CHAPTER - 1
INTRODUCTION

“Enlightenment is the key to everything, and it is the key to intimacy, because it is the true goal of authenticity”- Marianne Williamson

In the contemporary times, when great emphasis is being paid to superficiality, individuals are craving for authenticity. They are longing for leaders who are authentic, committed to building enduring organizations and who have a deep sense of purpose in life. The package they are looking for is “what you see is what you get”. Where millions of dollars are being spent by companies on developing leaders who truly lead, it becomes extremely important to focus on traits like authenticity, trustworthiness, vision, power to lead etc. This has led to a paradigm shift in leader-follower relationships and the focus is now on values, ethics, empowerment, engagement and various other positive psychological variables.

History has had examples on how humans have a natural tendency to admire individuals who feel one with others and they also place such people higher on the ladder of human evolution. The Upanishads or core foundations of Indian culture also emphasize that spirituality or feeling of oneness is the ultimate goal of every human being (Krishnan, V.R., 2007). According to Radhakrishnan (1929), “To live in perfect goodness is to realize one's life in all. This ideal for which the moral nature of man cries can be attained only if the finite self transcends its narrow individuality and identifies itself with the whole”.

Organizations can tap this uniqueness and facilitate its members in achieving this goal. The importance of spirituality is slowly increasing in the workplace, across
the globe today. Enhancing duty-orientation and this feeling of oneness among employees are also common objectives in leading organizations today as it is assumed that these two could individually or collectively enhance organizational performance and engagement.

A. AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP:

“True leaders don’t create followers.... they create more leaders” – J. Sakiya Sandifer

Leadership is an umbrella term with many connotations, meanings and applications. Over the last few decades, various adjectives like transformational, transactional, servant, charismatic etc. have been associated with leadership to narrow down its scope. The term authentic leadership (AL) is a coming-of-age term, which has added to the concept of leadership and how effective leadership can change the fate of organizations.

A.I. Conceptual Framework

The ‘development’ of AL originates from the domain of positive organizational behaviour, which reflect human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace. (Novicevic et al., 2005, p.1404). AL is the new-buzz term in the world of leadership and has been written and read about widely. Its roots can be traced back to the Greek philosophy of “to thine own self be true”, which signifies the importance of being true to oneself as the heart and soul of AL.
The theory of authentic leadership can also be linked to the concept of self-actualisation, which was developed by pioneering humanistic psychologists Abraham Maslow (1968, 1971) and Carl Rogers (1959, 1963). These theorists view self-actualized individuals as those who are “in-sync” with their basic ideologies and see their lives clearly. They have firmly-held ethical convictions and monitor their behaviour accordingly. It also seems to draw from developmental psychology (Erickson, 1995), and existential philosophy (Heidegger, 1962).

A. II Enacting that ‘True Self’:

When Barack Obama surprisingly won in the Iowa caucus in the initial stages of the Democratic primary election in 2008, polls indicated he held a strong lead going into the next primary in New Hampshire. But in reality, the predictions made by the pollsters were proved wrong when Hillary Clinton won by a thin margin of three percentage points at the New Hampshire elections. Media gave major credit for this victory to a particular event that took place during the final stages of the campaign and later called it ‘Hillary’s Tears’. When asked by a sympathetic woman supporter ‘How she kept going’ in the face of Obama’s upsurge of support, Hillary faltered. As reported on Fox News later that day:

“For the first time in public Hillary Clinton evidenced the strain and stress…
You see the emotion, you see the tears beginning to well in Hillary Clinton’s face, and the voice cracks just a bit…
We spoke with women voters after the interview and many of them were moved by Hillary Clinton’s show of emotion.”

Fox News 8 January 2008
This quote highlights a crucial facet of authenticity as it applies to leadership. Over the past five years, the need for a different kind of leader has increased because people have developed a deep distrust in leaders. Bill George challenged the new generation to lead authentically in his book named- ‘Authentic Leadership: Rediscovering the Secrets to Creating Lasting Value (2003)’. There is a sea of opportunities; businesses need new ways to create value, organizations need contemporary solutions to age-old problems, schools need to serve as a source of inspiration for the new bunch of learners, and communities need to focus on improving the quality of life of its members. Leaders are needed to pursue the opportunities of the 21st century, because problems are becoming increasingly global, interrelated, and complex.

A. III. What is Authenticity?

All these issues discussed above indicate towards one question, ‘What is it that a 21st century leader should have, to stand out from the rest?’ The answer probably is that the same leader now needs to be authentic, unique and original. Authentic leaders’ exhibit genuine leadership, lead from conviction, are self-made and not copies of others, and are value-driven. They establish long-term, meaningful relationships that go a long way in getting best results.

“Don’t take a part if it isn’t in you---a part has to be real to you before it can be real to an audience…”

Dustin Hoffman from the movie ‘Tootsie’ where he plays the role of Michael Dorsy Webster’s online dictionary defined authenticity as “the quality of being authentic or of established authority for truth and correctness”, and genuineness as “the quality of being genuine or not corrupted from the original”. In the same
dictionary, being authentic is defined as “having a genuine original or authority, in opposition to that which is false, fictitious, counterfeit, or apocryphal; being what it purports to be; genuine; not of doubtful origin; real; as, a paper or register.” The term authenticity as used here refers to “owning one’s personal experiences, be they thoughts, emotions, needs, wants, preferences, or beliefs, processes captured by the injunction to know oneself and further implies that one acts in accord with the true self, expressing oneself in ways that are consistent with inner thoughts and feelings” (Harter, 2002, p. 382).

Kernis (2003) defines the authenticity as “The unobstructed operations of one’s true or core, self in one’s daily enterprise”. Erickson (1995) & Heidegger (1962) are of the opinion that people are not born authentic or inauthentic, barring a very few like Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela to name a few, but that people eventually achieve a level of authenticity. There are people who have the potential to become authentic in their approach, but may need assistance in untapping this potential.

According to Shamir and Eilam (2005), ‘The overt display of one’s beliefs and values in one’s behaviour (which may be good or bad) is known as authenticity.’ According to Goffee & Jones (2005), ‘Authenticity is better understood as a quality than a personality trait and if one is authentic in his/her actions then others’ perception and belief must develop about this authenticity and others must attribute it to the person.’

Therefore authenticity can be understood as the degree to which a leader is aware of and overtly displays openness and clarity in his/her behavior toward others.
This openness and clarity can be achieved by information-sharing regarding decisions to be made, accepting employee’s and others perspectives on any given task, and being vocal about one’s personal needs, desires, motives, and feelings in a way that aids followers in assessing the capacities and competencies of the leader in a more accurate manner (F. O. Walumbwa, Wang, Wang, Schaubroeck, & Avolio, 2010, p. 901).

A. IV. Authentic leaders

After defining and understanding the concept of authenticity, it can be said that such a leader possesses basic qualities like confidence, resilience, optimism, morality, hope, far-sightedness and one who motivates his associates to emerge as leaders. According to Avolio et al. (2004), authentic leaders are “deeply aware of what they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values/moral perspectives, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and of high moral character”.

