2. THE CONCEPT OF WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY

2.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to present what the concept of spirituality is in general. Then discuss the differences and similarities in the overlapping yet distinct concepts of religion and spirituality. Further in this chapter literature on the concept, definitions, dimensions, measurement and practice of Workplace Spirituality is presented. Lastly, the concept has been discussed specifically in the Indian context.

2.2 THE CONCEPT OF SPIRITUALITY

The word Spirituality is derived from the Latin root “spiritus” which means – “breadth of life” (Elkins, 1999). Spiritus is defined as “an animating or vital principle held to give life to physical organisms” (Merriam-Webster)\(^1\). This implies spirit is the life force that inhabits us when we are alive and breathing (Garcia-Zamor, 2003). Scott (1994), offers a parallel definition for spirit as “the vital principle or animating force within living beings; that which constitutes one’s unseen intangible being; the real sense or significance of something” The construct spirituality is considered a kind of subjective experience which is complex, multifaceted, and difficult to define precisely (Benner, 1991).

There are a number of definitions and perspectives of spirituality appearing within the literature. The term ‘Spirituality’ means different things to different people and it is a difficult topic to comprehend and to date, scholars have not agreed on a definition. This section will review the development of the concept of Spirituality, and focus particularly on its relationship with religiosity. In table 2.1 several definitions of Spirituality given by various authors at different points of time have been listed along with the dimension each definition touches upon.

---

\(^1\) “Merriam-Webster dictionary”, britannica.com.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of Spirituality</th>
<th>Connection To Higher Being</th>
<th>Meaning And Purpose In Life</th>
<th>Larger Context</th>
<th>Behavioural Dimension</th>
<th>Connectedness</th>
<th>Self-Transcendence</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Related To Religion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clark (quoted by Lewis and Geroy, 2000)</td>
<td>“the inner experience of an individual when he or she senses a beyond, especially as evidenced by the effect of this experience on his or her behaviour when he or she actively attempts to harmonise his or her life with the beyond”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison (1983)</td>
<td>“the capacity to find purpose and meaning beyond one’s self and the immediate”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legere (1984)</td>
<td>“the attempt to give ultimate meaning to things. It is the ultimate context for humanity to understand itself. It is that interior quest for</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth (1984)</td>
<td>“that which enables the growth of positive and creative values in the human being Spirituality recalls the oneness and wholeness of Creation and demands bridges of understanding between different people and cultures”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moberg (1984)</td>
<td>“man’s inner resources especially his ultimate concern, the basic value around which all other values are focused, the central philosophy of life, whether religious, anti-religious, or nonreligious – which guides a person’s conduct, the supernatural and nonmaterial dimensions of human nature. Spiritual activities and perspectives are interwoven with all other aspects of life and hence are found in a wide range of contexts, not just those related to institutional religion”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning in life which expresses itself in both contemplation and action, and through which its divine presence is felt and understood.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elkins et al.</td>
<td>“a state of being and experiencing that comes about through awareness of a transcendent dimension and that is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, others,</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shafranske and</td>
<td>a unique, personally meaningful experience which although positively related to specific forms of religiosity was not reliant upon any given form or appearance”</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorsuch (1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canda (quoted by</td>
<td>“the conceptual gestalt of the total process of human life and development, the central dynamic of which is the person’s search for a sense of meaning and purpose through relationships between self, other people, the nonhuman world, and the ground of being (as described in theistic, nontheistic, or atheistic terms)”</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat, 1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helminiak</td>
<td>“an intrinsic principle of authentic self-transcendence... a strictly human reality”</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1987)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller and Martin (1988)</td>
<td>“the inner experience of acknowledging a transcendent being, power or reality greater than ourselves”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensley (1991)</td>
<td>“a subjective belief system that incorporates self-awareness and reference to a transcendence dimension, provides meaning and purpose in life, and feelings of connectedness with God or the larger reality”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block (1993)</td>
<td>“the process of living out a set of deeply held personal values, of honouring forces of a presence greater than ourselves. It expresses our desire to find meaning in, and to treat as an offering, what we do”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger and Associates</td>
<td>“experienced in those moments when we literally transcend ourselves (exceed the usual limits of our self-interests), such as in selfless</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>(1994)</td>
<td>(1995)</td>
<td>(1999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly (1995)</td>
<td>“a personal affirmation of a transcendent connectedness in the universe”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laabs (1995)</td>
<td>“about knowing that every person has within him or herself a level of truth and integrity, and that we all have our own divine power”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitroff and Denton (1999)</td>
<td>“the basic feeling of being connected with one’s complete self, others, and the entire universe”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClain et al. (2003)</td>
<td>“the way in which people understand their lives in view of their ultimate meaning and value”</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.1: Definitions of Spirituality*
From Table 2.1 it is clear that although most authors are in agreement on certain key components of Spirituality, the construct may be interpreted differently by different people. For now it seems appropriate to clearly define the construct of spirituality when working with it. Most authors mentioned in Table 2.1 are in agreement, for example, that spirituality refers to finding meaning and purpose in living, a value component, self-transcendence, an inner experience of events of living through thoughts, emotions and sensational experiences and the behavioural expression thereof, as well as a connectedness to a Higher Being.

Thus spirituality has been described as “the subjective feelings, thoughts, and behaviours that arise from a search for the “sacred” where the term “search” refers to “attempts to identify, articulate, maintain, or transform” and the term “sacred” is defined broadly as referring to “a divine being, divine object, Ultimate Reality or Ultimate Truth as perceived by the individual” (Hill et al. 2000).

Connectedness can be to themselves, other people, nature, the universe, a god or some other supernatural power. “It is apparent therefore that spirituality is subjective, intangible, complex, multi-dimensional and almost indefinable. However, Mitroff and Denton (1999a, b) and Smith and Rayment (2007), found a similarly in their research about the definition of spirituality in general. First, Spirituality is an inherent component of being human. Second, spirituality is a personal search for meaning and purpose in life. Third, spirituality is interconnectedness (Mitroff and Denton, 1999a, b). Fourth, many respondents in their research had a negative perception of religion, but positive of spirituality. Last, they observed as clear differentiation between religion and spirituality.

