fathers highlight the theological foundation of this principle by stressing that "God destined the earth and all it contains for all people and nations" (GS 69). Reflecting an increasingly nuanced view of private property in the Church's social doctrines, GS stresses the "social dimension" of private property even as it reaffirms private property as a means for people to freely pursue the human good (GS 71). The social imperative is particularly urgent when there are wide inequities in the ownership and use of resources.

GS also raises the dignity of the whole created order by highlighting that Christ, by his incarnation, death, and resurrection, assumed and sanctified "the whole of nature" (GS 41). Commentators note the Council Fathers' desire to highlight that the Christ event establishes that "not only man but the whole cosmos has received a new ontological dignity."[126] Notably, in response to one bishop's insistence that only those created beings possessing a spiritual nature could be raised to a supernatural destiny, most of the Fathers held that by virtue of the cosmos' intimate connection with the human person, the whole created order is raised to a new dignity.[127] Thus, GS accords a religious and eschatological finality to the whole created world, declaring that it is to be ultimately orientated, through the human person, to the praise of God for all eternity (GS 14, 34). Meanwhile, the "stability, truth and excellence" of creation, "the secrets of nature" with "its own order and laws" must be respected (GS 36). Since "the voice and the revelation of God" is recognized "in the language of creatures," the natural world cannot be treated "as if it had no relation to its creator" (GS 36). These principles are further elaborated in *Laudato Si*, which highlights the intrinsic dignity of all creation. Notably for management, *Laudato Si* cautions that "modern anthropocentrism has paradoxically ended up prizing technical thought over reality," and when "the technological mind sees nature as …. an object of utility," "the intrinsic dignity of the world is thus compromised."[128] In this regard, Dennis Doyle notes that GS's view of the human person, especially as expressed in GS 12 that "all things on earth should be ordained to humanity as to their center and summit," has been

[126] Auer, "Man's Activity Throughout the World," 196.

[127] Ibid.

[128] *Laudato Si*, par. 115.

criticized for being overly-anthropocentric.[129] Doyle helpfully points out the clarifications made in subsequent social teaching encyclicals that GS's notion of humans' "rule" (GS 12) over the earth refers more to God's sovereignty over creation, and humanity's appointment as stewards on God's behalf.[130] Thus, the emphasis is on responsible care for creation towards its divine goal.

In summary, GS's description of the social good provides helpful directions for the exercise of social responsibility in management. Its teachings require management theory and practice to uphold the common good, rather than favor the interests of one party over all others. Management must also promote justice, charity, solidarity, equity, mutual sharing of gifts, subsidiarity, and cultural advancement in organizations and societies, with special attention to the poor and most vulnerable. It must also safeguard the well-being of workers, as well as the integrity of the natural world. These principles resonate with the ideals advocated by alternative voices within the management field, and contrast sharply with the exploitative and competitive tendency of mainstream management science. Additionally, what is highlighted more uniquely by GS is the religious horizon of terminal values. GS's teleological principles imply that management must ultimately facilitate the orientation of the whole created order towards the praise and worship of God.

3.6.3 Balancing the individual and social good

Given that GS provides thick descriptions of terminal values in relation to both the individual human person and the whole of society, is there any conflict between the two? As mentioned earlier, one set of dialectics at the Council was between totalitarianism and liberal individualism. Whilst the Fathers from communist countries, led particularly by the Polish bishops, were vocal in decrying totalitarianism and its violation of personal freedom, especially religious freedom, there were also concerns about capitalist-style individualistic liberalism. It can be seen that the final text of GS attempts to integrate both the individual and social good. GS 25 highlights that "the fact that human beings are social by nature indicates that the betterment of the person and the improvement of society depend on each other". In the pastoral application section, GS 63 remarks that "in the sphere of economics and social life, too, the dignity and vocation of the human person as well as the welfare of society as a whole have to be respected and fostered; for people are the source, the focus, and the aim of all economic and social life." Nevertheless, GS acknowledges that balancing the individual and social good is

[129] Doyle, *The Church Emerging from Vatican II*, 332.

[130] Ibid., 333.

not always straightforward in practice. GS 75 accepts that "the understanding of the relationship between socialization and personal autonomy and progress will vary according to different areas and the development of peoples." Those in authority are warned against "totalitarian methods" while individual citizens are to avoid "narrow-mindedness" and be concerned for "the whole human family" (GS 75). For management, the need to balance the individual and social good must be borne in mind as a general principle. Following GS, application of this principle in specific cases will require contextual sensitivity.

3.7 Epistemology

Finally, Chapter 2 of this thesis has highlighted debates in the management field about its over-emphasis on technique and control, as well as its deterministic and empirical approach to the formulation and application of management tools. Alternative voices within the field have called for a more probabilistic approach which recognizes the limits of prediction and control, the intangible aspects of human work, and the need for practical wisdom in adapting management tools for different contexts. GS's teachings resonate with this alternative view and provide a theological, anthropological, and philosophical basis for them. The following points highlight its main principles on this matter.

3.7.1 Truth and human knowledge

Countering the empirical approach of the sciences, GS points to "truths of a higher order" and to "realities known only to the mind" which are deeper than "what can be observed by the senses" (GS 15). Noting that "modern scientific and technical progress can lead to a certain phenomenism or agnosticism … when scientific methods of investigation … are unjustifiably taken as the supreme norm for arriving at truth" (GS 57), the Council Fathers emphasize that beyond "visible realities" lie "those which are invisible" (GS 15). Ratzinger asserts that articles 14-15 demonstrate GS's affirmation of metaphysics and "is one of the fundamental positions of the schema."[131] Indeed, any empiricist and positivist stance to human knowledge is opposed by GS's overall message about the truth of humanity in terms of its divine foundation and eschatological goal, which are far beyond the physical senses. GS highlights that humans themselves are "superior to merely bodily creatures and … more than mere particles of nature" (GS 14). Its novel section on culture further elaborates its view of truth and human knowledge. GS 57 points out that the human vocation of mutual service and cultivating the world includes pursuing knowledge in the various disciplines so to "help humanity to reach a higher

[131] Ratzinger, "Dignity of Human Person," 133.

understanding of truth, goodness, and beauty, to make judgments of universal value." In such cultural development, GS stresses the need for "penetrating to the deepest nature of things" and to "search for higher values" (GS 57). In this regard, Ratzinger rightly criticizes that the modern emphasis on empirical data and scientific technique "holds man back from the genuine" and "does not indicate what use man actually puts his technique to."[132]

In relation to "truths of a higher order" (GS 15), GS also stresses the objective and permanent quality of such truths. In GS 4, amidst the changing "signs of the times", the Council Fathers point out the need for "recognizing permanent values and duly applying them to recent discoveries." Likewise GS 16 highlights the human conscience as the place where human beings "discover a law which they have not laid upon themselves and which they must obey" for it is "a law inscribed by God." Hence, in obedience to a "correct conscience", Christians and non-Christians alike can discover "the right solution to so many moral problems", "objective standards of moral conduct" (GS 16), as well as the perennial "binding force" of "the natural law of peoples and its universal principles" (GS 79).

Moreover, GS promotes an integrated rather than fragmented view of truth. GS 56 highlights that "as specialization in different branches of knowledge continues to increase so rapidly," there is a need for "the requisite synthesis" to "be worked out between them." Similarly in the document's introduction, GS 8 criticizes a "theoretical way of thinking which fails to master and synthesize the sum total of its ideas". The article also highlights the "conflict between the specialization of human activity and a global view of reality" (GS 8). Thus the pastoral constitution emphasizes the need for looking at the whole. Reiterating this, *Laudato Si* notes that specialization has led to "loss of appreciation for the whole," for "the relationships between things," and for "the broader horizon".[133]

This points to another feature of GS's teaching on truth and human knowledge. GS holds that humans "can, with genuine certainty" penetrate and recognize enduring truths (GS 15). The gift of wisdom in human beings "draws the human mind to look for and to love what is true and good" (GS 15). In fact, GS highlights humanity as "sharing in the light of the divine mind" (GS 15). Yet, the opposition between the Thomist and Augustinian stance on this issue is evident in the text. Countering the alleged over-optimistic view of the Thomists on humans' ability to discern truth, the Augustinians intervened to ensure that the final text recognizes the impairment

[132] Ibid. Cautioning against what he saw as a naïve optimism about technological progress, Ratzinger was particularly insistent at the Council on his view that "the advance of science and of the techniques which it makes possible, brings no certain assurance of man's future, which continues to be threatened if a lack of wisdom runs parallel with the growth of knowledge." Ibid., 133. It might be said that the proliferation of management tools, unguided by a proper set of terminal values, is a case in point.

[133] *Laudato Si*, par. 110.

of this ability by sin. Thus, GS 15 includes a qualifier that "as a result of sin, their vision has been clouded and their powers weakened." Likewise, conscience can become "almost blinded through the habit of committing sin" (GS 16). For the Augustinians, only Christian revelation can fully shed light on truth and guide human knowing. This view is resonated in various assertions throughout GS that it is in the light of the Christian faith that the full truth is revealed.[134] Ratzinger notes that the Council Fathers had strongly desired to counter agnosticism and had thus inserted the words "fully and with complete certainty" in describing the divine enlightenment given to humans' religious questioning in GS 21.[135] In contrast, statements such as those in GS 36 can be said to reflect the Thomists' view of humans' ability to arrive at truth without an explicitly religious perspective. GS 36 asserts that "the humble and persevering investigators of the secrets of nature are being led, as it were, by the hand of God, even unawares, for it is God, the conserver of all things, who made them what they are." In any case, the overall message of GS is that divine help, especially through the actions of the Spirit, is forthcoming in enabling both Christians and non-Christians alike to reach objective truths.[136]

GS's teachings counter the empirical stance of mainstream management science with its preference for the measurable, quantifiable, and technical. The pastoral constitution resonates with the alternative view in management which calls for the recognition of qualitative and non-measurable factors such as meaning and values in human work. GS's emphasis on seeking for deeper truths also resonate with those who stress that management theory and practice should not emphasize merely technical solutions while avoiding the deeper socio-cultural issues that underlie many management problems. In addition, GS's stance on the objective and normative nature of enduring truths, its emphasis on the integrated whole rather than isolated parts, and its affirmation of humans' ability to penetrate truth, counter a relativist tendency in management science. This relativism has been manifested in the current fragmentation of the management field, its conflicting schools of thought, and the lack of a foundational paradigm. In addition, GS's emphasis on the significance of divine assistance in helping humans penetrate truth implies that the secular sciences, including management science, would be fruitfully developed through dialogue with theology. Admittedly, this would probably be asserted more strongly by the Augustinians rather than the Thomists. In any case, it resonates with the alternative voices in the management field advocating a greater role for disciplines in the humanities such as

[134] For example, see GS 3, 10, 23, 40, 45 and 57.

[135] Ratzinger, "Dignity of Human Person," 157.

[136] See GS 15, 17, 22, 38, 41 and 57, in addition to GS 36.

philosophy and theology to help enlighten the foundations and assumptions of management science.

3.7.2 Heuristic approach and critical reflection

Complementing its assertion about objective and enduring truths which humans are able to penetrate with divine help, GS also points out the inexhaustible quality of such truths and the gradual, unfolding way of their appropriation by humanity. In line with the symbol of pilgrimage, human knowledge remains ever incomplete. Even conscience can err from "ignorance which it is unable to avoid" (GS 16). In addition, as already seen, GS distinguishes enduring truths from other types of human knowledge that are contingent in character. It repeatedly stresses that specific applications of its general principles vary with changing contexts and times. Hollenbach points out that GS's approach aligns with Aquinas' distinction between general moral principles and their specific application.[137] GS's conclusion reiterates that its teachings are "deliberately general" and has to be "pursued further and amplified" because it deals with "matters which are subject to continual development" (GS 91). Insightfully, the Council Fathers suggest that it is in the contextual adaptation of general principles that "many of our suggestions will succeed in effectively assisting all people" (GS 91), thus enhancing their universality.

All these teachings apply to the Church as well. Tanner remarks that the Council Fathers' admission that the Church "does not always have a ready answer to every question" (GS 33) revealed "surprising modesty and hesitation for an ecumenical council."[138] Likewise, Curran notes that GS demonstrates a change in ecclesiology at Vatican II from triumphalism to a Church on pilgrimage—one that acknowledges its own limitations, the sinfulness of its members, and its historical character, which "needs the maturing influence of centuries of past experience" (GS 43).[139] This reversal from the triumphalist stance has been described by Hollenbach as an "epistemological humility" shown in GS and by the Council.[140] It highlights the need for seeking and applying knowledge in a way that "avoids premature closure of inquiry and unwarranted certainty."[141] In fact, the Council Fathers point out what the Church can receive from the world, discerning "the many voices of our times" so that "the revealed truth may be more deeply penetrated, better understood, and more suitably presented" (GS 44).

[137] Hollenbach, "Commentary on *Gaudium et Spes*," 286.

[138] Tanner, "The Church and the World," 48.

[139] Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching*, 103-107.

[140] Hollenbach, "Commentary on *Gaudium et Spes*," 286.

[141] Ibid.

Remarkably, GS 44 also acknowledges the Church's on-going benefit from its opponents and persecutors.

For management, these teachings of GS are congruent with a more probabilistic, heuristic, and developmental way of theory formulation and application. They align with the alternative view in the management field which opposes the over-confident and deterministic stance of mainstream management science in proffering techniques with exaggerated truth claims. Instead, GS's teachings imply that management theories should have a more tentative quality, requiring practical wisdom and contextual sensitivity in their application rather than unthinking implementation of technique. In this regard, the need for critical reflection as pointed out by the alternative view in management is reinforced by GS's emphasis on the exercise of human intentionality, freedom, and conscience, rather than "blind obedience" (GS 79). GS 56 even speaks of "the need to safeguard humanity's powers of contemplation, and the wonder which leads to wisdom." Notably, GS 43 points out that in the Church, although lay persons may look to priests for guidance, they should "realize that their pastors will not always be so expert as to have a ready answer to every problem." Rather, with "a properly informed conscience" and Church teaching as a guide, lay people are to exercise responsible discernment (GS 43). In line with this principle, management tools should not aim to offer fail-safe technical solutions but should encourage critical reflection and discernment.

3.7.3 Dialogue and diversity

Finally, along with the attitude of humility as well as the emphasis on discernment and development in penetrating truth, the Council Fathers stress the need for dialogue, which is another prominent theme of GS. Commentators note that although this theme had already been introduced into an early draft of GS, it undoubtedly received greater impetus after the publication of Pope Paul VI's *Encyclical on the Church, Ecclesiam Suam*, in which dialogue was given strong emphasis.[142] This contrasts with earlier magisterial documents of the Church, including its social teachings, which tended to pronounce the Church's stance in a more unilateral way. Moral theologians observe that this unilateral, clerical, and triumphalist approach was rendered increasingly untenable by the trend of socialization in the world, which made the plurality of cultures and worldviews more evident.[143] Thus GS expresses from the start, the Council's desire to "enter into dialogue" with "the whole human family" (GS 3), and

[142] Moeller, "History of the Constitution," 26-27. Tanner points out that Pope Paul VI had in fact expressed his desire personally to GS's editors that dialogue be a key principle in the document. See Tanner, "The Church in the World," 527.

[143] Hollenbach, "Commentary on *Gaudium et Spes*," 276.

"cooperate in tackling the main problems facing the world today" (GS 10). Dialogue is especially prominent in Chapter 4 of Part I on the relationship of the Church with the world. The text highlights dialogue as the way of proceeding in the Church's mission (GS 40), in settling differences (GS 43), in pastoral study (GS 43), and in discerning the signs of the times (GS 44). Dialogue is also needed for believers and unbelievers to co-operate for the world's betterment (GS 21). Significantly, GS's conclusion highlights dialogue within the Church as well as with other Christian traditions, other faiths, and even the Church's opponents and persecutors (GS 92). According to the pastoral constitution, dialogue should be characterized by sincerity and prudence (GS 21), respect, understanding, and love (GS 28), as well as "unity in what is necessary, freedom in what is doubtful, and charity in everything" (GS 92). It is a dialogue that "excludes nobody" (GS 92).

In this regard, it can be seen that GS also affirms "legitimate diversity" within the Church (GS 92), and expresses gratitude for the help received by the Church from "people of all classes and conditions" (GS 44). Adopting a pastoral view towards diversity, the Council Fathers endeavored to ensure that GS took into account "the wide variety of situations and forms of human culture in the world" (GS 91). In fact, some scholars point out that the emphasis on the "partnership of man and woman" in humanity's intrinsic social nature (GS 12) implies that complementary diversity is a central feature of this social nature.[144] For management science, GS's affirmation of dialogue and diversity resonates with the alternative view in the management field which calls for participation and inclusiveness in the formulation and application of management theory. It counters the top-down approach of mainstream management, which tends to be discriminatory in terms of gender, culture, and worldview.

3.8 Conclusion

This exploration of GS has revealed many insights that are relevant to management. GS's teachings provide a rich and comprehensive view of the human person and human society, as well as the nature and teleology of human work. It also offers principles for the formulation and implementation of theory in management science. It can be seen that most of GS's teachings align with the alternative view in the management field. Nevertheless, the above analysis also reveals contrasting positions within GS, such that certain positions resonate more with mainstream management science on some aspects of management. These internal debates thus limit the ability of GS to offer normative principles for management, and for choosing between

[144] Doyle, *The Church Emerging from Vatican II*, 281.

the mainstream and alternative view in management theories. More fundamentally, although the pastoral constitution has been aimed at a general audience, it still draws significantly from doctrines within the Catholic faith tradition, which those outside the Church are not bound to follow. Hence, even as GS's teachings can fruitfully enrich management theories, they have a limited role as a normative guide. A more foundational view needs to be established by which to evaluate the various perspectives within GS and the management field, and to decide on the principles for reorientating management theories. This will be the task taken up in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4
Synthesis of the Reorientation Framework for Management Theories

4.1 Introduction

The notion of foundations in theology has been aptly described by Lonergan as the turning point where "theological reflection took a much more personal stance. It was no longer content to narrate what others proposed, believed, did. Foundations occurs … on the level of deliberation, evaluation, decision. It is a decision about whom and what you are for and, again, whom and what you are against. It is a decision illuminated by the manifold possibilities exhibited in dialectic. It is a fully conscious decision about one's horizon, one's outlook, one's world-view."[1] In foundations, one "deliberately selects the frame-work, in which doctrines have their meaning, in which systematics reconciles, in which communications are effective."[2] Following Lonergan, this chapter will bring together the "manifold possibilities" that have emerged from the preceding examination of management science and GS, and establish the foundations with which to evaluate them. It will first sort out the main resonances and conflicts by bringing into sharper focus the key areas where these resonances and conflicts lie. It will then be argued that the foundations with which to evaluate them can be found through intellectual, moral, and religious conversions as expounded by Lonergan. After elucidating their importance for management, the chapter will highlight the implications of these conversions, and apply them to the dialectics between management science and GS. The resulting principles for management will be consolidated into the reorientation framework for management theories, which is the main deliverable of this thesis. Finally, the chapter will point out the significance of this framework and show its applicability for management both in the Church as well as in all other organizations.

4.2 Resonances between management science and GS

Points of resonance among all the viewpoints in management science and GS highlight those aspects of management where there is broad agreement. Nevertheless, they cannot be taken immediately as normative principles for management without first being compared against a higher and more objective viewpoint, which will be established later in this chapter. Based on the preceding analyses, the main resonances are as follows.

[1] Lonergan, *Method*, 267-268.

[2] Ibid., 268.

4.2.1 Significance of human labor

A fundamental point of resonance among the various positions within management science and GS is their affirmation of human labor. Management science is founded upon the basic premise that human work is a key means of achieving human goals. GS not only resonates with this view but enhances it by elevating the status of human activity in all its various forms. The pastoral constitution stresses that human work is an essential participation in the divine economy of salvation, and is integral to the human vocation. By means of their labor, human beings build a better world, express themselves, co-operate with God's work of creation and redemption, and enter more deeply into union with God. In this regard, both management science and GS hold a favorable view of active human labor, rather than human passivity. Both affirm the significance of human enterprise and initiative, human ingenuity, human effort, and the impact of human actions.

4.2.2 Role of management

In relation to this, the second point of resonance between management science and GS is their recognition of the role of management. As seen in Chapter 2 of this thesis, management as a discipline in its own right emerged in the late-nineteenth century, and has since grown to become a major field of study and practice. Likewise, GS explicitly acknowledges "management", and the importance of coordination and "executive unity" (GS 68). It recognizes the need for the proper ordering of society through appropriate systems, structures, and institutions so as to facilitate co-operation, participation, and fruitfulness in human communities, whether at the local or international level. GS's frequent reference to human beings' exercise of mastery over the earth, as part of their mandate to order all things to God, can be said to resonate with the notion of the "Visible Hand" in management science.[3] Moreover, as seen in Chapter 3 of this thesis, the pastoral constitution highlights the intrinsic order of the temporal realm with its own "stability, truth and excellence, its own order and laws" which must be gradually deciphered and put to use (GS 36). This affirms a place for theories of organization and management in human societies. Management science thus contributes to the understanding and ordering of human work by elucidating various aspects of such coordination and organizing of human activity. Each school of thought, be it Scientific Management, the Human Relations model, the General Administration model, or any other model in

[3] As mentioned in Chapter 2, this phrase from a seminal work by Alfred Chandler has become a widely-used metaphor for the role of management and its significant influence. See Alfred D. Chandler, *The Visible Hand* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977).

management, casts a particular light on how human work can be better organized to achieve its goal. In this regard, the management field has demonstrated how a secular science complements theology by bringing its specialist knowledge to bear. This applies not only to human work in general but also to church management in particular, in line with GS's assertion that the Church, with its "visible social structure … can be enriched" by relevant contributions to "the development of the human community" (GS 44).

4.2.3 Productivity and historical progress

A third point of resonance between management science and GS is their emphasis on productivity and historical progress. As highlighted in Chapter 2, management science is highly performative in nature, and places much emphasis on results, productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency. Though GS adopts a much more nuanced stance with regard to progress in the temporal realm, it nevertheless highlights the importance of earthly productivity, fruitfulness, achievement of tangible progress in human endeavor, and optimization of human efforts and resources. As seen in Chapter 3 of this thesis, the pastoral constitution strongly encourages industrial and agricultural productivity, technical progress, and the spirit of enterprise especially for the betterment of the poor. It also emphasizes the need for proper skills, training, and proficiency in relevant fields, so that human activity can bear much fruit. In addition, although GS points out that the goal of human endeavor is fully consummated only in eternity, it still holds that visible signs of progress are possible within history. Hence, to different degrees, both the management field and GS display a certain result-orientation, and both affirm the importance of earthly progress.

4.3 Main areas of conflict

Beyond these general points of resonance between management science and GS, there is much conflict when it comes to specific aspects of management. Based on the discussions of the previous two chapters of this thesis, the conflicts can be classified into the following four areas: (i) approach to theory; (ii) terminal values; (iii) view of the human person, organization, and society; and (iv) religious and eschatological horizon. As highlighted earlier, contrasting stances are observed not only between management science and GS but also within each field.

4.3.1 Approach to theory

A fundamental area of conflict is the approach to theory. Mainstream management science adopts an empirical and positivist stance whereby theories on the means and ends of management are focused on the quantifiable and measurable. Such a bias towards only those

variables that can be monitored and evaluated with precision and certainty has led to a mechanical and technical approach to human work. As a result, less quantifiable factors such as moral values, human relationships, and non-material aspects of well-being are dismissed as unscientific. Chapter 1 of this thesis has shown how this emphasis on the empirical has also crept into Catholic pastoral management literature, manifesting itself in the many works that advocate quantitative growth, measurable performance indicators, and extensive data collection. At the extreme, a sole focus on numerical factors has even led some to see the Church only in terms of these factors. For example, Frederick Gluck, one of the founders of the National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management (NLRCM) in the US, has said in an interview that based on the Church's "annual budget" and "workforce", it is "comparable in size to Walmart" and should thus follow the management practices of these large business corporations.[4]

In contrast, a critical minority within the management field disagree with the field's emphasis on the empirical. As seen in Chapter 2, scholars such as Ghoshal, Mintzberg and Stewart have pointed out the importance of more qualitative aspects of management such as moral values, feelings, relationships, and deeper socio-cultural issues. They argue that these need to be taken into account in management theory and practice. Resonating with these views, GS stresses that truth is more than the empirical data of the physical senses. Pointing towards "realities known only to the mind" which are discernible by proceeding "through visible realities to those which are invisible" (GS 15), the pastoral constitution urges a "penetrating to the deepest nature of things" and a "search for higher values" (GS 57). The teachings of GS thus imply a rejection of the empiricist and positivist stance in mainstream management.