Bill George, author of ‘Authentic Leadership-Rediscovering the Secrets to Creating Lasting Value’, speaks of authentic leaders as those people who bring others to work together around a shared mission and values and empowers them to lead, in order to serve their customers while creating value for their stakeholders (George, 2007).

Thus, along with the positive qualities mentioned above, authentic leaders establish relationships based on trust that help them win the loyalty and commitment of employees instead of using manipulation or other measures to achieve the same.
Such leaders are aware of their own strengths and weaknesses, personality traits and motivations as well as that of their followers. This helps them drive followers towards attainment of goals, helping them learn, grow and succeed in life. Greenleaf (1977) suggests that authentic leaders push others in the right direction enabling followers to become wiser, freer and autonomous in their thoughts and actions. They are thus associated with positive attributes like being resilient, hopeful, optimistic, ethical and confident to list a few (May et al., 2003; Gardener et al., 2005). They serve as role models to transform followers into such authentic leaders in the future (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

F. Walumbwa et al. (2008) spoke of authentic leaders as people who are characterized as: (a) being a leader is the central component of their self-concept, (b) they have attained a high level of self-concept clarity, (c) their goals are consistent with self, and (d) their behavior is self-expressive”. They assert that authentic leadership is a relatively new theory in the realm of leadership practices that has developed as a result of the ethical and moral leadership crisis, common today.

Authentic leadership is defined as "a process that draws from both positive psychological capacities and a highly developed organizational context, which results in both greater self-awareness and self-regulated positive behaviors on the part of leaders and associates, fostering positive self-development" (Luthans & Avolio, 2003, p. 243). Gardner and Schermerhorn (2004) opine that authentic leaders have a strong influence on people’s ability that stimulates them to perform better. As a result, such individuals perform extremely well reaching the peak of their strength and efforts. Walumbwa et al. (2008) define authentic leadership as ‘a
pattern of leader behavior that draws upon and promotes both positive psychological capacities and a positive ethical climate, to foster greater self-awareness, an internalized moral perspective, balanced processing of information, and relational transparency on the part of leaders working with followers, fostering positive self-development.

A. v. Development of the concept of Authentic Leadership

As this construct is quite new, various researchers like Gardner et al., 2005; May et al., 2005; Shamir and Eliaam, 2005; Avolio and Luthans, 2003; have proposed different perspectives and views on how authentic leaders become what they are. Luthans and Avolio in 2003 conceptualized this development with the help of a model explained below.

**Figure 1.1 Authentic leadership development model. Adapted from Avolio and Luthans (2003).**

In this model, Luthans and Avolio have proposed that authentic leadership development is like human development which is life long process, dynamic and
always shaped by one’s personal experiences and situational events. Where a person comes from (life experiences) influences the positive psychological capacities that he develops over time (What I am) and that coupled with positive organizational context i.e. ‘How am I supported?’, affetcs how the person develops and behaves (self-awareness and positive self development) finally making him an auntentic leader. This authenticity then has the capacity to positively effect the followers, bringing out the best in them as well.

A.VI. Components of AL

Ilies et al. (2005) developed a model on AL based on the work and concept of authenticity by Michael Kernis (2003). This model specified four factors, namely self-awareness, unbiased processing, authentic behaviour/acting, and authentic relational orientation. They were based on the same lines as the one’s mentioned above. These factors are:

**Table 1.1 Components of authentic leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internalized moral</td>
<td>“Whether people act in accord with their true self as opposed to acting merely to please others or to attain rewards or avoid punishments through acting falsely”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>“One’s awareness and trust in, one’s own personal characteristics, values, motives, feelings and cognitions”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced processing</td>
<td>“Not denying, distorting, exaggerating or ignoring private knowledge, internal experiences, and externally based evaluative information”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational transparency</td>
<td>“An active process of self-disclosure and the development of mutual intimacy and trust so that intimates will see one’s true self-aspects, both good and bad”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walumba et al. (2008) kept the above dimensions as their base while developing ALQ, and finalized on 4 dimensions:

**a. Internalized moral perspective or ‘Doing the right thing’**

Internalized moral perspective is also known as self-regulation which is a process through which such leaders align their morals and ethics with their actions and goals. So they exhibit high levels of moral development and their actions are not driven by external pressures but by internal moral standards and values. Leaders high on moral perspective would generally think more openly and intensely about ethical matters, when faced with similar challenges. They have a tendency to act in accordance with their value structures. Thus they are true to their words i.e. they always say what they mean and mean every word that they say, which helps them manage tensions and unnecessary confusions and conflicts between their values and morals, their responsibilities at work, and the expectations of the followers.

**b. Self-awareness or ‘Knowing Thyself’**:

Such leaders promote self-understanding i.e. awareness of values, ideals and beliefs, as well as strengths and weaknesses. Self-awareness is one of the most fundamental concepts of authentic leadership. Researchers like Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Avolio et al., 2004; Gardner et al., 2005, have considered it as the starting point of such a leadership practice.

**c. Balanced processing or ‘Fair-mindedness’**:

This dimension is closely linked with the concept of self awareness. It involves analyzing available information objectively and exploring other people’s opinions before drawing conclusions or coming to a final decision. According to
work done by Gardner et al. (2005), such leaders prefer utilizing their time by trying to comprehend what led to certain issues and the corresponding outcomes; hence helping followers understand what should be attributed to internal and external causes of ethical behaviour and performance. Balanced processing has been described as ‘the heart of personal integrity and character’ that significantly influences a leader’s decision making and other actions (Ilies et al., 2005).

d. Relational transparency or ‘Just being genuine’:

This last dimension encompasses all the qualities mentioned above and refers to the quality of the leader to develop healthy relations and bonds through disclosures and maintaining a balance between his speech and actions. In short it’s a leader’s ability to be honest and transparent in his dealings with others at the workplace. This transparency of one’s true self to one’s followers helps build trust and intimacy, enhancing teamwork and cooperation (Gardner et al., 2005). Apart from this, the leader should also be willing to take inspection and feedback as it comes, which is crucial for an overall learning process (Mazutis & Slawinski, 2008).

In a nutshell, leaders who are almost close to being authentic hold a deep sense of self unlike those who are not authentic. They are well versed with their capabilities and how these influence others. Authentic leaders therefore showcase the capabilities of self-regulation, self-awareness, balanced processing and relational transparency and aim at creating a similar positive environment for the development of other members in the organization (Mazutis & Slawinski, 2008).
A.VII. The Five Benchmarks of AL

According to Cashman (1998), the five touchstones or benchmarks that make an authentic leader are:

- **Benchmark one: Knowing oneself authentically**: This refers to the ability to ‘Know Thyself’ which is a common preaching in various religious practices. If one knows himself in and out, then he can be much more effective with others around.

- **Benchmark two: Listening authentically**: This can also be understood in the terms of psychological reciprocity i.e. being generous and open to others opinions and beliefs without being judgmental or opinioned.

