

The Present State of Workplace Spirituality:
A literature review considering context, theory, and measurement/assessment.

Authors: David W. Miller (dwm@princeton.edu, Princeton University) and
Timothy Ewest (timothy.ewest@wartburg.edu, Wartburg College)

Date: 11 January, 2011

This paper was prepared for the 2011 Academy of Management Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Texas, USA, August 12-16, 2011 and should not be cited or duplicated without express permission of the authors.

Abstract

This paper seeks to review the growing body of quantitative and theoretical research on the field of workplace spirituality, with particular attention to determining the nature, aims, and unmet needs specific to scale development for spirituality in the workplace and faith at work. Extending the earlier and broader literature review work of Gorsuch and Miller (1999), Hill and Hood (1999), the Fetzer Group (1999), Moberg (2002), Mohamed, et al (2004), Day (2004), and Lund Dean and Fornaciari (2007), this paper also seeks to advance the direction of future psychometric scale development in the burgeoning and interdisciplinary academic field of workplace spirituality and faith at work. By suggesting a new rubric for understanding the literature (manifestation, development, and adherence), and analyzing the scale validity and reliability the authors hope to expand the conceptual imagination for new scale research.

Specifically, this paper argues that the previous research has begun to address important aspects of research scale development, although it has been limited in its applicability to workplace contexts, does not address diverse religious traditions, and falls short of understanding how and the degree to which individual or collective spirituality integrates and manifests itself in the workplace. Moreover, while much scale research has been directed towards personal fulfillment, faith maturity and wellness (Hill and Hood, 1999; Moberg, 2002), only recently have scales been developed with an eye towards workplace spirituality and faith at work.

To this end, this paper will codify and extend the aforementioned work by identifying the major drivers for the field, consider the present operationalized definitions, explore the theoretical connections between spirituality/religion and organizations, review existing scales and instruments, discuss the literature review findings, identify gaps and problems within the reviewed research, and resolve by suggesting specific areas for further research.

Introduction

The growing and sustained interest in the integration of spirituality and religion in the workplace suggests that we are experiencing more than a mere fad. This main stream interest in faith and work has various motivations and ramifications emanating from a broad spectrum of constituencies. The present state of academic research in the field of workplace spirituality is in many ways reminiscent of where leadership research was some 50 years ago. Academics are still trying to define basic terms, determine standards for measurement and interpretation, and explore the interrelationships between various variables, and the impact on organizational behavior, leadership, and performance. This should not be surprising for many who have participated in other fields of research, particularly where scholarship among various existing academic disciplines is combined to create a new contextual body of interdisciplinary vetted research. Over the past decade, several literature reviews have been conducted (Moberg, 2002; Day, 2004; Mohamed, et al, 2004; Lund Dean and Fornaciari, 2007) yet the pace of research and publication merits a fresh perspective and review, which we seek to do here.

To date much of the initial contribution to the emerging field of workplace spirituality has ranged from determining the philosophical veracity of religion/spiritually in organizations as a field of research, establishing operationalized definitions, reviewing literature in the field and development of scales both aim at measuring religious adherence as well as spiritual expression.

This emerging academic field has come to be known as Faith at Work (Miller, 2007), or Workplace Spirituality. Rego and Pina e Cunha, (2008), define workplace spiritually as the “recognition that employees have an inner life which nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work taking place in the context of a community” (p. 55). Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, (2003), “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 to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy" (p. 13). Lynn et al. (2009) prefer the term "workplace religion" because it allows for the inclusion of dogma, tradition and institution and allows one to capture rituals, beliefs and religious values (p.229). Whatever name one gives the field, there is general agreement that it is driven by people desiring to live integrated lives; who are no longer satisfied to park their faith tradition or identity at the door when they go into work, anymore than they are willing to deny or sublimate their ethnicity, race, gender, or sexual orientation (Miller, 2007). People in today's workforce want to live holistic lives, including recognition and acceptance of their spirituality.

The growing number of scholarly publications, university research centers, courses, academic conferences on workplace spirituality - not to mention the burgeoning popular interest and faith at work activity - suggest that this has emerged as a sustainable new field that is worthy of further research (Miller, 2007). One central question facing researchers is: what is the way forward? And in particular, are there accepted quantitative methods to understand this phenomenon of workplace spirituality? Steensland, et al, (2000) understand the how a person's participation in spirituality and religion have "a strong influence on contemporary social and political issues, because of religion's impact on a person's attitudes and behavior, it is important that scholars adequately measure these attitudes" (p. 309). Development of instrumentation to measure accurately is also recommended by Moberg (2002) who foresees the pursuit of a scale that will be regarded as "ontologically authentic in every religious and philosophical sphere..." (p. 58). However, Gorsuch and Miller (1999) would caution to avoid "creating more homemade scales when there are already psychometrically sound options" (p. 59).

This paper seeks to review the growing body of quantitative and theoretical research on the field of workplace spirituality, with particular attention to determining the nature, aims, and unmet needs specific to scale development for spirituality in the workplace and faith at work. Extending the earlier and broader literature review work of Gorsuch and Miller (1999), Hill and Hood (1999), the Fetzer Group (1999), Moberg (2002), Mohamed, et al (2004), Day (2004), and Lund Dean and Fornaciari (2007), this paper also seeks to advance the direction of future psychometric scale development in the burgeoning and interdisciplinary academic field of workplace spirituality and faith at work. By suggesting a new rubric for understanding the literature (manifestation, development, and adherence), and analyzing the scale validity and reliability the authors hope to expand the conceptual imagination and avenues for new scale research.

Specifically, this paper argues that the previous research has begun to address important aspects of research scale development, although it has been limited in its applicability to workplace contexts, does not address diverse religious traditions, and falls short of understanding how and the degree to which individual or collective spirituality integrates and manifests itself in the workplace. Moreover, while much scale research has been directed towards personal fulfillment, faith maturity and wellness (Hill and Hood, 1999; Moberg, 2002), only recently have scales been developed with an eye towards workplace spirituality and faith at work.

To this end, this paper seeks to codify and extend the aforementioned work by identifying the major drivers for the field, consider the present operationalized definitions, explore the theoretical connections between spirituality/religion and organizations, review existing scales and instruments, discuss the literature review findings , identify gaps and problems within the reviewed research, and resolve by suggesting specific areas for further research.

Drivers of Workplace Spirituality and Faith at Work

The field of Workplace Spirituality and Faith at Work owes its existence to various motivations and interests from broad phenomena within the wider culture. What appear to be the major drivers for the growth of the field include: Increasing ethnic and spiritual diversity, fresh recognition of religious resources; social and economic changes; a global emphasis' on human rights and a concern for global justice and finally; and a reactionary movement to archaic organizational structures.

