A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH FOR THE STUDY OF WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY

Adriana-Mercedes Cuéllar-Juárez[1*], José-de-Jesús Cuéllar-Juárez[2], Joel Molina-Reyes[3]

[*1]*Universidad Popular Autónoma Del Estado de Puebla, 17 sur 901, Barrio Santiago, 72410, Puebla, México.*
[2]*Universidad Popular Autónoma Del Estado de Puebla, 17 sur 901, Barrio Santiago, 72410, Puebla, México.*
cuellarjesus75@gmail.com (+52 222)7561717
[3]*Instituto Nacional de Astrofísica, Óptica y Electrónica, Luis Enrique Erro 1, Tonantzintla, 72840, Puebla, México.*
jmolina@inaoep.mx (+52 222) 2663100

Corresponding Author:-
Email:-amcuellarj@gmail.com . Mobile Noumber :-(+52 222)4511583

Abstract:-
Though several measuring instruments for workplace spirituality have been developed to understand its effect within organizations, there is a need to develop multidimensional instruments that could show a comprehensive reality of workplace spirituality. However, there is no literature analysis identifying the ways of measuring spirituality within measuring instruments, making difficult their identification and consideration for the development of comprehensive measuring instruments. This work qualitatively analyzes concepts and measuring instruments of spirituality, religiosity, and faith to identify frequently used scale categories, and to ease future integral multidimensional research by the use of a multidimensional conceptual model. We also analyzed the disclosed scale categories within measuring instruments to find science gaps. We identified four measuring kinds in which spirituality and religiosity are studied. Also, we found that the analyzed instruments measure spirituality, religiosity, and faith partially, according to the found scale categories. This article suggests a basis to comprehensively develop future studies.

Key Words: - *Workplace spirituality, competitiveness, religiosity.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Employing adequate strategies to keep a company's staff in optimum conditions is found to represent an impact on organizational competitiveness (Carmona, Céspedes-Lorente, and Martinez-del-Rio, 2012), and reflected on organizational financial affairs (Arnold, 2010; Raelin, 2004; McLaughlin, 1998). "High performance HR practices are positively related to employee outcomes" (Mostafa and Gould-Williams, 2014: 276). The facilitation of spirituality and religiosity in the workplace may be considered a strategy since it optimizes staff performance and boost competitiveness (Vallabh and Singhal, 2014). In this sense, spiritual organizations achieve competitive advantage over other organizations by being aware of their responsibilities towards stakeholders and environment, thus having satisfied and happy employees (Gupta, Kumar, and Singh, 2014) and becoming successful organizations (Dhiman and Marques, 2011). Since differentiation positioning strategy and cost leadership sets an organization in a competitive position (Porter, 2008), spirituality may positively impact on organizational competitiveness since spiritual facilitation positively influences organizational differentiation (Loureiro, Reijnders, and Dias-Sardinha, 2012) as well.

Spirituality has taken a very important role in organizational affairs. Some authors supports that the spiritual company has one of the best return rates (6% in the Miliman SWA case, an airline that promotes human capital with a strong sense of meaning and purpose in the workplace) (Arnold, 2010). Organizations considering employees' spirituality are "56% more likely to have a higher loyalty percentage of consumer [and are] 27% more likely to report higher profitability" (Raelin, 2004: 2). By the way, 39% of organizational variance performance is related to personnel (McLaughlin, 1998). Several studies aim to understand the effects caused by the facilitation of spirituality and religiosity within the workplace and the organization. Studies contrast spirituality, religiosity or faith instruments with organizational ones to measure issues such as performance (Osman-Gani et al. 2013; Fachrunnisa, Adhiatma, and Mutaminah, 2014), organizational commitment (Rego and Pina, 2008), employee's health and stress management (Kumar and Kumar, 2014), among others. Because of their effects, some authors stress the need to measure the impact of spirituality and religiosity in the company (Miller and Ewest, 2013; Khasawneh, 2011; Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007) and to do it in a multidimensional and holistic way (Miller and Ewest, 2013). The identification of dimensions so as other measuring ways, to contribute to the development of integral measurement instruments, is needed to develop multidimensional and holistic measuring instruments. Through literature, it is hard to find a classification of measuring ways through measuring instruments of spirituality and religiosity because of their scarce research on business issues. Moreover, literature on faith, spirituality and religiosity in the workplace is still in its infancy (Gotsis and Kortezi, 2008; Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007; Sheep, 2006). Although there is a conscience about the benefits that faith could bring to an organization, an effort that explicitly shows the ways in which this personal internal need (Sheldrake, 2007; King and Crowther, 2004) could be measured, to support multidimensional studies, is not explicitly found in literature. A study that may explicitly identify dimensions and other scale categories to consider in more complete representations of reality, could enable to researchers an easier decision about concepts and scale categories to consider in their instruments design for comprehensive spiritual measurement in workplace. An analysis of the consideration of concepts and scale categories considered by frequently used measuring instruments could expose multi-dimensionality measured on those measuring instruments, enabling the finding of some gaps in research. Additionally, when talking about spirituality, religiosity is frequently mentioned. So, to identify the ways of measuring faith could enable a more comprehensive study of this transcendental aspect of employees. Therefore, this work has three main objectives. First, to analyze the concepts of spirituality, religiosity and faith, to understand and to suggest the more complete conceptualization of spirituality in the workplace. Second, to identify the measuring scale categories so that future research could have a reference when designing a comprehensive measuring instrument or study. Third, to identify the scale categories disclosed from literature within measuring instruments, exposing the consideration of these scale categories to identify gaps on research.

This paper is comprises five sections. In a second section, a conceptualization of spirituality, religiosity and faith is provided. In a third section, we show the scale categories frequently found on literature. In a fourth section, an analysis of measuring scale categories into measuring instruments of spirituality, religiosity and faith is done to understand their measuring scheme and to find some gaps in research. Discussion and conclusions are provided in a fifth section.

II. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF WORKPLACE SPIRITUALITY, RELIGIOSITY AND FAITH
Conceptualization of spirituality

There is not a common definition of spirituality in the workplace, but we summarize some definitions on Table 1 for its better understanding. There are some similarities among definitions of spirituality such as

Table 1. Definitions of spirituality in the context of the workplace and beyond.

