

Article

The Employee Spirituality Scale as a Measure of Employees' Spirituality

Marcin Wnuk 

Department of Psychology, Adam Mickiewicz University, 61-712 Poznan, Poland; marwnu@amu.edu.pl

Abstract: The aim of the study was to assess the psychometric properties of the employee spirituality scale. The employee spirituality scale was found to be a reliable measure with good internal consistency. The internal consistency of this instrument, measured with Cronbach's α coefficient, was 0.94. Factor analysis confirmed the two-dimensional structure of this measure, the dimensions being: relationship to a Higher Power (God) and attitude towards workmates and employer. A statistically significant positive correlation was found between employee spirituality and job satisfaction, as well as age, and a negative correlation was found with their intent to leave their organization. According to expectation, the relationship to a Higher Power (God) as a religious dimension of employee spirituality was strong, positively related to religious practices and attitude towards workmates and employer, and a secular dimension of employee spirituality did not correlate with religious measures. Gender did not differentiate participants in terms of employee spirituality. The presented results provide evidence that the employee spirituality scale has good psychometric properties and is therefore recommended for use by researchers studying employee spirituality in Polish organizations.

Keywords: spirituality at work; religiosity; employees; measure; scale; reliability; internal consistency; theoretical consistency



Citation: Wnuk, Marcin. 2022. The Employee Spirituality Scale as a Measure of Employees' Spirituality. *Religions* 13: 72. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13010072>

Academic Editor: Hans Zollner

Received: 16 November 2021

Accepted: 10 January 2022

Published: 13 January 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The aim of the present article is to propose a definition of employee spirituality to distinguish it from religiosity, to construct a scale to measure it, and to investigate some psychometric properties of the scale. Spirituality research has been increasingly popular in various disciplines, such as psychology, medicine, and management. In the last 35 years of the 20th century, research devoted to health and well-being saw a dynamically increasing interest in spirituality issues, accompanied by a decreasing interest in religiosity (Weaver et al. 2006). The cause of this phenomenon is the progressing desacralization and secularization of religious values. Historically, the two concepts were strictly interrelated; from the point of view of its genesis, spiritual experience belonged to the religious domain and referred to human religious functioning (Wulff 1999). Since the 2nd half of the 20th century, there has been an ongoing autonomization of spiritual experience, which has been dissociated from its religious context and linked with values that are secular in nature.

The autonomization of spirituality was possible due to the fact that, historically, religiosity was not only associated with an organizational phenomenon regarding institutional church but also occurred as an individual phenomenon, specific to each person. Functional definitions of religion did not treat it as a set of experiences, practices, behaviors, and relationships centered around the concept of God, but rather began to stress its role and purpose in people's life. Psychologists did not treat religion as generally evil or good: they relativized its significance, depending on which aspect of religion is investigated. At present, religion is understood as institutional, ritualistic, and ideological; whereas, spirituality is defined as individual and personal, focused on feelings, experiences, and thoughts. As opposed to spirituality, religiosity has negative connotations and is treated as a static entity rather than a dynamic process (Pargament 1999).

Religiosity and spirituality are recognised as separate but overlapping rather than being the same or completely different constructs (Hyman and Handal 2006; Hodge and McGrew 2005; Baumsteiger and Chenneville 2015). Spirituality is a broader concept than religion—religiosity is a form of spirituality and spirituality includes religion (Hyman and Handal 2006; Baumsteiger and Chenneville 2015), and spirituality is seen as internal, individual, and subjective (Baumsteiger and Chenneville 2015; Hyman and Handal 2006), as opposed to religion, which is seen as external, collective, and objective (Hyman and Handal 2006; Baumsteiger and Chenneville 2015).

To sum up, it is rational to treat the two concepts as overlapping but semantically distinct (Benson et al. 2003; Emmons 1999). Religious conceptions of spirituality focus on specific religious beliefs and practices; whereas, broader conceptions of spirituality are focused on natural experiences, personal values, and a sense of connectedness (Piedmont 1999).

Despite the plethora of conceptions of and perspectives on spirituality, it is possible to identify certain common elements constituting this construct. The most important among them is the relational aspect, manifesting itself in individuals' relationships with themselves, with other people, and with a Higher Power (Bloch 2004; Dyson et al. 1997; Ingersoll and Bauer 2004; Martsof and Mickley 1998; Tse et al. 2005). In the first of these cases, it determines connectedness with oneself, which results in self-awareness and self-knowledge, as well as in a sense of intimacy, integrity, and identity. Connectedness with others is focused on a sense of community with other people, compassion, altruism, sharing with others, and helping them. "Relationship to Higher Power" refers to issues such as God, ultimate values, religiosity, holiness, fear of and reverence for God, religious practices, religious experience, or faith (Chiu et al. 2004).

In organizational psychology, increasing interest in spirituality is accompanied by a shift of focus from oneself to connectedness with other people (Capra 1993), by a shift from interest in oneself and one's own needs to interest in serving others (Neck and Milliman 1994), and by a change of orientation from materialistic to spiritual occupations (Neal 1997). According to Wagner-Marsh and Conley (1999), organizations based on spirituality are Toffler's fourth wave, which is the next stage after the technological revolution, this being the third wave in the history of mankind (Toffler 1980). In his work, Toffler emphasized the role of technological resources and did not appreciate the positive influence of employee's spirituality as a significant human cognitive-motivational resource for his productivity, effectivity, and well-being.

