

Author Queries - RMSR 365039

No queries

A spiritual audit of corporate America: ten years later (spirituality and attachment theory, an interim report)

Ian I. Mitroff^{a,b}, Elizabeth A. Denton^c and Can Murat Alpaslan^d

^aAlliant International University, San Francisco, California, USA; ^bCollaborative for Catastrophic Risk Management, The Haas School of Business, University of California, Berkeley, California, USA; ^cNew York, New York, USA; ^dCollege of Business, California State University, Northridge, California, USA

This paper represents the first in a series of reports of a 10-year follow up study of the authors' 1997–1999 study of spirituality in the workplace.

Forty-five responses to a modified questionnaire were analyzed. Attachment Theory was used to analyze the respondents' views and feelings with regard to a variety of items pertaining to religion and spirituality.

Those respondents having a Secure style of attachment were attracted to and had a much more positive view of spirituality than those with other attachment styles.

The low percentage of respondents and the fact that those who responded were overwhelmingly Secure limits the study. None the less, a very strong and clear portrait emerges of the link between a Secure attachment style and spirituality.

The data show clearly that Secure individuals have a much more positive view of their organizations, and furthermore that their organizations are perceived as more spiritual. A strong implication is that spiritual organizations are thus somehow more Secure. If this implication is borne out by further research, then it means that we have identified a potentially new model for practicing spirituality in the workplace beyond those that were identified in our 1997–1999 study.

Keywords: religion; spirituality at work; Attachment Theory; Secure organizations

Introduction

In 1999, with the help of Alpaslan, Mitroff and Denton (1999) published one of the first empirical studies of spirituality in the workplace: *A Spiritual Audit of Corporate America* (hereafter abbreviated as “Audit”). Although there had certainly been other studies well before Audit, and considerably more subsequently (the field has not only blossomed, but literally exploded; for instance, see Giacalone and Jurkiewicz 2003), Audit was distinguished by the fact that it was concerned primarily with the *personal meanings* that people attached to the concepts of religion and spirituality. This was in sharp contrast to most previous studies that focused almost exclusively on religious and spiritual *affiliations, practices, and values*, etc. Previous studies also tended to give their own a-priori definitions of religion and spirituality in order to assess the religiosity and spirituality of those who were studied. In contrast, Audit was interested in the “emergent” definitions of religion and spirituality of managers and executives. In other words, we made a conscious and deliberate choice *not* to define religion and

spirituality a priori, but instead to let it emerge from our respondents so that we could get *their* definitions and feelings about important terms and concepts.

The definitions and feelings that were expressed in our 1997–1999 study are still very much in evidence in the current study. Religion is still viewed primarily as a dogmatic and institutional phenomenon, whereas spirituality is viewed as an individual phenomenon. And religion is still viewed, for the most part, in highly negative terms such as dogmatic and intolerant, whereas spirituality is viewed in highly positive terms such as open and tolerant.

Most of all, Audit was distinguished by the fact that it attempted to come up with a small set of “basic models” as to how spirituality could be practiced in the workplace without inducing acrimony, conflict, controversy, and division over fundamental beliefs and values. By “basic models” we mean more than a series of separate attitudes or isolated management policies and practices. We mean a “holistic design” – an integrated series of management policies, practices, and principles, and organizational functions that supported them – for bringing about an entire workplace and organization that was oriented towards and practiced spirituality systematically and systemically. To our knowledge, Audit is still the only major study to date that has attempted to discern different models for practicing spirituality responsibly in the workplace.

In this paper, we wish to report a few of the preliminary findings of an on-going study of spirituality in the workplace. We highlight the words a “few,” “preliminary findings,” and “on-going” because this is neither the time nor the place to give a complete account of our continuing research. Suffice it to say that after 10 years, we felt that the time was overdue to see what, if anything, had changed from our initial 1997 – 1999 study and to broaden it by extending it to an international sample. Since we are in the initial phases of our new research, we are still in the process of gathering data. As a result, we do not yet have a full report.

