

Spirituality and Religion in the Workplace: An Overview and a Way Forward

Margaret Benefiel, Ph.D.

Andover Newton Theological School

210 Herrick Road

Newton Centre, MA 02459

mbenefiel@ants.edu

Louis W. Fry, Ph.D.

Texas A&M University – Central Texas

1901 South Clear Creek Road

Killeen, TX 76549

fry@tarleton.edu

Work is an integral part of our self-concept, and greatly affects the quality of our lives both at work and at home. Interest in spirituality and religion in the workplace (SRW), most often under the heading of workplace spirituality, has emerged over the last few decades (Bell and Taylor, 2004; Driver, 2005; Duchon and Plowman, 2005; Fry, 2003, 2005a, 2008; Fry & Kriger, 2009; Hicks, 2003; Krishnakumar and Neck, 2002; Lips-Wiersma, 2003; Lips-Wiersma and Mills, 2002; Lund-Dean, Fornaciari, & McGee, 2003; Tischler, 1999), gaining the interest of both scholars and practitioners (Hicks, 2003; Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2004; Krishnakumar and Neck, 2002). Workplace spirituality has been linked to a wide variety of organizational functions and practices, although the major emphasis so far has been on the positive impact of SRW to organizational reality (Benefiel, 2003, 2005, 2008; Neal and Biberman, 2004), management processes (Lewis and Geroy, 2000; McCormick, 1994; Steingard, 2005) and to leadership practices (Fry, 2005b; Reave, 2005). Why this is occurring is a matter of some debate (see Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, (2003a) for a full review). The most viable arguments are that society seeks spiritual solutions to ease tumultuous social and business changes (e.g., Mitroff & Denton, 1999); that profound change in values globally has brought a growing social consciousness and spiritual renaissance (e.g., Aburdene, 2005); and that growing interest in Eastern philosophies has resurfaced spiritual yearnings overall (Marques, 2010). Whatever the reasons, the increased attention directed toward SRW issues is undeniable.

Some argue that workplace spirituality provides answers to the complicated contemporary organizational problems resulting from major organizational changes – downsizing, reengineering, layoffs etc. (Driver, 2005; Fry & Slocum, 2008; Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2004, Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008). The distrust and diminished view of work that arises from these major organizational changes has made employees see themselves as expendable resources (Cohen, 1996) and compelled employees to search for deeper meaning and connection in life and, consequently, integrate a spiritual-work identity (Ali & Falcone 1995). Some argue that these changes, which result in the demoralization and

the spiritual disorientation of the employees (Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2004; Leigh, 1997), can be counterbalanced by the positive impact of SRW (Driver, 2005; Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2004).

In addition, there is a need for diversity within organizational settings based on workplace spirituality that appears to be significantly different from the standard human resource management training (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008; Litvin, 2006) as well as the need to reduce employee cynicism and mistrust by recognizing the potential for meaning and sense of community inherent in work (Cartwright and Holmes, 2006; Duchon & Plowman, 2005). As employees are spending an increasing amount of time at work, they are actively pursuing opportunities for meaningful experiences in the workplace (Neck & Milliman, 1994). Indeed, some employees are even expecting their employers to provide for such a spiritual search (Konz & Ryan, 1999). In addition to the number of work hours required for employees, the unstable work environment has increased distrust in organizations.

Among many in the field, SRW is perceived as providing the impetus, the necessary driving force towards this change (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008). Moreover, SRW is expected to have an essential contribution to a better – that is deeper and more meaningful – understanding of human work and corporate reality. To be more specific, workplace spirituality is generally treated in the literature as the missing attribute of both organizational life and organizational effectiveness (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003b; Fry & Slocum 2008), in the absence of which our understanding of corporate reality remains limited and incomplete. For example, Fry (2003) argues that the recent, rapid organizational changes inherent in the 21st century global, Internet age render obsolete the dominant traditional centralized, standardized and formalized bureaucratic organizational paradigm that has dominated the organizational scene since the beginning of the industrial revolution. Due to these changes he calls for a radical organizational transformation to a learning organizational paradigm based on workplace spirituality and spiritual leadership. Fry & Slocum (2008) contend that one of the greatest challenges facing leaders today is the need to develop new business models that accentuate workplace spirituality,

spiritual leadership, employee well-being, sustainability and social responsibility without sacrificing profitability, revenue growth, and other indicators of financial performance, the so-called triple bottom line, or “People, Planet, Profit” (Fry & Slocum, 2008).

This paper aims to systematically explore the underlying assumptions as well as the rationale of the main trends regarding SRW. We aim to give an overview of the field and a recommendation for ways in which it needs to develop in the future. We first briefly describe the history of the efforts to integrate spirituality and religion into the workplace. Next we provide a review of the recent literature on SRW and highlight the major integrative and empirical work in this arena to date. Then, particular challenges associated with integrative work in SRW are examined. Finally, exemplary examples of organizations attempting to integrate SRW and recommendations to advance integrative work in SRW are offered.

An Overview of the History of SRW

In the West, the integration of spirituality, religion, and work has a long and well-respected pedigree. For example, in the sixth century St. Benedict (c. 480-543) wrote his rule for monastic life, emphasizing the integration of work and prayer. For Benedict, work and prayer complemented one another in the daily discipline of spiritual formation on the path to holiness. Benedict viewed the work that comprised most of the hours of the monks’ day as just as holy as the regular hours of prayer that punctuated the work, since both provided discipline for body and soul and served a good end. Benedict’s teachings influenced the Christian West, both in the monastic and lay understandings of the holiness of labor.

During the Reformation Martin Luther reaffirmed the holiness of ordinary, daily work performed by lay people, which he felt had been devalued by the church’s gradual elevation of monastic life over the life of the laity through the medieval period. Luther claimed that all people,

whatever their calling, should “seek perfection” in their work, attaining holiness through the discipline of working faithfully.

The Protestant Work Ethic

With the advent of the industrial revolution, the Protestant Work Ethic (Weber, 1958) became the general foundation for a work ethic that was, in essence, an attempt to spiritualize the workplace and provide a moral framework for morally good behavior. This ethic set forth moral principles that, through the idea of a calling, provided meaning and purpose to work and the workplace. “People had a primary responsibility to do their best at whatever worldly station they found themselves rather than withdrawing from the world to seek perfection (Buchholz & Rosenthal, 2003, p.152).”

However, the values of the Protestant Work Ethic held certain pessimistic views about mankind (Mobley, 1971) – that man was basically sinful, his punishments and/or rewards were after death, and earthly pleasures and satisfactions were to be denied oneself in order to avoid hell and reach heaven. These views were reinforced by the Industrial Revolution which expanded the demand for objective information based on the Newtonian view of a deterministic, machine-like universe that, through the scientific method, removed the free will of man as the focus of observation and interest (Mason, 2003). Stability was the prevailing world-view and assumption in both theology and science. This classical world-view, coupled with the underpinnings of a structural theology describing a world of “isness,” saw the universe, including man, as basically stable and materialistic in nature (Mobley, 1971).

These assumptions led to the development of corresponding ideas about management and work. Since, in science, cause-effect is unidirectional, the past is supposed to predict the future, social structure needs hierarchy, and a supreme controlling agent must be in power – the company President. Therefore, classical management theory is rooted in the Protestant Work Ethic and asserts the need for the exercise of autocratic rule and power including the need to minimize employee conflict and resistance to work. The problem, of course, is that humans are not fixed and do not conform to this

kind of universe – humans are unpredictable and have free will with characteristics like imagination, hope and faith, ambitions, creativity, growth, and change. “If the universe was good (because God created it) then man must be bad because he doesn’t fit into the “good” machine-like universe” (Mobley, 1971, p. 188).

