

Spirituality at Work A Conceptualization and Measure

DONDE P. ASHMOS

DENNIS DUCHON

University of Texas at San Antonio

Get used to it. Spirituality is creeping into the office. . . . And companies are turning inward in search of a "soul" as a way to foster creativity and to motivate leaders. (*Business Week*, June 5, 1995, p. 82)

There's a strange talk being spoken in the hallways of Corporate America today. It's about inner peace and a desire to gain more from business than a hefty paycheck. (*Sales and Marketing Management*, August 1997, p. 46)

Yesterday's business motto was "lean and mean." Today's business motto is "lean and meaningful." (*HR Magazine*, August 1998, p. 46)

There is increasing evidence that a major transformation is occurring in many organizations. In what is sometimes referred to as the spirituality movement, organizations that have long been viewed as rational systems are considering making room for the spiritual dimension, a dimension that has less to do with rules and order and more to do with meaning, purpose, and a sense of community (*USA Today*, *Business Week*, *The Wall Street Journal*). Yet, we still know very little about this spiritual phenomenon. In this article, we offer a

conceptualization and definition of spirituality at work and present empirical support for a measure of it.

SPIRITUALITY AT WORK

Corporate America's growing interest in spirituality at work can be understood in relation to several trends in our society. First, many believe that the downsizing, reengineering, and layoffs of the past decade have turned the American workplace into an environment where workers are demoralized (Brandt, 1996; Hamel & Prahalad, 1994) and where there is a growing inequity in wages (Beyer, 1999). Second, the workplace is being seen more often as a primary source of community for many people because of the decline of neighborhoods, churches, civic groups, and extended families as principal places for feeling connected (Conger, 1994). For many, the workplace provides the only consistent link to other people and to the human needs for connection and contribution. A third factor is curiosity about Pacific Rim cultures and Eastern philosophies (Brandt, 1996). Philosophies such as Zen Buddhism and Confucianism, which encourage meditation and stress values such as loyalty

AUTHORS' NOTE: The authors are listed in alphabetical order, and the order of listing does not indicate contribution to this research. We would like to thank Seton Cove, in Austin, Texas, for his help in this research.

JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT INQUIRY, Vol. 9 No. 2, June 2000 134-145
© 2000 Sage Publications, Inc.

to one's groups and finding one's spiritual center in any activity, are finding acceptance (Valente, 1995). Fourth, some have even suggested that as aging baby boomers move closer to life's greatest uncertainty—death—there is a growing interest in contemplating life's meaning (Brandt, 1996; Conger, 1994). Finally, the pressure of global competition has led organizational leaders such as Lawrence Perlman, chief executive officer (CEO) of Minneapolis-based Ceridian Corp., to recognize that employee creativity needs a fuller expression at work. Such expression is difficult when work itself is not meaningful. Perlman, an advocate of spirituality at work, says, "Ultimately, the combination of head and heart will be a competitive advantage" (*Business Week*, p. 82).

Although spirituality is a relatively new idea in the workplace, it is certainly not a new idea elsewhere in human experience. All of the great religious traditions at some level encourage the contemplative life, in which the search for meaning and purpose is primary and the goal of living in harmony with others is fundamental. Thus, the language of the spirituality movement that is appearing in the workplace is grounded in the tradition of religious imagery: accomplishing personal transformation, rediscovering self, beginning a personal journey, having utopian visions, and experiencing renewal. These are familiar images in religious circles but uncommon in classical organization and management theory, such as that articulated by Weber (1947) and Taylor (1947). In their perspectives, managers were viewed as impersonal instruments to achieve material ends, and they were expected to control workers. In the bureaucratic and scientific management models of the workplace, rationality and legality provided the bounds for workplace behavior. "Under this organizational regime, managers and other employees were expected to complete their allotted task without involving their essential self, apparently reflecting the global triumph of rational, scientific consciousness" (Ackers & Preston, 1997, p. 678). The spiritual dimension of human beings—that dimension concerned with finding and expressing meaning and purpose and living in relation to others and to something bigger than oneself—was not yet welcome in the workplace. "Spirituality is an essential part of every one of us, but [it] isn't something companies traditionally have allowed employers to express at work" (Laabs, 1995, p. 61).

The quest for meaning at work has at times expressed itself, for example, in the human relations tradition of management theory, but more visible notions

about corporate spirituality may well shape the organization of the new millennium (Wheatley, 1992; Zohar, 1997). However, spirituality at work, despite religious imagery, is not about religion or conversion, or about getting people to accept a specific belief system. Rather, it is about employees who understand themselves as spiritual beings whose souls need nourishment at work. It is about experiencing a sense of purpose and meaning in their work beyond the kind of meaning found, for example, in the job design literature, which emphasizes finding meaning in the performance of tasks (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). Spirituality is also about people experiencing a sense of connectedness to one another and to their workplace community.

