



The Wheel of Mindfulness: a Generative Framework for Second-Generation Mindful Leadership

Elizabeth King¹ · Richard Badham¹

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2018

Abstract

The field of mindfulness research and programs, in the workplace and elsewhere, has been a matter of considerable ambiguity and contestation. Distinguishing between first-generation and second-generation mindfulness-based initiatives has been a useful and positive response to this uncertainty and controversy. Second-generation mindfulness interventions in leadership are defined as going beyond views of mindfulness as a means to reduce the stress inherent in continual change, and as instrumental support for organizational performance in an economy of attention. The purpose of this paper is to build on this work in two ways. Firstly, it acknowledges the contribution of first-generation psychological-therapeutic programs. Secondly, it highlights the value of extending the range and depth of Buddhist-derived interventions beyond such programs and most importantly, also capturing and exploring the value of critical and collective approaches to mindfulness that derive from other traditions and schools of thought. In order to guide such a progression, this paper presents a Wheel of Mindfulness model that captures the different, and inevitably selective, lenses on mindfulness, and provides a generative framework for exploring and building on sources of controversy and debate.

Keywords Mindfulness · Leadership development · Mindful leadership · Attention economy · Second-generation MBIs

The field of mindfulness research and programs has been a matter of considerable ambiguity and contestation. This ambiguity has been reflected in characterizations of mindfulness as a floating signifier (Islam et al. 2017; Wallis 2011), an exemplar of the Buddhist presumption of the inherent emptiness of being (Wilson 2014) and a term “so vague and elastic that it serves almost as a cipher into which one can read virtually anything we want” (Bodhi 2011, p. 22). Often, acrimonious contestation and debate add to the uncertainty and frustration, with ongoing tension existing between boosters and knockers of (Mc)Mindfulness research and programs (Harrington and Dunne 2015; Purser and Loy 2013).

One useful and positive response to this uncertainty and controversy has been to distinguish between first-generation

and second-generation mindfulness-based initiatives. This distinction captures first generation as the spread and wide-spread influence of individualistic, therapeutic, and primarily instrumental mindfulness programs designed to improve performance, health, and well-being (e.g., mindfulness-based stress relief or MBSR and mindfulness-based cognitive therapy or MBCT). Discussing and promoting second-generation programs also opens up the space for mainstream consideration of alternative and more expansive views of mindfulness which include expert-facilitation in ethics and reflection which are broader-based and better equipped to produce transformational change in practitioners (Shonin et al. 2016). The originators of the term (Van Gordon et al. 2015) developed and actively advocate a specific version of second-generation mindfulness: Buddhist-derived interventions (BDI) that are overtly spiritual in nature (Van Gordon et al. 2016) together with a specific meditation awareness training (MAT) program (Shonin et al. 2014) that combines meditative insight, ethical awareness, and wisdom insights and practices (Shonin and Van Gordon 2015).

The purpose of this paper is to guide the development of second-generation mindfulness based initiatives. In order to do so, it proposes a “Wheel of Mindfulness” framework

✉ Elizabeth King
elizabeth@metamindfulness.com

¹ Macquarie Graduate School of Management, Macquarie University, North Ryde, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia

designed to capture the different, and inevitably selective, lenses on mindfulness, and the sources of controversy and debate over what is valuable (or not) in mindfulness capabilities and programs.

The framework is intended to foster constructive discussion and development of, and between, these perspectives. In order to do so, the kinds of capabilities and qualities that the different discursive arenas of mindfulness seek to create and the behaviors that they require are identified before outlining the principles of the kinds of programs that might be created to develop and integrate such behaviors and qualities. The term “qualities” is intended to avoid the narrowly restrictive character of traditional models of skill development and is drawn from the Buddhist leadership and governance models grounded in the classic text “The Guide to the Bodhisattva” (Shantideva and Batchelor 1981; Bunting 2016; Galay 1999).

The Wheel of Mindfulness

Contemporary understandings of mindful leadership and debate over its value are dominated by support for, or critique of, individual-instrumental, first-generation mindfulness research, concepts, and programs. As illustrated in Fig. 1, alternative views are grounded in established and widely resonant perspectives (and associated prejudices) that advocate more collective (collective mindfulness) or ethical/substantive (individual wisdom) views of mindfulness, or combine these dimensions in a focus on more collective-ethical/substantive (collective wisdom) forms. One problem with using established definitions of mindfulness is that they tend to locate the center of gravity of any discussion within one of these discursive arenas.

For the purposes of elaborating an integrative and generative Wheel of Mindfulness, therefore, we require a general definition, grounded more in established and recognizable common sense views of mindfulness than contested specialist or disciplinary discourses. Mindfulness, for our present purposes, is taken to be a state or quality of mind that attends to experience by giving full and proper attention to presence, context, and purpose. This definition highlights attentiveness to experience and the contrast with mindless inattentiveness to situation and purpose, yet it leaves open for discussion and debate the nature of presence, context and purpose, and what full and proper attention involves. This definition draws on and recognizes the influence, contribution, and contested nature of Buddhist ideas of mindfulness as *sati*, both in its original form and as it has been appropriated in the West since Victorian times. However, in order to show, and indeed emphasize, the breadth and value of its appeal, it is grounded in and incorporates established uses of mindfulness in the English language from the thirteenth century on (OED

1979). In this way, it transcends and allows discussion and debate over competing definitions of mindfulness that are more attentive to here-and-nowism or memory, non-judgment or ethical awareness, attention-enhancement or personal transformation, stress-relief or reflective learning, personal or social issues, self-enhancement or self-transcendence, grounding in meditation or non-meditation, and so on. How the Wheel of Mindfulness supports the exploration of such issues is illustrated below.