In the literature on the subject, it is possible to find about 70 definitions of spirituality at work, but there is still no definition widely accepted by the academic community (Markow and Klenke 2005). Karakas (2010) identifies the problem of the lack of integral conception of employees' spirituality with the multifacetedness, the idiosyncrasy, and the elusiveness of this construct. Some definitions are very general and focus on reflections about employees' spirituality rather than the role of this phenomenon for individuals and organizations. A good exemplification of this thesis is Duchon and Plowman's (2005) approach, for whom spirituality consists of recognition that employees have an inner life, are motivated to find meaning at work, and need the conditions from the company to create the context for spiritual growth. Other ones are more specified, but are not pragmatic and not oriented on the function which spirituality has for both individual and organizational levels. A good example is the definition of spirituality at work as an inner consciousness (Guillory 2000), which enigmatically answers the question of what spirituality is, without explaining its roots and function at work. Additionally, in previous concepts, an employee's faith, as a vital and motivational value at work, is underestimated, omitted, or neglected, and not integrated as a significant and integral element of this phenomenon (Benefiel et al. 2014). According to Miller's (2007) third era (1986–present) in the history of the faith at work movement, it is the time for integration of faith and work and uses religion as a beneficial value for business and society to experience more adept spirituality at work. Taking into

consideration the presented postulations, preparing a new operationalization and measure to verify employees' spirituality is needed.

This gap in the research is going to be filled through the proposed definition of employee's spirituality, which focuses on function spirituality at work, as well as following [Benefiel et al.'s \(2014\)](#) integrative approach to religiousness and spirituality at work, in one conception. According to [Kolodinsky et al. \(2008\)](#), the developed instrument was supposed to measure spirituality at the individual level by focusing on the activity of this sphere and the functions it serves in the everyday performance of official duties, regardless of whether the organization supports these experiences, creating conditions for an employee to develop this sphere of life. In other words, the new measure of spirituality was meant to assess the activity of the spiritual sphere of individual employees in the context of their attitude at work, without reference to whether or not the organization cares about their spiritual development, by giving them the opportunity to give expression to this sphere of life during the work they do. According to this conception, and consistent with the trend of positive psychology, employees' spirituality is a beneficial and fruitful resource both for individuals' well-being and organizations' business goals ([Benefiel et al. 2014](#); [Karakas 2010](#)). In this approach, the role of religious values as an immanent element of religious individuals' worldview in influencing their attitude towards work, workmates, and employer was emphasized. It is important especially in the Polish societal and cultural context, within which religion plays an important role in spiritual growth, even in a religiously skeptical sample, such as self-help group participants ([Wnuk 2021a](#)). In Polish society, 87% of citizens have declared a Roman Catholic affiliation, and the rate of church attendance is the highest in Europe ([Pew Research Center, 2018](#)). This means that, for this sample, the Higher Power is probably identified with God, but for religious skeptics, as a significant minority in Poland, it seems to be another value.

The prepared employee spirituality scale is based on a conceptualization of spirituality at work as a given employee's relationship to a Higher Power ([Chiu et al. 2004](#)) and their attitude towards other people ([Bloch 2004](#); [Dyson et al. 1997](#); [Ingersoll and Bauer 2004](#); [Lewis 2008](#); [Martsof and Mickley 1998](#); [Tse et al. 2005](#))—in this case, towards their workmates.

The first of these factors is religious in nature, and can be seen as identical with the religious attitudes dimension that was distinguished in the model of spirituality proposed by [Heszen-Niejodek and Gruszczyńska \(2004\)](#); the second factor has secular connotations, and can be compared to the attitude towards others' dimension, which the authors of the model see as based on understanding, tolerance, respect, willingness to be of service, the ability to forgive, and altruism.

It was a conscious decision to use the term "Higher Power", which was modeled on the twelve-step program of Alcoholics Anonymous ([Alcoholics Anonymous 2014](#); [Kurtz 1990](#)), to stress that, for nonbelievers, this may be a different secular value, such as fate, cosmos ([Alcoholics Anonymous 2014](#)), or the other secular worldviews ([Taves et al. 2018](#)), responding on the most significant ontology, epistemology, axiology, praxeology, and cosmology questions ([Koltko-Rivera 2004](#)). This makes the proposed conceptualization of spirituality universal, since it refers to relationship to God in the case of believers, while in the case of people skeptical of religion—atheists and agnostics—it offers a possibility of referring to their own autonomous idea of a Higher Power. This is important because the object of interest for spirituality at work is not the idea of God or the Higher Power itself, but rather the answer to the question of what role the relationship to this phenomenon plays in an employee's everyday functioning.

The sense of connectedness with God or a Higher Power can be a source of a sense of meaning and purpose at work ([Ashmos and Duchon 2000](#); [Halstead and Mickley 1997](#)), transcendence ([Benson 2004](#); [Chiu et al. 2004](#); [Helminiak 2008](#); [Hodges 2002](#); [Ley and Corless 1998](#); [Martsof and Mickley 1998](#)), and source of comfort, as well as a resource for coping with difficult situations and problems at work ([Pargament et al. 2001](#); [Phillips et al. 2004](#)). According to Frankl's anti-reductionist perspective on motivation, a person is not

determined by drives—thanks to which, in the process transcendence, he or she is able to overcome all the limitations inherent in the drive-based human nature, and apart from the physical, mental, and social spheres, human functioning has a spiritual dimension, which constitutes the basis of transcendence (Frankl 1975). A key element of this dimension is an unconscious relationship to God—an immanently human, though frequently latent, attitude towards that which is transcendent. This means that, consciously or not, an individual intentionally tends towards God and remains in a relationship—always intentional, even if unconscious—with God. The spiritual instrument for realizing the will for meaning is conscience. It is transcendent in nature, and it is a voice of transcendence in itself, coming from God. Thanks to conscience, a person can realize the will for meaning, as a free and responsible being, which means that human freedom of will is freedom *from* being governed by drives, and freedom *to* be responsible (Frankl 1975). The second element of spirituality at work is attitude towards employer and workmates. This dimension partly overlaps with one of the aspects of spiritual transcendence, distinguished by Piedmont (1999), characterized, among other things, by the acceptance and non-judgment of other people as well as by sensitivity to their needs and suffering.

