Spirituality at Workplace: Perceptions, Contradictions and a Way Forward for Authenticity

Prachi Pathak[1] and Gaurav Tiwari[2*]

[1]Assistant Professor, School of Management, Doon University, Dehradun.
[2]Research Scholar, School of Management, Doon University, Dehradun.

Abstract

The progressive organization of the 21st century essentially is a dynamical configurational system that is in a constant state of flux and striving for efficiency and sustainability in the unpredictive environment. The market temperature has blurred the boundaries of the systems by challenging the structure and organizational temperature. The interplay of market complication and organizational complexity is forcing them to be governed by the unbecoming appetite and choose competition over collaboration and they are missing Spirituality at workplace. A critical review of more than 500 research papers of the last 25 years from 1993-2017 reveals incompleteness in the perception of spirituality at workplace and thus unable to answer the existential question in the networked system - what is the purpose? This incompleteness leads to the contradictions in the system like competition over collaboration, individual vs system, etc. thus, lack authenticity. The present study aims to understand the functioning of spirituality at workplace in the complex dynamical organization as systems behavior and to gain the significant wisdom to answer the purpose of the networked system-Authenticity (to evolve). It also provides a new doctrinal vision and framework to achieve subtlety for the smooth flow of informational energy in the networked organization.

Keywords: Spirituality at workplace, Authenticity, Organizational temperature, Networked system, contradictions, systems view.

Introduction

The contemporary workplaces are facing escalating chaos and a high degree of uncertainty. These organizations are forced to be more agile and flexible to meet the challenges of globalization (Hitt et al.,1998). They are not only experiencing the heat and pressure to survive but also to grow and develop. The ambiguity and volatility of the business scenarios are leading them to the issues of morality, ethicality, hostility, decreased morale and pessimism at workplace and in people (Biberman and Whitty, 1997; Cacioppe, 2000; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003a; Neal, 2000; Brandt, 1996; Duxbury and Higgins, 2002; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003a). It appears that the majority of the firms are still imbued by the wrong and wasteful ethos and their most vital part, people at work are feeling depleted. Frost (2003) and Leavitt (2007) identifies great suffering within and outside workplaces and deemed them to be flawed and unhealthy entities. The digitization and advent of technological and social advancements are setting new bars and standards of performance putting them in immense pressure to deliver excellence. The classical 4M of management are under severe stress of delivery and inevitably overburdened. The present doctrines are forcing them to compete rather than cooperating.

Complexity is one of the unique characteristics of this dynamical networked system of systems. These dynamical systems are in a constant state of flux and striving for efficiency, stability, and sustainability (Tiwari and Pathak, 2019). They are governed by the fuzzy interplay of market complications (arising in the form of market temperature) and organizational complexities (organizational temperature and appetite) blurring the systems' boundaries aiming for the flow of information energy

(Konsynski and McFarlan, 1990). These networked organizations pose patterned interactions among entities and the information energy consumed by the organizations and entities are clustered by an array of sources and they only can be understood if processed by systems approach as they have no significant meaning if treated in isolation. The organizations are lacking inclusiveness and put sheer thrust on self-assertiveness, domination, and control resulting in a crisis. The interplay of market temperature and organizational temperature made them more susceptible to disruption and forced them to remain competitive rather than collaborative with aggression. This aggressiveness fueled the crisis of system resulting in missing spirituality at workplace and diluted the ultimate purpose of the system- authenticity.

1. Definitions

To understand the concept of subtlety, it is essential to get acquainted with some of the terms that are used frequently while describing spirituality at workplace in the networked system. However, these definitions are not satisfactory, but they provide a valuable understanding.

1.1.   *A complex system-* In general, a system is an assembly of parts or entities having interaction as a complex unified whole (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1970). The Complex one is "a system comprised of a (usually large) number of (usually strongly) interacting entities, processes, or agents, the understanding of which requires the development, or the use of, new scientific tools, nonlinear models, out of equilibrium descriptions and simulations (Bertallanffy, 1977; Backlund, 2000)." Schweitzer (1998). These are systems' behavior, which is extremely difficult to model due to the high degree of interstate transition, gradient and multifaceted interactions among components. They also reflect some of the peculiar characteristics like, non- linear relationship, sensible intelligence, sustainability and efficiency (Bertalanffy, 1950, Ashby, 1964).

1.2.   *Networked organization-* A network is a collection of various related entities aiming towards common objectives. (Jarillo, 1988) defines networked organizations as a purposeful arrangement among unique but related entities. Similarly, Kaneko and Imai (1987) explained networks as a "multitudinal

relationship among organizational entities for information flow" while Johanson and Mettson (1987) conceptualize it as "mean to achieve coordination among business forces". Podolyy and Page (1998) gave a more comprehensive definition stating that the networked organization is a collection of stakeholders having exchanged relations with components both inside and outside the organization.

1.3.   *Spirituality at workplace-* Spirituality at workplace is "a framework of organizational values that are evidenced in the culture facilitating transcendence experience through work processes of people at work and induces their sense of being connected to others in a way providing feelings of completeness and joy (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003)."

1.4.   *Subtlety-* Subtlety can be defined as the 'preciseness of the system'. Subtlety is the essence of spirituality at workplace (Tiwari and Pathak, 2019b) which reflects in the functioning of the systems' components having least interactions with each other. it emerges as self-regulated interaction and manifests itself as evolving system behavior.

2. Concept and framework

Spirituality at workplace, in its all guise had been the key question for contemporary workplaces and people. The question of meaningfulness and worthiness at the workplace has a strong influence within and outside the organizations. Toffler (1980) and Wagner-Marsh and Conley (1999) considered it 'organizations' fourth wave leading to spirituality-based organizations. The general understanding of spirituality at workplace refers to the 'unseen make-up of people at work-the spirit' (Garrett, 2004). Highfield and Cason (1983) explained it as the dimension aiming to encompass the necessity to answer the questions of meaning and worth of work. Wedemeyer and Jue (2002), Eck (2001), Surak (2001), Fox-Genovese (1999) and Koehn (1999) believes in 'pragmatic spirituality' which suggest it as development of integration of ones' self to the surroundings while Mitroff and Denton, 2000; Cash et al., 2000; Burack, 1999; Izzo and Klein, 1997) viewed it as a reactionary response to the social and organizational upheaval resulting in alienated employees.