The Inner Life as Spiritual Identity

People often associate spiritual images with figures such as St. Augustine, Thomas Merton, or St. Claire of Assisi, who represented a sense of being removed from the material world. These mystics, as some would call them, lived their lives in contemplation of the inner life, the sacred journey. But spirituality at work is not about being an isolate or a mystic. It is, rather, about finding an opportunity at work to express many aspects of one's being, not merely the ability to perform physical or intellectual tasks. Understanding spirituality at work begins with acknowledging that people have both an inner and an outer life and that the nourishment of the inner life can lead to a more meaningful and productive outer life (Fox, 1994). This is consistent with Vaill's (1998) concern that organizations should pay attention to the "spiritual condition" of their leaders, meaning "the feeling individuals have about the fundamental meaning of who they are, what they are doing, the contributions they are making" (p. 218).

This notion of an inner life where the human soul exists is popular today in secular life, both at work and outside work. Conger (1994) elaborates on the inner life:

Spirituality gives expression to the being that is in us; it has to do with feelings, with the power that comes from within, with knowing our deepest selves and what is sacred to us, with, as Matthew Fox says, "heart-knowledge." (p. 9)

The inner life, for many, is about coming to understand one's own divine power and how to use that di-

vine power to live a more satisfying and more full outer life. As one writer puts it, "We live in and through a complex interaction of spirit and matter, a complex interaction of what is inside of us and what is 'out there' " Palmer, p. 23). Whether the spirit deals with the divine is not the crucial issue. What is crucial, as Vaill (1998) points out, is the recognition that whether people seek the spirit in sacred or secular places, there are dispiriting forces that will eat away at the inner spirit if people are not fully aware of the condition of their inner life.

The recognition of spirituality in the workplace means seeing the workplace as populated by people who have both a mind and a spirit and believing that the development of the spirit is as important as the development of the mind. Such notions are not far-fetched in a secular world where books such as Moore's (1992) *Care of the Soul*, Bolman and Deal's (1995) *Leading With Soul*, and Whyte's (1994) *The Heart Aroused: Poetry and the Preservation of the Soul in Corporate America* are best-sellers. Moreover, the development and expression of the spirit at work may have beneficial consequences for the organization. "More employers are encouraging spirituality in the workplace as a way to boost loyalty and enhance morale" (*USA Today*, May 14, 1998, p. 4b).

Meaning and Purpose in Work

After recognizing a spiritual element in employees, the expression of spirituality at work requires accepting that employees want to be involved in work that gives meaning to their lives. As Judith Neal, publisher of the "Spirit at Work" newsletter says:

People are saying, "that's enough. We're more than just a cost to the organization. We have spirits. We have souls. We have dreams. We want a life that's meaningful. We want to contribute to society. We want to feel good about what we do." (Neal, 1995, quoted in *Personnel Journal*, Sept. 1998, p. 68)

The quest for meaningful work is not new. The human relations movement emphasized job satisfaction and employee happiness, although many might argue that belief in the assumptions of the human relations movement disappeared from the workplace with the downsizing and employee layoffs of the 1980s. Some might question if those values were ever really there in the first place. Terkel (1985), for example, interviewed many workers who told how work had wounded

their spirits. He concluded that work must be "about a search, too, for daily meaning as well as daily bread, for recognition as well as cash, for astonishment rather than torpor; in short, for a sort of life rather than a Monday through Friday sort of dying" (p. xiii).

The importance of meaningful work has been noted in the popular press, but it has also become the focus of well-known theologians, such as Matthew Fox (1994), who argues,

Life and livelihood ought not to be separated but to flow from the same source, which is Spirit, for both life and livelihood are about Spirit. Spirit means life, and both life and livelihood are about living in depth, living with meaning, purpose, joy, and a sense of contributing to the greater community. A spirituality of work is about bringing life and livelihood back together. And Spirit with them. (pp. 1-2)

To understand spirituality and work is to recognize that workers are spiritual beings whose souls are either nurtured or damaged by their work. Novak (1996), in his popular book, *Business as Calling*, suggests that work should not only be meaningful, that it should be a calling. This echoes the writing of Moore (1994) that "all work is a vocation, a calling from a place that is the source of meaning and identity, the roots of which lie beyond human intention and interpretation" (p. 181). Similarly, writer and theologian Frederick Buechner (1992) encourages people to engage in meaningful work by recognizing that "the place God calls you to is the place where your deep gladness and the world's deep hunger meet" (p. 189). The spirituality at work movement is about more meaningful work, about connection between the soul and work, and it is getting the attention of corporate America partly because of the recognition that nourishing the soul at work may be good for business.

A Sense of Connection and Community

Spirituality at work is also about the notion that spiritual beings not only express inner life needs by seeking meaningful work but that part of being alive is living in connection to other human beings. The bureaucratic and scientific management models of organizations recommended specialization, which in turn led to a sense of isolation and alienation among workers (Bolman & Deal, 1995; Wheatley, 1992). But now the workplace is being recognized as its own kind of community. "Work itself is being re-discovered as a source of spiritual growth and connection to others"

(Mirvis, 1997, p. 193). Some have argued that we need to reenvision the workplace, from a view that it resembles a machine with distinct separation among parts into a view that the interconnections among parts of the system (workers) are the most important aspects of the system (Stacey, 1995; Wheatley, 1992).

