



Leadership Coping Skills: Servant Leader Workplace Spiritual Intelligence

Gary E. Roberts
Regent University

This paper presents the results of a pretest of 77 human resource and city manager respondents in the area of servant leader workplace spiritual intelligence (SLWSI). SLWSI is a subset of research on spiritual intelligence which consists of five components: a capacity for transcendence; the ability to enter higher states of consciousness; the facility to interject the sacred into everyday events; the capability to utilize applied sanctification principles to solve problems; and the ability to engage in ethical and virtuous behavior such as forgiveness, love, transparency, and humility. The results indicate that respondents who scored higher on servant leadership, an important workplace spiritual intelligence attribute, reported lower levels of job stress and higher levels of workforce engagement (more satisfied with peers and job challenge, higher organizational commitment and loyalty, greater motivation to improve performance, and higher overall performance level). SLWSI has great relevancy and promise for managers and executives.

Introduction

Executives, managers and supervisors at all sectors and levels are facing complex challenges on multiple fronts and are under increasing pressure to produce the same or expanded services and programs with lower levels of personnel and budgetary support. One of the key elements to effective long-term leadership is the cultivation of stress resiliency and the associated coping and adaption mechanisms/strategies. Effective managers reduce their own stress and attempt to

reduce the stress placed on other employees.

The current recession and ongoing budget and staffing pressures significantly elevate employee stress levels. A Pew Foundation survey (2010) found that 55% of all the adults in the labor force have suffered some form of job-related adverse action over the last 30 months (layoff, pay cut, reduction in hours, etc.). A recent Conference Board poll demonstrated that job employee job satisfaction has decreased from 61% in 1987 to 45% in 2009 (Gibbons, 2010). An American Psychological Association poll (2008) indicated that financial issues (81%) and job stress (67%) are the two top significant stress sources. The poll also indicated that prayer and attending religious services were the most effective stress reduction strategies (American Psychological Association, 2008).

This article summarizes preliminary research on a promising approach for helping HR executives shoulder the mental and physical burdens, that of servant leader workplace spiritual intelligence (SLWSI). One of the key elements in improving leadership is to promote a value system that concurrently cultivates mission achievement and the well-being of employees and clients. Servant leadership was first popularized in contemporary leadership and management circles by Robert Greenleaf (1977) with ongoing research by his mentee Larry Spears (1995).

This article presents the results of a survey of 77 human resource and city manager professionals assessing the influence of (SLWSI) from a Christian religious worldview perspective on self-reported stress and key organizational commitment variables. This research effort utilizes a Christian perspective on SLWSI, but the research model can be adopted for other religious perspectives as well. SLWSI is a subarea of research on spiritual intelligence (Gardner, 1993; Emmons, 2000). To date, there is no empirical research on the application of SLWSI within workplace settings.

SLWSI is the integration of Christian spiritual and religious values, principles and practices to leadership practice. It is a major factor in promoting individual life balance (work, family and personal time). SLWSI consists of: 1) an overall life orientation that is in harmony with the will of God, 2) a love-based, altruistic work motivational system, 3) God-honoring, golden-rule work behaviors, and 4) the application of moral/ethical “performance” standards to assess motives, behavior and outcomes. SLWSI is hypothesized to positively influence a range of desirable employee attitudes and behaviors including positive stress coping and adaptation strategies, among others. As noted above, the 2008 APA stress poll indicated that prayer and religious service attendance were the most effective stress management activities.

Literature Base

Research in the area of spiritual intelligence is in its formative stages and receiving considerable attention in the psychology literature. The seminal work in the field is from the 2000 special

issue in the *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* that presented a variety of theoretical and conceptual views on the validity of spiritual intelligence. Empirical research is largely limited to a variety of educational and psychotherapeutic applications (Sawyer, 2005; Delaney, 2002). There is a great need to extend spiritual intelligence research to the workplace. There is a growing popular press literature with some 24-plus books written on the subject, with only three addressing the workplace perspective (Primeaux & Pava, 2003). Research on workplace spiritual intelligence is interdisciplinary by definition, incorporating psychology, medicine, business, leadership, organizational behavior, and human resource management, largely from prescriptive and secondary research sources (MacHovec, 2002).