Most recently, Smith and Rayment (2007) define spirituality in general as “a state or experience that can provide individuals with direction or meaning, or provide feeling of understanding, support, inner wholeness or connectedness”.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journey</td>
<td>Search for meaning; quest; personal journey; search for fullest development; search for truth; rediscovering self; Spiritual quest is a dynamic process where people purposefully seek to discover their higher power or being; inward journey; quest through uncharted territory; personal process occurring over time; interior; transformation – awakening, transition, recovery, dark night, dawn</td>
<td>Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Benefiel, 2005; Bolman and Deal, 2001; Delbecq, 1999; Fry, 2003; Gull and Doh, 2004; Longbotham and Lee, 2007; Melina, 2007; Vaill, 1996; Vaill, 1998.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Feeling the sacredness of the moment; process of dialogue with other; inner experience of a sense of the beyond; inner experience; certain phenomenological states; enriching; experience of transcendence; transformation; renewal; transcendence; communion with the divine; experience of discovery</td>
<td>Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Conger, 1994; Delbecq, 1999; Gardner, 2000; Gull and Doh, 2004; Klenke, 2005; Krahne et al. 2003; Lewis and Geroy, 2000; Melina, 2007; Vaill, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life force</td>
<td>Vital, energising force or principle; higher power or Banks and Ledbetter, 2004; Bolman and Deal,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essence of who we are; defines inner self including</th>
<th>divinity; God; sense of transcendence; the transcendent; all embracing; something greater than oneself; transcendent mystery; relationship with a higher power; supreme power, a being, a force, that governs the entire universe; belief in transcendent; a dimension beyond self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Banks and physical and intellectual selves; core of energised self; Ledbetter, 2004; Benefiel, 2005; Bolman and what makes us human; inner person or being, soul, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal, 2003; Fairholm, 2011; Gull and Doh,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Connection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essence of who we are; defines inner self including</td>
<td>Belong; Sense of Belonging Vision of an order and a moral scheme that lies outside our material existence; bound to a higher reality; coherence to human existence; feeling connected; sense of connection; sense of belonging to a great whole; the spirit that we each are; pattern of events; collective force; connected to others; sense of being connected; unseen order of things; something sacred in existence; everything is interconnected; sacredness of everything; connection with self, others, God, higher power and the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholeness</td>
<td>Life and work; integration; wholeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning/Purpose</td>
<td>Gives meaning; Defines meaning; source of principle meaning; living in depth; meaning, purpose, and a sense of contribution to the greater community; sense of purpose; there is a purpose for everything and everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>Personal Mastery; yearning for personal development and evolution; consciousness; self-mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings or Qualities</td>
<td>“Ultimate Values”; core values Feelings: harmony; love, trust, working in partnership toward a common end;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith/Certitude</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of certainty in an uncertain world; deep Autry, 1998; Bolman and Deal, 2003; Fairholm, 2011; Mitroff and Denton, 1999; Pruzan and Polit, 2007 spiritually grounded; faith and willpower</td>
<td>Motivates individual action; enables human action; Banks and Ledbetter, 2004; Fairholm, 2011; Fry, 2003; Lewis and Geroy, 2000; Mitroff and Denton, 1999; Pruzan and Polit, 2007 Enables people to transcend their normal selves; a decision to search beyond; attempt to harmonize with the beyond; spiritual perspective constitutes the context for action the world; affects how one operates in the world; spiritual perspective constitutes context for action; actions of a person and the effects those actions have on others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Thematic view of frequently occurring words used to describe spirituality
Palmer (1998) remarked, “Spirituality, like leadership, is a very hard concept to pin down. Leadership and spirituality are probably two of the vaguest words you can find in our language, and when you put them together you get something even more vague”. Then there is the challenge of trying to figure out distinctions between spirit, spirituality, and soul, for the terms are often used interchangeably. Mitroff and Denton (1999) proposed that soul refers to “that which ties together and integrates all of the separate and various parts of a person . . . makes a person a human being”. Soul, according to Benefiel (2005) is the “lived manifestation of Spirituality in an individual”. The table 2.2 presents a thematic view of frequently occurring words used to describe spirituality:

2.3 SPIRITUALITY DISCERNED FROM RELIGION

Spirituality and religion are considered separate but overlapping constructs. Spirituality is generally conceptualised as a broader concept and represents transcendental beliefs and values that may or may not have any relation to religious organisation. Religiosity, on the other hand, refers to a set of rituals and creeds which are manifested in the context of a religious institution. A person may express spirituality in the religious context but a person’s religiosity is not always a result of Spirituality (Genia and Shaw, 1991). Religious beliefs mainly involve personal commitment to a chosen religious belief system, like the Christian, Hindu, or Islam belief systems. Spirituality involves a personal, subjective, and experiential orientation consisting of a transcendent dimension of self and life which may be experienced without the commitment to religious belief systems. Spirituality involves humans’ search for meaning in life, while religion involves an organised entity with rituals and practices about a higher power or God.

Weaver et al. (2006) made a systematic review of 1,100,300 articles published between 1965 and 2000 containing either only religion or spirituality and both religion and spirituality together as key words. They found a statistically significant
upward trend across years for the rate of articles dealing with religion and spirituality. They also found a significant downward trend for articles that addressed only religion. They argued that this result could be simply a reflection of change in language and more attention devoted to the construct of Spirituality which has become more popular than religion although many still use them interchangeably.

Hill et al. (2000) wrote from a psychology of religion perspective state that spirituality is a central and essential function of religion. They therefore assert that both spirituality and religiousness can (and often do) co-occur. To the extent that a person engages in spirituality that is prescribed by an identifiable group and whose spiritual pathways and goals receive some support and validation by that group, spirituality also occurs with religiousness. They also highlight the difficulty of separating religion from spirituality. Spirituality can and often does occur within the context of religion, but it also may not. Likewise, the practice of spirituality can lead people to become religious and to become part of an organised or emerging religion, but it also may not.

More recently, Ho and Ho (2007) concluded from their review of the psychology literatures that, spirituality and religiosity are overlapping constructs; accordingly, it is possible for a person to be religious without being spiritual or spiritual without being religious, be both, or be neither. The possibility for considerable overlap exists and attempting to define spirituality as a separate construct from religion is difficult as well as unlikely to establish the definitions of both constructs. In the psychology of religion field, thus to date, the term of spirituality has no universally accepted definition.

However, unlike the psychology of religion field, in the area of management and organisational studies most scholarships and practitioners define spirituality as being distinctive from religion. For example the following four definitions of spirituality have been proposed in recent years by organisational thinkers and practitioners
A specific form of work feeling that energises action (Dehler and Welsh, 1994).

Deeply held values that guide our life and work practices (Butts, 1999).

The particular way the human person in all its richness, the relationship of human person to the transcendent, the relationship between human persons, and the way to achieve personal growth are envisioned (Konz and Ryan, 1999) and

Secular or sacred values aimed at transcendence toward our ultimate values (Harlos, 2000).

In a similar manner, the most prominent empirical study of spirituality, religion, and values in the US Workplace was published in 1999 (Mitroff and Denton, 1999a, b). Mitroff and Denton conducted extensive interviews and discovered common denominators emerging in the participants’ definitions of spirituality. They concluded that spirituality is the basic feeling of being connected with one's complete self, others, and the entire universe. This definition, noted in their work, supported the notion that spirituality was indeed a concept separate from religion: (1) Not formal, structured, or organised; (2) Nondenominational, above and beyond denominations; (3) Broadly inclusive, embracing everyone; (4) Universal and timeless; (5) The ultimate source and provider of meaning and purpose in life; (6) The awe we feel in the presence of the transcendent; (7) The sacredness of everything, the ordinariness of everyday life; (8) The deep feeling of the interconnectedness of everything; (9) Inner peace and calm; (10) An inexhaustible source of faith and willpower; and (11) The ultimate end in itself.

Badrinarayan and Madhavaram (2008) discussed the differences between spirituality and religion which have been presented here in table 2.3. He stated that modern psychological approaches explicitly differentiate spirituality from religion and such a distinction has achieved a paradigmatic status in various literatures.
## Table 2.3: Difference between Religion and Spirituality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spirituality</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Exemplar Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An inner longing for meaning and community.</td>
<td>An organised belief system.</td>
<td>Duchon and Plowman (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly appropriate topic for discussion in the workplace</td>
<td>Highly inappropriate topic for discussion in the workplace</td>
<td>Kale (2004); Mitroff and Denton (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not dependent on or predicated by any form of religion.</td>
<td>May serve as a “vehicle” or “road map” to nurture, comprehend, and express spirituality.</td>
<td>Kale (2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader concept that represents beliefs and values.</td>
<td>Narrower concept that refers to behaviours. Has prescribed tenets, dogma, and doctrines.</td>
<td>Fry (2003); Westgate (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looks inward, within the individual. More inclusive, universally applicable and embraces diverse expressions of interconnectedness.</td>
<td>Often looks outward depending on rites and rituals. Sometimes tends to be dogmatic, exclusive, and patriarchal.</td>
<td>Klenke (2003); Marques, Dhiman and King (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not operationalised in terms of affiliation or denominational ideals.</td>
<td>Characterised by measures of church attendance amount of prayer, involvement in church-related among others.</td>
<td>Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003b); Koenig et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong theoretical and empirical support for a connection between spirituality and ethics.</td>
<td>No clear relationship between religion and ethics.</td>
<td>Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003b); Terpstra et al. (1993)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Badrinarayan (2008)
Parboteeah et al. (2010) attempted to relate religion to work. They used data from 44,030 individuals in 39 countries to investigate the influence of the world’s four major religions, Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, and Islam on extrinsic and intrinsic work values. Controlling for important variables such as age, gender, and education, they confirmed that religion is positively related to work values. They also found out that all religions except Christianity, showed a positive relationship with extrinsic work values. Vasconcelos (2010) stated that the study of convergence between religious and/or spiritual issues and the management field is feasible and desirable (King, 2008). Thus prayer which is related to a person’s religion as a managerial tool should not be disdained by workers, managers, and organisations. As there is no evidence to indicate substantial change in organisational life, prayer can be a suitable spiritual resource to help workers carry out their job routines. Bhunia and Mukhuti (2011) in their empirical study on the relationship between Workplace Spirituality and earnings management proved that there were no significant variances in the awareness of Workplace Spirituality among people from different religious beliefs.