We are refocusing on the deep longings we have for community, meaning, dignity, and love in our organizational lives. We are beginning to look at the strong emotions that are part of being human, rather than segmenting ourselves (love is for home, discipline is for work) or believing that we can confine workers into narrow roles, as though they were in cogs in the machinery of production. (Wheatley, 1992, p. 12)

Spirituality at work has appeared in part because people want to feel connected to work that is important, and they want to feel connected to each other at work. As Conger (1994) points out, the dissolution of many of our support communities has led to the hunger for spirituality, "not a spirituality confined narrowly to certain institutions or rituals or traditions but a spirituality rooted in relationships and in everyday experiences" (p. 16).

Feeling part of a community is an essential element of spiritual development. Many of the traditional religions, for example, have emphasized what Vaill (1998) refers to as the "fellowship aspect" of spiritual development. Thus, we include community as a component of spirituality at work because we agree with Vaill that "fellowship helps both leaders and members to confront the loneliness, disappointment, and pain of the modern organization and to decide that these conditions should not continue to rot the spirit of the organization and the people in it" (p. 227).

A CONCEPTUALIZATION AND MEASURE OF SPIRITUALITY AT WORK

Although spirituality and work are beginning to be recognized in the popular press, the topic is barely visible in the organizational science literature, and even there it is not necessarily welcomed. Ackers and Preston (1997), for example, question the ethics and efficacy of management development programs that are spiritually based and resemble a religious conversion experience. On the other hand, Mirvis (1997) argues that work is being rediscovered as a source of spiritual growth and connection to others and describes

community-building programs that are occurring in companies.

Regardless of whether academic writers believe spirituality is an appropriate concept in the workplace, no one has offered a definition of it. We define spirituality at work as the recognition that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community. Thus, we see spirituality at work as having three components: the inner life, meaningful work, and community. We want to emphasize that spirituality at work is not about religion, although people may sometimes express their religious beliefs at work. The spirit is nourished in sacred as well as secular places (Vaill, 1998).

This article is intended as a step toward understanding how the recognition of inner life, meaningful work, and community in the workplace contribute to organizational performance. Thus, we can envision some workplaces where spirituality is more observable than others. This may occur because some people are more aware of the inner life than others. For example, people who engage in practices such as meditation, self-reflection, and prayer are more likely not only to be sensitive to the inner life but also concerned about the relationship of the inner life to their work. Also, a workplace where people experience joy and meaning in their work is a place where spirituality is more observable than a place where people do not experience joy and meaning in their work. Finally, a workplace in which people see themselves as part of a trusting community, where they experience personal growth as a part of their work community, where they feel valued and supported, would be a workplace in which spirituality thrives.

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Based on our conceptualization of spirituality at work, we developed an instrument that would enable us to observe and measure the construct. The instrument was created based on a review of the literature, which led to the development of several dimensions of spirituality that could be broadly construed as contributing to inner life, meaningful work, and community. A list of potential items was generated, and the list was subjected to review by a panel consisting of academics, an organization development specialist, a former chief executive of a large hospital, and several

Table 1
Description of the Sample

Gender		Average age
181	Male	43.2 years (10.02)
515	Female	
Education		Average number of years in organization
140	High school	7.90 years (7.46)
90	Associate's degree	
209	College degree	Average number of years in position
218	Grad/professional degree	5.05 years (5.79)

Note: Because of missing data, not all categories add up to 696.

members of the local business community. This panel review, which satisfies concerns of face validity, agreed on the items reviewed in this article. The items reviewed here are grouped in three parts to address three levels of analysis. Part 1 addresses issues of spirituality and work as they are described by individuals. That is, in Part 1, informants are describing their own experience. In Part 2, informants are describing their observations of their work unit, and in Part 3, they are describing their observations of their work organization. The instrument development reported here focuses on factor analyses of the questionnaire items and should be seen as an early phase of the measure's development. Content validity and construct validity are issues that must continue to be addressed systematically over time.

PROCEDURE AND SAMPLE

The questionnaire was administered in four hospital systems in four different cities (one in the Midwest, one in the mid-South, and two in the Southwest) as part of a longitudinal study of meaning in the workplace. This article reports data obtained from 696 informants in an initial survey. The informants filled out questionnaire surveys that assessed demographic data and used a 7-point Likert-type scale to assess reactions to the items listed in the appendix. The 7-point scale ranged from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*.

Demographic data for the entire sample are presented in Table 1. The data in Table 1 show that informants are, on average, 43.2 years of age ($SD = 10.02$), have worked in their current organization for 7.9 years ($SD = 7.46$), and have held their current job for 5.05 years ($SD = 5.79$). A majority of the informants are fe-

male (74%), and the informants tend to be well educated (64% for whom data are available have at least a bachelor's degree, and 33% hold a graduate or professional degree).