What we do have are data from 45 questionnaires from a predominantly American sample. The results from the questionnaires, plus informal interviews with small groups of similar respondents, shed important, interesting, and new light on the phenomenon of spirituality in the workplace. For this reason, we wanted to publish an interim report.

For reasons that will become apparent shortly, in this paper, we shall mainly discuss a very particular aspect of our research. This has to do with three items that were added to the very end of our 1997 – 1999 questionnaire. (Other items were added as well. In addition, some items were changed altogether and others were reworded. See the full questionnaire in Appendix A.) The items are three very short sentence-paragraphs (item 53) that assess a respondent’s attachment style. Since Attachment Theory has not played a major role in management theory as a whole, and once again to our knowledge, it has not been involved centrally in research on spirituality, we give a brief primer on it in the next section.

A brief primer on Attachment Theory

In the 1930s, an influential group of psychoanalysts in the UK (John Bowlby was among the most notable) who were intensely dissatisfied with Sigmund Freud’s theories about children founded what later came to be known as Attachment Theory (for an interesting history, see Karen 1994). According to Freud, the complaints – the very remembrances – of patients concerning their childhoods were not only distorted by but

were the products of infantile fantasy. When patients complained that their parents were mean, didn't respond to them in ways that they had wished, or had even abused them, this was due to the in-born tendencies of children to fantasize, not because their parents were actually as described.

Bowlby and others disagreed strongly. They were not inclined to dismiss easily and quickly the claims of their patients as the products of mere fantasy. Many of the early theorists had worked at orphanages and at hospitals where children were separated from parents and caregivers for days, weeks, and even months on end. They saw first-hand the cruel effects of prolonged separations.

When perfectly normal children were first placed in hospitals or orphanages, they cried for hours and days on end. But then, within a few weeks, almost on cue, virtually all of them stopped. Furthermore, they wouldn't cry again. Even when they were finally reunited with their parents or caregivers, they exhibited virtually no emotional response at all. It was as though a gigantic switch governing their emotions – the very ability to feel – had been permanently turned off. They became zombie-like (Spitz 1945).

Witnessing these and other experiences deeply affected those who observed them. Indeed, they impacted them profoundly. Extrapolating to so-called normal family situations, they hypothesized that how parents actually treated their newborns made real differences in how they behaved later on in life. But how was one to measure precisely and scientifically the effects of early parenting and thus to show its influence?

Suffice it to say that the initial psychoanalysts and later social scientists who founded Attachment Theory were ingenious in inventing and discovering ways to measure the impact of early parenting on the subsequent behavior and development of children (Karen 1994). Some of the effects were so powerful that they affected people over the entire course of their lives (Parkes *et al.* 2005).

Four basic styles

Attachment Theory has identified four basic styles or ways of relating to people. In addition, the theory has also shown that there is a remarkable and persistent correlation between the attachment style of a person and one's primary caregiver(s), typically, but not always, one's mother (Parkes *et al.* 1991; Grossmann *et al.* 2005). So as to minimize any potential misunderstandings, as trite as it may be, it needs to be said as clearly as possible that the father also plays a crucial role in the child's upbringing and development. In other words, Attachment Theory does not place the full responsibility for a child's subsequent development and personality on the mother or on either parent alone for that matter. In the vernacular of family system's theory, a person's basic attitudes and behavior is a complex product of the entire family system, not one of its parts alone.

If one measures the attachment style of the mother/father family system soon after the birth of a baby and the style of the child from early childhood through adulthood, then there is a consistent and persistent correlation between the family system's and child's style. Furthermore, the attachment style of a person is remarkably stable over the person's lifetime (Parkes *et al.* 1991; Grossmann *et al.* 2005).

The four styles are: (1) Fearful Avoidants, (2) Avoidants, (3) Anxious, and (4) Secure. The following descriptions are of 'fully blown' (pure) types.

Fearful Avoidants are high in avoidance *and* anxiety. They are uncomfortable around others (they prefer to avoid people) and they are anxious at the prospect of

being around others. They have a propensity to a negative view of themselves and a negative view of others.

Mothers and fathers who are Fearful Avoidants may neglect both the subtle and not-so-subtle overt behaviors of their babies. They are not “there” either physically or emotionally. When they finally do attend to the cries or distress of their babies, they exhibit noticeable anxiety.

