

Workplace Spirituality: A Review of Approaches to Conceptualization and Operationalization

K.P. NandanPrabhu

Assistant Professor, School of Management, Manipal Institute of Technology, Manipal University

L. L.R. Rodrigues

Professor & Head, Department of Humanities and Management, Manipal Institute of Technology, Manipal University

K.P.V. Ramana Kumar

Professor & Dean, Faculty of Management Studies, SCSVMV University, Kanchipuram, Tamilnadu

Abstract

Workplace Spirituality is a contextualized phenomenon that seeks to identify and build meaning, connectedness and the sense of transcendence at workplace. In this regard, this paper analyzes the different approaches of researchers to pin down the concept of workplace spirituality. Further, it probes into the diverse ways in which various research constructs of workplace spirituality have been operationalized. In this connection, discussion is made with regard to levels of analysis of the constructs of workplace spirituality. The concept of workplace spirituality is situated as a contextualized phenomenon of spirituality in general, even as religion is distinguished from spirituality. The originality of this paper lies in the comparative study that it makes of the constructs of workplace spirituality conceptualized and operationalized by prior research at individual, group and organizational levels. Further, this paper has critically reviewed the scales that have been developed to capture the construct of workplace spirituality in its varied conceptualizations. Furthermore, this paper has identified the elements of commonly agreed upon dimensions of workplace spirituality that are sought to be operationalized across different measurement scales of workplace spirituality. Accordingly, this paper has theoretically contributed towards the development of robust measurement scales of the sub-constructs of workplace spirituality.

Introduction

There is growing concern among organizations that they can't aim at the growth of bottom line by sacrificing human values. Organizations have been deliberating upon the ways and means of achievement of fulfillment among employees. Accordingly man's search for meaning, which is the basis of the employees' sense of fulfillment, is understood to be expressing itself in the form of work. Therefore designing the structure of work in a manner that satisfies the demand and potential of body-mind-heart-soul has become a crucial challenge before organizations. As a result, the issue of workplace spirituality has entered into

academic discourse too. Therefore, universities have also begun to offer courses on workplace spirituality. Accordingly, research in the field of workplace spirituality is emerging and becoming vibrant. Researchers have tried to understand the various approaches to facilitate workplace spirituality (Pawar, 2009) so as to address the concerns mentioned above. In this regard, they have consistently tried to define spirituality in order to contextualize it to workplace. In this attempt, an almost consensus has emerged in the presence of essential difference between religion and spirituality (Sheep, 2006).

Need for spirituality, construct clarification,

facilitation of spirituality in organizations, appropriateness of research approaches, and performance outcomes of workplace spirituality are the broad areas in which research on workplace spirituality has proceeded so far. Though workplace spirituality is an emerging research area, there is an intellectually robust research activity in this field. Need for spirituality in organizations (Sheep, 2006; Garcia-Zamor & Jean-Claude, 2003; Corner, 2009; Marques et al, 2005; Marques, 2008; Kim, 2009; Johnson, 2007; Bygrave & Macmillan, 2008), concept specification (Neck & Milliman, 1994; Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Marques et al, 2005; Pandey et al., 2009; Pawar, 2009), organizational interventions in workplace spirituality facilitation (Pardasaniet al, 2014; Pawar, 2008), measurement development and methodological choices (Brooke & Parker, 2009; Lynn et al., 2009; Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008; Grant, O'Neil, & Stephens, 2004; Sheep, 2004), and assessment of performance outcomes of workplace spirituality (Chawla, 2014; Karakas, 2010; Ahiauzu, & Asawo, (2009); Garcia-Zamor & Jean-Claude 2003; Moore & Casper, 2006; Milliman et al, 2003; Rego, & Cunha, 2007) are the broad areas in which workplace spirituality research has unfolded itself. During the process of this research endeavor in the field of workplace spirituality, researchers have also deliberated on defining workplace spirituality (Krishnakumar & Neck, 2002; Mitroff & Denton, 1999), distinction between religion and spirituality (Hill et al., 2000), workplace spirituality facilitation (Pawar, 2009) and philosophical foundations of workplace spirituality (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008). This paper advances the research discourse on concept specification of workplace spirituality by discussing the commonly agreed components of the construct of workplace spirituality that are derived from the construct of spirituality. The prior research on workplace spirituality has not extensively discussed the components of workplace spirituality by relating the same to the components of workplace spirituality

operationalized by various measurement scales of different conceptualizations of the concept. This paper fulfills this need.

This paper contributes to the research discourse in several ways. First, this paper recognizes the dimensions of workplace spirituality in their entirety. Though the prior research on workplace spirituality (Pawar, 2009; Milliman et al., 2003; Ashmos & Duchon, 2000) has recognized the commonly accepted dimensions such as meaning, community and transcendence, the dimension of inner life (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000) is not considered by later researchers (Milliman et al, 2003). However the dimensions of inner life (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000) and mystical experience (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2004) point towards self-work integration and the resultant experiences of joy and completeness (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2004). As the integration of personal identity and work role identity is what constitutes 'inner life', the dimension can be aptly described as holistic dimension. In contrast to the earlier approaches to the conceptualization of the dimensions of workplace spirituality (Milliman et al, 2003), this paper views the holistic dimension or 'inner life' (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000) as an integral part of the conceptualization of workplace spirituality. This is because spirituality fulfills itself when human beings are able to find expression to all aspects of their 'self' and thus become 'whole person's' (Sheep, 2006). Second, this paper deliberates upon the sub-constructs and elements of all the four dimensions of workplace spirituality i.e. existential, relational, transcendental and holistic dimensions. Prior research hasn't made a comparative study of the operationalized sub-constructs and elements of the dimensions of workplace spirituality. This paper addresses this gap. Third, this paper has put together the operationalized constructs of workplace spirituality at individual, team and organizational levels so as to make a comparative study of the underlying elements of the sub-constructs.

The originality of this paper is due to three reasons.