Mitroff and Denton (1999) took another perspective viewing it as the fundamental feeling of being connected and argued that if a single word best captures the meaning of spirituality and the vital role that it plays in people's lives, that word is interconnectedness." Cash and Gray (2000) assert that spirituality looks inward to an awareness of universal values, while formal religion looks outward, using formal rites and scripture. Zinnbauer, Pargament, and Scott (1999) viewed it as individuals' psychological attributes having meaningfulness, wholeness, and inter-connectedness. This perspective puts thrust on the healing of one's inner-self (Fairholm, 1997), transcendental experience at workplace (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003; Mitroff and Denton, 1999) and connectedness (Pfeiffer, 2003). Ashmos and Duchon (2000) provide an organizational centric explanation defining spirituality at workplace as a "recognition of an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community".

3. Review of literature

Researchers, theorist, and business managers have shown a great zeal in spirituality at workplace in last two decades (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Cavanagh, 1999; Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2010; Tischler, 1999) and Howard (2002) is confident in claiming that it is the most influential trend of business research since 1950. Cowan (1993) explains it as ones' conscious awareness aligning him with others' 'spiritus'. Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2010) and Gibbons (2000) proclaimed spirituality at workplace as the manifestation of transcendence of employees' experience and its connectedness with organizational values. Mitroff and Denton (1999) explained spirituality at workplace as connectedness with the universe while Moore and Casper (2006) argued against it and claimed that it is the internalizations of behavior at work by an employee.

Considering the above arguments, three core dimensions of spirituality at workplace can be identified. These are-Meaningful work, sense of community and connectedness (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Milliman et al., 2003). The first dimension of Spirituality at workplace refers to the finding sense of purpose in work (Duchon and Plowman 2005). Meaningful work, as explained by (Ashmos and Duchon 2000; Kurth 1995; Neal 2000, Overell 2008), is about feeling a higher sense of purpose having a larger perspective and

greater importance. Meaningful work creates a sense of rejoicing, connected to others and makes them feel important and valuable at workplace (Duchon and Plowman 2005) and involves enlivening self by the full use of one's talents and potentials (Fry 2003). People at work seek not only competence and mastery through their work but also a sense that work has some social meaning or value (Pfeiffer, 2003).

The sense of community at workplace is based on the idea of togetherness like enlightened beings having mutual trust, obligations, commitments towards purpose and high-value sharing. (Ashmos and Duchon 2000; Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2006). Chappell (1993) and Chawla et al. (2012) rightly pointed out that ''common values and a shared and agreed sense of purpose can transform a company into a community where routine work takes on a deeper meaning and ultimate satisfaction''. Connectedness, the third dimension of spirituality at workplace involves the integration of the value and purpose of various parts of the individual and organization life of employees (Driver, 2005).

Various studies explain spirituality at workplace like a tool. For example, Altaf and Awan (2011) and Van der Walt and De Klerk, (2014). explain it as a tool for employee well-being which can reduce job overload and increase job satisfaction. Kolodinsky et al. (2008) saw it as an attachment-related outcome. Rego and Cunha (2008) has a similar notion as explains it as people's experience. Similarly, Pawar (2009) strongly argues that a comprehensive model must be charted out by integrating all the researches of spirituality at workplace. This was a good idea but will lead to a model that will deal only at the individual level. Sengupta (2010) visualized it as an individual's psychological power and Tombaugh (2011) defined it as the impact of personal beliefs. Sharma et al. (2013), linked it with organizational effectiveness. Petchsawang and Mclean (2017) suggested that meditation could lead to higher spirituality at workplace while Hicks (2000) proposes the spirituality at workplace as "respectful pluralism" but this idea was objected by Gotsis and Kortezi (2008) as it fails to capture the complexity of spirituality at workplace. Further, Naimon et al. (2013) explained it as a tool for predicting organizational incivility. Saks (2011) finds the linkage between spirituality at workplace and

employee wellbeing and the same is asserted by various authors (Krishnakumar and Neck, 2002; Houghten et al., 2016; Truce et al., 2013). DeJongh (2011) finds similarities between Spirituality at workplace and religion.

4. Research Gap and question

Academicians and mainstream researchers have overlooked the narratives and crucial perspectives in the domain of spirituality at workplace (Bell and Taylor, 2003; Forray and Stork, 2002). Scholars and theorist are criticized for their extensive result-oriented and technical approach (Benefiel, 2003; Bojé and Rosalie, 2003; Bell and Taylor, 2003; Brown, 2003; Elmes and Smith, 2001; Fenwick and Lange, 1998; Fornaciara and Lund Dean, 2001; Forray and Stork, 2002; Nadesan, 1999; Zhuravleva and Jones, 2006). Tischler et al. (2007) rightly said that existing literature on spirituality at workplace has been fragmentary, isolated and non-cumulating. These diversified views of spirituality at workplace and its mechanism strongly claim the need for integration and unification into a comprehensive model (Heaton et al., 2004; Jurkiewicz and Giacalone, 2004). There is not a single widely accepted definition of spirituality at workplace (Ashforth and Pratt, 2003; Freshman, 1999; Kahnwiler and Otte, 1997; Konz and Ryan, 1999; McGee, 1998) can be to some extent accountable for this phenomenon, since the existence of an agreed-on definition provides the minimum prerequisite for the development of a broadly accepted framework for theoretical discourse and empirical examination. The suggestion by Driver (2005) is notable that current definitions of spirituality at workplace must be abandoned, as they fail to grasp the essence of the phenomenon.

The literature review indicates the necessity of new doctrinal vision to establish the framework to achieve subtlety which is the essence of spirituality at workplace leading the flow of informational energy towards the attainment of sustainability, stability, and efficiency. A dynamical networked system is a function with an attitude doing the same thing repeatedly. A dynamical networked system is always knowing the direction of the system (Porter, 1985). The understanding of spirituality at workplace as an experience of the individual is adding complications to the system as it considers the components in isolation. The existing explanations of spirituality at workplace are incomplete perceptions. This perception is not able to explain a unique and existential question in the complex dynamical networked system - what is the purpose?