Author	
Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004: 129)	define workplace spirituality as "a framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promote employees' experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy".
Duchon and Plowman (2005:1)	Define workplace spirituality as "the recognition that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community".
Anderson (2000: 16)	Defines spirituality as "the vital principle of animating force traditionally believed to be within living beings, one's essential nature".
Ayoun, Rowe, and Yassine (2015)	Define spirituality as the experience of transcendence, and the possibility of reaching a deeper sense of life.
Kim, Huh, and Chae (2015)	Mention that spirituality is related to meaning, purpose in life, and connection with a sacred or transcendental reality.
Klerk (2005)	Explains spirituality as something that transcends the material providing energy and wisdom. This author states that spirituality deals with the balance, altruism, sacredness, meaning in life, connectedness to the universe, and awareness of something or someone greater than oneself (e.g. God, or an energy force).
Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis (2004: 63)	define spirituality as the "holistic process of positive transformation through the experience of pure spirituality" resulting a growth in all aspects of the individual's personality because of the spiritual practice. state that spirituality must deal with:
Anderson and Grice (2014: 4)	[...] ultimate questions or the things that make us aware of, and connected to, an intangible reality (e.g. Divinity, Truth, mindfulness). This means that spirituality is focused on an experiential knowledge, beyond what can be discerned solely by our physical senses (e.g. Touching, tasting, smelling, hearing, seeing), with an intangible reality. For instance, one could become aware of this intangible reality by experiencing an infusion of inner peace and yet not being able to physically touch, taste, feel, see or hear any evidence of the experience other than the resulting peace
Badrinarayanan and Madhavaram (2008)	Emphasize the difference between spirituality and religiosity. For them, spirituality is an inner desire for meaning and community that is not dependent on, nor preached by, any form of religion; it represents beliefs and values; It is inclusive, universally applicable, leading to interconnectivity
Cash and Gray (2000)	sustain that while religion goes through rites and rituals, spirituality goes inward to an understanding of universal values

the seeking of transcendence(Jurkiewicz and Giacalone, 2004; Kim, Huh, and Chae, 2015; Ayoun, Rowe, and Yassine, 2015; Klerk, 2005), the feeling of awareness of a higher power greater than oneself (Anderson and Grice, 2014; Miller and Ewest, 2013; Klerk, 2005), the search for a life meaning (Duchon and Plowman, 2005; Kim, Huh, and Chae, 2015) and the presence of some spiritual effects, such as values (Badrinarayanan and Madhavaram, 2008; Cash and Gray, 2000), that have an impact in all aspects of life. According to these authors' perspectives, spirituality is the inner cognition of the existence of a power greater than oneself, or divinity, which makes a person restless for the search of transcendence, and searching to fill this necessity, that leads persons to perform actions, frequently arriving to a state of inner peace, fullness and happiness.

Spirituality in the workplace is the organizational conscience of spirituality as a worker's need, therefore considering it in order to benefit employees to the same time that this facilitation positively impacts organizations. The facilitation of spirituality in the workplace enables the development of personal spiritual effects (e.g. values, fraud prevention, stress reduction, tolerance to adversity) that could be reflected in ethical behavior, decision making and into organizational culture, allowing the personal search of meaning and transcendence within workplace.

When studying spirituality, the concept of religiosity is frequently found in the literature. Therefore, it is relevant to analyze this concept in order to find if there's a relationship between religiosity and spirituality and the best way to consider their study.

Conceptualization of religiosity
To understand the relationship between spirituality and religiosity, the term religiosity is analyzed according to definitions given by several authors, summarized on Table 2.

Though there are authors that sustains the recommendation of a study of religiosity separated from the concept of spirituality (Badrinarayanan and Madhavaram, 2008; Valasek, 2009; Fry, 2003), there are several other authors that mention, implicitly or explicitly, the spiritual concept into their religious definitions. Cohen et al. (2012), Peterson and Seligman (2004), so as Koenig et al. (2000), in their definition of religiosity, mention the presence of a transcendental sense of spirituality and the search for a closeness to a higher power. This transcendental restlessness is an essential component in the definitions of spirituality given by Ayoun, Rowe, and Yassine (2015), Kim, Huh, and Chae (2015), Klerk (2005), Klerk (2005) and Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004) (see Table 1). Moreover, several authors mention the awareness of divinity, superior or supernatural power in their definitions of religiosity (i.e. Cohen et al. 2012; Koenig et

al. 2000; Valasek, 2009) as the reason why religiosity is performed. Cohen et al. (2012) and Luquis, Brelsford, and Rojas-Guyler (2012) explicitly mention the spiritual presence into the concept of religiosity. Anderson and Grice (2014) explain religiosity as the standard of spirituality, existing several standards or religious denominations. Miller and Ewest (2013: 2015), as well as Anderson and Grice (2014), find that spirituality complements religiosity, being religiosity a facilitator of spirituality. These approaches and definitions suggest that spirituality and religiosity are related.

Peterson and Seligman (2004: 802) states that spirituality comes from the conviction of the transcendent dimension of life, coming from a supernatural power to which individuals must respond [performing] ritual acts carried out in respect of that power". These performed acts lead the individual to a state of closeness

Table 2. Definitions of religiosity.

Author	Definition
Koenig et al. (2000: 18)	define religiosity as "an organized system of beliefs, practices, rituals and symbols designed […] to facilitate closeness to the sacred or transcendent (God, higher power, or ultimate truth/ reality) […]".
Miller and Ewest (2013: 36)	define religion as a "set of moral beliefs and perceptions shared by a group of people to explain and understanding of human existence within this universe".
Peterson and Seligman (2004: 600)	affirm that religiosity includes ''beliefs and practices that are grounded in the conviction that there is a transcendent (nonphysical) dimension of life''.
Cohen et al (2012: 802)	define the concept from Latin: "relegare" which means "to bind together", they find that religiosity is a bond between humanity and some greater power. Religiosity has been designated as a "supernatural power to which individuals must respond, a feeling in individuals who conceive of such a power, and ritual acts carried out in respect of that power", therefore, individuals interpret and organize their conduct for good. They say that the religious term is "broad enough to include a 'spiritual' component", indicating the relationship between concepts.
Ayoun, Rowe, and Yassine (2015: 941)	explain religion in terms of an "organized system of beliefs, practices, rituals and symbols".
Oh and Sarkisian (2012: 302)	explain the positive link between religiosity and interpersonal engagement, in the way of altruistic beliefs and behaviors such as being charitable and helping others. They suggest that religiosity has impact in social issues through a "[…] moral discipline including sacrifice, devotion, and compassion […] and by social capital created by religious service attendance".
Anderson and Grice (2014: 4)	describe religiosity as a group of doctrines or ideals able to bring the individual to the chosen standard of spirituality, the "core of any standard of spirituality".
Bloodgood et al. (2008: 559)	define religiosity as the "understanding, committing to, and following a set of religious doctrines or principles". They mention that religiosity may be assessed with behavioral indicators such as "[…] attendance at religious services, religious affiliation, prayer frequency, reading of sacred texts, and participation in religious discussions with others".
Luquis, Brelsford, and Rojas-Guyler (2012: 602)	talk about the benefits that religious practices have within spirituality, identifying some practices in religious affairs such as "self-rated extent of religiosity and religious service attendance, […] private religious practices, which include frequency of watching religious television, reading the Bible or other religious texts, and saying prayers or grace before meals".