The Dimensions of the Framework


Rather than viewing mindfulness as having an essential nature with singular meaning and unilateral significance, this perspective views it as an ambiguous and contested phenomenon (Islam 2017), a reflection of and contributor towards a complex modern culture with multiple axes of resonance (Rosa 2013), or orders of worth (Boltanski and Thevenot 2006). Two of the main axes of contention that are central to common misunderstandings and disputes about mindfulness are created by the ambiguities, conflicts, and disputes over what mindfulness is of and what mindfulness is for (Brazier 2002, 2013). In particular, these issues of and for concern whether mindfulness is viewed as an individual or collective experience and for instrumental or substantive purposes, substantive referring to considerations of ends rather than means.

Mindfulness perspectives are more individual in character when they are directed towards immediate personal experience, emphasizing awareness and attention to the present moment, stress reduction, emotion regulation, overcoming habitual thought and behavior, etc. They have a more collective focus when addressing the insubstantial nature of the individual self and the reality of interdependence, group mind, relational mindfulness, and organizational support for cooperative and heedful thought and action.

Mindfulness perspectives are characterized in instrumental terms when they are focused on how individual performance and well-being might be improved through mindful thought and behavior and how organizational sustainability and success might be enhanced. Mindfulness has a more strongly substantive focus when the viewpoint is mindful (re)consideration of purpose, the value of transcending self-centered concerns of individuals and organizations, and attending to the meaning of individual action and collective endeavors.

As outlined in Fig. 1, these two dimensions give us four discursive arenas with different foci or centers of gravity. The discursive arenas of individual and collective mindfulness are centrally concerned with self-development and organizational development—the performance and health of individuals and organizations. The discursive arenas of individual and collective wisdom extend the concern with mindfulness to consideration of the meaning and purpose of enterprises. They focus

Fig. 1 Mindfulness—axes of resonance



attention onto a deeper exploration of the source of the catastrophic living (Kabat-Zinn 1990) to which individual and collective mindfulness seeks to adapt us while questioning the value of focusing on a successful self or high performing and sustainable organization in an inherently interdependent and impermanent world.

While these dimensions have been selected to capture key areas of diversity within mindfulness research and programs, they have also been chosen because they reflect established cultural tensions in the (re)construction of Buddhism in the West. Many supporters and critics of individualistic and instrumental first-generation mindfulness programs simply praise or condemn such programs for their pragmatic and economic focus on developing individual potential to act with greater focus, creativity, and resilience. However, what underlies the popularity of such programs, as well as their critiques, are cultural resonances that lie deeper. In line with the observations of scholars of Buddhist modernism, the shaping of mindfulness rhetoric and initiatives in the West arguably reflects contradictory tensions in modern society (McMahan 2008). On the one hand, individuals and organizations gain autonomy and material rewards from modernity's individualistic and instrumentalist ethos. One source of mindfulness' popularity is its apparent ability to further such ends and hence the resonance of its more individualistic and instrumental forms. On the other hand, cultural modernism has always grappled with the disturbing consequences of this ethos, searching for forms of community to combat an alienating individualism and provide a quasi-religious sense of purpose for those living within an iron cage of bureaucratic instrumentality (Weber 1946, p. 156). A second source of mindfulness resonance lies in its promise to provide a basis for a sense of community and purpose, grounded in experience and without

relying on a religious deity—hence the appeal of the more collective and substantive dimensions of mindfulness.

The Wheel as Generative Metaphor

As a result of the differences and tensions surrounding what mindfulness is and what it is for, mindfulness can be appropriately characterized as an inherently multi-dimensional term. Ambiguous and tension-laden, the result is an essentially contested concept, one about which reasonable people have reasonable grounds to disagree (Gallie 1956). A key question, then, is how one is to proceed.

The Wheel of Mindfulness framework has been developed in order to steer a middle course between two temptations. One temptation is to explore, develop, and side with one perspective at the expense of the others. This inevitably parcels out the discursive arena of mindfulness into a contested terrain, occupied by saints and sinners, guilty perpetrators, and gullible victims (Burke 1984). The other temptation is to seek, and then impose, conformity. Such an approach attempts to silence dispute and overcome diversity by identifying the true nature or origins of mindfulness, revealing its real effects and, through the force of rhetoric and the power of practice, compel conformity (Kornberger et al. 2006). By identifying different discursive arenas, the matrix outlining the axes of resonance could, therefore, encourage pigeon-holing and entrapment within the first temptation while, more or less insidiously, reflecting the second when used to justify and impose partisan views as superior to the others. Our aim, however, in developing and deploying a Wheel of Mindfulness metaphor lies elsewhere. It is to help avoid such entrapments and provide a means for constructively promoting the range, power, and influence of mindfulness programs. It aims to do so by

encouraging an acknowledgement of diversity, recognizing its value, and incorporating the different insights and strengths in a generative discussion of further program development.

As outlined in Fig. 2, the Wheel of Mindfulness metaphor is employed to shift attention away from the confines of a mechanistic 2 × 2 matrix and onto the combined contribution and mutually reinforcing nature of the different discursive arenas. By representing the axes as spokes within a revolving wheel, the metaphor is intended to convey an image of ongoing movement and joint contribution. The shared assumptions that underlie the various approaches to mindfulness not only mean that they can be viewed as making different valuable contributions but also, in both theory and practice, discussions and actions within any of the different arenas inevitably raise issues that are addressed in greater depth by the others.

