Nurturing the Whole Person:
The Ethics of Workplace Spirituality
in a Society of Organizations

Mathew L. Sheep

ABSTRACT. In a world which can be increasingly described as a "society of organizations," it is incumbent upon organizational researchers to account for the role of organizations in determining the well-being of societies and the individuals that comprise them. Workplace spirituality is a young area of inquiry with potentially strong relevance to the well-being of individuals, organizations, and societies. Previous literature has not examined ethical dilemmas related to workplace spirituality that organizations might expect based upon the co-existence of multiple ethical work climates, nor has previous literature accounted for the relevance of the cosmopolitan (external, societal) source of moral reasoning in the ethical treatment of workplace spirituality. The purpose of this paper is to address these gaps by articulating two such ethical dilemmas related to workplace spirituality: the "quiet desperation" dilemma and the instrumentality dilemma. Moreover, I propose two theoretical contexts that foster "both-and" rather than "either-or" thinking, thereby mitigating (moderating) the relationships between climate combinations and conflictual aspects of the ethical dilemmas. For the "quiet desperation" dilemma, I propose a person–organization fit perspective to emphasize diversity of individual preferences instead of a managerially prescribed uniformity of spirituality. For the instrumentality dilemma, I propose a multiparadigm approach to workplace spirituality research to avoid the privileging of one research interest over another (e.g., instrumentality, individual fulfillment, societal good). I conclude with suggestions for future research.

It is not likely in the best interests of organizations or of society for its individual members to feel as the discussion forum respondent expresses that he does in the opening quote. Such instances give occasion for management researchers to ask two questions relating to the apparently unfulfilling "employer/employee" relationship voiced in the quote: (1) Would organizations be more productive and innovative, and individuals be able to live more satisfying lives, if those individuals felt inwardly connected to their work, fellow workers, and workplace? (2) Is it ethically incumbent upon organizations to improve the quality of life experienced by individuals as members of larger societies? More to the point, what workplace factors caused this employee to voice these attitudes (which are far from unique; Gavin and Mason, 2004), and should employers (organizations) bear any responsibility for helping to remedy the situation?

At least three areas of study within the management discipline might deem such questions within the purview of their research concerns and answer in the affirmative. First, *business ethics* scholars would surely recognize that "business is, above all, a social activity" (Solomon, 1992, p. 335) with mutual stakeholder responsibilities. In the above example, from the perspective of deontological, Kantian "moral rights," the forum respondent's work organization has apparently failed him in its responsibility to provide minimal levels of social satisfaction in the workplace setting (Cavanagh et al., 1981). The field of *corporate social responsibility* (CSR) might approach these questions by plumbing the implications of an apparent breach of the Lockean notion of social

---

"*It's as if your life has ended. Still, you get up every morning and fulfill your role as husband/wife, mother/father, employee/employer, because these are your duties or responsibility's (sic). You look forward to nothing. You have had all the fun/enjoyment life has to offer. There is nothing left but drudgery...quiet desperation.*" − Mike, a contributor to an online discussion forum on May 11, 2001.

contract between business and society as embodied in this employee and many others who voice similar frustrations. In other words, if certain workplaces are sources of such felt emptiness or discontent in the larger populace, the involved corporations may risk their standing as good "corporate citizens" in their local communities (Garriga and Melé, 2004).

The purpose of this paper is to propose and explicate a third and related area of study that has emerged in the management discipline as a theoretically potent approach to address such questions – that of *workplace spirituality*. While the relationship between business ethics and workplace spirituality has been introduced in the literature (e.g., Furnham, 2003; Parboteeah and Cullen, 2003), much remains to be theorized and explicated in how ethical issues and dilemmas might arise in the theory and practice of workplace spirituality. For example, previous literature has not examined ethical dilemmas that organizations might expect related to workplace spirituality that are based upon the co-existence of multiple ethical work climates (Victor and Cullen, 1988) either within or between stakeholder subgroups. This paper explores two ethical dilemmas surrounding workplace spirituality that are proposed to relate to certain pairings of ethical climates that conflict along the dimensions of ethical decision criteria and sources of moral reasoning (Victor and Cullen, 1988).

Calls for the development of workplace spirituality as a concept, measure, and theory have been numerous (e.g., Dehler and Welsh, 2003; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003). Various renderings of *spirituality*, or its narrower subset of religion, have been conceptualized and measured in other disciplines (e.g., psychology (Emmons and Paloutzian, 2003), sociology (Davie, 2004), and communication (Crocker-Lackness, 2000; Griffin, 1998)). Conceptualization and measurement of spirituality is most developed in psychology, tracing its roots as far back as William James' (1981/1890) notion of the conscious self as being comprised of three parts: material, social, and *spiritual*. In more recent times, and though there is still some lack of consensus, psychologists have defined and measured spirituality in ways that are useful to empirical research (e.g., MacDonald, 2000; Piedmont, 1999; Zinnbauer et al., 1999). Indeed, the number of studies in psychology is growing that show moderate support for higher levels of religion and/or spirituality being positively (though differently) related to improved physical and mental health (George et al., 2000; Hill and Pargament, 2003).

Spirituality (which would include, but not be limited to, the narrower term, *religion*) has been generally defined in the psychology of religion literature as "subjective feelings, thoughts, and behaviors that arise from a search for the sacred," where *sacred* is defined broadly as referring to "a divine being, divine object, ultimate reality, or Ultimate Truth as perceived by the individual" (Hill et al., 2000, p. 68). However, *workplace* spirituality, as a contextualized phenomenon that examines questions of how spirituality relates to one's work organization, can be broadly conceptualized as the lived experiences and expressions of one's spirituality in the context of work and workplace (with broader societal implications, as will be later discussed). Importantly, the combination of "spirituality" and "workplace" in the same theoretical breath – while potentially offering a perspective of the worker and his or her work that can make the workplace a source of human development rather than a hostile environment for it (cf. Argyris, 1957) – nevertheless introduces a number of ethical issues and dilemmas for organizations. In this paper, I address two ethical dilemmas – what I call the "quiet desperation" dilemma and the instrumentality dilemma. I also propose two theoretical approaches that frame future research directions in ways that can help to mitigate conflictual aspects of the dilemmas while also capitalizing upon the potential for human benefit in a world increasingly dominated by large organizations (Perrow, 1991). I begin with a discussion of the most basic unit of analysis of any theory of workplace spirituality – the organizational member as a "whole" person.

Whole persons report for work

Henry Ford asked, "Why is it that I always get the whole person when all I really want is a pair of hands?" (Pollard, 1996, p. 25). Whether or not organizations want the whole person, whole persons report for work. The concept of "whole person"

necessarily rests upon assumptions about the ontological status of human "being" in the world. Not only do disciplinary branches of psychology, sociology, management, and communication, see human beings as comprised of physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual dimensions, but so also do a diverse array of world cultures, belief systems, and philosophies (cf. Bell and Taylor, 2004; Dehler and Welsh, 2003; Richards, 1995). Nevertheless, the mention of something we call "spirit" can produce controversy among both theorists and practitioners, particularly if it is perceived to invoke religious discourses that may be considered by some as "off limits" for the workplace, conjuring up extreme images of fanatic managers proselytizing vulnerable workers to imposed, hegemonic belief systems. Such scenarios represent precisely the reverse values of the type of work environment and individual experience of it conceptualized by researchers of workplace spirituality, who envision the workplace more as a pluralistic community where differences can be not only tolerated but transcended (Mirvis, 1997). It is thus useful, before proceeding, to clarify the relative meanings generally ascribed to one's identification with a religion vis-à-vis the individual experience of spirituality.

Helpful to clarifying this difference, Mitroff and Denton (1999a) found that the managers in their sample overwhelmingly made a distinction between the terms 'spiritual' and 'religious,' some classifying themselves as spiritual but not religious. Moreover, the term spirituality was not necessarily invoked to preclude one's religiosity, but neither did spirituality imply one's identification with an institutionalized religion. *Religiosity* can thus be viewed as a subset of (or for many, as a vehicle for) a broader definition of personal *spirituality*, the latter of which may or may not involve religious affiliation. As noted earlier, common ground between the two terms has been expressed as "a search for the sacred" (Hill et al., 2000: p. 68) in terms of whatever one considers as the ultimate source of meaning.