First, this paper has identified the dimensions and elements that are commonly agreed upon among researchers who have attempted to develop scales to measure workplace spirituality. Second, this paper has identified the manifest indicators that best capture the corresponding dimensions. Third, this paper has investigated as to whether there exists reliability and validity in the scales that are developed for measuring the dimensions and sub-constructs of workplace spirituality.

This paper is organized as follows. First, the meaning of religion and spirituality is discussed so as to bring out the distinction between the two. Second, the constructs of workplace spirituality and their corresponding levels of analysis are discussed. Third, the paper would then proceed to bring out the different approaches to conceptualization and operationalization of the constructs of workplace spirituality. The objective of this comparative study of operationalization is to arrive at the convergence of research discourse on elements and sub-constructs that constitute the constructs of workplace spirituality at different levels i.e. individual, group and organization. Though this paper does not specifically discuss the distinct conceptualizations of workplace spirituality at different levels, the discussion carried out in this paper incorporates the constructs conceptualized at individual, group and organizational levels. Therefore, this paper serves the process of conceptualization and operationalization of workplace spirituality and thus facilitates the scale development process.

2. Religion and Spirituality: The Meaning and Distinction

Spirituality is viewed as personal, universal, non-denominational, inclusive and tolerant (Mitroff&Denton, 1999). Researchers in the field of workplace spirituality agree that it is indeed a challenging task to define workplace spirituality (Gull &Doh, 2004). The definitions of spirituality, as proposed by various researchers, point out that it has nothing to do with religion or religiosity (Neck

&Milliman, 1994; Dehler& Welsh, 1994). It is also observed that spirituality shouldn't be defined in terms of emotions alone (Gull &Doh, 2004). Therefore, it implies that spirituality's definition should include behavioral components too in order to make it relevant in the context of a workplace. In this regard, connectedness is the one theme that runs through many definitions of spirituality (Mitroff& Denton, 1999).

There is growing consensus among researchers that spirituality is distinct from religion. There exists general agreement that spirituality has nothing to do with application of religious practices at workplace. Religion isn't considered to be a relevant issue at workplace but spirituality is treated as such (Duchon& Plowman, 2005). Neither is spirituality viewed as religion in disguise. Thus the spirituality isn't viewed as a dogma, a doctrine which is what organized religions embody.

Distinction between spirituality and religion is the prime focus of the process of content specification process of workplace spirituality research discourse. Hicks(2003) and Lynn et al.(2008) advocate that religiosity is a part of workplace spirituality whereas Mitroff& Denton (1999) and Kolodinsky et al. (2008) articulate that workplace spirituality is non-religious.

3. Workplace Spirituality, the different facets of the construct

There are divergent views regarding the nature of the construct of workplace spirituality. It is further proposed that workplace spirituality can be interpreted in terms of individual spirituality, organizational spirituality and interactive spirituality. Individual workplace spirituality refers to the extent to which individuals bring their personal spiritual values to workplace. Organizational spirituality indicates the perceptions of individuals regarding the presence of spiritual values in their organizations. Interactive spirituality refers essentially to the

presence of person organization fit with respect to workplace spirituality in organizations. Researchers have also conceptualized workplace spirituality as a collective construct while developing and validating the construct of spiritual climate (Pandey et al., 2009).

Consensus is growing among scholars to define workplace spirituality as an organizational state rather than as an individual attribute (Pawar, 2008). However, there are divergent views among scholars which distinguish between individual spirituality and organizational spirituality. Spirituality in leadership (Fry, 2003) and group-based spirituality (Mirvis, 1997) are the two other facets of workplace spirituality that the scholars have deliberated upon. Though most of the researchers have postulated workplace spirituality as a macro-organizational factor, the view of workplace spirituality being an individual trait or status is also advocated.

Giacalone & Jurkiewicz (2003) define workplace spirituality as *'a framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promotes employees' experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy'*. This definition interprets workplace spirituality as an organizational state and therefore as a collective construct. Transcendence, connectedness, completeness, and joy are the four dimensions of workplace spirituality, in accordance with this definition.

There exists a dominant view that workplace spirituality is an effort to operationalize the 'whole-person' paradigm (Duchon & Plowman, 2005). Accordingly, workplace spirituality is said to manifest in a *'workplace that recognizes that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community'* (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000). Thus this definition considers three fundamental spiritual needs of human beings i.e. inner life, meaningful work, and community. The

definition presumes that individuals report to work as 'whole persons' and thus they try to integrate their individual identity with their social identity.

3.1 Workplace spirituality: as many levels, so many connotations

Workplace spirituality has been interpreted in terms of individual-focused, organization-focused, group-focused and leadership-focused connotations. Marques et al. (2005) provide an individual-focused conceptualization of workplace spirituality. Their conceptualization indicates that spiritual awareness of individuals is the starting point of workplace spirituality, which will finally result in beneficial organizational outcomes. From this point of view, workplace spirituality is an inside-out process. Though their conceptualization advocates the presence of individual spiritual values, it doesn't specify the process by which these values come into existence. Heaton et al. (2004), however, outline such process that results in what they term as 'spiritual development'. In this regard, they differentiate between pure spirituality and applied spirituality and also between outside-in and inside-out approaches to bring about organizational change. Aligning organizational systems and structures with desired behaviors is characterized by them as 'outside-in' approach whereas, according to them, inside-out approach encourages individuals who experience the spiritual side of life and thus they can grow and develop in ways consistent with organizational goals. Their study introduces and differentiates three terms i.e. pure spirituality, applied spirituality and spiritual development. While pure spirituality is individual awareness, applied spirituality has organizational implications, and spiritual development is sought to be measured through the objective evaluation of health, happiness, wisdom, success and fulfillment that individuals experience. It is also articulated that applied spirituality can manifest itself through organizationally beneficial emotional outcomes such as respect, love and courage (Heaton et al, 2004). Sheep (2006) distinguishes spirituality

from workplace spirituality, and conceptualizes it to be consisting of the dimensions such as self-work integration, meaningful work, transcendence of self, and growth and development.