It is not expected, however, that what this metaphor generates will be an easy conversation. With every perspective goes a prejudice, and the disagreements and controversies over the nature of mindfulness and its value run deep. These are rooted in different disciplinary regimes of truth, as well as embedded cultural tensions or fault-lines within the modern world view. This is another reason for using the metaphor of a Wheel of Mindfulness. In discussions of Buddhist-derived mindfulness initiatives, reference is frequently made to the Four Noble Truths, and in particular, the inevitability of dukkha which is commonly represented as suffering in the world (Silananda and Heinze 1995). The origins of the term, and its literal translation comes, however, from a reference to life’s experience as akin to that of a ride on a donkey cart with an off-center wheel, a little difficult, uncomfortable, and uneasy (Goldstein 2013). The Wheel of Mindfulness is, therefore, intended to also convey that the turn of the Wheel is likely to be a bumpy ride, with an off-centre axle presently biased towards individual mindfulness.




Fig. 2 The Wheel of Mindfulness

Frustrated aspirations, unintended consequences, and unproductive conflicts are likely to be as prevalent as celebrated achievements, intended outcomes, and cosmopolitan tolerance. In our initial presentation of the Wheel, for example, the existing hub is portrayed as off-center, more firmly located within the individual mindfulness quadrant as the bulk of discussions surrounds the, arguable, over-concentration of research and programs in that arena.

The Inner and Outer Rims of the Wheel

While providing contrasting perspectives on mindfulness, the discursive arenas above share common elements. In accordance with our previously mentioned general and inclusive definition, this involves shared views of the nature of experience that should be attended to and what this attentiveness involves. As illustrated in Fig. 3, the Wheel of Mindfulness also highlights the danger of spinning out from a productive exchange based on a recognition of similarity as well as diversity, relapsing into established prejudices and mutual recriminations between varied interpretations of the most important elements and contributions of mindfulness.

The inner rim of the Wheel of Mindfulness is made up of the common assumptions about what it is to pay full and proper attention to experience. Despite varied understandings and continuing disagreements over precisely what this involves, the psychological and medical literature on mindfulness has played an important role in capturing and defining commonly accepted key components. For the sake of brevity and accessibility, these may be presented as three As: breadth and clarity Awareness, meta-cognition and regulation of Attention, and an attitude of Acceptance that ranges from openness and non-judgment to care and compassion, with




Fig. 3 The Wheel of Mindfulness—the elaborated metaphor

curiosity occupying a half-way house between these components (Desbordes et al. 2014; Siegel 2007).

Overall, the benefits of mindfulness are attributed to the combination of these attributes, variously defined as re-perceiving (Shapiro et al. 2006) and a capability for attunement and discernment (Siegel 2007). The combination is a meta-mechanism whereby what was previously subject rotates to object. This rotation involves a move from a narrative to an experiencing view of the self (Desbordes et al. 2014; Farb et al. 2007), such that rather than being immersed in the drama of our personal narrative or life story, we are able to stand back and simply witness it. For Siegel (2007), this combines an attuned awareness and focused attention that goes beyond more effortful and active reflection, with a discerning dis-identification with the activities of the mind, viewing them as waves at the surface of the mental sea.

Identified psychological benefits of developing this trait or attaining this state are the elimination of aggravated emotional responses and stressful and unproductive ruminations and an increase in adaptive self-reflection (Desbordes et al. 2014; Williams 2010). For Buddhist scholars, it both requires and generates an ideal state of equanimity, combining an even-minded and calm mental state, a level of impartiality towards internal and external experiences and events, and a non-prejudicial equal attitude towards all things (Desbordes et al. 2014).

In addition to common elements concerning the meaning of paying full and proper attention to experience, there are frequently shared background assumptions about the nature of existence, assumptions that underlie the significance of attending to presence, context, and purpose. In traditional Buddhist terminology, these are equated with dependent origination and three marks of existence. Dependent origination or conditioned arising (Wallace 2003) refers to a view of all entities as being in process, interdependent, and conditioned by other phenomena, ultimately empty of self-nature. The three marks of existence refer to the existential phenomena this creates: of impermanence (*anicca*), unsatisfactoriness or suffering (*dukkha*), and non-self (*anattā*). While formally elaborated in such terms within Buddhist philosophy, this view of the nature of experience extends beyond Buddhism, and variants are embodied in each of the discursive arenas of mindfulness.

In order to enhance accessibility while avoiding too restrictive a view of the philosophical origins of these assumptions, these could be characterized as three “I”s of *Incongruity*, *Impermanence*, and *Identification*, embedded within a state of dependent origination or *Interdependence*. The three Is refer to the following: the inherently disjointed and unsatisfactory nature of our experiential existence (*Incongruity*—the Buddhist off-center axle); the impermanence of ourselves and everything around us (*Impermanence*—all things shall pass); and a lack of essential self but tendency to see the world in terms of our own personal development and satisfaction (*Identification*—clinging to and craving for self-centered satisfactions). We use the term

identification here to capture both the Buddhist notion of non-self and the observation of Buddhist and other philosophies of the human tendency to impose and presume an identity or self.