Ethnic and spiritual diversity/religious resources

The number of foreign-born Americans have been steadily increasing, leading to many changes in the American workforce. The actual percentage of foreign-born Americans in 1970 was 4.5 percent with 62 percent of the population being of European decent. By 2000 the foreign-born percentage increased to 12 percent with 52 percent coming from European descent. Notably, the vast majority of foreign-born Americans in 1970 were Christian. Yet by 2000, many of the foreign-born entering the American workforce, “were Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs or members of other [non-Christian] religions. Today 78.4 percent of U.S. adults are Christian and about 5 percent are members of other religions; 16.1 percent are unaffiliated” (Grossman, 2008, p. 29). The foreign-born population growth has created more ethnic diversity in the workplace and correspondingly more spiritual diversity. And many of these workers, such as many Muslims and Latin American Roman Catholics, find it normative to be open about their faith and include it in all spheres of life, including work. Accordingly, They do not ascribe to the western Baby Boomer led bifurcation of faith and work (Miller, 2007).

The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life (2008) provides a snapshot of America's present religious landscape citing the vast majority of Americans, 92%, say they believe in God; with 83% being affiliated with a religious group. Within this religious sector the common practices include: Religious group activities, worship attendance, prayer and meditation. Moreover 64% of religious Americans identify Holy Scripture (e.g. the Bible, Torah, Koran) as being the word of God (Grossman, 2008, p. 28).

This growing religious diversity and spiritual influx has led to confluence of shared ethical accents across the traditions that seek to provide, among other things, an ethical foundation to the marketplace. The ethical foundations of religious traditions are increasingly being studied and discussed about they apply to the marketplace. For examples, *Faith and the Global Agenda: Values for the Post-Crisis Economy*, a 77 page report that explicitly draws on the moral and ethical teachings of religion was produced by the World Economic Forum in collaboration with Georgetown University. Religious leaders have also sought to bring religious resources to bear on economic issues, including the global economic crisis triggered in 2008. Another group of business leaders, represented by The Caux Round Table, issued The Mountain House Statement, the first-ever commentary on economic matters developed by a gathering of Jewish, Christian, and Muslim scholars and ethicists. Further, Pope Benedict XVI's 2009 encyclical *Caritas in Veritate* (Charity in Truth) on the economy, where he called for "a world that needs to rediscover fundamental values on which to build a better future." *Charity in Truth*,(p. 20).The Pope further noted, the market, "must draw its moral energies from other subjects that are capable of generating them," *ibid*, (p. 37) by which he means religion. And finally, in his 2009 speech, "Ethics, Economics, and Global Justice," Rowan Williams, the Archbishop of Canterbury suggested "three central aspects of a religious - and more specifically, Christian - contribution to

the ongoing debate" about the economic crisis that included a return to the Christian values of trustworthiness, humility, and not abusing the weak.

Tectonic social and economic changes

In an examination of over 1,000 faith at work groups and individuals, Miller (2007) noted the primary driver for workplace spirituality and faith at work was a desire to live an integrated life. Further, he noted this impulse was not new, and has had three main waves of activity over the past century. This current wave is not driven by 9/11, as some suggest, but started in the late 1980s. Tectonic changes to several social and economic (massive white collar layoffs; migration of manufacturing to offshore; the dot.com revolution; increasing pressures at work; and reduced corporate loyalty) all combined to lead to anxious workers struggling to cope with these new forces and uncertainties, even those who benefited from the changes. Increasingly people sought meaning and purpose in their work, succor from pressure and uncertainty, finding that often in their faith traditions. This was context was amplified by broader social trends towards growing interest in spirituality and religion.

Human rights and concern for global justice

In the wake of World War II the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to establish a baseline universal respect and value for all human persons. Specifically, Article 2 affirms that everyone is to be entitled to all the rights and freedoms in the declaration without respect to religion. The preservation and enforcement of human rights has been seen recently in the Civil Rights movement (which had strong religious underpinnings and

motivations) and the equal treatment of woman in the workplace. The next major human rights hurdle may be equal treatment of those coming from different faith traditions.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights addresses religious human rights in Article 18 stating: “Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religious; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, workshop and observance”.

The upholding and preservation of religious human rights of individuals has become paramount in the last few years. While there has been support for the application in human rights to business ethics (Cragg, 2000), business strategy (Rice, 2002), little attention has been given to the religious human rights in the marketplace. Witte and van der Vyver (1996) do note that the lack of religious human rights has lead to “Employees and employees are denied opportunities to exercise their faith” (p. XVII). The marginalization of people because of their faith tradition may become more common if organizations do not become more assertive.

A 2008 survey conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) reported that 64 percent of organizations are to some degree religiously and spiritually diverse and an additional 25 percent reported a great degree of diversity (Grossman, 2008, p. 29). The onus will fall on organizations and managers to set up policies/boundaries that protect the rights of religious people of all faiths. The bureaucratic nature of the organization may not allow employees to set their own rules/norms for spiritual behavior and without a tool to analyze employees level of desire and general spiritual orientations. Managers are left with little except intuition to preserve employee spiritual rights and with even less ability to create normalized policies so people of faith can use their faith to contribute to their organizations.

Witte and van der Vyver (1996) suggest that the interpolation between religion and human rights plays a central role in many of the world's problems but also would be a valuable contribution to help solve many of the world's problems. Examples of some global issues that share a confluence of social, economic, and religious variables include localized problem as the practice of female circumcision (considered a violation of human rights) and more widespread concerns such as interfaith conflict and war, poverty, and access to clean water and medical care.

Organizational constructs and human interaction

Ashforth and Pratt (2010) believe that the exclusion of spirituality in the workplace is due largely to the historical organizational development. Historically, economic progress has passed through four stages: Agrarian, industrial, service and experience economy. They ascribe most of the present situation to the industrial era (Pine and Gilmore, 1998). The industrial era was a by-product of Weberian organizational Bureaucracy and Taylor's focus on operational efficiency (Citation). This era was dominated by manual labor, job fragmentation, increased worker output and militaristic taking of orders. Here workers were "expected to check their brain at the door – managers were responsible for the thinking required" (p. 61). This bifurcation created a division in the worker's life. To cope the person in the marketplace decided not to bring their private life to work and came to work as a public professional person.

This condition was carried forward into the present era labeled as the service economy. The perception carried by the employee was that they could not bring their whole selves to work (Miller, 2007). Mohamed, et al. (2004) illustrate the outcomes of the division in the worker when the 80's and 90's brought massive layoffs and constant reorganization. The result was that

workers began to view the inclusion of spirituality at work as a panacea (p.102). For Mitroff and Denton (2009) it created the Faustian Dilemma:

“If you express your faith you without a clear guidelines for its appropriate expression you may be punished, but if you do not express your faith, in the area where you devote the greatest amount of your waking hours, the development of the soul is seriously stifled if not halted”.