Regarding religiosity, a sacred aspect of work can be found in the teachings of most major world religions. For example, Krishnakumar and Neck (2002) have noted that Hinduism emphasizes a spirituality that is comprised of work done with complete devotion. Islam prioritizes devotion toward collectivist goals of work. Taoism and Confucianism teach that work is a connection with others and the universe – community and transcendence. Christian teachings have produced what has become known as the "Protestant work ethic" that regards work as a divine vocation (calling) that is ultimately rendered to God (Weaver and Agle, 2002).

Perhaps due to the impartation of sacred meaning to work across religions, religiosity has been a variable of empirical investigation and found to relate positively to ethical attitudes (Conroy and Emerson, 2004) and, in more complex ways (involving moderators), to ethical behaviors (Weaver and Agle, 2002). The relationship of workplace spirituality to business ethics has also been introduced. Mitroff and Denton (1999a) found that managers who perceived their organizations to be more spiritual also perceived them to be more ethical, but this finding has the limitation of being based solely upon self-report data, which the authors acknowledge. Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) proposed ways in which ethical work climates (Victor and Cullen, 1988) might be more or less conducive to the development of workplace spirituality, which I will later elaborate. However, Parboteeah and Cullen omitted a crucial level of ethical climate (the cosmopolitan, or external societal, level), which I herein propose to be of major theoretical importance. Workplace spirituality as a phenomenon that is contextualized in the organization, but embedded in (with implications for) larger social systems, forms a basis for answering the introductory question: "Is it ethically incumbent upon organizations to improve the quality of life experienced by individuals as members of larger societies?"

To posit workplace spirituality as a meaningful approach to address this question in relation to the ethical responsibilities of organizations directed both internally to its own members and externally to local, national, and global communities, I first situate workplace spirituality within a social systems perspective in order to examine the implications of a "society of organizations" (Perrow, 1991) comprised of whole persons. Next, I examine two ethical dilemmas inherent in combining such a value-laden notion as spirituality within multiple ethical work climates: (1) the "quiet desperation" dilemma; and

(2) the instrumentality dilemma. Following each dilemma, I propose a theoretical context that takes the dilemma into account and can help to mitigate its negative consequences: (1) a needs–supplies perspective of person–organization fit to mitigate the ''quiet desperation'' dilemma; and (2) a multiparadigm research approach to mitigate the instrumentality dilemma and its related methodological differences. I conclude with suggestions for future research.

Workplace spirituality from a social systems perspective

A useful way to open this section is with the question: What, then, might be suggested for organizations to offer toward the remedy of such exigencies as expressed by the forum respondent in the opening quote? Would higher pay and benefits help, or perhaps more leisure time, more efficient technology, or a Starbucks ® in the lobby area? While these would probably not hurt, neither would they be likely, in and of themselves, to satisfy the inward yearnings reflected in the respondent's discourse for his *raison d'être* regarding work and workplace. However, conceptualizations of workplace spirituality *do* contain elements that potentially could help to do just that – to provide a theoretical and practical basis for the facilitation of work meaningfulness, a holistic integration of the workplace with the purposes of one's life, transcendence of self to become connected to a larger community, and growth toward one's full potential as a whole person. A brief review of the literature follows in which these components converge in a multidimensional conceptualization of workplace spirituality.

A convergent definition of workplace spirituality

While a very broad definition of workplace spirituality was offered earlier in the paper, it is necessary to define more fully the components that are commonly considered in definitions of workplace spirituality before proceeding to set it within a social systems perspective. Even though scholarly investi-

gation into workplace spirituality can be traced to the early 1990's (e.g., Dehler and Welsh, 1994; Neck and Milliman, 1994), its definition still carries the punctuation of a question mark rather than a period: ''How should spirituality be defined?'' (cf. Ashforth and Pratt, 2003; Benefiel, 2003, p. 367; Dehler and Welsh, 2003). While an acknowledged *consensus* may yet be lacking among workplace spirituality researchers, I propose that a conceptual *convergence* has emerged based upon a review of the literature from 1994 to 2004. The convergence occurs in four recurring themes that are traceable as common dimensions of workplace spirituality throughout the literature: (1) *self–workplace integration* (a holistic approach to workplace and self); (2) *meaning in work* (a holistic approach to the meaning of work and self); (3) *transcendence of self* (rising above self to become part of an interconnected whole); and (4) *growth/development* of one's inner self at work (Sheep, 2004).

These four components were first articulated concurrently by Neck and Milliman (1994), although these authors did not label them as concepts *per se*, nor did they formally propose them as dimensions. In subsequent conceptual articles and empirical studies, authors have proposed 3 dimensions (Ashforth and Pratt, 2003; Ashmos and Duchon, 2000); 4 dimensions (Pfeffer, 2003); 10 (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003); 11 (Mitroff and Denton, 1999a); or over 20 (Freshman, 1999) as comprising the conceptual domain of workplace spirituality. However, the four dimensions noted above are commonly addressed in all of them and reasonably subsume subsequent parsings (see Sheep, 2004, for a review).

First, *self–workplace integration*, as a holistic approach to workplace and self, is conceptualized as a personal desire to bring one's whole being into the workplace (as workgroup or organization), or not to check one's spiritual component at the door. Mitroff and Denton (1999a) found in their study of 131 HR managers:

> People do not want to compartmentalize...their lives...The search for meaning, purpose, wholeness, and integration is a constant, never-ending task...They especially want to be acknowledged as whole persons in the workplace, where they spend the majority of their waking time (pp. xv–xvi).

Therefore, since "people bring their whole selves to the workplace, and seek to integrate work into their lives" (Dehler and Welsh, 2003, p. 115; cf. Pfeffer, 2003), organizations must treat workers as whole persons with "physical, mental, emotional, and *spiritual* needs" (Dehler and Welsh, 2003, p. 109).

Second, *meaning in work* as a dimension of workplace spirituality also reflects an individual desire for integration and holism, but it is directed toward the meaning with which one imbues the work itself rather than the work environment. Put another way, "spiritual beings... express inner life needs by seeking meaningful work" (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000, p. 136). Neck and Milliman (1994, p. 9) suggested that "work is intended to be one of the most profound ways...of experiencing spirituality." Employees thus ask such "meaning" questions of their work in ways that might include: "What is my purpose here at work or life?...What is it that I have to offer? What do I want to leave behind here?" (1994, p. 10). Therefore, the meaning of one's life (as one perceives it) must converge with the meaning of one's work (as one perceives it) in order for spiritual growth and development of the worker (the fourth dimension of workplace spirituality) to flourish at work (cf. Mirvis, 1997, p. 199).

Third, the dimension of *transcendence of self* (rising above self to become part of an interconnected whole) has been defined as "a connection to something greater than oneself" (Ashforth and Pratt, 2003, p. 93). However, there is some ambiguity surrounding what "something greater than oneself" comprises. Ashforth and Pratt (2003, p. 93) point out that the "something" can be "other people, causes, nature, or a belief in a higher power." Thus, to what "greater than oneself" is one transcending? A rather accessible concept that Mirvis (1997) calls "company as community" (p. 198) is built upon a transcendence of human differences rather than commonalities. Such transcendence allows employees to rise above traditionally divisive boundaries (e.g., rigid hierarchies, demographic categories, perhaps even spiritual orientation) and rather to "naturally look to their organization as a communal center" (1997, p. 198). That workers find a need for the workplace to take on this quality is hardly surprising, given the increasing role that one's work occupies in both time spent at work and increasing communal expectations

one has of the workplace (Ashforth and Pratt, 2003; Mirvis, 1997).

Fourth, *growth and development* of one's inner self at work is linked to the other three dimensions of workplace spirituality, but it is distinct in that it imposes a quality of dynamism upon the spirituality construct. A maturing process related to self–workplace integration, meaning in work, and transcendence of self must occur in the workplace if the human life at work is to be integrated and whole. Neck and Milliman (1994) assert that the main goal of workplace spirituality "is seen as being able to reach one's full potential and to have positive attitudes and relationships with the world" (p. 10). Organizations should thus "provide opportunities for employees to experience...greater personal growth and development" (p. 10).