To sum up, employee spirituality can be defined as a relationship to a Higher Power, which gives a sense of guidance, facilitates the finding of meaning and purpose in one's duties, makes it possible to transcend one's weaknesses and limitations at work, and serves as a source of balance and support in difficult situations. This dimension can be treated as the religious aspect of spirituality.

For believers, this relationship is a matrix for building a bond with their workmates and with the organization, based on the development of attitudes marked by concern for the employer's interest, the absence of a desire for revenge in cases of a sense of harm, standing up against injustice at work, sharing knowledge and experience, concern for a workmate's needs, and the ability to appreciate others. For nonbelievers, the source of positive attitude towards their workmates can be other, secular values, internalized in the course of personal development, in the course of primary or secondary socialization, or at the subsequent stages of ontogenesis.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants—Study 1

The participants in the study were 460 employees working in different organizations based in Poland. The study was conducted on an anonymous and voluntary basis. The sample consisted of 62.5% women and 37.5% men. The participants' mean age was 27.99 years ($SD = 9.19$).

2.2. Scale Preparation

Employee spirituality was operationalized as a relationship to a Higher Power, which for religiously inclined employees is God, but for religious skeptics—agnostics and atheists—this can be nature, evolution, etc. In this relationship to a Higher Power is a source of support, meaning, and comfort at work, coping with stress, career direction, forgiving workmates, and transcendence.

The second aspect of an employee's spirituality is their attitude towards their workmates and employer, which characterizes their sharing of knowledge and experience, their standing up against injustices at work, and their respect for every other employee—appreciating their effort and caring about their needs.

Based on this definition, a preliminary pool of short, simple, and comprehensible items, phrased in the affirmative, was prepared as indicators of employee spirituality (Hornowska 2017). The tentative items were subjected to linguistic analysis, performed by an expert who was a psychologist. A set of 48 introductory items were prepared by the author of this paper and verified by a group of psychologists, based on linguistic and content analysis. Twelve of them were excluded from the statistical analysis due to content

similarity and inappropriateness for being an indicator of one of the potential employee spirituality factors.

2.3. Statistical Analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Amos version 27 in 2 steps. The participants rated the items on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Firstly, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was applied to check whether prepared items reflected the expected two factors of the employee spirituality scale. Secondly, based on EFA results, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was applied. In the CFA was included items which were those with the highest discriminatory power, which means that, in accordance with the author's arbitrary decision, these were loaded on one factor, to a degree of at least 0.60, and at the same time, they were loaded on the other factor, to a degree that did not exceed 0.15. Additionally, these included selected items with the highest factor loadings, with item–factor correlations of at least 0.60. Additionally, items that had a Person correlation coefficient value higher than 0.9 were excluded from the CFA. Within the CFA, structural equation modelling (SEM) was employed to examine whether the model of the employee spirituality scale was well fitted to the data. To achieve this goal, the following model fit indicators were applied: root mean square error approximation (RMSEA), normed fit index (NFI), goodness-of-fit index (GFI), and comparative fit index (CFI) (Byrne 1994; Steiger 1990, pp. 183–90).

3. Results

3.1. Factor Analysis

EFA, using principal component analysis with Promax rotation, was conducted on the 36 items resulting from the linguistic and content analyses. The Kaiser–Mayer–Olkin sampling adequacy test yielded 0.971. Bartlett's sphericity test showed $\chi^2 \approx 16749.555$, $df = 595$, $p < 0.01$. This attested to the adequacy of the sampling. The factors that were distinguished explained 67% of the variance; the first factor, "Relationship to Higher Power", explained 48.86%, and the other factor, "Attitude Towards Employer and Workmates", explained 18.14% of the variance of the research construct. Both of these factors were weakly positively correlated (0.23). Next, CFA was used after excluding the too highly correlated items, as well as those items which did not fill the discriminant validity criterion. The maximum likelihood method of structural equation modeling was applied on 24 items—12 items per latent variable—to verify construct validity. The obtained values, RMSEA = 0.04, 90% CI [0.03, 0.05]; NFI = 0.96, GFI = 0.93, CFI = 0.98, χ^2 (χ^2 statistic value—CMIN) = 425.74, $df = 236$, and $p = 0.001$ (CMIN/DF = 1.80), confirmed that the model of the employee spirituality scale was well fitted to the data. The normed fit index (NFI) exceeded the level of 0.90, which was regarded as satisfactory; the goodness-of-fit index (GFI) also exceeded the 0.90 level, and the comparative fit index (CFI) exceeded the satisfactory threshold of 0.93 (Byrne 1994). Additionally, the value of RMSEA was below the 0.05 level, which was assumed to be ideal (Steiger 1990, pp. 183–90). The discriminatory power of the employee spirituality scale items, distinguished in factor analysis, is presented in Table 1. Items concerning the first latent variable loaded this factor at 0.87–0.92. Additionally, the items referring to the second latent variable loaded it at 0.60–0.80. This confirmed the very good internal consistency of the measure. The correlations of individual items of the first dimension with this factor ranged from 0.88 to 0.92, and in the case of the second factor, the correlations ranged from 0.66 to 0.81 (see Table 1). Discriminant validity was examined based on a new approach in assessing the discriminant validity through the heterotrait–monotrait ratio (HTMT) by Henseler et al. (2015). The HTMT is the average of the heterotrait–heteromethod correlations, relative to the average of the monotrait–heteromethod correlations. The HTMT was calculated in SEM by using the Gaskin plugin (Gaskin 2019). The achieved result of the HTMT (0.214) was below the acceptable cut-off level, which, according to Kline's (2011) recommendation, is below 0.85, and according to the less restrictive approach of Gold et al. (2001), it is below 0.9. This meant that the discriminant validity of employee spirituality scale is satisfied.