In the scale development study conducted by Liu and Robertson (2011) the authors theoretically argued and empirically validated that the notion of spirituality incorporates and transcends religiousness.

However, Noor and Arif (2011) stated that, religion was the motorway for spirituality, so spirituality and religion co-occur interchangeably. Spirituality is a personal perspective in individual reflection, feeling, and an emotional experience.

As Fry, (2003) notes, “Spirituality is necessary for religion but religion is not necessary for spirituality” From a review of the literature discussed above, Spirituality is seen as a global concept in that it seeks to express all that is beyond the sensory experiences of human beings. Spirituality involves humans’ search for meaning in life, while religion involves an organised entity with rituals and practices about a
higher power or God. It is proposed that spirituality, without religion, is a deep connection that can transcend one’s life’s essence but still remain connected to it. Furthermore, true spirituality can be defined as that, which stresses on one’s integrity, virtue, and the personal meaning one derives from it, rather than on institutional religious practice.

2.4 THE CONCEPT OF WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY

Workplace Spirituality has received great attention in the popular press and in the business and management literature (Fry, 2008; Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008; Kolodinsky et al. 2008; Pawar, 2009; Tisdell, 2008). “In the past decade, two formerly estranged domains, spirituality and work, have been increasingly linked” (Wheatley, 2002). However, it is also true that the study of Workplace Spirituality has been challenged because academic inquiry emphasises observed and measured behaviors (Duchon and Plowman, 2005; Fry, 2008; Pawar, 2009). Recently, the quality and scope of research on Workplace Spirituality has continually developed in terms of not only the definition and measurement of Workplace Spirituality, but also applications to leadership and organisation performance. Critical perspectives on Workplace Spirituality point to the misuse and abuse of Workplace Spirituality by organisations, along with increasing interest in Workplace Spirituality.

A variety of concepts of Workplace Spirituality have been suggested but they lack universally accepted definitions (Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008; Kolodinsky et al. 2008). Although the term Workplace Spirituality has been usually used in research papers and literature to describe the same phenomenon several terms have been used: Organisational Spirituality, Spirituality in the Workplace, Spirituality at Work, Spirituality in Business, and Workplace Spirituality (Brown, 2003; Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008).

McKnight (1984) suggested that when organisations deny humanness the spiritual nature of our being the loss is incalculable in terms of lessened
enthusiasm, effort, collaboration, creativity, sense of commitment, goal setting, quality performance, and persistence. According to McKnight, at the root of most productivity problems is a lack of organisational leadership which encourages employees to engage in some kind of purpose larger than them. The importance of pursuing a transcendent purpose was a hallmark of well-being as evidenced in interviews conducted by McKnight.

Block (1993) argued that Spirituality in the Workplace begins with our willingness and ability to connect our higher-order values to the actual work we perform on a daily basis, as well as to the roles, relationships, and responsibilities we hold, build, and accept as members of organisations. Thus, addressing Spirituality in the Workplace required that we investigate and make explicit the inherently spiritual nature of work on a micro level and of organisations on a macro level. Such investigations are performed as part of our overarching quest to make contemporary organisations and the work completed within them more fulfilling and meaningful, thereby enhancing individual and organisational outcomes.

Chappell (1994) came to the conclusion that beliefs drive strategy. He stated that creating a spiritual climate could allow workers to be fully engaged. In contrast, if the driving principle of the company was to maximise profit, workers would also limit themselves to the bare minimum required of them. Thus, when workers will get fully engaged, when they and their managers will have common values and shared sense of purpose, their daily work would be imbued with deeper meaning, which leads to satisfaction and fulfillment.

Mitroff and Denton (1999) stated that an option to understand Workplace Spirituality could be to look at this phenomenon from an energetic standpoint. One understands spirituality as being static. Spirituality is studied in terms of beliefs, rituals or qualities that remain more or less regular over time. The other conceives Spirituality as being dynamic, “a set of skills, resources, capacities, or abilities that are evolving and developing and interact with the external environment” (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003b). Mitroff and Denton (1999) further suggested that
Workplace Spirituality research should focus on **Spirituality as embedded in organisation culture** because a look at the individual level could cause conflicts between individual employees.

**Graber and Johnson (2001)** explained Workplace Spirituality as “achieving personal fulfillment or **Spiritual growth in the Workplace**”.

**Howard (2002)** said Workplace Spirituality is “the way an individual lives out his or her **sense of interconnectedness with the world** and [how] it encompasses truth, love, service, wisdom, joy, and wholeness,” adding, “we need to find meaning and purpose and develop our potential, to live an integrated and fulfilled life”

**Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2004)** conducted a qualitative study of 14 professionals who not only experienced Workplace Spirituality, but whose work also involved researching or promoting Spirituality in the Workplace. The study consisted of in-depth interviews and written surveys in order to ask the participants to describe a personal experience of spirit at work. As a result of this work, rather than focus on Workplace Spirituality, **Kinjerski and Skrypnek repositioned the construct into what they term “spirit at work”**. This formulation is distinct Workplace Spirituality in that it focuses on the individual’s experience at work, in contrast to other investigators (e.g., Mitroff and Denton, 1999a, b; Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Milliman et al. 2003; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003), who have tended to focus on attitudinal aspects such as desires to express their being and to be engaged in Meaningful Work versus experience-based aspects. Their definition of spirit at work characterises it as a distinct state that is characterised by physical, affective, cognitive, interpersonal, spiritual, and mystical dimensions.

**Sheep (2004)** argued that a conceptual convergence of Workplace Spirituality Person – Organisation Fit\(^2\) (WSP-OF) occurs in four recurring themes: a self-

\(^2\) Person-organization fit is the degree of congruence between worker values and organizational culture. Research suggests that better person-organization fit results in improved work attitudes, job satisfaction, commitment, and even organizational performance (Koldinsky, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2007).
workplace integration; meaning in work; transcendence of self and personal growth/development of one’s inner self at work. He viewed Workplace Spirituality through the lens of the concept of person-organisation fit (P-O fit).

Driver (2005) also emphasised connectedness to Workplace Spirituality, noting “feelings of wholeness and connectedness” and “integration of various parts of individuals’ professional and personal lives in authentic ways congruent with personal values”

![Figure 2.1: Areas of Research: Spirituality in Organisations. (Tischler, 2007)](image)

Tischler et al. (2007) mapped the many different approaches to research in Workplace Spirituality into a three dimensional model. The dimensions included levels, measures, and source of validity. The levels included society, organisation, work unit, and individual. The measures had to do with the type of data being collected and included cognition, emotion, actions or processes, and other measures. The source of validity concerned the manner in which the data is validated, either as
internally perceived experiences (interior) validated only by the person having or reporting the experience, or externally observed and measured phenomenon (exterior).

Pawar (2008) compared two approaches to Workplace Spirituality. The first approach can be identified as an organisation-focused approach that emphasises organisational processes to facilitate organisational spiritual values. The second approach deals with the spiritual development of individual employees.

Pawar (2009a) identified three other foci in the literature: individual experiences (Kinjerski & Skrypnek, 2004), the facilitation of individuals’ experiences through organisational culture and values (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003b), and Meaningful Work (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000).

Braud (2009) stated that transpersonal psychology addressed issues of Spirituality, ego-transcendence, wisdom, psycho spiritual growth and development, personal and societal transformation, and wholeness. He thus suggested ways in which transpersonal inquiry could supplement more established quantitative and qualitative research approaches in exploring Workplace Spirituality. He suggested that Workplace Spirituality could be optimally explored when spiritually relevant approaches and the researcher’s own “spiritual” qualities and skills are included. Further he stated that it was necessary to augment and expand one’s research methods, skills, and sensitivities in order to address previously hidden or neglected aspects of the topic. Lastly, he cautioned researchers to use research methods merely because they are handy, familiar, or well-regarded and not to get distracted from one’s true quest.