The Protestant Work Ethic does contain restrictions on consumption in that the wealth one creates should not be lavishly consumed but invested to create more wealth that in turn should lead to greater individual and societal well-being. However, even though the values underlying this ethic may have sought to bring meaning and purpose to the workplace, what it actually did was to make the production of economic wealth an end in itself, which became severed from any higher moral principles related to the ongoing enrichment of human existence. What has ensued is that whatever constraint the Protestant Work Ethic may have provided has disappeared due to an ever increasing demand for the creation of a consumer culture with products and services that could produce pleasure and instant self-gratification. Not only production but also consumption had become an end in itself, divorced from any broader or larger moral purposes beyond the production and consumption of more goods and services themselves to increase economic growth (Buchholz & Rosenthal, 2003; Fry, 2005a).

The Faith-at-Work Movement

The antecedents of today’s faith-at-work movement reach back to the late nineteenth century in Europe and the U.S. The faith-at-work movement arose in response to a perceived lack of interest on the part of the church toward lay people’s experience in the secular workplace. Faith-at-work scholar David Miller (2007) organizes the movement into three eras. According to Miller, the first era, the Social Gospel era (c. 1890’s - 1945), arose when Walter Rauschenbusch, a Protestant clergyman, and Bruce Barton, a Protestant advertising executive, both rediscovered the relevance of the gospel to issues of work and society. Rauschenbusch articulated the Social Gospel, calling Christians to address

both personal and societal transformation. In his essay, “Wanted: A New Kind of Layman (Miller, 2007, p. 29),” Rauschenbusch called Christians to enter business and transform it from the inside. In 1925 Barton, from the business side, wrote *The Man Nobody Knows*, which focused on Jesus as a role model for business leaders and quickly became a bestseller. At about the same time that Rauschenbusch started writing, Pope Leo XIII (Miller, 26) issued his social encyclical *Rerum Novarum (The Condition of Labor)* in 1891, echoing similar themes for Catholics.

Diminishing during the two World Wars and the Great Depression between them, the Faith at Work movement found new life in the Ministry of the Laity era (1946 - 1985), Miller’s (2007) second era. Among Protestants of the time, a burst of ecumenical activity after WWII focused on the laity and their work in the world. This movement joined with special-purpose groups focused on the ministry of the laity, such as International Christian Leadership, Full Gospel Businessmen’s Fellowship International, the Audenshaw Foundation, and the Coalition for Ministry in Daily Life, to revitalize the Faith at Work spirit. Among Catholics (Miller, 49), the Second Vatican Council (1962-65) affirmed the laity’s work in the world as equally important as the clergy’s work in the church.

In Miller’s (2007) third era, (1986 – present), the prevailing economic conditions of constant change led to a quest for integration of faith and work. No longer content to park their souls at the door, people sought to bring their whole selves – body, mind, heart, and soul, to work. Miller concludes his summary of the faith-at-work movement by organizing the quest for integration into four categories: ethics, evangelism, experience, and enrichment.

Overlapping chronologically with but often distinct in content from Miller’s Faith at Work era, the 1990’s saw books and articles in the popular press, primarily on spirituality (for the first time *sans* religion) in the workplace, and the first academic interest in spirituality, religion, and work (SRW). Bestselling books like Bolman and Deal’s *Leading with Soul* (1995) and Jaworski’s *Synchronicity: The Inner Path of Leadership* (1996) blazed the trail. Marc Gunther’s lead article in

Fortune in 2001, “God and Business,” built on the groundswell of interest in the nineties, highlighting six “spiritual” business leaders from a variety of religious backgrounds.

Integrative Work on SRW

In the academy, Mitroff and Denton, in *A Spiritual Audit of Corporate America* (1999), offered the first large-scale empirical study of the SRW phenomenon. Like many of the writers of the popular literature in the nineties, Mitroff and Denton separated spirituality from religion, advocating for spirituality in the workplace and arguing against religious expression in that sphere. As the concept of spirituality in the workplace has gained strength and interest, the Academy of Management created a new special interest group for its members. The *Management, Spirituality, and Religion* interest group was created in 2000 and is helping to legitimize the study of spirituality in the workplace while simultaneously paving the way for this emerging concept into the leadership arena (Academy of Management, 2006).

Workplace spirituality has been an ambiguous term, although scholars are increasingly bringing clarity to the definition. Duchon and Plowman (2005) defined workplace spirituality in terms of its components: (1) a recognition that employees have an inner life; (2) an assumption that employees desire to find work meaningful; and (3) a commitment by the company to serve as a context or community for spiritual growth. These dimensions have been incorporated into the term spiritual well-being (SWB), which is a “self-perceived state of the degree to which one feels a sense of purpose and direction” (Paloutzian, Emmons, & Keortge, 2003).

Other scholars suggest that workplace spirituality can be cultivated to produce increased organizational performance. Reder (1982) found that spirituality-based organizational cultures were the most productive, and through maximizing productivity they reach dominance in the marketplace. In addition, there is emerging evidence that workplaces that are spiritually healthy perform better (Duschon and Plowman, 2005; Elm, 2003; Garcia-Zamor, 2003).

In 2003, Douglas Hicks published *Religion and the Workplace*, analyzing the writings and issues that had surfaced in the spirituality, religion, and work literature by that time. Hicks agreed with those who claimed that employees shouldn't be asked to park their souls at the door, recognizing that employees bring their whole selves to work. At the same time, he argued that efforts to decouple spirituality and religion in the workplace were naïve and ineffective, and proposed an alternative way to integrate spirituality, religion, and work: "respectful pluralism." Hicks claimed that effective leaders should create an environment for employees to express their own faiths and respect one another's faiths.

Also in 2003, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz edited the *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*, the largest collection of essays up to that point, arguing for the necessity of linking workplace spirituality to organizational performance, integrating psychology, spirituality, and organizational science. Like Mitroff and Denton, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz arguing that integrating spirituality and work would improve organizational performance. They define workplace spirituality as:

A framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promotes employees' experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected in a way that provides feelings of compassion and joy.

This sense of transcendence -- of having a calling through one's work or being called (vocationally) -- and a need for social connection or membership are seen as necessary for providing the foundation for any theory of workplace spirituality. Workplace spirituality must therefore be comprehended within a holistic or system context of interwoven cultural and personal values. Also, to be of benefit to leaders and their organizations, any definition of workplace spirituality must demonstrate its utility by impacting performance, turnover, and productivity and other relevant effectiveness criteria (Sass, 2000).

In 2005, a special issue of *The Leadership Quarterly* addressed theoretical, practical, and empirical issues in SRW as they relate to leadership. From this issue, a theme comprised of three universal spiritual needs emerged, (Fry, 2005b): that what is required for workplace spirituality is an *inner life* that nourishes and is nourished by *calling or transcendence of self* within the context of a *community* based on the values of altruistic love. Satisfying these spiritual needs in the workplace positively influences human health and psychological well-being and forms the foundation for workplace spirituality. Benefiel's (2005) article in that issue focused on the epistemological challenges that arise when melding social scientific studies with philosophical/theological studies, and proposed an integrative approach as a way forward.

Miller's (2007) *God at Work* examined the faith-at-work movement (as summarized above), emphasizing the importance of religion and its potential value for business and society and offering compelling new evidence of the depth and breadth of spirituality at work, the integration of faith and work has positive implications at the personal level, as well as for corporate ethics and the broader economic sphere. The study of religion often investigates beliefs, rituals, and practices, and how they manifest themselves in various spheres of life. For many, faith is what shapes and informs their value system, ethics, character, leadership, and their attitude toward work. Research shows that most students, workers, marketplace professionals, and leaders wish to live a holistic life that integrates, among other things, faith and work, but have few resources to help them do that.