Table 1. Factor loadings and correlation coefficients between factors and items of the employee spirituality scale (N = 460).

Items	Factor Loadings	Correlation
	Component	Component
I believe that my Higher Power (for example, God) has an influence on the course of my professional career.	0.88	0.89
My Higher Power (for example, God) has an influence on the choices I make at work.	0.87	0.88
In difficult moments at work I turn to my Higher Power (for example, God).	0.90	0.91
I ask my Higher Power (for example, God) for help in doing my daily duties at work.	0.89	0.90
At work I try to act in accordance with the will of my Higher Power (for example, God).	0.87	0.89
Thanks to the Higher Power (for example, God) I am able to find the meaning of my work and duties.	0.90	0.91
The Higher Power (for example, God) gives me hope that matters at work will move in the right direction.	0.91	0.92
My Higher Power (for example, God) is a source of comfort for me at work.	0.91	0.91
Thanks to the Higher Power (for example, God) I am able to overcome my limitations at work.	0.92	0.92
Thanks to my Higher Power (for example, God) I try to see sense even in those duties at work that I don't like.	0.87	0.88
My Higher Power (for example, God) gives me the strength to forgive my workmates (colleagues).	0.88	0.89
I am sure that my Higher Power (for example, God) will help me manage in difficult moments at work.	0.91	0.92
I am convinced that every employee deserves respect regardless of his or her duties.	0.71	0.74
In my work I try to look after my workmates' needs.	0.64	0.71
At work I behave in such a way as not to harm my workmates.	0.66	0.70
I am glad to share my knowledge and experience at work.	0.68	0.72
I try to stand up against injustices at work, even if they do not concern me.	0.62	0.68
I have respect for every employee, regardless of the position he or she holds.	0.80	0.81
In my work I look after my employer's interest.	0.62	0.66
I am understanding towards my workmates.	0.69	0.68
I am able to notice and appreciate other employees' effort.	0.73	0.75
I would not take revenge on my employer, even if I had the opportunity.	0.60	0.67
I accept my workmates even though I am aware of their faults and oversights at work.	0.69	0.73
I believe every employee has inalienable dignity regardless of what he or she does.	0.79	0.78

(Source: own preparation).

The descriptive statistics for the final version of the employee spirituality scale are presented in Table 2. In Table 2, factorial scores were calculated as the sum of the raw scores.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics ($N = 460$).

Factor	Min.–Max.	M \pm SD
Employee Spirituality Scale	24–120	80.32 \pm 17.62
Relationship to Higher Power (God)	12–60	31.69 \pm 14.69
Attitude Towards Workmates and Employer	12–60	48.63 \pm 7.16

(Source: own preparation).

3.2. Internal Consistency

Internal consistency, measured as Cronbach's α coefficient, was 0.98 for the first factor and 0.91 for the second factor. Internal consistency of the employee spirituality scale as a whole was 0.94. According to the obtained results, the Relationship to Higher Power factor was very strongly correlated with the overall score on the scale, while the attitude towards employer and workmates was only moderately correlated with it, which means the former is more representative of the measure (Table 3). The weak correlation between the first dimension of the measure and the second one attests that they are distinct.

Table 3. Correlations between employee spirituality scale and its dimensions ($N = 460$).

Factor	2. Relationship to Higher Power (God)	3. Attitude Towards Workmates and Employer
1. Employee Spirituality Scale	0.91 **	0.58 **
2. Relationship to Higher Power (God)		0.22 **

** $p < 0.01$. (Source: own preparation).

Additionally, we checked whether gender was a variable differentiating the subjects in terms of spirituality at work. According to the obtained results, women and men did not differ in the level of spirituality at work, $t(460) = 0.85$, $p = 0.39$, their relationship to a Higher Power, $t(460) = 0.04$, $p = 0.96$, or their attitude towards their employer and workmates, $t(460) = 1.95$, $p = 0.52$. Another sociodemographic variable—namely, age—correlated positively, though weakly, with both the overall score and with the Relationship to Higher Power factor, and at the same time, it was not correlated with the second factor of the measure (Table 4).

Table 4. Correlation between employee spirituality scale and dimensions and age ($N = 460$).

Variable	Age
Employee Spirituality Scale	0.13 **
Relationship to Higher Power (God)	0.15 **
Attitude Towards Workmates and Employer	0.02

** $p < 0.01$. (Source: own preparation).

3.3. Participants—Study 2

The study was conducted on 804 employees from the different organizations localized in Poland. The survey was anonymous. All participants agreed to take part in the study. In the study sample, 41.9% participants were men and 58.1% were women. Mean seniority was 3.06 years ($SD = 6.59$), and mean age was 28.05 years ($SD = 10.27$).

3.4. Theoretical Consistency

In the next step, theoretical consistency was verified through confronting the employee spirituality scale with the gratitude towards organization scale, the intent to leave an organization, the job satisfaction, and the frequency of religious practices, such as frequency of prayer and Mass attendance. Most of recent studies have confirmed that the spiritual and religious spheres of life positively influence mental and occupational well-being ([Karakas 2010](#); [Wnuk and Marcinkowski 2014](#)). In the Walker study, employees' faith was negatively related to their intent to leave an organization and positively correlated with all three types of organizational commitment ([Walker 2013](#)). [Affeldt and MacDonald \(2010\)](#) confirmed that various aspects of religiosity are positively related to job satisfaction, organizational commitment, work ethics, and organizational citizenship behavior. In other studies, the sanctification of work was a significant predictor of job satisfaction, intent to leave an organization, and organizational commitment ([Carroll et al. 2014](#)).

