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Abstract

The Spiritual Leadership issue has received little consideration from management scholars. The purpose of this paper is to offer the Spiritual Leadership meta Model as a driver of willing to planning, self-controlling, ready to evolution, Exchange of leader & employees, organizational justice, organizational innovation. Iranian organizations offered as an illustrative case study of is an example of how this Meta Model can be applied. The results indicate that individuals who have a strong spiritual relationship with a higher power and are religious due to intrinsic motivation tend to be more willing to planning (in high level), more self-controlling (in middle level), ready to evolution (in middle level), Exchange of leader & employees (in high level), organizational justice (in middle level), organizational innovation (in middle level).
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Introduction

To understand the concept of spirituality and organizational change and development, the management's value systems and developmental capability are used. Spirituality at Work and the organizations scribed as especial feeling for their power to perform asks considered to be accurate. Spirituality and its relationship to workplace leadership is a compelling issue for management practitioners and researchers. The field of study is still in its infancy and as such is marked by differences in definitions and other basic characteristics.

Spiritual leadership of the social impact on Collective Social Influences and emphasizes that all individuals working group enables meaningful full ways. The spiritual management has less emphasis on the axial leader than other theories and focuses more on the spiritual needs of all members of the group in order to improve organizational commitment and performance highlights. This approach gives spiritual leadership and spiritual needs and who form the basis of a positive influence on the excellence of each individual group membership and performance can be seen as a leader. Thus, the spiritual leader is the interaction of formal and informal leaders and member's action and reaction.

Spiritual leadership involves motivating and inspiring employees through a transcendent vision and to foster a culture of philanthropic values for training motivated workforce and committed to be proficient. Then it causes to motivate them to do their best on job and thereby provide for their spiritual survival.

Belief in the spiritual life is two interesting effects:
First: guided inward toward the ideal of God and man and the thinking man's salvation capture and an element of self-oriented and sometimes oppressive, human, justice, and the right to seek. Second, the choice, never lets the man, lost the right and makes it trivial.

Theory of spiritual leadership is a theory of causal for organizational change and creating learning and self-motivated organizations. The theoretical model is based on the insights that inner motivation, faith, hope, love, friendship, spirituality and well-being and survival work environment combined with the spiritual and merged developed and completed.

Spiritual leadership comes from the interaction of love, altruism, vision, faith, and hope at members.

The output of Spiritual leadership then provides the leader and follower's basic needs for spiritual health by improving their sense of purpose and vision and move toward membership in groups.

At first, we discuss about the Meaning of spirituality term and then Roots of the spirituality discussion in management. Next, we review Religion versus spirituality and Spiritual leading versus spiritual leadership then we propose the Spiritual Leadership meta Model and Finally, we develop this proposal model in some Iranian organizations as an example of how spiritual leadership meta model can be applied.

The definition of Spirituality management
The term spirituality infers a number of conclusions and may firmly imply some form of religious connotation. Several authors have offered a variety of definitions of spirituality: Some with atheistic and materialistic constructions (Dehler & Welsh, 1994; Mitroff & Denton, 1999a; Ashmos & Duchon, 2000), and others with pantheistic and deistic visions (Benner, 1989;
Mohamed, Hassan & Wisnieski, 2001). To Griffin (1988), for example, spirituality is an inherent human characteristic that does not intrinsically infer any religious meaning: Spirituality in this broad sense is not an optional quality which we might elect not to have.

According to Mitroff and Denton, (1999a), spirituality is “the basic feeling of being connected with one’s completes self, others, and the entire universe” (p.86). Dehler and Welsh (1994) defined spirituality as “a specific form of work feeling that energizes action” (p. 19). Ashmos and Duchon (2000) discussed spirituality in the context of community work, and Benner (1989) believed that spirituality involves the process of establishing and maintaining a relationship with God.

Howard (2002) observes that spirituality is so difficult to describe because it is highly individual and intensely personal, as well as inclusive and universal. The definitions offered cover a wide range of phenomena including:
(a) Khanna & Srinivas (2000), who call it "beauty" and then discuss transformational relationships; (b) Levine (1994), who, in addition to creativity, insight, openness, and extraordinary performance calls it emptiness-emptying oneself or creating a vessel for receiving or containing spirit;
(c) Boozer (1998), who calls it "everything" as does Sperry (1997), who defines it as a spiritual union with any- and everything;
(d) Levy (2000), who says it’s inside of him, his quiet zone, very personal, encompassing everything he does;
(e) Mason & Welsh (1994) who define it as wonder, play, ignorance, spontaneity, joy, imagination, celebration, discernment, insight, and creativity; and,
(f) Lichtenstein (1997) who writes of grace, magic and a miracle — components of personal and organizational transformation.