5. The motivation of the study and Research Objective

The inability of the existing literature to ascertain the ultimate purpose of the system due to wrong and incomplete perception became a strong motivation to conduct the present study. How perception of individual creates a contradiction in the system as competitiveness over collaboration, individual vs system and many more and why and how the system can achieve its ultimate purpose- Authenticity motivated the researchers to re-visit the spirituality at workplace with a different perspective. The present paper aims to look at spirituality at workplace with a system view. The objectives of the present paper are as follows:

5.1.   To understand and explain the existing perception of spirituality at workplace and their incompleteness leading towards contradictions in the networked system.

5.2.   To understand and explain the spirituality at workplace as systems' behavior and how it functions in a complex environment.

5.3.   To ascertain the purpose of the spirituality at workplace.

6. Research methodology

The development of conceptual paper requires a focused and in-depth analysis of existing literature effectively to reflect the opinion of the wider population so that a logical gap could be identified (Bell, 2018). It heavily depends upon the skills and the ability of the researchers and demands scrutiny. Since the domain of spirituality at workplace is nascent and is dominated by the explanation at the individual level, it is required to analyze it since the beginning. Thus, in the present paper, the researchers have critically reviewed more than 500 research papers of the last 25 years from 1993-2017 meta-analytically. Both theoretical and empirical papers were evaluated with the systems approach. According to this approach, researchers begin with specific observations used to produce

generalized theories and conclusions drawn from the research. The reason for occupying the inductive approach was that it takes into account the context where research effort is active (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005).

7. Spirituality at workplace: Perceptions

7.1. Spirituality at workplace is an individual behavior- When Burrack (1999) bring forth some experiential and provoking questions like- What is the purpose of my work or Where it will lead me or Why I am doing this work or What is the meaning of this work or What is the reason for my existence in this organization etc., the researchers are not surprised as these questions clearly indicates that theorist are exploring individuals' spirituality at workplace' dimensions at personal level.   Zinnbauer, Pargament, and Scott, (1999) stated that it is one's psychological attribute and Fairholm (1997) brings forth the individual-centric perspective claiming it as an intimate relationship with one's inner self, values, morality, and needs. Guillory (2000) also has the same view and defined it as ''one's inner consciousness'' and noting, ''that which is spiritual comes from within- beyond our programmed beliefs and value.''

7.2. Spirituality at workplace is a goal- One of the perceptions regarding spirituality at workplace is that it is the destination. The argument of Heschel (1955) gives strength to this as he views it as a search of the ultimate being. Bragues (2006) sees it as employees' expectation to get something from workplace which is more than just work. Autry (1994) sees it as an achievement of an 'exquisite balance' of work-life. Highfield and Cason (1983) consider it as a need to find answer to meaning of work-life while Mitroff and Denton, 2000; Cash et al., 2000; Burack, 1999; Izzo and Klein, 1997) claims that it is a desire in the form of reactive response for social and personal business upheaval. The majority of the researchers have the myopic perception as they have a goal-centric approach of spirituality at workplace.

7.3. Spirituality at workplace and religion are the same- Often spirituality at workplace is misunderstood as religious spirituality. People often confuse religion and spirituality, thinking that they are the same thing. Zinnbauer et al. (1997) claimed that religious spirituality and spirituality at workplace have overlapping but different meanings. Association for Spirit at Work has found that managers often confuse spirituality with religion (Brandt, 1996). Many researchers like Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, 2003; Paloutzian and Park, 2005; Zinnebauer and Pargament, 2005 stresses that workplace spirituality can be identified and defined independently of any religious context. Religion is encompassed within spirituality, but spirituality is viewed as broader than religion. A distinction may be made between these two phenomena so that religion refers to formal institutional contexts for spiritual beliefs and practices, and spirituality refers to the human experience of discovering meaning, purpose, and morality (Brower, 1984; Siporin, 1985). The literature on spirituality and leadership often has differentiated between spirituality and religion, presumably to avoid the appearance of promoting one religion (Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003; Mitroff and Denton 1999). Hill and Smith (2003) admit that both forms may pertain to the workplace and both are more likely ''to resist the pressures of materialism and commodification.''

7.4. Spirituality at workplace is the linear sum of components- Another perception regarding spirituality at workplace is that the total spirituality at workplace is the linear sum of peoples' spirituality. Harrington (2004) argued that people have a common connection, cohesiveness, and commonality with each other in their work and collectively emerge as spirituality as it synchronized the system's energy.

8. Spirituality at workplace: Contradictions

Although the general understanding and the perceptions of spirituality at workplace seem to be very straight-forward and complete yet, looking more deeply and closely, various contradictions in theory and practices emerge. These contradictions, on the one hand, challenge the existing understandings of the phenomenon and on the other hand, provides an opportunity to explore the ways and approaches to understand it more clearly. The general

perceptions mentioned above are no exceptions and have the following contradiction:

8.1. Linear vs. non-linear- As argued earlier by authors, total spirituality at workplace is measured as the linear sum of individuals' spirituality. This linear way of measuring it is incomplete as it fails to accommodate the dynamism of spirituality. Spirituality at workplace is not a static behavior and by treating it linearly, we are just understanding a point. This depicts that spirituality is the end-product and aiming at the preservation. But in true nature, the dynamism of spirituality at workplace made it evolutionary henceforth can only be measured or understand in a non-linear way accommodating all the key changes and patterns.

8.2. Individual vs. system- Various researchers and theorists treated spirituality at workplace as an individual phenomenon (Ashforth and Pratt 2003) while some conceptualized it as ones' psychological state has an array of perceptions about work, co-workers and its managing. (Duchon and Plowman,2005). Chakraborty (1993) asserted that the focal point of spirituality at workplace is the individuals' spiritual transformation. Heaton et al. (2004) also have the same notion dividing spirituality into pure and applied considering the individual as the base. Again, all these arguments lead towards the contradiction because spirituality at workplace is not an individual phenomenon. It is not wise to focus just on people and their work and not their workplace which is a system itself. By treating spirituality at the individual level, we are closing the dimensions which are against the connectedness. The same argument is put forward by Mitroff and Denton (1999), who described it as an organizational dynamic, Marques (2005) and Jurkiewicz and Giacalone (2004) also asserted that every entity or group has spirit and spirituality at workplace is organizational characteristics.