The underlying research premise (hypothesis) is that higher levels of SLWSI are associated with a range of positive attitudinal (higher levels of job satisfaction, commitment), and lower levels of life and job stress promoting beneficial consequences for the leader, his subordinates, and the organization as a whole.

Servant Leader Attributes

Servant leadership is value-based approach with a variety of conceptual definitions and frameworks. Key elements of servant leadership include an emphasis on character traits such as forgiveness, humility, faith, teachability (willingness to receive feedback), integrity, empowerment, support and patience, among others (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999). Another key element is the promotion of accountability through setting clear and challenging performance goals and standards, high levels of motivation, and fair and firm discipline balanced by support and encouragement. Seven key attributes of servant leaders are altruistic behavior, empowerment, humility, genuine love, customer service orientation, cultivating trust, and an inspired vision (Patterson & Stone, 2003). Organizations are becoming less hierarchical, and employers that encourage situational leadership behaviors are in a better position to adapt to changing work conditions (Barzelay & Armajani, 1997). When employees and managers accept responsibility and are committed to the greater good, they are more likely to demonstrate leadership behavior as the situation dictates (focusing on the needs of subordinates, coworkers and clients; active listening; empowering employees; providing support, encouragement and recognition; promoting an open-door policy; accessibility and humility, and forgiveness, among others) (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002; Hodson, 2002).

This section of the literature summary presents illustrative projected linkages between SLWSI and key workplace behaviors (Knotts, 2000; Sowders, 2001; Browne, 2002). They are: 1) servant followership and organizational citizenship, 2) goal-directed achievement behavior that focuses energy, enhances persistence and reduces the influence of distractions, and 3) stress reduction/coping strategies and behaviors (Ryan, 2002; Shaddock, Hill, & van Limbeek, 1998; Snyder, Sigmon & Feldman, 2002).

SLWSI should be associated with higher levels of servant followership/organizational citizenship behaviors (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine, & Bachrach, 2000). There are three global citizenship behavioral dimensions, interpersonal helping, sportsmanship (high motivation irrespective of the work conditions), and civic virtue (active participation in the life of the organization) (Ryan, 2002). Example behaviors include taking time to help a coworker, even if it is inconvenient, and exerting extra effort to accomplish the job irrespective of the personal costs. These workplace behaviors are closely related to altruistic religious/spiritual values such as the primacy of duty, denial of the self, and golden rule conduct. Servant leadership has been linked to higher levels of organizational citizenship behaviors (Walumbwa, Hartnell, & Oke, 2010), commitment (Schneider & George, 2011), employee trust (Joseph & Winston, 2005; Senjaya & Pekerti, 2010), higher job satisfaction (Schneider & George, 2011), improved job performance (Jaramillo, Grisaffe, Chonko, & Roberts, 2009), and lower levels of turnover intention (Schneider & George, 2011; Babakus, Yavas, & Ashill, 2011).

Strong levels of SLWSI may enhance the employee's work focus by reducing the frequency and intensity of distractions (Knotts, 2000). These are the values that we associate with the Protestant work ethic and include high levels of work effort and a commitment to excellence (work as if you are working for God), hedonistic pleasure avoidance, independence (adhere to core values irrespective of the external conditions), and asceticism (Blau & Ryan, 1997). As such, these behaviors should exert a measurable impact on workplace outcomes.

SLWSI is associated with a variety of stress reducing strategies and behaviors applicable to a diversity of life circumstances and settings that reduce the likelihood of burnout on the job (Shaddock, Hill, & van Limbeek, 1998; Fisher, Francis, & Johnson, 2002). The ability to manage occupational stress is a key attribute to reducing the prevalence of dysfunctional workplace attitudes and behaviors (Knotts, 2000). In addition, more effective stress coping strategies can increase work productivity by reducing the incidence of mental and physical illness (Francis & Kaldor, 2002).