At the same time, increasing expressions of religion and spiritual practices at work also present the threat of divisiveness and discrimination. Miller (2007) concludes that workers and professionals have a deep and lasting desire to live a holistic life, to integrate the claims of their faith with the demands of their work. He documents the surprising abdication of this field by church and theological academy and its embrace, ironically, by the management academy. Miller concludes that faith at work

is a bona fide social movement and here to stay. He establishes the importance of this movement, identifies the possibilities and problems, and points toward future research questions.

In 2008, Biberman and Tischler edited *Spirituality in Business: Theory, Practice, and Future Directions*, presenting the various integrative approaches in the SRW field to date, such as: founding SRW on religiously-inspired compassion, drawing on appreciative inquiry, using “intentional intelligence,” using meditation, and integrating aspects of spiritual leadership. Drawing on the definition of workplace spirituality from Giacalone and Jurkiewicz offered above, the authors attempt to summarize and organize the research that has been done so far in the area of spirituality and work using a three dimensional model based on level, measures, and validity. In doing so they draw on the Dalai Lama’s (1999) distinction between spirituality and religion that signifies most approaches to SRW to date:

Religion I take to be concerned with faith in the claims of one faith tradition or another, an aspect of which is the acceptance of some form of heaven or nirvana. Connected with this are religious teachings or dogma, ritual prayer, and so on. Spirituality I take to be concerned with those qualities of the human spirit-such as love and compassion, patience tolerance, forgiveness, contentment, a sense of responsibility, a sense of harmony-which bring happiness to both self and others” (Dalai Lama, 1999, p. 22).

Jurkiewicz, Giacalone, and Fry (In press) note that workplace spirituality in the organizational sciences emerged from a very different mindset than one would expect from a sub-area in an organizational science. Organizational behavior, for example, borrowed heavily from psychology and sociology in its early development. Similarly conjoined, the field of human resource management developed a symbiotic relationship with industrial psychology. While many may have expected workplace spirituality to emerge from research on the psychology of religion, given the connotations suggested by the title, that is not at all the case. For example, Emmons and Palutzian (2003) in their

discussion of the rapid growth and progress in the psychology of religion over the last twenty-five years fail to even mention SRW. While the research may sometimes parallel or intersect now, the field of workplace spirituality was born of organizational and social psychology, ethics, and management.

The disconnection between these fields is primarily because the psychology of religion, particularly over the past 30 years, has been characterized by data gathering, while the study of workplace spirituality emerged through theoretical advocacy and organizational case study rather than by data sets compiled from individual respondents. Thus, the concept of workplace spirituality emerged from recognition and documentation of the phenomenon, and an articulated need for formalized study to address this salient aspect of organizational life. The stream of research that has arisen from this ontological tradition (see Biberman & Whitty, 2000) has led to important emerging issues regarding SRW in the social sciences (Fairholm, 1997; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003a; Mirvis, 1997; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Neal, 2001), including, “What are the variables of interest? What conceptual distinctions are appropriate? What should the focus of measurement be?” It is to these questions which researchers must turn in moving the study of SRW from a concept into a science (Jurkiewicz et al., in press).

Leadership and SRW

The need for SRW has been receiving increased attention in the organizational sciences (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003a; Mitroff & Denton, 1999), and the implications of SRW for leadership theory, research, and practice make this a fast growing area of new research and inquiry by scholars (Giacalone, Jurkiewicz, and Fry, in press). Moreover, there is emerging evidence that spiritual leadership not only leads to beneficial personal outcomes such as increased positive human health and psychological well-being but that it also delivers improved performance at the individual, unit, and organizational levels (Fry, 2005a; Fry & Slocum, 2008; Fry, Vitucci, & Cedillo, 2005; Fry, Hannah, Noel, & Walumba, in press; Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003b; Karakas, 2010; Reave, 2005).

To date, the most developed and tested theory of spiritual leadership has been proposed by Fry (2003, 2005a, 2008; Fry & Matherly, 2007). His model of spiritual leadership is developed within an intrinsic motivation framework that incorporates inner life, spiritual leadership (vision, hope/faith, and altruistic love), and spiritual well-being (calling and membership). The purpose of spiritual leadership is to tap into the fundamental needs of both leader and follower to create vision and value congruence across the strategic, unit, and individual levels and, ultimately, to foster higher levels of spiritual, and psychological well-being, positive human health, life satisfaction, organizational commitment and productivity, corporate social responsibility, and financial performance (Fry, 2005a, Fry & Matherly, 2007; Fry & Slocum, 2008)

Spiritual leadership comprises the values, attitudes, and behaviors necessary to intrinsically motivate one's self and satisfy fundamental needs for spiritual well-being through calling and membership, which positively influences personal commitment and productivity, psychological well-being, and life satisfaction (Fry, 2003, 2005a, 2008). A general model of personal spiritual leadership is given in Figure 2. Essential to personal spiritual leadership are the key processes of:

1. Creating a transcendent vision of service to others whereby one experiences a sense of calling so that their life has purpose and meaning and makes a difference.
2. Establishing or joining a social/organizational culture based on the values of altruistic love whereby one has a sense of membership, feels understood and appreciated, and has genuine care, concern, and appreciation for BOTH self and others.

Insert Figure 2 Here

The source of spiritual leadership is an inner life or spiritual practice that, as a fundamental source of inspiration and insight, positively influences development of (1) hope/faith in a transcendent vision of service to key stakeholders, and (2) the values of altruistic love. Inner life speaks to the

feeling individuals have about the fundamental meaning of who they are, what they are doing, and the contributions they are making (Vaiil, 1998). Inner life includes individual practices (e.g., meditation, prayer, religious practices, yoga, journaling, and walking in nature) and organizational contexts (e.g., rooms for inner silence and reflection) to help individuals be more self-aware and conscious from moment-to-moment and draw strength from their beliefs, be that a Nondual Being, Higher Power, God, or philosophical teachings (Fry, 2009; Fry & Kriger, 2009).

Organizations are beginning to recognize that employees have spiritual needs (i.e., an inner life) just as they have physical, mental, and emotional needs, and none of these needs are left at the door when they arrive at work (Duchon & Plowman, 2005). At the root of the connection between spirituality and leadership is the recognition that everyone has an inner voice that is the ultimate source of wisdom for the most difficult business and personal decisions (Levy, 2000). Observing, witnessing, and cultivating this inner voice, is often the purpose of an inner life or spiritual practice (Fry & Kriger, 2009). The existence of an inner life relates to both one's individual identity and social identity; whereby an individual's identity is part of a person's self concept, or their inner view, while the expression of that inner life is in part an expression of social identity (Duchon & Plowman, 2005).

Therefore, spiritual leaders who have an inner life or spiritual practice will be more likely to have, or want to develop, the other-centered values of altruistic love and a transcendent vision of service to key stakeholders and the hope/faith to "do what it takes" through to achieve the vision. To implement spiritual leadership leaders, through their attitudes and behavior, model the values of altruistic love as they jointly develop a common vision with followers. Subsequently, both leaders and followers gain a sense of membership – that part of spiritual well-being that gives one an awareness of being understood and appreciated. This then generates hope/faith and a willingness to "do what it takes" in pursuit of the vision, which in turn produces a sense of calling -- that part of spiritual well-being that gives one a sense that one's life has meaning, purpose and makes a difference. Hope/faith

adds belief, conviction, trust, and action for performance of the work to achieve the vision. Thus, spiritual leadership proposes that hope/faith in the organization's vision keeps followers looking forward to the future and provides the desire and positive expectation that fuels effort through intrinsic motivation.