Another major conflict in the approach to theory pertains to assumptions about control. Mainstream management science tends to harbor an optimistic view of human agency and the extent to which people and events can be controlled. A deterministic and over-confident stance thus prevails in much of management theory, whereby resolution of a problem or attainment of a desired future is almost guaranteed by simply applying the right management technique. Moreover, generalized solutions derived from specific cases are often proffered with exaggerated truth claims. Embedded within management science is an underlying assumption that human persons—or more specifically, managers—are able to willingly and flawlessly implement a prescribed management tool. The "Visible Hand" of management is highly estimated in terms of knowledge, ability, influence, self-mastery, and good intentions. Chapter 2 of this thesis has pointed out the mutual reinforcement between the management field's

[4] See Hannum, "The Parish that Works," 15.

positivist stance and its presumption of effective control, both underpinned by a desire to maintain an impression of scientific credibility, as well as to tap a lucrative market of managers seeking to regain a sense of control in an increasingly complex world. It can be said that this approach finds some resonance with the over-optimism and naivety about human ability, human influence, and earthly progress which are attributed to the Thomists in GS by their critics. Reflecting this approach, one pastoral management author, as highlighted in Chapter 1, declares that "like a lesson from a sports pro, once the best techniques are known, the pitfalls can be avoided, the 'secrets' can be practiced, and the game improved."[5]

In contrast, critical voices within the management field are more skeptical of its assertions about human ability, control, and the notion of technique. They point out the complexity and unpredictability of real life events, as well as the limitations which prevent human persons from implementing what is required in theory. They also highlight the biases, research errors, and other challenges that affect theory formulation. These views resonate with the more cautious stance of the Augustinians in GS, who emphasize that human beings' earthly advances "recoil upon them" (GS 4), and that in the face of events beyond human control, especially the reality of death (GS 18), it must be acknowledged that human enterprise is limited by "what cannot be planned."[6] The Augustinians also stress that humans' ability to penetrate truth is greatly limited by sinfulness and ignorance. In any case, as Chapter 3 has shown, GS's overall view of epistemology stresses the developmental nature of human knowledge, and the need for epistemic humility. All this calls for the over-confident truth claims about technique and control in mainstream management theory to be tempered with a more cautious and tentative stance. Furthermore, both GS and the alternative voices within the management field affirm the reality of human interiority, freedom, spontaneity, and the unpredictability of human intentions. This implies that human actions and decisions do not lend themselves to mechanistic calculations and predictions. GS goes further by highlighting humans' dynamic nature, in which human beings struggle between evil and sin on the one hand, and their innate capacity for self-transcendence on the other hand. Moreover, both GS and the alternative voices within the management field emphasize the importance of contingency and contextual adaptation. All these views necessitate the rejection of the deterministic approach to management theory in favor of a more probabilistic one. The latter approach entails recognizing inevitable uncertainties, adopting a more flexible and tentative stance in the formulation and

[5] Williams, *Improving Parish Management*, 6.

[6] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 140.

implementation of management tools, making contextual adaptations, and proceeding heuristically via an iterative process of hypothesis formulation, testing, and fine-tuning.

Closely associated with this, a third contrast in the approach to theory is in terms of responsibility and intentionality in theory formulation and application. Chapter 2 has highlighted how mainstream management science not only tends to overlook its embedded assumptions about values, human persons, society, and work, but also perpetuates unquestioning and uncritical application of its prescriptions. Individual autonomy, critical thinking, and reflexivity are often surrendered to the dictates of market forces and the prevailing managerial culture. As Chapter 1 has shown, many authors of Catholic pastoral management literature have illustrated this tendency by uncritically assimilating secular management thinking, and directly applying management tools which happen to be prevalent at the time. In contrast, critical voices in the management field have called out the lack of individual responsibility and reflexivity in the formulation and application of theory. They highlight the need to uncover the many embedded assumptions in management theory, and to make deliberate choices about these assumptions and thus about the management methods to pursue. These views resonate with GS's emphasis on human freedom, relative autonomy, and responsibility. The pastoral constitution stresses the priority of individual conscience and highlights that the exercise of freedom and discernment are central to the God-given dignity of the human person (GS 16-17). All this implies that management theory must promote human intentionality, critical reflection, and growth in human wisdom.

In relation to this, a fourth conflict in the approach to theory lies in the top-down nature of mainstream management science, which tends to accord a certain omnipotence to the theorist and manager, placing them over and above the created world in which they are actually a part. In contrast, critical voices within the management field call for a more participative approach in management theorizing and practice. They highlight the importance of the viewpoints of all stakeholders, and also stress that organizational outcomes often result from the aggregate actions and initiatives of all parties involved, rather than just the manager. Some scholars have also raised ethical questions over the control and manipulation of people. Resonating with this view, GS favors a dialogical approach to human learning and progress, in which diversity and participation are encouraged.

Finally, a fifth contrast in the approach to theory pertains to the fragmentation of the management field. As Chapter 2 has pointed out, management science is a highly divided discipline comprising different schools of thought, whose contrasting perspectives have yet to be resolved or integrated. Each model tends to focus on only one aspect of management in an isolated and narrow way. Consequently, such fragmentation is reflected in Catholic pastoral

management literature, which can be seen to proffer contrasting advice, as Chapter 1 has shown. Critical voices within the management field have underscored the need to reconcile and integrate the various schools of thought in management through a foundational paradigm or general theory of management. They hold that it is possible for a common foundation to exist, provided the various schools of thought are brought into dialogue. They have also pointed out that the lack of integration has rendered individual management tools ineffective in real life practice. In some cases, the narrow view of certain management tools has even resulted in devastating consequences for organizations. Although the Systems model of management, which emerged in the 1960s, promoted a more holistic and wider viewpoint, its approach has yet to gain traction in mainstream management theories. These alternative views in the management field find resonance with GS's teachings. The pastoral constitution stresses the objective nature of truth, and its accessibility to humankind through on-going effort aided by divine help. GS also calls for integration and synthesis among the various specializations in human knowledge.

In summary, the contrasts in the approach to theory are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Contrasts in the approach to theory

Mainstream management science[7]	**Alternative approach**[8]
Adopts empirical and positivist stance; Emphasizes quantifiable and measurable factors; Applies mechanical and technical approach to problem-solving.	Rejects empiricism and positivism; Acknowledges significance of qualitative and non-measurable factors in human work; Highlights importance of going beyond technical solutions to address deeper socio-cultural or spiritual issues.
Adopts a deterministic and prescriptive approach, with optimistic assumptions about human agency, control, and the predictability of events; Makes over-confident truth claims in management techniques generalized from particular cases.	Advocates a probabilistic, flexible, and heuristic approach based on more cautious views about human knowledge, ability, control, and predictability of events; Acknowledges humans' interiority, spontaneity, and dynamic nature, and the consequent limitations of a mechanistic approach; Emphasizes the need for contextual adaptation.

[7] Although certain positions in the debates within GS resonate with some of the stances of mainstream management science, the left-hand columns in all tables will be labelled simply as "Mainstream management science" for the sake of brevity.

[8] This refers to the views of critical scholars within the management field who have proposed alternative approaches to mainstream management theory, as well as to the teachings of GS which are in contrast with mainstream management science.

Reinforces unexamined assumptions and the uncritical following of market forces and the managerial culture.	Emphasizes human freedom and intentionality; Promotes discernment, critical reflection, and responsible choice.
Assumes a top-down approach in theory formulation and application.	Recognizes the aggregate influence of all parties in human work; Advocates dialogue, participation, and openness to diversity.
Perpetuates fragmentation of the field; Adopts narrow and isolated view within each specialization.	Favors integration of the field and establishment of a common foundation for management. Advocates a systemic, holistic, and wider view.

4.3.2 Terminal values

The next broad area of conflict pertains to terminal values. As Chapter 2 has pointed out, mainstream management theories are largely premised on maximizing shareholder wealth as the underlying goal. The conditions to achieve this goal, such as efficiency, quantitative growth, competitiveness, dominance in market share, and financial and material success, have in turn been normalized as desirable ends in themselves. These qualities have become synonymous with modern management methods, which are regarded in contemporary society as essential for progress. As seen in Chapter 1, even the Catholic Church is not without voices advocating for the adoption of modern management practices so as to be more up-to-date, attract more members, and achieve greater efficiency. However, these embedded values in management science often result in the detrimental treatment of human persons and the natural world.

Critical voices within the management field point out that the field is not value-neutral, and that its singular pursuit of shareholder wealth has been a conflation of means and ends. They stress that material wealth is but a means to the holistic well-being of human persons. In particular, the social responsibility movement advocates that equity, justice, community interests, and the welfare of all people should be taken into account in management. As highlighted in Chapter 2, thick descriptions of the human and social good have been offered by various sources within the management field. These descriptions demonstrate considerable convergence in their vision of human flourishing, which includes the safeguarding of human life, equitable distribution of resources, power, and opportunities, meaningful participation, equality, sustainability of the earth, and attention to the most vulnerable. Some also highlight the importance of human rights and human dignity, which include not only material well-being but also security, meaningful employment, proper working conditions, freedom of association,

autonomy, responsibility, and a sense of self-worth and self-respect. The need to integrate the spiritual, psycho-social, and physical aspects of the human person has also been recognized.[9]

GS resonates with these alternative views about terminal values in human work. It stresses the personalist principle, which implies that management theory and practice must be directed towards the good of the human person. To this end, GS presents a hierarchy of values which systematically draws together various elements of the human good, including the physical, social, cultural, psychological, moral, and spiritual. The personalist principle in turn calls for a social order that upholds the common good, where there is justice, equity, solidarity, participation, and the flourishing of cultural and spiritual life, with special attention to the poor. GS also stresses the equality of all human persons, denouncing various forms of discrimination. It highlights the universal and inter-generational dimensions of the common good, and also recognizes the need to respect the integrity of the natural world. Finally, it points out the intrinsic value of work for the human person, and promotes the right and responsibility of all persons to meaningful work and to personal development.

Table 2 summarizes the contrasting perspectives with regard to terminal values.

Table 2: Contrasts in terminal values

Mainstream management science	**Alternative approach**
Views teleology as unrelated to management and explicitly regards management theory as a value-neutral means to any end, while placing a *de facto* priority on shareholder wealth, efficiency, quantitative growth, competitiveness, and material success at the expense of human persons and the environment.	Highlights that management science is not value-neutral and calls for critical examination of embedded value assumptions in management theories; Advocates that management should promote the good of the human person and society based on a hierarchy of values which include material, social, cultural, psychological, moral, and spiritual well-being; Emphasizes the equality of all persons, the integrity of the natural world, and the right and responsibility of every person to meaningful work.

4.3.3 View of the human person, organization, and society

The third area of conflict pertains to the view of the human person, the organization, and society. Chapter 2 has pointed out that mainstream management science harbors a reductionist view of the human person as *Homo Economicus* ("Economic Man"). Humans are assumed to

[9] The main principles advocated by major global initiatives and conventions to promote ethical management and the human good are listed in Appendix 1.

be self-interested, pragmatic, and singularly focused on maximizing their own material gain. It can be said that this view finds some resonance with the Augustinian position in GS, which tends to place more emphasis on the sinful, self-seeking nature of human beings. Hence, both mainstream management theory and the Augustinian stance adopt a relatively pessimistic and skeptical view of the human person, although in the case of management science, this view has been applied more to the worker and other stakeholders than to the manager or theorist. In mainstream management, the worker is also regarded as a factor of production, a mere resource or instrument for the benefit of shareholder wealth, and an object of control. In addition, the management field also perpetuates a view of the human person as a consumer with unlimited wants that must be satisfied through the receiving of desired goods and services. Chapter 1 of this thesis has shown how such anthropological paradigms have influenced Catholic pastoral management literature which advocates viewing parishioners as customers, and pastoral workers as human resources that can be treated instrumentally.

Critical voices within the management field have called for a more holistic view of the human person, pointing out that human identity is much more than just that of "Economic Man", consumer, or factor of production. Scholars with this alternative view hold that humans are not solely materialistic and self-interested, but also demonstrate goodness, virtue, and a sense of ethics. These scholars point out that people are motivated not only by material gain but also by social relationships and a sense of fulfilment. As seen in Chapter 3, GS accords with and further strengthens these arguments by bringing to bear the full force of its theological anthropology. It points out the dignity of the human person, who is created out of divine love and called to loving union with God. Hence, much more than just a materialistic individual, the human being has the capacity for and most deeply desires union with the divine. Moreover, such union comes through self-transcendence, especially in self-giving for others. Although this intrinsic, positive human inclination towards the good was emphasized more by the Thomists in GS than by the Augustinians, this thesis has argued that on the whole, the pastoral constitution presents a dynamic view of the human person, who struggles between good and evil. GS also emphasizes the unity of body and soul, highlighting the existence of human interiority, freedom, conscience, and spontaneity. All this calls for a rejection of reductionist assumptions about the human person, in favor of more nuanced views that recognize the complexity of human beings.

With regard to the organization, mainstream management science also adopts a reductionist approach. The organization finds it sole raison d'être as a producer and seller of goods and services to consumers in order to meet their desires. In so doing, it fulfils its ultimate goal of increasing shareholder wealth. The organization is thus a dispensable means to an end,

a faceless legal and accounting entity which can be manipulated, downsized, sold, or acquired to ultimately suit the priorities of capital owners. Consequently, management, according to the classic definition, is simply a process of planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. Chapter 1 has shown how some Catholic pastoral management authors have adopted this organizational paradigm of mainstream management, viewing the Church to be "in the business of providing a service to people."[10] In contrast, critical voices within the management field place more emphasis on the organization as a focal point of collaboration among free and spontaneous human persons. GS goes further by highlighting the communal dimension of organizations, and their important role in facilitating solidarity and communion in society. This calls for management theories to promote genuine communion in organizations, in line with the human and social good.

As for the view of society, mainstream management science assumes that entities within society are in on-going competition for resources, customers, wealth, and market share. It thus espouses a paradigm for social relationships that is based on competition and self-seeking transactional exchanges. Once again, Chapter 1 has also shown how this competitive view has penetrated Catholic pastoral management literature. In contrast, alternative voices within the management field call for collaboration rather than competition. GS goes further by pointing out the intrinsic social nature of human persons, and the fundamental solidarity of humankind in God's design. This implies that management theories should promote meaningful social ties and the growth of fraternal communion in human society.

Table 3 below summarizes the contrasting paradigms discussed in this section:

Table 3: Contrasts in the view of the human person, organization and society

Mainstream management science	**Alternative approach**
Harbors a reductionist view of the human person as "Economic Man", consumer or factor of production.	Highlights human dignity and advocates a more holistic and nuanced view of human persons, which recognizes their interiority, and their dynamic and complex nature.
Views the organization as producer of goods and services to consumers, a faceless legal and accounting entity at the disposal of capital owners.	Regards the organization as an important locus for communion among human persons.
Views society as comprising competitive, self-seeking, and transactional relationships.	Highlights the social nature of human persons, and advocates solidarity and collaboration in society.

[10] Forster and Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish*, 56.

4.3.4 Religious and eschatological horizon

The final area of conflict concerns the religious and eschatological horizon. Mainstream management science is secular and anthropocentric in nature. It is based on a worldview which is limited to the temporal realm and which focuses on human abilities and interests. Success is to be sought fully within earthly history and depends primarily on human actions. On this last point, it could be said that the emphasis on human ability and human progress within history finds resonance with the Thomist view in GS. In addition, Chapter 1 has shown that Catholic pastoral management literature also tends to reflect this stance through the recommendation of management tools that focus on earthly success and human ability. In contrast, some scholars within the management field have called for dialogue with theology, as well as incorporation of religiosity and spirituality into management theory. Not surprisingly, GS goes much further. As seen in Chapter 3, it highlights the primacy of God in humanity's creation, sustenance, vocation, and final goal. It stresses the divine presence actively working with the human person, humanity's dependence on God, and the need for human work to be oriented towards God's law of love. Just as important, GS draws attention to the eschatological realm, and to the cross and resurrection. It points out that the goal of the human vocation is fully reached only at the end of time, beyond earthly history. Success in the temporal realm will ever remain partial, and human history will always be marked by failure and limitations. Once again, it is the Augustinians in GS who emphasize this more cautious and less optimistic view.

Recognition of the religious and eschatological horizon has several implications on management theory. First, it requires that the means and ends of management must be guided by a teleology in which human flourishing culminates in the eternal union of humanity and all creation with the divine. Second, methods of management must promote human co-operation with the indwelling spirit of God. As GS points out, this calls for the cultivation of human interiority, freedom, authenticity, as well as the habitual practice of responsible discernment. Third, the reality of the divine presence in human beings underscores the dignity of the human person. It opposes management methods that entail control and manipulation of people or involve deterministic calculations and predictions of human actions. Fourth, the religious horizon highlights the problem of evil and the fact that some challenges cannot be resolved simply through technical management solutions. This implies that management science must acknowledge its boundaries, and facilitate connections with other disciplines such as spirituality, religion, philosophy, and theology. Finally, the cross and resurrection highlight that failures and imperfections are not be unexpected in the temporal realm, and may even hold greater significance from a religious and eschatological viewpoint. Hence, the goals and processes of managing should not be guided solely by immediate, measurable, and unrealistic

targets based only on worldly criteria. This once again calls for reflexivity and discernment in management, and also implies that difficult issues can be confronted at a deeper level where necessary, in a spirit of openness, wisdom, courage, and patience, sustained by GS's overall message of hope.

These contrasting views with regard to the religious and eschatological horizon are summarized in the following table:

Table 4: Contrasts with regard to the religious and eschatological horizon

Mainstream management science	Alternative approach
Assumes a secular, temporal, and anthropocentric view without any consideration of divine, spiritual, or eschatological realities.	Highlights the primacy of God in the creation, sustenance, vocation, and final goal of humanity; Points out the reality of the eschatological horizon; Highlights union with God as the ultimate human good; Advocates cultivation of human authenticity and cooperation with the divine, respect for the dignity of human persons, and rejection of a deterministic approach to human actions; Acknowledges the reality of failure and imperfections; Recognizes the need to address deeper socio-cultural or spiritual challenges with hope, and the need for management to dialogue with theology and related disciplines.

4.4 Towards a normative foundation for management[11]

In the face of the above conflicts, an inappropriate response would be to selectively choose the mainstream approach for certain tasks or aspects of management, and the alternative approach for other tasks and aspects of management. This would make the choice seem arbitrary. As Chapter 1 has shown, such selectivity may even be linked to personal agendas and biases. Nor is it a matter of applying mainstream management science for secular organizations, and the teachings of GS for church organizations. As noted in the preceding analyses, internal debates and contradictions exist within each side. Moreover, neither resource presents a complete view of management, and each one can potentially benefit from the contributions of the other. In any case, as highlighted in Chapter 1, both the faith tradition and the secular sciences are not mutually exclusive. Throughout their development, each has been influenced by the other. Hence, a main assertion of this thesis has been that the teachings from a faith-

[11] A summary of this section has been presented as a conference paper at the 32nd Annual Fallon Memorial Lonergan Symposium, April 20–22, 2017, West Coast Methods Institute, Los Angeles, US; and the Australian Catholic Theological Association Conference, July 6-9, 2017, Sydney, Australia.

based resource such as GS, and the tenets of a secular discipline such as management science do not serve as foundations but as data towards the establishment of normative principles of management. To arrive at these normative principles, recourse needs to be made to a set of criteria from a higher viewpoint. To this end, I argue for a foundation that results from what Lonergan describes as intellectual, moral, and religious conversions.

4.4.1 Intellectual conversion

Lonergan refutes a commonly-held notion of reality as "what is out there now to be looked at."[12] He describes intellectual conversion as the adoption of criteria for reality and truth to be "the compounded criteria of experiencing, of understanding, of judging, and of believing."[13] Hence, reality and truth do not equate to physical sense data but to the resulting conclusions from our conscious operations on the data; that is, our intentional inquiring, understanding, judging, and deciding. This is because, as Lonergan points out, "the world of immediacy" is "but a tiny fragment of the world mediated by meaning."[14] Reality, truth, and existence lie not in mere empirical data but in the meaning that results from the operations of human consciousness; that is, our experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding. An example from management illustrates this point. As highlighted by the alternative approach discussed above, an organization is more than just a physical office or the sum total of the goods and services it produces. Rather, it has a deeper meaning and value, especially to those involved in it. It can be a community of people with a common vision, a source of belonging and shared experiences, a contributor to society's development, an institutional symbol of values and beliefs, or even a manifestation of a lifelong dream. In the human world of meaning and values, such notions of the organization are what is real and true, much more than the mere sense data of a physical office or a stockpile of inventory. Lonergan also highlights that with intellectual conversion, conclusions about truth and reality are arrived at not in a naïve or haphazard way but by being attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible. In other words, "genuine objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity."[15] In this regard, Lonergan emphasizes the importance of sustained communal effort in discovering truth because "the world mediated by meaning is a world known not by the sense experience of an individual but by the external and internal experience of a cultural community, and by the continuously checked and rechecked

[12] Lonergan, *Method*, 238.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid., 292.

judgments of the community."[16] In short, intellectual conversion implies the rejection of empiricist, relativist, idealist, and naïve realist stances in epistemology, and the adoption of an approach that can be called critical realism.

For the foundation of management theory, I argue for the necessity of intellectual conversion as expounded by Lonergan. The empiricist and positivist stance that currently dominates management science is not a viable one. As highlighted in Chapter 2, such a stance limits the vision even of the physical sciences, while also rendering them vulnerable to biases and other errors in observation. The human sciences inherit the same problem when they try to model themselves after the physical sciences. More seriously, they also neglect a central element in the very nature of human persons, which is the realm of meaning and values. For management in particular, human affectivity, relationships, attitudes, and values play a significant role in organizational life, and thus need to be taken into account in management theory and practice. In fact, the management field's emphasis on the empirical, together with its tendency to equate the empirical with financial and other accounting indicators, is a self-deception. This is because many of these indicators, such as profits, assets, and liabilities, are not sense data *per se* but accounting concepts in which the human world of meaning, values, and interpretations play a significant role. More fundamentally, it can be argued that the discipline of management itself would cease to exist if an empirical stance was adopted. In his critical reflections on management, Pattison has highlighted the suggestion of sociologist Keith Grint that management is largely a social construct, since each activity of management, such as planning, evaluating, and communicating, is also carried out by other people in society.[17] Hence, the identification of the management function does not result from physical sense data *per se* but from the human world of meaning, which attributes to certain persons the role of manager. In this light, intellectual conversion is needed even to affirm the reality of management itself!

Chapter 2 has highlighted that the management field suffers from a crisis of credibility to-date. It has been accused of irrelevance to real-life practice, biased research, over-generalizations, and exaggerated truth claims made from "rickety foundations".[18] Intellectual conversion issues an unceasing call to be attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible. It promotes authenticity, and reinforces human beings' unlimited questioning and native orientation to meaning, truth, and value. In opposition to superficiality, arbitrariness, and

[16] Ibid., 238.

[17] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 13. For the original discussion, see Keith Grint, *Management: A Sociological Introduction* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 47.

[18] Wooldridge, *Masters of Management*, 9.

irresponsibility, intellectual conversion encourages reflexivity, rigor, practical wisdom, depth, objectivity, openness, dialogue, and self-transcendence. This would pave the way for more robust and reliable management theories and tools. Hence, far from compromising the scientific credibility of the management field, intellectual conversion would strengthen management as a science, making it more integrated, effective, and relevant to practice. Chapter 2 has also highlighted the need for a foundational paradigm for management so as to further develop the field and overcome problems caused by excessive fragmentation and division. In this regard, observers note that even Critical Management Studies scholars have been hindered from making further headway because of their lack of consensus on a common basis with which to critique mainstream management.[19] Intellectual conversion, with its emphasis on objective truth and communal discernment, would facilitate the establishment of such a foundational paradigm.

Notably, a movement calling itself "critical realist" has recently emerged in relation to organizational studies.[20] This movement advocates that management research and theory formulation should reject positivist, relativist, and naïve realist approaches. It promotes research methods that study organizational actions and events by penetrating more deeply into their underlying factors, recognizing that such factors are greatly shaped by the human world of meaning and values. Critical realists also hold that objective and normative truths exist in management and organizational studies, which must be uncovered in a progressive, critical, dialogical, and on-going way. This emergence of the critical realist movement attests to the recognition among management scholars themselves of the need for intellectual conversion in management science.

4.4.2 Moral conversion

Moral conversion implies a shift from narrow self-interest and short-term satisfactions towards deeper and more enduring values. In Lonergan's words, it "changes the criterion of one's decisions and choices from satisfactions to values … Moral conversion consists in opting for the truly good, even for value against satisfaction when value and satisfaction conflict."[21] Acting in accord with moral conversion in turn develops one's moral character and leads to

[19] See Mats Alvesson, Todd Bridgman and Hugh Willmott, "Introduction," in *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*, eds. Mats Alvesson, Todd Bridgman and Hugh Willmott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 5.

[20] See Stephen Ackroyd and Steve Fleetwood, eds., *Realist Perspectives on Management and Organisations* (London: Routledge, 2000); and P. K. Edwards, J. O'Mahong and S. Vincent, eds., *Studying Organizations Using Critical Realism: A Practical Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). See also Christian Smith, *What Is a Person?: Rethinking Humanity, Social Life, and the Moral Good from the Person Up* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).