Methods

The data for this article was gathered from two web survey instruments. The first is a questionnaire directed at city managers selected from the International City Management Association Directory. Selected respondents received a mail letter inviting them to complete the on-line survey instrument. The second web survey consisted of personnel employees from a commercially purchased email list. This group of city managers and HR professionals work in highly demanding and stressful work environments similar to federal executives. Potential respondents were sent an email with an embedded encrypted link. Forty-four city managers completed the initial survey along with 30 personnel officials. Given the low response rates (approximately 11% for the city managers and .5% for the personnel officials), the pretest sample is a defacto convenience sample. It is likely that the respondents who completed the

survey were more religious and spiritually oriented than those who did not complete the instrument. The low response rates are not uncommon for commercial email blasts and web surveys with no follow-up.

Sample Attributes

The demographic and organizational variables measured include gender, race, education level, and age. Organizational variables assessed are job experience, organizational level, and number of employees supervised. The city manager sample is predominately male (91%), in the 51 to 65 age category (72%), white (91%), and possess a master's degree (84%). In terms of organizational moderators, the mean number of years of total job experience is 30 years, 91% are at the executive level, and they supervise a median number of 350 employees. The sample of personnelists manifests a different demographic profile. There are more women (67%) with a slightly younger age profile (50% are 50 or younger) and a lower education level (63% with a BA or less). Like the city manager sample, most are white (93%). In terms of organizational moderators, the job experience level is similar to the city managers (mean of 29 years) but with a more diverse organizational level profile (only 40% at the executive level) and fewer employees to supervise (median of 5.5).

Measuring Servant Leader Workplace Spiritual Intelligence

The measurement instrument for assessing SLWSI was a 60-item additive survey scale assessing servant leadership attributes for city managers, and 45 questions for the personnel officials, given fewer formal leadership duties. A combined sample scale was constructed consisting of 42 overlapping items. The underlying premise is that respondents with a higher level of SLWSI are more likely to: 1) possess explicit or intuitive knowledge of servant leadership elements, 2) to actively believe in the morality, ethicality and effectiveness of SLWSI in producing positive workplace attitudinal, behavioral and performance outcomes, and 3) practice and apply SLWSI behaviors with more consistency, integrity, and effectiveness. In essence, those with higher levels of SLWSI manifest a harmony and balance of knowledge, belief and practice.

In an ideal research setting, self-reports would be supplemented with independent "360 degree" peer, subordinate, client observational/experiential assessments, direct behavioral observations, and relevant objective data. As with any survey instrument, there are limitations. Response bias is likely to be present with surveys of this type given the sensitivity of the questions, the inherent psychological need to maintain a positive self-image, and the associated external image management issues. This possible rating inflation does not reduce the ability of the measurement process to assess relative strengths and weaknesses if there is a satisfactory range in item responses.

The respondents used a four-point scale to indicate how frequently they engaged in the listed behavior from “always,” “most of the time,” “sometimes,” or “rarely never.” The 42-item combined additive scale manifested a high degree of reliability at .84 (alpha value). The Servant Leadership scale exhibited a satisfactory degree of variance with a range from 101 to 163 with a mean total score of 129, a median of 129, and a modal value of 124. A frequency analysis demonstrated a normal distribution within the designated range. The mean item score was 2.15 on a 4-point scale, indicating that the most common response for frequency assessment for the behavior or the attitude was at the “sometimes” level, which is consistent with a lower level of response bias. However, the scores on the items which demonstrated a high degree of social desirability bias did exhibit greater frequency levels. For example, 73% of the respondents indicated that they always take joy in the success of co-workers. In contrast, the scores on the objective practice items such as journaling were much lower. Only one respondent (1.4%) indicated they always employ journaling with 70 percent indicating that they never engage in journaling. This high degree of variance indicates that respondents are making a good faith attempt to provide accurate responses. Below are the results organized by nine servant leader dimensions:

Accountability. Accountability is measured by four items and respondents reported high degrees of personal accountability at the always or most of the time level. Ninety-eight percent stated that those that they interacted with were worthy of trust, 95% recognized that not providing constructive performance feedback impedes growth and development, 88% percent assumed responsibility first for their personal contribution to a performance problem, and 69% exercised “tough love” accountability with employees.

Forgiveness. Forgiveness (4 items) is the essential spiritual intelligence attribute. The respondents demonstrated high levels of forgiveness for all items (always or most of the time) in affirming employees for good faith mistakes (98%), communicating to others that learning requires mistakes (95%), forgiving others for workplace mistakes (95%), and forgiving themselves (70%).