Table 2. Continued.

Author	Definition
Badrinarayanan and Madhavaram (2008)	define religiosity as an organized system of beliefs, principles, dogmas and doctrines that tends to be dogmatic, patriarchal and exclusive.
Valasek (2009)	conceptualizes religiosity as: proselytizing, a set of practices such as church attendance, amount of prayers, scripture reading, and the ritualistic; is authoritarian and has self-righteousness. It has a belief in the divine, doctrine and dogmas.
Fry (2003: 706)	mentions the not interdependence between the terms: "spirituality is necessary for religion but religion is not necessary for spirituality".

To a sacred reality (Koenig et al. 2000). In this view, this paper considers spirituality and religiosity as complementary concepts, naming this joint study as faith.

Conceptualization of faith

Miller and Ewest (2013: 6) propose a jointed study of spirituality and religiosity explaining that this interrelation contains the most "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" (Miller and Ewest, 2015). Spirituality and religiosity foster the development of each other (King and Crowther, 2004) acting as interrelated concepts (Proeschold et al. 2014). Religion arises as a consequence of, and according to, a human need (i.e. spirituality), destined to lead the individual to reach the highest spiritual level. Like this, spirituality and religiosity are indistinguishable concepts (Hicks, 2003). The separation of spirituality and religiosity is not sustainable because it could ignore important issues (Hicks, 2003). Spiritual effects such as behavioral change (e.g. values, help to others, forgiveness, etc.), are encouraged by religious practices (Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland, 2014), appearing religiosity as the faith variable that develops spirituality. In these religious practices, this human's need could be lead from the most basic level (e.g. sense of transcendence, search for truth, divine awareness) to the highest possible desired spiritual level (e.g. effects of the spirit, meaning, fullness, happiness, peace).

In the awareness of this interrelationship of concepts, and the good effects that spirituality has into organizations, this issue in organizations must to be studied, and also according to each organization. Though there are organizations that facilitate spirituality in the workplace, there are others that still do not enable spirituality in the organization, whose study need the proper selection of concepts and scale categories to consider into the instrument for the study. Since the approach of measuring spirituality and religiosity as complementary concepts is relatively new on literature, it is expected that measuring instruments were designed mostly in a separated consideration of the concepts of spirituality and religiosity through literature, consequently, few measuring instruments that measure faith are found (see Table 3). Pawar (2009), Miller and Ewest (2013) and Tischler, Biberman, and Altman (2007) affirms that there is a need of empirical study that includes multidimensional models (Miller and Ewest, 2013; Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007), in a holistic way (Miller and West, 2013; Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007) within organizational issues e.g. organizational competitiveness (Pawar, 2009). To enable this, this work aims to identify the scale categories of faith, spirituality, and religiosity through literature, to provide and to suggest a complete measuring scheme to design future multidimensional measuring instruments.

III. MEASURING SCALE CATEGORIES

To analyze the measuring scale categories within measuring instruments of faith, spirituality and religiosity, it is necessary to first identify them from literature. Inasmuch spirituality and religiosity are components of the faith concept adopted on this work, the scale categories analysis is applicable to spirituality and religiosity. So, we named measuring scale categories in relationship to the faith concept, but these scale categories are applicable also to spirituality and religiosity as separated concepts.

Named by other authors as complex phenomena (Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland, 2014), and measuring forms (Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007), scale categories (Miller and Ewest, 2013) of faith refer to all the ways in which a process of faith assimilation could be assessed by an instrument or scale within the organization. We have identified several variables that we classified into four main measuring scale categories named within this article as faith measuring dimensions, faith measuring levels, faith measuring approaches and faith measuring methods.

Measuring dimensions

This scale category asses the level of commitment that a person has in relation to his/her spirituality or religiosity, the stages of what can be called an assimilation process of faith. Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis (2004: 63) define spirituality as a "holistic process of positive transformation" that impacts all aspects of the individual after spiritual practice. In this work, we classify this process of faith assimilation in three dimensions: faith cognitive dimension, faith awareness dimension and faith behavior dimension.

Cognitive dimension

Named as manifestation scale by Miller and Ewest (2013), as pure spirituality by Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis (2004) and as cognitive level by Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland (2014), the faith cognitive dimension is related to the initial knowledge that a person experience about the existence of a divine being, that provokes a personal restlessness for a transcendent state. Regarding spiritual studies, cognitive dimension is about the "experiential knowledge, beyond what can be discerned solely by our physical senses (e.g. touch, tasting, smelling, hearing, seeing) with an intangible reality" (Anderson and Grice, 2014: 4). In religious studies, this dimension appears to be centered on the current knowledge about dogmas from a religious denomination that could lead to some behavior in order to achieve some promise from the religious denomination of belonging. A person who knows the recommendations or promises of his/her religious denomination seeks to do his/her best to win this promise (e.g. eternal life) (Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland, 2014).

Awareness dimension

This dimension is considered as the dimension where the spiritual development is taking place (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004; Miller and Ewest, 2013), where an affective state takes its place regarding the cognitive dimension (Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland, 2014). Named as an adherence stage by Miller and Ewest (2013), and internal validity by Tischler, Biberman, and Altman (2007), the awareness dimension is related to the individual inner certainty of the spiritual and religious beliefs, understanding them as real, conceiving a need to search for a spirituality living (an attitude to perform actions to it) in the search for a transcendent state, searching the closeness to the divine reality perceived, or the search of inner peace.