Brooke and Parker (2010) stated that Spirituality at work is implicit in organisations because organisations involve people. Hence, we are claiming that being human involves a spiritual dimension.

Karakas (2010) developed an integral framework for analysing and capturing diverse forms of value compasses of leaders in organisations. He introduced the
concept of “spiritual anchors” which indicted patterns of deeply held spiritual motives, values and attitudes that provide direction, meaning, wholeness, and connectedness to a person’s life or work. Based on qualitative interviews conducted with 32 managers in Turkey, he introduced nine spiritual anchors as the underlying basis of leadership values and team roles in organisations: perfection, compassion, passion, inspiration, investigation, dedication, appreciation, determination, and cooperation. They suggested that organisations should think more broadly about the different kinds of contributions which people can make, and develop multiple reward systems as well as multiple career paths to meet the diverse spiritual needs of employees in organisations.

Lindsay and Smith (2010) stated that while a growing literature has attended to the interplay between the domains of faith and work, relatively little attention has been paid to the ways elite actors negotiate the sometimes competing demands of religious convictions and workplace responsibilities. They examined how evangelicals in positions of public leadership account for the role of faith in Workplace decision-making. On the basis of interview transcripts of 360 national leaders, they constructed taxonomy of dispositions toward faith at work along two primary axes—the expression of faith in Workplace decision-making and the reception of it in various situations or by particular reference groups. They stated that the assessment of Workplaces by the evangelical elites is divergent and preach different forms of meaning making. With access to multiple and potent channels of influence, elite evangelicals find themselves well positioned both to draw upon and transmit ways of thinking and acting between professional contexts and the world of faith. They further stated that the growing presence of evangelicals among the American professional elite (Lindsay 2007) implies that greater numbers of public leaders actively but selectively incorporate religion in the workplace.

Marques (2010a) conducted a survey among 50 members of the Los Angeles Workforce, all within the age range of 20–50 years, and with a minimum of 2 years of
work experience and a minimum of 2 years of college education and delivered results that may be of interest to managers in their efforts to enhance workers’ satisfaction and successfully transcend the challenges of these times. The focus of this study was on values that mattered most in challenging times to members of the workforces. The hypothesis that inner and inter-human aspects would be considered more important than money and status in such times was highly supported, with values such as love and relationships and positive motivation, in an overwhelming lead. They stated that while financial worries were undoubtedly mattered, it was underscored that in times of trouble, employees reach inwardly and outwardly to inner-human and inter-human connectedness. They further opined that safety and intrinsic rewards like relationships and personal growth are now treated ahead of profit. Also, the spiritual mindset that started in the early 1990s is heading for a peak, now that greed has run us into a brick wall of mistrust and economic free fall.

Marques (2010b) suggested a new cycle of thinking and behaving for corporates which they called – ‘SMILE’ the new mainstream, consisting of spirituality, meaning, interbeing, leadership, and empathy. They suggested that a well-implemented SMILE will not only lead to greater workplace connection, ownership, and satisfaction, but also improve performance for the organization, the people, and the environment.

Rozuel and Kakabadse (2010) argued that self, as both the centre of our identity and the focus of our spiritual life has been ignored with regard to the ethics of managers and leaders. They suggested that the way we perceive and interpret our self affects our moral behavior. They further suggested that the ‘self’ possesses a distinctive spiritual dimension that defines us as individuals and transcends this individuality so that we can connect with others through the consciousness of our shared humanity. They warned that Compartmentalisation would pave the way to dangerous moral compromises, while realisation of the whole self will foster more consistent and more righteous behaviour.
Vasconcelos (2010) attempted to enlarge the religion based views on Spirituality in organisations and managerial through the perspective of the Spiritist Doctrine given by Allan Kardec. He posited that the Spiritist Doctrine tenets, while building on and expanding Jesus Christ’s teachings, encompass a framework that embraces corporate life coupled with some factors that may likely build and enhances one’s spiritual progress, the potential spiritual rewards derived from these factors, and the loci where the rewards are enjoyed.

Bhunia and Mukhuti (2011) and Bhunia and Das (2012) addressed the disputes and issues waiting for clarification with regard to the concept of Workplace Spirituality and based on a review of literature and focus group interviews, found that many studies on Workplace Spirituality ignore the essence and concepts of the workplaces. They thus postulated a Hierarchical Linear Model, and divided Workplace Spirituality into two aspects, which are spiritual awakening on the individual level, and organisational spirituality on the organisational level. The empirical analysis they conducted confirmed that spiritual awakening and organisational spirituality are different constructs, and exist at different levels.

Sri Rangarajan (2011) on the basis of a comprehensive literature review postulated that Karma Yoga is the eastern equivalent of spirit at work.

From the review of literature on the conceptual underpinning of Workplace Spirituality, revealed that Workplace Spirituality is about connection to our higher-order values to the actual work (Block, 1993) and it would allow workers to be fully engaged (Chappell, 1994) It is a dynamic phenomenon with a focus on Spirituality as embedded in organisation culture (Mitroff and Denton, 1999; Brooke and Parker, 2010) and would lead to spiritual growth in the workplace (Grabber and

---

Johnson, 2001) to an integration of various parts of individuals’ professional and personal lives (Driver, 2005), provide direction, meaning, wholeness, and connectedness to a person’s life or work (Karakas, 2010) and lead to greater workplace connection, ownership, and satisfaction (Marques, 2010b).

2.5 THE DEFINITIONAL FLUX

An important step in the scientific study of any phenomenon is a careful definition of terms. Unfortunately, this has arguably been one of the greatest challenges in Workplace Spirituality research. Numerous scholars have commented on the lack of definitional clarity regarding the nature of Spirituality in the Workplace (Cavanagh, 1999; Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008; Marques, Dhiman and King, 2005; Neal, 1997; Rego and Cunha, 2008; Tischler et al. 2007; Van Tonder and Ramdass, 2009). Several researchers have even identified the issue as the most significant impediment to progress in the field (Brown, 2003; Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008; Kolodinsky et al. 2007; Tischler et al. 2007).

The distress over definitional confusion is one of the most pervasive themes in Workplace Spirituality literature. Kolodinsky et al. (2007) suggested defining Workplace Spirituality is perhaps the most glaring challenge facing the field as it emerges from its infancy. It was Garcia-Zamor (2003) who decried the resulting definitional muddle. Definitional uncertainty has increased the level of difficulty in achieving scientific legitimacy for Workplace Spirituality researchers. Since there is no generally agreed-on definition of Workplace Spirituality, there is also no dominant paradigm or even any particular accepted framework for empirical examination (Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008).

One of the roots of the definitional problem facing Workplace Spirituality researchers is the subjects are highly abstract, multifaceted, complex, subjective, personal nature (Neal 1997; Marques, 2005). It can be viewed from numerous perspectives and from several different levels, and its boundaries are unclear (Garcia-
Zamor, 2003; Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008; Tischler et al., 2007). Even skilled researchers have frequently confused the definition of Spirituality with high morale, team spirit, powerful culture, ethics, or strong values (Thompson, 2000).

As evident from the previous portion of the chapter, the term Spirituality itself is extremely difficult to define. Spirituality at work has at least as many perspectives. It is a broadly and divergently interpretable phenomenon (Marques, 2005). Neal (1997) suggested the concept at its core may be very subjective and beyond categorising and that in the end, it is a very individual and personal matter. It can be conceived, understood, and experienced in many different ways. As a result, the subject crosses the boundaries of many scientific disciplines (Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008).

Not all scholars agree the lack of a clear definition for Workplace Spirituality is a major problem. In one seminal empirical work, Mitroff and Denton (1999a) discussed the definitional issues that have plagued Workplace Spirituality, highlighting two extremes. The first is that Spirituality is indefinable. The opposite extreme is that Spirituality is unique to every individual, and therefore has infinite definitions. Mitroff and Denton asserted strongly that both perspectives are erroneous. In their interviews they actually found great commonality in the definitions given for Spirituality. Similarly, Van Tonder and Ramdass (2009) found consistent themes and argued there is an increasing convergence of empirical observations regarding the nature of Workplace Spirituality. They asserted the emergence of a commonly accepted definition is improbable and may not be desirable, considering the multiplicity of perspectives and the value attributed to each of them.