In all four of the dimensions of workplace spirituality, ethical dilemmas in organizations arise in that individual *preferences* for these dimensions can vary widely both within and between workgroups. For example, if a member prefers a high degree of self–workplace integration, it will be manifested in that member's desire for spiritual expression at work and a clear sense that he or she can freely bring the spiritual self to work (Dehler and Welsh, 2003). The challenge is for organizations to facilitate equitably all internal stakeholders who desire spiritual experience and expression at work while also accommodating those who would prefer the work zone to be relatively free from such expression (e.g., strict secularists or atheists). Similar challenges with a diversity of preferences confront the other three dimensions, as well. Only a theoretical perspective that accounts for variance in individual preferences *without prescribing* a lockstep organizational uniformity would be commensurate with the concepts of diversity and transcendence in workplace spirituality. Such a perspective is that of person–organization fit (P–O fit), to be proposed later in the paper.

In sum, since the four dimensions explicated in this section are common to the conceptualizations of workplace spirituality since 1994, they are best taken as multiple indicators of workplace spirituality as a multidimensional construct (Law et al., 1998). Whether its dimensions are *effect indicators* or *causal indicators* of workplace spirituality (i.e., whether the structural path arrows point toward or away from the

dimensions in relation to workplace spirituality, respectively) is a conclusion that can be reached and supported only through future empirical research (Edwards, 2001; Law and Wong, 1999). The definitional relevance for our purposes is that workplace spirituality is a construct that is comprised of these four dimensions. In the P–O fit perspective, this means that the higher the preference for each of these dimensions, the higher the preference for the expression and experience of spirituality in the workplace.

Any definition that purports to conceptualize human spirituality in a work context must also take into account the social embeddedness of individuals in organizations, or more precisely, in a *society of organizations* (Perrow, 1991). Such an approach, a social systems perspective, yields ethical implications for individuals, particularly those in positions of power, as well as for social responsibility of organizations in societies.

The social systems perspective of organizations

Victor and Cullen (1988) proposed and tested a typology of nine ethical work climates, defined as "general and pervasive characteristics of organizations, affecting a broad range of decisions" (p. 101). The nine climates are differentiated along two axes of three classes each: (1) the *ethical criterion* used in moral reasoning (Y-axis); and (2) the *locus of analysis* (X-axis), or the "source of moral reasoning used for applying ethical criteria to organizational decisions" (p. 105). Along the Y-axis, three incompatible types of decision criteria give rise to different ethical work climates: (1) *egoistic* (based upon self-interest as a dominant decision criterion); (2) *benevolent* (a teleological, or consequential, concern with the well-being of others); and (3) *principled* (a deontological prioritization of rules and norms as moral criteria for decisions). Along the X-axis, Victor and Cullen identified three referent groups that serve as sources for moral reasoning at different levels: (1) *individual* (use of personal ethics); (2) *local* (workgroup or organizational ethics); and (3) *cosmopolitan* (ethics generated outside of the organization – e.g., professional, legal, or *societal* norms). The cosmopolitan source of moral reasoning bears the closest

resemblance to a "social systems" perspective of organizations, which views the organization as embedded in a larger society.

As noted earlier, Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) considered two of these levels (individual and local) to propose that benevolent and principled climates would be conducive to the development of workplace spirituality in organizations, whereas an egoistic climate would not (at both levels). They used only the individual and local levels as sources of moral judgment because they deemed these as having "primary relevance to the workplace" (p. 139).

However, I suggest that it is a major theoretical shortcoming to omit the *cosmopolitan* locus of analysis because it takes into account the expectations and norms of the larger society in which the organization is embedded. To overlook the cosmopolitan source of moral reasoning in workplace spirituality is to neglect what Paine (2003) saw in the external environment as a "restless sea of moral...expectations" placed upon organizations to be "more accountable for the impact of their activities, and more respectful of law and generally accepted ethical standards" (p. 227).

As a theoretical underpinning for this assertion, Charles Perrow (1991) has unambiguously asserted that "large organizations have absorbed society" (p. 726). Moreover, "organizations are the key phenomenon of our time, and thus politics, social class, economics, technology, religion, the family, and even social psychology take on the character of *dependent variables* (italics added)" (p. 725). While Perrow acknowledged the "imperialistic" nature of his position (cf. Deetz, 1992), his assertion that organizations are the primary social units and determinants of societal variables has profound implications. The premise invites us to consider nothing less than what the world is like when the decisions and actions of work organizations become the chief determinants of the well-being of societies.

Perrow was by no means a lone voice crying in the wilderness. Acknowledging that consequences of an "organizational society" are not all negative (e.g., the positive role of organizations in reducing gender and race discrimination), Stern and Barley (1996) nevertheless asserted, "So powerful have large corporations become that their decisions affect the welfare of entire states and nations" (p. 148). Basing

their conclusion upon the seminal work of Parsons (1956), who called for a focus on the impact of organizations upon larger sociocultural systems, Stern and Barley noted that a "social systems" perspective is yet largely lacking in organizational theory literature. Similarly, appealing to the work of Max Weber, Hinings and Greenwood (2002) asserted that one of the defining questions of organizational theory has historically been: "What are the consequences of the existence of organizations?" When this question has been addressed, it has usually been in terms of how organizations shape the distribution of "privilege and disadvantage" (p. 411), both within the organization and between the organization and its larger social system. Nevertheless, Hinings and Greenwood also conclude that this perspective has received only scant and sporadic attention in management research.

In the sections that follow, I seek to narrow this gap insofar as it applies to workplace spirituality by taking into account the cosmopolitan level or source of moral reasoning, or a social systems perspective, in which workplace spirituality is an especially appropriate concept to address the question, "What are the consequences of the existence of organizations?" both to individuals and to societies. It should be noted that the "social systems" authors cited above addressed sociological concerns at a very macro level. However, whole societies are impacted by organizations only because of the quality of life they engender in the humans that comprise them. Individuals populate organizations and societies as concomitant stakeholders in each, and one would be hard-pressed to speak of societal well-being without understanding that they are referring to an aggregate of individual well-being that is affected, for good or ill, by membership in one's work organization. As Mayer Zald (1993) expressed it: "Organizations are not only instruments for creating products and profits. They are instruments of power and domination. They are major sources of the individual's sense of wholeness and participation or alienation and worthlessness" (p. 517).

The spiritual quality of life for whole persons, populating a society of organizations, therefore depends heavily upon organizations either providing (or not providing) integrated environments that facilitate opportunities for meaningful work, communal connection, and personal growth. Our concern, then, becomes a theoretical framing of workplace spirituality that will allow for a full research stream with predictive validity for relevant outcomes, while not neglecting the ethical dilemmas presented by as volatile a topic as human spirituality (not to mention its potential for ethical abuse, to be discussed later).

Appealing to Toffler's (1986) distinction drawn between an ethical "issue" and ethical "dilemma," Maclagan (2003) noted that *issues* involve single concerns, particularly in a moral rights sense (e.g., providing safety, security, fairness), whereas *dilemmas* involve two or more conflicting values facing decision makers. In a "true" or "acute" moral dilemma, any decision one reaches will be viewed as at least partially "wrong" by at least some stakeholders (p. 23). In both ethical dilemmas to follow, managerial decisions to facilitate workplace spirituality (or, conversely, to ignore or discourage it) present dilemmas to organizations that will likely meet with welcome by some stakeholders while producing resistance by others due to *conflicting ethical priorities* inherent in the ethical climates typology (see Table I for a summary). Since multiple ethical climates will usually co-exist in a single organization (Victor and Cullen, 1988, p. 105), the best that many organizations can hope for is to hold ethical dilemmas in a dialectical tension, in which stakeholders are urged to adopt a "both-and" rather than an "either-or" mentality toward seemingly conflicting (paradoxical) priorities. Such is the approach that I will take toward both the "quiet desperation" and "instrumentality" dilemmas to follow.