Avoidants are high in avoidance, but low in anxiety. That is, they prefer not to be around or with others. In addition, they experience little anxiety in avoiding others. At a very early age, Avoidants have essentially given up hope at the prospect of ever having their emotional needs acknowledged or met. In other words, they have shut down their emotional response systems at an early age. As a result, they would have developed a distorted but positive view of themselves and a negative view of others. However, underneath their “surface cover,” they may actually harbor negative views of the Self. None the less, because of their defenses, they may be unaware of the negative feelings they have towards themselves (Brisch 2004).

Mothers and fathers who are Avoidants may be present physically, but they are not “there” emotionally. They are experienced as cold, uncaring, and unfeeling. They may attend to the physical needs of their child, but not to their emotional needs.

Anxious people have an intense need to be liked and to be loved, but they are extremely afraid (anxious) of being rejected. They literally hunger after relationships (they are low in avoidance), but they are desperately afraid of being rejected over and over again (they are high in anxiety). In short, they are very needy; they have a positive view of others, but a negative view of themselves.

Anxious mothers and fathers are “there” both physically and emotionally, but they feel inadequate and fearful with respect to the demands of motherhood/fatherhood.

Finally, Secure people want to be around others (they are low in avoidance) and they feel confident in the presence of others (they are low in anxiety). They have a positive view of themselves and of others.

Secure mothers and fathers are “truly there” both physically and emotionally for their children. They respond appropriately to both the physical and the emotional needs of their children. For instance, unlike Anxious mothers and fathers, they neither smother nor overprotect their children.

In brief, Fearful Avoidants are not OK, and others are not OK too. Avoidants are OK, but others are not. Anxious types are not OK, but others are. And, finally, Secure types are OK, and others are OK as well.

To summarize this point, there is a deep and powerful connection between how we were parented as young children and the choices we make later in life as adults. The kinds and the qualities of the bonds that are formed early in life could affect us over the entire course of our lives. In brief, our earliest relationships serve as “basic internal working models” that guide all of our subsequent interactions with people (Parkes *et al.* 1991; Grossmann *et al.* 2005).

Attachment Theory also shows that if humans have a deep and an undeniable capacity for sickness and evil, then they also have a tremendous capacity for health and goodness, but only if they are willing to change and grow through counseling, therapy, and treatment (Brisch 2004; Masterson 2005).

In sum, while Attachment Theory was originally formulated to explain the effects of different parenting styles on young children, it has proven just as powerful in explaining the behavior of adults.

The sample and study limitations

Before we turn to the relationship between the results of the current study and Attachment Theory, we first need to make some remarks about the 2007–2008 sample.

In 1997–1999, Denton did a special series of 18 interviews with people who were members of associations that were explicitly concerned with spirituality at work. While we can certainly make statistical comparisons between all of the groups we sampled in 1997–1999, the 2007–2008 sample of $n=45$ corresponds most closely to the 1997–1999 sample of $n=18$. We were especially interested in getting the responses of members of this group in 2007–2008 because we “surmised” that their members would be “more advanced in their ‘spiritual development’ and ‘thinking’.” Hence, we wanted to get a larger sample of the thinking of this group.

The sample was recruited as follows. An announcement was put in a newsletter of an international association for spirituality and work with a membership of approximately 2330. The announcement explained that we were interested in updating and expanding upon our 1997–1999 study. It asked those who were interested in filling out the questionnaire at the end of this paper to contact us. Out of the 2330 persons to whom the newsletter was sent, we received 55 requests to complete the questionnaire, or approximately 2.4%, which admittedly is very low. Approximately 42% or 25 of the 55 actually completed the questionnaire. This is approximately 1% of the initial membership of 2330, which is an even lower percentage. The rest of the sample was obtained from conferences on spirituality and work with similar to slightly higher response rates.