Gratitude is a one of the antecedents of spirituality and religiosity. In the [Van Cappellen et al. \(2016\)](#) study, gratitude as an emotion correlated positively with spirituality. In another study, gratitude was positively related to public and private measures of religiosity ([Emmons and Kneezel 2005](#)), as well as internally motivated religiosity ([Watkins et al. 2003](#)).

Assumption about the relationship to a Higher Power as a religious factor of employee spirituality, and attitude towards workmates and employer was tested as a secular dimension of employee spirituality. It was expected that religious practices would strongly correlate with relationship to a Higher Power, which, especially in Polish employees—as representatives of a very religious nation ([Pew Research Center 2018](#))—can be personified by God. In the same vein, the relationships between religious practices and secular factor of employee spirituality should not be statistically significant or at most weakly correlated. Additionally, it was expected that religious practices moderate the relationship between relationship to a Higher Power and the attitude towards workmates and employer. It means that, for nonbelievers or religious skeptical employees, who do not attend to religious practices or do so very seldom, their relationship to a Higher Power is negatively related to attitude towards workmates and employer, or, at most, this association is not statistically significant. On the other hand, those employees who are strongly involved in religious practices, with God as their connection to Higher Power, should see a positively predicted attitude towards workmates and employer. To examine the moderation role of religious practices in the relationship between Relationship to Higher Power and attitude towards workmates and employer [Hayes \(2013\)](#), a process macro, with probe interactions on -1 standard deviation (-1 SD), mean and $+1$ standard deviation ($+1$ SD), and the Johnson–Neyman output was used. Probe interactions on -1 SD, mean, and $+1$ SD are three points along the scale of the (continuous) moderator variable (W) representing “low,” “medium,” and “high” values on that variable (see, e.g., [Aiken and West 1991](#)). The Johnson–Neyman output serves to test the relationship between the independent variable (X) and the dependent variable (Y) on the range of significance across levels on the (assumed continuous) moderator variable (W).

3.5. Measures

Gratitude toward organization was tested by the gratitude towards organization scale ([Wnuk 2020](#)). In the study, we used four out of eight sentences regarding gratitude as a commitment to reciprocity. Each question is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The reliability of the scale, assessed by Cronbach's α coefficient, was 0.87.

Intent to leave an organization was measured using a scale consisting of three items ([Yücel 2012](#)). Participants responded on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The reliability of the scale, assessed by Cronbach's α coefficient, was 0.89.

Job satisfaction was measured using one statement—"Generally, I like working here". Participants responded on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

Religious involvement was measured by frequency of religious practices. Participants responded for questions regarding frequency of prayer and Mass attendance.

4. Results

The correlation coefficients from the employee spirituality scale factors and indicators of theoretical consistency are presented in Table 5. According to expectation, we noticed a strong positive correlation between religious practices as a frequency of prayer, as well as frequency of Mass attendance, and the religious dimension of employee spirituality as a relationship to a Higher Power (for example, God). Secular dimension of employee spirituality as an attitude towards workmates and employer did not correlate with religious practices. Both factors constituting the employee spirituality scale were weakly positively related to gratitude toward organization and weakly negatively related to intent to leave an organization. Both prayer and Mass attendance were moderated by the relationship between the connection to a Higher Power and the attitude towards workmates and employer. In both situations, the interactional effects were statistically significant: ($\beta = 0.041$, $t(804) = 3.29$, $p < 0.01$; 95%CI [LL = 0.166 to UL = 0.656]) and ($\beta = 0.034$, $t(804) = 2.82$, $p < 0.01$; 95%CI [LL = 0.104 to UL = 0.578]), respectively. Only for employees praying more frequently than average did we notice a positive, statistically significant association between the relationship to a Higher Power and attitude towards workmates and employer: ($\beta = 0.084$, $t(804) = 2.52$, $p < 0.05$; 95%CI [LL = 0.188 to UL = 0.1495]). In a group of both average and lower than average praying employees, the association between relationship to a Higher Power and attitude towards workmates and employer was not statistically significant: ($\beta = 0.021$, $t(804) = 0.94$, $p = 0.344$; 95%CI [LL = −0.228 to UL = 0.653]) and ($\beta = −0.040$, $t(804) = 1.61$, $p = 0.107$; 95%CI [LL = −0.886 to UL = 0.71]), respectively. For average and more frequent than average Mass participants, there was no statistically significant relationship between religious and secular spirituality factors: ($\beta = −0.002$, $t(804) = −0.07$, $p = 0.941$; 95%CI [LL = −0.453 to UL = 0.420]) and ($\beta = 0.005$, $t(804) = 1.57$, $p = 0.115$; 95%CI [LL = −0.124 to UL = 0.1135]), respectively; but for lower than average participants, this effect was negative ($\beta = −0.054$, $t(804) = −2.12$, $p < 0.05$; 95%CI [LL = −0.1045 to UL = −0.41]).

Table 5. Pearson correlations between the factors constituting the employee spirituality scale and the measures being indicators of the theoretical consistency employee spirituality scale ($N = 804$).

	Relationship to Higher Power (God)	Attitude towards Workmates and Employer
Frequency of prayer	0.71 **	0.11
Frequency of Mass attendance	0.71 **	0.04
Intend to leave an organization	−0.08 *	−0.30 **
Job satisfaction	0.01	0.27 **
Gratitude Toward Organization	0.11**	0.30 **

(Source: own preparation) * $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

5. Discussion

The aim of the study was to present the concept of spirituality and an instrument designed to measure it among employees of organizations in Poland, as well as to assess its psychometric properties. In Poland, despite several measures of spirituality being in use (Heszen-Niejodek and Gruszczyńska 2004; Wnuk 2009), no instrument has been developed so far in the fields of work psychology and human resource management that could be

used to measure manifestations of employees' spirituality in the context of the role of this sphere in their occupational functioning.