The reaction was that most executives and consultants realized the present organizational structure was not sustainable (p.102). This resulted in a new exploration of organizational models which allowed people to be full participants in the workplace. Porter and Kramer (2006), Senge (1990), Covey (1989), and Block (1996) envisioned a new paradigm where people could bring their whole-self to work. The change in executives and consultants orientation was a good fit with the present experience economic paradigm, which demands distinctive personal experience for the customers. The two orientations synergized around because a person who can bring their full selves to work are better able to equip their organization to meet unique and personal demands of the customers.

Definition of spirituality, religion, and faith

Presently there remains no consensus over the major operational definitions within the workplace spirituality and faith at work movement. Even the academy of Management Special Interest Group (SIG) that was formed over a decade ago struggled with how to name itself, settling eventually on the awkward "Management, Spirituality, and Religion" name. This SIG struggles still to differentiate between and find working definitions of: spirituality, religion, and faith. An academic debate appears to exist between those wed to conceptions of spirituality and

religion. While many scholars seem to embrace the suggestively more inclusive conception of spirituality over and against religion, its definition remains elusive,

Spirituality

Marty (1997) argues that "there will not and cannot be a universally satisfying nor even locally precise meaning to the designation [of spiritual]..." (p.67). Giacalone (2010) cites over 14 various definitions for spirituality. McGinn (1993) finds 35 different definitions which he classified into three categories: Theological or dogmatic, anthropological which emphasize human nature and historical-contextual approaching the accentuate experience in a particular community. As noted by Schmidt-Wilk, Heaton and Steingard (2000) the struggle over operational consensus is partially due to: to the amorphous nature of spirituality; the definition is owned by various disciplines; and the field as an organizational science is just beginning to develop. While it may be too soon to ossify the definitions of spirituality, classifying them may be the first simple step.

One potentially helpful approach is to find guiding rubrics to help ossify existing definitions. For instance McGinn (1993) defined classified spirituality into three categories: theological/dogmatic, which include interpretations from above; anthropological understandings which emphasize human nature and experience; and historical contextual approaches which emphasize experience rooted in a particular community. McGinn's classification is broad enough to encompass the various academic disciplines, but considerably too broad for the purposes of codifying spirituality as an operationalized definition for use in workplace spirituality and faith at work.

Nash (2001) also provides a rubric to codify existing definitions. The multiple definitions of spirituality are compared using a modified version of Nash's (2001) criteria. Nash finds three definitional components for the definition of spirituality that are found in most literature: the inner self; forces greater than the individual; and a search for significance in everyday life, including benevolence (p.17).

Religion (in opposition to spirituality)

Many scholars see a solid distinction between spirituality and religion citing spirituality as personal and inclusive, while religion is external and exclusive (Harlos, 2000; Shafranske and Malony, 1990). This definition suggests that spirituality finds its grounding in and cannot stand apart from religion. Religion is not a single person's belief; rather, it is a set of moral beliefs and perceptions shared by a group of people to explain an understanding of human existence within this universe. Religion is a set of values, doctrines, and principles that provide an ethical and moral framework for understanding, motivation, and behavior (King, 2007, p. 104). The outcome of these communities is a shared set of values and behaviors to which followers must adhere.

Religion (integration with spirituality)

One obvious solution is simply to leave the two fields separate. Spirituality and religion must not only be separate in definition, but also in function. The governing issue is that the two are conjoined. Slater, Hall, and Edwards (2001) understand spirituality as an individual expression and "Religion includes this element, but the search must be done in the context of a group that legitimizes its means and methods" (p. 5). The suggestion is that the two are

conjoined and inseparable. Zinnbauer et al (1999) posit that “For those who find the whole life to be sacred, there is little difference between the two process” (p.11).

Faith, religion, and spirituality

Miller (2007) suggests the scholarly debate within the Academy of Management guild on definitions of and comparisons between "spirituality" and "religion" is often flawed, and fails to draw on theological resources and the Academy of Religion, which has long engaged and studied this subject. Miller argues that the management guild often defines and places the terms religion and spirituality incorrectly in opposition to each other as if they were mutually exclusive. Moreover, some scholars bring a bias or view suggesting that religion is somehow "bad" and "spirituality" is somehow good. To resolve and move past this conundrum Miller suggest "faith" as an overarching term that includes the more formal and defined expressions of belief as found in religious constructs and the more informal and less-defined expressions of belief as found in spirituality. Lynn et al (2009) also wish to include dogma and belief systems in their understanding of spirituality at work.

If as suggested, spirituality and religion are interconnected, and might be understood under the broader terms of faith at work and workplace spirituality, then we need to explore more deeply the nexus between these aspects of the human experience and the workplace. For the purposes of this literature review we understand the interrelated aspects of as noted.

Theoretical frames for integrating workplace spirituality and faith at work

Before assessing the various scales which pertain to workplace spirituality and faith at work it is important to understand the various theoretical frames in which these models exist.

These frames determine the assumptions scholars have when constructing rubrics which guide their instrumentation development and research.

The first theoretical frame is posited by Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2010) who suggest three stances of the role of spirituality in the workplace: the parallel relationship; the adversarial relationship; and the integrative relationship. The parallel stance understands spirituality and the workplace as being in separate and different worlds. The two exist, but one has no impact on the other. The adversarial stance sees spirituality and the workplace as not belonging together, even creating antagonism and hostility. The final stance, the integrative, sees the connection between spirituality and the workplace as being potentially connected, even suggesting causal relationships between faith and work (p. 18).

Ashforth and Pratt (2010) find three types of organizations with openness to expressions of faith: enabling organizations; directing organizations; and partnering organizations. The three categories or types run along a continuum of low individual control as found in directing organizations, to high organizational control as found in the directing organization.

The first type of organization has high individual control and low organizational control. Enabling organizations “acknowledge strivings and allow individuals to discover their own idiosyncratic transcendence, whether prayer groups, mediation, yoga, journaling, spiritual retreats, or other means” (p. 47). The enabling organization is not interested imposing its any specific worldview on a employees and may or may not consider work to be a integral part of the employees spiritual activity.

The directing organization has low individual control and high organizational control that “effectively imposes its preferred cosmology on individually its preferred cosmology on individuals, a cosmology that is intimately tied to the mission and practices of the organization

itself” (p. 49). The cosmology they address is comprised of an employee identity, membership, values and purpose because these elements the grounds for what has to be done in the world.

The final type is a partnering organization that has high individual control and high organizational control. This type represents the middle territory of the two aforementioned types. This approach respects that workplace spirituality is both a “bottom-up and a top-down process, although not in a mechanistic or legalistic manner (p.52). Spiritually here is believed to be a social construction which is created through the free interchange between all members.

Other models also exist, including Mitroff and Denton (1999) who posit five organizational models of spirituality at work (i.e. religion-based organization, the evolutionary organization, the recovering organization, the socially responsible organization, and the values-based organization). They evaluate these types against 10 dimensions or characteristics. They conclude by prescriptively recommend a less specific and more generic conception of spirituality called the "hybrid-type organization" as best for the workplace.