In addition, Goertzen & Barbuto (2001) describe three components of spirituality: 1.) belief in the sacred; 2.) belief in the Unity; and 3.) belief in transformation; Strack et al. (2002) interviewed 20 transformational leaders who defined it as "God" or some other transcendent power, the source of one’s value and meaning, an awareness of one’s inner self, and a way of integrating all aspects of oneself into a whole. Freshman (1999), Konz & Ryan (1999), Krishnakumar & Neck (2002) among others, all describe spirituality as being pluralistic. Gibbons’ (2000) definition is the search for direction, meaning, inner wholeness and connection to others, to non-human creation, and to a transcendent.

Giacalone & Jurkiewicz’s (2003) definition (discussed earlier) attempts to both reconcile and incorporate these contradictions. For example, they note that the passive aspects of workplace spirituality such as beliefs and rituals are primarily internal and remain constant over time, whereas the dynamic aspects such as skills, resources, capabilities, or abilities evolve and develop over time, and interact with the external environment.

Both constructs of spirituality and leadership share the problem of not having a specific, consensus definition, and this lack of consensus in discourse perpetuates the conceptual fog and delays the progress of science (Fry & Smith, 1987). Furthermore, combining the terms spiritual and leadership complicates the definition process in that researchers already face a bewildering array of usages of these two terms independent of one another. For example, the term spiritual may be an aspect of a person whereas leadership may be a manifestation of specific group behaviors (Drath & Palus, 1994). Furthermore, when the concepts are combined, the newly formed unit may
create definitional redundancy and lead to confounding variables in organizational and leadership research.

Among the plethora of leadership definitions, Bennis & Nanus (1985), Cashman (1998) put forth definitions of leadership that may be a starting point for testing linkage with the Giacalone & Jurkiewicz (2003) definition of workplace spirituality. Bennis & Nanus (1985) claim that leadership is the natural expression of a fully integrated human being and Cashman (1998) describes leadership as the authentic self-expression that creates value. To date, Fry (2005) definition of spiritual leadership may provide a necessary link between the definition of leadership and workplace spirituality which can be improved upon by testing for congruence and contingency (Fry & Smith, 1987). He defines spiritual leadership as "the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival (Fleischman, 1994; Maddock & Fulton, 1998) through calling and membership" (p. 17).

Amram has identified 7 major dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence. They are Consciousness, Grace, Meaning, Transcendence, Truth, Serenity and Inner-Directedness. The researchers also describe this as below:

encouragement of spirituality at work could be resulted in advantages such as enhancement of creativity (Freshman, 1999), increasing of integrity and confidence (Wanger-Marsch and Conley, 1999), increased sense of personal evolution (Burack, 1999), enhancement of organizational commitment (Delbecq, 1999; Milliman et al, 2003), improvement of employees' work attitudes like job satisfaction, job involvement as well as decreasing turnover intention (Milliman et al, 2003), and increasing of working behavior and conscience and higher motivation (Marques et al, 2005).

Roots of the spirituality discussion in workplace and leadership
There is this slowly rising trend that can be observed, that the discussion about spirituality in management is getting more and more important.

The notion of spirituality in the workplace has attracted a considerable amount of attention in the last decade. The concept of spirituality and religion in the workplace has gained enough strength and interest that the Academy of Management has created a new special interest group (MSR) in 1994 for its membership. This group, Management, Spirituality, and Religion, has grown to more than 500 members since its inception (Robbins, 2003a) and is helping to legitimize within academia the study of spirituality in the workplace while simultaneously paving the way for introducing this emerging concept into the leadership research agenda (Academy of Management, 2004). Yet, the field of study is marked by all of the typical characteristics of paradigm development including a lack of consensus about a definition of workplace spirituality and a lack of clarity about boundaries of the subject in context of leadership. For example, some writers include ethics or team spirit within the boundaries although others do not, and some claim a nexus between spirituality and leadership practices while others treat workplace spirituality as an individual phenomenon.