Within Buddhist philosophy, the three marks of existence represents a view of experience as a temporal, fluid and conditional state of impermanence. The self is seen as a transient and illusory phenomenon, characterized by ongoing processes of identification. Human striving and conditions are characterized as beset by an inevitable incongruity, including those that result from our self-centered strivings to establish or preserve a stable state and avoid the realities of impermanence and the non-self. Together, these three laws of existence make up a state of dependent origination, with suffering ultimately grounded in a tendency towards adopting the deluded and inverted view that things are otherwise (Wallace, 2009: Ch.18). In general terms, of course, these assumptions are not the exclusive province of Buddhist-derived programs seeking to promote individual wisdom. An appreciation of incongruity and impermanence in human affairs is a central feature of collective mindfulness and collective wisdom debates. This is most apparent in their respective focus on the challenges of highly complex, risky, and turbulent environments, as well as the changing character of the disjunctions between commercial imperatives and social, ecological, and humanitarian aspirations. Similarly, the awareness of the nature and limitations of socially constructed and reified identifications is also a central feature of psychological-therapeutic views of individual mindfulness, as well as critical-discursive and sense-making views of individual wisdom and collective mindfulness. An acceptance and further exploration of both similarities and differences in such views is presumed and encouraged by the Wheel of Mindfulness metaphor and framework.

Beyond the Outer-Rim: a Generative Wheel or a Divisive Spinning Out

A central aim and contribution of the Wheel of Mindfulness is to encourage an acknowledgement of diversity, accompanied by recognition of common views on the nature of experience and how to attend to it. If successful in this enterprise, the discursive ground is created for constructive dialog and synergy. Individual mindfulness provides exemplary practical examples of programs with identifiable therapeutic benefits and commercial outcomes relevant for sustainable success in an attention economy. Collective mindfulness goes beyond individual mindfulness in addressing the nature and contribution of inter-personal collective minding, social intelligence, and relational leadership in complex and changing environments. Individual wisdom encourages and supports serious reflection on the basis and value of our presumed identities and meaningful endeavors, including consideration of the anxieties and dysfunctions created by uncritical acceptance of one-dimensional perspectives and externally imposed subjectivities. Collective wisdom extends such considerations into

systematic and collaborative reflection on the collective purposes and the dangers of organized irresponsibility.

If unsuccessful, however, the diverse interests, perspectives, and prejudices embedded within the different discursive arenas are liable to result in a divisive and antagonistic spinning out. Rather than complementing, and being part of a constructive synergy between the different approaches, they may be mindlessly pursued as the real or desirable approach to mindfulness and be unreflective about the partiality of their views and the limitations of their potential for narrow technocratic or ideological application. When spinning out, in this way, individual mindfulness programs embody an uncritical form of therapeutic individualism and institutional commercialism. Collective mindfulness concepts and programs are pursued as a form of mindless collectivism, excluding any consideration of the purposes for which this collective mindfulness is being deployed. Individual wisdom initiatives may become entrapped in marginal movements or static and disempowering negative critiques of a commercialized modernism. Collective wisdom movements may relapse into yet another version of normative human relations managerialism or an equally simple counter or critique, either a popularistic and ultimately hypocritical and bland de-politicization of the organized irresponsibility of our society of organizations or a blanket ideological rejection of corporate capitalism.

To encourage a productive Wheel of Mindfulness, exploring areas of common concern and exploiting synergies, while recognizing yet seeking to avoid the dangers of spinning out, it is helpful to consider the key question: What would programs promoting such a framework look like, and what kind of impact are they expected to have? Moreover, as Storey (2016, p. 28) observed, all initiatives to develop higher level or leadership abilities inevitably involve some views of the desired and expected range of capabilities and the behavioral accomplishments that will be created, often presuming that the latter depend on the former. What, then, are the kinds of skills, competencies, capabilities or qualities that different types of mindfulness programs are expected or required to deliver? And what identifiable behaviors, accomplishments and outcomes are intended or achieved?

As with any other attempt to define skills, competencies, or capabilities as outcomes required from management or leadership programs, this task is fraught with ambiguity, tension and controversy. This is particularly pronounced when it involves, as it does in this case, a movement from programs that create understanding (knowing that) to ones that incorporate regulating and/or applying what is known (knowing how), advancing from technical skills to those creating self-awareness and social intelligence, from single loop learning to double and triple loop learning, and technical proficiency to substantive qualities (involving character attributes and morality). In order to highlight, and help embed, the Wheel of Mindfulness framework, this paper provides provisional and

tentative guidelines on the kinds of capabilities (knowing that) and qualities (knowing how) that programs addressing the four discursive arenas of mindfulness focus on developing and the different types of behavioral and performance outcomes they are centrally concerned with.

Mindfulness Capabilities: Knowing That

The Wheel of Mindfulness grounds the different discursive arenas of mindfulness within a particular view of the nature of experience that embodies a *knowing that* view of mindfulness, i.e., that experience involves the following: incongruity (the inherently unsatisfactory nature of human existence, the inevitability of suffering, the disparity that exists between what we aspire to or yearn for and what we can achieve and realize), impermanence (the essentially contingent, fluid, emergent and uncontrollable nature of things, and the course of events), and identification (the lack of a coherent or enduring self, yet a self-preoccupation that ranges from perceptions of the world and its significance to clinging to, and craving for, self-centered satisfactions). Despite these commonalities, each of the discursive arenas represented in the Wheel of Mindfulness have a different emphasis or center of intellectual gravity in their interpretation of these issues. Given the broad range and diverse nature of research and programs within each of these arenas, what follows is intended as an initial summary and basis for generative inquiry not as an authoritative set of rigid and exclusionary guidelines.

Within individual-instrumental views of mindfulness, incongruity is represented as suffering from twin arrows, both our experiences of failure, pain and loss, and our thoughts about the experiences. Our awareness of impermanence comes through observation of the ephemeral and shifting nature of the thoughts, sensations, and feelings through presence in the moment. In terms of identification, the focus becomes one of knowledge and questioning of our identification processes through a meta-cognitive awareness of our self-narrated stories about events, the unproductive and anxiety creating ruminations that follow from them, and the value of a non-judgmental and compassionate response towards our experiences and our entrapments within these stories.