The "quiet desperation" dilemma of workplace spirituality

I derive the label "quiet desperation" from its use in the forum respondent's opening quote, which is likely borrowed from a well-known line by Henry David Thoreau (1854): "The mass of men [*sic*] lead lives of quiet desperation" (*Walden*, Chapter 1). If we, with Thoreau, consider this possibility, then we must eventually come to ask what part of that desperation is attributable to the work context – i.e.,

TABLE I
Ethical Dilemmas in the Theory and Practice of Workplace Spirituality

Dilemma Description	Ethical Work Climate Conflicts (cf. Victor and Cullen, 1988)	Theoretical Perspective to Mitigate Dilemma
"Quiet Desperation" Dilemma: A conflict across sources of ethical reasoning (or *levels*, ethical criteria held constant) Member preferences for the four dimensions of workplace spirituality put members in a vulnerable position that may tempt managers to co-opt intrinsic spiritual motivations as a means of normative control (i.e., "inspiring" higher performance at less cost than through extrinsic means). The dilemma arises as a matter of priority of *individual versus organizational development*.	An egoistic-individual desire to reach full potential as an *individual* *versus* An egoistic-local desire to reach full potential as an *organization* (Prop. 1) A principled-cosmopolitan normative expectation for *individuals* to develop their full potential *versus* A principled-cosmopolitan normative expectation for *organizations* to develop their full potential (Prop. 2)	*A needs-supplies perspective of person-organization fit (P–O fit):* an individually perceived congruence between member preferences of the four dimensions of workplace spirituality vis-à-vis organizational supplies along those dimensions. Workplace spirituality thus becomes driven by member preferences rather than a top-down, managed uniformity of spirituality
Instrumentality Dilemma: A conflict across ethical criteria (level held constant) The often proposed positive relationship between workplace spirituality and individual/organizational performance is viewed by some theorists as a misdirected rationale for studying workplace spirituality. Conflict arises over whether the theory and practice of spirituality in the workplace should be studied/developed because it is good for the "bottom line" (instrumentality) or because it is "the right thing to do" for individual members *and society* (ethicality).	An egoistic-local concern with maximizing company profits for the personal gain of owners (fiduciary responsibilities) and managers (agency theory) *versus* A benevolent-local concern with the personal well-being of all employees (Prop. 3) An egoistic-cosmopolitan expectation that organizations be efficient in the use of resources and productive of cost-efficient goods and services *versus* A benevolent-cosmopolitan expectation that organizations be socially responsible in the many ways in which they consequentially impact individuals and society (Prop. 4)	*A multiparadigm approach to workplace spirituality research:* Since this dilemma involves objectivist (material) versus subjectivist (experiential) outcomes, a parallel conflict arises in theoretical assumptions and research methods for workplace spirituality. A multiparadigm approach bridges perspectives and/or accounts for how their interplay can be synergistic to theory advancement.

whether the work context is a necessary contributor to the stifling of the human spirit (Anderson, 2000; Gavin and Mason, 2004). When we hear of "unsatisfied" or "unfulfilled" employees, we must ask: Unsatisfied with what? Unfulfilled by lacking what?

To address these questions positively, the dimensions of workplace spirituality are conceptualized in terms that potentially remedy such "lacks" as: (1) life fragmentation (with life integration with work); (2) meaningless work (with meaningful work); (3) individual self-absorption (with transcendence of self to a greater whole); and (4) personal stagnation and frustration (with growth and development). Regarding the latter dimension, personal growth and development might be construed by some as a veiled form of egoistic self-interest, either in the advancement of one's career interests, or simply as a narcissistic exercise in self-enhancement.

However, from a Kantian, moral rights perspective, the full development of one's potential is rather viewed as an individual "moral duty" (Maclagan, 2003, p. 23) to oneself, to one's organization, and to society in general. Thus, it is not patently unethical to be initially self-interested in the pursuit of spiritual growth in the workplace. In terms of ethical climates, the ethical dilemma introduced is a conflict between an *egoistic-individual* desire to realize one's potential and an *egoistic-local* motive to capitalize upon this desire in the form of increased employee performance (at minimum or zero increase in cost) to enhance organizational interests (i.e., profits). If these ethical climates co-exist and wield much the same relative influence or strength in an organization, then the following is proposed:

> *Proposition* 1: The degree to which the relative strengths of egoistic-individual and egoistic-local ethical work climates within the same organization approach equality is positively related to the degree of ethical conflict in the organization arising from the "quiet desperation" dilemma.

How might this happen? Within an egoistic-local climate, managers may be tempted to capitalize unethically upon the vulnerabilities of "desperate" and unfulfilled employees for no higher purpose than corporate gain. As an example, let us imagine

an organizational member with a high preference for the workplace spirituality dimension of "meaning in work." He or she is thus seeking a connection between some aspect of the work context (whether expressed in mission, philosophy, perceived worth or "goodness" of outcome, and so on) and his or her consciousness of what is worthwhile to pursue in life. To become spiritually fulfilling work, the work must "click" with some inner awareness or deep-seated drive of the person with the effect: "This is for me. This is what I *should be* doing with my life right here, right now." Not only is a paycheck received as extrinsic motivation (see Furnham, 2003, for a discussion of "money and happiness"), but a resonance between worker and work is also perceived as worthy of the investment of *self*. It is not far removed (if at all) from dedication to a "cause" such as a social movement, or a "religious" devotion in which one realizes that inner being (as manifested in deeply held values or beliefs, or in what Rousseau [1998] called 'deep-structure' identifications) and outward expenditure of time and resources are directed toward one harmonious purpose. Thus, in that it connects the deepest parts of inner self and identity to outward work efforts, workplace spirituality potentially becomes a powerful form of intrinsic motivation for attitudinal and behavioral outcomes in the workplace (Dehler and Welsh, 2003).

When viewed in terms of such motivating potential, it is no surprise to find that the interest in workplace spirituality has mushroomed in practitioner leadership literature and the popular business press (e.g., Conlin, 1999; Shorto, 2004). However, it also gives an ethical pause that such seemingly benign interest can mask more self-interested managerial motivations for exploitation of workplace spirituality as a powerful tool for normative control (Barley and Kunda, 1992). For example, Alvesson and Willmott (2002) note a rise in managerial discourses promoting "passion, soul, and charisma" that can be interpreted as "expressions of an increased managerial interest in regulating employees' 'insides'" (p. 622). This phenomenon hits very close to the domain of workplace spirituality, especially as it relates to the dimension of growth and development, which many authors define in terms of self-actualization (Ashforth and Pratt, 2003;

Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003; Mitroff and Denton, 1999a; Pfeffer, 2003) or to the development of one's full potential (Krishnakumar and Neck, 2002; Mitroff and Denton, 1999a; Neck and Milliman, 1994). Interestingly, it is the discourse of self-actualization that Alvesson and Willmott noted as "promulgating...a seductive means of engineering consent" (p. 624) in work organizations. Workplace spirituality in organizations as a self-actualizing discourse thus presents potential to become a bane or a blessing. Spiritually "hungry" individuals are particularly vulnerable to organizations that appear to assuage the gnawing "quiet desperation" of a meaningless work life, and the ethicality of organizations exploiting such vulnerabilities in a self-serving way is doubtful. The source of such exploitation may not be confined to top management, but may also derive from the concertive control of groups upon its members (Barker, 1993).

However, a complicating consideration must be taken into account that involves the cosmopolitan level or source of moral reasoning. As noted above, what begins as an egoistic pursuit of one's potential may end more as the individual following a principled norm of society – i.e., societies *expect* individuals to strive to develop their full potential for the good of their organizations and society.

Moreover, just as individual development of potential is not entirely self-interested, neither is the full development of local (organizational) potential. If individuals have a deontological "right" to self-development, then so do organizations. What some would insist is purely organizational self-interest (an egoistic-local climate) "is really just a shorthand for some notion of system-viability, survival or performance, in the interests of one or more stakeholder group or category" (Maclagan, 2003, p. 22) – including the larger society as an external stakeholder. Moral reasoning can thus be driven by the societal expectation that organizations develop their full potentials (efficiently) for the good of society (a principled-cosmopolitan climate). Thus, I propose

> Proposition 2: The degree to which the relative strengths approach equality of principled-cosmopolitan norms placed upon *individuals* and principled-cosmopolitan norms placed upon *organizations* (each to develop their full potentials) is positively

related to the degree of ethical conflict in the organization arising from a "quiet desperation" dilemma.

The "quiet desperation" ethical dilemma in both of these conflicts (Propositions 1 and 2) thus arises between whether individual or organizational development should be primary; it is a conflict across levels, while holding ethical criteria constant. However, organizations can work toward resolution of this dilemma if a "both-and" approach is taken seriously by management (i.e., to facilitate the mutual development of both individuals and organizations because it is interdependently "the right thing to do" *for both*). The ethical breach occurs when either organizational or individual development becomes the *only* real consideration (e.g., when managerial discourses of employee development, community, and so on, serve only as a placating function with the ulterior motive of extracting higher levels of performance at little or no additional cost, or higher margins).