However, since the analysis of the returned questionnaires gives us some very strong information with respect to the particular kinds of persons that were attracted to our study, we actually have some very strong results to report about this particular group. To repeat an earlier point, we believe that our preliminary findings are so important and suggestive that we wanted to report them at this time. None the less, we are very well aware that those responding may not be typical of the general population. As we shall see, we have an unusually high proportion of Secure types in our sample. This in itself is an interesting finding with very important implications. We have a limited but very interesting portrait of how a very special group responds to our survey on workplace spirituality.

The demographics of the sample are as follows: 38% of the sample is men; thus, 68% are women. The average length of time with their current position is 9.4 years. The average length of time with their company is 11.7 years. The average number of people supervised is 3, although the range is from 0 up to 44. The average age is 53 with a range from 33 to 72. Thirty-five work in the US; 9 outside the US (1 from Peru, Canada, Philippines, Australia, Switzerland, and Denmark; 2 from the UK, and 2 from the Philippines).

Results based on Attachment Theory

Item 53 lists three short sentence-paragraphs. Style A is a brief description of an Avoidant personality; Style B of Secure; and Style C of Anxious. [The correlations of the three short sentence-paragraphs with longer assessment instruments are strong (Bresnahan 2009). Therefore, in order to shorten the length of an already overly long questionnaire, we used these items instead of longer instrument.]

On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 indicates that one *disagrees strongly* with a particular description as it applies to oneself, and 7 indicates that one *agrees strongly* with it, then the average score for Avoidance is 2.5; for Secure, 5.6; and for Anxious, 1.9. In plain English, this means that our sample is moderately to strongly *not* Avoidant, *strongly* Secure, and moderately to strongly *not* Anxious. In other words, the sample is predominantly Secure, and not Avoidant or Anxious.

This raises interesting and important questions that only future research can answer: Do we have a sample of respondents who are highly Secure because the general population of those who are interested in workplace spirituality are more Secure than other groups who may or may not be interested in spirituality? Or, did those particular people in the general population who are interested in workplace spirituality and who are more Secure respond in greater numbers to our request to take our survey? Or, is neither the case? Do we just have an unusual and skewed sample for reasons that we do not know?

Even though we do not have answers to the preceding questions at the present time, the correlations with many of the earlier items on the questionnaire and the various attachment styles yield some very interesting and important results, none the less. The correlations not only reveal the power of Attachment Theory, but what it has to add to our understanding of a phenomenon as complex as spirituality in the workplace. In short, the correlations reveal a highly consistent pattern of what we would expect to find from Attachment Theory.

The more Avoidant a respondent is, then the more he/she describes his/her workplace/organization (item 16) as colder, more autocratic, uncaring, worldly, unprofitable, unhappy, putting profits first, and intolerant of minorities. This makes perfect sense, since by definition Avoiders have a positive of themselves and a negative view of others. We would thus expect them to have a negative view of their organizations as a “generalized ‘other’.”

On the other hand, there were no significant correlations between Anxious types and how they viewed their organizations. However, from Attachment Theory, we would expect them to view their organizations positively and themselves negatively. We thus intend to monitor this closely to see if this is indeed the case as we expand our sample.

The more Secure a respondent is, then he/she describes his/her workplace as warmer, more caring, spiritual, happy, lower in anxiety, more profitable, putting people first, and more tolerant of minorities. Once again, this makes sense since people who are Secure have a positive view of themselves and others.

Notice how being Secure and spirituality in the workplace go hand in hand. Notice especially that spirituality in the workplace is correlated with and therefore part and parcel of a host of other important workplace variables. In other words, “spirituality in the workplace” is a *systemic phenomenon*. It is not just that spirituality at work is “correlated” with other organizational variables, but it is inseparable from them. No wonder it has proved difficult to define and to study. Of course, this needs to be monitored carefully to see if it holds up as well with a larger sample.

There are other interesting results. Anxious types do not think that spirituality (item 24) is as important to them as it is for Secure types. The score for Anxious types is 5.67; for Secure, 6.86. If we define Anxious types as having a Style C score of more than 4, then there are 3 Anxious types in the sample (scores of 6). The difference between the spirituality score of the Anxious and the Secure is $6.86 - 5.67 = 1.19$. The difference is very significant ($p < 0.001$), even though the samples vary greatly in size.