For individual-substantive approaches to mindfulness, the focus is on the incongruities that exist in the form of the deficiencies we experience through gaps between our purposes and our achievements, as well as the problematic consequences of personal and interpersonal immoral conduct. It also highlights the impermanence of changing cultural discourses that entrap us within their problematizations of the world, accompanied by our experience of complexity, emergence, and lack of control in an ever-changing world. And, finally, it questions our identifications with restricted perspectives from which we seek to exercise control over the world,

as well as obsessions with individualistic and commercialized self-improvement solutions.

Collective-instrumental mindfulness approaches are centrally concerned with incongruities brought about by different and shifting views of group tasks and institutional goals rather than those of us as an individual. The focus on impermanence in this case is due to the unpredictably emergent nature of complex systems, as well as changing orientations and situations that render yesterday's solutions out of date, while for the collective instrumental dimension, identification is seen through clinging to and following earlier and established rules, understandings, identities, and views about the situation at hand.

For collective-substantive forms of mindfulness, in contrast, the central concern is with incongruities brought about through organized irresponsibility and conflicts between social, ecological, and economic goals. Notions of impermanence relate to organizational entities and systems in which integrative solutions are not sought and in which there are ongoing challenges involved in letting go of the past while letting the future come. Questions around identification involve the restriction of individuals and organizations identifying with the narrow interests and concerns of their own institutional arrangements and survival at the expense of a more expansive view of social and ecological sustainability and survival. A key dimension of mindfulness is knowing that individual and collective experience has the features elaborated above (see Table 1).

Mindfulness Qualities: Knowing How

What mindfulness also involves, however, goes beyond knowing *that* to include knowing *how*. This incorporates yet goes beyond extending mindfulness from a set of technical skills for improving performance and well-being to including a set of personal attributes including reflective capabilities and moral qualities. Knowing how, following Ryle (1949), involves moving beyond knowing that experience has certain characteristics and that there are more or less appropriate ways of handling the challenges that it presents to knowing how to handle these challenges. The Wheel of Mindfulness framework, as outlined earlier, addresses such attributes, capabilities, and qualities as a combination of awareness of, attention to, and acceptance of incongruity, impermanence, and identification. Again, however, different areas of focus are given more or less emphasis within the different discursive arenas of mindfulness. Similar to the focus on knowing that experience is marked by incongruity, impermanence, and identification, the following analysis of knowing how to handle this knowledge provides a set of generative guidelines for consideration rather than a rigid or exclusionary template to follow.

Within the individual mindfulness arena, knowing how involves the following: awareness of the direct experiences of

Table 1 Mindfulness: knowing that

	Individual	Collective
Substantive	Incongruity	Incongruity
	Subordination to self-imposed quests	Contradictions between economic and social/ecological objectives
	Impermanence	Impermanence
	Fluid cognitive constructions of purpose	Instability, uncertainty, and lack of sustainability in global systems
	Identification	Identification
	Commercial self-centered entrapments	Organized irresponsibility
Instrumental	Incongruity	Incongruity
	Twin arrows and surplus suffering	Risk of disaster from rigid and divergent views of group tasks and individual contributions
	Impermanence	Impermanence
	Present momentness and the transience of thoughts, feelings, sensations	Unpredictable emergence and situational contingencies in relationship, group and institutional endeavor
	Identification	Identification
	Metacognition and reflexivity on self-narratives	Entrapments of habituated relationships, - groupthink and institutionalised routines

suffering within, and the unsatisfactory nature of experience when unmediated by our thoughts about and responses to it; the partial and shifting nature of all of our thoughts, physical experiences, and feelings; the degree to which we view the world through our own self-centered beliefs about, and judgments of, these phenomena; paying sustained attention to these phenomena, taking them into account in regulating our attentiveness towards them and our responses; and, through acceptance, being able to constructively direct this regulation without being entrapped in distracting and painful judgment-based ruminations and to do so in a manner that is informed by curiosity and compassion, towards ourselves, others, and events. The latter is a phenomenon that creates, and depends upon, the creation of a state of equanimity.

Within individual wisdom, knowing how involves the following: awareness of the inevitable incongruity in our ability to realize our purposes, the impermanent and changing nature of how these purposes are constructed, and the entrapments of commercial and self-centered solutions; going further to pay attention to these phenomena in systematic, disciplined, and sustained analysis and reflection; and, in addition, fostering acceptance of the inevitability of our entrapments by such phenomena, the limitations they impose upon us, and the advantages of adopting a sympathetic approach that both acknowledges and goes beyond them.

Within collective mindfulness, knowing how involves the following: awareness of different knowledge about and views of collective endeavors from those involved, as well as the emergent and situated nature of required action; organizational routines, beliefs, and practices that support sustained attention to such matters; and a value-based and politically supported commitment to accepting such challenges, the need for open and honest attending to difference and failure, and the contribution of ongoing wariness.

Within collective wisdom, knowing how involves the following: awareness of incongruities within, impermanence of and entrapments of restricted identifications with economic, social, and ecological purposes; systems of stakeholder management and cultures that are both cosmopolitan and creative in encouraging and supporting attention to such matters; and an acceptance of the inevitable tensions and paradoxes that includes a curious, creative, and proactive commitment to coping with the anxieties and conflicts this creates and encouraging a search for possible solutions.