[21] Lonergan, *Method*, 240.

growth in authenticity. Elaborating on Lonergan's thought, Patrick Byrne points out an important aspect of moral conversion in that it is not simply about choosing to live according to a set of values which one defines for oneself. Rather, moral conversion is "a decision to accept the fact that deciding always occurs within the structure of ethical intentionality with its unrestricted intention of all values" and it "situates one's own deciding … within a larger universe of values" which sometimes even "unsettles our consciousness of preference."[22] In other words, moral conversion implies an awareness that a normative set of values takes precedence over our individual preferences. At the same time, there is a concomitant recognition that these normative values are hierarchically ordered. Such a normative and hierarchical view of the human good has not been unknown to philosophers and social scientists through the ages. For example, Abraham Maslow, whose work is widely used in management theories, defines a "hierarchy of needs" in ascending order from physiological to social to psychological.[23] Likewise, commenting on Lonergan's work on moral conversion, Brian Cronin points out Thomas Aquinas' view of successive levels of the good of human persons, first in their materiality, then as living beings, and then as rational beings. Cronin also highlights German philosopher Max Scheler's view of an "*a priori* emotive grading of values", moving up from values associated with the physical senses to "values of life", to "spiritual values".[24]

Resonating with these views, Lonergan proposes a five-level scale of values.[25] First, vital values pertain to the things needed for the physical well-being of the human person, such as food, health, shelter, and safety. Second, there is the level of social values which pertain to the good order of society, in which human persons relate with one another through various forms of social relationships, structures, and institutions. Since this social fabric enables vital values to be satisfactorily and equitably attained, social co-operation and cohesion become regarded in themselves as valuable human goods. Third, cultural values pertain to notions of meaning, goodness, beauty, wisdom, and identity that provide the motivation and ordering principles for social organizing, especially when conflict and sacrifice have to be faced in negotiating the social order. At the same time, cultural values are partly shaped by experiences at the social level. Fourth, there is the level of personal values, wherein human freedom, relative autonomy, responsibility, creativity, moral reasoning, and moral decisions are exercised. Personal values

[22] Patrick H. Byrne, *The Ethics of Discernment: Lonergan's Foundations for Ethics* (Toronto University of Toronto Press, 2016), 229, 232.

[23] Abraham H. Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, 3rd ed. (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1987), 15ff, cited in Alford and Naughton, *Managing as if Faith Mattered*, 43.

[24] Brian Cronin, *Value Ethics: A Lonergan Perspective* (Nairobi: Consolata Institute of Philosophy Press, 2006), 160.

[25] Lonergan, *Method*, 31-32.

are shaped by culture and in turn help to redress distortions in cultural values. Finally, religious values are experienced from a source beyond oneself, the ultimate fulfilment of our longing for meaning, truth, and value. This is where the human person encounters the unconditional love of the "ultimate originating value," the answer to humans' unrestricted questioning, and the source of all good which in turn shapes one's personal values.[26] As a general schema, the scale of values possesses an intrinsic intelligibility, and is an essentially heuristic representation of human flourishing. Although Lonergan implies that the scale can be apprehended by the human person, he also stresses that moral conversion requires on-going purification of one's horizon.[27] In this regard, moral and intellectual conversions mutually reinforce each other, facilitating the discernment, implementation, and evaluation of what is good, true, and meaningful, and bringing greater clarity towards a normative description of human terminal values.

In the management field, the call to recognize moral concerns has been gaining momentum in recent decades ever since the introduction of ethics in business schools in the 1970s. As pointed out in Chapter 2, this inclusion of ethics in the management curriculum arose from the realization that unbridled capitalism around the world had led to widespread social injustices, corruption, deterioration of worker welfare, and environmental degradation. More recent movements in corporate social responsibility and humanistic management have reinforced the need to consider the common good in management theory and practice. These developments show that an objective and normative scale of values does indeed "unsettle our consciousness of preference," inviting us to address the tension by gradually aligning our own scale of preferences with this normative scale.[28]

For the foundations of management theory, I argue that moral conversion is essential. Otherwise, if management science is not directed towards human flourishing and does not incorporate a normative account of terminal values, several problems arise. First, as Ormerod has rightly pointed out, without a normative view of human finality, the human sciences mistakenly treat all data as intelligible. Consequently, all human activity and intention, whether they promote or contradict human flourishing, are accorded the same status as data. Patterns are observed, explanations are offered, and before long, actions and attitudes which are actually contrary to human flourishing are normalized. There is no attempt to distinguish and reject those actions, aims, and meanings which contradict the greater human good, since the notion of a normative good has not been formally recognized. As Ormerod highlights, some data in

[26] Byrne, *Ethics of Discernment,* 398.

[27] Lonergan, *Method,* 240.

[28] Byrne, *Ethics of Discernment,* 232.

the human sciences might in fact be unintelligible because they contradict human terminal values. Thus, such data cannot be regarded as rational behaviour and accorded the same status as intelligible data.[29] In the management field, this problem is compounded because management science does not merely seek to understand and explain human organizations. Rather, its main goal is to prescribe management solutions and tools. As a result, even unintelligible and irrational actions become institutionalized into management theories and translated into recommended techniques and tools. A common example is where observations of self-seeking behavior among workers have been translated into management prescriptions for responding to and capitalizing on such behavior by manipulating employees through tangible incentives and disincentives. Furthermore, as highlighted in Chapter 2, paradigms embedded in the human sciences tend to be self-fulfilling because people start to believe what is practiced. Given the positivist nature of management research, a vicious cycle thus results. An additional problem is that besides using data from its own research, the management field also draws extensively from other social sciences such as economics, sociology, and psychology. It thus inherits the existing weakness of these other sciences in not taking human teleology into account. In particular, the liberal capitalist ideology in economics, with its emphasis on individualism, materialism, and wealth-creation for the capital-owning class, has been influential on management theories. Consequently, the means of management have compromised the good of workers, consumers, communities, and the environment.

A second problem is that, as Ormerod has observed for sociology, the absence of a normative teleology has resulted in fragmentation of the field and the existence of competing schools of thought. In management science, competing models espouse different views about what is more desirable, be it efficiency, human relationships, standardization, innovation, serving customers, or social responsibility. This has led to competing management tools with contrary effects. Moreover, the absence of a normative account of terminal values prevents the management field from achieving its own objective of facilitating goal-achievement because the competing goals and values of self-seeking groups cancel out each other, however well-managed each one strives to be. Hence, the tendency to avoid normative terminal values in mainstream management science is actually self-defeating. In short, if the management field truly seeks to be performative, it has to incorporate and promote a normative view of human

[29] Ormerod, *Re-visioning*, 43-48. To illustrate this point, Ormerod gives the concrete example of South Africa's apartheid regime, in which the arbitrary and irrational practice of racial discrimination in society was used as the basis for constructing a whole political system. Viewed against human terminal values especially truth, justice, and the dignity, well-being, and equality of all persons, such discrimination cannot be regarded as rational and intelligible social behaviour and taken as valid data for the formulation of social or political theories and norms. Ibid., 47.

flourishing. As Ormerod points out, following Lonergan, "in the social sciences it would be unscientific to eliminate [final causes] precisely because human beings live in a world mediated by meaning and motivated by value."[30] Moral conversion in management is especially pressing given the dynamic nature of human persons as discussed in Chapter 3. Human virtue and ingenuity co-exist with human sinfulness and weakness. Even though management science is unable to overcome the problem of evil, it can still make a difference by encouraging the good. Given the pervasiveness of the management discipline, management science has much potential to promote the human good in all realms of society, and thus enhance the probability of social flourishing rather than decline.

4.4.3 Religious conversion

Finally, religious conversion occurs when one's horizon is opened up to an ultimate reality beyond the temporal world. It is a reality to which human persons are already pre-disposed through their unrestricted questioning and longing for wholeness and meaning in life. Such a quest brings humanity ultimately to God its Creator and the ground of all being. Lonergan describes religious conversion as:

> being grasped by ultimate concern. It is other-worldly falling in love. It is total and permanent self-surrender without conditions, qualifications, reservations. But it is such a surrender, not as an act, but as a dynamic state that is prior to and principle of subsequent acts. It is revealed in retrospect as an under-tow of existential consciousness, as a fated acceptance of a vocation to holiness, as perhaps an increasing simplicity and passivity in prayer.[31]

Religious conversion in this sense is not synonymous with formal adoption of a particular faith tradition, although it can lead to such a decision. More fundamentally, it begins with a personal religious experience which can be described as an encountering of a transcendent 'other' whom the human heart recognizes as the answer to its unrestricted questioning and deepest yearning. The object of encounter is identified within consciousness as an autonomous, pre-existing, and benevolent reality, the first principle of all creation, and the source of life; in other words, that which most religions refer to as God. Moreover, such an encounter is experienced as a gratuitous gift and initiative of this transcendent other; not something that the human person can directly cause to happen, although one can certainly endeavor to be pre-disposed, such as through sustained attentiveness to one's inner life, deep contemplation of the created order, and a sincere search for meaning and wholeness.

[30] Ormerod, *Re-visioning*, 46.

[31] Lonergan, *Method*, 240-241.

Religious experience is a shift in horizons. When the human person responds to religious experience in a conscientious and sustained way, there is a gradual change in beliefs, perspectives, attitudes, actions, and life choices. One's life and actions become more aligned with goodness, truth, and beauty, with what is truly good for oneself and all creation. Hence, religious conversion animates moral and intellectual conversion. In Lonergan's words:

> First there is God's gift of his love. Next, the eye of this love reveals values in their splendour, while the strength of this love brings about their realization, and that is moral conversion. Finally, among the values discerned by the eye of love is the value of believing the truths taught by the religious tradition, and in such tradition and belief are the seeds of intellectual conversion.[32]

At the same time, religious conversion is more than just "efficacious ground for the pursuit of intellectual and moral ends"; rather, it is distinguished by an "other-worldly fulfilment, joy, peace, bliss."[33] In other words, religious conversion brings about a spiritual good that is distinct in itself, and which is not collapsed into moral and worldly goods.

I argue that religious conversion is not inconsonant with the management discipline for several reasons. First, despite claims about the diminishing role of religion in society, some organizational theorists are cognizant of research which shows that religion still plays a part in the lives of the majority of people in the world.[34] There is thus strong justification for those management theorists who advocate incorporating religion and spirituality into management principles and practices. Although some of these approaches focus on how existing secular management theories should take religiosity into account in worker motivation and organizational policy so as to better achieve the manager's goals, they at least acknowledge the reality of religious experience and conversion. More fundamentally, there are those theorists who advocate religious conversion in the very formulation of management theory. For example, Kent Miller highlights that a faith-based hermeneutics widens the horizon of management researchers, and leads to more innovative theories which can address problems that a secular paradigm is unable to do, especially in the area of corporate ethics.[35] Similarly, Bruno Dyck has shown through his research that attention to spirituality leads to management practices that

[32] Ibid., 243.

[33] Ibid., 242.

[34] See Paul Tracey, Nelson Phillips and Michael Lounsbury, "Taking Religion Seriously in the Study of Organizations," in *Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Religion and Organization Theory*, eds. Michael Lounsbury and Paul Tracey (Bradford, UK: Emerald Group Publishing, 2014), 6-7.

[35] Kent D. Miller, "Organizational Research as Practical Theology," *Organizational Research Methods* 18, no. 2 (2015): 276-299.

are more ethical than those in mainstream management.[36] Pattison points out that religion opens one up to the realm of transcendence and mystery, and can promote the betterment of humanity. Hence, it is an important counter-force to the secular management field, which over-emphasizes control, positivism, and quick resolution of problems with little regard for the common good.[37] Given these views, it is not surprising that the Management, Spirituality, and Religion Interest Group was formed within the Academy of Management more than a decade ago. This interest group promotes management research that not only takes into account religion and spirituality at the workplace but also explores what religious and spiritual traditions can bring to the formulation of management theory.[38] Indeed, scholars note a spiritual turn in management and organization studies since the mid-1990s.[39]

Religious conversion facilitates the establishment of more well-grounded alternative management theories. Max Weber has rightly observed that "the pursuit of wealth, stripped of its religious and ethical meaning, tends to become associated with purely mundane passions."[40] Thus, management theories from "specialists without spirit, sensualists without heart" will not be able to endure on their own without a solid grounding in ultimate meaning.[41] Weber further highlights that where there are attempts to propose alternative management theories without the firm foundation of "an alternative substantive rationality" such as a system of religious beliefs, such attempts tend to become eventually co-opted into the existing dominant logic of mainstream management, thus losing their counter-cultural potential.[42] His observation is well-illustrated by many contemporary examples in business ethics. For instance, scholars note that the trend of corporate social responsibility has largely become just another means of enhancing shareholder wealth instead of challenging the very logic of this goal.[43] Hence, alternative

[36] Bruno Dyck, "God on Management: The World's Largest Religions, the 'Theological Turn,' and Organization and Management Theory and Practice," in Lounsbury and Tracey, *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 23-62.

[37] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 166.

[38] See "Management, Spirituality and Religion Interest Group," *Academy of Management*, accessed July 1, 2016, http://division.aom.org/msr/. The main journals devoted to this topic include Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion, and Journal of Spirituality, Leadership and Management. A literature review of the work done in this area can be found in Paul Tracey, "Religion and Organization: A Critical Review of Current Trends and Future Directions," *The Academy of Management Annals* 6, no. 1 (June 2012): 87–134. See also Margaret Benefiel, "Mapping the Terrain of Spirituality in Organizations Research," *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 16, no. 4 (2003): 367-377.

[39] Margaret Benefiel, "Irreconcilable Foes? The Discourse of Spirituality and the Discourse of Organizational Science," *Organization* 10, no. 2 (May 2003): 383.

[40] Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. by T. Parsons (New York: Scribner's, 1958), 181-182, cited in Dyck, "God on Management," 26-27.

[41] Ibid., 27.

[42] Ibid., 54.

[43] Baden and Higgs, "Challenging the Perceived Wisdom of Management Theories and Practice," 543.

management paradigms are more likely to endure when supported by a religious foundation with a robust and systematic theology that can hold its own whilst engaging in dialogue with the world. This calls to mind Ratzinger's assertion that a religious faith tradition has its own "intelligibility and rationality" which can and should be brought to bear in understanding human life.[44] Although religious conversion does not directly mean adoption of a specific faith tradition, it nevertheless disposes people to seek out particular religious traditions as they strive to grow in their conversion in a more structured way. Hence, religious conversion facilitates the appropriation of the various benefits that a religious faith tradition can bring to bear on management. In relation to this, the ITC has rightly highlighted that theology enables other sciences to "engage with religious issues" and be open to the religious horizon, thus recovering their "scope and power".[45]

Besides facilitating dialogue between religion and management science, religious conversion is fruitful for the management discipline in view of an even more fundamental reason. In Lonergan's words, "the question of God … lies within man's horizon" because "implicitly we grant that the universe is intelligible and, once that is granted, there arises the question whether the universe could be intelligible without having an intelligent ground. But that is the question about God."[46] Hence, human beings' native and unrestricted inclination towards order, progress, and wholeness, which accounts for the very existence of management theory and practice, points towards an ultimate ground of order and goodness, or what Lonergan describes as "the question of God."[47] Management science is fundamentally premised upon this quest for greater order and fruitfulness in human work. This is a quest which finds its ultimate fulfilment in encounter and relationship with the ground of all order and wholeness, through religious experience, religious conversion, and sustained growth in this conversion. Hence, being open to religious conversion enables management theorists and practitioners to come closer to their goal. In fact, Lonergan asserts that "the only correct general form of [the] understanding [of the human sciences] is theological."[48]

Finally, as discussed above, the secular sciences on their own are unable to fully recognize unintelligibility in human actions or address breakdowns in human society. Divine intervention is needed in human history because it "reveals values in their splendor", clarifies normative

[44] Ratzinger, "Dignity of the Human Person," 120.

[45] ITC, *Theology Today*, para. 84.

[46] Lonergan, *Method*, 103, 101.

[47] Ibid., 103.

[48] Bernard J. F. Lonergan, "Theology and Understanding," in *Collection*, vol. 4, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Frederick Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 130.

terminal values, and assists humankind to better distinguish between good and evil, and to choose the good.[49] The management discipline has to recognize that some problems lie beyond a management analysis or solution. Rather, they arise from the heart of the human person and cause distortions in human intentionality and action. Without an awareness of the problem of evil, management science assumes that the human person is able to eventually reach his or her goals through ingenuity, technique, and persistent effort. Every issue is seen as something which can be simply resolved with practical intelligence, proper organizing, and better technique. This is arguably the management field's greatest blind-spot. It continues to overlook the fact that even its best advice is often not followed through for reasons that run deeper than mere lack of technique, time, information, managerial ability or control. It is here that management theorists would do well to acknowledge the boundaries of their field. Religious conversion not only facilitates this awareness but also supplies what is required for overcoming the problem of evil and for persevering in hope, towards the ultimate goal of human activity.

4.5 Implications of intellectual, moral, and religious conversions

In light of the above arguments, it is essential that management theories be based on the foundation that results from intellectual, moral, and religious conversions. The implications of these conversions provide the higher viewpoint with which to evaluate the dialectics discussed in the preceding chapters of this thesis, and to decide on the principles which should guide management theories. In brief, the implications of conversions are (i) the adoption of a critical realist stance; (ii) the incorporation of teleology into management science with a normative account of human finality; (iii) the replacement of the deterministic approach in management with a more probabilistic and heuristic one; and (iv) the incorporation of the religious horizon.

4.5.1 Adoption of a critical realist stance

Intellectual, moral, and religious conversions imply adopting a philosophical foundation for management science that aligns more with the stance of critical realism. Lonergan highlights that "only the critical realist can acknowledge the facts of human knowing and pronounce the world mediated by meaning to be the real world; and he can do so only inasmuch as he shows that the process of experiencing, understanding, and judging is a process of self-transcendence."[50] This calls for management theories and tools to be based on reflective, reasonable, and responsible study which engages not merely with measurable data but more

[49] Lonergan, *Method*, 243.

[50] Ibid., 239.

importantly with the complex world of human meaning, values, relationships, and affectivity. Management science must aim towards objective and enduring truths, which are penetrated progressively through attentive experience, intelligent understanding, reasonable judgement, and responsible decision. The positivist, relativist, and naïve realist approaches that are currently prevalent in the field must be rejected. Critical realism would also require management theorists to adopt a perspective that looks at the wider whole, rather than focus narrowly on isolated parts. Consequently, management theories and tools must take a systemic view of human work, and acknowledge the inter-connections among the various aspects of work, and between various entities in society. In addition, the possibility of a common foundational paradigm for management must be affirmed and pursued. This will help to develop the field and counter its current fragmentation. Moreover, rather than surrendering to prevailing norms or unexamined assumptions and biases, management science must encourage reflexivity, critical thinking, contextual sensitivity, discernment, and deliberate choice. It must also not avoid dealing with deeper socio-cultural issues that sometimes lie beneath management problems, and that invariably involve the realm of human meaning and values. In summary, management science should promote growth in human authenticity. These views are corroborated by scholars who have applied Lonergan's intellectual conversion to management, and have similarly highlighted the important habits of critical inquiry and critical thinking in management education and practice.[51]

4.5.2 Incorporation of teleology into management science

Another implication of conversions, especially moral conversion, is that management science must be oriented towards human flourishing, and adopt a normative account of such flourishing with its hierarchical order of values. This means that the management field has to incorporate human teleology as an essential reference point that guides research, theory formulation, and application. To this end, Lonergan's scale of values provides a useful starting point. Further, in order to better direct the means and ends of management, this basic schema can be elaborated into a more comprehensive account of human flourishing by drawing from additional sources, without losing its objectivity and normativity. In this regard, it is helpful to recall Lonergan's view of the social, historical, and transcendental criteria of insight, such that "the world mediated by meaning is a world known not by the sense experience of an individual

[51] For example, see Scott Kelley and Ron Nahser, "Developing Sustainable Strategies: Foundations, Method, and Pedagogy," *Journal of Business Ethics* 123, no. 4 (2014): 631–644; and Anthony Howard, "The Thinking Organisation," *Journal of Management Development* 31, no. 6 (2012): 620-632.

but by the external and internal experience of a cultural community, and by the continuously checked and rechecked judgments of the community."[52] He further explains that:

> although conversion is intensely personal, it is not purely private. While individuals contribute elements to horizons, it is only within the social group that the elements accumulate and it is only with century-old traditions that notable developments occur. To know that conversion is religious, moral, and intellectual, to discern between authentic and unauthentic conversion, to recognize the difference in their fruits—by their fruits you shall know them—all call for a high seriousness and a mature wisdom that a social group does not easily attain or maintain.[53]

This points to the possibility that a communal and historically-sustained effort to be attentive, intelligent, reasonable, and responsible can lead to insights that provide more detailed accounts of human flourishing, without losing their objectivity and normativity. In this regard, the various global conventions and movements to make management more socially responsible have been the result of sustained reflection and dialogue among international networks of diverse groups, and provide a viable source of knowledge on human flourishing. It is noteworthy that these conventions demonstrate a significant amount of resonance on what constitutes the human good. They also resonate with the teachings on human finality in GS, a document which has resulted from the Council Fathers' deliberations at an ecumenical council with unprecedented global representation, and through which the centuries-old faith tradition of the Church has been brought into dialogue with contemporary issues. Hence, drawing upon this collective wisdom, the scale of values can be further elaborated to describe the human good as comprising:

- Physical well-being through the satisfaction of material needs such as food, health, shelter, safety, rest, recreation, proper working conditions, and a sustainable means of livelihood;
- Healthy social bonds of family and community;
- Cultural goods, including education, moral, and intellectual formation, and development in cultural, artistic, and wisdom traditions;
- Freedom, relative autonomy, moral responsibility, the exercise of conscience, as well as opportunities to use one's gifts, develop one's potential, and engage in meaningful activity; and
- Religious freedom, a vibrant and authentic spiritual life, and relationship with the divine.

[52] Lonergan, *Method,* 238.

[53] Ibid., 269.

This view of the human good implies upholding the common good in society, wherein all individuals and communities are able to attain these values more fully and readily. Such a society would be marked by equity, participation, solidarity, justice, and peace, in addition to material fruitfulness, cultural flourishing, and openness to the spiritual and religious horizon. Particular attention would be paid to the poor and most vulnerable, as emphasized by GS and some of the global conventions.[54] The needs of future generations, and the integrity of the natural environment, would also be safeguarded.

This account of the human good can serve as a basis for formulating the means and ends of management. It can be seen that the account implies rejecting reductionist views of the human person and recognizing the multiple dimensions of human nature, including the material, social, cultural, moral, and spiritual. Similarly, competitive and transactional paradigms for society are rejected in favor of solidarity, equality, and collaboration. In accord with its heuristic character, this account of the human good should be regarded as a general orientation rather than a static end-state description of human finality. It is also open to further development and deeper insights, especially through contributions from the various religious, cultural, and wisdom traditions of humanity. In this regard, the method pursued in this thesis facilitates such further development since it begins from a normative and general schema of the human good, and moves towards a thicker account by bringing to bear points of resonance among various sources. Moreover, the above scale allows for application to specific contexts since it does not prescribe particular contents for each level of the human good.

As pointed out in Chapter 2, the treatment of ethics in the management field has remained largely at the procedural level, focusing only on processes of reasoning among the main ethical traditions, and avoiding commitment to any specific or thick description of terminal values. However, as some scholars have rightly noted, the topic of ethics in management has to go beyond thin or merely procedural accounts, so as to better guide action, and overcome the marginalization of social responsibility in management science. The adoption of a normative

[54] For example, see United Nations, "UN Global Compact," accessed February 20, 2016, https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/mission/principles; and United Nations, "Sustainable Development Goals," accessed February 20, 2016, http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/. With regard to the scale of values, Doran has pointed out how particular attention to the "voiceless" is consistent with the operations of the scale. In brief, the equitable distribution and sustainability of vital resources requires that the "victimized peoples of the earth" and "the voices of those who have been silenced," rather than the interests of those who already enjoy an excess of wealth and power, occupy a "hermeneutically privileged position" in the workings of the social, cultural, and higher levels of the scale. More generally, "the problems that any schemes of recurrence at the higher levels of value must meet are set by the more basic levels, and the proportions of the more basic problems set the criteria for the authenticity of the higher arrangements." Doran, *Theology and the Dialectics of History*, 423-424. Hence, the scale of values implied by moral conversion affirms the principle of preferential option for the poor and marginalized, as upheld by GS and alternative voices in the management field.

and more comprehensive account of human flourishing as described above will help to address this gap and make ethics a central consideration in management.

4.5.3 Probabilistic approach

A third major implication from intellectual, moral, and religious conversions is that the deterministic approach in management science must be replaced by a probabilistic and heuristic one. Management theories should steer away from premature generalizations and over-confident truth claims that guarantee success with the application of technique. Conversions call for a recognition of the partial nature of knowledge attained, and a constant openness to the possibility of further insights that are yet to be reached. In particular, as with all human sciences, management science needs to reject over-confident assumptions about being able to predict and control human actions. Intellectual, moral, and religious conversions highlight the reality of human interiority and its spontaneous nature, wherein the human person exercises freedom, relative autonomy, discernment, intentionality, self-transcendence, and spirituality. Hence, management methods that purport to predict or elicit certain behaviours from people in a deterministic way represent the false promise of technique. As Lonergan points out, whilst "nature unfolds in accord with law, … the shape and form of human knowledge, work, social organization, cultural achievement, communication, community, personal development, are involved in meaning" and unfolds within history in a non-linear way.[55] Echoing this, Ghoshal has highlighted the intentional nature of human actions at the individual level, and the resultant spontaneity of events at the social level. He stresses that social phenomena are "phenomena of organized complexity" and "in these fields there are definite limits to what we can expect science to achieve."[56]

However, this does not mean that management theories and tools should be abandoned altogether. They still have the potential to offer models for understanding human activities and better coordinate them. Ghoshal has helpfully remarked that theory and scholarship should be like "walking sticks".[57] They aid practitioners in navigating through the complexity of the real world. Moreover, as pointed out by social psychologist Kurt Lewin, "there is nothing so practical as a good theory."[58] Hence, the stronger the walking stick, the better the walking. Management theories and tools need to have strong explanatory power, and contribute to greater

[55] Lonergan, *Method*, 80-81.