- **Benchmark three: Appreciating authentically**: This is one criterion that clearly differentiates between an authentic leader and an unauthentic leader. An unauthentic leader would do too much but appreciate very little, which may help get short-term results but finally create feelings of fear and insecurity in the minds of the followers. On the other hand, an authentic leader would appreciate and energize followers and motivate them to achieve their goals and perceived limits.

- **Benchmark four: Expressing authentically**: This refers to the ‘true voice’ of the leader that automatically creates an environment of trust and coordination with everyone around.

- **Benchmark five: Serving authentically**: A leader is judged as successful when he serves his organization, followers, customers and community at large, instead of just leading them. Only when a leader serves authentically, does he create value.
A.VIII. Factors influencing AL

ANTECEDANTS: The two important antecedents of authentic leadership are the leaders self-knowledge and coherence between beliefs, values and the overt act. Research also indicates that leaders possessing positive psychological capacities like hope, confidence, resilience and optimism are more probable to emerge as authentic leaders. This idea holds true for many reasons. Firstly, leaders who set effective goals create a more hopeful environment for their followers. Secondly, resilient leaders perform much better in changing and challenging environments. Thirdly, optimistic leaders have a tendency to take situations in a positive stride that gives them an upper hand in motivating their followers and helping them anticipate future events with ease.

Another antecedent that has been highlighted in literature review is: Self-monitoring. The likeliness of an individual to actively manipulate his image according to the expectation of others is known as ‘self-monitoring’. Theory asserts that self-monitoring and authentic leadership are inversely related such that lower the self-monitoring, higher is the degree of authentic leadership. This is because low self-monitors would behave exactly like authentic leaders in terms of being real, genuine and acting in accordance with their beliefs and values.

MEDIATORS: AL promotes team potency, which refers to a team’s belief that they can succeed in competitive situations, which in turn leads to enhanced team performance. Authentic leadership also stimulates team performance by nurturing a sense of trust in the organization or team. The reason is quite simple, that the more
trust followers have in their leader, the more loyal they will be to him and the organization thereby increasing their own and the organization’s performance as a whole.

Research on authentic leadership is in its developing phase, but one prominent finding is that such leaders produce an emotional and psychological response from their followers which ultimately enhances individual as well as team/organization’s performance.

**CONSEQUENCES:** The most prominent consequence of such a leadership practice would possibly be increased team performance, follower’s belief in values (as reflected by the leader himself), and nurturing authenticity in the organization.

Leadership, therefore has always played a crucial role in the prosperity and growth of any organization and this strong relation between authenticity and leadership will help avoid (or reduce) unethical and unwanted practices in an organization, thus creating an environment of trust and connectedness. Authentic leaders act as role models for their followers, thereby motivating them to push their limits and achieving great heights and success. Also every individual has the capacity of emerging as an authentic leader, because it’s not a personality trait but a lifelong learning process like human development, shaped by critical life events and experience.
B. ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST (followers trust in their leader)

“Trust is the lubrication that makes it possible for organizations to work.” Warren Bennis and Nanus (1985)

To be a part of today’s competitive world, organizations need to build trusting relationships that not only require organizations but also its members to feel the trust, be trustworthy as well as trust others working with or for them. The term ‘trust’ in modern English is an adaptation of the word ‘trausr’ from Old Norse, which means trust or firmness, which is in turn originates from the Indo European base word ‘drew’ that refers to a tree (Webster, 1974). Therefore the origin of this word suggests it to be something as grounded and strong as a tree, that doesn’t fall or lapse when faced with a blow or tested against nature. Trust has been a prominent predisposing cause for the development of various positive attributes across disciplines like psychology, human resource management, sociology, marketing, knowledge management, philosophy to name a few. Trust under any situation or circumstance helps people deal with challenging and unexpected situations because it binds people together. It makes cooperation, understanding, team work and coordination possible.

Trust is as complicated as leadership in terms of definition. Leadership can still be observed, but trust is an emotional adhesive that beautifully brings leaders and followers together. Trust acts as a vital contributor in improving and strengthening the bonds between the leader and his followers as well as between individual members and organizations (Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998). According to Norman (2006), one of the prepondent characteristic that makes leading organizations outshine mediocre ones is the level of trust between leaders
and followers. Trust is defined as, “Confidence in or reliance on some quality or attribute of a person or thing, or the truth of a statement”, in the Oxford English Dictionary. Shoorman et al. (2007) defined trust as ‘a willingness to be vulnerable to another party’. Trust as a concept has been studied across disciplines like sociology, psychology, philosophy etc as well as across different levels starting from the individual level and moving up to the organizational level (Rousseau et al., 1998). The definition of trust includes the willingness to be vulnerable across all the disciplines and levels. On the other hand, some scholars also define trust as the willingness to rely on another, based on the characteristics of the other person (Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1988).

Leader and followers have to always work in harmony for organizations to succeed and an element that makes working together an easy job is trust. It is thus very important for a leader to create an atmosphere that is not only built on trust but one that fosters trust as well. In people-oriented organizations where members are treated equally; as grown-up adults and as members of the family, trust acts a vital element to success (Peters and Waterman, 1982). Therefore trust has always been basic to any organization, especially a successful one.

According to Tan and Tan (2000), organizational trust (OT) can be defined as, “The global evaluation of an organization’s trustworthiness as perceived by the employee. Organizational trust is defined as an employee’s feeling of confidence that the organization will perform actions that are beneficial, or at least not detrimental, to him or her”. In Fard et al.’s (2010) opinion, organizational trust acts a predisposing cause for enhancing organizational effectiveness thereby influencing
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both interpersonal and intrapersonal relations within and outside the realms of the organization. Shockley-Zalabak et al. (2010) are of the opinion that OT is “the overarching belief that an organization in its communication and behaviours is competent, open and honest, reliable, and worthy of identification with its goals, norms and values.” This definition highlights five key drivers of OT i.e. openness and honesty, competence, reliability, deep concern for employees and identification— that play an important role in any workplace. Competence refers to an organization’s ability to meet the demands of its environment with the help of its leaders, decision-making skills and capabilities of everyone working for the organization. The openness and honesty driver focuses on how organizations deal with problems and constructively manage and resolve disagreements at work. The third driver— reliability—is all about sticking to commitments and following through them, and the trust in the leaders that they will do what they promise and intend to do. Concern for employees is reflected through the communication policies and how the leaders convey information to all those who are affected by the decision. The last driver i.e. identification refers to the connection between the organization and everyone who is a part of it. It depends on the core values held by all and is high when stakeholders and members feel the organizations’ values are in-line with their core values.