Definitional ambiguity is challenging, but is certainly not a unique problem within organisational science, and it should not necessarily discourage researchers (Rego and Cunha, 2008). For example, Hendricks and Hendricks (2003) found that despite the enormous efforts of business ethicists, CEOs of the some of the largest companies in the world still couldn’t verbalise a clear definition for the word integrity,
even though the term is central to many of their mission statements. Markow and Klenke (2005) noted there are some 500 definitions of leadership. The study of corporate social responsibility has been plagued with definitional problems for decades (Aupperle et al. 1985; Waddock and Graves, 1997). Despite such challenges, valuable research continues in all of these fields (Dehler and Welsh, 2003).

Table 2.4 presents a representative sampling of definitions for workplace spirituality that appear in peer-reviewed research writings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams and Csiernik</td>
<td>“Workplace spirituality involves positively sharing, valuing, caring, respecting, acknowledging, and connecting the talents and energies of people in meaningful goal-directed behavior that enables them to belong, be creative, be personally fulfilled, and take ownership in their combined destiny”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cacioppe (2000)</td>
<td>“extends the thinking about spirituality beyond the experience =of a single individual by addressing how an organisation might create a humanistic work environment. Such an environment would treat each person as a whole being”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehler and Welsh (1994)</td>
<td>“a specific form of work feeling that energizes action”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Neal (1997)             | “Spirituality in the workplace can refer to an individual’s attempts to live his or her values more fully in the workplace. Or it can refer to the ways in which organisations structure themselves to support the spiritual
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashmos and Duchon, (2000)</td>
<td>“Spirituality at work is defined as the recognition that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003)</td>
<td>“a framework of organisational values evidenced in the culture that promote employees’ experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2006)</td>
<td>“a state of being characterised by engaging work which is perceived to have a higher purpose and to align with an individual’s personal values, by a spiritual connection to something larger than one’s self, by a sense of community and connectedness and by a unifying mystical or transcendent experience.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marques et al.(2007)</td>
<td>“an experience of interconnectedness among those involved in a work process, initiated by authenticity, reciprocity, and personal goodwill; engendered by a deep sense of meaning that is inherent in the organisation’s work; and resulting in greater motivation and organisational excellence.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Rayment, (2007)</td>
<td>“individuals and organisations seeing work as a spiritual path, as an opportunity to grow and to contribute to society in a meaningful way”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“the effort to pursue an ideal of a higher purpose within the practical constrains of everyday organisational life and the context in which this takes place”

“Spirituality concerns creating a sense of transcendence, or vocation, through one’s work and foster bonds of connectedness between employees experiencing completeness, fulfillment and self-actualisation in their work”

Table 2.4: Various Definitions of Workplace Spirituality

All of the specified definitions have some unique twists and view spirituality in the workplace from slightly different perspectives. According to the literature reviews above, scholars have provided definitions or identified components of workplace spirituality, and while there are differences in emphasis, there is also considerable overlap. As mentioned earlier, there are many possible levels of analysis for workplace spirituality such as individual, group, work unit, organisational level, or interactive perspectives. In spite of the obvious overlap in conceptualisations, the field still does not have a clear definition. To date, scholars have not yet agreed on a definition of spirituality in the workplace.

It is evident from the review of the major definitions above that most definitions involve personal meaning and purpose, connectedness, and personal fulfillment as characteristics of workplace spirituality when discussing them from an individual point of view.

Generally, researchers and writers on Workplace Spirituality have found some common dimensions in the definitions of Workplace Spirituality: Inner Life as wholeness, Meaningful Work related to meaning and purpose of individual life, and community or membership related to connectedness (Duchon and Powman, 2005; Fry, 2003, 2008). Ashmos and Duchon (2000), conducted research to measure
Workplace Spirituality at first, defining Workplace Spirituality as “recognition that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by Meaningful Work that takes place in the context of community”

Ashmos and Duchon provided the systematic dimensions of Workplace Spirituality: Inner Life, Meaningful Work in terms of meaning and purpose of personal life, and community in terms of connectedness. Their definition not only explained comprehensive dimensions of spirituality, but also included both individual and organisational perspectives (Duchon and Plowman, 2005; Fry, 2003).

The present research was to measure the perceived level of Workplace Spirituality in individual employees. Thus, for the purpose of our study the definition by Ashmos and Duchon (2000) were taken as the operational definition of Workplace Spirituality and its dimensions in our study.

2.6 DIMENSIONS OF WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY

While a precise and universally recognised definition of Workplace Spirituality has not been established, a number of themes have been consistently identified. Ashmos and Duchon (2000), defined Workplace Spirituality as the recognition that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by Meaningful Work that takes place in the context of community. These researchers definition, which has been adopted for use in this study, includes three components: Inner life as spiritual identity, meaning and purpose at work, and a sense of connection and community. However, other authors have proposed anywhere from three to 20 dimensions of Workplace Spirituality. These dimensions have varied widely. Table 2.5 highlights a few dimensions that have appeared most commonly in scholarly works on Workplace Spirituality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Inner self</th>
<th>Connectedness</th>
<th>Personal Fulfillment</th>
<th>Meaningful Work</th>
<th>Transcendence</th>
<th>Enjoyment At Work</th>
<th>Path Of Humanity</th>
<th>Energises Action</th>
<th>Meaningful Behaviour</th>
<th>Engaging Work</th>
<th>Higher Purpose</th>
<th>Organisational Values</th>
<th>Spiritual Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pawar, 2009</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badrinarayan and Madhavaram, 2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotsis and Kortezsi, 2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Safranski, 2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashmos and Duchon, 2000</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitroff and Denton, 1999</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolodinsky et al., 2008</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairholm, 1996</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konz and Ryan, 1999</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep, 2006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams and Csiernik, 2001</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehler and Welsh, 1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal, 1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2006</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marques, Dhiman and King, 2007</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Rayment, 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavanagh and Hazen, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.5: An overview of the various dimensions of workplace spirituality mentioned in scholarly literature*
Despite this diversity, however, a conceptual convergence (Sheep, 2006) is emerging of Workplace Spirituality as a multidimensional concept. Sheep suggested four dimensions are most prevalent in the literature: The development of Inner Life in a work setting, transcendence of self and interconnectedness, holistic integration of work and self and Meaningful Work.

![Figure 2.2: Dimensions of Workplace Spirituality. (Milliman et al. 2003)](image)

Milliman et al. 2003 suggested three levels of analysis of Workplace Spirituality. They argued that Workplace Spirituality consists of three different levels namely individual; group and organisation.

The three core dimensions include purpose in one’s work or “meaningful work” (individual level), having a “sense of community” (group level), and being in
Based on Figure 2.1, there are three dimensions of Workplace Spirituality. At the individual level is the first dimension based on the core concept of Meaningful Work. It is related to the meaning and purpose of one’s work and how the employees interact at the individual level. There are three important aspects of Meaningful Work namely i) enjoy work, ii) energised by work and iii) work gives personal meaning and purpose.

Ashmos and Duchon’s (2000) empirical study sought to conceptualise, define and measure Workplace Spirituality through three levels of analysis; individual, work unit and organisational. Rego and Cunha (2008) observed that they extracted seven factors/dimensions for the individual level (conditions for community, meaning at work, inner life, blocks to spirituality, personal responsibility, positive connections with other individuals and contemplation), two for the work-unit level (work-unit community; positive work unit values) and two for the organisation level (organizational values; individual and the organization).