Miller (2007) has also provided classifications for companies who choose to be sensitive to their employees' religious and spiritual interests and identities. Miller's classification recognizes and respects "the varieties of religious experiences" (James, 1902) evident in humanity in general, and in the modern workplace in particular. Instead of rejecting this religious diversity or seeking to flatten or reduce this diversity to a lowest common denominator (e.g. the Golden Rule), Miller offers the model of embracing spiritual diversity through the concept of being a "faith-friendly company." Consistent with the diversity and inclusion movement in the human relations field, Miller argues that companies should seek to be faith-friendly, which means respecting and welcoming all expressions of faith (so long as they are compliant with the law). Faith-friendly policies are welcoming and inclusive and do not privilege

one tradition over another. As such, the faith-friendly corporate model is different from faith-based organizations that are typically grounded in a single tradition. Faith-friendly companies are also integrative and avoid the problems associated with compartmentalization. Correctly implemented, Miller argues that faith-friendly companies have the potential to harness some of the positive dimensions of various traditions while avoiding conflictual aspects.

Literature review on existing scales and instruments

The following literature review has a particular focus on workplace spirituality instrumentation. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2005) suggests that religious scales are typically “designed to assess individual adherence to theistic connection, or membership affiliation,” and that workplace scales are different in that they have the challenge of measuring the “interactive relationship of organizational and personal beliefs and their impact on criterion variables” (p. 521). However, no rubric has been offered for the categorization of workplace spirituality scales, which this paper offers. Therefore, when classifying various instrumentation, this paper does not follow the classic bifurcations of religious and spiritual (Hill and Hood, 1999).

Instead, this paper suggests a new organizational rubric whereby the workplace spirituality instruments are classified into the following three categories: manifestation scales; development scales; and adherence scales. Manifestation scales pertain to the orientation to universal, religious or spiritual values, disclosing specific manifestations, phenomenological experiences without regard to specific traditions, and expressions of a person’s values and corresponding motivations. Development scales pertain to the level of development within the participant in reference to a range of mature versus immature behavior, and/or nascent or developed religious/spiritual expectations. Adherence scales pertain to authentic adherence of religious,

spiritual, or traditional beliefs and the integration or practice of specific religious or spiritual traditions without regard to maturity. Each of the scales reviewed is listed within their categories based year of issue.

Finally, the primary consideration for the selection of instrumentation in this review focused on the applicability of the relevant variables that demonstrate interactive relationships between personal beliefs, workplace spirituality, and faith at work. Furthermore, the instruments were also selected based on: best representation in a category; revision of widely used instrumentation; and uniqueness of scholarship.

Manifestation scales

Rokeach Value Survey (Rokeach, 1973)

Rokeach developed a survey to measure general human values. Human values are a prescriptive or proscriptive belief that a specific mode of behaviors or end-state is performed as opposed to an opposite end-state which could have been chosen. Human values are two in orientation, terminal values, which act as an end state and instrumental values which are the motivational values to arrive at an end state. Furthermore, some values that drive human behavior were interdependent and even in opposition to each other (Rokeach, 1973).

Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS) (Paloutzian and Ellison, 1982; Ellison, 1983)

The SWBS examines both psychological and religious dimensions. The religious dimension focuses on how a person perceives their well-being in relation to God. The psychological dimension concerns itself with how one perceives their well-being to one's self and to those around the participant. Ellison and Smith (1991) state, "One dimension (religious

well-being) refers to one's sense of well-being in relation to 'God', and the other (existential well-being) refers to a sense of life purpose and life satisfaction with no reference to anything specifically religious" (p.26). This scale does not focus on spiritual maturity, since these are proscribed by various religions or denominations; instead it focuses on transcendence by assessing the well-being one feels in relation to what is beyond oneself (Menke, 2005, p. 11).

Duke Religion Index (DUREL) (Koenig, Parkerson, and Meador, 1997)

The scale measures religiousness either as it pertains to an organizational or non-organizational setting, as well as considering intrinsic religiosity. This scale was developed to gain a comprehensive, and non-offensive scale to measure religiosity. The items were determined from 458 medical patients. The scale is short, comprised of only five questions. The first two questions measure an organizational dimension of religion. Two more questions measure nonorganizational dimensions of religion, followed by one final question on intrinsic religiosity (Hill, 1999, p. 130).

Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality (BMMRS) (Fetzer Institute and NIA, 1999)

A working group was formed in 1999 supported by the "Fetzer Institute in collaboration with The National Institute on Aging (NIA), part of the National Institutes of Health (NIH)" (Fetzer Institute, 1999, p.1). The result was the Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality for Health Research. The BMMRS measures eleven attitudes and behaviors of religiousness and spirituality as they relate to physical and mental health. The eleven named dimensions include, "daily spiritual experiences, values/beliefs, private religious

practices, religious and spiritual coping, religious support, religious/spiritual history, commitment, organizational religiousness, overall self-ranking of spirituality and religiousness, and meaning” (Masters e. al., 2009, p. 110).

Spirituality at Work (SAW) (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000)

This instrument was developed to measure spirituality in the workplace. The three aspects in SAW that are germane to spirituality in the workplace are: the inner life; meaningful work; and community. The instrument measures individual perception as well as organizational perception. The organizational aspect of the scale is concerned with how well one identifies with the mission, values, and goals of the organization. The goal of this scale is to understand how spirituality can contribute to more productive work organizations.

Spirit at Work Scale (SWS) (Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2006)

The SWS focuses on the individual experience of spirit at work. The objective of the research is to determine if “spirit at work” is something more than simply their spiritual selves at work. To explore this, the SWS measures four factors: engaging work; sense of community; spiritual connection; and mystical experience. Their research suggests that spirit at work “is a distinct state that is characterized by cognitive, interpersonal, spiritual and mystical experiences” (2006, p.12).

Spiritual Climate Inventory (SCI) (Pandey, Gupta and Arora, 2009)

This instrument is intended to provide a means for individuals to integrate their work and their spirituality, with the intent of providing wholeness at a person’s place of work. The

instrument measures harmony with self, harmony within the work environment and transcendence. Harmony with self concerns itself with a person finding meaning, purpose and personal enrichment from their work. Harmony with work environment concerns itself with respect for others and the diverse nature of relationships. Finally, transcendence concerns itself with the divine and mystical, the direct connectedness with existence.

Faith at Work Scale (FWS) (Lynn, Naughton, and VanderVeen, 2009)

Development of FWS was guided by three assumptions: the focus would remain on the perceived degree to which employees' work and religion were interrelated; the scale items would be focused on the Judeo-Christian sentiments; and that “workplace religion is formative and not necessarily linear” (Lynn, Naughton, and VanderVeen, 2009, p. 230). The scale measures five dimensions: relationship; meaning; community; holiness; and giving (Lynn, Naughton and VanderVeen, 2009, p. 237).