What can, hopefully, be seen from the above (and as illustrated in Table 1) is the degree to which the different discursive arenas provide alternative yet valuable insights into the range and depth of possible mindfulness qualities. In each case, the insights are derived from what is an inevitably diverse and evolving set of research and programs. Moreover, as becomes increasingly clear, there are similarities and overlaps, as well as differences, between those whose focus of attention is within one arena rather than another. The purpose of the Wheel of Mindfulness is to provide just such an understanding and to identify thematic similarities and continuities as well as relatively enduring patterns of difference and preference (and as illustrated in Tables 1 and 2).

Mindfulness Qualities: Showing How

It would be premature at this stage of the development of mindfulness research and programs to identify with any authority what major behavioral and performance accomplishments are to be expected. Continuing disagreement on outcomes of different forms of mindfulness and mindfulness education continues, including whether a number of these outcomes are beneficial or not. These disputes are grounded in conflicting evidence, diverse paradigms of proof and differing cognitive, and ethical and political foci and preferences. For an emerging field, formally committed to mindful heed and inclusiveness, this diversity should be acknowledged and respected. It is something to be aware of, attentive towards, and accepted in a manner that is open, sympathetic, and curious.

While acknowledging this state of affairs, however, in our view, it is important to extend generative conversation and debate about the potential of mindfulness into a more comprehensive and reflective consideration of identifiable behavioral

Table 2 Mindfulness: knowing how

	Individual	Collective
Substantive	Awareness Of subordination to transient, self-imposed, and commercialized self-centeredness and control	Awareness Of organized irresponsibility and contradictions between economic and social/sustainability concerns
	Attention Attention regulation and disciplined meta-cognition of such forms of subordination	Attention Collective attention regulation and disciplined meta-cognition of narrow and contradictory group and institutional purposes
	Acceptance Openness, curiosity, and compassion towards such entrapments and their transcendence	Acceptance Openness, curiosity, and compassion towards transcending tensions in complex purposive systems
Instrumental	Awareness Of the twin arrows, present-momentness, and the self-narrated nature of experience	Awareness Of the emergent and situated nature of collective action and risks of partial and habituated viewpoints
	Attention Attention regulation and disciplined meta-cognition of above individual experiences	Attention Collective attention regulation and disciplined metacognition applied to such experiences
	Acceptance Open, curious, and compassionate attendance to the above experiences	Acceptance Open, curious, and compassionate attendance to the experimental and risky nature of group and institutional endeavor

outcomes and accomplishments. For this reason, some general guidelines, as suggested in Table 3, Mindfulness Qualities: Showing How may be valuable if treated in a generative rather than authoritative fashion. While recognizing that behavioral outcomes and performance accomplishments will be contextual, Table 3 provides suggestive links between mindfulness qualities, or knowing that and knowing how, with the type of behavioral and performance outcomes that could be expected through showing how they are being exercised. Whether an outcome is a measure of performance or achievement, or not, is dependent on the individual, organization, context, and shared intention.

For individual mindfulness as characterized in the Wheel, this conversation involves further clarifying measures of: awareness of and focus on self, others, and complex environments; regulation of attention and double loop reflective meta-cognition of self-narratives and perspectives; levels of

Table 3 Mindfulness: showing how

Quadrants	Behavioral outcomes	Performance accomplishments
Individual mindfulness	Demonstrated awareness of self, others, and complex environments	e.g., low levels of stress e.g., select, sustain, and switch attention
	Demonstrated regulation of attention and double loop reflective metacognition	e.g., cooperative social relationships
	Demonstrated calm and equanimity in reacting to stress and attending to relationships	
Collective mindfulness	Established mindful infrastructures	e.g., low levels of accidents
	Demonstrated mindful organizing values, behaviors and practices	e.g., high levels of goal attainment in collective projects
Individual wisdom	Demonstrated meta-skills of self-awareness in establishing purpose and controls	e.g., level of engagement with goals and direction of action e.g., rapid and effective redirection in response to unpredicted crises
	Demonstrated meta-abilities in self-regulating behavior based on such awareness	e.g., level of experimental initiatives and achievements
	Demonstrated meta-qualities in open, curious, and compassionate responses to challenges	
Collective wisdom	Demonstrated institutional reflection on organized irresponsibility and socioeconomic contradictions	e.g., level of resourcing and scope of corporate social responsibility e.g., operational outcomes achieved by following principles and procedures
	Established routines, practices, and structures attending to such concerns	e.g., application of values when reacting to critical tests
	Institutionalized cultural values and power structures that acknowledge and experiment with such tensions	

equanimity in accepting with curiosity and compassion the results of this awareness and attention; and evidence of avoidance of mindless behavior through reduced anxiety and stress, enhanced resilience, less reactive behavior, and improved relationships (Crane et al. 2017).


For individual wisdom, it involves further identifying and clarifying the behaviors exhibited by individuals who are aware of incongruities, impermanence, and self-centered/commercialized entrapments in how they define the purpose of their endeavors; how far and in what ways they are able to regulate and reflect on such matters; the degree to which they are accepting, curious, and compassionate (towards themselves as well as others) in such enterprises; and in what ways

and to what degree they possess and achieve behavioral outcomes and accomplishments that avoid mindless restrictions and unreflective self-concern in their endeavors. Measures of such behaviors are notoriously difficult to operationalize. Work done on identifying meta-abilities or meta-qualities (Buckley and Monks 2004; Burgoyne et al. 2004; Pedler et al. 2010) refers to a broad list of capabilities and attributes including creativity, mental agility, and balanced learning habits and skills, as well as self-knowledge (and recommended further consideration of self-confidence). Identification of whether or not managers have succeeded in developing such meta-qualities, however, relies on broad categories, qualitative observation, and 360° feedback rather than simple or quantifiable measures or observations from singular viewpoints. After decades of effort and insights from the proliferation of programs, studies, and measures of mindfulness, there is an important task and challenge to be found in increasing attention to how this can be achieved through a focus on wisdom as evidenced in studies of second-generation interventions (Singh et al. 2015).