[56] Ghoshal, "Bad Management Theories," 78.

[57] Ibid., 81.

[58] Kurt Lewin, "Psychology and the Process of Group Living," *Journal of Social Psychology* 17, no. 1 (1943): 118.

understanding of reality through models that are as accurate and comprehensive as possible. In this regard, a more probabilistic and heuristic approach, instead of a deterministic one, would liberate management science to incorporate the realm of human meaning, values, affectivity, and spirituality, and thus serve as a better walking stick for the real world. As Baden and Higgs have pointed out, "it is wiser to pursue incomplete, messy, contextualized, uncertain knowledge that enriches our understanding of how to promote human welfare than to amass lots of clean data that is easy to manipulate and present, but yet is based on false assumptions."[59]

A probabilistic and heuristic approach would entail greater flexibility, openness, depth of reflection, as well as on-going engagement among all stakeholders in the formulation and application of management theory, making revisions and adaptations as situations unfold. Such a process is necessarily dynamic, dialogical, participative, and developmental. As Lonergan points out with regard to the moral good:

> One has yet to uncover and root out one's individual, group, and general bias. One has to keep developing one's knowledge of human reality and potentiality as they are in the existing situation. One has to keep distinct its elements of progress and its elements of decline. One has to keep scrutinizing one's intentional responses to values and their implicit scales of preference. One has to listen to criticism and to protest. One has to remain ready to learn from others. For moral knowledge is the proper possession only of morally good men and, until one has merited that title, one has still to advance and to learn.[60]

Hence, models and assumptions need to be constantly challenged, tested, re-examined, and revised where necessary, thus building better walking sticks. Mintzberg highlights that even as theories help us to think and understand, it is often the "surprising" and "discomforting" insights that expand and deepen our knowledge.[61] Likewise, Mats Alvesson and Jörgen Sandberg note that "breakdowns" in theoretical relationships have the potential to push the boundaries in a discipline.[62] All this calls for a more open and less deterministic stance in management theory and practice.

4.5.4 Incorporation of the religious horizon

Finally, conversions entail incorporating the religious horizon into management science. The means and ends of management must promote the spiritual good of the human person, which includes religious freedom as well as the cultivation of a vibrant spiritual life. The good of humankind finds its ultimate fulfilment in union with the divine source of all good, the

[59] Baden and Higgs, "Challenging the Perceived Wisdom of Management Theories and Practice," 541.

[60] Lonergan, *Method*, 240.

[61] Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs*, 249.

[62] Alvesson and Sandberg, "Has Management Studies Lost Its Way?" 146.

ultimate answer to humanity's unrestricted quest for meaning, truth, and love. Management theories must also take into account the divine presence actively working among humankind, such that human persons and human actions cannot be subject to manipulation or mechanistic calculations and predictions. Moreover, religious conversion highlights the problem of evil, and the dynamic nature of human persons in struggling between vice and virtue. This underscores, once again, the need to replace the deterministic approach in management theory with a more probabilistic one. At the same time, religious conversion calls for management science to promote human cooperation with the divine. In this regard, some scholars have proposed ways to incorporate contemplation and spiritual discernment into management practice.[63] Finally, religious conversion opens one up to the eschatological horizon, with the consequent acknowledgment of inevitable failures and imperfections in the temporal realm. Management science would need to be more realistic in its expectations of success, and recognize the limits of its role. Its theories and tools must facilitate the way for responses beyond management, and make connections to other disciplines such as theology, philosophy, and spirituality.

4.5.5 Summary

It can be seen that intellectual, moral, and religious conversions lead to a foundation for management that has a wider horizon because it goes beyond empiricism, narrow self-interest, anthropocentricism, deterministic techniques, and a temporal worldview. A foundation that adopts a critical realist stance, a normative scale of values, a probabilistic approach, and a horizon that includes the religious, has the potential to make management science more effective in facilitating the coordination of human work towards greater human flourishing. Going back to the comparison between management science and the teachings of GS, it can be seen that this foundation aligns more with the alternative approach rather than the mainstream approach to management. In other words, based on the higher viewpoint of this foundation, the principles in the right-hand columns of Tables 1 – 4 are affirmed while those in the left-hand columns are rejected. As for the points of resonance between management science and GS, the implications of conversions affirm these points. In particular, the scale of values highlights the importance of human labor and enterprise, the necessity of management in achieving the human and social good, and the importance of productivity and progress in the temporal order. Hence, these points of resonance, together with the principles espoused by the alternative approach to

[63] For example, see Case et al., "From *Theoria* to Theory," 345-361; David S. Steingard, "Spiritually-Informed Management Theory: Toward Profound Possibilities for Inquiry and Transformation," *Journal of Management Inquiry* 14, no. 3 (Sep 2005): 227-241; and Gerard Magill, "Theology in Business Ethics: Appealing to the Religious Imagination," *Journal of Business Ethics* 11, no. 2 (Feb 1992): 129-135.

management, can now be used to construct the reorientation framework for management theories.

4.6 The reorientation framework

To recap, the purpose of the reorientation framework is to render management theories more reliable and conducive to human flourishing, in a normative and objective way, while also being well-suited for church management. The envisaged framework would operate through a set of principles for evaluating a management theory or tool, and for making adjustments to it. The result of these adjustments is a reoriented theory or tool that can then be used for management in any organization. To this end, it is proposed that the principles under the alternative approach to management, as well as the points of resonance between management science and GS, can be consolidated into three broad areas: the human person, the community, and human activity. The reorientation principles in each of these areas, and the process of applying them, are as follows:

a. The human person

The first step in reorienting a management theory is to examine its treatment of the human person in its method and underlying goals. This pertains to all persons in the context of management, including workers, managers, capital owners, clients, members of the wider community, or any other stakeholder. Adjustments should be made to the management theory, where necessary, in accordance with the following principles:

(i) Reductionist assumptions of the human person, such as in management theories which focus solely on the materiality and self-interest of persons, should be replaced by a more holistic view that recognizes the social, psychological, intellectual, moral, and spiritual dimensions of human beings, their interiority, relative autonomy, spontaneity, and dynamic nature. This includes attending to qualitative factors such as human affectivity, meaning, and value.

(ii) Management theories that diminish human responsibility through top-down control or uncritical application of technique should be adjusted to promote human intentionality, freedom, critical reflection, discernment, responsible exercise of conscience, and growth in wisdom and authenticity. Management

theories should also facilitate attention to deeper issues that may underlie organizational problems, and promote self-transcendence and conversions.

b. The community

Moving from the individual to the collective, the second aspect of a management theory that should be examined is the communal dimension.

(i) Management methods that are based on unrealistic assumptions about unilateral control, or over-emphasis on isolated action by individual persons or organizations, should be adjusted to acknowledge the systemic nature of human organizations and society. Management theories should recognize that outcomes are often not the result of individual human or organizational actions, but of the aggregate actions of inter-dependent entities, and of related events whether anticipated and controllable or not. In addition, management theories that are focused on a particular aspect of management in an overly-narrow and isolated way should also be adjusted to have a broader, systemic, and integrated view. Management theories should respect the integrity of relationships in the whole created order.

(ii) Management theories that reinforce self-interest, narrow management goals, or instrumental treatment of people and organizations should be reoriented to promote the common good wherein all persons are able to attain:

- Physical well-being through the meeting of material needs such as food, health, shelter, safety, rest, recreation, proper working conditions, and a sustainable means of livelihood;
- A healthy family life, and meaningful relationships within organizations and in society, which are based on social equity, communion, solidarity, and collaboration;
- Cultural goods such as education, moral, and intellectual formation, and development in cultural, artistic, and wisdom traditions;
- Freedom, relative autonomy, moral development, opportunities to use one's gifts, express oneself, and develop one's potential, opportunities to fulfil one's responsibility towards society especially in self-giving for

others, and meaningful participation in social and organizational life, including participation in management;

- Religious freedom, a vibrant and authentic spiritual life, and openness to the divine.

c. Human activity

The third aspect of a management theory that must be examined is its approach towards human activity.

(i) Management theories should not adopt a deterministic, positivist, and mechanical approach which over-emphasizes measurement, prediction, and control. They should be based on a probabilistic and heuristic approach that promotes flexibility, adaptation, on-going learning, openness, dialogue, consideration of non-quantifiable factors, and acknowledgement of inevitable uncertainties. Management theories should also facilitate adaptation to the realities of specific persons, communities, and contexts.

(ii) The anthropological and temporal focus of management theories must be replaced by a view that acknowledges the religious and eschatological horizons. Management methods should promote openness to the divine, and humankind's unrestricted quest for wholeness, truth, goodness, meaning, and value. Unrealistic expectations of perfection and earthly success should be balanced by an acknowledgement of inevitable failure and suffering within the temporal order. Management theories must facilitate the exploration of broader responses beyond the management discipline, especially through connections with other fields such as theology, spirituality, and philosophy.

These three board areas and the six principles thus comprise the reorientation framework for management theories, which is the main goal of this research project.

4.7 Significance of the reorientation framework

As highlighted in this thesis, pastoral literature and training programs in church management need to engage with management science through an appropriate method for inter-disciplinary work. Accordingly, the reorientation framework outlined above has been synthesized through a systematic and explicit method of inter-disciplinary engagement. Such a

method has included critical examination of the management field, application of the faith tradition with appropriate rules of interpretation, and a structured means for resolving the dialectics. In contrast, as shown in Chapter 1, much of the existing pastoral materials in the Catholic Church not only lack in-depth understanding of the management tool being applied, but also demonstrate improper use of relevant resources from the faith tradition, and inappropriate ways of bringing both into dialogue. Hence, the reorientation framework serves as a pastoral resource that is methodologically more robust.

Moreover, instead of developing individual alternative tools for management as some pastoral authors and Catholic social ethics scholars have done, the framework provides a way for *existing or new* management theories and tools from the management field to be appropriately reoriented. Such a reorientation is done by testing each theory or tool against the principles in the framework, and then making adjustments to the relevant aspects of the theory or tool where needed. Since the framework comprises general reorientation principles rather than particular prescriptions, it is broad enough to be applied to theories and tools pertaining to any aspect of management, and allows for contextual customization. Thus, with this reorientation framework, new pastoral materials on various aspects of church management can be produced by applying the framework to the relevant methods from management science, and fine-tuning them to suit specific pastoral contexts and target audiences. Chapter 5 will illustrate how this is done, using two examples of management science tools that are commonly found in Catholic pastoral management literature.

Another significant feature of the reorientation framework is that it is equally suited for management in the Church as well as all other organizations. This is because the underlying reorientation principles are based on a foundational stance that results from intellectual, moral, and religious conversions. These conversions are not limited to any particular group or faith tradition, but are proposed by Lonergan as the way towards what is real, true, good, and holy for all peoples. Thus, these conversions have a normative and objective character. Moreover, in the synthesis of the framework, conversions resulted in the choice for management principles from the alternative view in the management field, and the main teachings of GS. The alternative view in management, promoted by some scholars within the field, is not targeted at only certain groups or sectors, but has been advocated for all managers and organizations alike. Similarly, as pointed out in Chapter 3, the teachings of GS on the nature and goal of the human person, human society, and human work, are offered to a general audience. These teachings draw not only from the Church's faith tradition but also from human experience, philosophy, and natural reasoning. The message of GS is thus relevant to human activity in all spheres of

life, and the application of GS's teachings to management covers all sectors whether economic, social, political, or religious.

At the same time, the reorientation framework does not lose its particular relevance to the Church. The implications of conversions in terms of a critical realist stance, the incorporation of a hierarchical order of terminal values into management, a probabilistic approach, and consideration of the religious and eschatological horizons, are consistent with the Catholic Church's tradition regarding its own nature and mission. In GS, even as the Council Fathers address their teachings to a universal audience, they also point out that the Church is to model the way in all these teachings. The principles of GS with regard to the human person, society, and human work resonate with Vatican II's ecclesiology. For example, the principle of participation, which is integral to the human vocation, finds a resonance with the principle of co-responsibility of all the baptized for the mission of the Church (LG 9-13). Participation is thus an important reorientation principle not just for organizational management in general but also for church management in particular. In this light, it can be said that management in the Church is not so much a unique task that is different from the management of all other organizations. Rather, in line with the Church's sacramental character, management in the Church should be a model that manifests and promotes a way of managing which foreshadows the finality of all humankind. In this regard, moral theologians have pointed out that there is no aspect of the Church's social teachings which are meant to be followed only by Christians and not the rest of society.[64]

Finally, the framework highlights that far from being just a means to any end, the very processes and methods of management can and should be a manifestation of human terminal values. Based on the framework, management can be re-defined as the heuristic and mutual coordination of work among a communion of human persons, in accord with the flourishing of the created order, and in co-operation with the divine. This definition contrasts with the classical definition of management as planning, organizing, directing, and controlling, as noted in Chapter 2. The reoriented definition is more cognizant of the complex reality and finality of human persons, human society, and human work. The classical definition, on the other hand, demonstrates an instrumental and temporal view of human persons and the natural order, over-assumption of managerial control, and a lack of epistemic humility. In Chapter 2, a tentative reorientation framework was constructed based on the alternative approaches to management proposed by scholars within the field. However, it was pointed out that although this tentative framework would help redress some of the problems with mainstream management theories, it

[64] For example, see Curran, *Catholic Social Teaching*, 39-43.

still lacked an adequate account of the human person and human society, a comprehensive view of human flourishing, and a well-grounded epistemology. In contrast, the reorientation framework synthesized in this chapter is based on a more comprehensive anthropology, account of human finality, and epistemology. What facilitated this improvement was dialogue with a faith tradition. Such a dialogue, evaluated through the critical role of foundations, has enabled the broader horizon and rich insights of a faith tradition to be brought to bear without compromising the objectivity and normativity of the framework. Management theories reoriented through this framework will be more effective, reliable, and conducive to human flourishing, and the reorientation framework can contribute towards a general theory of management that better aligns with is real, true, and good.

4.8 Conclusion

This chapter has accomplished the main task of this thesis, which is to construct a reorientation framework for management theories based on a dialogue between management science and the Catholic faith tradition, particularly as expressed in GS. The resonances and conflicts that emerged from this dialogue were evaluated from a foundation that resulted from intellectual, moral, and religious conversions as expounded by Lonergan. This enables the framework to serve as a normative and objective means for the reorientation of management theories not just for the Church but for all other organizations as well. At the same time, rich insights from the management field as well as from a faith tradition are brought to bear. The next chapter will illustrate how the framework is applied to specific management tools that have been frequently advocated in Catholic pastoral literature. Thereafter, an evaluation of this research project will be presented.

CHAPTER 5
Application of the Reorientation Framework

5.1 Introduction

This final chapter demonstrates the workings of the reorientation framework by applying it to two management tools that are often recommended in Catholic pastoral literature: (1) performance management systems; and (2) marketing and customer service strategies. The following discussions will briefly describe each tool, assess it against the reorientation framework, identify aspects of the tool that need to be reoriented, and describe what a reoriented tool might look like. It will be pointed out that the reoriented tool would be more effective and relevant for both ecclesial and other types of organizations. It will also be shown that the reoriented tool resonates with alternatives proposed by scholars for management practitioners in Church and society, thus attesting to the practical viability of the reoriented tool. The chapter will then look at the list of topics which Catholic pastoral authors typically consider to be constitutive of church management, and counter-propose how such a topical structure should be revised in light of the reorientation framework. It will be pointed out that these changes in respect of church management would apply to management in all other organizations as well. Finally, the outcome of this research will be evaluated, together with the strengths and limitations of the method adopted. Suggestions for further work will be made.

5.2 Application of the reorientation framework to specific management tools

As presented in the previous chapter, the reorientation framework consists of six reorientation principles which deal with the human person, the community, and human activity. These three broad areas highlight the main elements of organizational life that should form the focal points for management theory and practice. For ease of reference, the framework is reiterated here:

a. The human person

The first step in reorienting a management theory is to examine its treatment of the human person in its method and underlying goals. This pertains to all persons in the context of management, including workers, managers, capital owners, clients, members of the wider community, or any other stakeholder. Adjustments should be made to the management theory, where necessary, in accordance with the following principles:

(i) Reductionist assumptions of the human person, such as in management theories which focus solely on the materiality and self-interest of persons, should be replaced by a more holistic view that recognizes the social, psychological, intellectual, moral, and spiritual dimensions of human beings, their interiority, relative autonomy, spontaneity, and dynamic nature. This includes attending to qualitative factors such as human affectivity, meaning, and value.

(ii) Management theories that diminish human responsibility through top-down control or uncritical application of technique should be adjusted to promote human intentionality, freedom, critical reflection, discernment, responsible exercise of conscience, and growth in wisdom and authenticity. Management theories should also facilitate attention to deeper issues that may underlie organizational problems, and promote self-transcendence and conversions.

b. The community

Moving from the individual to the collective, the second aspect of a management theory that should be examined is the communal dimension.

(i) Management methods that are based on unrealistic assumptions about unilateral control, or over-emphasis on isolated action by individual persons or organizations, should be adjusted to acknowledge the systemic nature of human organizations and society. Management theories should recognize that outcomes are often not the result of individual human or organizational actions, but of the aggregate actions of inter-dependent entities, and of related events whether anticipated and controllable or not. In addition, management theories that are focused on a particular aspect of management in an overly-narrow and isolated way should also be adjusted to have a broader, systemic, and integrated view. Management theories should respect the integrity of relationships in the whole created order.

(ii) Management theories that reinforce self-interest, narrow management goals, or instrumental treatment of people and organizations should be reoriented to promote the common good wherein all persons are able to attain:

- Physical well-being through the meeting of material needs such as food, health, shelter, safety, rest, recreation, proper working conditions, and a sustainable means of livelihood;
- A healthy family life, and meaningful relationships within organizations and in society, which are based on social equity, communion, solidarity, and collaboration;
- Cultural goods such as education, moral and intellectual formation, and development in cultural, artistic, and wisdom traditions;
- Freedom, relative autonomy, moral development, opportunities to use one's gifts, express oneself, and develop one's potential, opportunities to fulfil one's responsibility towards society especially in self-giving for others, and meaningful participation in social and organizational life, including participation in management;
- Religious freedom, a vibrant and authentic spiritual life, and openness to the divine.

c. Human activity

The third aspect of a management theory that must be examined is its approach towards human activity.

(i) Management theories should not adopt a deterministic, positivist, and mechanical approach which over-emphasizes measurement, prediction, and control. They should be based on a probabilistic and heuristic approach that promotes flexibility, adaptation, on-going learning, openness, dialogue, consideration of non-quantifiable factors, and acknowledgement of inevitable uncertainties. Management theories should also facilitate adaptation to the realities of specific persons, communities, and contexts.

(ii) The anthropological and temporal focus of management theories must be replaced by a view that acknowledges the religious and eschatological horizons. Management methods should promote openness to the divine, and humankind's unrestricted quest for wholeness, truth, goodness, meaning, and value. Unrealistic expectations of perfection and earthly success should be balanced by an acknowledgement of inevitable failure and suffering within the temporal

order. Management theories must facilitate the exploration of broader responses beyond the management discipline, especially through connections with other fields such as theology, spirituality, and philosophy.

5.2.1 Reorientation of performance management systems

Performance management systems have become a common feature of organizational life not only in business corporations but also in non-profit, government, and increasingly, faith-based organizations. Catholic pastoral management literature frequently recommends some form of system for performance management, whether for pastors, employees, lay ministers, or volunteers.[1] In general, performance management systems are aimed at ensuring that workers deliver output which accord with an organization's objectives and targets. The assumption underlying most performance management systems is summarily expressed in the popular adage that what gets measured gets done. It is based on the belief that people need to be guided by empirical targets and empirical valuations of their performance, overseen by an external authority. Such systems also assume that people are best motivated by the prospect of tangible rewards or negative repercussions that await good or bad performance respectively. For example, writing on the management of lay ministers, pastoral author Daniel Koys says that "a performance management system … can influence the motivation of lay ministers. Goal setting is a very effective motivational technique, so the system should include goals valued by the ministers."[2] He adds that "people are also motivated to avoid negative outcomes, so including a discipline process in the performance management system will help to motivate the lay ministers."[3] Consequently, formal surveillance systems, measureable targets, and explicit incentives and disincentives are key features of this tool. The components of performance management systems featured in both church and secular management literature are similar.[4] These components typically include the following:

a. Establishment of the performance criteria

[1] For example, see Koys, "Human Resource Guidelines for Developing a Performance Management System," 19-28; Dantuono, "Human Resources," 177-178; Jarema, *Survival Guide for Church Ministers*, 112-117; NLRCM, "Rationale for a Performance Development System for Ordained and Lay Ministers in the Catholic Church," accessed January 30, 2017, http://www.ChurchEpedia.org.

[2] Koys, "Human Resource Guidelines for Developing a Performance Management System," 20.

[3] Ibid.

[4] For an example of performance management systems typically prescribed in leading college management texts, see Daft, *Management*, 12th ed., 422-423.

A set of performance criteria is established, based on a person's roles and responsibilities, as well as the current goals and priorities of the organization. The focus tends to be on quantifiable targets and measurable indicators. For example, Koys recommends that "the ultimate performance criteria for lay ministers' jobs is helping parishioners know, love, and serve God in this world so as to be happy with God in the next. Since those ultimate results do not lend themselves to an earthly performance management system, we may be able to use results such as the number of parishioners served, the knowledge gained in religious education programs, or staying within the budget. Many lay ministers' jobs do not have results that can be validly measured, so the next most useful performance criteria are behaviors needed to produce results … The least useful performance criteria are related to personality characteristics because they are very hard to validly measure."[5]

b. Fixed and regular period of review

The period for achievement of the targets is usually fixed and regular, regardless of the performance criteria, the nature of a person's work, the situation of the organization, and the prevailing circumstances around it. Typically, target-setting and performance reviews are done annually.

c. Appraisal form

The evaluation of performance is often documented in the performance appraisal form, and much emphasis is placed on the empirical capture of such information. In the words of pastoral author William Jarema, "documenting the *physical evidence* is a *primary goal* of a useful job performance evaluation" (italics mine).[6] Besides the annual targets, such appraisal forms also tend to include a list of behavioral attributes considered to be desirable for workers to demonstrate, in line with the expectations of their job. Examples include punctuality, neatness, customer-friendliness, teamwork, and leadership. Performance management literature typically stress that the focus of these attributes should be on observable behaviors rather than on virtues or character, and a numerical scale is invariably used to evaluate the extent of such behavior demonstrated by the worker. The appraisal form is filled out by the worker's immediate supervisor, although in some cases, the worker is also asked to indicate his

[5] Koys, "Human Resource Guidelines for Developing a Performance Management System," 20.

[6] Jarema, *Survival Guide for Church Ministers*, 113.

or her own ratings as a way of self-appraisal. Some performance management systems include "360-degree feedback", whereby the worker is also evaluated by peers, subordinates, and other stakeholders.[7]

d. Formal meeting

A formal meeting is carried out between the supervisor and worker to discuss the latter's performance. The contents of the appraisal form, as filled out by both parties, usually constitute the main focus of the meeting. Most of the literature recommends a dialogical approach in such meetings.

e. Rewards and remedial action

The final result of the performance review determines what tangible reward or disciplinary action would be received by the worker. Though the literature is divided on whether salary should be tied to performance appraisals, most authors advocate some kind of tangible benefit or disincentive to affirm good performance or discourage poor performance respectively. Often, comparisons are made across the organization so that rewards depend on workers' relative performance to one another.

f. Target-setting and performance improvement plan

Finally, targets are set for the next period. Targets tend to be incremental in nature, requiring workers to achieve more for the organization over successive periods. Sometimes a performance improvement plan is drawn up, comprising actions to be taken so as to address the worker's weaknesses and gaps in performance, or to build competencies for new targets. These performance improvement actions may include training, coaching, counselling, or closer supervision.