The correlation between item 24 and Anxious type score is negative and highly significant as well ($-.523, p=0.001$).

This fits with the overwhelming response of all the respondents that in sharp contrast to religion, spirituality is viewed as much more of an individual phenomenon (item 22). If the Self is not perceived as good, then how can one cozy up to a phenomenon that is quintessentially and essentially part of the Self?

Just as interesting, the more that one is Secure, the more that one feels the presence of a Deity at work (item 32). The more Anxious one is, the less one feels the presence of a Deity (Secure = 6.28, Anxious = 3.33, $p = 0.04$). The more Avoidant one is, the less one feels the presence of a Deity (Secure = 6.28, Avoidant = 4.62, $p = 0.012$). Once again, feeling the “presence of a Deity” is a very personal and individual act. Anxious types may not feel “worthwhile” to allow them to experience the presence of a Deity. In contrast, Avoidant types may not think that “feeling the presence of a Deity” is a “worthwhile experience.”

The implication is that one has to be Secure in order to feel the presence of a Deity at work. One could, of course, contend that feeling the presence of a Deity makes people more Secure, but we would point out that chronologically one’s Attachment style comes first during childhood and that feeling the presence of a Deity does not make much sense unless one is already at a certain level of development. (To be sure, young children also have religious and spiritual experiences but not at the same level and quality of more mature adults.) Thus, the arrow of causality runs from Secure to feeling the presence of a Deity.

Similarly, more Anxious types do not discuss spirituality or general philosophical ideas at work as much as Secure types do (items 33 and 34). (Philosophical Values Relevant: Secure = 5.88, Anxious = 4, $p = 0.046$; Spirituality Relevant: Secure = 6.01, Anxious = 2.67, $p = 0.002$; Spirituality Appropriate: Secure = 5.46, Anxious = 3.33, $p = 0.049$.) Spirituality is a very personal act that requires the individual to transcend his or her Self. To accomplish this, the individual cannot be overly preoccupied with the Self and others. He or she must be able to explore the domain(s) of spirituality without feelings of guilt, shame, inferiority, etc. This can be likened to how Secure children freely explore their environment whereas Anxious children constantly cry and want to be close to their caregivers. Perhaps this is why Anxious types don’t like to talk about topics such as spirituality and general philosophical ideas at work. They are preoccupied with trying to be perceived in a positive way by others.

None the less, these results are puzzling to a certain extent since one of God’s primary meanings is that of a “safe haven” to which can seek refuge and comfort in troubling times (Sim and Low 2003). Thus, one would expect that Anxious types would be more attuned to the presence of a Deity in the workplace than our results indicate. We have no explanation for this at the present time.

Finally, Secure types are able to express more of their complete and whole self at work (item 39) (see Table 1).

Avoidant types are able to express less of their complete and whole self at work (Table 2).

These two results are not only very strong, but they are very consistent with Attachment Theory. Secure people can freely express their complete Self (feelings, intelligence, etc.) whereas Avoidants can only do this to a lesser extent. The reason may be that Avoiders try to protect themselves by closing in and closing off. Or they may think that expressing one’s Self is not worthwhile because doing so means sharing one’s thoughts and feelings with others who are viewed negatively.

Table 1. What Secure versus non-Secure types can bring of themselves to work.

		Mean	<i>p</i> -value
5	Total Self	0	3.60
		1	5.40
	Total	5.18	0.022
10	Complete Creativity	0	4.20
		1	5.46
	Total	5.30	0.107
15	Total Feelings	0	2.60
		1	4.86
	Total	4.59	0.017
20	Complete Soul	0	3.40
		1	5.11
	Total	4.90	0.070
25	Total Intelligence	0	5.00
		1	5.86
	Total	5.76	0.247
30	Full Humor	0	3.80
		1	5.69
	Total	5.46	0.004

(0) Non-secure (equal to or less than 3 on the 1–7 scale); (1) Secure (greater than 4 on the 1–7 scale). There are 5 non-Secure and 36 Secure individuals.

Table 2. What Avoidant versus non-Avoidant types can bring of themselves to work.