The aforementioned scales are compared on Table 1.0. The dimensionality scales are compared by scale name, author, variable measured, date of publication, validity, and reliability.

[Table 1.0 insert here]

Development scales

Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) (Allport and Ross, 1967)

Allport (1950) theorized two existing polarities in religious orientation as an attempt to sort out religious motivation, so as to prevent the hijacking of religion for destructive purposes as

exemplified in WWII. Allport in his work, *The Individual and His Religion*, posited that people of religious conviction are either oriented towards the extrinsic or intrinsic. People who have Extrinsic Religious Orientation assume or expect some benefit will be received from their religious affiliation. “Extrinsic religiousness was considered to be instrumental in nature, described as immature and utilitarian, whereby a person uses his/her religiousness to achieve extra-religious (psychological and social) ends” (Flere and Lavrič, 2008, p. 521; Allport and Ross, 1967, p. 434).

In contrast, Intrinsic Religious Orientation sees religion, or devotion as the end, “the motive for religiousness would be autonomous and over-reaching” (Flere and Lavrič, 2008, p. 521). The intrinsically oriented individual is motivated by their religion to live their religion and in this living fulfill their commitment to their faith and jointly fulfilling their duty to those around them. (Hill and Hood, 1999, p. 119). Allport’s (1950) research led to the standard research model called Religious Orientation. The Religious Orientation Scale (ROS) is still in use but has been modified and undergone various iterations based on the original model.

Intrinsic/Extrinsic-Revised (I/E-R) Scale (Gorsuch and McPherson, 1989)

The Age Universal ROS was developed in 1983 by Gorsuch and Venerable (1989) to make the ROS scale more amendable to all educational levels. The intent was to be able to give the ROS to both adults and children. The I/E-R is a revision to the Age Universal ROS based on Kirkpatrick’s (1989) conclusions “that the extrinsic scale subdivides into two categories, a personally oriented (Ep) and socially oriented (Es) extrinsicness” (Hill, 1999, p. 154).

Religious Maturity Scale (RMS) (Dudley and Cruise, 1990)

Controversies over Allport's intrinsic/extrinsic orientation and Batson's Quest model (mentioned later) challenged the definition of religious development. The controversy surrounds the assumption by previous theories and the developed scales that positions people as either fanatically committed to their religion or as continual seekers never settling on a faith tradition. Dudley and Cruise (1990) refute the Quest model of flexibility between faith and doubt; they believe that doubt is contrary to the I/E model. They use a psychological versus a theological framework for defining religious maturity. Practices rather than theological beliefs are focused upon (Watson, 1999, p. 142).

High scores in the RMS theoretically reflect a creative tension between sincere commitment and a tentative open mindedness, rather than doubt. As described in this scale, the religiously mature individual believes, "I want to be ready to progress in my understanding when a new piece of the *truth* becomes clear to me. In the meantime I will live by the light I have" (Dudley and Cruise, 1990, p. 101; Watson, 1999, p. 142). The scale is intended for use with any type of religious tradition; however, a fairly high level of education may be demanded to comprehend some of the survey's terminology (Watson, 1999, p. 142-143).

Quest Scale (Batson and Schoenrade, 1991)

Batson (1991) discarded the intrinsic/extrinsic definitions and defined a third religious orientation of religious expression referred to as 'Quest'. Quest "Involves honestly facing existential questions in all their complexity, while at the same time resisting clear-cut, pat answers" (Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis, 1993, p. 166). Moreover, Quest involves a

willingness to struggle with existential questions, whether or not they involve a transcendent element (Beck and Jessup, 2004, pp. 284). With the Quest orientation, persons grow while they are wrestling with religious explanations of their human nature and existence. They are uncertain and therefore avoid settling on one specific religion or explanation.

These life struggles and contradictions lead to personal searches which develops an openness to spiritual growth. Quest is “characterized as the degree to which an individual’s religion involved an open-ended, responsive dialogue with existential questions raised by contradictions and tragedies of life” (Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis, 1993, p. 169). The scale “is intended to assess three distinct but interrelated aspects of the quest orientation: (a) readiness to face existential questions without reducing their complexity, (b) self-criticism and perceptions of religious doubts as positive, and (c) openness to change” (Batson and Schoenrade, 1991b, p.431). A high score on the Quest Scale indicates that faith and doubt are comingled revealing a more flexible perceptive of religiousness.

Spiritual Leadership (Fry, 2003; Fry, Vitucci and Cedillo,2005)

Fry's research interest is spiritual leadership, supported theoretically by positive psychology, demonstrates the direct contribution of human qualities, specifically altruism. Fry sees one of the primary roles of leaders is to create a culture based on altruistic love which is comprised of genuine care, concern and appreciation for yourself and others. The scale seeks to measure spiritual leadership, which is posited to establish a values congruence between the leader and follower specifically in areas strategy, empowering teams, and ultimately translating into great organizational commitment, productivity and employee well being (p. 835).

Multidimensional Quest Orientation Scale (MQOS) (Beck and Jessup, 2004)

The Multi--dimensional Quest Orientation Scale (MQOS) is an attempt to address concerns about the original Quest scale. The proposed issues in the original Quest scale had strong homogeneity among the features, but these features are theorized to have distinct, not homogeneous processes. This problem is illustrated by the various changes the Quest scale has undergone over the years. Batson and Schoenrade (1991) did suggest that there was a broader dimensionality to the process of Quest which included: readiness to face existential questions; religious doubt; and openness to change. However, they never provide constructs to measure these phenomena. The revision of the Quest variables include: tentativeness; change; ecumenism; universality; exploration; moralistic interpretation; religious angst; complexity; and existential motives (Beck and Jessup, 2004, p. 285).

The aforementioned scales are compared on Table 2.0. The dimensionality scales are compared by scale name, author, variable measured, date of publication, validity, and reliability

[Table 2.0 insert here]

Adherence scales

Belief Systems Analysis Scale (BSAS) (Montgomery, Fine, and James-Myers, 1990)

The Belief Systems Analysis Scale (BSAS) was developed to measure the degree to which one adheres to an Afro-centric worldview. Being highly spiritual in nature, persons with an Afro-centric worldview adhere to and “assume there is a nonmaterial-spiritual reality underlying observed material phenomena and that there is a unity of spirit (thoughts and

feelings) and matter (five sense perception)” (Montgomery, Fine, and James-Myers, 1990; Menke, 2005, p. 11).

Forgiveness Scale (FS) (Hargrave and Sells, 1997)

Forgiveness is central to being able to build and maintain relationships with oneself and others. Central to Judaism and Christianity, the concept of forgiveness can also be found in Zen Buddhism, Confucianism and Islam. The development of forgiveness has been correlated with the development of cognitive and moral reasoning.

The aforementioned scales are compared on Table 3.0. The dimensionality scales are compared by scale name, author, variable measured, date of publication, validity, and reliability.