Humility. Humility (12 items) is a foundational servant leader virtue. Humility includes such elements as promoting transparency of self and employees, recognizing personal limitations and weaknesses, and promoting the needs of the mission and other employees over self. The results indicated a high level of self-reported humility (always or most of the time) for 11 of the 12 items, including sharing the credit for success with others (100%), being satisfied with not being the center of attention at meetings (91%), finding humor in their performance mistakes (87%), avoiding personal comparisons of performance and ability (81%), recognizing that hiding weakness produces dysfunctional outcomes (80%), character development is more important than performance (78%), seeking actual or perceived hypocrisy in actions or behaviors (76%), using work problems and weaknesses for teaching moments (72%), giving up personal rights

(62%), identifying behaviors rooted in pride (64%), and confessing work related offenses to God or a higher power (54%). The only item with less than desirable frequency counts is related to linking performance achievements with self-worth. Sixty-six percent sometimes, most of the time or always link self-worth and achievement. Linking self-worth with achievement creates emotional instability given the multiplicity of factors beyond an executive's control that contribute to policy and management outcomes and recognizing that self-worth is based upon character and identity more than performance.

Faith. Faith (1 item) is the character attribute of trusting God's providential intervention to bring good from workplace trials. Over $\frac{3}{4}$ indicated God or a higher power guides or protects through increasing hope and stress resiliency.

Teachability. Teachability (6 items) is the openness to all forms of valid performance and character feedback, regardless of the source (younger employees, subordinates, etc.). It reflects an ongoing commitment and understanding that growth is a lifelong learning and growth process under the direction of the Holy Spirit. The results in this section were mixed. A majority of the respondents fail to react defensively when others are praised in their presence (97%, always or most of the time), reject equating negative feedback with self-worth (74% always or most of the time), and actively seek feedback (69% always or most of the time). However, only 54% use 360 degree feedback to improve performance, 39 percent have an accountability partner/mentor, and only 12% use the journaling method, which is a powerful tool for self-reflection. This section also reflects the significant difference in response patterns between objective tools, policies, and practices and the self-reported character and behavioral items. The inner-space psychological and character traits are more subject to potential social desirability and response bias.

Integrity. Integrity (7 items) is another important dimension and entails a consistency between word and deed adherence to standards of belief and conduct, honoring commitments, and self-awareness of motives. The responses to six of the seven items manifest high degrees of self-reported integrity in terms of recognizing that absence of character will corrupt effective performance (97% always or most of the time), recognizing the dangers of hypocrisy (96% always or most of the time), consistency between policy and practice (95% always or most of the time), denying praise to others produces anger (84% always or most of the time), recognize every virtue can become a vice with pride (82% always or most of the time), and that the most enduring motivation for success is love (77% always or most of the time). Interestingly, 78% report at a level of sometimes or greater that character flaws are sabotaging their success. This is another indicator that the social desirability effect bias is not adversely influencing all items.

Empowerment. Empowerment is measured by four items. The self-reported level of empowerment is high in regards to taking joy in the success of co-workers (99% always or most of the time), a greater focus on organizational mission accomplishment and goal achievement than self performance (87% always or most of the time), more concerned with accomplishing

mission purpose and goal achievement than their own performance (79% always or most of the time), and more concerned with helping others improve performance than themselves (65% always or most of the time).

Support. Support (3 items) is the ability to provide employees with genuine emotional, spiritual, and physical work environment encouragement through a variety of work situations. The respondents indicated a high level of encouragement and support at the always or most of the time levels. One hundred percent treat employees with dignity and respect, 96% take time to listen when busy and 94% percent recognized always or most of the time that their words have great power.

Patience. Patience (1 item) is the ability to delay gratification and persevere through trials and tribulations. Respondents indicated a high degree of patience in trials with 86% indicating that they believe that their trials produce long-term good.

These results demonstrate a high degree of self-reported SLWSI for the respondent sample.