This intrinsic motivation cycle (Fry, 2003) based on vision (performance), altruistic love (reward) and hope/faith (effort) results in an increase in ones sense of spiritual well-being (e.g. calling and membership) and ultimately positive individual and organizational outcomes such as organizational commitment and productivity (Fry, 2003) employee life satisfaction and corporate social responsibility (Fry, 2005b), and, given an effective market strategy, financial performance (Fry & Matherly, 2006a, 2007; Fry & Slocum, 2008).

Important Empirical Studies in SRW

This section will provide an overview of empirical studies in SRW, emphasizing the most important empirical studies to date: Mitroff and Denton (1999); Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003b); Duchon and Plowman (2005); Fry, Vitucci, and Cedillo (2005); Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2008); Harung, Travis, Blank, and Heaton (2009); and Fry, Hannah, Noel, and Walumbwa (in press).

Mitroff and Denton (1999) pioneered empirical research in SRW by using a combination of quantitative and qualitative to arrive at a conceptual frame. They sought to answer two questions: "Why should spirituality be integrated into organizations?" and "How can spirituality be integrated into organizations?" First, in response to the "why" question, Mitroff and Denton found that respondents who perceive their organizations as "more spiritual" also perceive them as "more profitable," "more caring," and "more ethical." (Whether these organizations actually are more profitable, more caring, and more ethical is a question requiring further research, Mitroff and Denton acknowledge.) Second, in response to the "how" question, Mitroff and Denton arrived at a composite best practice model through outlining five basic models which they observed in their interviews and in

their review of the literature, and through examining the strengths and limitations of each. Mitroff and Denton's contribution is important because they succeeded in providing the first wide-ranging spiritual audit of business organizations in America. They arrived at a conceptual frame, a best-practice model, grounded in their research, and thus set the stage for further empirical studies.

Concerned about the rising tide of unethical behavior in American business, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003c) studied the relationship between the perception of unethical business activities and personal spirituality among a network sample of 162 employees across the U.S. They found that individuals with a higher level of spirituality were more likely to characterize a morally questionable incident as unethical than individuals who scored lower on measures of spirituality. While they acknowledge limitations in their study (such as a static, trait-like measure of spirituality, and using a network sample), Giacalone and Jurkiewicz have made an important contribution to the SRW literature and to the business ethics literature, pioneering the path to examining the connection between the two, and demonstrating that empirical research on the connection is possible.

Duchon and Plowman (2005) investigate "work unit" spirituality and explore the relationship between work unit spirituality and performance in a study of six work units in a large hospital system. Workplace spirituality is defined as a workplace that recognizes that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community. Based on three fundamental spiritual needs, this definition has implications for how leaders can enhance work unit performance by nurturing the spirit at work. Using non-parametric procedures the results suggest that there is a relationship between the spiritual climate of a work unit and its overall performance. Propositions are then developed concerning the effect of work unit spirituality on work unit performance and the relationship between work unit spirituality and leadership.

Fry et al. (2005) tested Fry's (2003) model of spiritual leadership at the individual level that hypothesizes positive relationships among the qualities of spiritual leadership, spiritual well-being, and organizational productivity and commitment using longitudinal data from a newly formed Apache Longbow helicopter attack squadron at Ft. Hood, Texas. The results provide strong initial support for the causal model of spiritual leadership and the reliability and validity of its measures. A methodology was developed for establishing a baseline for future organizational development interventions as well as an action agenda for future research on spiritual leadership in general and Army training and development in particular. They argue that spiritual leadership theory offers promise as a springboard for a new paradigm for leadership theory, research, and practice given that it 1) incorporates and extends transformational and charismatic theories as well as ethics- and values-based theories (e.g., authentic and servant leadership), and 2) avoids the pitfalls of measurement model misspecification (Podsakoff, P. MacKenzie, Podsakoff. N. and Lee, 2003).

Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2008) studied the impact of a spirit at work intervention program for caregivers in a Canadian long-term care facility. With 24 staff participating in the intervention group the authors examined whether the program, a one-day workshop supplemented by eight weekly 1-hour booster sessions, made a difference in such areas as staff morale and quality of resident care. Using both quantitative and qualitative instruments, They found that teamwork, communication, and morale among employees improved, and that, as a consequence, resident care also improved. The intervention contributed to a reduction in absenteeism and employee turnover, two major concerns of the long-term care sector.

Harung, Travis, Blank, and Heaton (2009), over a ten-year period, used physiological measures and psychological tests to examine the relationships among consciousness, psycho-physiological integration, and leadership performance. They found that high-performing leaders showed higher levels of ego development, higher levels of moral reasoning, higher levels of brain

integration, and higher levels of consciousness. Related studies by this team and their colleagues (Schmidt-Wilk, Alexander, and Swanson, 1996; McCollum, 1999; Schmidt-Wilk, 2000) reached similar conclusions, establishing links between meditation, ego development, and managerial and leadership effectiveness.

Fry, Hannah, Noel, & Walumbwa (in press) examined emerging leaders at a military academy and found general support for the model of spiritual leadership at the unit level. They found a high degree of fit for the overall spiritual leadership model that provides support for the hypothesis that together the variables comprising spiritual leadership (i.e., hope/faith, vision, and altruistic love) form a higher order formative construct that positively influences spiritual well-being in groups (i.e., calling and membership). The high degree of model fit and significant coefficients further show that there is a positive and significant link from spiritual leadership, mediated through group membership and meaning/calling, to key outcome variables, including organizational commitment, productivity and, most importantly, three measures of squad performance taken from two separate external rating sources. These findings provide additional evidence that leadership that emphasizes spiritual well-being in the workplace produces beneficial personal and organizational outcomes.

Challenges Associated with Integrative Work in SRW

This section will examine several challenges associated with integrative work in SRW: the debate about whether spirituality should be used for instrumental ends at work or whether it should be a central organizing principle, how much spiritual expression should be allowed at work, how spirituality and religion are related to one another, individual rights versus company needs, what to do when individual rights clash, analyzing SRW at multiple levels, and how a social-scientific approach to studying business and management can be integrated with a philosophical/theological approach to studying spirituality.

Technique for Instrumental Ends versus Central Organizing Principle

A recurring debate in the SRW literature revolves around the motive for integrating spirituality, religion, and work: Should spirituality be integrated into the workplace for instrumental ends, i.e., to improve financial performance, or should spirituality be seen as a central organizing principle for the workplace? and Wiebe (2007) summarize the debate well, noting that SRW easily falls into a view that spirituality is a “technique to be used for instrumental, financial-centered ends.” Giacalone and Jurkiewicz represent the instrumental view well, arguing:

To have confidence that our suppositions are more than personal assumptions requires the dispassionate objectivism afforded by the scientific method. . . [O]rganizations need conclusive evidence connecting workplace spirituality with bottom line performance; anything less would bring into question their fiduciary responsibility to stockholders and their moral responsibility to stakeholders. For workplace spirituality to be a viable construct in improving organizations and the people in them, it requires a degree of confidence we can only attain through scientific measurement (Krahnke, Giacalone, and Jurkiewicz, 2003, 397-398).

Driscoll and Wiebe, on the other hand, using Jacques Ellul’s philosophical critique of “technical dominance” in the modern world, argue that spirituality should be the central organizing principle in the workplace rather than a means to the end of profitability. Using Ellul, they claim:

Where technique reigns, human values and value judgments are threatened and critical faculties are suppressed, as “technique never observes the distinction between moral and immoral use.” (2007, 334)

Driscoll and Wiebe call for an honoring of the soul on its own terms in the workplace, so that human values and critical faculties will not be eroded.