When employees are ready to face the consequences of an organization’s actions, it reflects OT. This readiness or willingness is present only if an organization transparently and unambiguously communicates its plan and subsequent actions to employees via different formal and informal communication networks. A major source of getting information is the employees’ immediate surrounding i.e. mostly co-workers and relevant others in his social environment. The social-information
processing theory asserts that this environment provides cues with the help of which employees can draw conclusions and model their ways of behaving at the workplace. The more employees feel similar to people in the social environment, the more relevance they give to the information received. Festinger (1954) was of the opinion that if information coming from formal networks is missing or unclear, then employees tend to depend on the social environment for information and subsequent interpretations. This reliance on co-workers can lead employees to be influenced by their ways of behaving, and then moulding or modifying their behaviour accordingly. Theorists opine that this trust on co-workers influences the trust that employees have in their organization. The reason behind this is when co-workers perceive organizational decisions as favourable and beneficial, then the employee are also influenced by this belief and develop a similar perception about the workplace.

OT is the employees’ loyalty and his strong belief that every decision-good or bad- that the organization takes will finally be for their benefit and goodwill. Keeping every possible factor aside, trust is one such element that helps organizations, employers, employees, stakeholders and others sail through thick and thin times. They give members a feeling of long-term stability and dependence on the organization. The possible outcomes of trust according to Dirks and Ferrin (2001) are positive and healthy attitude towards co-workers and organization, increased cooperation and enhanced performance and workplace behaviour. Laschinger et al. (2011) went on to explain what low trust in organizations could lead to and indicated increased absenteeism, disinterest in learning new tasks/activities, reduced creativity, negative thinking, longer breaks etc. as the possible outcomes. Thus because of these reasons and many others, trust in one’s
workplace is crucial for organizational performance and competitiveness especially in an increasingly global economy (Lamsa & Pucetaite, 2006). Studies have shown that organization’s that are successful in developing trust-based relationships pose as strong competitors (Barney & Hansen, 1994). Likewise developing internal and external climates of trust reap advantages for an organization in the competitive external market (Zaheer et al., 1998). Trust also leads to positive organizational outcomes like higher sales and profits, lower employee turnover (Davis et al., 2000), and increased levels of cooperative behavior among employees (Gambetta, 1988). The presence of trust is crucial to all types of industries, corporate and institutions, including colleges and universities.

According to Bibb and Kourdi (2004), various characteristics reflect an organizational culture based on trust. These characteristics alone or in combination give rise to an environment, where for most of the times, members of the organization trust others and are also trusted. These characteristics include shared values, missions and goals; authentic leadership; feelings of enjoyment at work as a result of the intrinsic environment; transparent and honest discussions, and an expression of altruistic behaviour not based on the desire to blame or put a colleague down.

Work places high on the domain of OT are made of people who are transparent in their dealings and do not hesitate in communicating their problems or conflicts. This produces confident and motivated employees who spend more time in learning and adapting oneself to any change rather than fearing future performance, leading to overall effectiveness (Ryan & Oestreich, 1998). In trust-
organizations, employees deliver more and help others more, helping organizations use resources more appropriately and effectively. When employees are part of an environment that reflect organizational trust and where employees feel that their opinions, ideas and abilities are valued, they are motivated to participate and share their ideas and opinions, feeling more satisfied alongside. Building trust is extremely important for cooperation and harmonious long-term relationships.

OT, thus, is an employees’ feeling of confidence and support in the employer and belief that the leader will be honest in his dealings and follow through commitments. Trust forms the backbone of any relationship, and is a very delicate thing, that takes time to grow and an instant to break, making it an extremely important matter for both employers and employees. Mishra and Morrissey (1990) opine that there are four core factors that nurture trust in an organization:

(i) Open communication,
(ii) Giving workers a greater share in decision making,
(iii) Sharing of critical information, and
(iv) True sharing of perceptions and feelings.

Communication stands out to be the most vital component of trust followed by the information shared with employees.

Based on the previous studies, OT can be understood as a mix of cognitive and affective components, the cognitive component focussing on an evaluative belief and knowledge about the other party. This belief increases the trust between two parties because they seem to be sharing common ethical principles.
The cognitive component of OT is helpful for short term affairs or goals, whereas for long term goal-achievement and development, the affective or emotional side of organizational trust is important. This trust can be understood as the degree of congruence between the values and interests held by the parties (Gulati & Sytch, 2008; Lämsä & Pucetaite, 2006; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

It is for these reasons that organizational trust theory has been in the limelight especially when talking about what companies can do to rebuild or improve its tarnished image. Just as distrust breeds distrust, trust builds trust and provides weightage and credibility to leadership practices, inspiring followers to perform better. Trust results in lowered costs and increased output and efficiency for organizations and gives employees the confidence for indulging in risk-taking behaviours or activities. In a world of complexities, ambiguities and uncertainties, trust is becoming a social phenomenon that is making work in organizations effortless and inter-organizational communication transparent and healthy. Therefore organizational trust is the favourable attitude of an organization’s member towards another member that the member will work ethically and will under no circumstances take undue advantage of an individual’s limitation or dependence in a demanding or risky situation (Das and Teng, 1998). Trust develops gradually when two parties (employee-employee, employee-employer, employee-organization etc.) regularly work with commonly shared values, ethics, norms and regulations (Fukuyama, 1995; Jones and George, 1998).
AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP AND ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST

‘The association between trust and authentic leadership is important because trustworthiness is the attribute that followers most seek in a leader’

According to Luthans and Avolio, authentic leaders are genuine, caring, trustworthy, dependable, and real. As evident from the characteristics mentioned, trustworthiness comes as an inbuilt feature of authentic leaders. Trust is not only an inbuilt characteristic of authentic leaders but an antecedent of authenticity as well; i.e trustworthy leaders are seen as being more authentic.

C. PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT

“An empowered organization is one in which individuals have the knowledge, skill, desire, and opportunity to personally succeed in a way that leads to collective organizational success.” - Stephen Covey

One of the most priced assets of any workplace is the people who work for them. They are the resources that no organization can function without. Employees are a reservoir of skills, knowledge, competence and abilities that are unique to their own selves. Although optimizing human resources should be a key responsibility for each and every organization, but in reality they are the most under-utilized of the lot. To overcome this issue, organizations focus on empowering employees, but again employees are hesitant in taking these responsibilities. There could be various reasons for this hesitation and fear as employees and organizations have faced rapid changes such as downsizing, layoffs, recession, technological advances etc since the advent of the 21st century. Empowerment is the factor that decreases this fear by giving employees a certain degree of authority and responsibility by motivating them to utilize the qualities and skills they possess and taking accountability for
everything they do. Empowerment is a mutual agreement between employees and their leader or supervisor to set clear, practical and attainable goals that they both expect to achieve. It is one of those factors that not only benefits the employees but also effects a variety of work-related outcomes like job satisfaction, performance of employees, innovative behaviours etc. Various studies in the past have considered empowerment as an important matter in organizational and management practises. It not only acts as a facilitator but also improves organizational effectiveness. In the Webster’s dictionary, the term ‘Empowerment’ is broken into three components: "em" at the beginning means putting in, going to work, going in; "power" is the ability to influence, persuade and convince others or alter activities in the expected way; and “Ment” is the status or condition that results from various actions like beginning, molding and empowering. Empowerment is defined ‘as an art of authorizing employees of any organization to control and manage their daily tasks and activities at work and also sharing and delegating power’ (Huxtable, 1995).