Measurement of Key Outcomes

There were two sets of dependent variables. The first were 17 items that assessed the various physical, mental and spiritual consequences of prolonged stress and the associated dysfunctional coping mechanisms, based on the work of Fawcett (2003) (Table 1). Respondents indicated how much the symptoms affected them over the last 60-day period, using a 4-point scale of always, most of the time, sometimes, and rarely/never. These questions demonstrated the desired level of variance with a range of 19 to 51 with a mean of 29.3 and a median and mode of 29. The scale was highly reliable with an alpha of .88. The frequency analysis indicated a normal distribution. The average item score of 1.7 on the 4-point scale is slightly below the 2.0 “sometimes” score. This group of respondents report fairly high stress scores (See Table 1) for the following items (most of the time or always): 1) fatigue (24.4%), 2) desire to be alone (24.1%), 3) anxiety, (20.3%), 4) impatience, (16.3%), and 5) sleep disorders (16.2%).

Table 1: Stress Scale Item Scores

Symptom Influenced in the Last 60 Days (n=74)

Variable	Always	Most of the Time	Sometimes	Rarely/Never
Fatigue	1 (1.4)	17 (23.0)	50 (67.6)	6 (8.1)
Difficulty in Concentrating	0	6 (8.1)	52 (70.3)	16 (21.6)
Stomach Disorders	1 (1.4)	4 (5.4)	17 (23.0)	52 (70.3)
Sleep Disorders	2 (2.7)	10 (13.5)	32 (43.2)	30 (40.5)
Eating Disorders	0	5 (6.8)	9 (12.2)	60 (81.1)
Headaches	1 (1.4)	5 (6.8)	22 (29.7)	46 (62.2)
Muscle Fatigue	1 (1.4)	4 (5.4)	39 (52.7)	30 (40.5)
Reduced Patience	2 (2.7)	6 (8.1)	51 (68.9)	15 (20.3)
Anxiety	3 (4.1)	12 (16.2)	37 (50.0)	22 (29.7)
Depression	1 (1.4)	4 (5.4)	20 (27.0)	49 (66.2)
Anger	0	3 (4.1)	40 (54.1)	31 (41.9)
Sadness	0	6 (8.1)	33 (44.6)	35 (47.3)
Impatience	3 (4.1)	9 (12.2)	48 (64.9)	14 (18.9)
Desire to be Alone	2 (2.7)	16 (21.6)	43 (58.1)	13 (17.6)
Easily Annoyed	0	5 (6.8)	37 (50.0)	32 (43.2)

Reduced Work Effectiveness	1 (1.4)	5 (6.8)	49 (66.2)	19 (25.7)
Reduced Spiritual Peace	0	7 (9.5)	32 (43.2)	35 (47.3)

The second set of outcome measures were 14 job related attitude questions. Respondents used a 10-point scale from 10 = high to 1 = low. The alpha for the 14 items is .92. The scores ranged from 35 to 138 with a mean of 110 and a mode and median of 114 (an item mean score of 7.9). This group of respondents demonstrated an overall high level of favorable job-related attitudes (See Table 2).

Table 2: Organizational Attitude Scale Items (10-point scale from 1 (low) to 10 (high))

(n=74)

Item	Mean	Median	Mode
Overall Job Satisfaction	7.82	8.0	8.0
Satisfaction with Supervisor	7.22	8.0	9.0
Satisfaction with Peers	8.0	8.0	9.0
Satisfaction with Compensation	7.95	8.0	9.0
Satisfaction with Job Challenge	8.1	9.0	9.0
Satisfaction with Job Interest	7.9	8.0	8.0
Organizational Trust	7.5	8.0	9.0
Organizational	8.6	9.0	10.0

Commitment			
Organizational Loyalty	8.9	9.0	10.0
Work Motivation	8.2	8.0	9.0
Motivation to Improve Performance	8.3	8.0	8.0
Overall Performance Level	8.2	8.0	9.0
Motivation to Seek New Position	6.4	7.0	8.0
Desire to Leave Present Job	7.0	8.0	10.0

Hypotheses

The main hypothesis is that those respondents with higher levels of servant leadership spiritual intelligence manifest more effective stress coping and adaptation strategies, which will produce lower levels of physical, emotional, and spiritual stress symptoms. The second hypothesis is that higher levels of servant leadership spiritual intelligence will produce more favorable job-related attitudes. These hypotheses are explored in the next section.