4. Workplace Spirituality: Conceptualization and Operationalization

The following section describes the dimensions and elements of different conceptualizations of workplace spirituality. Accordingly, it explains how these variables are operationalized as constructs in prior research. Further, this section also describes how the prior research studies have sought to operationalize the various notions of workplace spirituality.

Researchers have argued on the point that it isn't worthwhile to pin down the concept of workplace spirituality (Pawar, 2008). Despite the absence of consensus on defining workplace spirituality, psychologists are conceptualizing and operationalizing spirituality in ways that are compatible with empirical research. Accordingly, organizationally acceptable dimensions of workplace spirituality such as inner life, meaningful work, connectedness and transcendence are identified as the common features of various definitions of workplace spirituality (*Ibid*, 2008). These dimensions are accepted as having organizational ramifications too.

An analysis of the definitions of workplace spirituality reveals that there could be four broad dimensions under which all other above-noted dimensions can be included. The essential components of workplace spirituality have been identified as meaning, community, transcendence, and inner life. Meaning in work that describes a holistic approach to work and self, connectedness that employees experience in a workplace, and transcendence of self which concerns itself with rising above 'self' to attain the experiences of interconnectedness and self-actualization, and inner life or self-work integration facilitated by the

workplace - these components have emerged as the fundamental dimensions of workplace spirituality. These components can also be described as existential, relational, transcendental and holistic dimensions of workplace spirituality.

4.1 Meaningful work: the existential dimension

The existential dimension of workplace spirituality refers to search for meaning. The search for meaning is essentially a search for purpose, values, efficacy and sense of self-worth (Baumeister, 1991). Social psychology lends support to the idea that people go beyond material rewards associated with work and seek meaning in it (Etzioni, 1995). Dedication to work in spite of riches, desire for connection of jobs with higher purpose in life, and search for work that has social meaning are all well-documented in prior research (Gallup Poll, 1987; Learner, 1996; Pfeffer, 2003). Though the concept of meaningful work has its roots in job enrichment theory, it goes beyond it by integrating meaning in work represented partly by attributes of job, and meaning at work or membership and calling, the sense of joy and the sense of contribution to community through work (Ashforth & Pratt, 2003; Duchon & Plowman, 2005). Therefore, the idea of meaningful work is of that work which provides not only meaning but also contributes to '*larger good and to things viewed by workers as important in life*' (Wrzesniewski, 2003; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003).

Personal completeness and joy (Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004), meaningful work (Pawar, 2008), meaning at work, responsibility, contemplation (Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009), responsibility (Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004), meaning (Lynn et al, 2008), self-work immersion, self-actualization (Moore & Casper, 2006) self-motivation, acceptance (Marques et al, 2005) point towards the existential dimension of workplace spirituality.

Researchers have done considerable work in order to conceptualize the sub-constructs of 'meaningful work'. As workplace spirituality is conceptualized

in different ways such as individual spirituality, organizational spirituality, spiritual climate, workplace spirituality person-organization fit, and 'spirit at work', there exists some variation in the conceptualization of the construct. Further, due to the attempts of researchers to improve the nature of conceptualization of sub-constructs, there have been varying conceptualizations of the construct. The following table summarizes the dimensions included / excluded in different conceptualizations. The table analyzes the scale of workplace spirituality developed by researchers such as Ashmos & Duchon (2000), Milliman et al (2003), Sheep (2004), Kinjerski & Skrypnek (2006), Rego & Cunha (2007), Petchsawang & Duchon (2009), and Pandey et al (2009). A few of these scales measure workplace spirituality at three levels i.e. individual, group and organization (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Milliman et al, 2003). Some other scales measure individual experiences and perceptions of workplace spirituality (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006; Petchsawang &

Duchon, 2009). There are scales that measure person-organization fit in the context of degree and presence of workplace spirituality (Sheep, 2004). Further, spiritual climate present in organizations is also sought to be measured (Pandey et al, 2009). Accordingly, scales have been developed by researchers to measure workplace spirituality as both individual and collective constructs.

The dimensions of sense of completeness, sense of joy, sense of efficacy, sense of value, the idea of transcendence expressed through self-actualization (Milliman et al, 2003; Sheep, 2004; Rego & Cunha, 2007) are all embodied in the sub-construct of meaning in work. Sense of contribution, sense of efficacy (Rego & Cunha, 2007; Baumeister, 1991) are embodied in the sub-construct of meaning at work.

The summary of the above discussion is presented below:

4.1.1 Elements of the dimensions of 'meaning'

Sub-constructs	Elements
1. Meaning in work (Sheep, 2004; Rego & Cunha, 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal significance of work or connection of work to what is viewed as important in life • Relation between work and what is valued in life • Experience of joy in work • Enthusiasm to report to work • Sense of completeness embodied in work • Achieving one's full potential • Sense of personal fulfillment
2. Meaning at work (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Milliman et al, 2004; Rego & Cunha, 2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection between work and larger social good of community • Sense of work being helpful to society

Table 1 presents the presence or absence of various elements pertaining to the dimension of 'meaningful work' included / excluded in different scales.

Table 1: Elements relating to the dimension of 'Meaning' included in various scales

Elements	Ashmos & Duchon, 2000	Milliman et al. 2003	Sheep, 2004	Kinjerski & Skrypnik, 2006	Rego & Cunha, 2007	Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009	Pandey et al. 2009
Meaning in Work							
Personal significance of work	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Connection of work to what is viewed as important in life	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes*
Experience of joy in work	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes*	Yes	Yes
Enthusiasm to report to work	Yes	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	No
Sense of completeness embodied in work	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*	No	Yes*	No
Achieving one's full potential	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	No	Yes*	No
Sense of personal fulfillment	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes*
Meaning at work							
Connection between work and larger social good of community	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes*	Yes	Yes*

*Though these items are not included in the scale in the very same words, they are either included by the use of some other words that convey the same meaning, or they are included in other dimensions of the scale, by the use of alternate words.