The dilemma for the ethical development of workplace spirituality both in theory and practice thus becomes to advance theory in ways that can show its relevance and benefits (or not, if those are the findings) to legitimate organizational concerns with performance, while minimizing unethical exploitation. Given this dilemma, it is incumbent upon those who would develop a theory of workplace spirituality to lay a foundation that takes into account and attempts to mitigate its negative consequences. Toward that goal, I next propose P–O fit as a theoretical framework of workplace spirituality that should moderate the relationships proposed in Propositions 1 and 2. In other words, when the fit between member preferences and organizational supplies are viewed as benefiting both individual and organizational outcomes, the presence of different ethical work climates will have a reduced impact on conflict. It is no longer a competitive (either-or) but rather a cooperative or dialectical (both-and) relationship between individual and organizational interests.

A P–O fit perspective to mitigate the "quiet desperation" dilemma

I propose a P–O fit perspective to approach theory and research of workplace spirituality for two

reasons: (1) it is a relatively established perspective within mainstream organizational behavior theory; and (2) it can be conceptualized as driven by member preferences rather than organizational mandate or prescription. Regarding the first reason, the theoretical development of workplace spirituality has been slowed by a relatively independent evolution of the construct. Rather than trying to develop a spirituality literature apart from established management research streams, a more fruitful approach would be to situate spirituality within a nomological network of existing concepts in organizational theory, organizational behavior, or strategy, in order to hypothesize and test the relevance of workplace spirituality to individual and organizational outcomes of interest. For example, if workplace spirituality is found empirically to alleviate the "lacks" discussed earlier, then it should have relevance to such extant variables as job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors.

Regarding the second reason for choosing a P–O fit framework, I focus upon a *needs–supplies perspective* of P–O fit, defined as a "match between individual preferences or needs and organizational systems and structures" (Kristof, 1996, p. 5). In any scale for workplace spirituality to be developed from such a perspective, member preferences for the four dimensions of workplace spirituality explicated earlier would be cognitively compared by the member to his or her perceptions of the workplace environment and resources (e.g., how reward structures and communication patterns [Kristof, 1996] enable or constrain workplace spirituality). Perceived P–O fit of workplace spirituality can have an advantage over actual fit because individual perceptions can influence certain individual attitudinal and behavioral outcomes more than actual organizational characteristics (Kristof, 1996).

Many outcome variables of workplace spirituality P–O fit may coincide with those already hypothesized for P–O fit generally. For example, Chatman (1989, p. 340) proposed that organization-level outcomes of P–O fit are changes in norms and values. Individual-level outcomes are value change, extra-role behaviors, tenure, and job satisfaction (Chatman, 1989, 1991). However, it is not the purpose of this paper to theorize all potential outcomes of workplace spirituality P–O fit. Rather, it is to propose theoretical context for workplace spirituality in terms of P–O fit that can be used to test any attitudinal or behavioral outcome of P–O fit assessed on the basis of workplace spirituality preferences and supplies.

Moreover, the P–O fit approach to workplace spirituality offers a theoretical context that can help to mitigate (moderate) the conflict of the "quiet desperation" dilemma because its framework serves to minimize managerial and normative group manipulation of spirituality in individually invasive or prescriptive ways. I propose that the theoretical relevance of (and thus a significant portion of the variance explained by) workplace spirituality to attitudinal and behavioral outcomes is driven by *widely varying degrees* of member preferences vis-à-vis organizational supplies, rather than by managerial control or prescription of a preferred version or level of spirituality.

Such an approach would most closely resemble that of an *enabling* organization, the least invasive of the three-way typology developed by Ashforth and Pratt (2003) of spiritually enabling, partnering, and directing organizations. These organizational types are varied along a continuum of increasing degrees of spiritual control of members by managers, the enabling organization serving only as a passive facilitator for individual spiritual strivings. However, it should be noted that directing organizations are not necessarily unethical if its individuals genuinely *prefer* an organization with a more proactive approach, as characterized by *partnering* organizations (in which spirituality is a negotiated process of social construction) and *directing* organizations (in which a preferred belief system is imposed on employees). However, the important point is that the ethicality of such modes of control is dependent upon the level of individual *member* preferences rather than managerial pronouncement. The P–O fit perspective thus allows for a full range of diversity in individual preferences for a "spiritual" workplace, as well as a full range of degrees to which the organization supplies these preferences (zero to full facilitation). Most importantly, this perspective does not prescribe degree, content, or process of what spirituality "should be" for any given individual or organization. Rather, the focus is upon the fit between what

individual members prefer for themselves, and to what degree the organization is congruent with their preference, from the perspective of the member, whether manager or employee.

The instrumentality dilemma

A widely posited rationale for studying workplace spirituality has been its proposed instrumental relation to individual and organizational performance (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Dehler and Welsh, 1994; Mirvis, 1997; Mitroff and Denton, 1999a). A theoretical framing problem lies in the way spirituality has typically been cast in contradistinction to Weberian bureaucracy or Taylorist scientific management (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Dehler and Welsh, 2003). Paradoxically, although workplace spirituality is quite different from classical management theories in its emphasis upon the inner person rather than mechanical efficiency, there is still a distinct instrumental rationality that runs throughout the workplace spirituality literature. As noted above, the rationale for devoting time and resources to the study of workplace spirituality is its alleged link to increased performance and productivity – the bottom line (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003).

However, this seemingly strange admixture of spirituality and more prosaic business motives has not gone unchallenged. On the other side of the debate are theorists who problematize the uncritical acceptance of instrumental organizational goals as the primary utility of spirituality research. Rather, they would explore "how business can be a part of spirituality instead of how spirituality can be a profitable tool for business" (cf. Benefiel, 2003; Krahnke et al., 2003, p. 401). In other words, business and work become phenomena to be employed in the service of human spiritual development, not *vice versa*. Dehler and Welsh noted this ongoing paradox of instrumentality by warning that managers may exploit spirituality for the sake of the bottom line rather than "treating people as complete human beings as the 'right' thing to do" (Dehler and Welsh, 2003, p. 115).

In terms of ethical work climates (Victor and Cullen, 1988), the second ethical dilemma, or the "instrumentality" dilemma, seems to have been

generated by much of the literature framing it as a conflict of values between instrumental organizational concerns with profit (an *egoistic-local* interest) versus member well-being and development (a *benevolent-local* concern in which "each individual is concerned with the well-being of each other" (Parboteeah and Cullen, 2003, p. 145)). These ethical climates will pose a dilemma if they are both relatively influential within the same organization.

> *Proposition* 3: The degree to which the relative strengths of egoistic-local and benevolent-local ethical work climates within the same organization approach equality is positively related to the degree of ethical conflict in the organization arising from the instrumentality dilemma.

From a social systems (cosmopolitan-level) perspective, Victor and Cullen (1988) exemplify the larger social system's *egoistic-cosmopolitan* interest in organizations as one of "efficiency" (pp. 104, 106). In contrast, they characterize the *benevolent-cosmopolitan* ethical environment as one where consideration of the "social responsibility" of the organization is paramount. Thus, when organizations draw upon ethical criteria from conflicting sources or interests within the larger society, they can experience an ethical dilemma in which of those interests to privilege.

> *Proposition* 4: The degree to which the relative strengths of egoistic-cosmopolitan and benevolent-cosmopolitan ethical work climates within the same organization approach equality is positively related to the degree of ethical conflict in the organization arising from the instrumentality dilemma.

Unlike in the "quiet desperation" dilemma, both propositions of the instrumentality dilemma hold the level (or source of moral reasoning) constant while the ethical criteria vary. The variance has been constructed as an "either-or" dichotomy between incompatible egoistic and benevolent decision criteria at both local and cosmopolitan levels. However, the resolution of this dilemma again lies in viewing it as a "both-and" bridging of the legitimate interests of each criteria. While I do not dispute that societies have a legitimate interest in the cost-efficient production of firms (an egoistic/instrumental concern), I maintain that societies have at least as great an

interest in their social responsibility (a benevolent/ moral concern) to contribute toward rather than erode the social capital of organizational members as part of larger communities (e.g., in such forms as civic engagement and family association; Putnam, 1995). Put another way, the quality of lives that organizational members are able to live in and contribute toward their larger societies (a *benevolent-cosmopolitan* concern) is because of – rather than, say, in spite of – their concomitant membership in and efficient contribution to their work organizations (an *egoistic-cosmopolitan* concern). The two interests are *complementary* and do not necessarily conflict.