Results

The hypotheses were tested using Bivariate correlation analysis (one-tailed test). The SLWSI Scale was significantly correlated with the Organizational Attitude Scale and the associated favorable job related attitudes ($r = .428$, $Sig = .002$). Individual regressions indicated the SLWSI scale was significantly correlated in a positive manner with 10 of the 14 items. The Stress Scale Regression confirmed that higher levels of servant leader spiritual intelligence was associated with lower levels of stress ($r = -.25$, $Sig = .05$) and a significant predictor for 3 of the 17 individual variables. To fully explore the relationships, separate multiple regression analyses were completed for each dependent variable item for the Stress and Organizational Attitude Scales. The Servant Leader SI Scale was a significant predictor for 4 of the 17 variables: anxiety, desire to be alone, easily annoyed, and reduced work effectiveness. The easily annoyed and

anxiety equations manifested F levels at the .05 significance level. Hence, servant leader spiritual intelligence is a major factor in reducing dysfunctional stress.

The same process was employed for the Organizational Attitude Scale. The Spiritual Intelligence SI scale was significant predictor for 6 of the 14 items: satisfaction with peers, satisfaction with job challenge, organizational commitment, organizational loyalty, motivation to improve performance, and overall performance level. The satisfaction with peers, satisfaction with job challenge, organizational commitment, and motivation to improve performance equations reached the .05 F level significance.

Discussion and Conclusion

This preliminary analysis confirmed the positive association between servant leader spiritual intelligence (SLWSI) and lower levels of stress and more favorable organizational attitudes. Elevated levels of SLWSI were associated with higher levels of motivation to improve performance and higher performance levels. Hence, the results suggest that knowledge and practice of SLWSI is associated with more effective coping and adaption strategies to the many internal and external sources of strain associated with the modern workplace. This endows managers with a higher level of SLWSI with greater resiliency and ability to resist the temptations to adopt dysfunctional coping mechanisms, and achieve higher levels of performance.

Hence, for this sample of city managers and personnelists, adherence to servant leadership principles and the associated character attributes of accountability, forgiveness, humility, faith, teachability, integrity, empowerment, support, and patience endow stress resistance and the ability to channel time and energy productively with more laser-like focus and intensity. With higher levels of SLWSI, there is a greater degree of resiliency, increased resistance to temptation, and more effective decision-making. With lower levels SLWSI, more time and energy must be invested in coping with dysfunctional stress, thereby impeding internal and externally directed positive thoughts and behaviors.

The research findings here should generalize to executives and managers in other settings as well, given the generalizable and universal application of spiritual and religion beliefs. For managers and leaders who are spiritually/religiously inclined, the integration of SLWSI has the prospect of decreasing personal and subordinate stress. This will increase the over harmony and trust in the workplace. Many of the elements of SLWSI contain general "Golden Rule" ethical and moral elements that are applicable to all faith and spiritual traditions. Hence, most of these practices can be adopted by those with little or no spiritual or religious belief.

The small sample size precluded definitive conclusions and will require larger and more diverse samples of managers and employees. Given the sensitivity of the subject matter, careful attention

must be directed towards three areas: 1) ensuring that research subjects are protected and protocols for informed consent are followed explicitly, especially respondent confidentiality/anonymity (O'Sullivan, Rassel & Berner, 2003); 2) that variable measures are designed to reduce nonresponse and social desirability bias (Bainbridge, 1989); and 3) multiple methods and sources of information (subordinates, peers, etc.) are used (Isaac & Michael, 1981). Careful attention to survey instrument development and interview protocols are necessary to minimize hypothesis guessing and image management (Ryan, 2002).

Given that workplace spiritual intelligence is a dynamic and changing force over time, longitudinal studies that track panels or cohorts of employees would add greatly to the knowledge base (Ingersoll-Dayton, Krause, & Morgan, 2002). How do factors such as organizational experience, promotions and other career development episodes moderate the influence of SLWSI (Fisher, Frances, & Johnson, 2002; Miller & Hardin, 2002)? Another fertile area for research relates to whether there are moderator influences by type of religion, both between (Christian versus Buddhist, for example) and within religions (testing for denominational influences) (Cohen, 2002; Cohen, Siegel, & Rozin, 2003).