ANALYSIS

The survey addressed informants' attitudes about three different circumstances. Part 1 (Questions 1 through 34) addressed informants' attitudes about themselves and their immediate work environment. Part 2 (Questions 35 through 50) addressed informants' attitudes about how their work unit functions, and Part 3 (Questions 51 through 66) addressed informants' attitudes about their work organization as a whole. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the items in Part 1. Table 3 presents item means and standard deviations for Part 2, and Table 4 presents item means and standard deviations for Part 3 of the questionnaire. Table 5 presents the inter-item correlation matrix for Part 1, Table 6 presents the inter-item correlation matrix for Part 2, and Table 7 presents the inter-item correlation matrix for Part 3.

These data were subjected to factor analyses using the maximum likelihood extraction method with a varimax rotation. Table 8, which presents the results of the factor analysis for Part 1, shows that seven factors achieved eigenvalues of at least 1.0 and that these seven factors accounted for 58.6% of the variance. Table 9, which presents the results of the factor analysis for Part 2, shows that two factors achieved eigenvalues of at least 1.0 and that these two factors accounted for 60.1% of the variance. Table 10, which presents the results of the factor analysis for Part 3, shows that two factors achieved eigenvalues of at least 1.0 and that these two factors accounted for 60.8% of the variance.

Table 8 shows that only three items from Part 1 load at .400 or higher on more than one factor, thus suggesting a fairly straightforward factor structure. Table 9 shows that four items from Part 2 load at .400 or higher on both factors, and Table 10 shows that eight items from Part 3 load at .400 or higher on both factors.

The appendix reports the items grouped together to reflect the factor structures reported in Tables 8, 9, and 10. Cronbach alphas are reported for the factors that seem viable as scales, and these alphas range from .69 to .93, which are acceptable levels of reliability.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Items Addressing Individuals

Question ^a	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
1	2.00	7.00	5.6405	1.0981
2	1.00	7.00	5.2864	1.0481
3	1.00	7.00	5.3499	1.0461
4	1.00	7.00	2.3931	1.7723
5	1.00	7.00	5.2095	1.2347
6	1.00	7.00	5.5889	1.2615
7	1.00	7.00	2.6990	1.7518
8	1.00	7.00	5.6939	1.1896
9	1.00	7.00	5.3982	1.3157
10	2.00	7.00	5.7230	1.1185
11	1.00	7.00	5.6942	1.0788
12	1.00	7.00	5.3082	1.5533
13	1.00	7.00	5.7714	1.1897
14	1.00	7.00	5.7946	1.0197
15	1.00	7.00	6.3328	.8278
16	1.00	7.00	6.6007	.7114
17	1.00	7.00	4.7356	1.4980
18	1.00	7.00	5.7311	1.0901
19	1.00	7.00	5.0556	1.4757
20	1.00	7.00	5.2822	1.5306
21	1.00	7.00	4.5467	1.7287
22	1.00	7.00	5.3504	1.4199
23	1.00	7.00	6.1571	1.1375
24	2.00	7.00	6.2096	.9677
25	1.00	7.00	6.0673	1.0816
26	1.00	7.00	1.9941	1.5038
27	1.00	7.00	5.7140	1.4774
28	1.00	7.00	5.8031	1.1520
29	1.00	7.00	2.5643	1.7034
30	1.00	7.00	2.0804	1.5575
31	1.00	7.00	4.5650	1.8075
32	1.00	7.00	5.6630	1.3063
33	1.00	7.00	5.6713	1.4840
34	1.00	7.00	2.8859	1.7786

a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this article was to offer a conceptualization and definition of spirituality at work and present empirical support for a measure of it. Based on our review of the literature, we arrived at the following definition of spirituality at work: recognition of an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community. After generating a list of questionnaire items addressing individual, work unit, and organizational levels of interest, factor analyses were used to examine the data. The analyses show the items addressing the individual produce the cleanest factor structure, whereas some of the items addressing the work unit load on both factors, and several of the items addressing the organization load on both factors.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Items Addressing the Work Unit

Question ^a	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
35	1.00	7.00	4.5540	1.5584
36	1.00	7.00	5.2681	1.3937
37	1.00	7.00	2.8368	1.6861
38	1.00	7.00	5.3577	1.3141
39	1.00	7.00	2.1681	1.5761
40	1.00	7.00	5.0304	1.4011
41	1.00	7.00	5.0052	1.5432
42	1.00	7.00	5.3419	1.3282
43	1.00	7.00	5.1590	1.4640
44	1.00	7.00	5.3444	1.4611
45	1.00	7.00	5.4828	1.3143
46	1.00	7.00	5.5886	1.2629
47	1.00	7.00	5.5324	1.3928
48	1.00	7.00	5.6659	1.2460
49	1.00	7.00	5.2965	1.5538
50	1.00	7.00	2.2788	1.5692

a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics for Items Addressing the Organization