At the same time, in calling for new business models that accentuate ethical and spiritual leadership, employee well-being, sustainability and social responsibility without sacrificing profitability, revenue growth, and other indicators of financial performance - the so-called triple bottom line - Fry and Slocum (2008) make the case that this is not an either/or proposition. They draw

from the emerging fields of workplace spirituality, spiritual leadership, and conscious capitalism and present a general model for maximizing the triple bottom line through the development of the motivation and leadership required to simultaneously optimize employee well-being, social responsibility, and organizational effectiveness.

Advocating for SRW versus Suppressing It

Another challenge to integrative work in SRW focuses on whether and how religion and spirituality should be expressed in the workplace. The study of workplace spirituality has, to date, been relatively free of denominational politics and ideological conflict. In fact, religious ideology itself has been virtually disregarded. Under the rubric of spirituality, the issues that have surface have avoided any mention of a comparatively right and wrong ideology (Jurkiewicz et al., in press). While some, e.g., the authors of the empirical studies noted above, advocate for more spiritual and/or religious expression on the grounds that whole people make better employees, Hicks (2003) points out:

That some scholars have encouraged companies to become more explicitly religious or spiritual has created significant controversy and criticism. Why would a business get involved in promoting spirituality or a specific religion among its employees? Do the company leaders take proper consideration of the religious, spiritual, and moral diversity of their employees (p. 113)?

Advocates of religion and/or spirituality in the workplace may be overstepping their bounds in unduly influencing employees' religious or spiritual expressions or lack thereof.

At the same time, there are problems inherent in suppressing an employee's religious and spiritual side. While some companies claim to be values-free by suppressing all religious/spiritual expression, Hicks notes that the purely secularist position which prohibits any expression of religion or spirituality in the workplace also imposes a values-based worldview on its employees:

It is simply impossible to avoid taking a values-laden position vis-à-vis the diverse religious and spiritual (and cultural and political) commitments that employees and managers bring with them to work (2003, p. 114).

Hicks' proposed solution, "respectful pluralism," offers a way forward, a middle way between 1) advocacy of particular religions and spiritualities in the workplace, and 2) prohibiting religious and spiritual expression altogether. For Hicks,

The guiding principle of respectful pluralism is termed the *presumption of inclusion*. It can be stated as follows: To the greatest extent, workplace organizations should allow employees to express their religious, spiritual, cultural, political, and other commitments at work, subject to the limiting norms of noncoercion, nondegradation, and nonestablishment, and in consideration of the reasonable instrumental demands of the for-profit enterprise (2003, 173).

Spirituality versus Religion

Some would claim that focusing on spirituality rather than religion solves the foregoing problem, that spiritual expression in the workplace should be encouraged but religious expression should be denied. Hicks (2003), among others (e.g., Miller, 2007), challenges this position. He argues:

[T]he mantra "spirituality unites, but religion divides" is much more problematic than scholars or proponents of spiritual leadership would have us believe. . . . [T]he corresponding definitions of spirituality are too broad to be coherent and the frequent emphasis on the potential of spirituality to create unity or common ground in the workplace overlooks difficult issues (Hicks, 2003, 48).

Hicks and Miller go on to show that the separation of religion and spirituality is a relatively recent phenomenon, and argue that the separation is not sustainable.

Individual Rights versus Company Needs

Lund Dean, Forniciari, and Safranski (2008, p. 191) ask, "how should a company: accommodate an individual's right to express himself or herself spiritually as he or she best sees fit

when those practices involve proscribed behaviors such as proselytizing or engaging in actions based on spiritual/religious beliefs that may be disruptive to the firm, other employees, or its customers?” They ask, for example, how a firm should respond to a request from forty Muslim employees on a production line to leave at the same time for their daily prayers.

In the same essay, the authors note that:

the SRW paradigm currently provides little direction on how individuals of different faiths should interact with the religious rights of others who may have very different worldviews and beliefs. Do employees have to honor or accept other faiths as legitimate (pps. 191-2)?

For example, they provide the illustrative case of a Christian woman who came to work (2008, 195) “wearing a sizable button with a color photo of a fetus,” claiming that her religion required her to “witness against abortion.” Her co-workers complained and she refused the accommodations management offered and was fired. When she sued the company, she lost the case when the court ruled that “offering three ‘reasonable’ options was consistent with employer responsibility (2008, p. 195).”

Analyzing SRW at Multiple Levels

Strategic leaders are ultimately responsible for creating vision and value congruence across the individual, group, or team and organizational levels as well as developing effective relationships between the organization and environmental stakeholders (Fry; 2003). At the organizational or strategic level, SRW is a descriptor of the organization as an entity. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003b) defined it as a framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promote employees’ experience of organizational transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy. As such, workplace spirituality at this level can be considered both in terms of vision and cultural values.

At the group or team level, organizations must establish a unit culture with values that reflect the organization's culture and values. Especially important for SRW is empowerment. Empowerment is power sharing, the delegation of both power and authority and all but symbolic responsibility to organizational followers (Bowen & Lawler, 1995; Spreitzer, 1996). It is this linkage that creates the cross-level connection between group and individual jobs and the organization's vision and values, thereby giving followers a sense of direction in which to act. In addition to empowerment, this process of providing directed autonomy, competence and relatedness is also the foundation for intrinsic motivation and workplace spirituality (Deci & Ryan, 2002; Ford & Fotler, 1995; Fry, 2003).

SRW at the individual level refers to a personal set of values that promote the experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating a sense of connectedness to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003b). Research has not determined whether employees necessarily bring spiritual values into the workplace, or adopt them an organizational ethic (Jurkiewicz, 2010). In much the same way that some employees may feel that it is best to leave personal ethics at home, some employees may sense that spirituality does not fit the work environment either. Thus, in understanding workplace spirituality at the individual level, the level or integration of that spirituality into the organizational environment must be determined.

Methodological issues

Finally, on the academic level, methodological challenges arise in the study of SRW. As Benefiel (2005) points out, the dominance of a quantitative approach in social-scientific empirical research raises important questions for the study of spirituality: Can spirituality be quantified? Are there questions in the study of spirituality that that don't fit into traditional social-scientific research paradigms? What can SRW scholars learn from scholars who study spirituality from a philosophical/theological perspective? Both the social-scientific perspective and the philosophical/theological perspective need to taken into account when studying SRW. Benefiel (2005)

provides one workable way of doing so by integrating the two approaches academically, based on the philosophical work of the philosopher/methodologist Bernard Lonergan.

A further complexity arises when trying to establish a relationship between individual SRW, group SRW, and organizational SRW: is it appropriate to aggregate individual-level responses to the organizational level to determine the organizational level of these variables? Indeed, in the postmaterialism literature, this problem of aggregation has been a source of continual debate (e.g., Grendstad, & Selle, 1997). If workplace spirituality is conceptualized at the group and/or organizational level much work is needed to determine if and how current measures can be developed that do not suffer from aggregation bias (Fry et al., in press; James, Demaree, & Wolf, 1993; Jurliewicz et al., in press; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000).

Exemplary Efforts to Integrate Religion and Spirituality into the Workplace

Many companies are beginning to recognize the importance of supporting an employees' inner life. Cordon Bleu-Tomasso Corporation in Canada has established a room for inner silence. Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd's have developed training programs focusing on "High Performance" mind techniques and "quiet rooms" for individual spiritual practice. Missouri's Ascension Health is committed to a workplace that deepens personal spirituality through the adoption of ethical discernment process that fosters self-reflection. Other organizations such as Southwest Airlines, Toro, The Body Shop, Tom's of Maine, Greyston Bakery, St. John Medical Center, and Sisters of the Road Café all provide good examples of how spirituality can be integrated into the workplace in ways that address the challenges outlined in the previous section. This section will highlight Cordon Bleu-Tomasso Corporation (Matherly, Fry, & Ouimet, 2005; Our Project), Interstate Batteries (Fry & Matherly, 2006; Fry & Slocum, 2008), St. John Medical Center (Benefiel, 2008), and Wainwright Bank (Benefiel, 2008) as organizations that demonstrate how both religiousness and spirituality can be integrated into the workplace responsibly and respectfully.