[Table 3.0 insert here]

Discussion of findings in literature

Certain proposed theoretical models for integration of faith and work have begun positing the various types of organizational culture or ethos that exist which allow for the phenomena of the expression and or integration of spirituality in the workplace (Mitroff and Denton, 1999; Miller, 2007; Ashforth and Pratt, 2010; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2010). These theories, while remaining untested for the most part, begin to address a gap in the literature (to be discussed later). Moreover, they point toward and recognize the complex nature of multi-variable relationships that need to be identified and measured.

The development of psychometric scales and instrumentation in the last eight years has begun to address specific variables that are directly connected to spirituality in the workplace.

This can be clearly seen in the work of Fry et. al. (2005) with reference to leadership, Lynn, Naughton, and VanderVeen (2009) with their Faith at Work Scale for Christians, and Pandey, Gupta, Arora (2009) with their conception of spiritual climate inventory in an organization. The emergence of these scales specifically designed for measuring spirituality in the workplace represent attention directed towards spiritual and religious phenomena, and their correlations and interpolations that exist uniquely in the workplace. Aside from the few scales such as noted here, the vast majority of scales for religiosity and/or spirituality do not locate the phenomenon and its expression or manifestations in the workplace. Moreover, a review of these scales may indicate the possibility of something more than a singular distillation of workplace spirituality; they may suggest correlates between people, organizations, and spiritual phenomenon existing within the workplace that have heretofore not been evaluated, thus suggesting the emergence a truly unique research field.

Gaps and difficulties in the literature

It appears that the variety of definitions of spirituality/religion is due in part to the multidimensional nature of the spiritual/religious experience. This is further complicated by the existence of mediating and moderating variables within the individual herself and in the organization where she works. Moreover, the different scholarly guilds often have different definitions, understandings, and means of measuring spirituality/religion. A concern moving forward is the multiplicity of operationalized definitions concerning spirituality, religion and faith. If as Marty (1997) suggests that “there will not and cannot be a universally satisfying nor even locally precise meaning to the designation . . . [of spirituality]” (p. 3), then one may need to find a model which inculcates a multitude of operationalized definitions as is suggested by

Moberg (2002). Moreover, most extant scales are not designed for pluralistic organizational contexts where a multitude of faith traditions are present

The existing scales have only recently begun to assess the specific existing variables germane to workplace spirituality. The workplace spirituality scales that exist are in the nascent stage of development and cannot at present take into account vital aspects of spirituality such as various stages of spiritual development. Moreover, Hill and Hood (1999) suggest that generally speaking most scales have poor reliability. In addition, they find validity is weak on the majority of existing scales with the exception of the Quest Scale (Batson, 1993), the Mysticism Scale (Hood, 1997) and the groups of Intrinsic/Extrinsic Scales. Some of the scales reviewed here have satisfactory reliability and validity (see Tables 1.0, 2.0, and 3.0), but on the whole most scales are poor in this regard (Hill and Hood, 1999).

Gorsuch and Miller (1999) suggest that broadly speaking many of the scales suffer from generalizability because many of the scales used a convenience sample. In addition, scale use may be culturally specific. Therefore, to improve the sample frame, this would require matching specific scales with specific people within specific contexts and in conjunction with this, measures should be used within the groups that are familiar with the spiritual/religious language and customs they are designed to measure (p. 59-60).

Finally, Giacalone, Jurkiewicz and Fry (2005) find little research to determine if, in fact, employees integrate spiritual values into the workplace (p. 518). While the valid scales can determine the existence of latent variables within the person's self perceived awareness, no scale exists to determine the level of integration of that person's faith, religion, or spirituality within the context of the workplace..

Suggestions for Further Research

This paper argues that the previous research has begun to address important aspects of research scale development, although it has been limited in its applicability to workplace contexts, diverse religious traditions, and falls short of understanding how and the degree to which individual or collective spirituality integrates and manifests itself in the workplace. While much research has been directed towards personal fulfillment, faith maturity and wellness (Hill and Hood, 1999; Moberg, 2002), only recently have scales been developed with an eye towards workplace spirituality and faith at work. The objective of this paper was to codify and extend the aforementioned work and advance the existing work and literature to examine its import for future workplace spirituality research and scale development.

As a result of this literature review and analysis, three areas seem ripe for further research. First, if spirituality is multidimensional, as stated previously, then research models should be developed that are broader in scope allowing the capture of a multiplicity of spiritual manifestations as they exist in the workplace. This paper suggests scale development to follow the advice of Moberg (2002) who recommends constructing scales which will “be recognized as ontologically authentic in every religious and philosophical conceptual sphere...” (p. 58). This must be done in a manner that avoids the reductionism in ossifying operationalized definitions of variables in reference to spirituality, religion and faith. The challenge will be to develop models with supporting theoretical anchors that support the multidimensionality of spirituality in the workplace. Within the rubric of this literature review, the further development of manifestation scales should be paramount.

Second, research should also be targeted to investigate moderating, mediating and outcomes variables. Areas of research could include: human rights of the individual; legal issues;

correlations between existing leadership theories and faith/spirituality/religious motivations for moral behavior; socializing impacts of organizational values on people of faith; direct impact(s) of spirituality on organizational objectives; job satisfaction; and work-life balance. While research of this nature runs the risk of commoditizing spirituality, research which does not take into account praxis runs the risk of becoming irrelevant, one hand, or being manipulated or misused on the other hand.

Finally, research should continue the work of Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2010), Ashforth and Pratt (2010), Miller (2007), and Nash (2001) to examine which types of organizational ethos or culture allows for the person of faith to integrate this aspect of herself into the workplace. This would begin to address the poignant observation raised by Giacalone, Jurkiewicz and Fry (2005) who suggest that people can claim to be spiritual in the workplace and yet no measurement exists to confirm the kind or degree of its manifestations.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to review and analyze the growing body of literature on religion and spirituality with particular attention to determining the nature, aims, and unmet needs specific to scale development for spirituality in the workplace and faith at work. Extending the earlier and broader literature review work of Gorsuch and Miller (1999), Hill and Hood (1999), the Fetzer Group (1999), Moberg (2002), Mohamed, et al (2004), Day (2004), and Lund Dean and Fornaciari (2007), this paper also sought to set the course for future psychometric scale development in the burgeoning and interdisciplinary academic field of workplace spirituality and faith at work. By suggesting a new rubric for understanding the literature in three categories

(manifestation, development, and adherence), and analyzing the scale validity and reliability the authors hope to expand the conceptual imagination and avenues for new scale research.

The review cited existing strengths in the field such as an emerging aim of measuring spirituality and religion as a context-specific phenomena in the workplace, even though most extant scales had weak validity and reliability. Further, this paper suggests the need for more research into whether, how, and to what degree people integrate their personal faith identity and its manifestations into the workplace. Moreover, this review observes further gaps in research such as a deeper exploration into the multidimensionality of spirituality and the lack of good models to capture the various manifestations of spirituality, and whether commonalities or differences exist between traditions.