The findings of Ashmos and Duchon’s (2000) seminal study demonstrated that the individual level of Workplace Spirituality was most significantly represented by factors: Inner Life, Meaning at Work and Conditions for Community. Duchon and Plowman (2005) referred to Vaill’s (1998) work as they highlighted Inner Life as “the feeling individuals have about the fundamental meaning of who they are, what they are doing and the contributions they are making”. Consistent with this idea, the authors noted that Inner Life was related to the organisational behavior constructs individual identity and social identity. Through self-concept theory of Shamir, 1991⁴, Plowman and Duchon (2005) explained that individual identity is a part of a person's

⁴ Shamir (1991) argued that an individual’s motivation to do a task would be enhanced to the extent that (a) job related identities are salient in the person’s self-concept, (b) actions required in the job are consistent, or can be performed in a manner consistent with the person’s self-concept and, (c) career opportunities on the job are congruent with the person’s possible selves.
self-concept and if their self-concept entails spiritual characteristics then they are likely to be more motivated, if their employing organisations "enable expression of their spiritual identity". Social identity, however, occurs when an individual is able to understand and express themselves through the larger context of a social group. As such, it can be said that one's identity and self-concept can be shaped by the individual's membership in a social group and how others perceive the group for which they belong.

"After recognising a spiritual element in employees, the expression of spirituality at work requires accepting that employees want to be involved in work that gives meaning to their lives" (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000). Pulling from the job design literature, Plowman and Duchon (2005) recognised that meaning at work was connected to job enrichment. That is, "the employee perceives their work as worthwhile or important by some system of values she/he accepts…and that the job has substantial impact on the lives of others". As such, the authors postulate that Meaningful Work and Workplace Spirituality are interrelated because the search for meaning is a part of our spiritual being.

Finally, Conditions for Community also showed significance on the individual level of analysis. The authors state, "Spirituality at work is also about the notion that spiritual beings not only express Inner Life needs by seeking Meaningful Work but that part of being alive is living in connection to other human beings" (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000). Specifically, work conditions that facilitate community in a way that allows individuals to feel a mutual obligation to, and share with, one another assist in their interconnectedness. Therefore, those who identify themselves as important to the community, are aligned with the community's purpose, feel valued and supported, and experience personal growth are said to belong to a spiritually thriving work environment (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Duchon and Plowman, 2005).

The work unit/group level of workplace spirituality includes the factors work unit community and positive work unit values. It pulls from the organisational climate
literature, and in this case, climate refers to worker's shared beliefs, perceptions, attitudes and values about their work unit, whether it is encouraging and caring and if its members identify with the work unit's values, goals and mission (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Duchon and Plowman, 2005). The authors note, "Members of a work unit have spiritual needs and when these needs are acknowledged, the work unit has a unique kind of climate" (Duchon and Plowman, 2005). As such, a spirit-friendly work unit will embody a group consciousness where members are aligned with the climate and whose leader exhibits and supports Inner Life, community and a sense of Meaningful Work.

Lastly, the organisational level of Workplace Spirituality comprises organisational values and individual and the organisation. On this level, individuals feel a strong alignment with the organisation's vision, mission and purpose (Milliman et al., 2003). Research has shown that individuals who reported that their work gave them great meaning and purpose also felt that they were associated with a good and ethical organization (Mitroff and Denton, 1999).

2.7 MEASUREMENT OF WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY

Due to the increased interest in researching Spirituality at Work, new measures have been developed. As there is no widely accepted definition or theoretical model of Spirituality at Work in academic research, measuring the concept of Spirituality at Work is problematic (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003b; MacDonald and Friedman 2002). Ultimately, this may have largely contributed to the devaluation of existing Spirituality at Work research and the lack of understanding of how spirituality should be applied to work (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003b). More recent studies noted the gaps in spirituality research, such as lack of empirical research, little replication of studies and few validated measures (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003b; MacDonald and Friedman 2002; Milliman et. al. 2003).
Some authors tried to close these gaps by developing measures and validating instruments that measure spirituality quantitatively, empirically and critically (Ashmos and Duchon 2000; Milliman et al. 2003). Compared to measures of individual spirituality (e.g., Hatch et al. 1998) and religious-related spirituality (e.g., Fabricatore et al. 2000; Kass et al. 1991; Paloutzian and Ellison 1982; Seidlitz et al. 2002), few measures of Spirituality at Work have been developed (e.g., Ashmos and Duchon 2000; Mitroff and Denton 1999b).

In comparison to individual Spirituality and religious-based Spirituality, the number of available instruments designed specifically to measure spirituality in a work context, were few.

Mitroff and Denton (1999b) aimed to investigate Spirituality in the Workplace empirically with ‘The Questionnaire of Meaning and Purpose in the Workplace’, which involved both quantitative and qualitative components. The questionnaire contained items concerning meaning and purpose in the workplace and employee perceptions of their organisation. The questionnaire also aimed to investigate employee perceptions about spirituality and religion, perceptions about self-expression in the workplace, the role spirituality and personal values play in the workplace and what processes employees to recommend to initiate discussions about Spirituality in the Workplace. Although enlightening on the topic of Spirituality in a Workplace context, Mitroff and Denton did not define any subscales or provide any reliability or validity values for the questionnaire.

Where Mitroff and Denton (1999b) studied both spirituality and religion by using quantitative and qualitative methods, Ashmos and Duchon (2000) researched Spirituality at Work empirically, but focused specifically on Spirituality at Work (not religion) using a quantitative approach. They developed the ‘Finding Meaning and Purpose at Work Survey’, which measured Spirituality at Work dimensions (Conditions for Community, Meaning at Work and Inner Life) on the individual, work unit and organisational levels. Their measure had the advantage over other previous
measures in that it was multi-dimensional and assessed the degree to which employees experienced particular aspects of Spirituality at Work. The authors also conducted reliability analyses for their scale.

Ashmos and Duchon (2000) in their research developed and validated a measurement instrument for three levels of analysis: individual, work team and organisation. Their study results showed the measurement instrument was valid only at the individual level rather than work unit and organisational level. They extracted seven dimensions for individual level (Conditions for Community; Meaning at Work; Inner Life; blocks to spirituality, personal responsibility; positive connections with other individuals; and contemplation), two for the work-team level (work-unit community; positive work-unit values) and two for the organisation level (organisational values; individual and organisation).

Ashmos and Duchon (2000) were cited repeatedly in spirituality and spirituality at work literature (Dent et al. 2005; Harrington et al. 2002; Kinjerski and Skrypnek 2006; Milliman et al. 2003) and their spirituality at work measure was used frequently (Duchon & Plowman 2005; Harrington et al. 2002; Milliman et al. 2003). Milliman et al. (2003) further improved Ashmos and Duchon’s (2000) measure by renaming the factors, using only some of the original items and including some of their own items.

Milliman et al. (2003) placed forward three components as the central dimensions of Spirituality in the Workplace: (1) Meaningful Work means the degree to which people experience a deep sense of meaning and purpose at work; (2) Sense of community represents that people see themselves as connected to each other and that there is some type of relationship between one’s inner self and the inner self of other people; and (3) Alignment of values measures whether or not individuals experiences a strong sense of alignment between their personal values and the larger organisational mission/purpose.
Combining items that reflect individual and organisational Workplace Spirituality, Sheep (2004) proposed the Workplace Spirituality Person-Organisation Fit scale based on what he suggested as the four recurring themes that characterise Workplace Spirituality: a self-workplace integration; meaning in work; transcendence of self; and, personal growth/development of one’s inner self at work. This scale measured a combination of: (1) An individual’s attitudes towards the workplace as a place for personal and spiritual growth and expression and (2) Their perception of the extent to which their current workplace allows for such growth and expression.

Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2006) developed the Spirit at Work Scale, an 18 item scale, which focused on the individual experience of spirit at work. The objective of the research was to determine if “spirit at work” was something more than simply their spiritual selves at work. To explore this, the Spirit at Work Scale measured four factors: engaging work; sense of community; spiritual connection; and mystical experience. Their research suggested that spirit at work “is a distinct state that is characterized by cognitive, interpersonal, spiritual and mystical experiences”

Pandey et al. (2009) designed the Spiritual Climate Inventory. Their instrument measured harmony with self, harmony within the work environment and transcendence. Harmony with self concerned itself with a person finding meaning, purpose and personal enrichment from their work. Harmony with work environment concerned itself with respect for others and the diverse nature of relationships. Finally, transcendence concerned itself with the divine and mystical, the direct connectedness with existence.