4.2 Community: the relational dimension

The second dimension of workplace spirituality is community. It is also viewed as the sense of connectedness (Marques, 2005). Mirvis (1997) states that '*work itself is being re-discovered as a source of spiritual growth and connection to others*'. It is not just being present in a community, a worker must feel the sense of embeddedness (Duchon & Plowman, 2005). Therefore, Mirvis (1997) calls '*company as community*'. Accordingly, the dimension of community is also expressed variedly as sense of connectedness and transcendence of self. The dimension of community occurs at the group level of human behavior.

Interconnectedness (Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004; Pawar, 2008; Moore & Casper, 2006; Marques et al, 2005), conditions for community, positive connections with other individuals, work unit community, positive work unit values (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000), benevolence, humanism, integrity, justice, mutuality, receptivity, respect, trust (Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004), relationship, community (Lynn et al, 2008), ethics, respect, understanding, honesty, trust, kindness, team orientation, few organizational barriers, a sense of peace and harmony, aesthetically pleasing workplace, encouraging diversity (Marques et al,

2005), and harmony in environment (Pandey et al, 2009) converge around the relational dimension of workplace spirituality.

Sense of community does not mean mere membership of a community. It implies embeddedness, which means the low degree of likelihood of people leaving the organization due to their strong connections with people in the organization. Accordingly, they consider the cost of leaving the organization as greater than being in it, which motivates them to remain in the organization (Duchon & Plowman, 2005).

It is also argued that identification of individuals with the purpose of the organization facilitates the achievement of organizational objectives. Therefore, it is the responsibility of leaders to create organizational conditions and practices that foster the sense of community (*Ibid*, 2005).

4.2.1 Elements of the dimension of community

The dimension of 'community' is interpreted as interconnectedness or connectedness (Duchon & Plowman, 2005; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Pfeffer, 2003). It is also interpreted as transcendence of self (Sheep, 2004; Milliman et al, 2004). As it is a group level construct the perceptions such as the presence of strong sense of community at

workplace, preference of individuals to work in places where they can connect themselves with others, ability of the workplace to create unity, presence of mutual respect in the workplace are operationalized as the elements of the dimension of 'community' (Sheep, 2004). Interconnectedness that expresses itself in the form of mutual support and care among the members of the team/group, common purpose that binds members, sense of being part of a family are operationalized as the elements of the dimension of community by Rego & Cunha (2007). Freedom of expression, sense of

unity, sense of co-operation, mutual link among employees with a common purpose are the elements with which Milliman et al, (2003) conceptualized the dimension of 'community'. Sense of unity, freedom of expression, sense of co-operation, mutual support and care, and sense of being part of a family are the different elements that capture the dimension of 'community'.

The inclusion / exclusion of different elements of the relational dimension in different scales is given in Table 2:

Table 2: Elements relating to the dimension of 'community' included in various scales

Elements	Ashmos & Duchon, 2000	Milliman et al. 2003	Sheep, 2004	Kinjerski & Skrypnek 2006	Rego & Cunha, 2007	Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009	Pandey et al. 2009
Sense of Unity	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes*	No
Freedom of Expression	Yes	Yes	No	No*	No*	No	Yes
Sense of co-operation	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	Yes*
Mutual Support		Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	Yes*
Mutual Care	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes*	Yes	Yes*	Yes*
Linked with a common purpose		Yes	No	Yes*	Yes	No	Yes
Fair Evaluation	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No

**Though these items are not included in the scale in the very same words, they are either included by the use of some other words that convey the same meaning, or they are included in other dimensions of the scale, by the use of alternate words.*

4.3 Transcendence: the transcendental dimension

Transcendence of self has been defined as '*a connection to something greater than oneself*' (Pratt & Ashforth, 2003). That '*something other than oneself*' to which one transcends can be '*other people, causes, nature, or a belief in a higher power*'. It is argued that transcendence '*allows employees to rise above traditionally divisive boundaries*' such as '*rigid hierarchies, demographic categories and even spiritual orientation*' (Pandey et al, 2009).

Transcendence of self (Neck & Milliman 1994; Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008; Sheep, 2006);

transcendence (Pandey et al, 2009; Pawar, 2009) organizational values, individual and organization (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000), generativity (Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2004), and alignment with organizational values (Marques, 2008) revolve around the transcendental dimension of workplace spirituality.

There are mainly three elements of the dimension of transcendence: alignment with organizational values, concern for social and natural environment and meditative work. Alignment with organizational values happens when '*individuals experience a strong sense of alignment between their personal values and their organization's mission and purpose*' (Milliman et al, 2003). This

aspect of transcendental dimension is the result of efforts of individuals to rise beyond their individual self and understand the organizational mission and purpose. It also implies that there exists *'belief among employees that managers and employees in their organization have appropriate values, have a strong conscience, and are concerned about the welfare of its employees and community'* (Milliman et al, 2003; Ashmos & Duchon, 2000). Alignment with organizational values is also suggestive of the fact that employees desire to work with an organization, which goes beyond becoming a mere corporate citizen and thus conceptualizes a company that *'seeks to have a high sense of ethics or integrity and make a larger contribution than the typical company for the welfare of employees, customers and society'* (Milliman et al, 2003).

Researchers have pointed out that meditative work, which implies the *'experience of being absorbed in work, losing sense of self and becoming one with the activity'* is also a part of the transcendental dimension of workplace spirituality (Pandey et al, 2009). Accordingly, the sub-construct of *'Lokasangrah'* or the concern for natural and social environment is included as an element of transcendental dimension of workplace

spirituality.

4.3.1 Elements of the dimension of 'Transcendence'

Researchers have conceptualized three sub-constructs of 'transcendence' i.e. alignment with organizational values, meditative work, and concern for social and natural environment (Milliman et al, 2003; Marques, 2005; Pandey et al, 2009). Perceived concern of an organization about its employees, being connected with values, mission and goals of the organization, perceived care and conscience of the organization, perceived helpful attitude of leaders of an organization towards the larger social good of the community constitute various elements of the sub-construct of 'alignment with organizational values' (Rego & Cunha, 2007; Milliman et al, 2004). Experiences of being absorbed in work, lack of mental diversion from the activity are the elements of the sub-construct of meditative work (Pandey et al, 2009). Avoiding wastage of any kind, concern of people in the organization about the natural environment are the elements of the sub-construct of concern for natural and social environment (Pandey et al, 2009).