For example, Mitroff and Denton (1999b) write in their study

> Those associated with organizations they perceived as "more spiritual" also saw their organizations as "more profitable." They reported that they were able to bring more of their "complete selves" to *work*. They could deploy more of their full creativity, emotions, and intelligence; in short, organizations viewed as more spiritual get more from their participants, and vice versa (p. 8).

If organizations can nurture the whole person *and* benefit tangibly at the same time, why would that not be a worthy goal? Undoubtedly, the "dilemma" character of the instrumentality debate will not entirely be put to rest but will more likely (and, at best) be held in a dialectical tension. There will always be managers who place more emphasis on performance outcomes than relational and individual well-being, and vice versa. It is not unlike the longstanding typology of task-oriented and person-oriented leader behaviors (see House and Aditya, 1997, for a review), or of transactional versus transformational leadership styles (Bass, 1985), but the two can exist in a complementary way, even if in tension, in healthy organizations.

Related methodological differences

A debate surrounding research methodology and measurement of spirituality parallels of the ethical debate of instrumentality. Those who favor the former position (e.g., "nourishing the soul at work may be good for business" (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000, p. 136)) also generally favor objectivist epistemological assumptions and a quantitative approach to research methods. Those who question such economically-driven motives for spirituality research tend to favor subjectivist assumptions with an interpretive approach to research methods (e.g., Krahnke et al., 2003; Lips-Wiersma, 2003). That methods should vary along these lines is logical in that these two groups are concerned about different outcomes – the former being organizational performance (objective outcomes) and the latter being individual fulfillment (subjective outcomes) for the greater good of both individual and societal well-being.

I take a middle position in relation to the two. Workplace spirituality can be measured quantitatively, particularly in terms of the perceptual (in)congruence of P–O fit, but with outcomes that are not solely instrumental ends for the organization (e.g., levels of stress, job satisfaction). In proposing a preferences-supplies P–O fit approach (Kristof, 1996), I also answer affirmatively the often debated question, "Is it appropriate to measure spirituality in quantifiable units?" (Benefiel, 2003, p. 367). How can one develop theory around a construct unless its relative presence or absence can be assessed? Moreover, I agree in principle with the position of Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (Krahnke et al., 2003, p. 398):

> For workplace spirituality to be a viable construct in improving organizations and the people in them, it requires a degree of confidence we can only attain through scientific measurement. Only with reliable data can we assuage the understandable reluctance of organizations to integrate spirituality into their workplaces.

The need for quantitative measurement in no way diminishes the value of qualitative methods, whether in positivist or interpretive paradigms. Where quantitative testing of a model can never fully describe a phenomenon, qualitative methods can generate richer data and meaning to generate theory. Thus, a both-and mentality should be maintained regarding research methods and paradigms in the task of theorizing workplace spirituality. Similar to the first dilemma, the cooperative "both-and" mentality facilitated by a multiparadigm approach, explained next, should moderate (by decreasing) the relationship between co-existent ethical work climates and the conflicts predicted in Propositions 3 and 4.

A multiparadigm approach to mitigate the instrumentality dilemma

The foregoing section on the debate surrounding the instrumentality and measurement of workplace spirituality is a function of paradigmatic assumptions on each side of the debate and consequent research methods that require different types of data. If objectivists favor quantification of workplace spirituality and subjectivists favor more interpretive methods to theorize workplace spirituality, different epistemological and ontological assumptions (i.e., paradigmatic assumptions) are at the root of that division. Workplace spirituality researchers should, therefore, examine the lessons already learned (or at least promulgated) by the emerging literature on multiparadigm approaches as a way forward for productive research.

Two important goals of multiparadigm inquiry include: "(1) to encourage greater awareness of theoretical alternatives and thereby facilitate discourse and/or inquiry across paradigms, and (2) to foster greater understandings of organizational plurality and paradox" (Lewis and Keleman, 2002, p. 258). Such an ethic of research promotes an accommodating ideology that respects differing approaches because they can inform one another, a stratified ontology that acknowledges multiple dimensions of reality, and a pluralist epistemology that privileges no single way of knowing (Lewis and Keleman, 2002). Therefore, multiparadigm research can be used to *bridge* rather than exclude opposing perspectives. Metaparadigm theory building "transcends paradigm distinctions to reveal disparity and complementarity" (Lewis and Grimes, 1999, p. 673) in the insights that different paradigmatic approaches offer to our understanding of a phenomenon. Transcending paradigms would seem to be a logical methodological fit for a concept such as workplace spirituality that is itself built upon a notion of transcendence.

Of course, the multiparadigm approach itself is not uncontested within the field of management. Workplace spirituality, embedded in that broader field, is now facing the very real possibility of taking part in that larger debate of paradigm incommensurability (incommunicability across paradigms due to different assumptions) versus multiparadigm research (communicability across paradigms). Some organizational scholars have attempted to move the field toward a dominant-paradigm consensus (Pfeffer, 1993), eschewing paradigm plurality, while others "celebrate, rather than deny, variation, diversity, and difference" (Clegg and Hardy, 1996, p. 3). These divergent attitudes have erupted into "paradigm wars" that have characterized much of the recent development of the field (Canella and Paetzold, 1994; Pfeffer, 1993; Van Maanen, 1995).

It would be tragic indeed if the theoretical development of workplace spirituality became immobilized in the quagmire of the paradigm wars experienced elsewhere in our discipline. Rather than an "either-or" mentality toward whether workplace spirituality ought to be measured quantitatively and tested for statistical significance in its instrumental effects (a functionalist paradigm), or to be interpreted in terms of its negotiated, intersubjective meanings (an interpretivist paradigm), the future research stream in workplace spirituality is an ideal candidate to serve as an exemplar for the "both-and" mentality of multiparadigm research.

Such an approach is best summed up by Weaver and Gioia (1994):

> Might we not see competing paradigms as distinct but mutually intelligible because they comprise parts, if not of some singular entity, nevertheless of some ultimately unified picture?....Without some commonality, we would have irreconcilably different phenomenon rather than multifaceted ones (p. 577).

Likewise, those who study workplace spirituality from different vantage points are not studying different phenomena, but a multidimensional one. Since the instrumentality debate is reflected in its paradigmatic assumptions and methodological designs, a "both-and" mentality that begins in the respectful interplay of "the simultaneous recognition of both contrasts and connections between paradigms" (Schultz and Hatch, 1996, p. 530) can also result in a "both-and" approach to instrumental, individual, and societal outcomes of interest for workplace spirituality.

Suggestions for future research

The future research directions of workplace spirituality and its relation to the ethical dilemmas noted in this paper will be heavily constrained by the ongoing theoretical development of the workplace spirituality construct. Therefore, four directions for future research are suggested: (1) the development of a construct valid scale; (2) the exploration of what other extant streams of research can be informed by the inclusion of workplace spirituality as a variable; (3) the potential for multi-paradigm research; and (4) the empirical testing of the proposed relationships among ethical work climate combinations and ethical dilemmas of workplace spirituality.

First, the conceptualization and measurement of workplace spirituality are necessary developments if the construct is to contribute usefully to business ethics theory as well as other fields within the management discipline. In addressing this exigency, I proposed a definitional convergence of workplace spirituality as a four-dimensional construct. If a multidimensional definition can become generally accepted, and it is determined that workplace spirituality indeed should be measured, next steps would include the development of a construct valid scale utilizing the P–O fit approach to workplace spirituality. Such a scale would be comprised of parallel items that elicit responses indicating both individual preferences for and organizational supplies of the elements of the conceptual domains for each dimension. Additionally, this type of scale (based upon preferences/supplies congruence) lends itself well to polynomial regression techniques of testing fit hypotheses, which yield three-dimensional response surfaces as outputs (Edwards, 1994). Thus, the P–O fit approach has the additional benefit of producing more complex information about the relationships among individuals, organizations, and outcomes.