		Mean	<i>p</i> -value
30	Total Self	0	5.58
		1	4.12
	Total	5.28	0.020
35	Complete Creativity	0	5.68
		1	4.38
	Total	5.41	0.032
40	Total Feelings	0	5.13
		1	3.00
	Total	4.69	0.005
45	Complete Soul	0	5.32
		1	3.75
	Total	5.00	0.038
50	Total Intelligence	0	6.18
		1	4.62
	Total	5.86	0.007
55	Full Humor	0	5.87
		1	4.25
	Total	5.54	0.003

(0) Non-avoidant (equal to or less than 3 on the 1–7 scale); (1) Avoidant (greater than 4 on the 1–7 scale). There are 8 Avoidant and 31 non-Avoidant individuals.

Concluding remarks

We have tried to show both the importance and the power of Attachment Theory as it relates to spirituality in the workplace. If the results of our analysis of the preliminary surveys hold up with a larger sample, then we will be able to show that some very basic and fundamental “internal working models of the Self and others” from Attachment Theory are important variables in explaining how and why some people are drawn to spirituality and why others are not.

From a developmental perspective, to transcend the Self, one must get beyond its attachments to previous stages and states (Wilber 2006; Mitroff and Silvers 2009). To transcend the Self means becoming one with others and a “generalized Other.” Having a negative view of the Self or others (or both) makes it difficult for the Self to engage in spiritual practices.

The strongest conclusion that emerges thus far is that Spiritual organizations are somehow more Secure. This does not necessarily mean that everyone connected with them is Secure, or that even a majority of its members or stakeholders are. It means that those who lead the organization, and thus set the “tone” of its culture, are more Secure, and most likely its founders were as well. As we gather more data, we hope in future papers to spell out more precisely the nature of Secure organizations. If this conclusion is borne out by further research, then we will have developed a new model for practicing spirituality in the workplace that goes beyond the models that were presented in Audit.

References

- Bresnahan, C.G., 2009. *Members' attachment style as a predictor of group conflict, post-conflict relationship repair and trust of leaders' leadership style*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Brisch, K.H., 2004. *Treating attachment disorders, from theory to therapy*. London: The Guilford Press.
- Giacalone, R.A. and Jurkiwicz, C.L., eds., 2003. *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Grossmann, K.E., Grossmann, K., and Waters, E., eds., 2005. *Attachment from infancy to adulthood, the major longitudinal studies*. London: The Guilford Press.
- Karen, R., 1994. *Becoming attached, unfolding the mystery of the infant-mother bond and its impact on later life*. New York: Warner Books.
- Masterson, J.F., ed., 2005. *The personality disorders through the lens of attachment theory and the neurobiologic development of the self, a clinical integration*. Phoenix, AZ: Zeig & Theisen.
- Mitroff, I.I. and Denton, E.A., 1999. *A spiritual audit of corporate America, a hard look at spirituality, religion, and values*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mitroff, I.I. and Silvers, A., 2009. *Dirty rotten strategies: how we trick ourselves and others into solving the wrong problems precisely*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Parkes, C.M., Stevenson-Hinde, J., and Marris, P., eds., 2005. *Attachment across the life cycle*. New York: Routledge.
- Sim, T.N. and Low, B.S.M., 2003. Attachment to God: measure and dynamics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20 (3), 373–389.
- Spitz, R.A., 1945. Hospitalism: an inquiry into the genesis of psychiatric conditions in early childhood. *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Child*, 1, 53–74; 2, 113–117.
- Wilber, K., 2006. *Integral spirituality, a startling new role for religion in the modern world*. Boston, MA: Integral Books.