Behavior dimension

Named by other authors as application of spirituality (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004), as behavioral level (Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland, 2014), and as external dimension (Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007), the behavioral dimension is usually measured in terms of spiritual effects e.g. justice, prudence, temperance; nature care (Afsar, Badir, and Kiani, 2016; Glicksman, 2009), forgiveness, and relationship with God (Glicksman, 2009). When spirituality and religiosity become into actions, a series of personal values arise that are studied according to the degree of commitment of persons to them. Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004), propose a set of values that should be measured in organizations, which result from the facilitation of spirituality in the workplace (i.e. benevolence, generosity, humanism, integrity, justice, mutuality, receptivity, confidence). Likewise, Benefiel (2005) shows a path of five stages where spirituality is developed since the basic awareness of a spiritual reality, to the highest point that is the alignment with the transcendent power, a sense of connectedness with the universe, and spiritual practices. Regarding religiosity, some examples of personal behavioral dimension are: "I try hard to live all my life according to my religious beliefs [...] My whole approach to life is based on my religion" (Jamali and Sdiani, 2013: 316), "[C]hurch/mosque/synagogue attendance [... F]requency of personal prayer and religious behavior" (Yegane, 2013: 27), and Bible study (Glicksman, 2009).

It should be mentioned that this article considers religious practice, not as suggested by Jamali and Sdiani (2013: 312) whose qualify external religious practices as "[...] utilitarian, based on personal gratification, the social environment and the perceptions of others [leading to] a social gain", but as a constructive approach of religious behavior. Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland (2014: 4) state that "[t]he intensity of religious behavior reinforces the influence of religious belief on business behavior. Participation in a religious community fulfills an important role in translating religious belief into practice". Referring to religious activities, these authors state that "[o]ther religious activities, such as private prayer and religious study, can also affirm and reinforce expectations with respect to the behavior of believers" (4). The present article considers the constructive approach of external religiosity, in much the same way that McCullough and Larson, who argue that "[i]n the same way that physical exercise can reduce stress, regular spiritual practice of prayer, chanting, meditation, drumming, or any practice that supports the meaning of life can reduce stress" (Dombo and Gray, 2013: 96). In addition, the religious behavior can extend to health in employees boosting "[...] serotonin levels and arousing spiritual practices such as singing [...;] high engagement worship practices norepinephrine boost and dopamine which increases energy" (96).

Measuring levels

Also known as categories (Pawar, 2009), as constructs (Khasawneh, 2011) and as applications (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004), measuring levels (Mazereeuw, Kaptein, and Graafland, 2014) conform the scale category distinguished by the studied focused audience. We identified measuring levels and classified them into four subcategories: the individual or personal level (Khasawneh, 2011; Liu and Robertson, 2011; Pawar, 2009: Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007; Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004), group or work unit level (Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007), organizational level (Pawar, 2009; Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007; Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004), and society level (Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007; Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004).

Individual measuring level

This subcategory refers to the studies made in the workplace that measure the faith perception on the individual, not considering organizational, society or work group related faith influences. This measuring level is found to be studied within different parts of the faith assimilation process (i.e. cognition, awareness and behavior) (see Table 3).

Group measuring level

This subcategory encompasses the studies aiming to understand organizational work unit relationships and the impact of spirituality on them. This dimension responds to questions such as "[m]y work-group has a vision statement that brings out the best in me" (Fry et al. 2010: 310), "[c]ommunications within my work group are excellent and I entertain easy and agreeable relationships with my colleagues" (311), and "[m]y work group is very productive" (312).

Organizational measuring level

This is the subcategory encompassing the studies that evaluate the perception of the arrangements that the institution provides to facilitate faith in the workplace. Instruments measuring this organizational measuring level could include questions about the perception of provided spiritual leadership (Fry et al. 2010), perception of formal and informal organizational efforts in workplace for faith facilitation e.g. its inclusion on organizational mission, vision, values, conductance code (Sherafati, Mohammadi, and Ismail, 2015), art decoration (Hodge, 2013), faith phrases, organizational norms (Soltani, 2012), and systems support (Benefiel, 2005). Organizational measuring level responds to questions such as: "[m]anagement systems encourage personal and spiritual transformation [? … M] Y supervisor is positive about workers who express their emotions? […] My superiors listen attentively to my suggestions?" (Khasawneh, 2011: 692).

Society measuring level

This subcategory studies the benefit of the spiritual facilitation of the company in relationship with the community foreign to the company's staff. It responds to questions such as: "I have a commitment to promote the well-being of my community […] my employer provides and sponsor charitable social service to the local community?" (Khasawneh, 2011: 692), "[I d]emonstrate God's love to clients [… We] inspire clients' faith via staff's actions" (Ebaugh, Chafetz, and Pipes, 2006: 2264).

We will see later in the instrumental analysis, these measuring levels are found to be applied within one or more stages of the faith assimilation process (i.e. measuring dimensions), and in combination with other measuring approaches.

Measuring approaches

Named by other authors as focus (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004) and as validity (Tischler, Biberman, and Altman, 2007), the measuring approaches classify the study of spirituality and religiosity according to impacted subject on organizations, ergo, the effects of the spiritual person impacting the organization and, by the other hand, the effects of faith facilitation towards persons. Pawar (2009: 377) explains that these approaches can be identified in literature since the "focal point or source point wherefrom spiritual transformation in workplace evolves". We named these approaches as inside-out and outsidein approaches.

Outside-in approach

This subcategory measures the effects that an organizational faith facilitation may trigger into a person. The outside-in approach responds questions about the effects of spiritual facilitation, such as the perception of organizational systems and their effects on personal stress management, fraud prevention (Purnamasari and Amaliah, 2015) and resistance to adversity. Since outside-in measuring approach includes organizational facilitation perspectives, this approach is frequently found to study organizations that already have a kind of spiritual or faith facilitation (e.g. Dhiman and Marques, 2011).

Inside-out approach

This scale category identifies the studies that measure the effects that a person's faith may do in the organizational environment or in organizational affairs. The inside-out approach answers questions such as "[m]y faith helps me deal with difficult work relationships" (Lynn, Naughton, and VanderVeen, 2009: 236), "I view my work as part of God's plan to care for the needs of people […] and the most of questions described above on the measuring dimensions explanation. The inside-out approach measures the impact, influence or correlation of faith with other organizational affairs e.g. performance (Arnold, 2010; McLaughlin, 1998), engagement (Chau et al. 1990), workplace stress level (Nash and McLennan, 2001) and other organizational issues. Organizations that still do not have a spiritual facilitation within their organizational strategy are frequently measured with the inside-out approach, by the comparison of measuring instruments of spirituality, religiosity, and faith with those used to analyze and measure organizational affairs.

Measuring methods

Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk and Travis (2004) propose a classification of studies according to their measuring methods, considering the objective and subjective subcategories.