Interstate Batteries

Interstate Batteries is a leader in battery marketing and distribution with a network that provides consumers with “Every Battery for Every Need.” It provides more than 7,000 types of batteries for households and businesses. The Dallas-based company has revenues of over \$1.5 billion and holds the largest share of the replacement car-battery market. It has received the Toyota Excellence Award, being acknowledged for demonstrating “sustained effort, uncompromising attention to detail, and a commitment to performance excellence.” The 58 year-old company actively demonstrates both personal and organizational Spiritual Leadership. More than 300 franchise distributors service Interstate Batteries’ 200,000 retail dealers, who provide automotive, commercial, marine/RV, motorcycle, lawn and garden or specialty batteries most anywhere in the U. S., as well as in Canada and select international locations. Interstate demonstrates their commitment to improving the environment through an active battery recycling program and by being a sponsor of National Recycling Month in April and Earth Day on April 22. They take pride in being the #1 battery recycler in the U.S. with more than 850 million pounds of Batteries recycled last year alone. The company also sponsors the highly successful Interstate Batteries Winston Cup team and an NHRA Funny Car Team.

In his book, *Beyond the Norm*, Interstate’s CEO Norm Miller writes, “The bottom line of Interstate is to love people and try to meet their needs, all in the context of top performance and reasonable profitability.” At Interstate, Miller and Interstate’s workers do not hide their faith (predominately Christian) but, he insists, neither do they want to “cram religion down anyone’s throat.” There is a corporate chaplaincy program that is available for ministry to employees and customers. Any time employees or visitors gather to eat, there is a prayer. The company sponsors prayer breakfasts and other spiritual studies before and after work and it maintains an e-mail prayer chain. Employees may elect to have up to five dollars a paycheck deducted for a catastrophic relief fund administered by the corporate chaplaincy. These funds are used to help Interstate employees who

need temporary financial assistance. A company library lends employees reading material and videotapes. A monthly pizza get-together hosts spiritual speakers and offers employees free pizza.

One of Miller's first initiatives as president was to make Organizational Spiritual Leadership a primary component of the business. Part of what makes Interstate a unique company is its unabashed mission to conduct business in a way that honors God. That was Norm Miller's vision when he became President in 1978 and it is clear from Interstate's current mission statement that Interstate Batteries has found a way to incorporate workplace spirituality and both Personal and Organizational Spiritual Leadership to maximize the triple bottom line:

To glorify God as we supply our customers worldwide with top quality, value-priced batteries, related electrical power-source products, and distribution services. Further, our mission is to provide our partners and Interstate Batteries System of America, Inc. (IBSA) with opportunities which are profitable, rewarding and growth-oriented.

While it is not necessary to be a Christian to be employed, it is a part of the daily work life for Interstate team members. He initiated optional daily prayer times, and he made sure he and his staff applied spiritual principles that underlie Christianity to everything they did, although they also make sure that the practices of all spiritual and religious traditions are respected and supported. Norm even hired a company chaplain to care for his staff and to oversee Interstate's involvement in the community. Today, Interstate and its employees support all sorts of charitable projects all around the world. These include their battery recycling program, the Family Care Fund that assists Interstate team members and their immediate families faced with urgent short-term financial needs; a camp scholarship program to make it possible for indigent children to attend summer youth camps; the Angel Tree Christmas Project that buys gifts for children of prison inmates under the umbrella of the Prison Fellowship outreach program; and women's, men's, Dallas Warehouse BBQ (off-site) and Pizza luncheons that provide opportunities for spiritual encouragement and growth.

Wainwright Bank

In the early 1990s, Bob Glassman, cofounder and cochairman of Wainwright Bank in Boston, found himself in a challenging situation. A few years earlier, the bank had dared to dream by beginning to experiment with social justice projects, most notably forming a partnership with the Pine Street Inn shelter to address homelessness. Although Bob was committed to a vision of social justice for the bank, he realized that not everybody on the bank's board shared his vision. While they were willing to tolerate a smaller experiment, a serious, ongoing commitment to social justice was unheard of for a bank. Concerned about the values vacuum at the core of the banking industry, Bob puzzled over how the bank could stay true to its motto of "Banking on Values."

Bob Glassman focused on something more than the bottom line. In a banking world known for its focus on the single bottom line of profitability, Wainwright Bank became known, first, for its double bottom line, focusing on both people and profits, and then, later, for its triple bottom line, focusing on people, profits, and the planet. In order to focus on the bigger picture, Bob took small steps, beginning by talking with his business partner in the early 1990s. When Bob told his partner he'd like the bank to pursue his vision of social justice, his partner pledged his full support.

Bob worked to develop shared vision at Wainwright Bank. When Bob clarified his vision for the direction of the bank with board members, he found that some eyes lit up and others shut down. Some self-selected off the board, while new members who shared Bob's vision for the bank joined the board. Bob also sought to develop shared vision among the members of the bank's management team. As some managers caught the vision and as new managers joined the bank for its vision, an inner core of board members and managers who shared the vision solidified. In time, the board articulated Wainwright Bank's mission:

With a sense of inclusion and diversity that extends from the amilroom to the boardroom, Wainwright Bank and Trust Company resolves to be a leading socially responsible bank. The Bank is equally committed to all its stakeholders – employees, customers, communities, and shareholders.

Again and again, Bob Glassman returned to his vision of social justice as a mission for Wainwright Bank. As he sought to take small steps toward putting the mission into practice, he returned to the vision regularly for inspiration and guidance. In the early days, for example, the vision served as his compass whenever a new product was launched or an annual report was written: “Utilizing every platform available to the bank, including speaking engagements, annual reports, newsletters, product brochures, and print ads, there was a subtext, and the heart of that message was always our commitment to social justice.” By 2010, twenty-three years after the bank’s founding, Wainwright Bank boasted numerous products that manifested its mission. The bank provides loans to underserved groups, including loans for affordable housing, homeless shelters, food banks, environmental protection, health centers, HIV/AIDS services, and immigration services. It also offers “Green Loans,” loans with reduced interest rates for energy-efficient buildings.

Naysayers assumed that Wainwright Bank would suffer financially for its idealism, claiming that loans for homeless shelters and food banks are risky business. In fact, the opposite is true: Wainwright Bank’s \$700 million in community development loans has experienced zero losses over the 23 years of the bank’s life, in sharp contrast to other banks’ loan portfolios.

Wainwright Bank focused on sound lending practices in other arenas, as well. The bank did not participate in sub-prime lending for home mortgages, nor did it bundle together mortgages and sell them off in risky speculation. When the financial crisis of late 2008 hit, Wainwright Bank found itself on solid financial footing while banks all around it were teetering on the brink of collapse.

Recommendations to Advance Integrative Work in SRW

Research on SRW still finds itself in an early stage of development. The most promising integrative approaches to date are the meditation integration approach outlined by Heaton and Schmidt-Wilk in Biberman and Tischler’s (2008) text, Fry’s model of spiritual leadership, and Hicks’s respectful pluralism. Heaton and Schmidt-Wilk’s meditation integration approach shows promise

because of its solid empirical base linking meditation, ego development, and leadership effectiveness, and because of its simplicity in practical application. Like the meditation integration approach, Fry's spiritual leadership approach shows promise because of its strong empirical base and its ease of application. Hicks's respectful pluralism underlies these practical, empirically-based approaches, providing a context in which they can be practiced effectively and ethically. In addition are issues surrounding spirituality-based versus religion-based research and those related to building upon extant spiritual leadership research.