8.3. Goal vs. approach- The drawback of treating spirituality at workplace as an individual phenomenon is that it has been wrongly conceptualized as a destination rather than a journey. This is contradictory to the evolutionary nature of spirituality which puts thrust on improvisation. The individual experience of spirituality gives the myopic understanding and becomes a desire which further transforms into the expectation of getting something or achieving something. Spirituality at workplace, in its true sense, is a journey where various components connect with others for a smooth transition. It is a way to look at the phenomenon as a whole rather than looking part of it.

8.4. Collaboration vs. competition- The classical as well as contemporary literature of spirituality at workplace takes the individual as a unit and treats him in isolation. Here the entities are in a state of conflict with each other in the form of competition. This competition is for gaining more and more control over resources in the form of unbecoming appetite. This causes wrong and wasteful behavior in the workplace. But spirituality at workplace encompasses all the elements in an integrated manner. It facilitates togetherness as connectedness is it's one of the core premises.

8.5. Existentialism vs. orientalism- The orientalism views the difference of the notion of eastern and western understanding of work, workplace, culture and distinguishes the work and workplace. On the other hand, existentialism views spirituality at workplace as a quest of finding meaning at work and workplace (Naylor et al., 1996; Neck and Milliman, 1994; Kahnweiler and Otte, 1997). It reflects the notion that work must not also just interesting or challenging but also have deeper meaning. expressing one's inner life needs by seeking meaningful work, and contributing to others (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000; Fox, 1994; Neal, 1998). Hawley (1993) observed that part of living by one's inner truth involves working in an organization with integrity and a purpose that is beneficial to others beyond simply making a profit.

9. Spirituality at workplace: A way forward for Authenticity

"The spirit does not exist as the servant of the workplace; rather the workplace exists as the playground of the spirit."

To understand the spirituality at workplace, the researcher views it as a system having various interrelated and interdependent components that persist inside and outside of the organization. The systems approach attempts to view the spirituality at workplace   in terms of irreducibly integrated systems. It focuses attention on the whole, as well as on the complex interrelationships among its constituent parts (Laszlo and Krippner, 1998). On the basis of aforesaid argument, the authors propose that Spirituality at workplace is "the tendency of the systems' configurational energy to achieve sustainability, stability, and efficiency by assimilating the disorder of the system and transcend it into orderliness in inclusive and subtlety is the essence of spirituality (Tiwari and Pathak, 2019a)."

As argued earlier, an organizational entity including people can operate effectively in isolation. Modern complex networked organizations have a presence of emergent interaction and these interactions are not apparent from its subsystems or components in isolation but resulting due to their togetherness as a system. This emergent interaction in the system can describe any phenomena which seem to be difficult and impossible from the smaller entities of the system. The connections both at the structural level and non-structural level are the peculiar features of networked organizations.

One of the key questions that is needed to be answered and which is seriously missing in the discussion of spirituality at workplace, is the purpose of organizations and how it can be achieved with it. Progressive organizations require an automated, spontaneous, sensitive and intelligent approach to achieve the ultimate purpose of any system and that is Authenticity- the conservation of the system. they are required to assimilate the disorder of the system into orderliness helping them to emerge as an evolutionary organizational system that is agile enough to cope-up with the turbulent market with agility and allowing the smooth transformation of information energy by ascertaining its priorities and thus, resulting in the authentic system.

Authenticity is usually conceptualized as something genuine or original establishes by a certain scientific process (Van Leeuwen, 2001). Authenticity defined in the psychology literature is " the unobstructed operation of one's true-or core-self in one's daily enterprise " (Kernis and Goldman, 2006). But this conceptualization is incomplete

when it comes to social authority and needs a more comprehensive definition in terms of approach. Thus, authenticity is "an approach to keep the system intact by invoking knowledge, technology, information, and humanity." It is the manifestation of spirituality at workplace.

10. Spirituality at workplace as a system

10.1. An open system– Spirituality at workplace is inclusive in its nature and the systems approach became the necessity for gaining significant knowledge (Tiwari and Pathak, 2018). Spirituality at workplace is an open system having open architecture allowing components to interact and assimilated. The openness facilitates the non-linear interaction of the components and provides means and choices for ascertaining purpose and optimization with minimal inputs in a complex networked system. The openness of the system manifests sustainability, stability, and efficiency by transcending the ability of the Spirituality at workplace.

10.2. Spirituality at workplace lies in configuration- The majority of the researchers and theorists argued that spirituality at workplace in the individual phenomenon. This purview is incomplete if not incorrect as it lacks the holistic approach. The systems view of spirituality at workplace helps to understand it as a whole. The openness of the spiritual system allows configurations of various types and spirituality at workplace lies in the configuration in the form of information energy allowing n number of components to be connected residing within and outside. This connectedness in the networked system appears in two forms a) connectedness of structure b) connectedness of non-structure. The connectedness of structure refers to the linear and mechanical interaction while connectedness on non-structure refers to the interaction of the behaviors of the system. Both works in tandem to bring spirituality at workplace system adding dynamism to the networked system. These configurations help to develop various pathways allowing a smooth transition of

information energy. It governs the system towards the dynamism making system more organic (Tiwari et. al, 2017; Tiwari and Pathak, 2018). Organizations having sound configurations achieve greater dynamic equilibrium and thus, they have more spirituality at workplace.