Empowerment can be seen as a completely different way of working people. Research shows that traditional organizations that are following the strategy of leading and controlling the employees are only using about 25 to 30 percent of the employee's ability. Maximization of PE leads to the display of leadership behaviours by the employee/managers like enhanced performance, desire for innovation, reduced resistance to change etc. irrespective of the position or level they are working at (Spreitzer and Quinn, 2001).

There are generally two approaches to understanding the concept of empowerment: structural and psychological. Structural empowerment, also known as formal empowerment is a managerial frame that focuses on the transfer of power
down the organizational hierarchy. It is a process by which the decision making authority is granted to employees and is formal because it’s a part of job design and other aspects of job. Psychological empowerment (PE), on the other hand is informal as it is the feeling of an individual employee and thus can be put to use for enhancing or altering individual behaviour. It works on a motivational frame that focuses on what intrinsically motivates an employee and the perceptions and feelings that he/she has for the workplace and not vice-versa.

Empowerment as a psychological construct emphasizes on an employees’ perception of empowerment (Spreitzer, 1995, 1997; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). The perception that an individual has the knowledge, power and capabilities to actively mould their life and the community around is PE. Earlier research studied this concept in the context of power and control. Empowerment was seen a guiding force to understand the power struggle between an employer and an employee and to enhance or improve the existing relationship between them. Psychologically empowered individuals experience a change in their attitudes, cognitions, behaviours which lead them to be more value-oriented, have higher self-esteem and self-consciousness, indulgence in patriotic actions, and an ability to delay gratification if need be. There have been different schools of thoughts regarding what empowerment means, what psychological empowerment means, and how are these constructs important for an employee as well as for an organization at large. Spreitzer defines psychological empowerment as ‘a person’s active orientation to his or her work role and comprises of cognitions and ideas shaped by the environment at the workplace rather than just being a personality trait or attribute that is more or less stable over time.’ According to Conger and Kanungo (1988)
Empowerment is ‘a process to enhance feelings of self-efficacy among employees through the identification of conditions that foster powerlessness and through their removal by both formal organisational practices and informal techniques of providing efficacy information.’ The organic approach to understanding psychological empowerment explains that empowerment is not something that a leader provides to his followers, but the attitude an employee holds towards the organization he works for. Conger and Kanungo (1998) were inspired by Bandura’s theory on self-efficacy and suggested that the roots of empowerment can be traced to basic motivational needs that humans have, and that every act that strengthens self-efficacy needs result in enhanced empowerment. They further defined empowerment as ‘the process of reinforcing employees’ sense of self-efficiency by discovering and removing conditions in the organization which make them powerless and incapable.’

Based on these definitions, empowerment can be understood as an act i.e. an act of giving power to the employee being empowered; a process that helps this employee experience power; and a psychological state that is visible in the form of cognitions that can be measured.

A cognitive model on empowerment was designed by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) where empowerment was seen as being determined by the work context in which the person works and also his personality type and typical traits. According to their model, psychological empowerment is made up of four cognitions: meaning, competence, choice and impact. Meaning refers to the value of the individuals work; competence is the confidence in the person to perform a task; choice is the freedom
to initiate and regulate actions; and finally impact as the term suggests is how much ability does the individual have to affect the organizational outcomes.

Spreitzer (1995) modified this cognitive model by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) and defined empowerment as ‘...a motivational construct manifested in four cognitions: meaning, competence, self-determination and impact. Together these four cognitions reflect an active, rather than passive orientation to a work role. By active orientation is meant an orientation in which an individual wishes and feels able to shape his or her work role or context.’ Moreover Spreitzer (1995) retained 3 out of the 4 cognitions proposed by Thomas and Velthouse (1990). They are explained as:

1. **Meaning**: refers to the ‘value of a goal or task, determined on the basis of an individual’s own ideals and standards’ (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990). It is when an individual feels that his work has certain value or importance in his life and that whatever he is doing is worth the time, energy and effort put in. It is thus the ‘fit’ between a person’s work role and his set of beliefs and values. For e.g. My job activities are personally meaningful to me.

2. **Competence**: is the belief of an individual in him of performing any given task successfully. It is related to the concept of self-efficacy i.e. having knowledge about one’s skills required to carry out a task. Menon (2001) followed the concept of Bandura that people tend to run away or certainly avoid situations that exceed their capacity to deal with it, but termed it as competence as it caters specifically to the workplace and not everyday living. For e.g. I am confident about my ability to do my job.
3. **Self-determination:** is an individual’s feeling of having control over the work and his sense of having a choice of initiating and regulating actions (Deci, Connell and Ryan, 1989). Where competency refers to gaining mastery over one’s behaviour, self determination is the freedom to take decisions and maintain current behaviours. For e.g. I have significant autonomy in determining how I do my job.

4. **Impact:** Impact is the degree to which an individual can significantly influence the system in which they are embedded (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). These beliefs and feelings involve an understanding about whether an employee’s activities are influencing organizational outcomes in positive ways (Spreitzer, 1995). For e.g. My impact on what happens in my department is large.

Thus, psychological empowerment is a psychological state that can be measured (Menon, 2001). Therefore, employees in general tend to avoid events that exceed their capacity to deal with it, and on the other hand prefer situations where they judge themselves as being capable of understanding the situation and acting confidently (Mishra and Spreitzer, 1998). The four cognitions/dimensions of psychological empowerment could give employees a feeling of control. It refers to the feelings of authority and power that an employee may have in an organization.

According to Zimmerman, psychological empowerment is a construct composed of three interrelated components: 1) an intrapersonal component, which includes cognitive appraisals of control, competence, determination, and motivation. It is an individual’s belief in his capacity to affect social and political systems
(Zimmerman and Rappaport, 1988); 2) an interactional component as the term suggests is composed of critical skills and knowledge. It is the interaction between employees and the environment (other employees or organization as a whole); and 3) a behavioural component, including participatory, change-oriented behaviours in formal and informal contexts and organizations. It is the overt display of exercising control on the social and political systems. It has been suggested that these three components are positively correlated with one another.

ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT

Trust and empowerment are closely related to each other. Employees’ feel psychologically empowered when they perceive their work environment as supportive and driven by trust. (Corsun and Enz, 1999). During any organizational change, employees have a tendency to resist it or adopt defensive positions to avoid the change. In this case, organizational trust can be helpful, because employees feel they are trusted and any change is likely for their benefit only, thereby increasing their perceptions of psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, Noble, Mishra, & Cooke, 1999). McKnight and Chervany (1996) suggested that if leaders work towards creating environments that reflect feelings of trust, then employees will be expected to feel more empowered. Developing trust is like fostering a soft skill that facilitates and gives way to various activities in an organization. This is another reason why empowered employees display stronger organizational trust as they are sure of being treated equally and fairly. There is no feeling of inequity or a feeling that they’d be treated impartially (Mogholy et al, 2009). Organizational effectiveness and efficiency can also be improved if employees have trust in their organization.
AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT

Authentic leadership, organizational trust and psychological empowerment are factors that are beautifully and intricately related to and dependant on each other. Authentic leaders tend to stand out from the crowd because they create cultures that involve followers in the decision making activities as much as possible. Such leaders understand and respect their followers’ desire for finding meaning in the work they do, and the self-confidence that arises out of being trusted for taking initiation and performing with a certain degree of freedom (Ilies et al., 2005). When employees perceive their leader as understanding their basic desires for growth and considering their opinions while making decisions, they have higher chances of experiencing each component of psychological empowerment i.e impact, meaningfulness, self-determination and competence at work. They also enjoy taking more and more responsibility (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Thomas and Velthouse, 1990). Spreitzer, who performed various works on psychological empowerment, found that there was a strong relation between the behavioural characteristics of authentic leaders like openly and readily sharing information etc and follower’s psychological empowerment.

He further explained that one of the reasons for this strong relationship was the leader’s moral perspective and their balanced approach, which helped them indulge in constructive feedback- a vital component of psychological empowerment. Apart from this, empowerment positively correlates with various followers’ outcomes like organizational commitment, individual work performance, overall productivity etc.
D. EMPLOYEE WORK ETHICS

Ethics refer to a group of values, morals and behaviours that guide the behavior of humans. The values that make adjustments and performance better in organizations are known as positive work ethics. Ethics are theoretically ingrained in an individual, which can be enhanced through various economical and psychological factors. Employees who have high work ethics are normally quite motivated at their workplace. Ethics can be understood as guides of personal conduct, thereby explaining work ethics that is an extension of this conduct and decorum at the place of work. It could range from moral behavior at work, to being professional i.e. healthy interpersonal relationships with co-workers. Ethical behavior is demonstrated by employees who act in accordance with how the business world views morals, values and principles. These work ethics are affected by employees’ knowledge, skills, personal goals, values and personality. In any organization, employees are likely to be high on work ethics when they have complete information about things they are expected to do. Work ethics greatly help employees in increasing productivity and efficiently maintaining a balance between their work and personal life.

Before understanding the concept of employee work ethics in Indian context, it is important to focus on the dimensions of work ethics. Work ethics is an integration of 5 qualities:

i. **Sense of responsibility**: The amount of responsibility given to an employee decides how he does the work given to him and also how much. An employee has a tendency to be punctual, responsible and extremely cautious
about the work he does, when he knows that the responsibility is in his hands.

ii. **Integrity**: As the term suggests, integrity takes a 360 degree account of everything about an employee job, right from the work he is supposed to do, to his relations with the leader or senior, co-workers and business clients. This helps an employee feel loved and understood from all sides because clients respect the advices given by the employee, co-workers appreciate the honest and transparent feedback and finally the supervisors trust the employees work, overtly acknowledge their high morals and do not doubt him without reason.

iii. **Focus on quality**: Individuals who work for the sake of finishing the task at hand mostly compromise on the quality. Employees with firmly-held work ethics are exactly the opposite, because they work not because there is a deadline pushing them, but because they derive inner-satisfaction and feel responsible. By doing this they not only enhance their personal performance but that of the organization as well.

iv. **Focus on discipline**: Discipline is another important work ethic, because it guides a person to do anything in the right manner. Discipline motivates an employee to stay on the right track and finish the task taken before moving on to other projects or more desirable activities.

v. **Emphasis on teamwork**: Teamwork always aids in enhancing performance of individual employees and the organization. Employees with a strong feeling of teamwork always focus on cooperation and bringing together people while working on any activity and also make collaborations a smooth process.
Employee work ethics (EWE) in this study has been conceptualized as duty-orientation or karma yoga, a virtue deeply rooted in the Indian culture. Karma-Yoga is the yoga of selfless action. India and the world have seen various examples like Mahatma Gandhi, Dalai Lama, Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King to name a few, who have treated work as worship and emerged as role-models that the world will never forget. This concept originates from the path of action, which is considered as an effective way of dealing with life according to the Indian philosophy. Kanungo and Mendonca (1996) conducted various works on ethical leadership and what it takes to emerge as an effective leader, and found that various non-western norms and values focus on devoting oneself to work and selfless duty. Karma-Yoga is actually a suggested means for people like managers of business organizations who deal with employees and followers on a daily basis. It is understood as fulfilling our duties and completing the work at hand with full dedication, without bothering about the results that this work will fetch on completion. It is an even more important concept in the Indian business culture as it differs from the others, particularly in terms of this work-related aspect. People socialized in such a society give more importance to the duty rather than the right of getting to work. They believe that it is only through honest and unselfish work, that they’ll be able to connect with the rest of the world.

According to the verses in Gita and other Hindu teachings, there are four spiritual yogas of which Karma yoga has gained maximum importance in the workplace. It is a culmination of two major dimensions i.e. a sense of obligation or duty towards others, and an absence of desire for rewards (Mulla & Krishnan, 2006). Sense of obligation is an individual’s natural tendency to act in various
situations, act that are driven and motivated by a desire. The best way to satisfaction and happiness at work is to consider every action as a repayment of earlier dues, rather than wishing for the fruits of each act done thereof. This is the sense of duty towards others which is one of the most ideal employee work ethic. As a result of this feeling, an individual keeps on performing, without being bound by an external desire to achieve and rise above the others. The other dimension focuses on the difference between body and soul. When an individual understands that his soul is what lives forever and not the body, he is motivated towards performing acts that lead to self-actualization rather than craving for materialistic rewards that only give temporary satisfaction. This leads to the absence of a desire of rewards in an employee/individual. These practitioners see business and its related activities as being self-transcendent as a result of which he cares about the performance and not the outcome or reward. Karma-Yoga or Hinduism highlights the importance of carrying the right attitude to work as that will decide one’s experience of it. According to Gibbons (2000), “With love and enthusiasm towards our work, what was once a chore and hardship now becomes a magical tool to develop, nourish and enrich our lives.” Buddhism also believes in the awakening of soul that leads to the decrease and finally elimination of pain or dukh. Businesses and workplaces that focus on reinforcing the states of love, selflessness, altruism and self-control and removing the unwanted states of greed, selfishness and hatred for others have chances of moving towards great successes.

Research has shown that Karma-Yoga strongly correlates with various psychological variables like transformational leadership, spirituality and emotional intelligence (Mulla & Krishnan, 2007, 08, 09). Another work by Srirangarajan et al.
(2011) has indicated towards a win-win situation for employees and organizations as a result of practising Karma Yoga, wherein the employees’ rate higher job satisfaction, self-growth and fulfilment and the organization enjoys increased productivity and enhanced overall performance.