Second, an intended consequence of such research is to reduce marginalization of workplace spirituality in organizational studies by the empirical demonstration of its relevance (or irrelevance, if that be the case) in terms of significant (or insignificant) relationships to a wide array of outcomes of interest to organizations and individuals – e.g., job satisfaction, levels of stress, organizational citizenship behaviors, leadership styles, absenteeism. One example of an established construct with a potentially interesting relationship to workplace spirituality is that of organizational commitment. An interesting research question would be: How does a high preference for workplace spirituality (or a high perception of congruence in P–O fit of workplace spirituality) relate differentially to one's affective, normative, and continuance commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Cullen et al. (2003) found that organizational commitment was negatively related to an egoistic ethical work climate, positively related to a benevolent climate, and positively related to a principled climate for professional workers. These results are very similar to the relationships that Parboteeah and Cullen (2003) propose between workplace spirituality and types of ethical work climate. This suggests that the relationship should be explored between workplace spirituality and organizational commitment, as they are both theorized to relate similarly to types of climates based upon ethical criteria.

Generally speaking, developing workplace spirituality theory in an esoteric vein serves little purpose in the advancement of organization theory. Its inclusion in established research streams is long overdue given the rise in awareness of workplace spirituality evidenced in a burgeoning popular and practitioner literature. Scholarship would thus serve society (and organizations) well to catch up with the phenomenon of workplace spirituality.

Third, the advantages of a multiparadigm approach to the research of workplace spirituality have been discussed extensively in the preceding section. It is noted here to encourage the early consideration of researchers to incorporate a multiparadigm view as well as to account for the differing assumptions of the paradigms employed. For example, more emergent qualitative research is needed in grounded theory (Eisenhardt, 1989) and interpretive studies that provide richer description and meaning of workplace spirituality as it is experienced in the workplace. Case studies, ethnographies, as well as the testing of scales and models all lie ahead in the path of theoretical development.

Fourth, the propositions of this paper relating co-existent types of ethical work climates to ethical dilemmas of workplace spirituality should be operationalized and empirically tested. The miti-

gating (moderating) influences of the theoretical perspectives proposed (as they are deployed in theoretical and managerial schemas) should also be operationalized and tested.

Conclusion

With a growing spiritual consciousness in many cultures, including that of American organizations, expectations that spiritual needs be fulfilled in the workplace will only become a more salient criterion for members as they assess their congruence of P–O fit. The influence of workplace spirituality can no longer be viewed as "undiscussable in objectivist science" (Vaill, 1998, p. 28), nor should it be hindered by paradigmatic fragmentation. Rather, workplace spirituality should be given greater attention by management researchers as organizational members report for work increasingly aware of their wholeness and spirituality. I have proposed P–O fit as a way that workplace spirituality scholars can frame theory such that human preferences are privileged over managerial fiat in such a sensitive and defining issue as personal spirituality. I have also proposed a multiparadigm approach to research in order that no one concern (instrumentality, individual fulfillment, societal good) is necessarily privileged over another. In a world that can be increasingly described as a society of organizations, workplace spirituality is a concept with potential to address some of the most crucial needs confronting organizations in relation to the quality of life of its members and the larger society. Due to the nature of the double hermeneutic, in which the theoretical interpretations of scientific observers have a feedback effect upon constructed realities (Giddens, 1984), it is incumbent upon those who would theorize workplace spirituality to take into account the ethical implications of their theoretical assumptions and contexts upon the question: What are the consequences of the existence of organizations to societies and the individuals that comprise them?

References

Alvesson, M. and H. Willmott: 2002, 'Identity Regulation as Organizational Control: Producing the Appropriate Individual', *Journal of Management Studies* **39**(5), 619–644.

Anderson, P.: 2000, 'This Place Hurts My Spirit!', *Journal for Quality and Participation* **23**(4), 16–17.

Argyris, C.: 1957, 'The Individual and Organization: Some Problems of Mutual Adjustment', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **2**(1), 1–24.

Ashforth, B. E. and M. G. Pratt: 2003, 'Institutionalized Spirituality: An Oxymoron?', in R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (M. E. Sharpe, New York), pp. 93–107.

Ashmos, D. and D. Duchon: 2000, 'Spirituality at Work: A Conceptualization and Measure', *Journal of Management Inquiry* **9**(2), 134–145.

Barker, J. R.: 1993, 'Tightening the Iron Cage: Concertive Control in Self-managing Teams', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **38**(3), 408–437.

Barley, S. R. and G. Kunda: 1992, 'Design and Devotion: Surges of Rational and Normative Ideologies of Control in Managerial Discourse', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **37**(3), 363–399.

Bass, B. M.: 1985, *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations* (Free Press, New York)

Bell, E. and S. Taylor: 2004, 'From Outward Bound to Inward Bound: The Prophetic Voices and Discursive Practices of Spiritual Management Development', *Human Relations* **57**(4), 439–466.

Benefiel, M.: 2003, 'Mapping the Terrain of Spirituality in Organizations Research', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **16**(4), 367–377.

Cannella, A. A. and R. L. Paetzold: 1994, 'Pfeffer's Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: A Rejoinder', *Academy of Management Review* **19**(2), 331–341.

Cavanagh, G. F., D. J. Moberg and M. Velasquez: 1981, 'The Ethics of Organizational Politics', *Academy of Management Review* **6**(3), 363–374.

Chatman, J. A.: 1989, 'Improving Interactional Organizational Research: A Model of Person–organization Fit', *Academy of Management Review* **14**(3), 333–349.

Chatman, J. A.: 1991, 'Matching People and Organizations: Selection and Socialization in Public Accounting Firms', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **36**(3), 459–484.

Cullen, J. B., K. P. Parboteeah and B. Victor: 2003, 'The Effects of Ethical Climates on Organizational Commitment: A Two-Study Analysis', *Journal of Business Ethics* **46**(2), 127–141.

Clegg, S. R. and C. Hardy: 1996, 'Introduction: Organizations, Organization and Organizing', in S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy and W. R. Nord (eds.), *Handbook of Organization Studies* (Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA), pp. 1–28.

Conlin, M.: 1999, 'Religion in the Workplace: The Growing Presence of Spirituality in Corporate America,' *Business Week* (November 1, 1999) http://www.businessweek.com.

Conroy, S. J. and T. L. Emerson: 2004, 'Business Ethics and Religion: Religiosity As a Predictor of Ethical Awareness among Students', *Journal of Business Ethics* **50**(4), 383–396.

Crocker-Lackness, J. W.: 2000, 'New Age Spiritual Communication in A Course in Miracles', *Journal of Communication and Religion* **23**, 123–157.

Davie, G.: 2004, 'Creating an Agenda in the Sociology of Religion: Common Sources/ Different Pathways', *Sociology of Religion* **65**(4), 323–340.

Deetz, S. A.: 1992, 'Corporate Colonization of the Life World', in S. A. Deetz (ed.), *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization* (State University of New York Press, Albany), pp. 13–43.

Dehler, G. E. and M. A. Welsh: 1994, 'Spirituality and Organizational Transformation: Implications for the New Management Paradigm', *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **9**(6), 17–26.

Dehler, G. E. and M. A. Welsh: 2003, 'The Experience of Work: Spirituality and the New Workplace', in R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (M. E. Sharpe, New York), pp. 108–122.

Edwards, J. R.: 1994, 'The Study of Congruence in Organizational Behavior Research: Critique and a Proposed Alternative', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **58**, 51–100.

Edwards, J. R.: 2001, 'Multidimensional Constructs in Organizational Behavior Research: An Integrative Analytical Framework', *Organizational Research Methods* **4**(2), 144–192.

Eisenhardt, K. M.: 1989, 'Building Theories from Case Study Research', *Academy of Management Review* **14**(4), 532–550.

Emmons, R. A. and R. F. Paloutzian: 2003, 'The Psychology of Religion', *Annual Review of Psychology* **54**(1), 377–402.

Freshman, B.: 1999, 'An Exploratory Analysis of Definitions and Applications of Spirituality in the Workplace', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **12**(4), 318–329.

Furnham, A.: 2003, 'Ethics at Work: Money, Spirituality, and Happiness', in R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (M. E. Sharpe, New York), pp. 257–276.