There is no indication that the aforementioned drivers for workplace spirituality and faith and work will abate in the years to come. If anything, immigration patterns and religious diversity will grow, and the attendant social and economic variables will only increase in force. This will make research into psychometric scales and theory development for workplace spirituality and faith at work all the more timely and important to scholars and practitioners alike.

References

- Allport, G.W. 1950. *The individual and his religion*. New York: MacMillan.
- Allport, G.W. & Ross, J.M. 1967. Religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Pratt, M. G. (2010). Institutionalized spirituality: An oxymoron? In R. A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*, (pp. 93-107). New York, NY: M.E. Sharper, Inc.
- Ashmos, D. & Duchon, D. 2000. Spirituality at Work. A Conceptualization and Measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 134-145. <http://search.ebscohost.com>.
- Batson, C.D. 1976. Religion as prosocial: Agent or double-agent? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 15, 29-45.
- Batson, C.D. & Schoenrade, P.A. 1991. Measuring religion as quest: 2. Reliability concerns. *Journal for the scientific Study of Religion*, 30, 430-447.
- Batson, C.D., Schoenrade, P.A., & Ventis, W.L. 1993. *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, R. & Jessup, R. 2004. The Multidimensional Nature of Quest Motivation. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 32(4), 283-294.
- Block, P. 1993. *Stewardship: Choosing Service over Self-interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Caux Roundtable. 2010. "Mountain House Statement," Repairing our Stewardship of Creation: Abrahamic Social Thought and the Global Economic Crisis
<http://www.cauxroundtable.org/>
- Covey, S. R. 1989. *The Seven Habits of Highly Successful People*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Cragg, W. 2000. Human Rights and Business Ethics: Fashioning a New Social Contract, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27: 205-21.
- Day, N. 2004. Religions in the Workplace: Correlates and Consequences of Individual Behavior. *Journal of Management Religions and Spirituality*. 2(1), 104-135.
- Dean, K. & Sasfranski, S. 2008. No Harm, No Foul? Organizational Intervention in Workplace Spirituality. In *Journal of Public Administration*, 31, 359-371.

- Dehler, G. & Neal, J. (Guest eds.) Spirituality in contemporary work: Its place, space, and role in management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(5).
- DeJong, Faulkner & Warland. 1976. also developed a similar scale which measures experience, religious practice, moral consequences and social consequences called *Cross Cultural*”
- Dudley, R. L. & Cruise, R.J. 1990. Measuring religious maturity: A proposed scale. *Review of Religious Research*, 32(2), 97-109.
- Ellison, C.W. 1983. Spiritual well-being: conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 11, 330-340.
- Ellison, C. W. & Smith, J. 1991. Toward an integrative measure of well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 19 (1), 35-48.
- Fetzer Institute. *Multidimensional measurement of religiousness/spirituality for use in health research*. Bethesda, MD: Fetzer Institute, National Institute of Aging; 1999. pp. 1–95. Retrieved from <http://www.fetzer.org/images/stories/pdf/MultidimensionalBooklet.pdf>
- Flere, S. & Lavrič, M. 2008. Is intrinsic religious orientation a culturally specific American Protestant concept? The fusion of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation among non-Protestants. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, (38), 521-530. (www.interscience.wiley.com) DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.437
- Fry, L.W. 2003. Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727.
- 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.
- Giacalone, R. & Jurkiewicz, C 2005. From Advocacy to science: The next steps in workplace spirituality and research. In *Handbook of Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. New York Guildford Press.
- Giacalone, R.A.; Jurkiewicz, C.J.; and Fry, L.W. (2005). From advocacy to science: The next steps in workplace spirituality research. In *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. Park, P editor The Guildford Press, New York.
- Giacalone, R. & Jurkiewicz, C. 2010. *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Gorsuch, R., & McPherson, S. 1989. Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E - Revised and "sin"gle-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 28: 348-54.

- Gorsuch, R. L., & Miller, W. R. 1999. Assessing spirituality. In Miller, William R. (Ed), *Integrating spirituality into treatment: Resources for practitioners*. (pp. 47-64). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi: 10.1037/10327-003
- Grossman, R. 2008. Religion at Work. (cover story). *HRMagazine*. 53(12), 26-33. Retrieved from Business Source Premier database.
- Hargrave, T.D. & Sells, J.N. 1997. The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 23, 1, 41-62.
- Harlos, K. 2000. Toward a spiritual pedagogy: Meaning, practice, and applications in management education. *Journal of Education*. 24, 612-630.
- Hill, P.C. 1999. Duke Religion Index. In P. C. Hill, & R. W. Hood, Jr. (Eds.), *Measures of Religiosity*. (pp. 130-132). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Hill, P.C. 1999. Religious Orientation Scale-Revised. In P. C. Hill, & R. W. Hood, Jr. (Eds.), *Measures of Religiosity*. (pp. 154-156). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Hill, P.C., & Hood Jr., R. W. 1999. *Measures of Religiosity*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Hood, R. 1997. "The empirical study of mysticism – retrospective and prospective", in Belzen/Wikström (ed.) *Taking a step back*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- King, S. 2007. Religion, Spirituality, and the Workplace: Challenges for Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 103-114. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00700.x
- Kinjerski, V. & Skrypnik, B.J. .2006. Measuring the intangible: Development of the Spirit at Work Scale, in M. Weaver (ed.), Best Paper Proceedings of the Sixty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (CD), ISSN 1543-8643. A1:A6.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A. 1989. A psychometric analysis of the Allport-Ross and Feagin measures of intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation. In Mobert, D.O. & Lynn, M.L. (Eds.) *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- James, W. 1902. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Koenig, H.G., Parkerson, G. Religion Index for Psychiatric research: A 5-item measure for use in health outcome studies. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 154(6), p. 885.
- Lund Dean, K. and C. J. Fornaciari: 2007, 'Empirical Research in Management, Spirituality and Religion During Its Founding Years', *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion* 4, 3–34.