Overall, it can be seen that performance management systems involve a high degree of external monitoring, standardization, formalization, quantification, and comparison. In light of the reorientation framework, many aspects of this management tool need to be redressed. Firstly, the reorientation framework calls attention to underlying assumptions about the human person in performance management systems. Such assumptions point to a reductionist view of people, whereby workers are assumed to be materialistic, self-interested, untrustworthy, and

[7] NLRCM, "Rationale for a Performance Development System for Ordained and Lay Ministers in the Catholic Church."

motivated mainly through external control. On the other hand, supervisors are assumed to be objective and unbiased in their management and assessment of workers, and able to possess an accurate and comprehensive view of workers' performance. The reorientation framework would require that these simplistic assumptions be replaced by a more nuanced view of the human person. Such a view would recognize the dynamic and multi-dimensional nature of the human being, who is motivated by a hierarchy of values, capable of self-transcendence, and vulnerable to biases and imperfect knowledge. Secondly, the reorientation framework exposes performance management systems to be tools for the manipulation and control of human persons. The emphasis in these systems on formal and externally-imposed surveillance, target-setting, and evaluation, is premised on the logic of control, and is demeaning to workers. Such systems should be reoriented to promote the dignity, freedom, responsibility, and growth in authenticity of every person. This is all the more urgent given the self-fulfilling nature of management tools, as highlighted in this thesis. In particular, performance management systems, with their immediate reward and punishment mechanisms, can lead to the entrenchment of self-seeking behaviors and short-term interests.

In terms of the community, the reorientation framework highlights the need to recognize that performance outcomes are often the result of events and inter-dependent interactions among various entities in the organization and its environment, which are beyond the worker's control. In particular, the attainment of goals often does not only depend on a single person's isolated effort but on the co-operation and concerted action of several parties. Hence in performance management systems, the emphasis on the individual needs to be replaced by a more communal and systemic view. The tool should also be used in tandem and alignment with other functions and objectives of management, such as the promotion of teamwork, the streamlining of work processes, and the ensuring of sustainable resources. Such alignment seems to be overlooked in the isolated manner in which most performance management systems are prescribed, whether in church or secular management literature. Another important point that emerges in light of the reorientation framework is that performance management systems are usually recommended without any normative guide for the content of performance goals. Such systems are seen as just a means to an end, whatever the goals of the organization might be. Consequently, the good of the worker, the environment, and the common good, are often surrendered to the immediate goals of the organization. All that is monitored is the worker's contribution to the organizational goals. There is usually no evaluation of the benefit to the worker, whose well-being can be compromised in striving to reach the performance targets especially if his or her livelihood is at stake. The reorientation framework would require that

performance management systems be aligned towards the common good wherein all persons, including workers, are able to attain progress in their physical, social, psychological, moral, and spiritual well-being. A reoriented system would facilitate the pursuit of what is meaningful, true, and good, as well as promote trust, collaboration, and solidarity in the organization and society. This applies not only to the targets and goals in the system but also to the processes involved in achieving them.

Finally, the reorientation framework highlights that performance management systems are based on a deterministic, mechanical, and empiricist approach to human activity. These systems amount to the uncritical application of standardized techniques to predict and achieve performance, with the associated over-emphasis on measurement. The result is often a shift in the organization's attention from its original objectives to pseudo-goals which are more empirical but less critical. For example, in the above remark by Koys on performance criteria, it seems that the original objective to "know, love, and serve God" is reduced to a mere matter of "the number of parishioners served, the knowledge gained in religious education programs, or staying within the budget."[8] Moreover, when it comes to assessing desired behaviors, the empirical emphasis in performance management systems becomes self-contradictory since it is impossible to quantify behaviors such as leadership and teamwork. The reorientation framework would require that this deterministic, technical, and empirical approach be replaced by a more probabilistic and tentative one which demonstrates flexibility, contextual sensitivity, acknowledgement of uncertainties, recognition of the qualitative nature of goals, and adaptation to specific circumstances and persons. The system should also consider the contributions of workers which are intangible in nature, and often more important. In particular, a worker's presence and interactions within the organization in his or her totality as a unique human person makes a difference in many unquantifiable ways, and often impacts the organization more profoundly than the tangible products of his or her formal performance targets. Hence, to reduce these manifold contributions and value of a person to a mere handful of quantitative indicators is reductionist, distorted, and demeaning.

The deterministic and technical approach in performance management systems is even more untenable in view of the religious and eschatological horizons. The reorientation framework highlights the divine presence working through human persons, as well as the problem of evil. This has several implications for any attempt to manage performance. First, it counters the over-emphasis on predictability and control inherent in performance management

[8] Koys, "Human Resource Guidelines for Developing a Performance Management System," 20.

systems. Fruitfulness in human work is ultimately dependent upon divine assistance. Moreover, as noted in Chapter 2 of this thesis, some critical observers within the management field have pointed out that people can and do outsmart the system, and manipulate it to their own advantage, such as by negotiating targets that are within easy reach, or by being pretentious about desired behaviors. Second, the reality of failure and imperfection in earthly life needs to be taken into account. It is unrealistic to expect workers to have a perfect score in the performance appraisal—let alone an appraisal system that has relentlessly incremental targets—and face repercussions if they fall short. A more realistic approach that espouses a longer-term view is needed. Third, the reorientation framework calls for performance improvement plans, which are by nature manipulative and extrinsic, to be balanced with the promotion of genuine intellectual, moral, and religious conversions. This includes the incorporation of spiritual and religious perspectives in the development of workers and managers, so as to improve human co-operation with the divine, and promote growth in human authenticity.

In summary, a reoriented tool would be one that recognizes the multiple dimensions of the human person, promotes the responsibility and authenticity of workers and all other persons, recognizes the communal and systemic nature of performance outcomes, and seeks the common good in the setting of goals as well as in the method employed. Moreover, instead of a purportedly fail-safe technique to control the actions of workers and ensure that they produce output in line with the organization's targets, the reoriented tool would be a heuristic process that promotes communal synergy towards worthy goals that are often qualitative in nature. It would also facilitate every person's contribution and fruitful development of talents, in a way that incorporates the religious dimension. Applying these principles, the reoriented tool could comprise the following components:

a. Communal dialogue to identify organizational goals for the immediate and long term in light of the organizational mission, which should in turn be guided by an understanding of the requirements of the common good in the particular context. Where there are diverse views, these should be occasions for deeper reflection and discernment on what is truly good, meaningful, and worthwhile, thus gradually building up the communal wisdom. The dialogue should allow for participation by people at all levels of the organization. In the context of church management, such a communal dialogue to establish specific organizational goals would be an important means of facilitating the co-responsibility of all for the mission of the Church.

b. Goals should not be just a set of quantitative targets, though there may be occasions to include some measurable indicators, as long as these are treated as merely indicative of a broader goal. It should be acknowledged that such broader goals are often qualitative in nature, such as improved well-being of people in society, a sense of solidarity in the community, and advancement in the spiritual life. Evaluation of progress towards such goals entails discernment and critical reflection.

c. Thereafter, the role and contribution of each person towards the goals can be agreed upon, in line with his or her formal responsibilities, talents, and potential.

d. The time for review of progress should depend on the nature of the goals, and the internal and external contexts of the organization, such as whether unexpected events have taken place.

e. The review should be in the form of a communal dialogue that evaluates progress towards the goals, the impact of changing contexts, and the need for adjustments, if any. It should also examine the collaboration among co-workers, and the effectiveness of current organizational systems and structures in facilitating such collaboration, and in enabling the attainment of the agreed goals. Such examination should identify areas for improvement while acknowledging the limitations of evaluation, and being realistic about failures and imperfections. The main focus of the review should be the overall synergy and collaboration in the organization, rather than the performance of individual persons.

f. Feedback and support to individual workers can be given spontaneously in the course of work, with the aim of helping them contribute meaningfully to the common goals, and develop themselves to their best potential. Such spontaneous occasions within the everyday context of work would be more conducive for frank communication between workers and managers. In contrast, the formal and evaluative setting of an appraisal meeting is less likely to promote honest dialogue. Moreover, spontaneous feedback given throughout the course of work would be more responsive to the situation, performance, and needs of a worker at specific points in time, thus recognizing the dynamic nature of human persons, and the changing nature of their personal circumstances.

g. Tangible rewards should not be a major feature of the system as this tends to inhibit genuine moral conversion and growth in human authenticity, responsibility, objectivity, and freedom. Moreover, in the Church setting, tangible rewards run counter to the principle of co-responsibility for mission. Instead, organizations should support and provide what is needed by each worker for his or her own good, paying attention to all dimensions of the human good so that the contribution of all persons can continue fruitfully and sustainably.

h. At appropriate times, the members of the organization could undertake further discernment to identify new or revised goals, so that the organization continuously strives towards the greater good, amidst changing contexts.

These features of the reoriented tool are not far-fetched in practice, and resonate in many ways with alternative systems advocated by contemporary scholars for practitioners. For instance, in the church setting, Michael Jacobs recommends a dialogical and qualitative approach to evaluation that also pays attention to the holistic personal needs of the minister or pastoral worker, rather than a controlling approach that merely tracks quantitative indicators such as church growth, and scrutinizes the minister's performance. In addition, he points out the need to take a systemic view, and thus identify areas of improvement needed in the local church or community as a whole, rather than just focusing on the strengths or faults of the person being appraised.[9] Similarly, Doohan advocates spontaneous conversational feedback with the minister rather than formal evaluation. Whilst the latter tends to be more judgmental, critical, and cause workers to feel threatened, the former is more dialogical, descriptive, and conducive for real change.[10]

Besides its applicability in church management, the reoriented tool also resonates with alternatives proposed by internal critics of the management field. For instance, Axson suggests that instead of setting and evaluating fixed performance goals, organizations need to take into account changing circumstances in the wider environment, and review and adjust the goals accordingly. He points out that in view of the unpredictability of the business environment, it is often unrealistic to set performance targets one year ahead. Instead, greater flexibility and on-going adaptation are needed.[11] This resonates with the probabilistic and heuristic approach

[9] Michael Jacobs, *Holding In Trust: The Appraisal of Ministry* (London: SPCK, 1989), 133-148.

[10] Doohan, *The Minister of God*, 53.

[11] Axson, *Management Mythbuster*, 174-177.

of the reoriented tool proposed above. Highlighting another important perspective, Bruno Dyck and Mitchell Neubert emphasize that evaluation systems should focus on team rather than individual performance, in view of the communal nature of human work. They also advise that the overall aim of appraisals should be towards training and development of the worker, rather than towards rewards. In addition, organizations should pay attention to the hierarchy of what is valued by workers, and not just to material motivators.[12] Affirming these views, David Rock and Beth Jones note that more companies are moving away from quantitative performance rating systems, and replacing them with qualitative and spontaneous conversations, which are seen to be more effective in guiding workers' efforts. Rock and Jones also highlight that companies are increasingly cognizant of the communal nature of work, and of the fact that it is often not possible for actual results to be traced back or attributed definitively to specific persons and their actions. Moreover, making comparisons of individual performance ratings among co-workers thwarts collaboration. Standardized review times such as the regular 12-month appraisal period are also incongruent with the reality and variety of organizational goals. Resonating with the principles of the reorientation framework, Rock and Jones conclude that "it should be no surprise that treating an employee like a human being and not a number is a better approach."[13] Finally, Pattison has also examined the nature of performance management systems and highlighted several criticisms, many of which corroborate with the points raised in the above assessment of such systems in light of the reorientation framework.[14] Hence, it can be seen that a more effective, reliable, and ethical way of facilitating and directing human work in church and other organizations can be arrived at by applying the reorientation framework to current performance management systems.

5.2.2 Reorientation of marketing and customer service strategies

[12] Bruno Dyck and Mitchell Neubert, *Management: Current Practices and New Directions* (Boston: Cengage Publishing Company, 2010), 378.

[13] David Rock and Beth Jones, "Why More and More Companies Are Ditching Performance Ratings," *Harvard Business Review*, September 8, 2015, accessed November 24, 2016, https://hbr.org/2015/09/why-more-and-more-companies-are-ditching-performance-ratings. See also Boris Ewenstein, Bryan Hancock and Asmus Komm, "Ahead of the Curve: The Future of Performance Management," *McKinsey Quarterly*, May 2016, accessed November 24, 2016, http://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/ahead-of-the-curve-the-future-of-performance-management.

[14] See Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 107-113.

Just like performance management systems, the marketing and customer service paradigm from the business sector, and its associated strategies, are widely adopted by government, non-profit, and religious organizations. As Chapter 1 has shown, these strategies are frequently advocated by authors of Catholic pastoral management literature. The marketing and customer service paradigm is based on the belief that if an organization desires a certain action from people, be it patronage of its product, service, or program, or even adoption of a new habit or behavior, it can elicit this action by satisfying certain needs and wants of the people, in return for the desired action. As an example, church management author Larry Boone advocates that pastors should regard parishioners as customers. Pointing out that in contemporary culture, customers have come to expect service quality and to be treated well, Boone advises that pastors should meet or even surpass these expectations in order to secure people's on-going attendance at the parish.[15] In the marketing and customer service paradigm, the identity of an organization is predominantly that of a producer and seller of goods and services, and the persons or groups with which it interacts are seen as buyers and customers. Consequently, relationships are viewed as essentially transactional and utilitarian in nature. Moreover, a central tenet in this paradigm is that of customer sovereignty, commonly expressed in the adage that the customer is king, and that organizations should always put the customers first. Thus, the preference of customers is taken as the reference point for all that should be done by an organization. This is underpinned by an inherent supposition that an organization's very existence depends solely on the patronage of customers, and that, more fundamentally, the organization's growth—usually by some tangible measure—or at least its continued existence, is a desirable end in itself.

The main elements of marketing and customer service tools are similar among church and mainstream management literature.[16] These elements include the following:

a. Knowing what the customer wants

   This entails finding out the profile, preferences, and needs of the people from whom the organization wishes to elicit the desired patronage or behavior. The means of obtaining such information range from personal observation, informal conversation,

[15] Boone, "Parish and Service Quality," 107.

[16] Examples of church management literature promoting the marketing approach, as mentioned in Chapter 1, include Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality," 105-125; Foster, *Church Marketing Manual for the Digital Age*; Clements, *Stewardship: A Parish Handbook*; White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*; and Forster and Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish.* As pointed out in Chapters 1 and 2, a leading secular management work that advocates the marketing and customer service approach is Peters and Waterman, *In Search of Excellence.*

formal surveys and interviews, to extensive market research involving large quantities of data. With regard to the latter, recent advances in information technology have led to a renewed emphasis on the quantitative aspect of market research. The specialized field of data analytics, with its sophisticated methods of collecting, mining, and analyzing large pools of data, has become a major sub-discipline in management science. Echoing this tendency, pastoral authors Forster and Sweetser advocate that in a parish, "the leadership must discover what people want and then respond to their wishes".[17] The authors suggest that parishes adopt the "motto" that "the parishioner is always right" and recommend "a monitoring process that kept in touch with the parishioners' level of satisfaction at Mass, during meetings, or at formation classes" through expansion of information collection on "what people really want and need."[18]

b. Adopting customer perspectives

A further level of detail is often required in terms of finding out how customers perceive and define their preferences. In the words of Boone, "customer satisfaction is achieved by providing customers with quality, convenience and service as *customers define those terms*" (italics in original).[19] For instance, it is not enough for an organization to merely know that its customers prefer convenience. Just as important is how those customers define convenience from their own perspective, and exactly what types of experiences are perceived as convenient. Some people may associate convenience with physical accessibility whilst others may associate it with minimization of waiting times. This calls for market research to have a considerable level of detail.

c. Meeting or exceeding customer preferences

Having gathered all the required information, the organization then needs to take measures to deliver on what customers desire. For example, Boone highlights that if a parish wishes to attract the type of persons who value "psychological comfort", defined as feeling that their time has been efficiently spent, then the parish should provide them with masses that are "time-conscious".[20] The assumption is that when

[17] Forster and Sweetser, *Transforming the Parish*, 54.

[18] Ibid., 54-55.

[19] Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality." 108.

[20] Ibid., 120.

such persons perceive that their desire for psychological comfort has been satisfied, they would more likely come back for future masses at the same parish. In addition, marketing and customer service theories often advocate that organizations should strive for not just customer satisfaction but even "customer delight" by going the extra mile to exceed customer expectations.[21] The notion of "excellent customer service" thus becomes an ideal that organizations should strive for.[22]

d. Segmentation

A core feature of marketing is the division of existing or potential consumers into segments according to certain classifications or parameters that would enable the organization to tailor particular strategies for each group. Typical parameters include demographical profile, specific consumer needs, consumer behaviors, and levels of consumption. Customized products, services, or programs, and other targeted actions would be undertaken to better attract the patronage of each group. As seen in Chapter 1, pastoral authors White and Corcoran have segmented the population around a parish as either "church people" or "lost people", and have formulated parish outreach strategies accordingly.[23] Moreover, segmentation is often accompanied by decisions about which segments are deemed more important and thus deserving of closer attention.

e. Flexibility

Being flexible to the needs and wants of customers is greatly emphasized in marketing and customer service tools. This often entails making exceptions to organizational policies or even bending over backwards to meet a customer's desires, especially for customers in highly-coveted segments.

f. Customer-orientation of workers

All this implies a strong customer-orientation in the attitudes and actions of workers. Organizations are exhorted to ensure this by recruiting the appropriate type of people, putting workers through the required training, tailoring rewards and disincentives accordingly, and cultivating a service-orientated organizational culture.

[21] Ibid., 110.

[22] Ibid., 107.

[23] White and Corcoran, *Rebuilt*, 51 and 67.

g. Empirical emphasis

Finally, marketing and customer service tools tend to have a strong emphasis on empirical factors. Market research often focuses on quantitative data, and growth targets are usually in the form of measurable indicators. There is also a tendency to focus on the material and sensory aspects of consumer preferences. For example, Boone highlights that "for many in our contemporary context, caring equals convenience."[24] The issue of branding is also central in marketing and customer service strategies. Discussions about branding tend to place more emphasis on the external aspects of an organization's image, such as its logo and other sensory dimensions. For example, church marketing author Bryan Forster highlights that "branding is often a person's first contact with the church. It is usually a visual image seen. It may also be a verbal input."[25]

In assessing the marketing and customer service strategy against the reorientation framework, many problems become evident. Firstly, it can be seen that this strategy reinforces a reductionist and debasing view of the human person. People are regarded primarily as consumers who expect their unlimited wants to be satisfied, and who are driven mainly by primal needs and self-interest. Their actions and responses are conditional upon these interests being met. For example, Boone declares that "showing up requires proactive behavior on the part of the parishioner and is most often a direct response to feeling welcome, respected, and cared for."[26] In contrast, the reorientation framework highlights a more holistic view of the human person, who is motivated by a hierarchy of values, and possesses a capacity for knowing and doing what is truly good. Human persons can and do undergo moral conversion, and are capable of choosing values over satisfactions when these are in conflict. In the ecclesial context for instance, parishioners might participate actively in the parish because of their own convictions, sometimes despite not being treated well. The reorientation framework in fact emphasizes the importance of promoting human responsibility as well as active and meaningful participation in service of the community. In contrast, marketing and customer service tools reinforce an attitude of passivity, self-interest, and the desire to receive rather than to give. They also suppress the responsibility and authenticity of leaders by encouraging blind adherence to

[24] Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality," 116.

[25] Foster, *Church Marketing Manual*, 125.

[26] Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality," 107.

what customers want, rather than the discernment of what is right. Moreover, these tools are manipulative in nature because they exploit people's desires and fears in order to secure their patronage of the organization's products, programs, and services. In the process, genuine human freedom and authenticity are diminished. The dignity and well-being of workers are also subordinated to the goal of meeting or surpassing customer expectations.

With regard to the community, the reorientation framework exposes the tendency of marketing and customer service strategies to promote a competitive rather than collaborative stance. Organizations, including churches, are assumed to be competing with each other to win over 'customers'. Theologian Kenneson rightly observes that this paradigm urges churches to do whatever attracts more members lest people "take our business elsewhere"; hence, it destroys the view of the Church as one united family in God.[27] Moreover, in this paradigm, society is carved up into segments which are then compared against one another. Each segment is valued and treated differently, thus reinforcing social inequalities. All these stand in contrast to the reorientation framework, which promotes the values of solidarity, equality, co-responsibility, and mutual collaboration towards the common good. In fact, a fundamental problem of marketing and customer service tools is their absolutization of customer preferences and perspectives. As Boone puts it, "customer satisfaction is achieved by providing customers with quality, convenience and service as *customers define those terms*. Customer *perception* is key. What leaders of an organization believe customers *should* desire is inconsequential" (italics in original).[28] This once again points to the problem of the lack of teleology in mainstream management science, and the importing of this problem into church management when the prevailing theories from the management field are adopted uncritically. As highlighted earlier, without the solid foundation of a normative account of terminal values, management science can end up prescribing tools which work against the human good. What customers desire may not be in line with their own good nor the good of the community. In the for-profit business sector, there is no shortage of examples of products and services which are detrimental to human persons and the environment but which continue to be produced in response to market demand. Similarly, in the Church, Boone says that "the American consumer has grown accustomed to being appreciated," adding that rising expectations about service quality are based on extensive "research on human behaviour."[29] Hence, "because of this service quality culture and the importance of mission, Church leaders can and should apply the concept of service quality to

[27] Kenneson, "Selling (out) the Church in the Marketplace of Desire," 341.

[28] Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality," 108.

[29] Ibid., 114.

their operations."[30] If this advice on responding mainly to demands for service quality is followed, churches would end up with members who expect to be served rather than to serve, thus contradicting a core message of the Christian Gospel.

Boone's remarks about research also highlight how the lack of teleology in mainstream management leads to the non-differentiation between intelligible and unintelligible research data. A rise in expectations for excellent customer service does not necessarily auger well for humanity's growth in responsibility and self-transcendence. This is because the expectation to be served well as a customer often stems more from the self-seeking pursuit of satisfactions rather than values, and is thus contrary to moral conversion. However, without a normative account of terminal values, such research data are not differentiated as unintelligible, but are instead taken into account in policies, structures, and systems, thus normalizing the "social surd", to borrow a term from Lonergan.[31] Ironically, Boone's reference to the importance of mission appears as an after-thought, secondary to the service quality culture. Moreover, as a result of absolutizing people's expectations about service quality, Boone prescribes further recommendations about making a "customer" feel that those in the organization "go out of their way to serve me well" and ensuring that people enjoy a "pleasant" experience in the parish, which should extend to what they hear in the homilies.[32] In summary, marketing and customer service tools prioritize consumer preferences to the detriment of genuine human flourishing, the common good, the well-being of workers, and the sustainability of the earth's resources. Ultimately, the underlying goal is the growth of the organization itself, measured in quantitative terms, and achieved by winning over customers. In contrast, the reorientation framework would require that a normative view of human finality, which includes a healthy balance of the individual and social good, take priority over customer preferences.

Finally, the tendency to present marketing and customer service techniques as a guaranteed way to secure desired responses from target groups is illustrative of the deterministic approach of mainstream management, and its over-optimism about predictability and control. The focus on measurement and on external factors also demonstrates an empiricist stance. In contrast, the reorientation framework calls for a more probabilistic approach that acknowledges the ambiguities of human behavior, and recognizes the importance of intangible factors. Moreover, contrary to the ideals of customer delight and excellent customer service in the

[30] Ibid., 107.

[31] Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), 230. Lonergan uses this term to describe actions and behaviors of people at the societal level, that would be regarded as unreasonable and irrational when viewed through the lens of a normative vision of the human good.

[32] Boone, "The Parish and Service Quality," 107, 117-118.

marketing paradigm, the reorientation framework points out the inevitability of suffering, imperfections, and unmet needs in earthly life. In the Church context, the Christian Gospel even promises not material comfort but the cross. In addition, the reorientation framework highlights the boundaries of management as a whole, including the limitations of marketing and customer service tools. The reasons for the absence of a desired behavior, whether it is coming to church or consuming a healthy product, often go deeper than mere lack of adequate marketing and customer service. They ultimately touch on issues of religious faith, human sin, and the problem of evil. At the heart of it lie intellectual, moral, and religious conversions. Marketing and customer service tools need to recognize the boundaries of their role, and open the way towards genuine conversions, instead of offering superficial solutions which mask the real issues and postpones their genuine resolution.

In the light of all these points, a reoriented approach would replace the buyer-seller paradigm of marketing and customer service tools with a view that all persons and organizations in society are co-responsible collaborators towards the common good. Rather than market research, there would be respectful dialogue to understand the objectives, needs, and potential contributions of each party. More importantly, organizations and their stakeholders should engage in communal reflection regarding terminal values, and how these would be concretely manifested in their particular contexts, especially when preferences of different parties are in conflict. The reoriented approach would thus have the following elements:

a. There should be dialogue and discernment among all stakeholders of an organization on what products, services, programs, and actions would be in line with the common good in their particular context. For example, representatives of a community around a parish, together with the pastoral leaders, can dialogue about the programs that the parish should embark on for the greater good of the community, in line with the Church's goals.

b. Opportunities should be made for all stakeholders to participate freely, meaningfully, and collaboratively in achieving these goals, according to their talents and abilities, rather than just passively expecting and receiving customer service from the organization. This emphasis on participation resonates with the principle of co-responsibility for the Church's mission.

c. There should be on-going evaluation to monitor the benefit of the product, service, or program, and its impact on workers, the wider community, and the environment. For

this purpose, various feedback channels can be explored, taking into consideration both quantitative and qualitative factors. The probabilistic and tentative nature of such evaluation should also be borne in mind.

d. Finally, fine-tuning of the product, service, or program through joint efforts of all stakeholders can be carried out, with realistic expectations of its effectiveness. Where necessary, other means to address perceived gaps and failures should be explored, especially if such problems point to deeper issues beyond management.