Objective methods

This subcategory refers to the quantitative research of spirituality and religiosity. Some objective methods' reactants applied to the inside out measuring approach are "[% of] sales new products vs. plan […] % Waste […] % Absenteeism […]" (Fry et al. 2010: 303). Also, this subcategory considers calibrated instruments such as the mentioned in Nelson and Sutton to the measurement of psychological stress i.e. blood pressure, breathing rate, and heart rhythm (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004).

Subjective methods

This subcategory comprehends self-referral measurements (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004), responding themes such as stress management and executive well-being with instruments or scales as the mentioned by Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis (2004) (i.e. perceived stress scale, symptom checklist, MHI-5th mental health inventory), and items like the provided in Fry et al. (2010: 303) (i.e. "% Agree life satisfaction […] % Agree hope/faith"). This subcategory tends to add solid value to this field of study; however, such measurements are not usually found in faith-based research in the workplace.

The consideration of these scale categories into measuring instruments would theoretically show a wider representation of spiritual and religious reality in an organizational context. However, some authors affirm the necessity of multidimensional measurement of spirituality, religiosity, and faith, this fact suggest the partial consideration of scale categories within measuring instruments, but, there is not found any study analyzing the scale categories based on the inner analysis of measuring instruments, to expose this gap on science. This study analyzes the identified scale categories into measuring instruments of spirituality, religiosity, and faith to understand the comprehensiveness of measuring instruments, and to suggest the more comprehensive design of instruments, to support future researchers' decision about the scale categories to consider for comprehensive studies.

IV. CONCEPTS AND SCALE CATEGORIES WITHIN MEASURING INSTRUMENTS OF SPIRITUALITY, RELIGIOSITY, AND FAITH

We selected 20 measuring instruments to analyze. 11 measuring instruments were considered from the selection that King and Crowther (2004) made from a compendium of 125 measuring instruments on Hill and Hood (1999) according to their relevance and frequently and practical use on organizational studies. The other 9 measuring instruments were considered from recent literature studying spirituality, religiosity or faith on business. We considered the most of instruments studying spirituality, religiosity or faith on

Table 3. Scales and instruments used to measure spirituality, religiosity and faith.

Authors	Instrument ne	Concepts	Levels	Dimensions	Approaches	Method	Description
Ebaugh, Chafetz, and Pipes, 2006	Coalition and religiosity	religiosity, spirituality	individual, group, organizational	behavior	inside-out	ubjective	An 18 item questionnaire, with three principal dimensions: service religiosity, staff religiosity and organization religiosity.
Jurkiewicz and Giacalone, 2004	Values Framework of Workplace Spirituality	Spirituality	Individual, group, organizational	Awareness, behavior	Inside-out, Outside-in	Subjective	A 10 spiritual values including: justice, respect, responsibility, benevolence, generativity, humanism, integrity, mutuality, receptivity.
Piedmont, 2001	Spiritual Transcendence Scale	Spirituality, religiosity	Individual	Awareness, behavior	Inside-out	Subjective	A 24 items scale, including three subscales: connectedness, prayer fulfillment, and universality.
Sandage, 1999	Religious Values Scale (RVS)	Religiosity	Individual, grupal	Awareness, behavior	Inside-out	Subjective	It measures the subscales: sacred writings, religious leaders, authority afforded, religious group identification and commitment, tolerance for different views.
Koenig et al. 1997	Duke Religious Index (DUREL)	Religiosity	Individual, organizational	Awareness, behavior	Inside-out	Subjective	A 5 items scale, with three items measuring intrinsic religiosity, one organizational religiousness and other item non-organizational religiousness
Edwards, 1986	Religious Experience Questionnaire (REQ)	Religiosity, spirituality	Individual	Cognitive, awareness	Inside-out	Subjective	With 12 items questionnaire, this instrument differentiates between the affective, experiential, and cognitive dimensions of belief in a religious system and in doctrinal statements.

Subjective

Table 3. Continued.

Authors	Instrument name	Concepts	Levels	Dimensions	Approaches	Methods	Description
Edwards, 1986	Religious Experience Questionnaire (REQ)	Religiosity, spirituality	Individual	Cognitive, awareness	Inside-out	Subjective	With 12 items questionnaire, this instrument differentiates between the affective, experiential, and cognitive dimensions of belief in a religious system and in doctrinal statements.
Edwards, 1986	Religious Experience Questionnaire (REQ)	Religiosity, spirituality	Individual	Cognitive, awareness	Inside-out	Subjective	With 12 items questionnaire, this instrument differentiates between the affective, experiential, and cognitive dimensions of belief in a religious system and in doctrinal statements.
Hall and Edwards, 1996	Spiritual Assessment Inventory (SAI)	Spirituality	Individual	Cognitive, awareness	Inside-out	Subjective	A 54 self-report items, assessing awareness of God, grandiosity, realistic acceptance, instability, disappointment, and an experimental management scale.
Pargament et al. 1988	Religious Problem-Solving Scale (RPS)	Religiosity	Individual	Cognitive, behavior	Inside-out	Subjective	26 items in a 3 subscales questionnaire: self-directing, collaborative, and deferring.
Batson and Ventis, 1982	Quest	Religiosity	Individual	Awareness	Inside-out	Subjective	A 12 item instrument. Three dimensions: readiness to face existential questions, self-criticism and perceptions of religious doubts, and openness to change.

Business context, due to the scarce study of this field. On Table 3, we qualitatively analyzed and summarized these measuring instruments specifying their consideration of concepts (i.e. spirituality, religiosity, and faith) and of measuring scale categories (i.e. dimensions, levels, approaches and methods). Authors, instruments names and descriptions are also provided.

Discussion

In this instrument review, we can appreciate that faith, spirituality and religiosity instruments are mostly studied in the individual measuring level subcategory. This let us know that instruments are, most of the time, developed in an inside-out measuring approach, which means that organizational measuring level is not directly considered in these instruments, until the moment that the instrument is compared with an organizational affair measuring instrument, as the study made by Jamali and Sdiani (2013), where corporate social responsibility is studied in its relationship to spirituality, or as it is the study of Wilson and Hollensen (2013) where religiosity is studied in relation with organizational performance.

It can be seen that the most of the instruments apply a subjective methodology. A possible reason for this fact is the nature of objective measurements that eventually could need specialized knowledge for the management of specialized tools measuring concrete issues e.g. blood pressure, heart rhythm or breathing rate (Heaton, Schmidt-Wilk, and Travis, 2004).