Table 3: Elements relating to 'Transcendental' dimension included in various scales

Elements	Ashmos & Duchon 2000	Milliman et al. 2003	Sheep, 2004	Kinjerski & Skrypnik, 2006	Rego & Cunha, 2007	Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009	Pandey et al. 2009
Alignment with Organizational values							
Perceived concern of an organization about its employees	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Being connected with values, mission and goals of the organization	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Positivity regarding values prevailing in the organization	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Perceived care of the organization	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes*	No	Yes*
Perceived conscience of the organization	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Perceived care of the organization about energizing the spirit of employees	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

Perceived concern of the organization about the health of its employees	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Feeling good about future of the organization	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Meditative work							
Experience of being absorbed in work	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes
Lack of mental diversion from the activity	No	No		No	No	No	Yes*
Concern for Natural and Social Environment							
Avoiding waste of any kind	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Concern of people in the organization about the natural and social environment	No	No	No	No	Yes*	No	Yes
Mystical Experiences							
Experience of 'high' at work	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes*	No
Absence of sense of time or space	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Blissful experience at work	Yes	Yes*	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Indescribable spirit or energy at work	Yes	Yes*	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes*

**Though these items are not included in the scale in the very same words, they are either included by the use of some other words that convey the same meaning, or they are included in other dimensions of the scale, by the use of alternate words.*

4.4. Inner life: the holistic dimension

'Inner life' constitutes an important dimension of workplace spirituality. The notion of 'inner life' is based on the idea that an individual has several selves i.e. physical, mental, emotional and spiritual, which derive themselves from four aspects of human personality i.e. body, mind, heart and soul. The idea of 'inner life' is inspired by the belief that employees bring whole selves to work (Duchon & Plowman, 2005). Accordingly, they expect opportunities for expression of their whole self at work. The idea of workplace spirituality seeks to provide expression of spiritual selves of people at work.

The holistic dimension of workplace spirituality, which pertains to the dimension of inner life is

considered as an independent dimension of workplace spirituality in the definition provided by Duchon & Plowman (2005). The dimension of inner life seeks to know whether the individual identity and social identity of individuals are reinforced by the work environment. Therefore the dimension of 'inner life', as conceptualized by Ashmos & Duchon (2000), relates to congruence of '*self-concept at work and the social identity that is derived from work unit membership*'. The notion of 'inner life' is based on the premise that individuals report to work as 'whole persons'. Individuals bring their spiritual selves also to work. Individuals experience 'inner life' in their work. In addition to physical, emotional and cognitive selves to the extent their individual and social identities find their expression in work environment.

Sheep (2006) introduced the dimension of self-work integration, which conveys the essence of 'inner life'. Self-work integration is viewed as an ingredient of workplace spirituality, which is interpreted as a particular kind of psychological climate at the individual level. Therefore, in accordance with the conceptualization of Duchon & Plowman (2005), 'work units that can be characterized' by a high degree of workplace spirituality are ones where workers are aligned with the organizational climate. In this regard, Sheep (2006) argues that it is person-organization fit with regard to workplace spirituality that determines organizational outcomes. The concept of person-organization fit aligns well with the need for 'non-interventionist' approach to spirituality in organizations.

The idea of 'inner life' has its theoretical roots in the theory of 'self-concept' of Shamir (1991). This theory argues that a job becomes highly motivating when there exist congruence among one's job, content of the job, and one's self-concept. Accordingly, one's work facilitates the expression of one's individual identity. Further, the notion of 'inner life' attains its fulfilment when there exist congruence between one's individual identity and the social identity that one derives out of his or her

membership of a work community. This implies that 'individuals require a larger social context or group for the full expression of their individual identity'. Prior research on social identity has shown that there arises energizing of workers along with the manifestation and reconciliation of identities in a group setting (Ellemers, de Gilder, & Haslam, 2004). It is interesting to note that membership of a group can also contribute to one's self-concept (Duchon & Plowman, 2005). In this regard, it is argued that belongingness to a group also contributes, in part, to the process of shaping one's individual identity (Dutton et al., 1994). Moreover, it is also argued that it is not just the organization that contributes to one's individual identity but also the sub-unit where one works which could be a greater force than the organization in this process. Therefore the idea of 'inner life' is the result of presence of an atmosphere at workplace, which facilitates the manifestation of one's self-concept that includes the contribution to one's self-concept, and the social identity that one receives at the workplace (Duchon & Plowman, 2005).

It may be observed that dimensions of opportunities for inner life (Rego & Cunha, 2007), self-work integration (Milliman et al, 2003; Sheep, 2004) are integrated into the sub-construct of 'inner self' itself.

4.4.1 Elements of the Dimensions of 'Inner life'

<p>Sub-constructs 1. Inner life or self-work integration, the alignment of one's values with work life (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Milliman et al, 2004; Sheep, 2004; Rego & Cunha, 2007)</p>	<p>Elements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression of one's spirituality at workplace or space for expression of spirituality at one's workplace • Facilitation of integration of work life and spiritual life or respect to spiritual values at workplace
---	---

Table 4 presents the elements of the dimension of 'inner life' included / excluded in various sub-scales operationalized by several researchers:

Table 4: Elements of the dimension of 'inner life' included in various scales

Elements	Ashmos & Duchon, 2000	Milliman et al. 2003	Sheep, 2004	Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006	Rego & Cunha, 2007	Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009	Pandey et al. 2009
Role of spiritual belief in everyday decisions at work	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Inspiration or guidance from a higher power at work	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Connection with a greater source resulting in positive affect at work	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Respect of the organization for one's inner life	No	No	Yes*	No	Yes	No	No
Respect for one's values at workplace	No		Yes*		Yes	No	No
Organization's help to live in peace or harmony	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Hopefulness about life	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes*
Influence of one's spiritual values on one's choices	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes		No	No
Self-identification as being spiritual	Yes	No	Yes*	No	No	No	No
An attitude of importance towards prayer	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Care about the spiritual health of one's co-workers	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Scope for expression of one's spirituality at one's workplace	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Sense of awareness	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Living in the present moment	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Paying total attention to what is at hand	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No

**Though these items are not included in the scale in the very same words, they are either included by the use of some other words that convey the same meaning, or they are included in other dimensions of the scale, by the use of alternate words.*

5. Discussion

This paper has carried out a thorough review of prior research on the scales developed to measure workplace spirituality so as to pin down the common elements that consist of commonly agreed dimensions. Accordingly this attempt has led to some findings on the same, which shall be discussed in this section.