The theory development of workplace spirituality and its relationship to leadership is in its infancy. Reichers & Schneider (1990) call this emerging stage of construct development introduction and elaboration.
Many authors and scholars link spirituality to organizational leadership (Fairholm, 1998; Fry, 2003; Strack, Fottler, Wheatley, & Sodomka, 2002) as well as other organizational factors such as absenteeism, productivity, turnover, ethicality, stress, and health (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003). Giacalone & Jurkiewicz (2003) state that workplace spirituality can be either active or passive and that these supposedly contradictory elements must be blended together in order to define it. Spirituality is believed to enhance organizational learning (Bierly, Kessler, & Christensen, 2000), unify and build communities (Cavanaugh, Hanson, Hanson, & Hinojoso, 2001), serve the need for connecting to others at work, and to work itself (Khanna & Srinivas, 2000), and is the source of a healing and harmonizing expression of compassion, wisdom, and connectedness that transcends all egocentric, sociocentric, or anthropocentric forms (Maxwell, 2003). Cacioppe (2000a) argues that leaders have a central role in the evolution of integrating spirituality at work and instilling a sense of the spiritual realm at the individual, team, and organizational level. Leaders who bring their spirituality to work transform organizations from merely mission-driven activities into places where individual and collective spirituality are encouraged and spiritual development is integrated into the day-to-day work life (Konz & Ryan, 1999). Fairholm (1996, 1998) was one of the first scholars to put the terms spiritual and leadership together to explain spirituality in context of workplace leadership, and since then others have attempted to validate his model in order to move the field toward a theory of spiritual leadership (e.g., Fairholm, 2002; Fry, 2003). Other authors have put forth spiritual leadership models that relate to constructs such as emotional intelligence, ethics, values, and to leadership models such as charismatic, stewardship, transformational, and servant (Biberman, Whitty, & Robbins, 1999; Cacioppe, 2000a; Tischler, Biberman, & McKeage, 2002). To date, these constructs have been confounded and need conceptual distinction (Fry, 2003).

Strack et al. (2002) contend that the research agenda linking spirituality and leadership is a conceptual quagmire because each construct can be defined in hundreds of ways. Ashmos & Duchon (2000) and others (Brandt, 1996; Conger, 1994) speculated on corporate America’s interest in workplace spirituality and believe it may be best understood by tracing some of the societal trends over the past decade. For instance, many believe that the American workplace has been turned into a tense environment with demoralized workers due to downsizing, reengineering, restructuring, outsourcing, and layoffs, as well as a growing inequity in wages. Also, the workplace has become for many a substitute for extended families, churches, neighborhoods, and civic groups that previously had been the source for the essential human feelings of connectedness and contribution. Konz & Ryan (1999), deny the possibility of a positive relationship between spiritual development and productivity. Many of the authors contend that spiritually empowered employees are more creative, more honest, stronger, more resilient, and more compassionate human beings (Bento, 1994). Cacioppe (2000a) concludes that spirituality in the workplace is not just good for business, it is the only way leaders and organizations can succeed. Goertzen & Barbuto (2001) note that although spirituality is not necessarily a religious state, religiosity has been found to have a positive effect on physical health, well being, and quality of life.

King & Nicol (1999), using Jacques’ stratified systems theory, suggest that people placed in roles that match their potential capability will achieve full capacity and thus fulfill their spiritual quest.
Furthermore, this growth enhances the health and performance of the organization, resulting in a new level of spirituality. Neck & Milliman (1994) claim that spirituality values and attitudes not only have a positive effect on one’s personal life, but also on an individual’s job performance. Organizational leaders who are more willing to use their personal spiritual values to make business decisions and transform organizations instill values that become the standard against which all organizational activities are measured. These organizations are believed to be more profitable and perform better (Biberman & Whitty, 1997; Biberman et al., 1999; Bierly et al., 2000; Burack, 1999; Cacioppe, 2000a; Dehler & Welsh, 1994; Delbecq, 1999; Konz & Ryan, 1999; Korac-Kakabadse & Korac-Kakabadse, 1997; Korac-Kakabadse et al., 2002; Kriger & Hanson, 1999; Mitroff & Denton, 1999; Porth, McCall, & Bausch, 1999; Sass, 2000; Strack et al., 2002).