Developing the employee spirituality scale was an effort to meet the increasing interest in the issues of spirituality at work in the context of effective management, as well as in the context of creating optimal work conditions; at the same time, it was a manifestation of concern for employees' development and their possibilities of self-expression in the workplace. It is also a sign of transformation taking place in management, from the command approach, based on fear and control, to an approach based on trust and empowerment (Conger and Kanungo 1988), as well as a shift from transactional to transformational leadership (House and Shamir 1993). From the perspective of human resource management, spirituality is a factor improving well-being at work. From the philosophical perspective, spirituality helps employees to discover the meaning and purpose of work, and from the interpersonal perspective, it makes it easier for employees to develop a sense of connectedness and community with their workmates. From all of the above perspectives, spirituality leads to an increase in effectiveness and efficiency, as well as to the better performance of duties at work (Carroll et al. 2014; Karakas 2010).

The presented employee spirituality scale is well grounded in theory and properly set in the literature. It has very good psychometric properties. The scale's very good internal consistency has been confirmed by Cronbach's α coefficient. It consists of two factors, representing the relationship to a Higher Power and the attitude towards the employer and workmates.

According to the conception of spirituality adopted here, the relationship to a Higher Power gives an employee a sense of guidance, makes it possible to overcome his or her limitations and weaknesses at work, facilitates the discovery of meaning and purpose at work, provides comfort, and facilitates coping with difficult situations.

The employee spirituality scale has very good internal consistency: its Cronbach's α coefficient was 0.94. Gender did not differentiate the subjects in terms of spirituality. Age correlated weakly and positively, both with the overall score on the scale and with the attitude towards Higher Power dimension, which means that, as in previous studies, the expression of the spiritual and religious sphere increased with age (Wnuk 2009).

The employee spirituality scale has good theoretical consistency. According to recent research, both employee spirituality factors were related to occupational well-being, measured according to intention to leave an organization and job satisfaction (Walker 2013; Affeldt and MacDonald 2010; Carroll et al. 2014). Lack of a significant correlation between relationship to a Higher Power and job satisfaction can be explained through the moderating role of religious practices. Among employees who attend Mass once a week or more, the relationship to a Higher Power was positively correlated with job satisfaction, while among those who never attend Mass, this variable negatively predicted job satisfaction. In the same vein, among employees praying every day, the relationship to a Higher Power was positively related to job satisfaction, and among those who never pray, these variables were not correlated (Wnuk 2018). As in previous research, gratitude was positively related both to religious and secular dimensions of employee spirituality (Van Cappellen et al. 2016; Emmons and Kneezel 2005; Watkins et al. 2003).

As expected, religious practices positively and strongly correlated with the religious dimension of employee spirituality, as a relationship to a Higher Power was not related to secular factors. Obtained results are consistent with assumptions that employee spirituality consists of two dimensions—one religious and one secular—and they are relatively independent (Wnuk 2018) but weakly correlated only in the general population, without differentiation between employees within religious commitments in religious practices. Taking into consideration commitment in religious practices, this relationship is more complex. For religious employees, this relationship is a matrix for building a bond with their workmates and the organization, that is based on trust and the formation of attitudes which are characterized by care and concern for the employer's interest, the absence of a desire for revenge in cases of a sense of harm, counteracting injustice at work, sharing knowledge and

experience, taking care of workmates' needs, the ability to appreciate others and perceive their dignity, and showing respect, regardless of a person's position or duties. A positive attitude towards workmates and employer can be a consequence of a relationship to a Higher Power, identified by religious employees with God, but for non-believers, religious skeptics, agnostics, and atheists, a Higher Power can be perceived as other secular values, such as the cosmos or non-religious worldviews (Taves et al. 2018), etc. As was confirmed, the beneficial effect of attachment to a Higher Power for the attitude towards workmates and employer is available only to employees who pray more frequently than average. At the same time, the relationship to a Higher Power was a negative predictor of attitude towards workmates and employers only in a group of research participants who do not attend Mass. These results are consistent with recent research conducted on Polish students who pray more frequently than the average, and for whom faith serves as a meaning-oriented system (Silberman 2005), which facilitates finding meaning in life. In a group of students attending Mass less than average, faith did not fill this function, being a negative predictor of finding meaning and purpose in life (Wnuk 2021b). It suggests that, for employees who are involved in religious practices and who have a relationship to a Higher Power understood as a God, their Higher Power can serve as a religious generalized oriented system, which influences their attitude towards themselves, the world, other people, and life events—including workmates and employer. For nonbelievers, agnostics, and atheists who are not involved in religious practices—with another secular value being their Higher Power—their Higher Power can fill the function of a meaning-oriented system, which leads to their attitude towards workmates and employer. Relationship to a Higher Power is a universal dimension of employee spirituality, available both for religion-affiliated individuals as well as religious skeptics (agnostics and atheists); this is because, as in self-help groups, the opportunity to identify a Higher Power, in God or in another secular value consistent with worldview and preferred axiological system (Alcoholics Anonymous 2014; Taves et al. 2018). This factor of the employee spirituality scale should be approached as a religious dimension of spirituality only among religiously committed individuals who identify their Higher Power with God. For non-religious individuals, for whom another secular value personifies their Higher Power, their relationship to this Higher Power should be recognized as a second secular dimension of spirituality.

The instrument that has been developed can be successfully used in Polish organizations to monitor employee's spiritual activity, reminding both employers and employees that, apart from the physical, mental, and social spheres, humans are also constituted by the spiritual sphere, which plays a key role in their relationships to themselves, the Higher Power, the world, and other people. In their relations with employees, employers and their representatives should create conditions for spiritual development at work, or at least should not restrict that development as an important aspect of their occupational functioning.