In the instrument analysis, there are some authors that include all measuring dimensions in a single instrument (what theoretically evidence the compatibility of sub levels from the measuring scale categories used on those instruments). However, these instruments consider only one concept of faith, being the spiritual concept on Webb, Toussaint, and Dula (2014) and Lynn, Naughton, and VanderVeen (2009), and the religious concept on the study of Bardis (1961). This non-inclusion of concepts results in a measurement of spirituality or religiosity susceptible to be improved for future research, with the merge of measuring instruments, searching for the inclusion of the missing concept and measuring dimension in order to enable a better contribution of the measurement of spirituality, religiosity and faith to organizational issues.

Nevertheless, there were found instruments that include both concepts of faith (i.e. Hall, Koenig, and Meador, 2010; Ebaugh, Chafetz, and Pipes, 2016; Edwards, 1986; Paloutzian, Jackson and Crandall 1978). However, within these instruments, some measuring dimensions, measuring approaches or measuring methods, are not found, limiting their contribution and their representation of reality.

According to this analysis, the concepts of spirituality, religiosity, and faith are studied in organizations mostly since an inside-out approach. This discloses the possibility to explore the outside-in approach where the perceptions of

organizational spiritual facilitation could contribute broadly to the development of the field. Moreover, according to this analysis, studies that could reflect spiritual, religious and faith effects within an organizational context, by using calibrated instruments and special techniques, are lacking in the literature.

Though there were found instruments that measure all (and nearly all) measuring levels in the same instrument (Khasawneh, 2011; Ebaugh, Chafetz, and Pipes, 2006; Jurkiewicz and Giacalone, 2004), there is the possibility to improve these and future instruments by the inclusion of the missing scale categories.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This article joins to the theory of faith where spirituality and religiosity are complementary variables (Miller and Ewest, 2013) affirming that in order to develop the spiritual effects, also religiosity should be enhanced, therefore moving from the very first sense of transcendence, felt by most of the people (Miller and Ewest, 2013) to the practice of spiritual effects that lead to organizational cultural benefits that impact on organizational competitiveness.

Through instrumental analysis showed that there is no instrument that could measure faith (i.e. spirituality and religiosity as interrelated or complementary concepts) in a multidimensional way (i.e. including cognition, awareness and behavior) be it in an insideout or outside in approach, objective or subjective method. So, in the theoretical understanding of compatibility of scale categories through analyzed instruments, future studies should consider or develop instruments that include these measuring scale categories enabling more complete studies of faith, at different levels (i.e. individual, group, organizational, community), dimensions (i.e. cognition, awareness, and behavior), approaches (i.e. internal, external, inside-out, outside-in), and methods (i.e. subjective, objective). The recommendation of making more comprehensive instruments is also applicable to the study of spirituality or religiosity as separated theories, since this is a relative new field of research that need to be developed in the most exhaustive way, and because these concepts, as components of faith, were reference to identify the scale categories here disclosed.

Though faith is a relatively new field of research, the present analysis found that there is the need to develop instruments that could measure faith in a more complete way. The consideration of the missing dimensions (i.e. cognition, awareness, behavior), approaches (i.e. outside-in, inside-out), methods (i.e. subjective, objective) and levels (i.e. individual, group, organizational, community/society) here exposed, theoretically may build stronger and more complete measuring instruments, showing an integral, holistic and multidimensional picture of faith reality.

Organizational sustainability (Hochachka, 2005) and competitiveness (Vallabh and Singhal, 2014; Carmona, Céspedes-Lorente, and Martinez-del-Rio, 2012) are some faith effects within organizations. Its facilitation also impacts positively to other organizational affairs (e.g. performance, engagement, fraud prevention, conflict prevention, etc.). Because of this importance of spirituality, religiosity and faith in the organization, this work aimed to contribute to fill the gap of literature where the need to multidimensionally and holistically measure spirituality, religiosity and faith was needed and, still, latent. This study identifies a basis for future multidimensional research of spirituality, religiosity and faith, strengthening to the comprehensive contribution of this field of study to other organizational issues.

REFERENCES

[1].   Afsar, B. Y. Badir, and U. Kiani. 2016. "Linking Spiritual Leadership and Employee Proenvironmental Behavior: The Influence of Workplace Spirituality, Intrinsic Motivation, and Environmental Passion." *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 45:79-88. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvp.2015.11.011.

[2].   Allport, G. W. 1950. *The Individual and His Religion: A Psychological Interpretation.* New York, NY: Macmillian.

[3].   Anderson, J. A. and J. W. Grice. 2014. "Toward an Integrated Model of Spirituality." *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 33: 1-3.

[4].   Anderson, P. 2000. "This Place Hurts my Spirit!" *Journal for quality and participation* 23: 16-17.

[5].   Arnold, J. L. 2010. *Spirituality in the Workplace and its Impact on Organizational Performance*

[6].   Ayoun, B. L. Rowe, and F. Yassine. 2015. "Is Workplace Spirituality Associated with Business Ethics?" *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 27 (5): 938-957. Doi: 10.1108/IJCHM-01-2014-0018.

[7].   Badrinarayanan, V. and S. Madhavaram. 2008. "Workplace Spirituality and the Selling Organization: A conceptual Framework and Research Propositions." *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management* 28 (4): 421–434.

[8].   Bardis, P. 1961. "A Religion Scale." *Social Science* 36: 120-3.

[9].   Batson, C. D. and W. L. Ventis. 1982. *The Religious Experience: A Social-psychological Perspective*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[10]. Benefiel, M. 2005. "The Second Half of the Journey: Spiritual Leadership for Organizational Transformation." *Journal of the Leadership Quarterly* 16 (5): 723-747. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.005.

[11]. Bloodgood, J. M. W. H. Turnley, and P. Mudrack. 2008. "The Influence of Ethics Instruction, Religiosity, and Intelligence on Cheating Behavior." *Journal of Business Ethics* 82 (3): 557-571. Doi: 10.1007/s10551-007-9576-0.

[12]. Carmona, M. E. J. Céspedes-Lorente, and J. Martinez-del-Rio. 2012. "Environmental Human Resource Management and Competitive Advantage." *Management Research: Journal of the Iberoamerican Academy of Management* 10 (2): 125-142. Doi: 10.1108/1536-541211251607.

[13]. Cash, K. and G. Gray. 2000. "A Framework for Accommodating Religion and Spirituality in the Workplace." *Academy of Management Review* 14 (3): 124–133. Chau, L. L. R. C. Johnson, J. K. Bowers, T. J. Darvill, and G. P. Danko. 1990. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity as Related to Conscience, Adjustment, and Altruism." *Personality and Individual Differences* 11(4): 397–400.