Individuals who consider their work as worship have a typical way of behaving, conducting themselves and connecting with co-workers. Chakraborty (1987) went on to classify Karma-Yoga into five categories:

1. **Ends-means reconciliation**: An important characteristic of Karma-Yoga, ends-means reconciliation refers to concern for work and not the results. Once an individual decides on something, he then directs all his energies towards the completion of that task. With such an approach, neither does failure in the given task break the person’s confidence completely, nor does success beyond expectations, boast him too much. An individual understands that good and bad are sides of the same coin and they both create respective effects, and thus devotion to work, helps them transcend over the worry of being too attached to the work they do, as attachment is a direct result of expectations.

2. **Belief in the law of causality**: This is the belief that what happens today is a result of past actions. Law of causality is the counterpart in the moral world of the law of uniformity in the physical world. Nothing comes for free or without efforts and can only be earned. Hence being unattached to work is what works best for individuals whether it be their personal life or professional. Employees devoted to work understand this principle and work
accordingly on tasks given to them in an unattached way. They believe in the cycle of Karma, that every effect in the future will be a reflection of deeds carried out in the present. This would pressurize every individual to act righteously and refraining from anything wrong or unethical, and making them more introspective (Chakraborty, 1987).

3. **Being non-judgmental**: Every individual has a unique way of working and takes up challenges accordingly. It is therefore not right to judge anyone based on the performances of others or the like. Being constantly compared with others produces feelings of disliking and hatred. So the yardstick for analysing one’s performance should be his previous performances and ability to do a task (Vivekananda, 2000). Hence, devotion to work makes individuals more rational and they do not believe any fact or belief, unless they feel that it’ll finally be good for one and all. This is what is called as being non-judgemental.

4. **Self-abnegation**: Karma-Yoga means performing without thinking about the outcome and working towards super-ordinate goals rather than limiting oneself to one’s own interests (Chakraborty, 1987). It is the setting aside of one’s own interests and desires for that sake of others. When an individual achieves self-abnegation, Karma-Yoga is at its peak.

5. **Calmness in work**: Like a sea remains calm despite of the innumerable hurdles in its way, real greatness and true character of a individual is reflected when he works without being affected or disturbed by external circumstances and downfalls.
Devoted individuals concentrate only on efforts and their work without paying heed to ridicule or praise. A man’s calm is tested in times of turmoil and sailing through the turmoil with a focussed and composed mind is the ideal of Karma-Yoga. Thus, Karma-Yoga is a beautiful culmination of work ethics and philosophy that help individuals attain freedom of mind by indulging in unselfish, unbiased and unattached actions.

Karma-Yoga or duty orientation has widespread application in businesses and organizations as it can lead to increased dutifulness and a comparatively stress free environment (Mulla and Krishnan, 2006). It has also been seen that frustrations and stress are a direct result of high expectations and the failure to live up to them. Karma-Yoga tends to play a vital role here because its philosophy is ‘focus on the work done and not on the impending thoughts about the outcomes/results.’ Thus employees who possess such a work ethic can greatly reduce stress and conflict at work because their main aim would be to work productively without being bothered by the end result.

E. SPIRITUALITY

“Recent social trends indicate that increasing numbers of people are searching for greater meaning and purpose in their work” (Hill & Smith, 2003, p. 241).

Spirituality is the ultimate form of personal, political and social consciousness which if used wisely will be an important tool in blending ancient wisdom with the creative methods of present times. The 21st century is troubled with various social, economic and political issues that have made people greedy and
uncompassionate towards others. This lack of love has brought about a heightened desire in people to search for peace and humanity, finally leading to the attainment of spirituality. In organizations there exists a concept of horizontal spirituality, i.e. the desire to serve others and feel concerned for them. This service-orientation and concern for others gives employees a feeling of connectedness, increasing their commitment towards colleagues and work, belongingness and effectiveness (Garcia-Zamor, 2003). These feelings come from within and pertain to our dreams, aspirations, thoughts and emotions.

Rev. Scotty McLennan quotes “business people spend the majority of their waking hours at work, and many of them want to find it meaningful.” Not only do such people search for meaning in work but also desire carrying out their business dealings and affairs ethically. These ethics are learnt via religious practices or traditions prevalent in societies worldwide or through the philosophical explanations of morality inherited from families. Spirituality is one of those values that can transform any business organization by connecting the co-workers. It gives way to the development of a moral framework that guides behaviour of employees. Work takes a different meaning and provides managers with increased levels of commitment, loyalty and attachment.

Spirituality is derived from the Latin word ‘spiritus’ which means ‘a breath of life’. It is seeing oneself as a soul that lives forever rather than a mere body. Spirituality is defined and conceptualized differently in fields like psychology, literature, management and organizations etc. It has been defined as an experience that can direct or give meaning to situations, enhance understanding, increase
support, inner wholeness, insight and connectedness. This connectedness can be with oneself, with others (personal or work-life), nature, cosmos, the Almighty or any other supernatural power’ (Smith and Rayment, 2007). Spiritual analysts, Konz and Ryan (1999), say that spirituality grounds people in their work and allows them to connect with the transcendent in all they do.’ According to Mitroff and Denton (1999), spirituality is ‘the basic feeling of that connection with oneself, others and the universe at large.’ Plotnikoff (2002) explained spirituality as ‘a journey toward, or experience of, connection with the source of ultimate meaning…with one’s self, with others, with nature and with a higher power.’ Spirituality was conceptualized as a psychological power which leads to the creation of positive energy and a favourable attitude towards one’s own self as well as other beings (Sengupta 2010).

In fields like philosophy, psychology etc, religion and spirituality have been understood as overlapping terms, but in the field of management, it isn’t so. Researchers have explained that these two terms have different meanings when seen from a managements’ or organizations’ perspective. According to Butts (1999) spirituality refers to strongly held values that give direction to the work practises of employees and their life at large. Harlos (2000) went on to explain it as sacred or secular values that help individuals transcend towards their ultimate goals and values. Smith and Rayment (2007) worked on a number of US samples and explained spirituality as a state or position that can give direction, meaning, understanding, inner-wholeness and the feeling of being connected with others. So spirituality and religion are not the same, so much so that an individual can be spiritual without being religiously inclined. Spirituality is tolerant, adaptive, inclusive and personal,
whereas religion on the other hand is legalistic, rigidly held-on to, exclusive and institutional.

Thus spirituality is a general tendency of people to connect with their inner-self, others and the universe. It is in one word, a feeling of ‘interconnectedness’. Such individuals don’t think for their benefit, but use their intelligence, abilities, creativity etc for the complete growth and benefit of self and others. They are of the impression that organizations that promote an environment of spirituality and connectedness, will excel in producing products and services par excellence.

Ashforth and Pratt (2003) went on to categorize spirituality into 3 dimensions: (i) Self-transcendence i.e. to rise and see beyond one’s own self; (ii) holism and harmony, which can be linked to characteristics like authenticity, maintaining balance, taking initiative and perspective, and (iii) self-growth i.e. gaining insight into one’s potential and capabilities.