This reoriented approach would cultivate a more cohesive and collaborative community, whose members are co-responsible for the common good, and work towards it in a realistic way. It would also build up the communal wisdom about values and what makes for the human good. In contrast, the current mainstream management approach reinforces a self-interested consumer mentality, constant dissatisfaction, social rivalry, and perverted values. It can be seen that alternative approaches proposed from both faith-based and secular perspectives resonate with the reoriented approach outlined above. For example, in highlighting the erroneous view that the Church is a service agency which exists to satisfy people's felt needs, Kenneson stresses that the Church should in fact challenge people to re-examine their preferences if these do not resonate with the values of the faith.[33] Such a view aligns with the reorientation framework's emphasis on terminal values rather than the absolutization of customer preferences.

Likewise, drawing upon Catholic social teaching, Alford and Naughton point out the importance of examining whether a product desired by consumers truly serves the human good. They stress that consumers should not demand things that are detrimental, immoral, or compromise the well-being of workers. At the same time, producers should not prey on human fears and weaknesses to peddle their products for profit. Both producers and consumers must exercise moral responsibility through the pursuit of truth and the common good. To this end, the authors add that communities with a strong sense of common values would find it easier to arrive at a consensus on what products and services are desirable.[34] This resonates with the dynamics of Lonergan's scale of values, which highlights the important role of cultural values in helping a society negotiate potential conflicts in the shaping of its socio-economic structures. Alford and Naughton also point out the need to build meaningful relationships through respectful dialogue between a firm and its customers right at the beginning of the product

[33] Kenneson, "Selling (out) the Church in the Marketplace of Desire," 337.

[34] Alford and Naughton, *Managing as if Faith Mattered,* 195.

development process so that "the firm and its customers are co-operators in the pursuit of common goods," thus cultivating greater solidarity in society.[35] Drawing also upon Catholic social teaching, Dyck proposes an alternative marketing approach to mainstream management whereby the production process promotes participation, builds meaningful relationships in the community, seeks the human good, and minimizes detrimental effects in the created order.[36] All these views align with the alternative approach proposed above through the reorientation framework.

From the secular perspective, Mark Bonchek advocates a shift in mindset from treating people as consumers to engaging them as "co-creators" towards a "shared purpose" in society.[37] This view resonates strongly with the above faith-based approaches as well as with the reoriented system described above. Finally, with regard to the issue of service quality, Pattison advises that the idealistic pursuit of excellence should be replaced by a more realistic striving towards the "good enough".[38] This would not only take account of the limitations and imperfections of earthly life but also promote maturity, discernment, and mutual responsibility. In summary, the reorientation framework has facilitated the replacement of the marketing and customer service approach of mainstream management science with an alternative process that better serves the common good in a realistic, participative, and sustainable way.

5.2.3 Summary

The above discussion has demonstrated the application of the reorientation framework to existing management tools. It can be seen that the six principles in the framework help to bring out more clearly, aspects of a management tool that contravene what is real, true, and good, and thus need to be reoriented. These principles also provide guidelines for the constitutive elements of a reoriented approach. Hence, an alternative management tool could be counter-proposed in each case. The above discussion has also pointed out that these alternatives are not impractical or unrealistic, as they resonate with the approaches advocated for management practitioners by critical voices within the secular management field as well as in church management. Hence,

[35] Ibid., 203.

[36] Dyck, "A Proven Way to Incorporate Catholic Social Thought in Business School Curricula," 159-161.

[37] Mark Bonchek, "Why the Problem with Learning Is Unlearning," *Harvard Business Review*, November 3, 2016, accessed November 24, 2016, https://hbr.org/2016/11/why-the-problem-with-learning-is-unlearning.

[38] Pattison, *Faith of Managers*, 82.

proceeding through the six principles of the reorientation framework via the steps illustrated above, the framework can be applied to any number of management tools, and facilitate their transformation into viable alternatives which better promote human flourishing and effective management.

5.3 Application of the reorientation framework to the topical structure of church management materials

In Chapter 1, it was pointed out that management science has been developed mainly within the context of the business sector. Consequently, its constitutive topics reflect the nature and purpose of for-profit business corporations. However, this same range of topics has been mirrored in Catholic pastoral management literature and training programs as a result of an uncritical adoption of management science, leading to conflicts with the nature and mission of the Church. It was highlighted that if this range of topics is left unchecked, it can distort our understanding and practice of ecclesiology in the long run. Hence, it is important to establish a more appropriate list of topics that would guide pastoral workers in church management. In this section, the reorientation framework will be applied to the topical structure of current Catholic pastoral management materials, and a reoriented list of topics will be proposed. It will be shown that the reoriented list is more consistent with the nature and mission of the Church, and can serve as a guide for the development of future pastoral literature and training on church management.

5.3.1 Topics in current Catholic pastoral management materials

Presently, Catholic pastoral management literature and training programs, as exemplified in the publications and training courses highlighted in Chapter 1, commonly focus on the following topics:

a. Planning and evaluation

   In this topic, pastoral authors typically highlight the importance of having a medium - term plan such as a parish pastoral plan, and prescribe a process for coming up with such a plan. Tools from the strategic planning specialization in management science, such as the analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT), are often advocated. The final result is a comprehensive plan that includes a mission statement, several objectives for a stipulated period, a list of goals and targets to achieve, and a detailed action plan. The sub-topic of evaluation is discussed either in

relation to planning or as a separate subject. Pastoral authors usually emphasize the importance of obtaining objective assessments of the church organization, and prescribe ways of making such evaluations. As observed in Chapter 1, the range of criteria used for evaluation tends to be arbitrary, and often reflects the business sector's emphasis on measurable growth, customer satisfaction, corporate governance, and internal controls.

b. Financial and resource management

This topic deals with the establishment and maintenance of a financial system in a church organization, along with the imparting of basic financial literacy skills. It usually stresses the importance of internal controls and risk management, and prescribes processes and systems that church organizations should put in place to safeguard their assets, reputation, and legal liability. The maintenance of other resources such as physical property is also dealt with.

c. Fund-raising and stewardship

Strategies and tools for fund-raising and encouraging financial stewardship, especially among parishioners, is a major topic in Catholic pastoral management materials. Pastoral authors typically provide advice on cultivating a spirit of stewardship among members of the organization, ensuring a steady stream of income through planned-giving programs, raising capital for building projects, and organizing ad-hoc fund-raising events.

d. Human resources

This topic often mirrors closely, both in content and structure, its equivalent subject in secular management science. It deals with the recruitment, employment, supervision, motivation, and compensation of personnel in church organizations. Common tools in secular management, such as job descriptions, performance appraisals, and grievance processes are usually advocated. The topic of volunteer management is sometimes included.

e. Marketing, service quality, and program development

This topic focuses on the growth of the organization in terms of expanding its outreach and developing its programs. Theories and tools from the sub-discipline of marketing in secular management are often advocated in a wholesale way. A related area of focus is that of customer service and quality assurance. As highlighted above, church organizations are encouraged to view their target groups as customers, and develop programs and services according to the preferences of these target groups.

f. General administration

This broad area covers topics such as meetings, decision-making, communication, information management, organizational structures, and legal issues. Pastoral authors offer a variety of advice for putting in place appropriate policies and systems in these aspects of management. Specific methods and tools are also prescribed for the various tasks associated with these functions, such as how to run effective meetings, improve communication, keep proper records, and establish appropriate organizational departments.

g. Leadership

This topic is often regarded as the 'soft' side of management. Its content tends to reflect current leadership trends in the secular management field, as well as the personal experience of pastoral authors. The main focus is on the leader of the church organization, and the target audience of materials on this topic is usually the parish priest. Whilst some of the materials deal with leadership attributes and values, others focus on working relationships, team-building, delegation, managing change, and having a long-term vision. There is also pastoral literature that focus on self-care and time-management. As pointed out in Chapter 1, there is great diversity of opinion on the definition of leadership, and on what constitutes good leadership. This mirrors the current fragmentation in the secular management field.

5.3.2 Evaluating the current list of topics with the reorientation framework

In light of the reorientation framework, several problems with the above topical structure become evident. Firstly, the human person seems marginalized in the whole system. Reflecting the tendency of mainstream management science, the focus of the current pastoral materials seems to be on the growth and maintenance of the church organization. Where attention is given to human persons, this tends to be accompanied by reductionist views of people as either human

resources, financial stewards, or customers. Consequently, the pastoral advice demonstrates instrumental treatment of human persons, especially in the form of manipulative methods of motivation and control. At the same time, there is an unrealistic assumption of the pastoral manager as omnipotent leader, on whose individual shoulders rest the vision and governance of the church organization. Moreover, the emphasis on the mere following of technical management solutions suppresses human responsibility, intentionality, and discernment. The reorientation framework would require that the pastoral management materials pay more attention to the human person, and promote the dignity of all persons. It should adopt a holistic view of people, and emphasize growth in personal authenticity as a key topic for all personnel, whether managers, workers, or members of the community.

In terms of the communal dimension, the reorientation framework reveals that the current topical structure is too narrowly-focused on the church organization and its own actions and interests. In fact, the emphasis is often on the influence and prerogative of the individual pastoral manager. Such a stance is blind-sighted to the influences of the wider environment, the needs and concerns of other entities, the web of relationships in which the church organization exists, and the limitations of control by the organization or manager. Moreover, each topic tends to be approached in isolation, without much integration among them or recognition of the systemic links between various aspects of church management. Consequently, the pastoral advice given in the different topics sometimes contradict each other. One example that has been pointed out earlier is that recommendations on exceeding customer service expectations often conflict with recommendations on work-life balance for employees. Most significantly, a normative view of terminal values does not seem to permeate through all the topics. There is often a lack of in-depth discussion on the common goal of all church organizations based on the mission of the Church. Consequently, all the topics tend to be directed towards a *de facto* objective of the growth and maintenance of the church organization itself, relativizing the rest of the communal order towards this end. The reorientation framework would require that the topics in church management be approached in a more systemic and integrated way, and that a normative hierarchy of values based on the Church's view of human finality be expounded upon and used to direct the means and ends of each aspect of church management.

In terms of the approach to human work, it can be seen that the current topical structure of the Catholic pastoral management materials is based on a mechanical and deterministic view of human activity. Each topic is about exercising control over an aspect of the church organization, be it the programs, processes, structures, resources, people, or even its future. The emphasis on technique is also accompanied by a preference for the empirical and quantifiable,

especially when it comes to evaluation. The reorientation framework would require that the topics and their content demonstrate a more probabilistic and heuristic approach to church management, acknowledging the limitations of control, and taking greater account of the qualitative aspects of church management. This is especially pertinent given that the concerns of church organizations are often non-quantifiable in nature, such as spirituality, values, and relationships. Finally, the current topical structure shows an anthropocentric and temporal emphasis, especially in its focus on planning, evaluation, marketing, and leadership. There is inadequate regard for the religious and eschatological horizons. On one hand, this is surprising given that the pastoral materials are targeted for the ecclesial context. On the other hand, the anthropocentric and temporal emphasis is not to be unexpected, since the culture and tenets of mainstream management science are often applied uncritically. The reorientation framework would require that church management methods take greater account of the divine presence working among people, the reality of grace and sin, the limitations of earthly success, and the hope that is to be ultimately placed in the fulfilment of all human work in the eschatological realm.

5.3.3 A reoriented list of topics for church management

Based on the reorientation framework, a revised list of topics in church management would be as follows:

a. Personal authenticity

   A key starting point for church management is the intellectual, moral, and religious conversions of the pastoral manager and all other persons in the church organization. This topic would describe these conversions, highlight their alignment with the Catholic faith tradition, and explain their importance for church management. It would suggest ways to cultivate the habit of being attentive, intelligent, reasonable, responsible, and open to loving encounter with God. The importance of promoting growth in human authenticity, whether on the part of the manager, workers, or other members of the church organization would be emphasized. Some ways to facilitate growth in the interior and spiritual life, and in the unrestricted human quest for goodness, truth, and value would be proposed. The topic of leadership would be dealt with here, but the present focus on attributes, personal effectiveness, and self-care of the leader as seen in the current pastoral materials would be reoriented to emphasize

the more fundamental issue of growth in human authenticity and responsibility among all persons.

b. Mission

This topic would focus on the mission of the Church, particularly in terms of its vision of human finality, with a normative hierarchy of values. The topic would encourage exploration of this vision, and how it might be manifested in the specific context of particular church organizations. It would then facilitate reflection on how the specific mission of a church organization could be translated into concrete objectives, programs, and services. Methods for planning can be included but with emphasis on the probabilistic and heuristic nature of planning, the need for meaningful participation of all persons involved with the church organization, the inappropriateness of focusing only on measurable targets, and the avoidance of unrealistic expectations of earthly progress. These same principles would apply to the task of evaluation. In addition, this topic would highlight the need for on-going discernment of the signs of the times, and developing the church organization's direction and programs accordingly.

c. Communion

The communal dimension of pastoral work is an important aspect of church management. This topic would elaborate on the principle of co-responsibility for mission, and the importance of meaningful participation. Skills for dialogue, communication, collaboration, and community building would be emphasized. In addition, this topic would point out the sacramental role of church organizations in manifesting the communal vocation of humankind. It would highlight the importance of promoting a complementary diversity of charisms, the spirit of equity, charity, love, and solidarity in working relationships. Instead of human resource policies and practices, this topic would suggest ways to support workers' and community members' growth in intellectual, moral, and religious conversions, and enhance the well-being of each person in terms of the hierarchical scale of values. Attention would also be drawn to the need for church organizations to adopt a wider view beyond themselves, and work collaboratively with others in society towards the common good.

d. Order and institutions

This topic would highlight the need for proper order so that people can collaborate fruitfully towards the church organization's mission. It would offer ways to design appropriate structures and systems to facilitate such collaboration, including the establishment of policies and procedures to institutionalize appropriate recurrent activities in the church organization's programs and administration. At the same time, this topic would emphasize the need to be flexible, adaptive, and ensure that systems and structures are in accord with the hierarchical scale of values. In particular, structures for decision-making, communication, resource allocation, and job design should promote participation, communion, personal development, and growth in responsibility, authenticity, and spirituality.

e. Resources

This topic would deal with the cultivation of resources towards the church organization's mission. Such resources include physical and financial resources, as well as other non-material resources like information. The need to respect the intrinsic dignity and order of the created world would be emphasized. Rather than focusing narrowly on the church organization's own prerogatives, this topic would highlight the universal destination of goods, and the inter-generational dimension of the common good. Its approach to resources would be to transform them towards greater flourishing of the created order for the benefit of all. Instead of fund-raising, this topic would propose ways to cultivate co-responsibility in mission.

5.3.4 Evaluation of the reoriented list of topics

Compared with the current topical structure of Catholic pastoral management materials, the reoriented list of topics is more integrated and coherent in terms of its normative view of human finality and the Church's goal. It also begins with the human person, and the promotion of interiority and authenticity as the starting point for management. It reinforces a positive movement towards broader horizons, by calling attention to the qualitative, communal, systemic, religious, and eschatological dimensions of human work. Overall, it can be seen that the approach to church management in this reoriented topical structure aligns with the Church's values, ecclesiology, and worldview, unlike much of the current pastoral materials where

management science tools are applied uncritically. This underscores the importance of the reorientation framework.

Beyond church management, the reoriented list of topics described above is equally suited for management in all types of organizations. Chapter 4 has established that the management of any organization must be founded upon intellectual, moral, and religious conversions. Such management would necessarily attend to personal authenticity, alignment with a normative view of human finality, communion and collaboration, a heuristic ordering of human activity through appropriate systems and structures, and flourishing of the created order. Notably, a comparison of this reoriented list of topics with the work of scholars in the management field who have argued for a more holistic approach to management education reveals several similarities. For instance, Mintzberg presents an alternative management curriculum which begins with personal reflection and the cultivation of human interiority, including spirituality. The curriculum also emphasizes communal collaboration rather than manipulation and control, practical wisdom rather than blind application of technique, and attention to culture and values rather than financial and empirical goals.[39] Similarly, Stewart argues for management training to be modelled upon a liberal arts education where, instead of just focusing on technical management tools, students are exposed to a wide range of humanities subjects. This would help deepen their view of life, develop their moral character, and enable them to approach management more ethically and critically, with greater awareness of the underlying cultural, ideological, and philosophical influences in many management techniques.[40] These points resonate with the emphasis on personal authenticity, terminal values, and a critical realist approach in the reoriented topical structure proposed above. In addition, the attention to personal authenticity in the revised topical structure echoes the sub-topic of virtues, which is commonly included in standard texts and courses on management ethics.[41] Although this sub-topic tends to receive only marginal attention, the 2008 gathering of leading figures in the management field to identify future directions for the field, as mentioned in Chapter 2, has advocated that an emphasis on human virtues, such as "honor, truth, love, justice, and beauty," should "no longer be relegated to the fringes of management."[42] Other scholars such as Scott Kelley and Ron Nahser point out that global management conventions like the United Nations

[39] Mintzberg, *Managers Not MBAs*, 292-312.

[40] Stewart, *The Management Myth*, 293.

[41] For example, see Archie B. Carroll, Jill Brown and Ann K. Buchholtz, *Business & Society: Ethics, Sustainability & Stakeholder Management*, 10th ed. (Boston: Cengage Learning, 2015), 235.

[42] Hamel, "Moon Shots for Management," 97.

Principles of Responsible Management Education, and the United Nations Global Compact will be actualized only if management education makes several key shifts: from positivism to intellectual conversion, from isolated analyses to systems thinking, and from being values-neutral to being values-driven.[43] The authors illustrate that these views are not mere impractical ideals by highlighting an existing university which has been running a viable business school program that has made the above key shifts. In summary, the reorientation framework leads to a revised topical structure that is not only better aligned with the nature and mission of the Church but also with general principles of human flourishing, and is imperative and practically viable for all organizations.

Finally, the reoriented list of topics is more likely to facilitate a radical transformation that is needed in current management theory and practice. This is because the revised topical structure is based on very different starting points, underlying assumptions, and overriding goals compared with conventional management. These differences have resulted from the application of the reorientation framework, which has been founded upon the radical implications of intellectual, moral, and religious conversions. This reoriented topical structure contrasts with the work of some scholars who have proposed alternative curricula for management, without fundamentally reforming the basic premises of management science. For instance, Dyck and Neubert have described a "multistream" approach to management which takes ethics and the common good into account.[44] However, the conventional topical structure and logic of mainstream management science are still used as the starting point and applied throughout their text, with the multistream approach inserted as an optional alternative, after the description of each mainstream management theory and tool.[45] Similarly, Cafferky adopts the perspective of a specific religious tradition and has presented alternative approaches to management enlightened by the Christian Scriptures.[46] However, these alternative approaches are still oriented along the conventional topical structure of mainstream management. In fact, the management topics listed by these authors are structured exactly around Fayol's traditional view of management as planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. Hence, the underlying assumptions of mainstream management still prevail, particularly the emphasis on technique, control, and the manager's influence. Furthermore, the specific ethical principles adopted in Dyck and Neubert's alternative theories appear arbitrary and lacking in a clear foundation,

[43] Kelley and Nahser, "Developing Sustainable Strategies," 631-644.

[44] Dyck and Neubert, *Management*, xix.

[45] For example, see ibid., 65-88.

[46] See Cafferky, *Management*, Chapters 6-14.

whilst the biblical source of Cafferky's work has limited claims on a universal audience. These shortcomings are typical of many works offering alternatives to mainstream management. In contrast, the revised topical structure formulated through the reorientation framework in this thesis is based on normative and objective principles for management, derived through comprehensive dialectics, explicit conversions, and clear foundations. It thus has the potential to contribute towards a genuine reform of management theory and practice not just for the benefit of the Church but for all sectors of society.

5.4 Overall summary and evaluation of this research project

5.4.1 Summary

This thesis began with a critical examination of how management science theories and tools have been applied in Catholic pastoral management literature. It has highlighted that much of the literature applies management science uncritically, treating it as merely a means to an end. Chapter 1 has discussed the problems with such an approach, especially from a theological point of view. In particular, a direct application of secular management tools in the Church often leads to conflicts with the faith tradition in terms of values, ecclesiology, and worldview. In seeking to redress this problem, this thesis has drawn attention to the fundamental issue of methodology in theological and pastoral engagement with the secular sciences. Upon exploring various positions regarding such engagement, it was argued that pastoral theology and practice would still benefit from engagement with management science, provided that the latter was reoriented appropriately. It was proposed that such a reorientation could be effected by a reorientation framework, synthesized through an appropriate inter-disciplinary method. The method employed in this thesis involves dialogue between management science and a resource from the Catholic faith tradition, with the functional specialty of foundations in theological reflection playing a pivotal role. It was also proposed that the reorientation framework could be made suitable not just for management in the Church but in all other organizations as well, so that this theological endeavor contributes not only towards the Church's internal administration but also to its mission in the world.

The thesis then proceeded to synthesize the reorientation framework through the inter-disciplinary method proposed. First, a critical examination of the management field was carried out. Chapter 2 analyzed the field's historical development and internal debates, pointing out that major criticisms of the field centered around its lack of terminal values, its reductionist assumptions about the human person, the organization, and society, an over-emphasis on technique, the top-down nature of management theory, and the lack of integration through a

foundational paradigm. A tentative reorientation framework based on alternative principles proposed by scholars within the field was established. However, with only insights from the management field itself as resources for constructing this tentative framework, it was pointed out that gaps still remained. These gaps pertained especially to a fuller account of the human person, human society, and human work, as well as terminal values, epistemology, and the religious horizon. It was then proposed that these gaps could be fruitfully enlightened by dialogue with a faith tradition.

To this end, Chapter 3 turned to a relevant resource from the Catholic faith tradition, GS, for insights on management from its teachings. In discussing the background of GS and the principles for its interpretation, it was noted that internal debates within the Second Vatican Council, including that between the Thomists and Augustinians, were a major force in shaping the document. The chapter highlighted GS's teachings on the human person and society, the nature of human work, human finality, and human knowledge, noting the conflicts within the document in some of these areas. It was concluded that whilst insights from GS are illuminative for management, there are also gaps and limitations which prevent the document from being used as a normative resource. Hence, the contributions of both GS and management science need to be evaluated from a more objective and normative viewpoint.

Chapter 4 thus sought to establish such a viewpoint. First, the resonances and conflicts among various positions within management science and GS, as well as between the two resources, were identified. In view of their mutual influence as well as their internal conflicts and gaps, it was pointed out that these resources should be treated as data rather than foundations for the synthesis of the reorientation framework. To assess their resonances and resolve their conflicts, it was argued that an objective and normative viewpoint was needed, and that such a viewpoint could be found in intellectual, moral, and religious conversions as expounded by Lonergan. Chapter 4 established the relevance and necessity of these conversions for management, and highlighted their implications. These include the adoption of a critical realist stance, the incorporation of a normative and hierarchical view of the human good into management science, the replacement of its deterministic approach with a more probabilistic and heuristic one, and the incorporation of the religious and eschatological horizons. Based on this foundational view, the appropriate principles from the management field and from GS could be chosen. These principles were then consolidated to form the reorientation framework for management theories. It was shown that the framework was equally applicable to management in the Church as well as in all other organizations.

Chapter 5 illustrated the workings of this framework by applying it to two examples of management theories commonly found in Catholic pastoral management literature. It also applied the framework to reorientate the current topical structure of such literature. By comparing the results with alternative management tools and curricula proposed for practitioners by scholars who sought to critically address the underlying principles of management in both Church and secular organizations, this chapter has shown that the reorientation framework is not only aligned with sound principles and values, but is also practically viable for use in Church and society.

5.4.2 Strengths of the reorientation framework

Overall, this research project has achieved its aim of producing the reorientation framework and illustrating an appropriate method for theological engagement with management science. The framework that has been synthesized has several important strengths. Firstly, as highlighted in Chapter 4, the significance of the reorientation framework is that it operates at the meta-level in terms of enabling existing or new management theories and tools to be reoriented and applied fruitfully in Church and society. This contrasts with efforts by other scholars in constructing alternative methods and tools for one specific aspect of management at a time. While these are useful contributions to the field, they nevertheless respond to the problems of management in a piecemeal way, and merely add to the pool of alternatives, while leaving mainstream management science largely intact. The piecemeal responses also mean that some aspects of management may have received less attention than others. Moreover, such an approach lacks an integrated and wider view which takes account of the connections between various aspects of management, and the inter-dependence of their associated tools. In contrast, the reorientation framework pertains to all aspects of management, and is to be applied to existing management tools in all of these aspects, thus transforming management science in a radical yet coherent way.

Secondly, Chapter 4 has also pointed out how the reorientation framework is equally suited for management in the Church as well as in all other organizations. This is due to the objective and normative nature of intellectual, moral, and religious conversions, as well as the orientation of both GS and the alternative voices within the management field towards a general audience. Moreover, the establishment of the foundation resulting from conversions was the focal point in the synthesis of the reorientation framework, and its relevance to management was explicitly argued. This contrasts with the alternative management tools proposed by other scholars, which often lack adequate attention to and justification of the bases for their alternatives. As highlighted in Chapter 4, the implications of conversions, and the consequent

principles for management, also align with the Catholic Church's tradition regarding its nature and mission. Hence, the reorientation framework will be a valuable resource for the development of pastoral management materials that will be more aligned with the Church's values, ecclesiology, and worldview. At the same time, the framework can be accepted in all other sectors and used to develop management theories and tools that would render management practice more effective and more conducive for human flourishing.