Question ^a	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
51	1.00	7.00	4.7978	1.4804
52	1.00	7.00	5.0843	1.4338
53	1.00	7.00	2.5547	1.6608
54	1.00	7.00	5.1725	1.3441
55	1.00	7.00	2.6517	1.7060
56	1.00	7.00	5.2187	1.3547
57	1.00	7.00	4.7485	1.5397
58	1.00	7.00	5.6821	1.2908
59	1.00	7.00	5.8560	1.3266
60	1.00	7.00	5.0420	1.5593
61	1.00	7.00	5.2671	1.4618
62	1.00	7.00	5.4098	1.3679
63	1.00	7.00	5.2768	1.4954
64	1.00	7.00	5.6762	1.2761
65	1.00	7.00	5.1907	1.5285
66	1.00	7.00	2.3910	1.4948

a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

Individual Level

As noted above, the appendix presents the items grouped by factor. The factors for Part 1 (the individual) are consistent with our expectations. We call the first three factors Conditions for Community, Meaning at Work, and Inner Life. Conditions for Community includes items that assess the extent to which necessary elements or enabling conditions for community are present. Thus, a community is a place in which people can experience personal growth, be

Table 5
Intercorrelation Matrix for Items Addressing Individuals

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	
2	54	—																																	
3	43	57	—																																
4	-27	-15	-18	—																															
5	60	40	39	-16	—																														
6	42	30	32	-20	38	—																													
7	-23	-13	-15	33	-20	-26	—																												
8	49	35	34	-27	45	37	-18	—																											
9	64	37	35	-29	53	46	-28	43	—																										
10	42	37	42	-23	41	40	-21	54	48	—																									
11	38	43	46	-19	34	42	-18	35	43	46	—																								
12	32	21	24	-19	25	37	-25	31	36	31	34	—																							
13	42	29	32	-21	36	43	-23	41	43	41	44	51	—																						
14	46	38	36	-26	47	38	-20	46	47	46	47	32	52	—																					
15	28	17	17	-19	23	26	-16	30	27	29	30	21	39	42	—																				
16	26	23	30	32	20	30	36	23	16	17	-20	15	24	-19	64	—																			
17	32	26	22	-11	27	37	-12	30	36	27	29	52	38	30	16	11	—																		
18	18	17	20	-06	20	27	-14	24	29	20	27	30	28	29	27	20	42	—																	
19	33	30	27	-15	30	46	-20	26	42	35	35	48	39	36	24	17	50	44	—																
20	30	22	21	-20	19	38	-21	24	32	27	27	61	36	26	18	24	42	32	50	—															
21	16	04	08	-12	10	19	-19	11	15	17	14	35	31	18	13	15	25	14	27	41	—														
22	40	29	28	-20	38	45	-33	30	45	33	36	57	45	41	28	23	51	36	56	59	39	—													
23	27	26	16	-21	21	23	-18	24	29	18	28	14	23	32	32	29	11	21	25	16	13	22	—												
24	26	26	17	-16	24	24	-10	27	25	27	29	11	27	34	29	27	14	26	22	16	15	18	48	—											
25	22	27	13	-13	21	18	-08	24	22	24	26	12	26	31	24	20	12	21	13	15	06	15	36	71	—										
26	-17	-05	-02	37	-06	-15	34	-17	-18	-16	-12	-12	-16	-17	-14	-16	-09	-13	-14	-19	-08	-16	-20	-28	-25	—									
27	18	26	13	-06	20	11	-03	19	19	15	23	09	17	20	17	14	15	18	12	06	-06	11	15	50	61	-16	—								
28	17	23	18	-12	21	21	-11	26	23	25	26	18	25	32	21	19	18	19	18	17	03	20	23	52	56	-23	55	—							
29	-15	-16	-16	35	-12	-22	27	-25	-21	-24	-18	-20	-22	-19	-14	-17	-15	-16	-26	-23	-14	-24	-18	-16	-08	41	-04	-20	—						
30	-07	-06	-05	33	02	-05	18	-10	-10	-11	-17	-04	-10	-18	-17	-23	02	-11	03	-04	00	-04	00	-27	-21	-14	32	-05	-10	24	—				
31	14	21	15	-08	22	13	-01	11	16	18	18	12	23	28	18	10	15	16	19	09	04	15	16	37	42	-13	47	41	-11	05	—				
32	17	20	14	-16	22	15	-05	20	19	20	19	12	28	33	33	24	18	18	10	03	19	24	36	38	-14	35	37	-09	-16	55	—				
33	-16	-11	-03	00	-16	-04	-03	-05	-22	-02	-03	-12	03	-04	07	08	-13	-11	-19	-14	09	-20	-01	05	11	-04	-05	00	05	02	-07	03	—		
34	-25	-15	-13	31	-18	-32	35	-22	-33	-28	-26	-35	-30	-21	-16	-19	-29	-18	-38	-39	-19	-47	-25	-17	-12	33	-06	-16	45	25	-12	-15	20	—	

Note: Decimal points are omitted. Correlations $\geq .07$ are significant at least at .05 level.