Spiritual employees possess certain behavioural characteristics like:

(a) Desire to rise above their own ego i.e. transcend over their self-interests;
(b) Being aware of and accepting their oneness or interconnectedness with others, the universe and their creator;
(c) Having a holistic approach towards life by looking beyond the immediate work to super-ordinate goals;
(d) Believing in the world that lies outside the realms of the materialistic world.
Michael Lerner (2000) in his book Spirit Matters, considers spirituality as involving the following:

(a) A feeling of love, affection and oneness with others.

(b) Respecting the uniqueness of every individual by recognizing the ultimate unity of all beings.

(c) A strong belief that the world is a happy place to live in which is not infected by negativities but filled with love and other good things.

(d) A cheerful and compassionate way of meeting others and dealing with them.

(e) Feeling that everything is fair and each individual gets what he/she deserves.

(f) A deep trust that there is a spiritual energy that binds everyone and drives the world towards oneness, affection, compassion, freedom and the like; and

(g) Knowing that our life has meaning and that our physical body is a manifestation of the Almighty or ultimate power of universe.

Spiritual employees therefore wish to live authentically where happiness comes as a result of possessed loving relationships and not through materialistic rewards. Spirituality for such individuals is a state of being, rising above the bodily self and connecting with the soul. Spirit is actually nothing but a thread that sews people together into a larger web of community. This is where the essence of spirituality lies.

Spirituality is seen in the way employees think, find, reason, answer and use to understand the self in this universe. It is a cumulated effect of one’s belief system and knowledge base, inner-self, and the self that is visible to the world and universe. These three dimensions are not mutually exclusive and continue to interact with one
another. They form the base for human experiences, influencing the organization and world at large. Thus when extended to the organization, employee spirituality emerges from finding meaning at work and connecting with the others taking them to the path of transcendence.

Spirituality not only helps a person rise above his materialistic self, but also improves organizational performance. Spirituality leads to enhanced well-being of employees and an improved QOL, it helps employees find meaning of the work they do and their real purpose for doing the same, and finally it leaves the employee with feelings of connectedness with self, others and the society. The interplay of these enhanced feelings and perceptions lead to improved productivity and organizational performance.

Since this study has focussed on the Indian organizational culture - Employee Work Ethics has been understood in terms of Karma-Yoga or duty-orientation, Spirituality has been explained in the light of oneness with all beings. The earliest Indian philosophy, Upanishads, have also mentioned the fact that the day humans realize that their soul or spirit is what stays forever and not the materialistic body, will they be able to connect with the universe. So when individuals realize that they are all made from the same clay in God’s hand, they will understand that harming others would indirectly mean harming one’s own self, leading to spiritual growth. The ultimate truth in this world is the existence of a universal spirit, something that lies deep within an individual. It can be related to Freud’s concept of unconscious, such as the spirit lies so deep within us that sometimes we even forget about its existence. This leads to false imagination of
individuals being made of the visible body and mind, and that every individual is a separate entity living independently in the world, whereas in reality it is just the reflection of a light on a screen, whose hidden source is the eternal spirit that individuals fail to see. Individuals grow spiritually when they consciously differentiate between the mere perceived reality of our appearance and the actual reality of the existence of a spirit.

In organizations, it is a typical kind of work feeling that drives action, values and beliefs that guide one’s behaviour at work and the desire to transcend over the belittle and connect with the Almighty. It is feeling one with the creation i.e. with all beings as children of god. Oneness with others at work is a central quality of this entity. People high on spirituality or oneness with others possess certain qualities that differentiate them from people low on this domain. They are sociable, friendly, compassionate, and receptive to the needs and feelings of others, unbiased and show love for self and other beings. When people see no boundary or difference between self and others, then a good deed done for self or for others isn’t seen as a favour but as help done for oneself only. They are not biased towards some people but unbiased towards every individual. As a result of this understanding they are empathetic and value not only the feelings of others but also their needs, desires, aims and goals in life.

To conclude with, spirituality is a “thing” that isn’t about cognitions, intellect, emotions or the visible being. Whether visible or not, it is always present inside an individual and is entirely personal. The individual is aware of the existence of a Superior power or something outside self along with an understanding of the interconnected and oneness between one’s self/soul, others around, the Superior
power and the universe as a whole. Spirituality is finding meaning in life and constructive thinking because this is what forms an individual’s identity. An individual, institution or organization can ‘lose their soul’ or search for meaning in life in the absence of basic intention. Everything that a person does is because of his quest in life and spiritual formation occurs when one moves towards discovering the ‘real’ authentic self. These experiences are different from those of an individual’s everyday life.

**AUTHENTIC LEADERSHIP AND SPIRITUALITY**

Nurturing and valuing the human spirit is an integral element of leadership. Authentic leaders because of their typical qualities lead their followers with a sense of spirituality. They are spiritual because of various sources in their life like religion, values, upbringing, education, morals etc. Authentic leaders base their decisions on strongly held values and morals while taking decisions for themselves or for the members of an organization. As a result of this, an authentic leader works and leads with honesty without keeping his personal gains and profit as the focus. Spirituality is connected to our superego which keeps a check on our do’s and don’ts. According to the Catholic view, each individual is blessed with a conscience i.e. an inner voice that drives him to always speak the truth. Authentic leaders listen to this inner voice and consider it as a driving force.

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SPIRITUALITY, ETHICS AND WORK**

As discussed above, spirituality of employees, their work ethics and the business they are involved in are closely related. These values are gaining great demand and place in organizations today and the focus of companies are shifting
from only profit-making to honouring a triple-bottom line i.e. bringing together 3 P’s- people, planet and profit. Various articles and studies have highlighted how spiritual and ethical values have changed the face of organizations over the past few years. They have all come to one conclusion that people who are spiritually inclined are more ethical in their actions finally benefitting the organization they work for. Spirituality can explained in the light of Maslow’s concept of self actualization and transcendence, as here an individual authentically strives to find his true inner self and peace. Although spirituality is a subjective phenomenon its existence can be seen in the overt expression of ethical work style and behaviours.

Ethics again can be compared to the concept of superego by Freud, as it’s an individual’s judgement of right and wrong and owing up to one’s decisions as it not only effects him but everyone around him. Again the decision to appear ethical is a moral belief and an employee should think carefully while deciding any course of action.

Spirituality and profit-making are exclusive behaviours today and moral and ethical values have become the driving force for organizations today as they lead them to increased profitability, retention of employees, reduced attrition rate, customer loyalty to name a few. Businesses want to focus on the practical aspects of spirituality rather than just believing in it. Employees are bringing their body, mind and soul to work thus feeling more fulfilled and happy. In a USA weekend poll, 47% Americans marked spirituality as one of the most important reasons behind their experience of happiness. Health was seen as the main factor. On a global level,
the desire to find meaning and purpose at work is constantly increasing and people want their work to reflect their real personal missions in life.

Therefore if people are able to do what they are best at doing everyday in their organizational lives, they are going to find greater meaning and reach greater levels of transcendence in their lives, finding more joy, satisfaction and congruency in their work which will directly increase their productivity.