10.3. Subtlety is the essence of Spirituality at workplace- Openness and configurations of the system require networking. This networking is precise and delicate and self-evolving in nature arising due to the requirement of the system. This is done by developing synapses between components. These are the points where the structure and non-structure of the system interact. Development of synapses is one of the important features of spirituality which facilitates the flow of systems information energy and makes them sensitive, agile and adaptive. Synapses help the system in inter or intrastate transformation. This synaptic interaction is regulated by the Info Motive Force (IMF) which is the gradient of information potential between synapses. It helps to reduce the contradictions of the system and ensure the flow of informational energy of the system flows without enforcing it. The primary aim of spirituality and workplace is to gain orderliness through the interactions within and outside the system. The synaptic points also act as the interface between components and acts as circuit breakers if the gradient is high, the interface helps the system to ascertain its priorities for enhancement and hence, helps to create an intelligent system which is flexible enough to sense and response the changes in environment accordingly. The info motive force regulated the flow of informational energy at subtlety enhance cooperation and collaboration among components. This cooperation provides new pathways for the assimilation of unordered patterns of behavior which will result in the development of a coherent system. The coherent system will facilitate the synergy in networked organizations. The sub-systems/ components will have lesser and lesser contradictions and they can complement each other in the realization of the ultimate purpose of the networked system- to evolve. This coherence and

complementarity help them to attain sustainability, stability and a high degree of efficiency. The synaptic interface also ensures the least governance as there are minimal interventions. This all resulted in subtlety where responses are self-evolved, making the organizational system more organic. Subtlety helps the system to find a new pathway to understand, develop and solve more complex challenges by minimizing contradictions and maximizing complementarity.

10.4. Evolutionary nature- The sensitivity for challenges of the environment and ability to prioritize them helps the system to respond intelligently. The intelligence here refers to the ability of the system to prioritize the needs of the system and then deciding the responses. System sense and predict by modeling and remodeling the scenarios of challenges proactively. It also does the improvisation by allowing new configurations using minimal resources and efforts and enable the system to gain sustainability. It is due to its highly adaptable configurational system and subtle synaptic interactions. The Spirituality at workplace strongly thrives towards more orderliness allowing chaos to play a vital role by providing new arrangements. It ensures that the pointer of the evolved system must be in the right and correct direction.

10.5. Authenticity in the system- Spirituality at workplace regulates the unbecoming appetite of the system in a precise manner and helps the system to interact with its environment subtly. It adapts and assimilates the chaos of the system and facilitates the knowledge, information, humanity, and technology. Subtlety is the essence of spirituality at workplace. It also helps to gain spontaneity, agility, and efficiency and keeps the system intact. The subtle system will provide the direction to the organizations towards its purpose and transform the system and its components into an intelligent and sensible organizational system.

11. Factors affecting the system of Spirituality at workplace

11.1. Organizational temperature and market temperature- No system or its component can operate without its environment within and outside. The environment constantly interacts and challenge the system. The system of spirituality at workplace is greatly affected by the randomness of the heterogeneity of system and environment. Two of the most affecting factors are organizational temperature and market temperature. Organizational temperature refers to heterogeneity of the organizational system encompassing factors like age, gender, experience, location, salary, designation, etc. These factors add randomness to the system and aim to achieve the dynamic equilibrium. This randomness causes the rise and fall of temperature. On the other hand, market temperature refers to the randomness of heterogeneous factors that reside outside of the organizations and is comprised of economic conditions, socio-technological, market trends, governance models, etc. The organizational temperature always thrives to achieve homeostasis- a state of balance to response market temperature. The relationship between market temperature and organizational temperature must be governed by the coupling effect. These temperatures are vital for the stability of Spirituality at workplace and help interface to regulate the stability of the system.

11.2. A high degree of interstate conversion- Spirituality at workplace   has many homogenous and heterogeneous sub-systems functioning in complementarity. The complementarity of the system facilitates a high degree of interstate conversion and transformation of various components of the system to gain order. It is due to the dynamic nature of the spiritual system. This interstate conversion facilitates the objectivity in the system and decides the pointer of the systems' pathway. One of the peculiar features of the conversion is that it follows the path that requires the least time and least resources and thus, provides efficiency to the Spirituality at workplace.

11.3. The appetite of the system- The appetite of spirituality at workplace   in the organization greatly impacts the smooth functioning of the system. The appetite of the spiritual system refers to the ability of the system to hold and control the induction, adoption, and assimilation of various functions without getting hampered. If the appetite of the system is strong and large, it will be able to assimilate the disorder of the system in orderliness and vice versa. The appetite of the system greatly depends upon the organizational temperature and market temperature.

11.4. Other factors- Other intervening factors like hidden or latent patterns of systems' behavior, the dominance of output-oriented mechanism, lack of access to the resources and lack of authentic view of the problem, etc. are the other factors affecting Spirituality at workplace.

12. Conclusion and way forward for future researchers

Although researchers from all across the globe have put enormous effort to understand and explain spirituality at workplace, almost all of them are missing its true sense (Campbell, 2014). The reason is that it is not understood only at the individual level (Phipps et al., 2013). The idea of spirituality at workplace as individual experience as explained by various authors (Gupta et al. 2014; Garg, 2017; Mukherjee,2016; Pradhan, 2017;) or its similarity with religious spirituality (Benefiel et al., 2014) is not incorrect as individual is also a sub-system of large organizational system but it is incomplete. However, in the present paper, it is clear that spirituality at workplace lies in the configuration and emerges as subtlety. The synapses and the networking among the components, both inside and outside, are the keys enabling the flow of information energy. Well-groomed synapses and interdependent networking flourish spirituality at workplace and enable the organization to realize its true purpose (Tiwari and Pathak, 2019). Thus, Spirituality at workplace, in its true sense is a system's behavior that manifests the authenticity of the organization and emerges as subtlety. Subtle interactions facilitate collaboration among the components ensuring the smooth transition of information energy and helps the organization to conserve. Subtle interaction facilitates the constant creation of new synapses and the removal of old and obsolete ones. It enables the

organization to become spontaneous, agile and resilient for the challenges of the environment in an automated and auto-regulated manner resulting in the form of an approach that keep the system intact and live. Spirituality at workplace facilitates authenticity by invoking knowledge, technology, information, and humanity and helps organizations to understand and resolve contradictions and add complementarity. The future scholars may take the quantitative as well as qualitative approach for generalization of the framework of spirituality at workplace for authenticity. A non-linear approach to understanding the subtlety in the networked organization could be helpful using evolutionary modeling and remodeling.

References

Altaf, A., and Awan, M. A. (2011). Moderating affect of workplace spirituality on the relationship of job overload and job satisfaction. *Journal of business ethics, 104*(1), 93-99.

Ashby, E. 1964. Pressure or Suction? *Higher Education Quarterly.* 18(3), 231-240. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.1964.tb01024.x.