a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

Table 6
Intercorrelation Matrix for Items Addressing the Work Unit

Question ^a	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
36	61	—													
37	-26	-37	—												
38	47	55	-29	—											
39	-19	-29	30	-25	—										
40	57	55	-31	51	-21	—									
41	44	47	-22	40	-12	49	—								
42	61	61	-41	55	-21	66	61	—							
43	42	39	-30	34	-20	43	32	50	—						
44	56	55	-37	56	-29	58	57	71	51	—					
45	57	62	-41	52	-25	58	51	71	55	80	—				
46	55	60	-40	55	-29	59	46	67	49	68	69	—			
47	57	51	-34	49	-25	57	58	66	44	71	65	67	—		
48	51	55	-36	47	-33	55	44	63	49	58	65	77	67	—	
49	48	54	-32	46	-25	50	46	61	33	56	54	59	55	59	—
50	-32	-40	38	-48	43	-34	-27	-42	-24	-44	-46	-47	-40	-45	-45

Note: Decimal points are omitted. Correlations $\geq .07$ are significant at least at .05 level.

a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

Table 7
Intercorrelation Matrix for Items Addressing the Organization

Question ^a	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65
52	64	—													
53	-20	-27	—												
54	60	64	-20	—											
55	-31	-38	40	-31	—										
56	61	57	-28	60	-33	—									
57	56	51	-08	50	-22	52	—								
58	55	58	-41	51	-35	59	52	—							
59	49	45	-35	37	-30	55	34	66	—						
60	64	61	-28	60	-32	59	67	67	58	—					
61	63	58	-31	55	-32	56	59	70	61	85	—				
62	61	63	-37	57	-34	58	53	73	58	74	77	—			
63	59	55	-24	62	-31	56	61	61	48	77	73	70	—		
64	57	57	-38	51	-37	56	52	74	63	67	70	77	68	—	
65	52	58	-22	53	-33	49	55	58	42	62	57	61	57	62	—
66	-39	-45	40	-54	41	-48	-36	-45	-33	-46	-45	-49	-46	-43	-43

Note: Decimal points are omitted. Correlations $\geq .07$ are significant at least at .05 level.

a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

valued for themselves as individuals, and have a sense of working together. This dimension represents the fellowship dimension of spiritual development described by Vaill (1998). Meaning at Work includes items that capture a sense of what is important, energizing, and joyful about work. That is, it taps into work-related dimensions of human experience that are neither physical nor intellectual but spiritual. Inner Life is composed of items that capture an individual's hopefulness, awareness of personal values, and concern for spirituality. Note that these items, although self-report, do not solely address attitudes about an inner life. Rather, they report behaviors that might plausibly express an inner life.

Although we found the three factors we expected to find in the data, we also found four additional factors, all of which support and complement our conceptualization. The appendix shows, for example, that Factor 4 seems to capture Blocks to Spirituality, that is, conditions that would inhibit the development of spirituality in the workplace. Factor 4 can be seen as an inverse of the first three factors. Factors 5 (Personal Responsibility) and 6 (Positive Connections With Other Individuals) can plausibly be seen to capture aspects of community that enrich the concept. Factor 7 (Contemplation) captures additional behaviors associated with expressing an inner life. All in all, we believe the data support the idea that spirituality in the work-

Table 8
Rotated Factor Matrix for Items Addressing Individuals

Question ^a	Factor						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	201	737	109	144		170	
2		417	196			564	
3	127	364				674	
4		-274		-508			
5	143	678	121			128	118
6	405	415		150	146	160	
7	-197	-224		-436			
8	188	545	136	169	115	162	
9	272	671	120	187			
10	235	478	105	240	124	269	
11	244	361	172	131	187	434	
12	744	210		104			
13	471	399	110	132	221	112	172
14	215	506	173	144	279	165	181
15	135	215	125	104	763		170
16	141	147	121	160	629	102	
17	604	211				101	109
18	409		184		241	101	
19	598	183		109		166	
20	706	103		190			
21	506			133			
22	662	280		183	101		
23		200	430	195	295		-112
24	110	132	794	158	198		
25		138	868				139
26	-113		-207	-580			
27			636				327
28	112	124	573	113		115	297
29	-233			-530		-141	
30			-112	-422	-215		
31			375				666
32		123	322		221		578
33	-129	-122			150		
34	-427	-154		-465			
Eigenvalue	9.34	3.03	1.99	1.82	1.49	1.15	1.07
Percentage of variance	27.48	8.92	5.86	5.37	4.40	3.38	3.14

Note: Only factor loadings of .100 or higher are reported. Factor loadings greater than .400 are in bold. Decimal points are omitted.
a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

place involves inner life, community, and meaningful work.