5.4.3 Strengths of the method of synthesis

A major strength of the method employed in this thesis is that it brings together theology and a secular science in a systematic, transparent, and critically reflective way. This contrasts with the arbitrary, selective, and uncritical application of church teachings and secular management tools as seen in existing Catholic pastoral management materials. As highlighted in Chapter 1, this lack of methodological rigor in the current materials has resulted in an uncritical assimilation of the managerial culture with its associated problems, as well as an erroneous use of resources from the faith tradition as proof-texts to support personal biases. In contrast, this research has critically examined the management field and GS, using methods of analyses proper to each discipline, especially in regard to GS and its particular features. Pointing out that these resources are not foundations but data for theology and pastoral ministry, the choice of principles for management was not made through an arbitrary choice for either resource, but deliberately through the functional specialty of foundations. Moreover, the application of intellectual, moral, and religious conversions in an explicit way not only enables the reorientation framework to be objective and normative, but also invites potential adopters to take a deliberate stance regarding their own horizons for the foundations of management, and thus exercise personal freedom, intentionality, and responsibility. Such an invitation would also catalyze dialogue towards a common and better understanding of management, and the formulation of better management tools. In particular, conversions do not eliminate the contributions of the secular science and the faith tradition, but in fact provide a way for their insights to be brought to bear appropriately. In this regard, a methodological contribution of this research is its demonstration of how Lonergan's thought on dialectics, foundations, and conversions can be fruitfully applied in inter-disciplinary work, and in establishing a normative and general theory of management. Prior scholarship on the application of Lonergan's work to

the field of management have tended to focus on the operations of consciousness, the scale of values, and the realms of meaning as expounded by Lonergan.[47]

This thesis has also shown how a faith tradition can contribute to making a secular science more integrated, effective, and of better service to the human good. Although debates and alternative voices within the management field have already identified some problems and offered proposals to improve integration, effectiveness, and values in management, it is from the resources of a faith tradition, such as GS, that more comprehensive insights can be found regarding anthropology, epistemology, human flourishing, and the religious horizon. As a result, a richer and more well-developed reorientation framework could be synthesized. As pointed out in Chapter 4, this supports the view held by scholars from both the theology and management fields that the secular sciences can benefit much from dialogue with spiritual and religious traditions. In this regard, GS has many strengths to offer. As highlighted in Chapter 3, the pastoral constitution was written to address concerns that resonated with the very controversies which the management field was confounded with, especially regarding socio-economic and technological developments, human values, human ability, and human flourishing. With pastoral sensitivity, the Council Fathers set out a message on the dignity of the human person, the social nature of the human community, and the ultimate purpose of human activity, all within a horizon that holds in view both the earthly and the divine. As noted by several scholars, GS has even greater relevance in the world today, in view of the current challenges of globalization, secularization, social divisions, and rapid technological change. Moreover, the pastoral constitution has been written for a universal audience, and brings to bear not only the wisdom of the Catholic faith tradition but also human reasoning, experience, and philosophical traditions. This facilitates its dialogue with a secular discipline. As a theological resource, GS bears the authoritative weight of an ecumenical council. The teachings of Vatican II remain foundational for the Catholic Church, and GS is regarded as one of its four pillars. The document has also been a prominent reference point in the Church's social teaching tradition to-date. Recent social encyclicals and other magisterial teachings still make reference to GS's key tenets, such as those on the common good and human conscience. On the whole, the reorientation framework has reaped much fruit from the engagement with GS for dialogue with management science.

[47] For example, see Kelley and Nahser, "Developing Sustainable Strategies," 631-644; Howard, "The Thinking Organization," 620-632; Kenneth R. Melchin, "What is 'the Good' of Business? Insights from the Work of Bernard Lonergan," *The Anglican Theological Review* 87, no. 1 (2005): 43-61; and John David Little, "Lonergan's Intentionality Analysis and the Foundations of Organization and Governance: A Response to Ghoshal" (unpublished PhD Thesis; Australian Catholic University, 2009).

Finally, in this research, the reorientation framework was synthesized through a structured and systematic process, with each step and its underlying rationale elucidated as clearly as possible. Such a transparent and structured process, together with the role of conversions in providing the required basis for evaluation, allows for collaboration and development to fine-tune the reorientation framework. For example, other resources can be brought to bear in place of GS or in addition to it, such as resources from other religious, cultural, and wisdom traditions. Future debates within the management field can also be incorporated to expand the dialectics and add further insights. In this way, the reorientation framework can be continually strengthened, in line with its own principle regarding growth in authenticity, truth, and value.

5.4.4 Limitations of this research

In terms of limitations, it could be argued that the central role of conversions would exclude the 'unconverted' from using this reorientation framework. Moreover, growth in intellectual, moral, and religious conversions is an on-going process. Authentic subjectivity always remains an ideal to strive towards, rather than a fully-manifested reality. Nevertheless, conversions do occur in varying degrees among people, and are meant to be an on-going orientation rather than a static end-state. They provide the possibility of a common ground for management. More importantly, they call attention to the need for critical examination of one's horizon when faced with conflict or disagreement over management methods. This promotes self-appropriation, discernment, human interiority, freedom, and responsibility. It also encourages dialogue and learning, thus developing the communal wisdom. Without conversions, it would be impossible to arrive collectively at what is true, good, and meaningful, and the current problem of the superficial, deterministic, and quick-fix tendency of the management field would prevail.

Another limitation of this research is that the reorientation framework has drawn mainly upon GS for dialogue with management science. It thus lacks insights from other resources that might further develop the principles for management or even highlight additional ones. This once again points to the need to view the framework as a heuristic tool for management, requiring on-going development, in line with its own principles.

5.4.5 Comparison with contributions to management from Catholic social ethicists

As mentioned in Chapter 1, scholars writing from the Catholic social teaching tradition have been proposing alternative approaches to business management, and some of these also

draw upon GS.[48] Compared with these works, this thesis provides a value-added contribution in several respects. First, as mentioned above, whilst most scholars, including those working from the Catholic social teaching tradition, have formulated particular management tools as alternatives to mainstream ones, this thesis has synthesized a general framework that can reorientate any existing or new management tool. Hence, the product of this thesis has wider application. Second, while Catholic social teaching scholars focus on the ethical dimension of management, this thesis has taken on a broader view, addressing philosophical, epistemological, and religious issues as well. Hence, the reorientation framework includes not only principles dealing with moral values but also with anthropology, systems, human intentionality, and philosophical stances in the social sciences. In relation to this, the works of Catholic social teaching scholars, ironically, tend to leave out the religious and eschatological horizons in their alternative management methods. Their focus has been mainly on promoting human dignity and the common good in the temporal order. In contrast, this thesis has explicitly included religious and eschatological considerations in the reorientation principles—a move made possible by the foundational role of conversions. Third, whilst Catholic social teaching scholars have mainly dealt with business management, this thesis has sought to bridge management in Church and society by examining the two domains, and constructing a reorientation framework that addresses the prerogatives of both. In doing so, it has made an important contribution of highlighting the similarity of problems created by the managerial culture in both Church and society, thus paving the way for collaboration and dialogue to improve management theory and practice for all.

Just as there are conflicting views in the interpretation and application of resources from the faith tradition, there have also been contradictions in the application of Catholic social teaching to management. In particular, the views of Catholic social teaching scholars tend to be shaped by their personal biases in terms of political and socio-economic leanings. For instance, reflecting an individualistic and liberal capitalist stance, scholars such as Michael Novak more strongly extol free market economies and the pursuit of individual self-interest as the best possible way to cultivate a fruitful society and attain the common good.[49] In contrast, Michael Naughton and other notable scholars emphasize the communal dimension of business corporations, and of society as a whole, and the detrimental effects of pursuing only the self-

[48] For example, see Anthony Percy, "Human Action, Work, and Enterprise: The Second Vatican Council" in *Entrepreneurship in the Catholic Tradition* (Victoria, Australia: Connorcourt Publishing, 2011), 125-140; and Lloyd Sandelands, "The Business of Business is the Human Person: Lessons from the Catholic Social Tradition," *Journal of Business Ethics* 85, no. 1 (2009): 93–101.

[49] See Michael Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good* (Lanham, MD: Madison Books, 1989).

interest of shareholders or individual stakeholders.[50] On the whole, it can be observed that scholars applying Catholic social teaching to management each tends to assume that the Church's social teaching tradition provides a coherent and unified view of ethical management. There is often inadequate consideration of the tensions among the social teachings, and the conflicts within each specific document itself, as the discussion on GS in this thesis has shown.

This points to a fundamental limitation inherent in the alternative management approaches proposed by Catholic social teaching scholars. Their proposals are largely derived from directly applying the contents of resources from the faith tradition to management, and often lack explicit consideration of underlying foundations or higher viewpoints with which to validate and highlight the objectivity and normativity of these contents. As a result, the contributions of Catholic social teaching scholars remain marginal, and have yet to make a decisive impact on mainstream management. Such a sense of marginality is typically reflected in the words of one author who, after advocating an alternative view of human resource management based on Catholic social teaching, nevertheless concludes that "because the emphasis of this paper has been on Catholic Social Teaching, one final question lingers: can this body of proscriptions provide a set of useful guidelines for managers of any faith, or those who profess no faith at all? To answer this, employers and human resource managers are encouraged to examine carefully the cited documents for themselves, and to use the contents of this paper to supplement their own interpretations and conclusions."[51] In contrast, this thesis has focused on management at the foundational level, with the aid of theology. It has drawn upon Lonergan's work on intellectual, moral, and religious conversions to establish normative and objective principles for management, which in turn facilitate the use of insights from both management science and the faith tradition. Such a method has even enabled the incorporation of the religious horizon without compromising the relevance of the reorientation framework to a general audience. The principles of the framework can thus be promoted as not merely optional alternatives to mainstream management but as critical foundations for a stronger and more robust management science.

5.4.6 Areas for further research

As noted above, one limitation of this thesis has been the lack of resources apart from GS to provide insights for the dialogue with management science. Hence, one area for further research is to examine these other resources, such as Scripture or other Catholic social

[50] Naughton, "The Corporation as a Community of Work," 33-76.

[51] Zigarelli, "Catholic Social Teaching and the Employment Relationship," 81.

encyclicals, as well as resources in other religious, cultural, and wisdom traditions. The implications for management from the teachings of these resources can be compared with the underlying principles in the reorientation framework produced in this thesis. With conversions providing the foundational and evaluative lens, the principles of the framework can be further developed accordingly. Another trajectory for further research would be to apply the method illustrated in this thesis, particularly with the pivotal role of conversions, to inter-disciplinary engagement among other fields, such as between a faith tradition and economics or the life sciences. Such application can potentially produce helpful insights to address controversies in these fields. Meanwhile, going back to the original motivation for this study, an immediate task would be to translate the above list of reoriented church management topics into pastoral literature that can help those responsible for managing church organizations to fulfil their role faithfully and effectively.

5.5 Conclusion

Resonating with intellectual, moral, and religious conversions, GS 27 has highlighted that "the social order requires constant improvement: it must be founded in truth, built on justice, and enlivened by love." This research has demonstrated how an internal pastoral issue within the Church can be turned into an opportunity for mission in the world through the improvement of the social order. Church organizations face many management challenges that are similar to those faced by other organizations. There is thus much potential for collaboration to improve the service of management science to both Church and society. On the Church's part, this requires theological reflection that is responsive to pastoral realities, attentive to methodological issues, and open to the challenges of inter-disciplinary work. In this way, theology would be better placed to support the Church's role as a fellow-pilgrim with the rest of humanity towards a common vision of human flourishing. It is hoped that the reorientation framework synthesized in this thesis will catalyze further efforts towards this end.

Appendix 1

Extracts from Global Conventions on Ethical Management and the Human Good

The MBA Oath

As a business leader I recognize my role in society.

- My purpose is to lead people and manage resources to create value that no single individual can create alone.
- My decisions affect the well-being of individuals inside and outside my enterprise, today and tomorrow.

Therefore, I promise that:

- I will manage my enterprise with loyalty and care, and will not advance my personal interests at the expense of my enterprise or society.
- I will understand and uphold, in letter and spirit, the laws and contracts governing my conduct and that of my enterprise.
- I will refrain from corruption, unfair competition, or business practices harmful to society.
- I will protect the human rights and dignity of all people affected by my enterprise, and I will oppose discrimination and exploitation.
- I will protect the right of future generations to advance their standard of living and enjoy a healthy planet.
- I will report the performance and risks of my enterprise accurately and honestly.
- I will invest in developing myself and others, helping the management profession continue to advance and create sustainable and inclusive prosperity.

In exercising my professional duties according to these principles, I recognize that my behavior must set an example of integrity, eliciting trust and esteem from those I serve. I will remain accountable to my peers and to society for my actions and for upholding these standards.[52]

[52] "The MBA Oath," accessed February 20, 2016, http://mbaoath.org/about/the-mba-oath/.

The United Nations Global Compact

Human Rights

Principle 1: Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; and

Principle 2: make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.

Labor

Principle 3: Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;

Principle 4: the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labor;

Principle 5: the effective abolition of child labor; and

Principle 6: the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

Environment

Principle 7: Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges;

Principle 8: undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and

Principle 9: encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.

Anti-Corruption

Principle 10: Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.[53]

The United Nations Principles for Responsible Management Education

As institutions of higher education involved in the development of current and future managers we declare our willingness to progress in the implementation, within our institution, of the following Principles, starting with those that are more relevant to our capacities and mission. We will report on progress to all our stakeholders and exchange effective practices related to these principles with other academic institutions:

[53] United Nations, "UN Global Compact," accessed February 20, 2016, https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/mission/principles.

Principle 1: Purpose

We will develop the capabilities of students to be future generators of sustainable value for business and society at large and to work for an inclusive and sustainable global economy.

Principle 2: Values

We will incorporate into our academic activities and curricula the values of global social responsibility as portrayed in international initiatives such as the United Nations Global Compact.

Principle 3: Method

We will create educational frameworks, materials, processes and environments that enable effective learning experiences for responsible leadership.

Principle 4: Research

We will engage in conceptual and empirical research that advances our understanding about the role, dynamics, and impact of corporations in the creation of sustainable social, environmental and economic value.

Principle 5: Partnership

We will interact with managers of business corporations to extend our knowledge of their challenges in meeting social and environmental responsibilities and to explore jointly effective approaches to meeting these challenges.

Principle 6: Dialogue

We will facilitate and support dialogue and debate among educators, students, business, government, consumers, media, civil society organisations and other interested groups and stakeholders on critical issues related to global social responsibility and sustainability.

We understand that our own organisational practices should serve as example of the values and attitudes we convey to our students.[54]

[54] United Nations, "UN Principles for Responsible Management Education," accessed February 20, 2016, http://www.unprme.org/about-prme/the-six-principles.php.

Humanistic Management Network: Principles and Manifesto

The Humanistic Management Network advocates a paradigm shift away from economistic views on market activities towards a humanistic approach. To move from criticism of the status quo towards a fruitful discourse on alternatives we have developed a three stepped approach offering guidance and an anchor for reflection on managerial decisions as well as decision making processes. We understand humanistic management on the basis of three interrelated dimensions.

These are:
Firstly, that we as humans deserve and rightfully expect our dignity to be respected under all circumstances.
Secondly, that ethical consideration must form part and parcel of business decisions, and
Thirdly, that actively embracing corporate responsibilities is contingent upon initiating and maintaining an ongoing dialogue with all stakeholders.

In summary, humanistic management is the pursuit of strategies and practices aimed at the creation of sustainable human welfare. In combination, these three dimensions promote human well being through economic activities that are life-conducive and add value to society at large. Submitting business decisions to these three guiding principles is what we call humanistic management.

MANIFESTO:
We believe that market economies hold a substantial potential for human development in general. To promote life-conducive market activities, we want to complement the quantitative metrics, which hitherto define managerial and economic success, with qualitative evaluation criteria that focus on the human dignity and well-being of every woman and every man.

In business as well as in society, respect for human dignity demands respect for human freedom. Hence, collective decision-making, in corporations just as in governments, should be based on free and equal deliberation, participation, or representation of all affected parties. Concerns of legitimacy must, in economics like in politics, precede questions of expediency.

The Humanistic Management Network defends human dignity in the face of its vulnerability. The dignity of the human being lies in her or his capacity to define, autonomously, the purpose

of her or his existence. Since human autonomy realizes itself through social cooperation, economic relations and business activities can either foster or obstruct human life and well-being. Against the widespread objectification of human subjects into human resources, against the common instrumentalization of human beings into human capital and a mere means for profit, we uphold humanity as the ultimate end and key principle of all economic activity.[55]

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Article 1:

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Article 2:

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

Article 3:

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

Article 4:

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

Article 5:

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 6:

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

[55] Humanistic Management Network, "About Humanistic Management," accessed June 10, 2016, http://www.humanetwork.org/index.php/en/about-us/about-humanistic-management.

Article 7:

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

Article 8:

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

Article 9:

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 10:

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

Article 11:

(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

Article 12:

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 13:

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.
(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

Article 14:
(1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.
(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Article 15:
(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.
(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

Article 16:
(1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.
(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.
(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

Article 17:
(1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article 18:
Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19:

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Article 20:

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

Article 21:

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

Article 22:

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

Article 23:

(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24:

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25:

(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Article 26:

(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

Article 27:

(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 28:

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

Article 29:

(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.
(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.
(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.[56]

United Nations Sustainable Development Goals

Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere
Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
Goal 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
Goal 9: Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries
Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
Goal 12: Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
Goal 14: Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development

[56] United Nations, "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," accessed February 20, 2016, http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/.

Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss

Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels

Goal 17: Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development[57]

[57] United Nations, "Sustainable Development Goals," accessed February 20, 2016, http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(I) Church management and practical theology

Bausch, William J. *The Hands-On Parish: Reflections and Suggestions for Fostering Community*. Mystic, CN: Twenty-Third Publications, 1989.

Bourgeois, David. *Ministry in the Digital Age: Strategies and Best Practices for a Post-Website World.* Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013.

Brennan, Patrick J. *Parishes that Excel: Models of Excellence in Education, Ministry, and Evangelization.* New York: Crossroad, 1992.

——— . *Re-Imagining the Parish.* New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Brough, Michael and Christina Ferguson, eds. *The Francis Effect and Changing Church Culture: Advancing Best Managerial and Leadership Practices*. Washington DC: National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management, 2016.

Budde, Michael L. "The Rational Shepherd: Corporate Practices and the Church." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 21, no. 1 (2008): 96-116.

Byron, William J. "Applying Best Practice from Business to Our Parishes." *The Pastoral Review* 6, no. 1 (2010): 41-44.

Campbell, Thomas C. and Gary B. Reierson. *The Gift of Administration: Theological Bases for Ministry.* Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982.

Castrilli, Michael J. "Contractor/Vendor Selection Made Simple for Parish Managers." *Villanova Newsletter*, Spring 2016.

Chater, Mark. "Theology and Management." *Modern Believing* 40, no. 4 (1999): 64-69.

Clements, C. Justin. *Stewardship: A Parish Handbook*. Liguori, Missouri: Liguori Publications, 2000.

Damast, Alison. "Mastering the Business of Church." *Bloomberg Business,* January 3, 2008.

"Degree Programs Aim for Best Practices in Mission and Management." *National Catholic Reporter*, September 1, 2006.

Dietterich, Inagrace T. "A Particular People: Towards a Faithful and Effective Ecclesiology." *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (1993): 349-368.

DiNoia, Josep. A. "Communion and Magisterium: Teaching Authority and the Culture of Grace." *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (October 1993): 403-418.

Doohan, Helen. *The Minister of God: Effective and Fulfilled.* New York: Alba House, 1986.

Duch, Robert G. *Successful Parish Leadership: Nurturing the Animated Parish.* Kansas City: Sheed & Ward, 1990.

Evans, G. R. and Martyn Percy, eds. *Managing the Church?: Order and Organization in a Secular Age.* Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Fischer, Mark F. *Making Parish Councils Pastoral.* Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2010.

——— . "Parish Councils: Why Good Delegators Don't Always Make Good Leaders." *Today's Parish* (March 1997): 27-30.

Forster, Patricia M. and Thomas P. Sweetser. *Transforming the Parish: Models for the Future.* Franklin, Wisconsin: Sheed & Ward, 1993.

Foster, Bryan. *Church Marketing Manual for the Digital Age.* Benowa, Queensland: Great Developments, 2011.

Frank, Thomas E. "Leadership and Administration: An Emerging Field in Practical Theology." *International Journal of Practical Theology* 10, no. 1 (2006): 113-136.

Gill, Robin. "Values and Church Management." In *Moral Leadership in a Postmodern Age,* 109-122. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.

Gluck, Frederick W. "Crisis Management in the Church." *America*, December 1, 2003.

Hannum, Kristen. "The Parish that Works." *US Catholic*, July 2011.

Heney, David. *Motivating Your Parish to Change: Concrete Leadership Strategies for Pastors, Administrators and Lay Leaders.* San Jose, CA: Resource Publications, 1998.

Hiesberger, Jean M. *Fostering Leadership Skills in Ministry: A Parish Handbook.* Liguori, Missouri: Liguori Publications, 2003.

Holden, Carol M., Thomas P. Sweetser and Mary B. Vogel. *Recreating the Parish: Reproducible Resources for Pastoral Ministers.* Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1996.

Holmes, Paul A., ed. *A Pastor's Toolbox: Management Skills for Parish Leadership*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014.

Jacobs, Michael. *Holding In Trust: The Appraisal of Ministry.* London: SPCK, 1989.

Jarema, William J. *A Survival Guide for Church Ministers.* New York: Paulist Press, 2011.

Jesuit Asia Pacific Conference. "LST-EAPI Offer New Program in Pastoral Leadership and Management." April 30, 2015. Accessed January 1, 2017. http://sjapc.net/content/lst-eapi-offer-new-program-pastoral-leadership-and- management.

Jnana-Deepa Vidyapeeth Pontifical Institute of Philosophy and Religion. "JDV Centres." Accessed January 1, 2017. http://jdv.edu.in/jdv-centers/.

Lencioni, Patrick. "A Guide to Building Teams for Catholic Parishes." Accessed May 1, 2017. https://amazingparish.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/catholic-fg.pdf.

——— . “A Real Leadership Team: Working Styles.” Accessed May 1, 2017. https://amazingparish.org/category/conference-videos/.

——— . “Our Model.” Accessed May 1, 2017. https://amazingparish.org/get-started/#blocks.

——— . “Overcome Team Dysfunction.” Accessed May 1, 2017. https://amazingparish.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Overcome-Team-Dysfunction.pdf.

Lowney, Chris. *Everyone Leads: How to Revitalize the Catholic Church*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017.

Kenneson, Philip D. “Selling (out) the Church in the Marketplace of Desire.” *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (Oct 1993): 319-348.

Kheng, Christina. “Evaluating Church Organisations by the Light of *Lumen Gentium*: A Dialogue between Ecclesiology and Management.” *Ecclesiology* 11, no. 1 (2015): 9-33.

——— . “The Church and Modern Management: An Unholy Alliance?” *Doctrine and Life* 66, no. 9 (November 2016): 37-51.

Kress, Robert. “The Priest-Pastor as CEO.” *America*, March 11, 2002.

Mallon, James. *Divine Renovation: From a Maintenance to a Missional Parish.* Toronto: Novalis, 2014.

——— . *Divine Renovation Guidebook: A Step-by-Step Manual for Transforming Your Parish.* Toronto: Novalis, 2016.

Martin, Diarmuid. “The Future of the Catholic Church in Ireland.” *Archdiocese of Dublin Website*, May 10, 2010. Accessed May 25, 2016, http://www.dublindiocese.ie/1052010-the-future-of-the-church-in-ireland/#sthash.qDQoPbzf.dpuf.

McKenna, Kevin E., ed. *A Concise Guide to Catholic Church Management.* Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2010.

Milbank, John. “Stale Expressions: The Management-Shaped Church.” *Studies in Christian Ethics* 21, no. 1 (April 2008): 117-128.

National Association of Church Personnel Administrators (NACPA). *Personnel Policies And Procedures for Church Organizations.* Alexandria, VA: NACPA, 2006.

National Leadership Roundtable on Church Management (NLRCM). “An Assessment Tool for Parish Leadership Relationships, Parish Ministry and Management: To Identify Current Strengths and Potential for Improvement.” August 8, 2008. Accessed May 1, 2016. http://www.theleadershiproundtable.org/churchepedia/docs/NLRCMLeadershipRelationship AssessmentToolv708082008.pdf.

——— . “ChurchEpedia: Ideas for Best Practices in Church Management, Finance and Human Resources.” Accessed May 1, 2016. http://www.theleadershiproundtable.org/churchepedia/default.asp.

——— . “Our History.” Accessed May 1, 2016. https://leadershiproundtable.org/who-we-are/our-history/.

——— . “Rationale for a Performance Development System for Ordained and Lay Ministers in the Catholic Church.” Accessed January 30, 2017. http://www.ChurchEpedia.org.