6. Limitations and Future Research

The main limitation of this study is its cross-sectional design and lack of verification stability in time. The present study is a preliminary one, constituting an introduction to further research on the measure that has been developed. In the next stage, the employee spirituality scale should be evaluated in another cultural context, especially among a population who are not as religiously involved as the Polish population, and with employees representing denominations other than Roman Catholics. It could be interesting to verify which exact value is identified with a Higher Power among nonbelievers, agnostics, and atheists, and whether this value is related to their attitudes towards their workmates and employers.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Ethical review and approval were waived for this study, due to non-potential harming influence.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy of the participants.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Affeldt, Dawn L., and Douglas A. MacDonald. 2010. The relationship of spirituality to work and organizational attitudes and behaviors in a sample of employees from a health care system. *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* 42: 192–208.
- Aiken, Leona S., and Stephen G. West. 1991. *Testing and Interpreting Interactions in Multiple Regression*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Alcoholics Anonymous. 2014. *Alcoholics Anonymous: Big Book Reference Edition for Addiction Treatment*. Scotts Valley: Createspace.
- Ashmos, Donde P., and Dennis Duchon. 2000. Spirituality at Work: A Conceptualization and Measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 9: 134–45. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Baumsteiger, Rachel, and Tiffany Chenneville. 2015. Challenges to the conceptualization and measurement of religiosity and spirituality in mental health research. *Journal of Religion and Health* 54: 2344–54. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Benefiel, Margaret, Louis W. Fry, and David Geigle. 2014. Spirituality and religion in the workplace: History, theory, and research. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 6: 175–87. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Benson, Peter L. 2004. Emerging themes in research on adolescent spiritual and religious development. *Applied Developmental Science* 4: 47–50. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Benson, Peter L., Eugene C. Roehlkepartain, and Stacey P. Rude. 2003. Spiritual development in childhood and adolescence: Toward a field of inquiry. *Applied Developmental Science* 7: 204–12. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Bloch, Deborah P. 2004. Spirituality, complexity and career counseling. *Professional School Counseling* 7: 343–50.
- Byrne, Barbara M. 1994. *Structural Equation Modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- Capra, Fritjof. 1993. A Systems Approach to the Emerging Paradigm. In *The New Paradigm in Business*. Edited by Michael Ray and Alan Rinzler. New York: Tarcher Books, pp. 230–37.
- Carroll, Stephen Thomas, Joseph A. Stewart-Sicking, and Barbara Thompson. 2014. Sanctification of work: assessing the role of spirituality in employment attitudes Stephen. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture* 17: 545–56. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Chiu, Lyren, Julia D. Emblen, Lynn Van Hofwegen, Rick Sawatzky, and Heather Meyerhoff. 2004. An integrative review of the concept of spirituality in the health sciences. *Western Journal of Nursing Research* 26: 405–28. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Conger, Jay A., and Rabindra N. Kanungo. 1988. The empowerment process: integrating theory and practice. *The Academy of Management Review* 13: 471–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Duchon, Dennis, and Donde Ashmos Plowman. 2005. Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly* 16: 807–33. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Dyson, Jane, Mark Cobb, and Dawn Forman. 1997. The meaning of spirituality: A literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 26: 1183–88. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Emmons, Robert A. 1999. *The Psychology of Ultimate Concerns: Motivation and Spirituality in Personality*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Emmons, Robert A., and Teresa E. Kneezel. 2005. Giving thanks: Spiritual and religious correlates of gratitude. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 24: 140–48.
- Frankl, Viktor E. 1975. *Unconscious God: Psychotherapy and Theology*. New York: Simon and Shuster.
- Gaskin, James. 2019. *HTMT Plugin for AMOS*. (IBM SPSS AMOS Version Number 26). Windows: James Gaskin.
- Gold, Andrew H., Arvind Malhotra, and Albert H. Segars. 2001. Knowledge management: An organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems* 18: 185–214. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Guillory, William A. 2000. *The Living Organization: Spirituality in the Workplace*. Salt Lake City: Innovations International Inc.
- Halstead, Marilyn Tuls, and Jacqueline Ruth Mickley. 1997. Attempting to unfathom the unfathomable: Descriptive views of spirituality. *Seminars in Oncology Nursing* 13: 225–30. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hayes, Andrew F. 2013. *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Helminiak, Daniel A. 2008. Confounding the divine and the spiritual: challenges to a psychology of spirituality. *Pastoral Psychology* 57: 161–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Henseler, Jörg, Christian M. Ringle, and Marko Sarstedt. 2015. A New Criterion for Assessing Discriminant Validity in Variance-based Structural Equation Modelling. *Journal of the Academic, Marketing, Science* 43: 115–35. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Heszen-Niejodek, Irena, and Ewa Gruszczyńska. 2004. The spiritual dimension of a human being, its importance in the psychology of health and its measurement. *Przegląd Psychologiczny* 47: 15–31.
- Hodge, David R., and Charlene Chen McGrew. 2005. Clarifying the distinctions and connections between spirituality and religion. *Social Work and Christianity* 32: 1–21.
- Hodges, Shannon. 2002. Mental Health, depression, and dimensions of spirituality and religion. *Journal of Adult Development* 9: 109–15. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Hornowska, Elżbieta Małgorzata. 2017. *Psychological Tests Theory and Practice*. Warsaw: Scholar Scientific Publisher.
- House, Robert J., and Boas Shamir. 1993. Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary spirituality and performance in organizations theories. In *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*. Edited by Martin M. Chemers and Roya Ayman. New York: Academic Press, pp. 81–107.
- Hyman, Corine, and Paul J. Handal. 2006. Definitions and evaluation of religion and spirituality items by religious professionals: A pilot study. *Journal of Religion and Health* 45: 264–82. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ingersoll, R. Elliott, and Ann L. Bauer. 2004. An integral approach to spiritual Wellness in school counseling settings. *Professional School Counseling* 7: 301–8.