There are intellectual pitfalls in the question of whether increased workplace spirituality leads to increased productivity or profitability. Some authors note that spirituality, by definition, is anti-materialist. At the same time, although increased spirituality would presumably prohibit an individual from certain forms of work, there seems to be great promise that she or he can be more effective at performing work consistent with her or his spiritual principles.

At the current state of knowledge, determining the productivity increase of an increase in spirituality is analogous to the same calculation for a variety of organizational phenomena—culture change, diversity awareness, leadership improvement, and so forth. All of these examples present a controversial set of measurement examples and issues. Whether an increase in spirituality results in an increase in productivity or profitability, both causal relationships have the same set of issues; and, coupled with additional issues such as the anti-materialist nature of the phenomenon, pose significant challenges in the scientific inquiry of this category and its relationship to spiritual leadership.

The spiritual leadership impacts on organizations and staffs

The role of faith and religious beliefs on ethical business practices becomes a highly pertinent question (Quddus, Bailey, and White, 2005).

So the higher the level of Emotional and Spiritual Intelligence, the more successful will be the entrepreneur in their pursuit to be creative and innovative. 

Spirituality at the working environment refers to the act of bringing together the people’s mind, body, and spirit (Ashmos, D., & Duchon, 2000). Mitroff & Denton (1999) supports the argument and defended that spirituality and work as the basic desires to find the meaning and purpose of life. Spiritual intelligence focuses on the abilities that draws on spiritual themes that predicts functioning, adaptation and being able to produce valuable products and service (Emmons, R., 1999).

Burack (1999) counts tree Pillars for spirituality in the workplace, which includes: internal, external, and they are combined and divides them to four different results, but very relevant to share.

1. Leadership and organization: employees ‘interest, respect for others, adaptation actions and apparent sharpness
2. Staffs: employees ‘skills and elaborated development of knowledge, versatility
and continuous functions

3. External quality: consistency, accountability of public awareness
4. Mutual trust and shared responsibility for the common wealth

Workplace spirituality can help the developing organizations by developing an environment in which important characteristics such as trust, respect, and creativity can be organized. It is expected that each of these features can have a significant impact on team effectiveness.

Set of propositions that are offered include:

1. Spirituality at work will help to develop trust among team members, creativity, Respectability, which means that a positive and significant relationship are between spiritual meanings and trust in the workplace.
2. The high levels of creativity, confidence and respectability in organizations that are steeped in spirituality will have positive and significant confidence with the satisfaction and performance and also a high level of negative confidence with opposition relationships at work among the team members.

Religion versus spirituality

Mohamed, Hassan, and Wisnieski (2001), highlighted the fact that several scholars (Harlos, 2000; Shafranske & Malony, 1990) defended the importance of defining the conceptual differences between spirituality and religiosity. Thus, in their view, spirituality may be personal, inclusive, and positive, whereas religiosity might be external, exclusive, and negative.

However, taking a different direction, Mohamed et al. claimed that the attempt to differentiate between spirituality and religiosity is merely artificial. As an alternative to this unnecessary dichotomy, they proposed that the concept of spirituality should be added to the five-factor psychological model of personality, the “Big Five,” as its sixth dimension. Their justification, nevertheless, attempted to find support in the facts that the concept of spirituality is not in opposition to other well-established psychological constructs and that the Big Five has already been linked to job performance. Mohamed et al. also speculated that spirituality, managerial behavior and, job performance are, to some extent, interconnected, which could explain some of the variances in job performance that have not yet been elucidated by the Big Five.

In general, religiousness is usually seen as a social phenomenon, whereas spirituality is fundamentally viewed as an individual attribute within a certain context (Thoresen, 1998). Accordingly, considerable psychological research has demonstrated that spirituality and religiousness are positively correlated to a variety of life situations including, but not limited to, illness recovery, ability to cope with stress, disease occurrence, mortality, self-esteem, and overall satisfaction with life (Miller & Thoresen, 2003; Powell, Shahabi, & Thoresen, 2003).

Empirically, spirituality has been found to have a positive influence on an individual's career purpose, development of self, and priority to serve others (Lips-Wiersma, 2002).