Appendix A: Questionnaire on meaning and purpose in the workplace

Please give us some background information about yourself:

- 5 (1) Sex: Male ___ Female ___
 (2) Current Position/Title: _____
 (3) Length of time in your current position _____
 (4) Length of time with current company _____
 (5) Company: _____
 (6) What is your country of residence? _____
 10 (7) Number of Employees You Supervise _____
 (8) Undergraduate Degree and Major: _____
 (9) Highest Graduate Degree and Major: _____
 (10) Birthplace: _____
 (11) Age: _____
- 15 (12) What gives you the most meaning and purpose in your JOB? (Check only the **TOP THREE**)
- (a) Being associated with an ethical organization _____ (g) Service to my immediate community _____
 (b) Service to others _____ (h) Interesting work _____
 20 (c) Making money _____ (i) Being innovative _____
 (d) Having good colleagues _____ (j) Nothing _____
 (e) Realizing my full potential as a person _____
 (f) Producing good products/ services _____
- 25 (13) How much does your work contribute to the general meaning in your life?
 Not at All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Contributes Very Much
- (14) What is the approximate percentage of downsizing that your organization has undergone in the last 3 to 5 years? _____
- (15) (a) Please list briefly some of the basic values that guide your life:

- 30 (b) How often do you feel you are forced to compromise your basic values in making important decisions At Work?
- Never Forced to Compromise 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often Forced to Compromise
- 35 (16) On each of the dimensions below, please circle the number that best describes your organization. For instance, if your organization is more “warm” than “cold,” then circle one of the numbers 1, 2, or 3 depending upon how “warm” your organization is.
- | | | |
|------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Warm | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Cold |
| Rigid | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Flexible |
| Autocratic | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Democratic |
| 40 Caring | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Uncaring |
| Spiritual | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Worldly |
| Happy | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Sad |
| Unprofitable | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Profitable |
| Turbulent | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Calm |
| Profits-first | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | People-first |
| 45 Ethical | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Unethical |
| Insane | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Sane |
| Tolerant of Minorities | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Intolerant of Minorities |
| High anxiety | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Low anxiety |
| Tolerant of Gays | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Intolerant of Gays |



(17) Please write in the current religious affiliations, if any, of your parents, yourself, and your spouse.

Mother: _____

Father: _____

You: _____

Your spouse: _____

5

(18) How often did your parents attend religious services?

Never Very Rarely Once or twice a year 3 to 6 times a year Once a month 1 to 3 times a week Every Day

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

(19) How often do you and your spouse attend religious services?

Never Very Rarely Once or twice a year 3 to 6 times a year Once a month 1 to 3 times a week Every Day

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10

(20) How often do you pray or meditate?

Never Very Rarely Once or twice a year 3 to 6 times a year Once a month 1 to 3 times a week Every Day

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15

(21) What meaning does the term religious have for you? (Please write in.)

20

(22) What meaning does the term spiritual have for you? (Please write in.)

(23) How important is religion in your life?

Not important at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very important

25

(24) How important is spirituality in your life?

Not important at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very important

(25) Very briefly, what are the main differences between religion and spirituality for you?

30

(26) Please rate the term "religious" on the following dimensions.

Tolerant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intolerant
Close-minded 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Open-minded
Inclusive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Exclusive

(27) Please rate the term "spiritual" on the following dimensions.

Tolerant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Intolerant
Close-minded 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Open-minded
Inclusive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Exclusive

35

(28) What is the role of spirituality in the workplace?

Irrelevant 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Relevant

An inappropriate topic 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 An appropriate topic
for discussion at work for discussion at work
Should be dealt with 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Should be dealt with
outside of work at work

40

Why?

45

38 I.I. Mitroff et al.

(29) What is the role of general philosophical values in the workplace?

Irrelevant	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Relevant
An inappropriate topic for discussion at work	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	An appropriate topic for discussion at work
Should be dealt with outside of work	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Should be dealt with at work

5

Why?

10

(30) What processes, if any, would you recommend that organizations could use to foster fruitful discussions of the role of spirituality in the workplace (e.g. the use of a trained outside facilitator, special team building exercises, etc.)? (Please write in.)

15

(31) Do you believe in a Deity or Higher Power?
Disbelieve Strongly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Believe Strongly

(32) Have you ever felt the presence of a Deity or Higher Power at work?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often

Describe the situations when you experienced a Deity or Higher Power at work:

20

(33) Have you ever discussed issues of spirituality with your co-workers?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often

Which topics have you discussed?

25

(34) Have you ever discussed issues of general philosophical values with your co-workers?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often

Which topics have you discussed?