Future studies should link SLWSI to outcomes variables at the individual, work group, departmental, and organizational levels. From a "bottom-line," return on investment (ROI) perspective, does SLWSI improve productivity, reduce turnover, and enhance job satisfaction (Chmielewski & Phillips, 2002)? If so, should organizations implement formal policies to cultivate SLWSI (Fowler, 1993)? How can organizations support spiritual/religious practices while avoiding violating first amendment and religious establishment clauses and Title VII religious discrimination law through imposing religious beliefs and thus creating a hostile work climate (Digh, 1998; Cash, Gray, & Rood, 2000; Huang & Kleiner, 2001; Atkinson, 2000; Starcher, 2003)? Irrespective of the formal integration of religious practice in the workplace, employee workplace behavior and outcomes will be influenced by their formal spiritual and religious beliefs.

About the Author

Gary E. Roberts is an Associate Professor and MPA program director at the Robertson School of Government at Regent University. Dr. Roberts has 20 years of experience in higher education in graduate government and business degree programs. His primary teaching areas are nonprofit administration, human resource management, and public administration. Current research interests include workplace spiritual intelligence and the integration of faith into the workplace, servant leader human resource policy and practice, the impact of the religious friendly workplace, and organizational policies to promote employee work-life balance. He has authored more than 44 journal articles, one book, and many book chapters on various human resource and

public management issues. For questions regarding this article, he can be reached at garyrob@regent.edu.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2008). Stress in America. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2008/10/stress-in-america.pdf>
- Atkinson, W. (2000). Divine accommodations: Religion in the workplace. *Risk Management, 47*(10), 12-17.
- Babakus, E., Yavas, U., & Ashill, N. J. (2011). Service worker burnout and turnover intentions: Roles of person-job fit, servant leadership, and customer orientation. *Services Marketing Quarterly, 32*(1), 17.
- Bainbridge, W. S. (1989). *Survey research: A computer-assisted introduction*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Barzelay, M., & Armajani, B. J. (1997). *Breaking through bureaucracy*. In J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), 491-513. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Blau, G., & Ryan, J. (1997). On measuring work ethic: A neglected work commitment facet. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 51*, 435-448.
- Browne, L. A. (2002). *On faith and work: The relationship between religiosity and work values*. Dissertation Abstracts International, Abstract: 2002-95011-152.
- Cash, K. C., Gray, G. R., & Rood, S. A. (2000). A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace. *The Academy of Management of Executive, 14*(3), 124-134.
- Chmielewski, T. L., & Phillips, J. J. (2002). Measuring return-on-investment in government: Issues and procedures. *Public Personnel Management, 31*(2), 225-237.
- Cohen, A. B. (2002). The importance of spirituality in well-being for Jews and Christians. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(3), 287-310.
- Cohen, A. B., Siegel, J. I., & Rozin, P. (2003). Faith versus practice: Different bases for religiosity judgments by Jews and Protestants. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(1), 1-15.
-

33(2), 287-295.

Delaney, M. (2002) *The emergent construct of spiritual intelligence: The synergy of science and spirit*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 3(5-B), Dec 2002. 2565.

Digh, P. (1998). Religion in the workplace: Making a good-faith effort to accommodate. *HR Magazine*, 43(13), 84-91.

Emmons, Robert. A. (2000). Is spirituality an intelligence? Motivation, cognition, and the psychology of ultimate concern. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 10(1), 3-26.

Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6, 49-69.

Fawcett, J. (2003). *Stress and trauma handbook: Strategies for flourishing in demanding environments*. World Vision International. Monrovia, CA: World Vision International.

Fisher, J. W., Francis, L. J., & Johnson, P. (2002). The personal and social correlates of spiritual well-being among primary school teachers. *Pastoral Psychology*, 51(1), 3-11.

Fowler, F. J. (1993). *Survey research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Francis, L. J., & Kaldor, P. (2002). The relationship between psychological well-being and Christian faith and practice in an Australian population sample. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 41(1), 179-184.

Fredrickson, B. (2003). How does religion benefit health and well-being? Are positive emotions active ingredients? *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(3), 209-213.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.

Gibbons, J. M. (2010). I can't get no... job satisfaction, that is. The Conference Board.
Retrieved from:
<http://www.conference-board.org/publications/publicationdetail.cfm?publicationid=1727>

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant-leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.