First, the review of the current literature on the dimension of 'meaning' has shown that the elements such as personal significance of work, work-life integration, and the sense of personal fulfillment have emerged to be the common aspects of the dimension of 'meaning'. Second, the elements such as sense of community, sense of co-operation, and mutual support and care have emerged to be the common aspects of the dimension of 'community'. Third, the elements

such as perceived care of the organization, perceived presence of values in the organization, experience of being absorbed in work, and the perceived presence of energy at work have emerged to be the common elements of the 'transcendental' dimension of workplace spirituality. Fourth, the elements such as the role of spiritual beliefs in everyday's work, respect of the organization for one's inner life and values at workplace, hopefulness, influence of spiritual values, and expression of spirituality at workplace have emerged to be the common elements of the dimension of 'inner life'. However, the frequency of occurrence of the elements that belong to the dimension of 'transcendence' and 'inner life' is less than that of the elements that pertain to the dimensions of 'meaning' and 'community'. This is an important finding of this research. There are two possible explanations of this. First, human beings experience different levels of 'meaning'. The most

common form of meaning that human beings explore is at their workplace as also in their relationship with their colleagues. Therefore, 'meaning' and 'community' have emerged to be the preeminent dimensions of workplace spirituality. Second, the dimensions of 'transcendence' and 'inner life' belong to the higher aspects of meaning that one pursues at workplace. Further, both these dimensions symbolize self-interest transcendence. Accordingly, these two dimensions do not find their place as intensely as the dimensions of 'meaning' and 'community' do.

The measurement scales that we find in the current literature on workplace spirituality have invariably reported on reliability. All scales have reported acceptable levels of reliability. However, most of the scales haven't reported their findings on discriminant validity though some scales have reported their findings on convergent validity. The following is the explanation of the related findings on reliability and validity of the scales that this paper has investigated.

The purpose of the Faith at work scale (Lynn et al, 2008) is to measure the concept of 'workplace religion'. This scale attempts to capture five dimensions of the construct i.e. 'workplace religion'. The scale has the theoretical underpinning that the idea of 'workplace religion' cannot be divorced from 'workplace spirituality'. The scale captures the dimensions such as relationship, meaning, community, holiness, and giving. The scale has demonstrated reliability (Cronbach's Alpha – 0.77) and convergent validity ($r = 0.81$ $p > 0.0001$) by demonstrating correlation with a related construct i.e. Faith Maturity Scale. However, the authors haven't reported on discriminant validity.

Spirit at work scale (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006) measures the individual spiritual experiences at workplace. Spirit at work is seen as a distinct state. Accordingly, the purpose of this scale is to measure experiences of spirit at work. The scale has demonstrated adequate reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.93). However, there is no empirical data

on validity of the scale. Despite this, the construct is similar to other scales, such as those of Ashmos and Duchon (2000), Milliman et al, (2003), and Sheep (2004) as regards the components of workplace spirituality at the individual level i.e. meaning and community. However, the authors of the scale do not report any findings on convergent validity and discriminant validity.

Person-organization fit scale (Sheep, 2004) measures the workplace spirituality present in an organization from the standpoint of needs-supplies perspective. The purpose of this scale is to assess the individual's preferences, i.e. their attitudes/expectations toward their work/workplace and how well the organization supplies or facilitates these expectations. This scale (Sheep, 2004) has demonstrated acceptable range of Cronbach's Alpha values (from 0.82 to 0.92). Exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis have demonstrated acceptable range of values of factor loading and fit indices (*Ibid*, 2004). Further, it has been reported that the scale has demonstrated convergent and discriminant validity also (*Ibid*, 2004).

The scale developed by Ashmos and Duchon (2000) has addressed the components of workplace spirituality at individual, group, and organizational levels. The purpose of this instrument is to observe and measure spirituality at work. The first part of this instrument measures individuals' experiences, which is similar to the spirit at work scale. The second and third parts of this instrument intend to assess spirituality at the work unit and organizational levels. The components such as meaning at work and inner life have demonstrated reliability as the corresponding values of Cronbach's Alpha of both these components are above 0.80. However, the authors do not report their evaluation of either convergent validity or discriminant validity.

The Spiritual Climate Inventory (Pandey et al, 2009) attempts to measure the degree of spiritual climate present in the work unit or an organization. It captures the shared perceptions of organizational

members regarding the presence of spiritual climate within the organization. It has demonstrated a high degree of reliability (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.873). Further, the Cronbach's Alpha values ranged between 0.74 and 0.91 (*Ibid*, 2009). Both EFA and CFA were conducted by the authors of this scale to decide on the factor structure of the scale and its reliability. CFA resulted in Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.883 (*Ibid*, 2009). Though there were no issues with regard to the assessment of reliability, discriminant validity was tested only by observing the presence of negative loading of reverse coded items. The Fornell – Larcker criterion (1981) wasn't used to evaluate the discriminant validity of the construct. Further, the authors have tested the convergent validity of the construct by finding out the acceptable value of correlation of the scale with a related construct i.e. supportive environment scale. Moreover, the theoretical distinction of the construct is discussed in relation to other 'climate' constructs, that are discussed by the literature, on the variants of organizational climate.