Ashforth, B.E., and Pratt, M.G. (2010). Institutionalised spirituality: An oxymoron? In R.A. Giacalone, and C.L. Jurkiewicz (Eds), *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance* (2nd ed., pp. 44 – 58). New York: Sharpe.

Ashmos, D.P. and Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: a conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 134-45.

Autry, J. A. (1994). *Life and work: A manager's search for meaning.* William Morrow and Co.

Backlund, A. (2000). The definition of system. *Kybernetes, 29*(4), 444-451.

Bell, E., Bryman, A., and Harley, B. (2018). *Business research methods.* Oxford university press.

Bell, E., & Taylor, S. (2001, August). 'A RUMOR OF ANGELS': RESEARCHING SPIRITUALITY AND WORK ORGANIZATIONS. *Academy of Management Proceedings.* 2001(1), A1-A6. Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.

Benefiel, M. (2003). Mapping the terrain of spirituality in organizations research. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(4), 367-77.

Benefiel, M., Fry, L. W., and Geigle, D. (2014). Spirituality and religion in the workplace: History, theory, and research. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 6*(3), 175.

Bertalanffy, L. (1950). An outline of General System Theory. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, 1*(2), pp (134-165).

Bertalanffy, L. V. (1977). *Teoria geral dos sistemas* (Vol. 3). Petrópolis: Vozes.

Biberman, J. and M. Whitty: 1997, 'A Postmodern Spiritual Future for Work', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 10(2), 130–138.

Boje, D. M. and Rosalie, G. A. (2003). "Towards festivalism: Or, can I be spiritual and still walk on the dark side?" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *Academy of Management*, Seattle, WA. Bragues (2006).

Brandt, E.: 1996, 'Corporate Pioneers Explore Spirituality', *Magazine 41*, 82–87.

Brower, L. P. (1988). Avian predation on the monarch butterfly and its implications for mimicry theory. *The American Naturalist, 131*, S4-S6.

Brown, R. B.: 2003, 'Organizational Spirituality: The Sceptic's Version', *Organization 10*, 393–400.

Burack, E. H. (1999). Spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of organizational change management, 12*(4), 280-292.

Cacioppe, R. (2000). Creating spirit at work: re-visioning organization development and leadership–Part I. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 21*(1), 48-54.

Campbell, J. K., and Hwa, Y. S. (2014). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment influence on job performance among academic staff. *Jurnal Pengurusan (UKM Journal of Management)*, 40.

Cash, J. I. (1985). Konsynski. BR IS Redraws Competitive Boundaries. *Harvard Business Review, 63*(2), 134-142.

Cash, K. C., and Gray, G. R. (2000). A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace. *Academy of management perspectives,*

14(3), 124-133.

Cavanagh, G. (1999) Spirituality for Managers: Context and Critique. *Journal of Organizational Change Management,* 12(3), 186.

Chakraborty, S.K. (1993), Managerial Transformation by Values, *Sage Publications,* London.

Chappell, T., *The Soul of a Business*: Managing for Profit and the Common Good, Bantam, New York, NY, 1993.

Chawla, V., and Guda, S. (2013). Workplace spirituality as a precursor to relationship-oriented selling characteristics. *Journal of business ethics, 115*(1), 63-73.

Cowan, J., (1993). *The Common Table: Reflections and Meditations on Community and Spirituality in the Workplace.* New York: Harper Collins.

Cowan, M., and Futrell, J. C. (1993). Companions in grace: A handbook for directors of the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius of Loyola. Sheed and Ward.

Dehler, G., and Welsh, M. (1994). Spirituality and organizational transformation: Implications for the new management paradigm. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 19(6), 17–26.

De Jongh, E. C. T. (2011). Responding to the situation: A study of spirituality in organisations.

Denzin, N. K. (2005). In NK Denzin and YS Lincoln. *Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research, NK Denzin, YS Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed.), Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA USA (2005),* 1-32.

Duchon, D. and Plowman, D.A. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *Leadership Quarterly, 16*(5), 807–833.

Duxbury, L. and C. Higgins: 2002, Work-Life Balance in the New Millennium: Where are We: Where do We Need to go? (Carleton University School of Business, Ottawa).

Eck, D. 2001. *A new religious America,* San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Elmes, M., and Smith, C. (2001). Moved by the spirit: Contextualizing workplace empowerment in American spiritual ideals. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 37*(1), 33-50.;

Fairholm (1997 Fairholm, G. W.: 1996, 'Spiritual Leadership: Fulfilling Whole–Self Needs at Work', *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 17(5), 11–17.

Fenwick, T., and Lange, E. (1998). Spirituality in the workplace: The new frontier of HRD. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education, 12*(1), 63-87.

Fornaciari, C. and K. Lund Dean: 2001, 'Making the Quantum Leap: Lessons from Physics on Studying Spirituality and Religion in Organizations', *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 14*(4), 335–351.

Forray, J. M., and Stork, D. (2002). All for one: A parable of spirituality and organization. *Organization, 9*(3), 497-509.

Fox, M.: 1994, The Reinvention of Work: A New Vision of Livelihood for Our Time (HarperCollins, San Francisco).

Fox-Genovese, E., and Lasch-Quinn, E. (Eds.). (1999). *Reconstructing history: the emergence of a new historical society.* Psychology Press.

Frederick, W. C.: 2006, Corporation, Be Good! The Story of Corporate Social Responsibility (Dog Ear Publishing, Indianapolis).

Freshman, B. (1999). An exploratory analysis of definitions and applications of spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*(4), 318-325.

Frost, P. J., Dutton, J. E., Maitlis, S., Lilius, J. M., Kanov, J. M., and Worline, M. C. (2006). Seeing organizations differently: Three lenses on compassion. *The Sage handbook of organization studies, 2,* 843-866.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a Theory of Spiritual Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly* 14(6), 693–727.

Garrett, B. (2004) Personal identity. In E. Craig (Ed.), Routledge encyclopedia of philosophy. London: Routledge. Retrieved March 7, 2009, from http://www.rep.routledge.com/article/V024SECT1 Giacalone, R. and Jurkiewicz, C. 2010. *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Giacalone, R. and Jurkiewicz, C. (2010). *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.