Newsome, Robert R. *The Ministering Parish: Methods and Procedures for Pastoral Organization.* New York: Paulist Press, 1982.

Ormerod, Neil. “The Evangelising Diocese: A Response to Martin Teulan.” *Australasian Catholic Record* 80, no. 1 (2003): 62-69.

Pattison, Stephen. *The Challenge of Practical Theology: Selected Essays.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers, 2007.

Peri, Paul F. *Catholic Parish Administration: A Handbook*. New York: Paulist Press, 2012.

Pickard, Stephen. *Theological Foundations for Collaborative Ministry.* Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2009.

“Pope Francis ‘Appoints Management Consultant’ to Advise on Reform of Roman Curia.” *Catholic Herald*, June 13, 2013.

Rocca, Francis X. “We Don’t Need Bishops Who Are Like Corporate Managers, Says Francis.” *Catholic Herald*, February 28, 2014.

“School of Pastoral Management at the Lateran Pontifical University.” *Angenzia Info Salesiana*, November13, 2014.

Senior, Donald. *The Gift of Administration: New Testament Foundations for the Vocation of Administrative Service.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2016.

Simon, William E. *Great Catholic Parishes: A Living Mosaic - How Four Essential Practices Make Them Thrive.* Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2016.

Sweetser, Thomas. *Successful Parishes: How They Meet the Challenge of Change.* Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1983.

Teulan, Martin. “The Evangelising Diocese.” *Australasian Catholic Record* 78, no. 4 (Oct 2001): 409-421.

Thomasis, Louis D. *My Father's Business: Creating a New Future for the People of God.* Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1984.

Thompson, Barney. “Church of England Management Courses Overlook God, Say Critics.” *Financial Times*, December 18, 2014.

Vasarri, Chiara and Flavia Rotondi. “Pope Francis is Sending His Clergy Off to Management Lessons.” *Sydney Morning Herald*, February 26, 2015.

Villanova University. “Center for Church Management and Business Ethics Newsletter.” Accessed May 1, 2016. https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/business/centers/churchmanagement/newsletter.html.

Villanova University School of Business. “International Festival of Creativity in Church Management.” Accessed May 1, 2017. https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/business/centers/churchmanagement/programs/iccm.html.

Watkins, Clare. “Laity and Communication: Some Implications of Organization Theory for the Ecclesiology of Vatican II.” Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Cambridge, 1990.

——— . “Organizing the People of God: Social-Science Theories of Organization in Ecclesiology.” *Theological Studies* 52 (1991): 689-711.

——— . “The Church as a ‘Special’ Case: Comments from Ecclesiology Concerning the Management of the Church.” *Modern Theology* 9, no. 4 (1993): 369-384.

White, Michael and Tom Corcoran. *Rebuilt: The Story of a Catholic Parish.* Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press, 2013.

Whitehead, James D. and Evelyn E. Whitehead. *The Promise of Partnership: Leadership and Ministry in an Adult Church.* New York: Harper Collins, 1991.

Wilkes, Paul. *Excellent Catholic Parishes: The Guide to Best Places and Practices.* New York: Paulist Press, 2001.

Williams, George M. *Improving Parish Management: Working Smarter, Not Harder*. Mystic, CN: Twenty-Third Publications, 1983.

Zech, Charles E., ed. *Best Practices in Catholic Church Ministry Performance Management*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010.

——— . *Catholic Parishes of the 21st Century.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

———, ed. *The Parish Management Handbook.* Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 2003.

Zech, Charles E., Mary L. Gautier, Robert J. Miller and Mary E. Bendyna. *Best Practices of Catholic Pastoral and Finance Councils.* Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor Press, 2010.

(II) Theological method, inter-disciplinary studies, and social science

Boff, Clodovis. *Theology and Praxis: Epistemological Foundations*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1987.

Byrne, Patrick H. *The Ethics of Discernment: Lonergan's Foundations for Ethics.* Toronto University of Toronto Press, 2016.

Doran, Robert. *Theology and the Dialectics of History.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Fiorenza, Francis Schussler and John P. Galvin, eds. *Systematic Theology: Roman Catholic Perspectives*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2011.

Geertz, Clifford. "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture." In *The Interpretation of Cultures*, 3-30. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Gill, Robin, ed. *Theology and Sociology: A Reader*. London: Cassell, 1996.

International Theological Commission, *Theology Today: Perspectives, Principles and Criteria*. Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2012.

Lewin, Kurt. "Psychology and the Process of Group Living," *Journal of Social Psychology* 17, no. 1 (1943): 113-131.

Lonergan, Bernard J. F. *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. New York: Philosophical Library Inc, 1956.

——— . *Method in Theology*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1972.

——— . "Theology and Understanding." In *Collection,* vol. 4, *Collected Works of Bernard Lonergan*. Edited by Frederick Crowe and Robert M. Doran. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1984.

McLuhan, Marshall. "The Medium is the Message." In *Media and Cultural Studies*. Edited by Meenakshi G. Durham and Douglas Kellner, 107-116. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons, 2005.

Milbank, John. *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason.* 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Miller, Vincent J. *Consuming Religion: Christian Faith and Practice in a Consumer Culture.* New York: Bloomsbury, 2003.

O'Collins, Gerald. *Fundamental Theology.* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1982.

Ormerod, Neil J. "Quarrels with the Method of Correlation," *Theological Studies* 57, no. 4 (1996): 707-719.

——— . *Re-visioning the Church: An Experiment in Systematic-Historical Ecclesiology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.

Rahner, Karl. *Foundations of Christian Faith: An Introduction to the Idea of Christianity*, trans. by William V. Dych. New York: Crossroad, 2000.

Roberts, Richard H. *Religion, Theology and the Human Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Smith, Christian. *What Is a Person?: Rethinking Humanity, Social Life, and the Moral Good from the Person Up.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

Williams, Bernard. *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985.

(III) Management theories, ethics, and critical analyses

Academy of Management. "Management, Spirituality and Religion Interest Group." Accessed July 1, 2016, http://division.aom.org/msr/.

Ackroyd, Stephen and Steve Fleetwood, eds. *Realist Perspectives on Management and Organisations.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Adler, Paul S. "Corporate Scandals: It's Time for Reflection in Business Schools." *Academy of Management Executive* 16, no. 3 (2002): 148-149.

Alford, Helen J. and Michael J. Naughton. *Managing as if Faith Mattered.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.* New York: Longman, 1999.

Alvesson, Mats and Hugh Willmott. *Making Sense of Management: A Critical Introduction*. London: Sage Publications, 2012.

Alvesson, Mats and Jörgen Sandberg. "Has Management Studies Lost Its Way? Ideas for More Imaginative and Innovative Research." *Journal of Management Studies* 50, no.1 (January 2013): 128-152.

Alvesson, Mats, Todd Bridgman and Hugh Willmott, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Axson, David A. J. *The Management Mythbuster*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

Baden, Denise and Malcolm Higgs. "Challenging the Perceived Wisdom of Management Theories and Practice." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 14, no. 4 (December 2015): 539-555.

Bate, Nicholas. *Instant MBA: Think, Perform and Earn Like a Top Business-School Graduate.* Oxford: Infinite Ideas, 2008.

Benefiel, Margaret, "Irreconcilable Foes? The Discourse of Spirituality and the Discourse of Organizational Science." *Organization* 10, no. 2 (May 2003): 383-391.

——— . "Mapping the Terrain of Spirituality in Organizations Research." *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 16, no. 4 (2003): 367-377.

Bennis, Warren G. and James O'Toole. "How Business Schools Lost Their Way." *Harvard Business Review* 83, no. 5 (May 2005): 96-104.

Birkinshaw, Julian and Gita Piramal, eds. *Sumantra Ghoshal on Management: A Force for Good*. London: Prentice Hall, 2005.

Bloom, Nicholas, Raffaella Sadun and John Van Reenen. "Does Management Really Work? How Three Essential Practices Can Address Even the Most Complex Global Problems." *Harvard Business Review* 90, no. 11 (November 2012): 77-82.

Bonchek, Mark. "Why the Problem with Learning Is Unlearning." *Harvard Business Review*, November 3, 2016. Accessed November 24, 2016. https://hbr.org/2016/11/why-the-problem-with-learning-is-unlearning.

Bowie, Norman E. *Business Ethics in the 21st Century*. New York: Springer, 2013.

Byrne, John A. "Why the MBA has Become the Most Popular Master's Degree in the U.S." Fortune Magazine, June 1, 2014.

Cafferky, Michael E. *Management: A Faith-Based Perspective.* New Jersey: Pearson, 2012.

Carroll, Archie B., Jill Brown and Ann K. Buchholtz. *Business & Society: Ethics, Sustainability & Stakeholder Management*. 10th ed. Boston: Cengage Learning, 2015.

Case, Peter, Robert French and Peter Simpson. "From *Theoria* to Theory: Leadership Without Contemplation." *Organization* 19, no. 3 (2012): 345-361.

Chandler, Alfred D. *The Visible Hand*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Christensen, Clayton M. *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail.* Boston: Harvard Business Review Press, 1997.

Cronin, Brian. *Value Ethics: A Lonergan Perspective.* Nairobi: Consolata Institute of Philosophy Press, 2006.

Daft, Richard L. *Management.* 12th ed. Boston: Cengage Learning, 2016.

———— . *Organization Theory and Design.* Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning, 2013.

Davis, Ian and Elizabeth Stephenson. "Ten Trends to Watch in 2006." *The McKinsey Quarterly*, January 27, 2006. Accessed February 20, 2016. http://www.mckinseyquarterly.com.

Drucker, Peter F. *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices.* New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Dyck, Bruno. "A Proven Way to Incorporate Catholic Social Thought in Business School Curricula: Teaching Two Approaches to Management in the Classroom." *Journal of Catholic Higher Education* 32, no.1 (2013): 145-163.

Dyck, Bruno and Mitchell Neubert. *Management: Current Practices and New Directions.* Boston: Cengage Publishing Company, 2010.

Edwards, P. K., J. O'Mahong and S. Vincent, eds. *Studying Organizations Using Critical Realism: A Practical Guide.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Ewenstein, Boris, Bryan Hancock and Asmus Komm. "Ahead of the Curve: The Future of Performance Management." *McKinsey Quarterly*, May 2016. Accessed November 24, 2016. http://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/ahead-of-the-curve-the-future-of-performance-management.

Feraro, Fabrizio and Jeffrey Pfeffer. "Economics Language and Assumptions: How Theories can Become Self-fulfilling." *Academy of Management Review* 30, no. 1 (2005): 8–24.

Franklin, Peter. "Problematics in Management Theory and Practice." *Strategic Change Journal* 13, no. 7 (November 2004): 383-404.

Frederick, William C. "The Next Development in Management Science: A General Theory." *Academy of Management Journal* 6, no. 3 (September 1963): 212-219.

Friedman, Milton, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits." *The New York Times Magazine,* September 13, 1970.

Ghoshal, Sumantra. "Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices." *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 4, no. 1 (2005): 75-91.

Grint, Keith. *Management: A Sociological Introduction.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

Grey, Christopher. "Towards a Critique of Managerialism: The Contribution of Simone Weil." *Journal of Management Studies* 33, no.5 (September 1996): 591-611.

Gruber, Robert E. and Mary Mohr. "Strategic Management for Multiprogram Nonprofit Organizations." *California Management Review* 24, no. 3 (Spring 1982): 15-22.

Hamel, Gary. "Moon Shots for Management." *Harvard Business Review* (February 2009): 91-98.

——— . *The Future of Management.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2007.

Handy, Charles. "What's A Business For?" *Harvard Business Review* 80, no. 12 (Dec 2002): 49-56.

Harvard Business Review Store. "Reorg: How to Get it Right." Accessed February 10, 2017. https://hbr.org/product/ reorg-how-to-get-it-right/10072-HBK-ENG.

Hoopes, James. *False Prophets.* New York: Basic Books, 2007.

Howard, Anthony. "The Thinking Organisation." *Journal of Management Development* 31, no. 6 (2012): 620-632.

Humanistic Management Network. “About Humanistic Management.” Accessed June 10, 2016. http://www.humanetwork.org/index.php/en/about-us/about-humanistic-management.

“John A. Ryan Institute for Catholic Social Thought.” Accessed Jan 1, 2017. http://www.stthomas.edu/cathstudies/cst/.

Kanter, Rosabeth M. “What Theories Do Audiences Want? Exploring the Demand Side.” *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 1 (March 2005): 93-95.

Kellerman, Barbara. *The End of Leadership*. New York: Harper Business, 2012.

Kelley, Scott and Ron Nahser. “Developing Sustainable Strategies: Foundations, Method, and Pedagogy.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 123, no. 4 (2014): 631–644

Kennedy, Robert. “What Catholic Social Teaching can Learn from Business.” In *Catholic Social Teaching and the Market Economy.* Edited by Philip Booth and Samuel Gregg, 182-188. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, 2007.

Keulena, Sjoerd and Ronald Kroezeb. “Introduction: The Era of Management: A Historical Perspective on Twentieth Century Management.” *Management & Organizational History* 9, no. 4 (Oct 2014): 321-335.

Khurana, Rakesh. *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as a Profession.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Kiechel, Walter. “The Management Century. Spotlight: HBR at 90: How Management Changed the World.” *Harvard Business Review* 90, no. 11 (November 2012): 63-75.

Koontz, Harold. “The Management Theory Jungle.” *The Journal of the Academy of Management* 4, no. 3 (December 1961): 174-188.

Kotter, John P. *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press, 1996.

Lee, Bill and Catherine Cassell, eds. *Challenges and Controversies in Management Research.* New York: Routledge, 2011.

Little, John D. “Lonergan's Intentionality Analysis and the Foundations of Organization and Governance: A Response to Ghoshal.” Unpublished PhD Thesis. Australian Catholic University, 2009.

Lounsbury, Michael and Paul Tracey, eds. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations: Religion and Organization Theory*. Bradford, UK: Emerald Group Publishing, 2014.

MacMillan, I.C. “Competitive Strategies for Not-for-Profit Agencies.” *Advances in Strategic Management* 1 (1983): 61-82.

Magill, Gerard. “Theology in Business Ethics: Appealing to the Religious Imagination.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 11, no. 2 (Feb 1992): 129-135.

"MBA Oath: Responsible Value Creation." Accessed February 20, 2016. http://mbaoath.org/about/the-mba-oath/.

McGrath, Jim and Bob Bates. *The Little Book of Big Management Theories and How to Use Them.* London: Pearson, 2013.

McGrath, Rita G. "No Longer a Stepchild: How the Management Field Can Come Into its Own." *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 6 (2007): 1365-1378.

Melchin, Kenneth R. "What is 'the Good' of Business? Insights from the Work of Bernard Lonergan." *The Anglican Theological Review* 87, no. 1 (2005): 43-61

Miller, Kent D. "Organizational Research as Practical Theology." *Organizational Research Methods* 18, no. 2 (2015): 276-299.

Mintzberg, Henry. *Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2005.

———— . *Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning.* New York: Free Press, 1994.

Mitroff, Ian I. "An Open Letter to the Deans and the Faculties of American Business Schools." *Journal of Business Ethics* 54, no. 2 (2004): 185-189.

Novak, Michael. *Free Persons and the Common Good.* Lanham, MD: Madison Books, 1989.

Olster, Sharon. *Strategic Management for Nonprofit Organizations: Theory and Cases.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Pattison, Stephen. *The Faith of the Managers: When Management Becomes Religion.* London: Continuum International Publishing, 1997.

Pearson, Gordon J. *The Rise and Fall of Management: A Brief History of Practice, Theory and Context*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012.

Percy, Anthony. "Human Action, Work, and Enterprise: The Second Vatican Council." In *Entrepreneurship in the Catholic Tradition,* 125-140. Victoria, Australia: Connorcourt Publishing, 2011

Peters, Thomas and Robert Waterman. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies.* New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. "A Modest Proposal: How We Might Change the Process and Product of Managerial Research." *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 6 (2007): 1334-1345.

———— . "Barriers to the Advance of Organisational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependent Variable." *Academy of Management Review* 18, no. 4 (1993): 599–620.

———— . "Why Do Bad Management Theories Persist? A Comment on Ghoshal." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 1 (Mar 2005): 96-100.

Pindur, Wolfgang, Sandra E. Rogers and Pan Suk Kim. “The History of Management: A Global Perspective." *Journal of Management History* 1, no. 1 (1995): 59-77.

Pirson, Michael A. and Claus Dierksmeier. “Reconnecting Management Theory and Social Welfare: A Humanistic Perspective.” *Academy of Management Annual Meeting Proceedings* (2014). Accessed June 10, 2016. Doi:10.5465/AMBPP.2014.11.

Robbins, Stephen P. and Mary Coulter. *Management.* 14th ed. New Jersey: Pearson, 2017.

Rock, David and Beth Jones. “Why More and More Companies Are Ditching Performance Ratings.” *Harvard Business Review*, September 8, 2015. Accessed November 24, 2016. https://hbr.org/2015/09/why-more-and-more-companies-are-ditching-performance-ratings.

Rosenzweig, Phil. “The Halo Effect and Other Managerial Delusions.” *The McKinsey Quarterly*, Issue 1 (February 2007). Accessed February 20, 2016. http://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/the-halo-effect-and-other-managerial-delusions.

——— . *The Halo Effect and the Eight Other Business Delusions That Deceive Managers*. New York: Free Press, 2007.

Sandelands, Lloyd. “The Business of Business is the Human Person: Lessons from the Catholic Social Tradition.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 85, no. 1 (2009): 93–101.

Schaefer, Stephan and Christopher Wickert, “The Efficiency Paradox in Organization and Management Theory,” *Academy of Management Proceedings*, no. 1 (2015): 10958.

Sørensen, Bent M. et al. “Theology and Organization.” *Organization* 19, no. 3 (2012): 267-279.

Steingard, David S. “Spiritually-Informed Management Theory: Toward Profound Possibilities for Inquiry and Transformation.” *Journal of Management Inquiry* 14, no. 3 (Sep 2005): 227-241.

Stewart, Matthew. *The Management Myth: Debunking Modern Business Philosophy*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 2009.

Tracey, Paul. “Religion and Organization: A Critical Review of Current Trends and Future Directions.” *The Academy of Management Annals* 6, no. 1 (June 2012): 87–134.

United Nations. “Sustainable Development Goals.” Accessed February 20, 2016. http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/.

——— . “United Nations Global Compact.” Accessed February 20, 2016. https://www.unglobalcompact.org/what-is-gc/mission/principles.

——— . “United Nations Principles for Responsible Management Education.” Accessed February 20, 2016. http://www.unprme.org/about-prme/the-six-principles.php.

——— . “Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” Accessed February 20, 2016. http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/.

Urwick, Lyndall. “Management in Perspective: The Tactics of Jungle Warfare.” *Academy of Management Journal* (December 1963): 316-329.

Wankel, Charles. “Management.” In *Encyclopaedia of Business in Today's World*, 1051-1053. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2009.

Witzel, Morgen. *A History of Management Thought*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Wooldridge, Adrian. *Masters of Management: How the Business Gurus and Their Ideas Have Changed the World – For Better and For Worse*. New York: Harper Business, 2011.

Wren, Daniel A. *The History of Management Thought*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2005.

Zigarelli, Michael A. “Catholic Social Teaching and the Employment Relationship: A Model for Managing Human Resources in Accordance with Vatican Doctrine.” *Journal of Business Ethics* 12, no. 1 (Jan 1993): 75-82.

(IV) Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes*, and church documents

Alberigo, Giuseppe, Jean-Pierre Jossua and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds. *The Reception of Vatican II.* Kent, England: Burns & Oates, 1987.

Alberigo, Giuseppe and Joseph A. Komonchak, eds. *History of Vatican II, Volume I-V.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995-2006.

Benedict XVI. *Caritas in Veritate, Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth.* Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2009.

——— . *Porta Fidei, Apostolic Letter for the Indiction of the Year of Faith.* Vatican City: Vatican City Press, 2011.

Cardman, Francine. “History and Hope: Retrieving *Gaudium et Spes* for the Church and the World.” In *Hope: Promise, Possibility and Fulfillment.* Edited by Richard Lennan and Nancy Pineda-Madrid, 224-239. New York: Paulist Press, 2013.

Catechism of the Catholic Church. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1994.

Curran, Charles E. *Catholic Social Teaching, 1891-present: A Historical, Theological, and Ethical Analysis.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2002.

Doyle, Dennis M. *The Church Emerging from Vatican II: A Popular Approach to Contemporary Catholicism.* Mystic, CN: Twenty-Third Publications, 2002.

Faggioli, Massimo. “The Battle over *Gaudium et Spes* Then and Now: Dialogue with the Modern World after Vatican II.” *Origins* 42, no. 34 (January 31, 2013): 545-551.

Faggioli, Massimo and Andrea Vicini, eds. *The Legacy of Vatican II*. New York: Paulist Press, 2015.

Flannery, Austin, ed. *Vatican Council II: The Basic Sixteen Documents: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations. A Completely Revised Translation in Inclusive Language.* Northport, NY: Costello, 1996.

Francis. *Evangelii Gaudium, Apostolic Exhortation on the Proclamation of the Gospel in Today's World*. Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2013.

——— . *Laudato Si, Encyclical Letter on Care for Our Common Home.* Vatican City: Vatican Press, 2015.

Hollenbach, David. "Commentary on Gaudium et Spes." In *Modern Catholic Social Teaching: Commentaries and Interpretations*. Edited by Kenneth R. Himes, 266-291. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2005.

Jechura, Chet Mitchell. "A Grammar of the Natural Law: A Celebration of Josef Fuchs and His Legacy for Natural Law Renewal." *The Heythrop Journal* 56, no. 4 (2015): 559-569.

John Paul II, *Laborem Exercens, Encyclical Letter on Human Work.* Vatican City: Vatican Press, 1981.

Kasper, Walter. "The Theological Anthropology of *Gaudium et Spes.*" *Communio* 23 (1996): 129-140.

——— . *Theology and Church.* New York: Crossroad, 1989.

Keenan, James F. "Vatican II and Theological Ethics." *Theological Studies* 74 (2013): 162-190.

Komonchak, Joseph A. "Augustine, Aquinas or the Gospel *sine glossa*? Divisions Over *Gaudium et Spes.*" In *Unfinished Journey: The Church 40 Years after Vatican II. Essays for John Wilkins*. Edited by Austen Ivereigh, 102-118. London: Continuum, 2003.

——— . "The Redaction and Reception of *Gaudium et Spes*: Tensions within the Majority at Vatican I." Accessed May 1, 2016. https://jakomonchak.files.wordpress.com/2013/04/jak-views-of-gaudium-et-spes.pdf.

——— . "The Significance of Vatican Council II for Ecclesiology." In *The Gift of the Church: A Textbook on Ecclesiology in Honor of Patrick Granfield, O.S.B.* Edited by Peter C. Phan, 69-92. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000.

Latourelle, Rene, ed. *Vatican II Assessment and Perspectives: 25 Years After*. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Lawler, Michael G., Todd A. Salzman and Eileen Burke-Sullivan. *The Church in the Modern World: Gaudium et Spes Then and Now*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2014.

Massaro, Thomas. *Living Justice: Catholic Social Teaching in Action.* Franklin, WI: Sheed & Ward, 2000.

Miller, John H, ed. *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

Moltmann, Jürgen. "Horizons of Hope." *The Christian Century*, May 20, 2009.

Naughton, Michael. "The Corporation as a Community of Work: Understanding the Firm Within the Catholic Social Tradition." *Ave Maria Law Review* 4 (2006): 33-76.

O'Malley, John W. "Vatican II: Did Anything Happen?" *Theological Studies* 67, no. 1 (March 2006): 3-33.

O'Malley, John W. *What Happened at Vatican II.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Peterson, Brandon. "Critical Voices: The Reactions of Rahner and Ratzinger to 'Schema XIII' (*Gaudium et Spes*)." *Modern Theology* 31, no. 1 (Jan 2015): 1-26.

Pius XI. *Quadragesimo Anno, Encyclical on Reconstruction of the Social Order.* Vatican City: Vatican Press, 1931.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, *Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church.* Washington DC: USCCB Publishing, 2005.

———. *The Vocation of the Business Leader.* Rome: Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, 2014.

Rush, Ormond. *Still Interpreting Vatican II: Some Hermeneutical Principles*. New York: Paulist Press, 2004.

Schindler, David L. "Christology and the Imago Dei: Interpreting *Gaudium et Spes.*" *Communio* 23 (Spring 1996): 156-184.

Selling, Joseph A. "*Gaudium et Spes*: A Manifesto for Contemporary Moral Theology." In *Vatican II and its Legacy.* Edited by M. Lamberigts and L. Kenis, 145-162. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

Sullivan, Maureen. *The Road to Vatican II: Key Changes in Theology.* New York: Paulist Press, 2007.

Synod of Bishops. "The Final Report of the 1985 Extraordinary Synod of Bishops." *Origins* 15 (December 19, 1985).

Tanner, Norman. *The Church and the World: Gaudium et Spes, Inter Mirifica*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2005.

Vorgrimler, Herbert, ed. *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II, Volume I-V.* New York: Herder & Herder, 1967.