Petehsawang and Duchon (2009) presented the development of a measure for Workplace Spirituality and suggested a four-factor model comprising of compassion, Meaningful Work, mindfulness and transcendence. They defined Workplace Spirituality as having compassion toward others, experiencing a mindful inner consciousness in the pursuit of Meaningful Work and that enables transcendence.
They stated that the scale was applicable in the Buddhist centric Asian workplace as well as the western workplace. They stated the need for more empirical work on Workplace Spirituality in the eastern context, for making a more generalisable and validated scale and the need to connect spirituality with work outcomes.

**Liu and Robertson (2011)** integrated the literature on spirituality in different disciplines and proposed a new theoretical conceptualisation of spirituality, based on which they develop a new scale of spirituality. Using structural equation modeling, the authors conducted confirmatory factor analysis on survey data collected from 2,230 individuals to test and cross-validate the spirituality scale. They stated that the construct of spirituality was best captured by three correlated, yet distinct, factors: interconnection with a higher power, interconnection with human beings, and interconnection with nature and all living things.

Consistent with the theoretical foundation of **Ashmos and Duchon (2000)** and **Milliman et al. (2003)** this study focuses on the three dimensions of Workplace Spirituality for the individual level of analysis: Inner Life, Meaning at Work, Conditions for Community. Those three dimensions build the essence of spirituality in the workplace and are best suited to study the relationships of spirituality in the workplace with other constructs like behaviors and work attitudes (**Rego and Cunha, 2008**).

### 2.8 PRACTICE OF SPIRITUALITY IN ORGANISATIONS

Organisations are now going beyond the profit-pursuing purpose and materialistic interests. More importantly, they are supportive of the practice of doing good, behaving ethically, and providing substantial benefits to society. In a nutshell, their feats and acts speak for themselves. Taken together, those firms are embracing a truly spiritual organisational frame (**Vasconcelos, 2011**). Table 2.6 exemplifies how companies are following this path.
This organisation shows a strong sense of purpose by creating safe and authentic products in such a way that it is reflected in its corporate culture, which encourages active participation in decision-making processes. During Max DePree’s tenure this firm was regularly listed on Fortune’s list of “the best managed” and “the most innovative”. In addition, his humane and religious-based philosophy of management has prevailed. This organisation shows a strong sense of purpose by creating safe and authentic products in such a way that it is reflected in its corporate culture, which encourages active participation in decision-making processes.
This company has an internal program (credo) of employee empowerment that is aimed at creating a culture based on mutual respect, valuing each employee or owner (as coined by its CEO). It is a kind of firm that believes in putting service before profit. This company has the commitment to be completely honest with its customers and employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ouimet-Tomasso</td>
<td>It has demonstrated that human happiness and organisational efficiency are both intertwined and achievable aims.</td>
<td>Ouimet (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ServiceMaste</td>
<td>In this organisation, both people and profit are part of its mission. It commonly hosts regular Bible study classes for employees.</td>
<td>Pfeffer (2003) Lawler (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Airlines</td>
<td>This company has exhibited excellent human resource policies, sound values (such as empowerment, humor, enthusiasm, sense of community), and positive outcomes.</td>
<td>Milliman et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starbucks</td>
<td>This company shows outstanding features such as interconnectedness, authenticity, reciprocity and personal goodwill, a deep sense of meaning, greater motivation, and organisational excellence.</td>
<td>Marques (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom’s of Maine</td>
<td>Tom has successfully used an advertisement style that covers both products and corporate philosophy. Besides, this organisation was pioneer on corporate social responsibility concerns. It is a clear example of positive deviance to Spreitzer and Sonenshein, and a spiritual organization for us.</td>
<td>Wagner-Marsh and Conley (1999) Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toro Company’s</td>
<td>This company has an internal program (credo) of employee empowerment that is aimed at creating a culture based on mutual respect, valuing each employee or owner (as coined by its CEO).</td>
<td>Wagner-Marsh and Conley (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Schmidt of Schmidt Associates, Inc</td>
<td>It is a kind of firm that believes in putting service before profit.</td>
<td>Wagner-Marsh and Conley (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetherill Associates</td>
<td>This company has the commitment to be completely honest with its customers and employees.</td>
<td>Wagner-Marsh and Conley (1999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6: Exemplifying the adoption of Spiritual Orientation by companies. Adapted from Vasconcelos 2008a
McLaughlin (2009) stated that spiritual practices at companies include prayer and study groups, meditation, centering exercises such as deep breathing to reduce stress, visioning exercises, building shared values, active, deep listening; making action and intention congruent; and using intuition and inner guidance in decision-making. Meditation classes are now held at many major corporations, such as Medtronic, Apple, Google, Yahoo, McKinsey, Hughes Aircraft, IBM, Hughes Aircraft, Cisco, Raytheon.

Apple Computer’s offices in California have a meditation room and employees are actually given a half hour a day on company time to meditate or pray, as they find it improves productivity and creativity. A former manager who is now a Buddhist monk leads regular meditations there.

Corporations are increasingly hiring chaplains to support their employees, as they are good listeners and quick responders in crises, and can serve people of any (or no) faith. Tyson’s Foods, for example, has 127- part-time chaplains in 76 sites, and Coca-Cola Bottling has 25 chaplains serving employees at 58 sites. Fast food companies such as Taco Bell and Pizza Hut hire chaplains from many faiths to minister to employees with problems, and credit them with reducing turnover rates by one half.

Southwest Airlines, one of the only airlines staying profitable after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The secret recipe they had was that they say that people are their most important resource, and they mean it. Company policy is to treat employees like family, knowing that if they are treated well, they in turn will treat customers well. They have a “University for People” and their policy is to hire people based on their attitude and then train them for skills, rather than the reverse. Unlike other airlines, negotiations between management and employees for pay raises and benefits are much shorter and easier as both sides come to the table wanting to hand write a
win/win contract. They have been named many times as one of Fortune magazine’s “100 Best Companies to Work For.”

The World Bank has embraced notions of Spirituality in the Workplace by allowing employees to discuss the relationships among personal and spiritual values and business issues (Labb, 1995).

In India, Art of living courses by Sri Sri Ravishankar foundation are gaining acceptance among managers these days. Vipassana- a10 day programme has found favor with companies like Wipro, Escotel, Dabur, Vam organics. Many a companies in India thus follows the new-age principles, which have their moorings in Indian ethos to increase the spiritual health of the organisation. Meditation for better stress management, Purushartta for achieving balance between professional and personal life, yoga for healthy, disease-free life are some of the often used new age principles that are finding its way in to the otherwise soulless, lifeless corporates. If Indian Companies can borrow new-age principles from Vedic precepts and practice it religiously, the western world cannot be left behind.

One result is that employees observe greater trust and shared values. One employee noted: “we find everything at a spiritual dimension because whatever we do affects the people for whom we are working. It’s resulted in a strong sense of shared values, which has been a very powerful tool” --Surinder Deol (Labb, 1995).

Organisations that have carried out an applied spirituality in a coherent manner are supportive of the practice of doing good, behaving ethically, and providing substantial benefits to society. Taken together, those firms are embracing a truly spiritual organisational frame. Such organisations are spiritually oriented and are less likely to be involved with instances of ethical misconduct (Gull and Doh, 2004). This is accomplished through whole-system values that enable honesty and mutual trust (Burack, 1999; Butts, 1999; Krishnakumar and Neck, 2002). In all, a culture of Workplace Spirituality does have a direct influence on an organisation’s financial
success (Turner, 1999) through improving the human experience at work, which improves individual performance and ultimately increases organisational performance (Bell and Taylor, 2003; Garcia-Zamor, 2003; Krishnakumar and Neck, 2002). In the long term, such cultural arrangements assist in achieving long term enterprise growth, stability, and profitability, all of which are all measurements of high performance organisations (Burack, 1999).