Giacalone, R. A., and C. L. Jurkiewicz. (2003a). *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Gibbons, P. (2000). Spirituality at work: Definitions, measures, assumptions, and validity claims. *Paper presented at the Academy of Management annual meetings, Toronto.*

Gotsis, G., and Kortezi, Z. (2008). Philosophical foundations of workplace spirituality: A critical approach. *Journal of business ethics, 78*(4), 575-600.

Guillory, W. A.: 2000, The Living Organization: Spirituality in the Workplace (Innovations International Inc, Salt Lake City, UT).

Gupta, M., Kumar, V., and Singh, M. (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.

Harrington, W. and Preziosi, R. and Gooden, D. (2004, October 7-9). Worldview resiliency of business degree graduate students – An examination of spiritual experiences and psychological attitudes. *Association of Employment Practices and Principals, 119. Harvard Business Review*, pp.134-142.

Hatch, M. J. (2018). *Organization theory: Modern, symbolic, and postmodern perspectives.* Oxford university press.

Hawley, J., and Hawley, J. A. (1993). *Reawakening the spirit in work: The power of dharmic management.* Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Heaton, D. P., Schmidt-Wilk, J., and Travis, F. (2004). Constructs, methods, and measures for researching spirituality in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17*(1), 62-82.

Heschel, A. J. (1955). *Symbolism and jewish faith*. Institute for Religious and Social Studies.

Hicks, D. A. (2000). *Inequality and Christian Ethics* (Vol. 16). Cambridge University Press.

Highfield, M. F., and Cason, C. (1983). Spiritual needs of patients: Are they recognized? *Cancer nursing, 6*(3),

187-192.

Hill, R. P., Stephens, D., and Smith, I. (2003). Corporate social responsibility: an examination of individual firm behavior. Business and Society Review, 108, 339-364.

Hitt, M. A., Hoskisson, R. E., Johnson, R. A., and Moesel, D. D. 1996. The market for corporate control and firm innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 1084–1119.

Houghton, J. D., Neck, C. P., and Krishnakumar, S. (2016). The what, why, and how of spirituality in the workplace revisited: A 14-year update and extension. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion, 13*(3), 177-205.

Howard, S. (2002). *A spiritual perspective on learning in the workplace. Journal of Managerial Psychology.* 17(3).230-242. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940210423132.

Izzo and Klein, 1997. Information Systems Management: Text and Cases, 4th ed., Irwin Publishings.

Jarillo, J. C. (1988). On strategic networks. *Strategic Management Journal, 9,* 31–41.

Johanson, J., and Mattsson, L. G. (1987). Interorganizational relations in industrial systems: a network approach compared with the transaction-cost approach. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 17*(1), 34-48.

Giacalone, R. A., and Jurkiewicz, C. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance.* Me Sharpe.

Jurkiewicz, C. L. and Giacalone, R. A. (2004). A value framework for measuring the impact of workplace spirituality on organizational performance. *Journal of Business Ethics, 49*(2), 129-142.

Kahnweiler, W., and Otte, F. L. (1997). In search of the soul of HRD. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 8*(2), 171.

Kaneko, I., and Imai, K. (1987, March). A network view of the firm. first Hitotsubashi/Stanford conference. Japan: Hitotsubashi University.

Kast, F.E., and Rosenzweig, J.E. (1970) *Organization and*

Management: A Systems Approach, McGraw-Hill.

Kernis, M. H., and Goldman, B. M. (2006). A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity: *Theory and research. Advances in experimental social psychology*, 38, 283-357.

Kinjerski, V.M. and Skrypnek, B.J. 2006. Creating organizational conditions that foster employee spirit at work. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 27: 280-95.

Koehn, D. (1999). What can Eastern philosophy teach us about business ethics? *Journal of business ethics, 19*(1), 71-79.

Kolodinsky, R. W., Giacalone, R. A., and Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2008). Workplace values and outcomes: Exploring personal, organizational, and interactive workplace spirituality. *Journal of business ethics, 81*(2), 465-480.

Konsynski, B. R., and McFarlan, F. W. (1990). Information partnerships--shared data, shared scale. *Harvard Business Review, 68*(5), 114-120.

Konz, N.P.G. and Ryan, F.X. (1999). Maintaining an organizational spirituality: No easy task. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*(3), 200–210.

Kurth, K. (1995). *An exploration of the expression and perceived impact of selfless service in for-profit organizations.* (Doctoral dissertation). George Washington University.

Laszlo, A. and Krippner, S. 1998. Systems Theories: Their Origins, Foundations, and Developments. *J.S. Jordan (ed.), Systems Theory and Priori Aspects of Perception. Amsterdam, Elsevier Science*, 1998, 3(47-74).

Levitt, S. D., and List, J. A. (2007). On the generalizability of lab behaviour to the field. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique, 40*(2), 347-370.

Macaluso, E., and Driver, J. (2005). Multisensory spatial interactions: a window onto functional integration in the human brain. *Trends in neurosciences, 28*(5), 264-271.

Marques, J. (2005). Yearning for a More Spiritual Workplace. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, Cambridge, 7 (1), 149-153.

McCormick, D. W. (1994). *Spirituality and management. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 9*(6). 5-9.

McGee, R. W. (Ed.). (1998). *The ethics of tax evasion*. Dumont Inst for Public Policy.

Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A.J., and Ferguson, J. (2003). Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 1*(6), 426 – 447.

Mitroff, I. I., Mitroff, I., and Denton, E. A. (1999). A spiritual audit of corporate America: *A hard look at spirituality, religion, and values in the workplace* (Vol. 140). Jossey-Bass.

Mitroff, I. (2003). Do Not Promote Religion Under the Guise of Spirituality. *Organization, 10*(2), 375–382. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508403010002011.

Moore, T. W. and Casper, W. J. (2006). An examination of proxy measures of workplace spirituality: A profile model of multidimensional constructs. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 12*(4), 109-118.

Mukherjee, S., Bhattacharjee, S., and Singha, S. (2016). Workplace Spirituality: A Paradigm Shift to Ethics from Business. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, e-ISSN*.

Nadesan, M. H. (1999). The discourses of corporate spiritualism and evangelical capitalism. *Management Communication Quarterly*. 131. 3-42. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0893318999131001

Naimon, E. C., Mullins, M. E., and Osatuke, K. (2013). The effects of personality and spirituality on workplace incivility perceptions. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion, 10*(1), 91-110.