For collective mindfulness, the identification of behavioral accomplishments requires greater clarification and work on identifying: collective levels of awareness of diversity, uncertainty, and emergence concerning group tasks and how they are and should be achieved, elaboration on levels of development of supportive mindful infrastructures based on established principles and further customization of high reliability principles of organization (c.f. Weick and Sutcliffe 2015), and identifying and measuring mindful organizing (Vogus and Sutcliffe 2012) behaviors and practices that support and develop these forms of awareness and attention practices.

In regard to collective wisdom, as argued by Green (1999), the challenge of identifying core competencies at the level of the organization is accompanied by the requirement to include within this identification, considerations of shared purpose, beliefs, and culture in regard to why work is done rather than simply how work is done. What this necessitates is the capture and operationalization of behavioral outcomes in relation to collective awareness of the incongruities, impermanence, and limitations of institutional self-definition of purpose, specifically in regard to how it blends economic, social, and ecological concerns; the routines, practices, and structures established by institutions to ensure that they attend to such concerns; and the cultural values and institutional politics established to ensure that the tensions this involve are acknowledged and accepted and that the requirement to live with these tensions and explore partial/possible solutions is carried out with curiosity and compassion. As is the case for individual wisdom, however, there are significant challenges involved in determining the collective behavioral accomplishments in establishing this type of sustainable learning organization. Despite the inevitable incompleteness, addressing the challenge of describing observable behaviors associated with individual and collective wisdom may foster continued

Fig. 4 Second-generation mindfulness programs



development of Buddhist derived (second generation) development programs by enabling closer integration of these programs into existing human resource protocols such as competency and capability matrices (Griffin et al. 2007; Mumford et al. 2007).

Implications for Second-Generation Mindful Leadership Interventions

Van Gordon et al.'s (2015) distinction between first-generation and second-generation mindfulness-based initiatives is a useful and positive response to the uncertainty and controversy surrounding mindfulness at work. The purpose of this paper has been to build on this work by acknowledging both the contribution of first-generation psychological-therapeutic programs and the value of extending the range and depth of Buddhist-derived Interventions and then to open up the space for exploring overlaps, differences, and positive contributions of other traditions and schools of thought.

Using Bunting's (2016) call for a deeper view of mindful leadership as an illustration, one objective of second-generation mindfulness interventions in leadership becomes to draw on, and yet go beyond, arguments for mindfulness as a means to reduce the stress inherent in continual change (Beck and Cowan 2014; Benson and Allen 1980), while supporting sustainable, high performance (Tenney and Gard 2016) within an economy of attention (Davenport and Beck 2013). Going beyond suggests an approach that will shift interest towards a substantive and critical view of mindful leadership that, while it supports enhanced performance (Benson et al. 2003) and profitability (Tenney and Gard 2016), aligns

more with initiatives to provide a sense of life's meaning and purpose (Garland et al. 2011), thereby also fulfilling aspirations for leaders to develop goodness through virtue-driven behavior (Muyzenberg and HRH the Dalai Lama 2011; Niemiec et al. 2012). In order to guide such a progression, the Wheel of Mindfulness is designed to capture not only the different, and inevitably selective, lenses on mindfulness, but also the sources of controversy and debate over what is valuable (or not) in mindfulness capabilities and programs.

Using two axes to capture different views of what mindfulness is of (individual or collective) and what mindfulness is for (instrumental or substantive), the Wheel concept recognizes the distinctive nature of first-generation programs as developing individual-instrumental mindfulness. However, the Wheel also opens up and provides support for, consideration of, and debate over, a broad range of second-generation mindfulness programs that are more diverse, collective, and substantive in character. In this way, as outlined in Fig. 4, it is hoped that this paper will contribute to the increasing sophistication, further development, and constructive impact of second-generation mindfulness programs.

References

- Beck, D. E., & Cowan, C. (2014). *Spiral dynamics: mastering values, leadership and change*. Maiden: Blackwell.
- Benson, H., & Allen, R. L. (1980). How much stress is too much? *Harvard Business Review*, 58(5), 86–92.
- Benson, H., Proctor, W., & De Munn, J. (2003). *The break-out principle*. Simon and Schuster Audio.