The scale developed by Milliman et al, (2003) measures the components such as meaningful work, sense of community, and alignment with organizational values. Their analysis showed the Cronbach's Alpha values of 0.88, 0.91, and 0.94 for the components of meaningful work, sense of community, and alignment with organizational values respectively. Except an item on the connection between work and social good, all items of the sub-construct of meaningful work had factor loadings above 0.70. Except an item on concern of the organization about the poor, all items of the sub-construct of 'alignment with organizational values' had the factor loadings above 0.70. However, the authors of this scale haven't tested for discriminant validity by adopting the traditional Fornell-Larcker criterion or cross-loadings of indicators. Despite this, validity assessments were made through confirmatory factor analysis. Item loadings were above the acceptable threshold value of 0.70.

The scale developed by Rego & Cunha (2007)

captured workplace spirituality at all three levels i.e. individual, team and organization. The five-factor solution that emerged to capture workplace spirituality demonstrated acceptable levels of reliability. However, discriminant validity of the construct wasn't examined in this study. This study has further demonstrated that the factorial structure of the scale adopted corresponds to the commonly agreed upon dimensions of workplace spirituality. The above-discussed scales measure workplace spirituality at various levels. Therefore, researchers should be able to distinguish among these scales depending upon the level of analysis that these scales address. While the spirit at work scale (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2006) captures the individual spiritual experiences, faith at work scale measures the construct of 'workplace religion' at the individual level. Both these scales measure workplace spirituality at the individual level. Though these scales have demonstrated reliability, there is no report on discriminant validity of these scales. Further, the scales developed by Ashmos and Duchon (2000) and Milliman et al, (2009) measure workplace spirituality at all three levels such as individual, group and organization. These scales have also not reported on discriminant validity. Furthermore, the scales developed by Pandey et al, (2009) and Sheep (2004) measure workplace spirituality at the organizational level. However, these scales also do not report findings related to discriminant validity. Accordingly, we find that the scale development process has adequately captured reliability of the scales though the attention paid to measure discriminant validity is relatively scarce.

6. Limitations and future directions

This paper has several limitations. First, this paper has not discussed the distinction of workplace spirituality from other related constructs. The constructs of workplace spirituality i.e. spirit at work, spiritual climate etc. have their own related constructs. Though the prior research has made an attempt to establish discriminant validity of workplace spirituality as a construct at the organizational level (Pandey et al, 2009), similar

attempts are still to be made for the constructs of workplace spirituality at the individual as well as group levels. Second, this paper hasn't discussed the issue of situating workplace spirituality in appropriate academic contexts. Prior research discourse has made some attempts in this regard (Pawar, 2009) to situate workplace spirituality as a consequent of concepts such as transformational leadership, procedural justice, perceived organizational support, and organization citizenship behavior. Similarly, links between workplace spirituality and ethics are also discussed by prior research (Sheep, 2006; Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008). However, this paper hasn't addressed the issue of situating workplace spirituality before proceeding to conceptualize the same. Third, this paper hasn't provided theoretical foundations of the research discourse on workplace spirituality. Future research should explore the theoretical foundations of workplace spirituality, which can be found especially in the academic disciplines such as social psychology that can provide sound theoretical grounding to conceptualize the concept in order to proceed to develop the appropriate constructs.

This paper has several research implications. First, the literature review conducted for this paper calls for situating the workplace spirituality against sound theoretical grounding that the theories of psychology and sociology can provide, especially the theories of social psychology. Though there exists general reference to the theories that have emanated from the academic discipline of social psychology in the workplace spirituality literature, there exists several gaps in this regard which can be addressed by future research endeavors. Second, robust scales have to be developed that strengthen the rigor of academic research. There exists research opportunities, in this regard, to develop scales to measure workplace spirituality at all levels i.e. individual, group, and organization. Third, future research should pay attention to reporting on discriminant validity. Lastly, attempts are required to show how the concept of workplace spirituality can be situated within the academic disciplines such as organization behavior and

business ethics.

7. Conclusion

Workplace Spirituality research has moved from its initial stages to the stage where researchers are trying to find out the organizationally beneficial effects of the idea of workplace spirituality. Spirit at work, individual spirituality, organizational spirituality, spiritual development, spiritual climate and spiritual leadership are the various research constructs which the researchers have developed in the domain of workplace spirituality research. The qualitative research in this field has identified antecedent and consequent variables of workplace spirituality. Further, research endeavors in this field have also positioned the variants of the notions of workplace spirituality as moderating or intervening variables in various conceptual frameworks. Therefore, the study of the ways in which different notions of workplace spirituality are conceptualized and operationalized assume significance. This facilitates the research to move from the process of scale development to the stage of empirical testing of the same in order to satisfy the tests of reliability and validity of the instruments concerned. Thus, this process contributes to the robustness and empirical vigor of workplace spirituality research, toward which this paper has contributed so as to facilitate the process of strengthening the psychometric properties of the scales that measure workplace spirituality.

References

- Ahiazu, A., & Asawo, S. (2009). Unwavering hope and workers' commitment in the Nigerian manufacturing industry: A study in workplace spirituality. *Business Renaissance Quarterly*, 4(1), 105-124.
- Ashforth, B.E. & Pratt, M.G. (2003). Institutionalized Spirituality: An Oxymoron?. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at Work: A Conceptualization and Measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 134-145.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1991). *Meanings of life*. New York:

Guilford Press.

Brooke, C., & Parker, S. (2009). Researching spirituality and meaning in the workplace. *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods*, 7(1), 1-10.

Bygrave, C., & MacMillan, S. (2008). Spirituality in the workplace: A wake up call from the American dream. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, 13(1), 93-112.

Chawla, V. (2014). The effect of workplace spirituality on salespeople's organisational deviant behaviours: research propositions and practical implications. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 29(3), 199–208.

Corner, P. D. (2009). Workplace spirituality and business ethics: Insights from an eastern spiritual tradition. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(3), 377–389.

Dehler, G. & Welsh, M. (1994). Spirituality and organizational transformation: implications for the new management paradigm. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 17-26.

Duchon, D., & Plowman, D. A. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(5), 807–833.

Dutton, J.E., Dukerich, J.M., & Harquail, C.V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 39: 239–263.

Ellemers, N., De Gilder, & S. A. Haslam. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. *Acad. Management Rev.* 29: 459–478.