Naylor, T.H., Willimon, W.H. and Osterberg, R. (1996), *The Search for Meaning in the Workplace*, Abington Press, Nashville, TN.

Neal, 1998). Neal, C.: 1999, 'A Conscious Change in the Workplace', *The Journal for Quality and Participation*. Mar/Apr 1999. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3616/is_199903/ai_n8843120/pg_2.

Neal, J. A. (2000). Work as service to the divine: Giving our gifts selflessly and with joy. *American Behavioral Scientist, 43*(8), 1316-1333.

Neck, C. P., and Milliman, J. F. (1994). Thought self-leadership: finding spiritual fulfillment in organizational life. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 9*(6), 9-16.

Overell, S. (2008). *Inwardness: The rise of meaningful work, provocation series* (Vol. 4[2]). London: The Work Foundation.

Paloutzian, R. F., and Park, C. L. (2005). Integrative themes in the current science of the psychology of religion. *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality, 1*, 3-20.

Pawar, B. S. (2009). Workplace spirituality facilitation: A comprehensive model. *Journal of business ethics, 90*(3), 375.

Petchsawang, P., and McLean, G. N. (2017). Workplace spirituality, mindfulness meditation, and work engagement. *Journal of Management, Spirituality and Religion, 14*(3), 216-244.

Pfeffer, J. (2003). *Business and Spirit: Management Practices That Sustain Values.* In R. A. Giacalone and C. L.

Phipps, K., and Benefiel, M. (2013). Spirituality and religion: seeking a juxtaposition that supports research in the field of faith and spirituality at work. In *Handbook of Faith and Spirituality in the Workplace* (pp. 33-43). Springer, New York, NY.

Podolny, J. M., and Page, K. L. (1998). Network forms of organization. *Annual review of sociology, 24*(1), 57-76.

Porter, M. E., and Millar, V. E. (1985). How information gives you competitive advantage.

Porter, Michael E., 1985, Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance, London: Collier Macmillan.

Rego, A., and Pina e Cunha, M. (2008). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: an empirical study. *Journal of organizational change management, 21*(1), 53-75.

Saks, A. M. (2011). Workplace spirituality and employee engagement. *Journal of management, spirituality and religion, 8*(4), 317-340.

Schweitzer, F. (1998): Modelling migration and economic agglomeration with active Brownian particles. Advances in Complex Systems 1, 11–37.

Sengupta, S.S. (2010) 'Correlates of spiritual orientation and managerial effectiveness', *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 46*(1), pp.45–60.

Sharma, S. K., Rastogi, R., and Garg, P. (2013). Workplace spirituality and managerial effectiveness among Indian managers. *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management, 6*(3), 382-390.

Siporin, M. (1985). Deviance, morality and social work therapy. *Social Thought, 11*(4), 11-24.

Surak, J. G. (2001). Eastern influence. *Food Technology, 55*, 19.

Tischler, L. (1999). The growing interest of spirituality in business: A long term socio-economic explanation. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 12(4). 273-279. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09534819910282117.

Tischler, V., Rademeyer, A., and Vostanis, P. (2007). Mothers experiencing homelessness: Mental health, support and social care needs. *Health and social care in the community, 15*(3), 246-253.

Tiwari, G. and Pathak, P. (2018). Ethical Behaviour Through the lens of Workplace Spirituality: A review agenda. *International Journal of Business Ethics in Developing Economies, 7(1)* 2018, 23-31. http://publishingindia.com/ijbede.

Tiwari, G. and Pathak, P. (2019a). Understanding Spirituality at Workplace Through System View: A Way Forward". *International Journal of Management Research*, Vol. 10(1), Forthcoming June 2019 issue, ISSN No.: 0976-6669.

Tiwari, G. and Pathak, P. (2019b March). Subtlety in Networked Organizational System- A Conceptual Framework. Paper presented at NCIBP FMS-BHU, Varanasi, India.

Tiwari, G., Srivastava, S., and Pathak, P. (2017). Linking Self Efficacy and Workplace Spirituality in IT (Information Technology) Industry using Structural

Equation Modeling. *SAMVAD: SIBM Pune Research Journal, Vol XIV, 1-6, December 2017. ISSN (Print): 2249-1880 ISSN (Online): 2348-5329*.

Toffler, A., and Alvin, T. (1980). *The third wave* (Vol. 484). New York: Bantam books.

Tombaugh, J.R., Mayfield, C. and Durand, R. (2011) 'Spiritual expression at work: exploring the active voice of workplace spirituality', *Int. J. Organizational Analysis,19*(2), pp.146–170.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). What is Authenticity? *Discourse Studies, 3*(4), 392–397. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445601003004003

Wagner-Marsh, F., and Conley, J. (1999). The fourth wave: The spiritually based firm. *Journal of organizational change management, 12*(4), 292-302.

Wedemeyer, R. A. and Jue, R. W., (2002). *The Inner Edge: Effective Spirituality in Your Life and Work*. The McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

Zhuravleva, E., and Jones, G. (2006). Keep walking the road: outgrowing our instrumental approach to workplace spirituality. In *annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, GA*.

Zinnbauer et al. (1997 Zinnbauer, B. J., Pargament, K. I., and Scott, A. B. (1999). The emerging meanings of religiousness and spirituality: Problems and prospects. *Journal of personality, 67*(6), 889-919.

Zinnbauer, B. J., and Pargament, K. I. (2005). Religiousness and spirituality. *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality*, 21-42.

_____

Prachi Pathak is Assistant Professor in School of Management, Doon University, Dehradun. She is Ph.D. in Human Resource Development from Rohilkhand University, Bareilly. Having teaching experience of more than 18 years, she has core specialization in Organizational Behaviour Science and Human Resource Development. She has keen interest in Spirituality at workplace, team behaviour, emotional intelligence and entrepreneurship. She also has publication in journals of repute.

Gaurav Tiwari is Research Scholar under the supervision of Dr. Prachi Pathak in School of Management, Doon University Dehradun. He is pursuing his Ph.D. in organizational behaviour science. He has a core interest in issues related spirituality at workplace, system science and small teams.