Spirituality Versus Religion

A central hypothesis to be tested relates to distinction between spirituality and religious approaches to SRW across the individual, group, and organizational levels (Fry, 2003; Jurkiewicz et al., in press). Many feel that viewing workplace spirituality through the lens of religious traditions and practice is divisive in that, to the extent the religion views itself as the only path to God and salvation, it excludes those who do not share in the denominational tradition (Cavanaugh, 1999). Furthermore, religious practices often conflict with the social, legal, and ethical foundations of business, law, and public and nonprofit administration (Nadesan, 1999). Thus, religion can lead to arrogance that a particular company, faith, or society is better, morally superior, or more worthy than another (Nash, 1994). Imbuing religion into workplace spirituality can foster zealotry at the expense of organizational goals, offend constituents and customers, and decrease morale and employee well-being (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003). Accentuating the line between religion and spirituality in regards to workplace spirituality is essential in honoring the integrity of both disciplines.

There is even the potential, if spirituality is viewed through the lens of religion, for it to be divisive in that it may exclude those who do not share in the denominational tradition or conflict with a society's social, legal, and ethical foundations of business and public administration (Cavanaugh, 1999; Nadesan, 1999). "Adherence to a religious workplace orientation can lead to arrogance that a

particular company, faith, or even nation is somehow ‘better’ or worthier than another (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz , 2003, p. 13).” Any workplace practices, whether under the guise of religion or some other spiritual tradition that stifles free expression could lead to negative individual and organizational outcomes (e.g., lower commitment, productivity, life satisfaction, and psychological well-being).

Spiritual Leadership

Research on several fronts is necessary to establish the validity of spiritual leadership theory before it should be widely applied as a model of organizational and professional development toward the end of fostering systemic change and transformation. Research is just beginning on the relationship between the qualities of spiritual leadership and organizational outcomes. However, spiritual leadership theory can be viewed as an emerging paradigm within the broader context of SRW (Fry, 2005b). To date, the theory of spiritual leadership (Fry, 2003, 2005, 2008) has been studied and tested in a diverse range of organizations including schools, military units, city governments, police, and for profit organizations. These studies have found support for the spiritual leadership causal model and the general reliability and validity of its measures. Findings to date include a significant positive influence of spiritual leadership on employee life satisfaction, organizational commitment and productivity, sales growth, and other unit performance outcomes (Fry & Matherly, 2006; Fry & Slocum, 2008; Fry et al, 2005; Fry et al., in press; Fry, Nisiewicz, Vitucci, & Cedillo, 2007; Fry, Nisiewicz, Vitucci, & Cedillo, 2007; Malone & Fry, 2003).

Research on several fronts is necessary to establish the validity of spiritual leadership theory before it should be widely applied as a model of organizational development to foster systemic change and transformation. Outcomes across levels (e.g., spiritual well-being: joy, peace, and serenity; corporate social responsibility, financial performance) hypothesized to be affected by spiritual leadership (Fry, 2005a; Fry & Slocum, 2008) also need to be validated for spiritual leadership theory to develop. Additional longitudinal studies are needed to test for changes in key variables over time,

particularly as relating to performance. Studies are also needed that incorporate more objective performance measures from multiple sources (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Finally, the conceptual distinction between spiritual leadership theory variables and other leadership theories, such as authentic leadership, ethical leadership, and servant leadership in relation to workplace spirituality should also be refined (Fry, 2003; Fry & Whittington, 2005; Fry, Matherly, Whittington, and Winston, 2007). Further, research might investigate whether these theories are perhaps mutually reinforcing or serve to moderate the effects of one another.

References

- Aburdene, P. (2005). *Megatrend 2010*. Charlottesville, VA: Hampton Roads Publishing Co.
- Ali, A. J., & Falcone, T. (1995). Work Ethic in the USA and Canada. *Journal of Management Development*, 14, 26-33.
- Bell, E. & Taylor, S. (2004). From Outward Bound to Inward Bound: The Prophetic Voices and Discursive Practices of Spiritual Management Development, *Human Relations* 57, 4, 439–466.
- Benefiel, M. (2003). Irreconcilable foes? The Discourse Of Spirituality And The Discourse Of Organizational Science, *Organization*, 10, 383–391.
- Benefiel, M. (2005). The second half of the journey: Spiritual leadership for organizational transformation. *The Leadership Quarterly* 16:5, 723-747.
- Benefiel, M. (2008). *The Soul of a Leader*. New York: Crossroad.
- Biberman, J. & Tischler, L. (2008). *Spirituality in Business: Theory, Practice, and Future Directions*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Biberman, J. & Whitty, M. (1997). A postmodern spiritual future for work. [*Journal of Organizational Change Management*](#), 10, 2, 130-139.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (1995). *Leading with Soul*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowen, D. E., & Lawler, E. E. III. (1995). Empowering service employees. *Sloan Management Review*, 73-84.
- Buchholz, R. A., & Rosenthal, S. B. (2003). Spirituality, consumption, and business: A pragmatic perspective. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Cartwright, S. & Holmes, N. (2006). [The meaning of work: The challenge of regaining employee engagement and reducing cynicism](#). *Human Resource Management Review*, 16, 2, 199-208

- Cavanaugh, G. F. (1999) Spirituality for managers: Context and critique. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 186-199.
- Cohen, G. (1996). Toward a Spirituality Based on Justice and Ecology. *Social Policy (Spring)*, 6(18).
- Deci, E. L. , & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 4, 227-268.
- Driscoll, C. and Wiebe, E. (2007). Technical spirituality at work: Jacques Ellul on workplace spirituality. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 16:4, 333-348.
- Driver, M. (2005). From empty speech to full speech? Reconceptualizing spirituality in organizations based on a psychoanalytically-grounded understanding of the self. *Human Relations*, 58, 9, 1091–1110.
- Duchon, D. & Plowman, D. A. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly* 16:5, 807-833.
- Emmons, R. & Paloutzian, R. (2003). The psychology of religion. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 377-402.
- Fairholm, G.W. (1997). *Capturing the heart of leadership: Spirituality and community in the new American workplace*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Ford, R. C., & Fottler, M. D. (1995). Empowerment: A matter of degree. *Academy of Management Executive*, 9, 21-31.
- Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*. 14, 693-727.
- Fry, L. W. (2005a). Toward a Theory of Ethical and Spiritual Well-being, and Corporate Social Responsibility Through Spiritual Leadership in Giacalone, R.A., Jurkiewicz, C.L., & Dunn, C., (Eds.). *Positive Psychology in Business Ethics and Corporate Responsibility*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 47-83.
- Fry, L. W. (2005b). Toward a Paradigm of Spiritual Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 619-622.
- Fry, L. W., Vitucci, S., & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual leadership and army transformation: Theory, measurement, and establishing a baseline. *The Leadership Quarterly* 16:5, 835-862.

Fry, L. (2008). Spiritual Leadership: State-of-the-Art and Future Directions for Theory, Research, and Practice. In J. Biberman & Tishman, L. (Eds.), *Spirituality in Business: Theory, Practice, and Future Directions* (pp. 106-124). New York: Palgrave.

Fry, L. (2009). Spiritual leadership as a model for student inner development. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 3, 3, 79-82.

Fry, L. W. & Matherly, L. L. (2006). *Spiritual Leadership and Organizational Performance*. Academy of Management, Atlanta, Georgia.