Garriga, E. and D. Melé: 2004, 'Corporate Social Responsibility Theories: Mapping the Territory', *Journal of Business Ethics* **53**, 51–71.

Gavin, J. H. and R. O. Mason: 2004, 'The Virtuous Organization: The Value of Happiness in the Workplace', *Organizational Dynamics* **33**(4), 379–392.

George, L. K., D. B. Larson, H. G. Koenig and M. E. McCullough: 2000, 'Spirituality and Health: What We Know, What We Need To Know', *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* **19**(1), 102–116.

Giacalone, R. A. and C. L. Jurkiewicz: 2003, 'Toward a Science of Workplace Spirituality', in R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (M. E. Sharpe, New York), pp. 3–28.

Giddens, A.: 1984, *The Constitution of Society: Introduction of the Theory of Structuration* (University of California Press, Berkeley)

Griffin, E.: 1998, 'Journal of Communication and Religion: A State-of-the-Art Critical Review', *Journal of Communication and Religion* **21**, 108–140.

Hill, P. C. and K. I. Pargament: 2003, 'Advances in the Conceptualization and Measurement of Religion and Spirituality', *American Psychologist* **58**(1), 64–74.

Hill, P. C., K. I. Pargament, R. W. Hood, M. E. McCullough, J. P. Swyers, D. B. Larson and B. J. Zinnbauer: 2000, 'Conceptualizing Religion and Spirituality: Points of Commonality, Points of Departure', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* **30**(1), 51–77.

Hinings, C. R. and R. Greenwood: 2002, 'Disconnects and Consequences in Organization Theory', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **47**(3), 411–421.

House, R. J. and R. N. Aditya: 1997, 'The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo Vadis', *Journal of Management* **23**(3), 409–473.

James, W.: 1981, *The Principles of Psychology* 1 (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA) (Originally published in 1890)

Krahnke, K., R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz: 2003, 'Point–counterpoint: Measuring Workplace Spirituality', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **16**(4), 396–405.

Krishnakumar, S. and C. P. Neck: 2002, 'The 'What', 'Why' and 'How' of Spirituality in the Workplace', *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **17**(3), 153–158.

Kristof, A. L.: 1996, 'Person–organization Fit: An Integrative Review of its Conceptualizations, Measurement, and Implications', *Personnel Psychology* **49**(1), 1–49.

Law, K. S. and C. Wong: 1999, 'Multidimensional Constructs in Structural Equation Analysis: An Illustration Using Job Perception and Job Satisfaction Constructs', *Journal of Management* **25**(2), 143–160.

Law, K. S., C. Wong and W. H. Mobley: 1998, 'Toward a Taxonomy of Multidimensional Constructs', *Academy of Management Review* **23**(4), 741–755.

Lewis, M. W. and A. J. Grimes: 1999, 'Metatriangulation: Building Theory from Multiple Paradigms', *Academy of Management Review* **24**(4), 672–690.

Lewis, M. W. and M. L. Kelemen: 2002, 'Multiparadigm Inquiry: Exploring Organizational Pluralism and Paradox', *Human Relations* **55**(2), 251–275.

Lips-Wiersma, M.: 2003, 'Making Conscious Choices in Doing Research on Workplace Spirituality', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* **16**(4), 406–425.

MacDonald, D. A.: 2000, 'Spirituality: Description, Measurement, and Relation to the Five Factor Model of Personality', *Journal of Personality* **68**, 153–197.

Maclagan, P.: 2003, 'Varieties of Moral Issue and Dilemma: A Framework for the Analysis of Case Material in Business Ethics Education', *Journal of Business Ethics* **48**(1), 21–32.

Meyer, J. P. and N. J. Allen: 1991, 'A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment', *Human Resource Management Review* **1**(1), 61–89.

Mirvis, P. H.: 1997, '"Soul work" in Organizations', *Organization Science* **8**(2), 193–206.

Mitroff, I. I. and E. A. Denton: 1999a, *A Spiritual Audit of Corporate America: A Hard Look at Spirituality, Religion, and Values in the Workplace* (Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco).

Mitroff, I. I. and E. A. Denton: 1999b, 'A Study of Spirituality in the Workplace', *Sloan Management Review* **40**(4), 83–92.

Neck, C. P. and J. F. Milliman: 1994, 'Thought Self-leadership: Finding Spiritual Fulfillment in Organizational Life', *Journal of Managerial Psychology* **9**(6), 9–16.

Paine, L. S.: 2003, *Value Shift: Why Companies Must Merge Social and Financial Imperatives to Achieve Superior Performance* (McGraw-Hill, New York)

Parboteeah, K. P. and J. B. Cullen: 2003, 'Ethical Climates and Spirituality: An Exploratory Examination of Theoretical Links', in R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (M. E. Sharpe, New York), pp. 137–151.

Parsons, T.: 1956, 'Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **1**(1), 63–85.

Perrow, C.: 1991, 'A Society of Organizations', *Theory and Society* **20**, 725–762.

Pfeffer, J.: 1993, 'Barriers to the Advance of Organizational Science: Paradigm Development as a Dependable Variable', *Academy of Management Review* **18**(4), 599–620.

Pfeffer, J.: 2003, 'Business and the Spirit: Management Practices that Sustain Values', in R. A. Giacalone and C. L. Jurkiewicz (eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (M. E. Sharpe, New York), pp. 29–45.

Piedmont, R. L.: 1999, 'Does Spirituality Represent the Sixth Factor of Personality? Spiritual Transcendence and the Five-Factor Model', *Journal of Personality* **67**, 985–1013.

Pollard, C. W.: 1996, *The Soul of the Firm* (Harper Business, Grand Rapids, MI)

Putnam, R. D.: 1995, 'Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital', *Journal of Democracy* **6**(1), 65–78.

Richards, D.: 1995, *Artful Work: Awakening Joy, Meaning, and Commitment in the Workplace* (Berkeley Books, New York)

Rousseau, D. M.: 1998, 'Why Workers Still Identify with Organizations', *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **19**, 217–233.

Schultz, M. and M. J. Hatch: 1996, 'Living with Multiple Paradigms: The Case of Paradigm Interplay in Organizational Culture Studies', *Academy of Management Review* **21**(2), 529–557.

Sheep, M. L.: 2004, 'Nailing Down Gossamer: A Valid Measure of the Person–Organization Fit of Workplace Spirituality', *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2004, B1–B6.

Shorto, R.: 2004, 'Faith at Work', *The New York Times Magazine* (Oct. 31, 2004), http://www.nytimes.com.

Solomon, R. C.: 1992, 'Corporate Roles, Personal Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach to Business Ethics', *Business Ethics Quarterly* **2**(3), 317–339.

Stern, R. N. and S. R. Barley: 1996, 'Organizations and Social Systems: Organization Theory's Neglected Mandate', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **41**(1), 146–162.

Toffler, B. L.: 1986, *Tough Choices: Managers Talk Ethics* (John Wiley and Sons, New York)

Van Maanen, J.: 1995, 'Fear and Loathing in Organization Studies', *Organization Science* **6**(6), 687–692.

Vaill, P.: 1998, *Spirited Leading and Learning: Process Wisdom for a New Age* (Jossey-Bass, San Francisco)

Victor, B. and J. B. Cullen: 1988, 'The Organizational Bases of Ethical Work Climates', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **33**, 101–125.

Weaver, G. R. and B. R. Agle: 2002, 'Religiosity and Ethical Behavior in Organizations: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective', *Academy of Management Review* **27**(1), 77–97.

Weaver, G. R. and D. A. Gioia: 1994, 'Paradigms Lost: Incommensurability versus Structurationist Inquiry', *Organization Studies* **15**(4), 565–589.

Zald, M.: 1993, 'Organization Studies as Scientific and Humanistic Enterprise: Toward a Reconceptualization of the Foundations of the Field', *Organization Science* **4**(4), 513–528.

Zinnbauer, B. J., K. I. Pargament and A. B. Scott: 1999, 'The Emerging Meanings of Religiousness and Spirituality: Problems and Prospects', *Journal of Personality* **67**, 889–919.

Department of Management,
University of Cincinnati,
P.O. Box 210165,
Cincinnati, OH, 45221-0165,
U.S.A.
E-mail: sheepml@email.uc.edu