- Lynn, M., Naughton, M., & VanderVeen, S. 2009. Faith at Work Scale (FWS): Justification, Development, and Validation of a Measure of Judaeo-Christian Religion in the Workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(2), 227-243. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1007/s10551-008-9767-3.
- Marty, M. 1997. Designed to be imprecise. *Aging and Spirituality*, 9 (1), 3.
- Masters, K.S., Carey, K.B., Maisto, S.A., Caldwell, P.E., Wolfe, T.V, ... Himawan, L. 2009. Psychometric Examination of the Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality Among College Students. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 19:106-20. doi:10.1080/10508610802711194
- McGinn, B. 1993. The letter and the spirit: Spirituality as an academic discipline. *Christian Spirituality Bulletin*, 1(2), 1-10.
- Menke, C. 2005. Synthesizing a comprehensive definition of spirituality and spiritual development and the construct validity of the optimism subscale of the Belief Systems Analysis Scale. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/theses/available/etd-03242005-105044/unrestricted/etd.pdf>.
- Miller, D.W. 2007. *God at work: The history and promise of the faith at work movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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 Inc.
- Moberg, D. 2002. Assessing and Measuring Spirituality: Confronting dilemmas of universal and particular evaluative criteria. *Journal of Adult Development*, 9(1), 47-60.
- Mohamed, A. A., Hassan, A. M., & Wisnieski, J. M. (2001). Spirituality in the workplace: A literature review. *Global Competitiveness*, 9, 644-652.
- Montgomery, D. E., Fine, M. A., & James-Myers, L. 1990. The development and validation of an instrument to assess an optimal Afrocentric worldview. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 17, 37-54.
- Nash, L. & McLennan, S. 2001. *Church on Sunday, work on Monday: A guide for reflection*. Jossey-Bass.
- Paloutzian, R.F. & Ellison, C.W. 1982. Loneliness, spiritual well-being and quality of life. In L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy* (pp. 224-237). New York: Wiley Interscience.
- Pandey, A., Gupta, R.K. and Arora, A.P. 2009. Spiritual Climate of Business Organizations and Its Impact on Customers' Experience, in *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 88, pp. 313-332.

- Pandey, A., Gupta, R.K. and Arora, A.P. 2009. 'Spiritual Climate Inventory' *Pfeiffer Annual for Consulting*, San Francisco, U.S.A.
- Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. 2008. *U.S. Religious Landscape Survey*. Retrieved December 6, 2009, from: <http://religions.pewforum.org/pdf/report-religious-landscape-study-full.pdf>.
- Pine, B., & Gilmore, J. 1998. Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, July-August, 97-105.
- Porter, M.E. & Kramer, M.R. .2006. "Strategy and Society: The Link Between Competitive Advantage and Corporate Social Responsibility", *Harvard Business Review*, December 2006, pp. 78-92.
- Rego, A., & Pina e Cunha, M. 2008. Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: an empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1), 53-75. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1108/09534810810847039.
- Rice, 2002. Human rights strategies for corporations Business Ethics: *A European Review*, 11 (2) April 2002.
- Rokeach, M. 1973. *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Schmidt-Wilk, J., Heaton, D. P., & Steingard, D. 2000. Higher education for higher consciousness: Maharishi University of Management as a model for spirituality in management education. *Journal of Management Education*, 24(10), 580–611.
- Senge, P. 1990. *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of a learning organization*. New York: Currency Book.
- Shafranske, E. & Malony, H. 1990. Clinical Psychologists' Religious and Spiritual Orientations and their Practice of Psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 27 (1), 72–78.
- Slater, W., Hall, T. & Edwards, K. 2001. Measuring Religion and Spirituality: Where Are We and Where are We Going? *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 29(1), 4-21.
- Stensland, B., Park, J.Z., Regnerus, M.D., Robinson, L.D., Wilcox, W. B. & Woodberry, R.D. 2000. The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 291-318.
- Watson, P.J. 1999. Religious Maturity Scale. In P. C. Hill, & R. W. Hood, Jr. (Eds.), *Measures of Religiosity* (pp. 142-154). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Witte, J. & van der Vyver J., eds. 1996. *Religious Human Rights in Global*

Perspective: Religious Perspectives. The Hague: Martinus Nijhof.

Zinnbauer, B. Pargement, K & Scott, A. 1999. The emerging meanings of religiousness and spirituality: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 889- 919.

Table 1.0

Manifestation Scales

Scale name (SN), author (A), variable measured (V).	Date	Validity	Reliability	Scale Type
<u>SN</u> : <i>Rokeach Value Survey</i> <u>A</u> : Rokeach <u>V</u> : Measures general human values. Two types, terminal and instrumental.	1973	N/A	.70-.80	Value Ranking
<u>SN</u> : <i>Spiritual Well-Being Scale</i> <u>A</u> : Paloutzian & Ellison <u>V</u> : A global measure of one's perception of their spiritual well-being.	1982	Yes	.82-.99	20 Items 6-point Likert
<u>SN</u> : <i>Duke Religion Index</i> <u>A</u> : Koeng, Patterson, & Meador <u>V</u> : Organizational or Non-organizational religion and intrinsic religiosity	1997	.40-.85	.75 Cronbach's Alpha	5 Items 6-point Likert
<u>SN</u> : <i>Brief Multidimensional Measure of Religiousness/Spirituality</i> <u>A</u> : Fetzer Institute <u>V</u> : Religious and Spiritual	1999	N/A	.69 - .91	38 Items 6-point Likert
<u>SN</u> : <i>Spirituality at Work</i> <u>A</u> : Ashmos & Duchon <u>V</u> : Inner life, meaningful work and community	2000	N/A	N/A	38 Items 7-point Likert
<u>SN</u> : <i>Spirit at Work Scale (SWS)</i> <u>A</u> : Kinjerski, Skrypnek <u>V</u> : Engaging work, sense of community, spiritual connection and mystical experience.	2006	.86-.91	None	18 Items 5-point Likert
<u>SN</u> : <i>Spiritual Climate Inventory</i> <u>A</u> : Pandey, Gupta, Arora <u>V</u> : Harmony with self, harmony at work, Transcendence.	2009	N/A	.85 Cronbach's Alpha	20 Items 5-point Likert

<u>SN</u> : <i>Faith at Work Scale</i> <u>A</u> : Lynn, Naughton, & VanderVeen <u>V</u> : Relationship, meaning, community, Holiness and giving.	2009	.81	.77	15Items 5-point Likert
--	------	-----	-----	---------------------------

Table 2.0

Development Scales

Scale name (SN), author (A), variable measured (V).	Date	Validity	Reliability	Scale Type
<u>SN</u> : <i>Religious Orientation Scale</i> <u>A</u> : Allport & Ross <u>V</u> : Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation	1967	N/A	.70-.84	21 items 9 point Likert scale
<u>SN</u> : <i>Intrinsic/Extrinsic-Revised Scale</i> <u>A</u> : Gorsuch & McPherson <u>V</u> : Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation	1989	Yes	.57-.83	14 items 5 point Likert scale
<u>SN</u> : <i>Religious Maturity Scale</i> <u>A</u> : Dudley & Cruise <u>V</u> : Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Motivation, specifically the process of growing commitment	1990	None	.55-..68	11 items 5 point Likert scale.
<u>SN</u> : <i>Quest Scale</i> <u>A</u> : Batson & Schoenrade <u>V</u> : Face existential questions, self criticism, openness to change.	1991	.85	.63-.81	12-items 9- point agreement response format
<u>SN</u> : <i>Multidimensionnel Quest Orientation Scale</i> <u>A</u> : Beck & Jessup <u>V</u> : Tentativeness, change, ecumenism, universality, exploration, moralistic interpretation, religious angst, complexity, existential motives.	2004	N/A	.68-.71	62 items 7 point Likert