30

(35) How often have you felt joy and/or bliss at work?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often

Why? Over what?

35

(36) How often have you had an epiphany, or a strong spiritual experience, at work?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often

Why? Over what?

40

(37) How often have you felt depressed at work because of the nature of your job and/or organization?

Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Often

Why? Over what?

45

- (38) What gets you through hard times at work?

- (39) (a) How much of your total self are you able to express at work? 5
 Very little of me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 All of me
 (b) How much of your complete creativity are you able to express at work?
 None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely
 (c) How much of your total feelings are you able to express at work?
 None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely
 (d) How much of your complete soul are you able to express at work? 10
 None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely
 (e) How much of your total intelligence are you able to express at work?
 None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely
 (f) How much of your full humor are you able to express at work?
 None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Completely
- (40) How often do you pray and/or meditate AT WORK? 15
 Never Very Rarely Once or twice a year 3 to 6 times a year Once a month 1 to 3 times
 a week Every Day
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
- For what, if anything, do you pray? (List all that apply) 20
- (a) To get me through the day _____ (g) For general guidance in making
 tough decisions _____
 (b) To renew myself _____ (h) To help with feelings of loneliness _
 (c) To overcome boredom ____ (i) To fight off attacks to my esteem __
 (d) To exist in a dysfunctional organization _____ (j) To cope with an angry boss _____ 25
 (e) To prepare myself for difficult situations _____ (k) To cope with angry co-workers ____
 (f) For co-workers who are going through difficult times _____ (l) To give thanks for something good that
 has happened _____
 (m) To cope with a difficult personal loss _____ 30
 (n) Other (Please write in): _____
- (41) Please give the names, if any, of those organizations which you would regard as a role
model in fostering spiritual values at work: 35

- (42) How many of the following programs does your organization have? (Check all that
 apply)
- (a) Twelve Step programs _____ (i) Stress management programs ____
 (b) Wellness groups _____ (j) Psychological counseling _____ 40
 (c) Health programs _____ (k) Psychotherapy _____
 (d) Consciousness raising programs ____ (l) Mandatory drug testing _____
 (e) Family counseling _____ (m) Diversity programs _____
 (f) Community service at company expense and time _____ (n) Prayer groups _____
 (g) Flex-time _____ (o) Other: ____ 45
 (h) Meditation groups _____
- (43) How would an organization demonstrate that it is spiritual?



40 *I.I. Mitroff et al.*

(44) Please list all of the spiritual practices and/or policies that have been instituted in your organization. What has your role, if any, been in these?

5

(45) In the list above, what's worked versus has not worked, and why?

(46) Where do you get your ideas about spirituality at work?

10

(47) What's surprised you the most in relation to spirituality at work?

15

(48) What's deepened your understanding of spirituality at work the most?

(49) What positive and negative outcomes have resulted for you and your organization from spirituality at work?

20

(50) Has instituting spirituality at work made your organization more profitable?
Significantly less profitable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Significantly more profitable

(51) Has instituting spirituality at work resulted in less dissension in your organization?
Significantly less dissension 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Significantly more dissension

25

(52) Does your organization have any programs or initiatives, e.g. corporate responsibility, ethics, sustainability, that reflect a spiritual orientation? (Please list all that apply.)

30

(53) Please read each of the three descriptions below: A, B, and C. Next, please indicate how well or poorly each description corresponds to your general relationship style by agreeing or disagreeing with it. (Note: The terms "close" and "intimate" refer to psychological or emotional closeness.)

35

A. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; I find it difficult to trust them completely, difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, others want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.

B. I find it relatively easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me.

40

C. I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me or won't want to stay with me. I want to get very close to my partner, and this sometimes scares people away.

Style A

Disagree Strongly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly

45

Style B

Disagree Strongly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly

Style C

Disagree Strongly 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Agree Strongly





THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

If you wish to receive a summary report, please give us your name and address.

Name: _____

Name of Your Organization: _____

Address : _____

Email Address: _____

If you would be willing to be interviewed over the phone, please give us your telephone number: _____

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

40

45