Fry, L. W. & Matherly, L. (2007). Workplace spirituality, spiritual leadership and performance excellence. Steven G. Rogelberg (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Industrial/Organizational Psychology*. San Francisco: Sage Publications.

Fry, L. & Kriger, M. (2009). Toward a Theory of Being-Centered Leadership: Multiple Levels of being as Context for Effective Leadership. *Human Relations*, 62, 11, 1667-1696.

Fry, L. W. & Slocum, J. (2008). Maximizing the Triple Bottom line through a Strategic Scorecard Business Model of Spiritual Leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 31, 1, 86-96.

Fry L.W. & Vitucci S. & Cedillo, M. (2005). Spiritual Leadership and Army Transformation: Theory, Measurement, and Establishing a Baseline. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 835-862.

Fry, L., Hanna, S., Noel, M. & Walumba, F. (In Press). Impact of Spiritual Leadership on Unit Performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*.

Giacalone, R A., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003a). Toward a science of workplace spirituality, In R. A. Giacalone, & C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3-28). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharp.

Giacalone, R. A. & Jurkiewicz, C. L., (eds.). (2003b). *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Giacalone, R. A. & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003c). Right from wrong: The influence of spirituality on perceptions of unethical business activities. *Journal of Business Ethics* 46, 85-97.

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

Grendstad, G., & Selle, P. (1997). *Cultural theory, postmaterialism, and environmental attitudes*. Boulder, CO: Westview, Press.

Gunther, M. (2001). God and business: The surprising quest for spiritual renewal in the American workplace. *Fortune*, July 9, 2001, 58-80.

Harung, H., Travis, F., Blank, W., & Heaton, D. (2009). Higher development, brain integration, and excellence in leadership. *Management Decision* 47:6, 872-894.

Heaton, D. & Schmidt-Wilk, J. (2008). Awakening the leader within: Behavior depends on consciousness, Biberman, J. and Tischler, L., eds., *Spirituality in Business*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 125-140.

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

James, L. R., Demaree, R. G., & Wolf, G. (1993). Rwg: An assessment of within group interrater agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 306-309.

Jaworski, J. (1996). *Synchronicity: The Inner Path to Leadership*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Jurkiewicz, C.L. (2010). Ethics and Spirituality in Crisis. *The Handbook of Workplace Spirituality*, 2nd Edition. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Jurkiewicz, C., Giacalone, R., & Fry, L. (In press). From concept to science: Continuing steps in workplace spirituality research (2nd Ed.). In R. Paloutzian & Park, C. L., (Eds.), *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*.” Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Karakas, F. (2010). [Spirituality and performance in organizations: A literature review](#). *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 1, 89-106.

Kinjerski, V. & Skrypnek, B. (2004). Defining Spirit at Work. Finding Common Ground, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, 165–182.

Kinjerski, V. & Skrypnek, B. J. (2008). The promise of spirit at work. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing* 34:10, 17-25.

Klein, K & Kozlowski, S. (2000). *Multilevel Theory, Research, and Methods in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Krishnakumar, S. & Neck, C. (2002). The what why and how of spirituality in the workplace, *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 17(3), 153–164.

Konz, G. & Ryan, F. (1999.) [Maintaining an organizational spirituality: no easy task](#). *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 3, 200-211.

Krahnke, K., Giacalone, R. A., and Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). Point-counterpoint: measuring workplace spirituality. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 16:4, 396-405.

Leigh, P. (1997). The New Spirit at Work, *Training & Development*, 51, 26–41.

Levy, R. (2000). My experience as participant in the course on spirituality for executive leadership. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 129-131.

Lewis, J. & Geroy, G. (2000). Employee Spirituality in the Workplace: A Cross-Cultural View for the Management of Spiritual Employees, *Journal of Management Education*, 24, 682–694.

Lips-Wiersma, M. (2003). Making Conscious Choices in Doing Research on Workplace Spirituality. Utilizing the Holistic Development Model to Articulate Values, Assumptions and Dogmas of the Knower, *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 16, 4, 406–425.

Lips-Wiersma, M. & Mills, C. (2002). Coming out of the Closet: Negotiating Spiritual Expression in the Workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17, 183–202.

Litvin, D. (2006). Diversity: Making Space for a Better Case. In A. M. Konrad, P. Prasad and J. K. Pringle (Eds.). *Handbook of Workplace Diversity* (pp. 75–94). Thousand Oaks: CA. Sage Publications.

Lund-Dean, K., C. J. Fornaciari, C., & McGee, J. (2003). Research in Spirituality, Religion and Work: Walking the Line Between Relevance and Legitimacy, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16, 378–395.

Lund-Dean, K., Fornaciari, C., & Safranski, S. R. (2008). The ethics of spiritual inclusion, Biberman, J. and Tischler, L., (Eds.), *Spirituality in Business*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 188-202.

Matherly, L., Fry, L. W., & Ouimet, R. (2005). [*A strategic scorecard model of organizational excellence through spiritual leadership*](#). Academy of Management, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Marques, J. (2010). Toward Greater Consciousness in the 21st century workplace; How Buddhist practices fit in. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 92, 211-225.

Mason, R. O. (2003). Spirituality and information. In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Miller, D. W. (2007). *God at Work: The History and Promise of the Faith at Work Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McCormick, D. (1994). Spirituality and Management. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9, 5–8.

McCollum, B. (1999). Leadership development and self-development: an empirical study. *Career Development International* 4:3, 149-154.

- Mitroff, I. & Denton, E. (1999). *A spiritual audit of corporate America: A hard look at spirituality, religion, and values in the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mobley, L. R. (1971). Personal values and Corporate Ethics. In A. Klose & R. Weiler (Eds.), *Men in decision making; Social ethics and the policy of society* (pp. 1887-1199). Freiburg: Herder.
- Nadesan, M.H. (1999). The discourse of corporate spiritualism and evangelical capitalism. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13, 3-42.
- Nash, L. (1994). *Believers in Business*. Nashville, TN: Nelson.
- Neal, J.A. (2001). Leadership and spirituality in the workplace. In Lusssier, R.N., & Achua, C. F. (Eds.) *Leadership theory, application, skill development* (pp. 464-473). South-Western Publishing.
- Neal, J. & Biberman, J. (2004). Research that Matters: Helping Organizations Integrate Spiritual Values and Practices, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17, 7–10.
- Neck, C, & Milliman, J. (1994). Thought self-leadership: Finding spiritual fulfilment in organizational life. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 9, 6, 9-16.
- Our project: Reconciliation of human well-being with productivity and profits. (n.d.) retrieved July 9, 2010, from <http://www.notreprojet.org/Homepage-Our-project.html>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lee, J. Y. (2003b). The mismeasure of man(agement) and its implications for leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 615-656.
- Reave, L. (2005). Spiritual Values and Practices Related to Leadership Effectiveness, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 655–687.
- Schmidt-Wilk, J. (2000). Consciousness-based management development: case studies of international top management teams. *Journal of Transnational Management Development* 5:3, 61-85.
- Schmidt-Wilk, J., Alexander, C. N., and Swanson, G. C. (1996). Developing consciousness in organizations: the transcendental meditation program in business. *Journal of Business and Psychology* 10:4: 429-444.
- Spreitzer, G. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39,2, 483-504.
- Steingard, D. (2005). Spiritually-Informed Management Theory: Toward Profound Possibilities for Inquiry and Transformation, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14, 227–241.
- Tischler, L. (1999). The Growing Interest in Spirituality in Business. A Long Term Socio-Economic Explanation , *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12, 273–279.
- Vaill, P. (1998). *Spirited Leading and Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weber, M. (1958). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. New York: Scribner's.



Figure 1: Model of Spiritual Leadership