Etzioni, (1995). The socio-economics of work. In: F. C. Gamst, Editor, *Meanings of work: Considerations for the twenty-first century*, State University of New York Press, Albany (1995), pp. 251–260.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693–727.

Gallup Organization. (1987). *The Gallup Report No. 259. April*. Princeton, NJ: Gallup Organization.

Garcia-Zamor & Jean-Claude. (2003). Workplace spirituality and organizational performance. *Public Administration Review*, 63(3), 355-363.

Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2004). A values framework for measuring the impact of workplace spirituality on organizational performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 49, 129-142.

Giacalone, R.A. & Jurkiewicz, C.L. (2003). "Toward a science of workplace spirituality", in Giacalone, R.A. and Jurkiewicz, C.L. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*, ME Sharpe, Armonk, NY, pp. 3-28.

Gotsis, G., & Kortezi, Z. (2008). Philosophical Foundations of Workplace Spirituality: A Critical Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78(4), 575–600.

Grant, D., O'Neil, K. & Stephens, L. (2004), "Spirituality in the workplace: New empirical directions in the study of the sacred", *Sociology of Religion*, 65(3), 265-83.

Gull, G. A., & Doh, J. (2004). The "transmutation" of the organization: Toward a more spiritual workplace. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13(2), 128-132.

Heaton, D. P., Schmidt-Wilk, J., & Travis, F. (2004). Constructs, methods, and measures for researching spirituality in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(1), 62–82.

Hicks, D. A. (2003). *Religion and the Workplace: Pluralism, Spirituality, Leadership*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Hill, P. C., Pargament, K. I. I., Hood, J. R. W., McCullough, M. E., Swyers, J. P., Larson, D. B., & Zinnbauer, B. J. (2000). Conceptualizing religion and spirituality: points of commonality, Points of departure. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30(1), 51.

Johnson, A. L. (2007). Mary Parker Follett: Laying the foundations for spirituality in the workplace. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30(4), 425-439.

Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Giacalone, R. A. (2004). A values framework for measuring the impact of workplace spirituality on organizational performance. *Journal of business ethics*, 49(2), 129-142.

Karakas, F. (2010). Spirituality and performance in organizations: A literature review. *Journal of business ethics*, 94(1), 89-106.

Kim, L. (2009). Improving the workplace with spirituality 1+1=5. *Journal for quality & participation*, 32(3), 32-35.

Kinjerski, V. & Skrypnek, B.J. (2006). "Measuring the Intangible: Development of the Spirit at Work Scale", in

- Weaver, K.M. (Ed.), Proceedings of the sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (CD).
- Kolodinsky, R. W., Giacalone, R. A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2008). Workplace Values and Outcomes: Exploring Personal, Organizational, and Interactive Workplace Spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81(2), 465–480.
- Krishnakumar, S., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The “what”, “why” and “how” of spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 17(3), 153–164.
- Learner (1996). *The politics of meaning*. MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Lynn, M.L., Naughton, M.J. & VanderVeen, S., (2008). Faith at Work Scale (FWS): Justification, Development, and Validation of a Measure of Judaeo-Christian Religion in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(2), 227–243.
- Marques, J. (2005). Yearning for a more spiritual workplace. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 7(1), 149–153.
- Marques, J. (2008). Spirituality at Work: Internal Growth with Potential External Challenges. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 31 (3), 24.
- Marques, J., Dhiman, S., & King, R. (2005). Spirituality in the workplace: Developing an integral model and a comprehensive definition. *The Journal of American Academy of Business*, 7(1), 81–91.
- Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A.J., & Ferguson, J. (2003). Workplace Spirituality and Employee Work Attitudes: An Exploratory Empirical Assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16, 426–447.
- Mirvis, P. H (1997). Soul Work' m Organizations. *Organization Science*, 8(2), 190–206.
- Mitroff, I., & Denton, E. (1999). A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review*, 40(4), 83–92.
- Lynn, M.L., Naughton, M.J., Veen, S.V. (2009). Faith at Work Scale (FWS): Justification, Development, and Validation of a Measure of Judaeo-Christian Religion in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85, 227–243
- Moore, T. & Casper, W. (2006). An examination of proxy measures of workplace spirituality: A profile model of multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(4), 109–118.
- Neck, C.P. & Milliman, J.F. (1994). “Thought self-leadership”. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9 (6), 9–16.
- Pandey, A., Gupta, R. K., & Arora, A. P. (2009). Spiritual climate of business organizations and its impact on customers' experience. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(2), 313–332.
- Pardasani, R., Sharma, R. R., & Bindlish, P. (2014). Facilitating workplace spirituality: lessons from Indian spiritual traditions. *Journal of Management Development*, 33(8/9), 847–859.
- Pawar, B. S. (2008). Two Approaches to Workplace Spirituality Facilitation. A Comparison and Implications. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 29, 544–567.
- Pawar, B. S. (2009). Workplace spirituality facilitation: A comprehensive model. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 90(3), 375–386.
- Petchsawang, P., & Duchon, D. (2009). Measuring workplace spirituality in an Asia context. *Human Resource Development International*, 12(4), 459–468.
- Pfeffer, J. (2003). 'Business and the Spirit-Management Practices that Sustain Values', in R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *The Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY), 29–45
- Pratt, M., & Ashforth, B. (2003). Fostering meaningfulness in working and at work. In K. Cameron, J. Dutton, & R. Quinn (Eds.). *Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 309–327). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Rego, A. & Cunha, M.P. (2007). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: an empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1) 53–75.
- Shamir, B. (1991). Meaning, self, and motivation in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 12(3), 405–424.
- Sheep M. L. (2004). Nailing Down Gossamer: A Valid Measure of the Person-Organization Fit of Workplace Spirituality. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2004, B1–B6.
- Sheep, M. L. (2006). Nurturing the Whole Person: The Ethics of Workplace Spirituality in a Society of Organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66(4), 357–375.
- Wrzesniewski, A. (2003). Finding positive meaning in work. In Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E. and Quinn, R.E. (Eds), *Positive Organizational Scholarship: Foundations of a New Discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.