2.9 WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY: THE INDIAN PERSPECTIVE

Following are a few studies that discuss Indian principles and practices in the context of workplace spirituality.

Balagangadhara (2010) suggested approaches to integrating spirituality and management based on two different ways of dealing with the limitless nature of human desires. In the first approach suggested by him we seek spirituality based on the belief that we are our worst enemies, that human nature (spontaneously) prevents us from becoming spiritual. In this model, we need Gurus, priests, or experts to tell us what ‘true happiness’ is, and to believe that we can become spiritual if we learn to be ascetic and control our desires. He stated that the other approach told us that happiness comes through learning about the nature of the impediments that hinder our search. He stated that Buddha or Shankara, for instance, claims to teach us knowledge about human beings the way scientists teach us about Nature. This knowledge would also help develop the ability to go-about with Desire. He further stated that current theories in management represent only the Western, Judeo-Christian view which is the first approach. He suggested approaching the issue from the eyes of the Indian traditions and opined that this would generate novel ways of relating to our fellow human beings. This would engender a new perspective on corporate responsibilities, the nature of CEOs, and companies’ responsibility in society.

Borden and Shekhawat (2010) stated that the cross linkages of Buddhism, science, and management are now being recognised. Also, they elaborated upon the
theme of meditation in the terms of the ideals provided by Buddhist *Dharma* and stated that they further insights into how we can spiritualise our lives and workplaces and align them to more noble goals. To enrich executives they proposed Mindfulness training and the teaching of Buddhist philosophy, through reading, classes, or in a coaching context to explore its practical application.

![SWOT analysis of Buddhist practices in the twenty-first century workplace](image)

**Figure 2.3: SWOT analysis of Buddhist practices in the twenty-first century workplace.** (Marques 2010)

**Marques (2010)** discussed the applicability of Buddhist practices in today's workplaces. They presented a SWOT analysis of Buddhist practices in the twenty-first century workplace. This analysis, enlisted a number of strengths for using Buddhist practices in workplaces such as pro-scientific, greater personal responsibility, and...
healthy detachment, while potential weaknesses such as non-harming, equanimity, and no competition. They stated that both the strengths and the weaknesses could be listed in reverse if applied to a different extent. Among the opportunities were issues such as re-educating the world of business, enhancing personal ownership and a healthier society, while the threats comprised issues such as creating different imbalances, disinterest, and stationary development. Marques further stated that when implemented to a responsible degree, the application of Buddhist practices could lead to greater organisational performance and wellbeing without crass politics; to greater acceptance without narrow mindedness, to greater satisfaction without feeling exploited and to a better view of the company’s long term direction and contribution to the wellbeing of humanity without obsession with short-term profits.

Rupani (2010) stated that spirituality and business seem to be integrated at first but as far as business is concerned, it is characterised by being corrupt and materialistic. He stated that companies that have become little republics now are engines of efficiency and growth. And hence they need to be responsible. They also stated that research suggested that companies in crisis mainly were found to have one problem that was bad CSR policies. They further stated that as per Bhagavad-Gita teachings, a prayerful attitude, working in the name of God without attachment to the end results and accepting the results as God’s blessings would add a spiritual element to the secular values. They concluded by stating that dating back to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, some very big businesses were originally founded on loving and spiritual principles.

Bhattacharjee (2011) attempted to establish the relevance of the teachings of Ancient Indian scriptures like Vedas, Upanishads, Bhagavad Gita, Manu-smriti, Arthashastra, etc in the practice of modern management. He stated that though Drucker’s modern management paradigms like MBO are very ideal theoretically and can be derived from the ethical and spiritual frameworks of ancient Indian ethos however, in practice, companies are struggling to implement these frameworks.
effectively because they are still not aligned to the teachings of ancient Indian scriptures. He created a model which depicted a 6-fold path of “Jnan” or Knowledge through which better management can be carried out at the individual, organisational and global level. He stated that such a framework could also contribute to restoring World peace and uniform economic order through spiritual congruence.

Sri Rangarajan and Bhasker (2011) reviewed literature and extended the research on the Indian perspective of spirit at work further. He postulated that Karma Yoga, the Indian psycho-philosophical concept of work is comprehensive and inclusive in nature and enables the incorporation of most of the key dimensions of spirit at work as identified in literature. Rather, in most cases, there is a direct equivalent available between a key dimension of spirit at work and aspects of Karma Yoga. He summarised by stating that Karma Yoga could be the plausible way to operationalise spirit at work in organisations.

Gupta et al. (2012) stated that driven by 'Spiritual Consciousness' this 21st century is witnessing the fourth developmental wave\(^3\). This expression of 'spiritual consciousness' at the workplace is being called 'Workplace Spirituality and also 'Organisational Fourth Wave'. They further said that Indian philosophy centers on the dynamics of improving life and is based on the principle of oneness in creation. It integrates the spiritual and physical dimensions of human existence through righteousness (Dharma). Wealth creation is considered to be one of the main goals of life; hence, religion and business have always co-existed and are responsible for all human growth and evolution in the Indian tradition. They developed an operationally feasible and efficacious 'Indian Ethos Based Workplace Spirituality' model that can transform the organisational culture from a pure economic stance to a socially

\(^3\) Toffler (1981:46) said 'every civilization has a hidden code – a set of rules or principles that run through all its activities. From the economic perspective human history can be divided in four distinct developmental waves, with the fourth Wave unfolding in this 21 century and characterizing (1) Shift in Consciousness, (2) Disenchantment with Scientism, (3) Inner Sources of Authority and Power, (4) Respiritualization of Society, (5) Decline of Materialism, (6) Political and Economic Democratization, and (7) Beyond Nationality, (Maynard & Mehrtens, 1993: 3-5)
responsible socio-economic stance. They emphasised that following the Workplace Spirituality model is a long transformational process but would lead to the reward of 'Increase in Sustainability' in terms of societal support, enhanced brand value and enthusiastic investors waiting to invest in the organisation.

Figure 2.4: Buddhist values that contribute to Personal and Professional Well-Being (Marques 2012)

Marques (2012) reviewed the element of consciousness from a Buddhist and a non-Buddhist (Western) perspective. Within the Buddhist perspective, two practices toward attaining expanded and purified consciousness were included: The Seven-
Point Mind Training and Vipasana. Within the Western perspective, David Hawkins’ works on consciousness were used as a main guide. In addition, a number of important concepts that contribute to expand and purified consciousness were presented. Among these concepts are impermanence, *karma*, non-harming (*ahimsa*), ethics, kindness and compassion, mindfulness, right livelihood, charity, interdependence, wholesome view, collaboration, and fairness. Finding an answer to the much asked question about the integration of Religion or Spirituality in the workplace Marques (2012) reviewed the Buddhist values and stated that “Fact is that a review of supportive literature on Buddhism and its applicability in the workplace delivers a great number of results. It seems that the interest in Buddhist practices as instigators to positive transformation of the work environment is growing. “Johansen and Gopalakrishna (2006), confirm the increasing popularity and importance and attribute this to the continued globalisation of work and the expanding economic power and influence of Asian nations.

Building upon a case for Workplace Spirituality in India, one cannot foresee that the roots of spirituality and its integration with work in India which can be traced back to 3000 BC in the holy text of Hindus – *Bhagavad Gita*. Yet, it is only after the jingles of the concept were heard from the West, that the Indian academia and industry woke up to the current call of getting back to the roots. Today, when the West is looking back towards the East for attaining spiritual insights, we in the East have held a laid back attitude in exploring the vast knowledge bank hidden in our own culture. *Bhagavad Gita*, the holy Hindu text that resonates with moral and spiritual codes is being discussed gingerly in the board rooms of corporate America today. And yet we have failed to pick up our work ideals from our own religious and spiritual text.

Sri Rangarajan and Bhasker (2011) in his research published that *Karma-yoga* is the eastern equivalent to Workplace Spirituality. His contribution to building literature on workplace spirituality is important and calls for a further inquiry into the
eastern equivalents to workplace spirituality along with ways to cultivate and groom it using high power techniques of practicing and acquiring spiritual orientation by digging into techniques very much a part of our culture and tradition.
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