Work Unit Level

The factors from Parts 2 (work unit) and 3 (organization) produce factors complementary to the notions of Community, Meaning at Work, and Inner Life. Factor 1 in Part 2 relies on items that describe informants' sense of their work unit as a community, that is, the extent to which the work unit is encouraging and caring. Factor 2 in Part 2 (Positive Work Unit Values) describes the extent to which informants identify with

Table 9
Rotated Factor Matrix for Items Addressing the Work Unit

Question ^a	Factor	
	1	2
35	616	338
36	631	369
37	-393	-238
38	588	311
39	-273	-239
40	621	374
41	594	269
42	743	414
43	466	371
44	801	343
45	737	431
46	577	622
47	623	507
48	355	934
49	536	450
50	-474	-298
Eigenvalue	8.48	1.15
Percentage of variance	52.9	7.17

Note: Only factor loadings of .100 or higher are reported. Factor loadings greater than .400 are in bold. Decimal points are omitted.
a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

Table 10
Rotated Factor Matrix for Items Addressing the Organization

Question ^a	Factor	
	1	2
51	500	562
52	404	696
53	-202	-334
54	387	667
55	-185	-443
56	428	615
57	571	395
58	605	517
59	532	374
60	839	384
61	854	338
62	689	513
63	706	423
64	381	303
65	483	511
66	-301	-579
Eigenvalue	8.47	1.26
Percentage of variance	52.9	7.85

Note: Only factor loadings of .100 or higher are reported. Factor loadings greater than .400 are in bold. Decimal points are omitted.
a. Text of questions may be found in the appendix.

the work unit's values, goals, and mission. These two factors seem to us to capture notions of community and meaningful work. But the data addressing the work unit level are not as compelling as the data addressing the individual level data. There are several

reasons why this might be the case. It is conceptually easier to answer questions about oneself than to project and characterize the attitudes of others, particularly in the collective sense implied by the concept of a work unit. Therefore, informants' responses for the work unit may not be as precise as the responses about themselves. It is also possible that the notion of a spiritual work unit is too abstract and, therefore, difficult to comprehend. We tried to translate the spirituality factors into a work unit context, and it is possible that something was lost in the translation. In any event, the work unit items are not as promising as the items addressing individuals.

Organizational Level

Factor 1 in Part 3 (Organization Values) captures informants' perception of and attitudes about the values of their organization. Factor 2 (Individual and the Organization) seems to capture an evaluation of the individual in relation to his or her organization. There is, however, a great deal of overlap in the factors. We must conclude that the organization level items are disappointing as measures. Like the work unit-level items, the organization-level items ask informants to describe their relationship with an abstraction (the organization), and this is a considerably more subtle task than asking informants to describe themselves in relation to other people and events in their daily work life. Again, it seems that the idea of spirituality in the workplace was more difficult to capture and assess as the focus of the questionnaire items moved away from the individual toward increasingly abstract conceptualizations.

CONCLUSIONS

Our long-term goal is to understand how spirituality can contribute to more productive work organizations. Although this article does not address performance issues, it is an attempt to identify the construct of spirituality at work by identifying the dimensions of that construct. Clearly, more work needs to be done in regard to convergent and discriminant validity issues. We feel, however, that presentation of a conceptualization and preliminary empirical evidence of the construct is a way to initiate a scholarly conversation about spirituality in the workplace.

Developing a conceptualization and measure of spirituality at work is important so that organizational scientists can begin understanding and observing this workplace phenomenon. Mirvis (1997) suggests that this "soulful" transformation that many companies are experiencing has promise for organizations. There are "many different ways in which community and spirituality are making their way into organizational life and have something to offer, to both practice and theory" (Mirvis, 1997, p. 198). If we are to know, however, whether there really is a promise here and to examine what the practice and theory have to offer, as scientists we must be able to observe it. In this article, we have taken steps toward being able to do that with the conceptualization and measures we offer. Our hope is that these items will be a stepping stone to a fuller and more important understanding of what spirituality at work is all about.

APPENDIX Questionnaire Items

Factor 1, Part 1: Conditions for Community $\alpha = .859$

6. I feel part of a community in my immediate workplace (department, unit, etc.).
12. My supervisor encourages my personal growth.
13. I have had numerous experiences in my job which have resulted in personal growth.
17. When I have fears, I am encouraged to discuss them.
18. When I have a concern, I represent it to the appropriate person.
19. At work, we work together to resolve conflict in a positive way.
20. I am evaluated fairly here.
21. I am encouraged to take risks at work.
22. I am valued at work for who I am.

Factor 2, Part 1: Meaning at Work $\alpha = .858$

1. I experience joy in my work.
2. I believe others experience joy as a result of my work.
5. My spirit is energized by my work.
8. The work I do is connected to what I think is important in life.
9. I look forward to coming to work most days.
10. I see a connection between my work and the larger social good of my community.
14. I understand what gives my work personal meaning.

Factor 3, Part 1: Inner Life $\alpha = .804$

23. I feel hopeful about life.
24. My spiritual values influence the choices I make.
25. I consider myself a spiritual person.
27. Prayer is an important part of my life.
28. I care about the spiritual health of my coworkers.