- Bodhi, B. (2011). What does mindfulness mean? A canonical perspective. *Contemporary Buddhism*, 12(1), 19–39.
- Boltanski, L., & Thevenot, L. (2006). *On justification: economies of worth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Brazier, D. (2002). *The new Buddhism*. London: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Brazier, D. (2013). Mindfulness reconsidered. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling*, 15(2), 116–126.
- Buckley, F., & Monks, K. (2004). The implications of meta-qualities for HR roles. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 14(4), 41–56.
- Bunting, M. (2016). *The mindful leader: 7 practices for transforming your leadership, your organization and your life*. Milton: Wiley.
- Burgoyne, J., Hirsch, W., & Williams, S. (2004). *The development of management and leadership capability and its contribution to performance: the evidence, the prospect and the research needs*. London: UK Dept. of Education and Skills, Research Report RR560.
- Burke, K. (1984). *Attitudes towards history*. San Francisco: University of California Press.
- Crane, R., Brewer, J., Feldman, C., Kabat-Zinn, J., Santorelli, S., Williams, J., & Kuyken, W. (2017). What defines mindfulness-based programs? The warp and the weft. *Psychological Medicine*, 47(6), 990–999.
- Davenport, T. H., & Beck, J. C. (2013). *The attention economy: understanding the new currency of business*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Desbordes, G., Gard, T., Hoge, E. A., Hölzel, B. K., Kerr, C., Lazar, S. W., Olendzki, A., & Vago, D. R. (2014). Moving beyond mindfulness: defining equanimity as an outcome measure in meditation and contemplative research. *Mindfulness*, 6(2), 356–372.
- Farb, N. A., Segal, Z. V., Mayberg, H., Bean, J., McKeon, D., Fatima, Z., & Anderson, A. K. (2007). Attending to the present: mindfulness meditation reveals distinct neural modes of self-reference. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 2, 313–322.
- Galay, K. (1999). *Gross national happiness*. Thimphu: Centre for Bhutan Studies.
- Gallie, D. (1956). Essentially contested concepts. *Proceedings of the Aristotelean Society*, 12, 167–198.
- Garland, E. L., Gaylord, S. A., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2011). Positive reappraisal mediates the stress-reductive effects of mindfulness: an upward spiral process. *Mindfulness*, 2(1), 59–67.
- Goldstein, J. (2013). *Mindfulness: a practical guide to awakening*. Boulder: Sounds True.
- Green, P. (1999). *Building robust competencies: linking human resource systems to organizational strategies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Griffin, M. A., Neal, A., & Parker, S. K. (2007). A new model of work role performance: positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 50(2), 327–347.
- Harrington, A., & Dunne, J. (2015). When mindfulness is therapy: ethical qualms, historical perspectives. *American Psychologist*, 70(7), 621–631.
- Islam, G., Holm, M., & Karjalainen, M. (2017). *Sign of the times: mindfulness as an empty signifier*. Organization, November, 1–27.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living*. New York: Delacorte.
- Kornberger, M., Clegg, S. R., & Carter, C. (2006). Rethinking the polyphonic organization: managing as discursive practice. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 22(1), 3–30.
- McMahan, D. (2008). *The making of Buddhist modernism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mumford, T. V., Campion, M. A., & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). The leadership skills strataplex: leadership skill requirements across organizational levels. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(2), 154–166.
- Muyzenberg, L., & HRH the Dalai Lama. (2011). *The leaders way: business, Buddhism and happiness in an interconnected world*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Niemiec, R. M., Rashid, T., & Spinella, M. (2012). Strong mindfulness: Integrating mindfulness and character strengths. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 34(3), 240.
- Oxford English Dictionary. (1979). *Compact edition*. London: Complete Text Book Club Associates.
- Pedler, M., Burgoyne, J., & Boydell, T. (2010). *A manager's guide to leadership: an action learning approach* (2nd ed.). London: McGraw Hill.
- Purser, R., & Loy, D. (2013). Beyond McMindfulness. The blog: *Huffington Post*, 1.
- Rosa, H. (2013). *Social acceleration: a new theory of modernity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ryle, G. (1949). *The concept of mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shantideva, A., & Batchelor, S. (1981). *A guide to the Bodhisattva way of life*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Work and Archives.
- Shapiro, S. L., Carlson, L. E., & Astin, J. A. (2006). Mechanisms of mindfulness. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 62, 373–386.
- Shonin, E., & Van Gordon, W. (2015). Managers experiences of meditation awareness training. *Mindfulness*, 6(4), 899–909.
- Shonin, E., Van Gordon, W., Dunn, T., Singh, N., & Griffiths, M. D. (2014). Meditation awareness training for work-related wellbeing and job performance: a randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 12, 806–823.
- Shonin, E., Van Gordon, W., & Griffiths, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Mindfulness and Buddhist-derived approaches to mental health and addiction*. New York: Springer.
- Siegel, D. (2007). *The mindful brain*. New York: Norton.
- Silananda, U., & Heinze, R.-I. (1995). *The four foundations of mindfulness*. Somerville: Wisdom Publications.
- Singh, N. N., Lancioni, G. E., Karazsia, B. T., Myers, R. E., Winton, A. S. W., Latham, L. L., & Nugent, K. (2015). Effects of training staff in MBPBS on the use of physical restraints, staff stress and turnover, staff and peer injuries, and cost effectiveness in developmental disabilities. *Mindfulness*, 6, 926–937.
- Tenney, M., & Gard, T. (2016). *The mindfulness edge: how to rewire your brain for leadership and personal excellence without adding to your schedule*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Van Gordon, W., Shonin, E., & Griffiths, M. D. (2015). Towards a second-generation of mindfulness-based interventions. *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 49, 591–592.
- Van Gordon, W., Shonin, E., Lomas, T., & Griffiths, M. D. (2016). Corporate use of mindfulness and authentic spiritual transmission: competing or compatible ideals? *Mindfulness and Compassion*, 1, 75–83.
- Vogus, T., & Sutcliffe, K. (2012). Organizational mindfulness and mindful organizing: a reconciliation and path forward. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 11(4), 722–735.
- Wallace, B. Alan. (2003). *Buddhism and Science: breaking new ground*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wallace, B. Alan. (2009). *Mind in the balance, meditation in science, buddhism and christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wallis, J. (2011). The elixir of mindfulness. *Speculative-Non-Buddhist*. <https://speculativenonbuddhism.com/2011/07/03/elixir-of-mindfulness/#more-237>.
- Weber, M. (1946). Class, status, party. I. In H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (pp. 180–195). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weick, K. E., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2015). *Managing the unexpected: sustained performance in a complex world*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Williams, M. (2010). Mindfulness and psychological process. *Emotion*, 10(1), 1–7.
- Wilson, J. (2014). *Mindful America: the mutual transformation of Buddhist meditation and American culture*. London: Oxford University Press.