Hodson, R. (2002). Management citizenship behavior and its consequences. *Work and Occupations*, 29(1), 64-97.

- Huang, C., & Kleiner, B. H. (2001). New developments concerning religious discrimination in the workplace. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 21, 128-136.
- Ingersoll-Dayton, B., Krause, N., & Morgan, D. (2002). Religious trajectories and transitions over the life course. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 55(1), 51-70.
- Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego, CA: Edits.
- Jaramillo, F., Grisaffe, D. B., Chonko, L. B., & Roberts, J. A. (2009). Examining the impact of servant leadership on sales force performance. *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 29(3), 257-276.
- Joseph, E. E., & Winston, B. E. (2005). A correlation of servant leadership, leader trust, and organizational trust. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(1), 6-22.
- Knotts, T. L. (2000). *Religious involvement and dispositional characteristics as predictors of work attitudes and behaviors*. Dissertation Abstracts International, Abstract: 2000-95021-020.
- MacHovec, F. J. (2002). *Spiritual intelligence, behavioral sciences, and the humanities*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- McGeachy, C. (2005). *Spiritual intelligence in the workplace*. Dublin, Ireland: Veritas Publications.
- Miller, L. M., & Hardin, S. I. (2002). Relations among and between career values and Christian religious values. *Counseling & Values*, 46(2), 96-107.
- Mull, H. B. (2004). *Spiritual intelligence in psychotherapy with grieving clients*. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 65(2-A), 2004. 420.
- O'Sullivan, E., Rassel, G. R., & Berner, M. (2003). *Research methods for public administrators* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- Patterson, K., & Stone, A. G. (2003). The seven habits of servant leaders. *Regent Business Review*, 4, 13-14.
- Pew Research Center (2010). A Balance Sheet at 30 Months. How the Great Recession Has Changed Life in America. Retrieved from: <http://pewsocialtrends.org/assets/pdf/759-recession.pdf>

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513-563.
- Powell, L. H., Shahabi, L., Thoresen, C. E. (2003) Religion and spirituality: Linkages to physical health. *American Psychologist*, 58(1), 36-52.
- Primeaux, P., & Pava, M. L. (eds.) (2003). *Spiritual intelligence at work: Meaning, metaphor and morals*. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Science & Technology Books.
- Ryan, J. J. (2002). Work values and organizational citizenship behaviors: Values that work for employees and organizations. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17(1), 123-132.
- Sawyer, L. L. (2005). *Seeding and sustaining transformative learning, development, and spiritual growth in higher education: A case study*. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 65(12-A), 2005. 4431.
- Schneider, S. K., & George, W. M. (2011). Servant leadership versus transformational leadership in voluntary service organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(1), 60-77.
- Sendjaya, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010). Servant leadership as antecedent of trust in organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(7), 643 – 663.
- Sendjaya, S., & Sarros, J. C. (2002). Servant leadership: its origin, development, and application in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(2), 57-63.
- Shaddock, A. J., Hill, M., & van Limbeek, C. A. H. (1998). Factors associated with burnout in workers in residential facilities for people with an intellectual disability. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, 23(4), 309-318.
- Snyder, C. R., Sigmon, D. R., & Feldman, D. B. (2002). Hope for the sacred and vice versa: Positive goal-directed thinking and religion. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(3), 234-238.
- Sowers, S. A. (2001). *Faith matters: The effects of religious orientation and counseling approach on ratings of counselor effectiveness and anticipated client satisfaction*. Dissertation Abstracts International, Abstract: 2001-95021-088.
- Spears, L. (1995). *Reflections on leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's theory of servant*

leadership influenced today's top management thinkers. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons. Spears, L. (2002). *Servant-leadership (2002 Silver Anniversary Edition)*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Starcher, K. (2003, November/December). Should you hire a workplace chaplain? *Regent Business Review*, 17-19.

Tipping, C. C. (2005). *Spiritual intelligence at work*. Marietta, GA: Global 13 Publications.

United States Office of Personnel Management. *Federal Human Capital Survey 2008*. (2008). Retrieved July 5, 2010.

Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: A cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(3), 517.