- Karakas, Fahri. 2010. Spirituality and performance in organizations: A literature review. *Journal of Business Ethics* 94: 89–106. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kline, Rex B. 2011. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modelling*, 3rd ed. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kolodinsky, Robert, Giacalone A. Robert, and Carole L. Jurkiewicz. 2008. Workplace values and outcomes: Exploring personal, organizational and interactive workplace spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics* 81: 465–80. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Koltko-Rivera, Mark E. 2004. The psychology of worldviews. *Review of General Psychology* 8: 3–58. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kurtz, Ernest. 1990. *Spiritual Rather than Religious Character of Alcoholics Anonymous*. Warsaw: Institute of Psychiatry and Neurology.
- Lewis, Lisa M. 2008. Spiritual assessment in African-Americans: A review of measures of spirituality used in health research. *Journal of Religion and Health* 47: 458–75. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ley, Dorothy C. H., and Inge B. Corless. 1998. Spirituality and hospice care. *Death Studies* 12: 101–10. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Markow, Frank, and Karin Klenke. 2005. The effects of personal meaning and calling on organizational commitment: an empirical investigation of spiritual leadership. *International Journal of Analysis* 13: 8–27. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Martsof, Donna S., and Jacqueline R. Mickley. 1998. The concept of spirituality in nursing theories: Differing world-views and extent of focus. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 27: 294–303. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Miller, Dawid W. 2007. *God at Work: The History and promise of the Faith at Work Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neal, Judith A. 1997. Spirituality in management education: A guide to resources. *Journal of Management Education* 21: 121–40. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Neck, Christopher P., and John F. Milliman. 1994. Thought self-leadership: Finding spiritual fulfillment in organizational. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 9: 9–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pargament, Kenneth I. 1999. The psychology of religion and spirituality? Yes or no. *Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 9: 3–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pargament, Kenneth I., Nalini Tarakeshwar, Christopher G. Ellison, and Keith M. Wulff. 2001. Religious coping among the religious: The relationship between religious coping and well-being in the national sample of presbyterian clergy, elders and members. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40: 497–513. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pew Research Center. 2018. Eastern and Western Europeans Differ on Importance of Religion, Views of Minorities, and Key Social Issues. Available online: <https://www.pewforum.org/2018/10/29/eastern-and-western-europeans-differ-on-importance-of-religion-views-of-minorities-and-key-social-issues/#fn-30843-1> (accessed on 2 November 2021).
- Phillips, Russell E., III, Kenneth I. Pargament, Quinten K. Lynn, and Craig D. Crossley. 2004. Self-directing religious coping: A deistic God, abandoning God, or no God at all? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 43: 409–18. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Piedmont, Ralph. L. 1999. Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? Spiritual transcendence and the Five-Factor Model. *Journal of Personality* 67: 985–1013. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Silberman, Israela. 2005. Religion as a meaning system: Implications for the new millennium. *Journal of Social Issues* 61: 641–63. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Steiger, James H. 1990. Structural model evaluation and modification: An interval estimation approach. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 25: 173–80. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Taves, Ann, Egil Asprem, and Elliott Ihm. 2018. Psychology, meaning making, and the study of worldviews: Beyond religion and non-religion. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* 10: 207–17. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Toffler, Alvin. 1980. *The Third Wave*. New York: Morrow.
- Tse, Samson, Chris Lloyd, Leon Petchkovsky, and Wiremu Manaia. 2005. Exploration of Australian and New Zealand indigenous people's spirituality and mental health. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal* 52: 181–87. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Van Cappellen, Patty, Maria Toth-Gauthier, Vassilis Saroglou, and Barbara L. Fredrickson. 2016. Religion and well-being: The mediating role of positive emotions. *Journal of Happiness Studies* 17: 485–505. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wagner-Marsh, Fraya, and James Conley. 1999. The fourth wave: The spiritually-based firm. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12: 292–301. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Walker, Alan G. 2013. The relationship between the integration of faith and work with life and job outcomes. *Journal of Business Ethics* 112: 453–61. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Watkins, Philip C., Kathrane Woodward, Tamara Stone, and Russell L. Kolts. 2003. Gratitude and happiness: Development of a measure of gratitude, and relationships with subjective well-being. *Social Behavior and Personality* 31: 431–52. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Weaver, Andrew J., Kenneth I. Pargament, Kevin J. Flannelly, and Julia E. Oppenheimer. 2006. Trends in the scientific study of religion, spirituality, and health: 1965–2000. *Journal of Religion and Health* 45: 208–14. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wnuk, Marcin. 2009. Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale as a reliable tool to measure spiritual activity. *Przegląd Religioznawczy* 4: 89–106.

- Wnuk, Marcin. 2018. Spirituality and job satisfaction. Mediating role of stress, gratitude towards organization and trust in supervisor. Moderating role of religious practices. *Modern Management Review* 23: 277–96. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Wnuk, Marcin. 2020. A psychometric evaluation of the Gratitude Toward the Organization Scale. *Central European Management Journal* 28: 149–67. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Wnuk, Marcin. 2021a. Do involvement in alcoholics anonymous and religiousness both directly and indirectly through meaning in life lead to spiritual experiences? *Religions* 12: 794. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Wnuk, Marcin. 2021b. Links between faith and some strengths of character: religious commitment manifestations as a moderators. *Religions* 12: 786. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Wnuk, Marcin, and Jerzy Tadeusz Marcinkowski. 2014. Do existential variables mediate between religious-spiritual facets of functionality and psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Religion and Health* 53: 56–67. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Wulff, David M. 1999. *Psychology of Religion: Classic and Contemporary Views*. New York: Wiley.
- Yücel, İlhami. 2012. Examining the relationships among job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention: An empirical study. *International Journal of Business and Management* 7: 44–58. [[CrossRef](#)]