[14]. Cohen, M. Z. L. M. Holley, S. P. Wengel, and R. M. Katzman. 2012. "A Platform for Nursing Research on Spirituality and Religiosity: Definitions and measures." *Western Journal of Nursing Research* 34 (6): 795-817. Doi: 10.1177/0193945912444321.

[15]. Dhiman, S. and J. Marques. 2011. "The Role and Need of Offering Workshops and Courses on Workplace Spirituality." *Journal of Management Development* 30 (9): 816–835.

[16]. Dombo, E. A. and C. Gray. 2013. "Engaging Spirituality in Addressing Vicarious Trauma in Clinical Social Workers: A Self-Care Model." *Social Work and Christianity* 40(1): 89-104.

[17]. Duchon, D. and D. A. Plowman. 2005. "Nurturing the Spirit at Work: Impact on Work Unit Performance." *The Leadership Quarterly* 16 (5): 807-833. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.008.

[18]. Ebaugh, H. R. J. S. Chafetz, and P. F. Pipes. 2006. "Where's the Faith in Faith-Based Organizations? Measures and Correlates of Religiosity in Faith-Based Social Service Coalitions." *Social Forces* 84 (4): 2259-2272. doi:10.1353/sof.2006.0086.

[19]. Edwards, K. J. 1986. *Sex-Role Behavior and Religious experience*. In Donaldson, W.J. Jr (eds.), Research in Mental Health and Religious Behavior: An Introduction to Research in the Integration of Christianity and the Behavioral Sciences, Psychological Studies Institute, Atlanta, GA, pp. 224-38.

[20]. Fachrunnisa, O. A. Adhiatma, and Mutaminah. 2014. "The Role of Work Place Spirituality and Employee Engagement to Enhance Job Satisfaction and Performance." *International Journal of Organizational Innovation.* Accessed online July 1, 2015.

[21]. Fry, L. W. 2003. "Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership." *Leadership Quarterly* 14 (6): 693-727.

[22]. Fry, L. W. L. L. Matherly, and J. Ouimet. 2010. "The Spiritual Leadership Balanced Scorecard Business Model: The case of the Cordon Bleu-Tomasso Corporation." *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion* 7 (4): 283-314. doi:10.1080/14766086.2010.524983.

[23]. Glicksman, A. 2009. "The Contemporary Study of Religion and Spirituality among the Elderly: A Critique." *Journal of Religion, Spirituality and Aging* 21: 244-258. Doi: 10.1080/15528030903127130.

[24]. Gotsis, G. and Z. Kortezi. 2008. "Philosophical Foundations of Workplace Spirituality: A Critical Approach." *Journal of Business Ethics* 78: 575–600.

[25]. Gupta, M. V. Kumar, and M. Singh. 2014. "Creating Satisfied Employees through Workplace Spirituality: A Study of the Private Insurance Sector in Punjab India." *Journal of Business Ethics* 122 (1): 79-88. Doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1756-5.

[26]. Hall, D. E. H. G. Koenig, and K. G. Meador. 2010. "Episcopal Measure of Faith Tradition: A Context-Specific Approach to Measuring Religiousness." *Journal of Religion and Health* 49 (2): 164-178. Doi: 10.1007/s10943-009-9240-3.

[27]. Heaton, D. P. J. Schmidt-Wilk, and F. Travis. 2004. "Constructs, Methods, and Measures for Researching Spirituality in Organizations." *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 17 (1): 62-82. doi: 10.1108/09534810410511305

[28]. Hicks, D. A. 2003. *Religion and the Workplace Pluralism, Spirituality, Leadership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[29]. Hill, P. C. and R. W. Hood, eds. 1999. *Measures of Religiosity.* Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

[30]. Hochachka, G. 2005. *Developing Sustainability, Developing the Self: An Integral Approach to International and Community Development*. Canada, BC: Drishti Centre for Integral Action.

[31]. Hodge, D. R. 2013. "Implicit Spiritual Assessment: An Alternative Approach for Assessing Client Spirituality." *Social Work* 58 (3): 223-230. doi:10.1093/sw/swt019.

[32]. Jamali, D. and Y. Sdiani. 2013. "Does Religiosity Determine Affinities to CSR?" *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion* 10 (4): 309-323. doi:10.1080/14766086.2013.802251.

[33]. Jurkiewicz, C. L. and R. A. Giacalone. 2004. "A Values Framework for Measuring the Impact of Workplace Spirituality on Organizational Performance." *Journal of Business Ethics* 49 (2): 129-142. doi:10.1023/B:BUSI.0000015843.22195.

[34]. Khasawneh, S. 2011. "Cutting-Edge Panacea of the Twenty-First Century." *International Journal of Educational Management* 25 (7): 687-700. doi:10.1108/09513541111172090

[35]. Kim, N. H. Huh, and J. Chae. 2015. "Effects of Religiosity and Spirituality on the Treatment Response in Patients with Depressive Disorders." *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 60: 26-34. doi:10.1016/j.comppsych.2015.04.009.

[36]. King, J. E. and M. R. Crowther. 2004. "The Measurement of Religiosity and Spirituality: Examples and Issues from Psychology." *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 17 (1). 83-101. doi: 10.1108/09534810410511314.

[37]. Klerk, J. J. 2005. "Spirituality, Meaning in Life, and Work Wellness: a Research Agenda." *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis* 13 (1): 64-88.

[38]. Koenig, H. G. M. McCullough, and D. B. Larson. 2000. *Handbook of Religion and Healt.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[39]. Koenig, H. G. G. R. Parkerson, and K. G. Meador. 1997. "Religion Index for Psychiatric Research: a 5-Item Measure for the Use in Health Outcome Studies." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 154(6): 885-97.

[40]. Kumar, V. and S. Kumar, 2014. "Workplace Spirituality as a Moderator in Relation between Stress and Health: An Exploratory Empirical Assessment." *International Review of Psychiatry* 26 (3): 344-351. doi:10.3109/09540261.2014.924909.

[41]. Leak, G. K. 2008. "Factorial Validity of the Faith Development Scale." *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 18 (2): 123-131. Doi: 10.1080/10508610701879399.

[42]. Liu, C. H. and P. J. Robertson. 2011. "Spirituality in the Workplace: Theory and Measurement." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 20 (1): 35-50. Doi: 10.1177/1056492610374648.

[43]. Loureiro, S. M. C. L. Reijnders, and I. M. Dias-Sardinha. 2012. "The Effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on Consumer Satisfaction and Perceived Value: The Case of the Automobile Industry Sector in Portugal." *Journal of Cleaner Production* 37: 172178. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.07.003.