Factor 4, Part 1: Blocks to Spirituality $\alpha = .736$

- 4. My work does not give meaning to my life.
- 7. I am not able to use my gifts and talents at my work.
- 26. There is no room for spirituality in the workplace.
- 29. Spiritual values are not considered important in my workplace.
- 30. I am not aware of what is truly meaningful to me.
- 34. Who I am as a human being is not valued in the workplace.

Factor 5, Part 1: Personal Responsibility $\alpha = .772$

- 15. I feel responsible for my own growth.
- 16. I feel personally responsible for my behavior.

Factor 6, Part 1: Positive Connections With Other Individuals $\alpha = .737$

- 2. I believe others experience joy as a result of my work.
- 3. My work creates meaningful work experiences for others.
- 11. I make a difference to the people with whom I work.

Factor 7, Part 1: Contemplation $\alpha = .689$

- 31. Meditation is an important part of my life.
- 32. Personal reflection is an important part of my life.

Factor 1, Part 2: Work Unit Community $\alpha = .871$

- 35. My immediate work unit cares about whether my spirit is energized by my work.
- 36. My immediate work unit makes it easy for me to use my gifts and talents at work.
- 38. My immediate work unit encourages employees to develop new skills and abilities.
- 40. My immediate work unit encourages the creation of community.
- 41. My immediate work unit takes into account the responsibilities I have to my family.
- 43. My immediate work unit is concerned about the poor in our community.
- 44. My immediate work unit cares about all its employees.
- 50. In my immediate work unit, people are not encouraged to learn and grow. (reversed)

Factor 2, Part 2: Positive Work Unit Values $\alpha = .914$

- 42. I feel positive about the values of my immediate work unit.
- 45. My immediate work unit has a conscience.
- 46. I feel connected with my immediate work unit's goals.
- 47. My immediate work unit is concerned.
- 48. I feel connected with the mission of my immediate work unit.
- 49. I feel positive about my future with my immediate work unit.

Factor 1, Part 3: Organization Values $\alpha = .929$

- 51. The organization I work for cares about whether my spirit is energized by my work.
- 58. I feel positive about the values of this organization.
- 59. This organization is concerned about the poor in our community.
- 60. This organization cares about all its employees.
- 61. This organization has a conscience.

- 62. I feel connected with this organization's goals.

- 63. This organization is concerned about the health of those who work here.

Factor 2, Part 3: Individual and the Organization $\alpha = .837$

- 52. The organization I work for makes it easy for me to use my gifts and talents at work.
- 54. This organization encourages employees to develop new skills and abilities.
- 55. I do not have a significant role to play in this organization. (reversed)
- 56. This organization encourages the creation of community.
- 65. I feel positive about my future with this organization.
- 66. In this organization, people are not encouraged to learn and grow. (reversed)

REFERENCES

- Ackers, P., & Preston, D. (1997). Born again? The ethics and efficacy of the conversion experience in contemporary management development. *Journal of Management Studies*, 5(34), 677-697.
- Armour, S. (1998). Employers hope spirituality lifts workers' morale. *USA Today*, May 14, p. 4.
- Beyer, J. (1999). *Culture, meaning, and belonging at work*. Paper presented at the 1999 Chicago Academy of Management meeting.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1995). *Leading with soul*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brandt, E. (1996, April). Corporate pioneers explore spirituality peace. *HR Magazine*, pp. 82-87.
- Buechner, F. (1992). *Listening to your life* (G. O'Connor, Ed.). San Francisco: Harper.
- Cohen, A. (1997, August). The guiding light. *Sales and Marketing Management*, pp. 46-54.
- Conger, J. A. (1994). *Spirit at work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fox, M. (1994). *The reinvention of work*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Galen, M., & West, K. (1995, June). Companies Hit the Road Less Traveled. *Business Week*, pp. 82-84.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975, April). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, pp. 159-170.
- Laabs, J. J. (1995, September). Balancing spirituality and work. *Personnel Journal*, pp. 60-76.
- Lancaster, H. (1995, April). Managing Your Career. *Wall Street Journal*, pg. B1.
- Lean and Meaningful: A New Culture for Corporate America. (1998, Aug.) *HR Magazine*, pg. 117.
- Mirvis, P. H. (1997). "Soul work" in organizations. *Organization Science*, 8(2), 193-206.
- Moore, T. (1992). *Care of the soul*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Novak, M. (1996). *Business as calling*. New York: Free Press.
- Palmer, P. P. (1994). *Leading From Within*. In Conger, J. (Ed.). *Spirit at Work*, pg. 19-40. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Stacey, R. D. (1992). *Managing the Unknowable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

- Taylor, F. W. (1947). *Scientific management*. New York: Harper.
- Terkel, S. (1995). *Working*. New York: Ballantine.
- Vaill, P. (1998). *Spirited leading and learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization* (A. M. Henderson & Talcott Parsons, Eds., Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1992). *Leadership and the new science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Whyte, D. (1994). *The heart aroused: Poetry and the preservation of the soul in corporate America*. New York: Doubleday.
- Zohar, D. (1997). *Rewiring the corporate brain*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.