[44]. Luquis, R. R. G. M. Brelsford, and L. Rojas-Guyler. 2012. "Religiosity, Spirituality, Sexual Attitudes, and Sexual Behaviors among College Students." *Journal of Religion and Health* 51 (3): 601-614. Doi: 10.1007/s10943-011-9527-z.

[45]. Lynn, M. L. M. J. Naughton, and S. VanderVeen. 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. Doi: 10.1007/s10551-008-9767-3.

[46]. Mazereeuw, C. M. Kaptein, and J. J. Graafland. 2014. "Religiosity, CSR Attitudes, and CSR Behavior: An Empirical Study of Executives' Religiosity and CSR*." Journal of Business Ethics* 123 (3): 437-459. Doi: 10.1007/s10551-013-1847-3.

[47]. McLaughlin, C. 1998. "Spirituality and Profitability." *Business Source Premier* 20: 7.

[48]. Miller, D. W. and T. Ewest. 2013. "The Present State of Workplace Spirituality: A Literature Review Considering Context, Theory, and Measurement/Assessment." *Journal of Religious and Theological Information* 12: 29-54. doi:10.1080/10477845.2013.800776.

[49]. Miller, D. W. and T. Ewest. 2015. "A New Framework for Analyzing Organizational Workplace Religion and Spirituality." *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion* 12 (4): 305-328. doi:10.1080/14766086.2015.1054864.

[50]. Mostafa, A. M. S. and J. S. Gould-Williams. 2014. "Testing the Mediation Effect of Person– Organization Fit on the Relationship Between High Performance HR Practices and Employee Outcomes in the Egyptian Public Sector." *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* 25 (2): 276-292.

[51]. Nash, L. L. and S. McLennan. 2001. *Church on Sunday, Work on Monday: The Challenges of Fusing Christian Values with Business Life*. San Francisco.

[52]. Oh, S. and N. Sarkisian. 2012. "Spiritual Individualism or Engaged Spirituality? Social Implications of Holistic Spirituality among Mind-Body-Spirit Practitioners." *Sociology of Religion: A Quarterly Review* 73 (3): 299-322. doi:10.1093/socrel/srr054.

[53]. Osman-Gani, A. M. J. Hashim, and Y. Ismail. 2013. "Establishing Linkages between Religiosity and Spirituality on Employee Performance." *Employee Relations* 35 (4): 360-376. Doi: 10.1108/ER-04-2012-0030.

[54]. Paloutzian, R. F. S. L. Jackson, and J.E. Crandall. 1978. "Conversion Experience, Belief System, and Personal and Ethical Attitudes." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 6: 266-75.

[55]. Pargament, K.I. J. Kennell, W. Hathaway, N. Grevengoed, J. Newman, and W. Jones. 1988.

[56]. "Religion and the Problem-Solving Process: Three Styles of Coping." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 27: 90-104.

[57]. Pawar, B. S. 2009. "Workplace Spirituality Facilitation: A Comprehensive Model." *Journal of Business Ethics* 90 (3): 375-386. Doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0047-7.

[58]. Peterson, C. and M. E. P. Seligman. 2004. *Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

[59]. Piedmont, R. L. 2001. "Spiritual Transcendence and the Scientific Study of Spirituality." *Journal of Rehabilitation* 67: 4-11.

[60]. Porter, M. E. 2008. *On Competition*. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

[61]. Proeschold-Bell, R. C. Yang, M. Toth, M. Rivers, and K. Carder. 2014. "Closeness to God Among those Doing God's Work: A Spiritual Well-Being Measure for Clergy." *Journal of Religion and Health* 53 (3): 878-894. Doi: 10.1007/s10943-013-9682-5.

[62]. Purnamasari, P. I. Amaliahb. 2015. "Fraud Prevention: Relevance to Religiosity and Spirituality in the Workplace." *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 211: 827–835.

[63]. Raelin, J. 2004. "The Bottom Line of Leaderful Practice." *Ivey Business Journal* 68: 1-5

[64]. Rego, A. and M. Pina e Cunha. 2008. "Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Commitment: An Empirical Study." *Journal of Organizational Change Management 2*1 (1): 53-75. Doi: 10.1108/095348108810847039.

[65]. Sandage, S. J. 1999. "Religious Values Scale." Pp. 108-12 in *Measures of Religiosity*." Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

[66]. Sheep, M. L. 2006. "Nurturing the Whole Person: The Ethics of Workplace Spirituality in a Society of Organizations." *Journal of Business Ethics* 66 (4): 357–375.

[67]. Sheldrake, P. 2007. *A brief history of spirituality*. Wiley-Blackwell.

[68]. Sherafati, M. R. Mohammadi, and M. N. Ismail. 2015. "The Study of the Effect of Organizational Culture on Organizational Spirituality." *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences* 4 (1): 165.

[69]. Soltani, M. R. 2012. "Situation Analysis and Optimal Design of Corporate Culture of Organizations, Armed Forces Based on Religious Principles and Values of the Islamic Revolution." *The Journal - Research in Islamic Management* 20 (1): 99-122.

[70]. Tischler, L. J. Biberman, and Y. Altman. 2007. A Model for Researching about Spirituality in Organizations." *Business Renaissance Quarterly* 2 (2): 23.

[71]. Vallabh, P. and M. Singhal, 2014. "Workplace Spirituality Facilitation: A Person– Organization Fit Approach." *Journal of Human Values* 20 (2): 193-207. Doi: 10.1177/0971685814539407.

[72]. Valasek, A. J. 2009. "Examining the Relationship of Spirituality and Religiosity to Individual Productivity in the United States." Dissertation Abstract International.

[73]. Webb, J. R. L. Toussaint, and C. S. Dula. 2014. "Ritualistic, Theistic, and Existential Spirituality: Initial Psychometric Qualities of the RiTE Measure of Spirituality." *Journal of Religion and Health*, 53 (4): 972-985. Doi: 10.1007/s10943-013-9697-y.

[74]. Wilson, J. A. J. and S. Hollensen. 2013. "Assessing the Implications on Performance when Aligning Customer Lifetime Value Calculations with Religious Faith Groups and Afterlifetime Values - A Socratic Elenchus Approach." *International Journal of Business Performance Management* 14 (1): 67-94. doi:10.1504/IJBPM.2013.050588.

[75]. Yeganeh, H. 2013. "An Investigation into the Cultural and Religious Determinants of National Competitiveness." *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal 2*3 (1): 23-40. Doi: 10.1108/10595421311296605.