Tied to religion

Several of the articles see spirituality in a religious context, and many do not. We begin with several examples of the former. Ali & Gibbs (1998) relate the Ten Commandments of three major religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) to the work ethics and practices of their believers. They argue that in a global marketplace and economy, with diversity as the norm rather than the exception, leaders and managers can benefit from understanding the basic embedded religious
drives that members of these three religions may bring to their work environment. Cash & Gray (2000) define spirituality, religion, and "sincerely held beliefs" (p. 127) and conclude that to protect the rights of all employees, all three should be regarded as the same.

Elmes & Smith (2001) contend that workplace empowerment has a strong spiritual underpinning with roots in Puritan and Christian ideals, emphasizing that hard work, right living, and doing for others lead to individual and corporate prosperity. Gibbons (2000) claims that spirituality cannot be separated from ancient religious traditions because it is important to many people: 95% of Americans believe in God; there are 1.5 billion Buddhists in the world; and Western Europe is estimated to be 80% Christian. Hicks (2002) critically examines the spirituality–religion dichotomy and argues that the scholars of leadership have too broadly defined spirituality and fail to acknowledge the religious diversity, despite the fact that America is one of the most religiously diverse nations in the world (Eck, 2001). He contends that scholars invoke the religion–spirituality dichotomy to argue that if a practice or belief is controversial, it is probably religious and not spiritual, and thus conflict is defined away.

Korac-Kakabadse, Kouzmin, & Kakabadse (2002) state that spirituality includes terms such as energy, meaning, and knowing, and that it can be related to the various spiritualities of Tao, Buddhism, Hinduism, Zen, and Native American. Kriger & Hanson (1999) suggest that the world’s major religious traditions have endured the test of time and note that the inherent values in those religions may be relevant to the organizations of today. Moch & Bartunek (submitted for publication) contend that spirituality and religion cannot be separated and illustrate how religion interprets spirituality and how religion and business have given evolved each other over the last three centuries. Mohamed et al. (2001) argue that there is no significant difference between religion and spirituality despite the fact that many see the prior as negative and the latter as positive.

Religion may also provide a conceptual framework for governance (Duignan & Bhindi, 1997), which may promote a leadership praxis linking the theory, practices, and ethics of leadership.

Not tied to religion
Conversely, several articles contend that spirituality should be seen as separate from any religious context. For example, Ashmos & Duchon (2000) argue that spirituality is neither about religion nor about getting people to accept a specific belief system. Rather it is about employees who understand themselves as spiritual beings at work whose souls need nourishment, a sense of purpose and meaning, and a sense of connectedness to one another and to their workplace community. Bierly et al. (2000) define spirituality as moral and emotional in nature, which involves an understanding and appreciation of one’s position in the universe, one’s soul, and the role of a God. Organized religions provide rituals, routines, and ceremonies that can provide a vehicle for achieving spirituality. They contend that one could be religious by faithfully attending the religious rituals but lack spirituality.

Dehler & Welsh (1994) claim that religion is not required for context in defining spirituality and its relationship to the workplace. Elkins, Hedstrom, Hughes, Leaf, & Saunders’ (1988) research shows that a growing number of people are developing their spirituality outside traditional, organized religion, citing a study by Shafranske & Malony (1985) that found 74% of the respondents indicated that organized religion was not the primary source of their spirituality. Goertzen & Barbuto (2001), in their meta-analysis of literature on spirituality, argue that it is critical.
to dispel the myth about spirituality, which it is not necessarily a religious state (Brandt, 1996; Maher & Hunt, 1993; Mitroff & Denton, 1999).
While the Giacalone & Jurkiewicz (2003) definition includes transcendence and connection, it does not explicitly acknowledge religion as an integral aspect to workplace spirituality.
Most of the articles suggest that spirituality can be defined separately from religion. Those who believe it can, point out that people can participate in activities of a religious institution without having a spiritual experience, and that it is possible to have a spiritual experience outside an environment of religion. It is also the case that for many people, religion often has the negative connotations of being parental, authoritarian, and requiring unconscious obedience (Mohamed et al., 2001). Spirituality for many means self-managed, adult, self-directed, and conscious development. As model and theoretical development proceeds, this research suggests that spirituality should be defined in a context that takes religion into consideration.
Though, we are not restricting our comments to a large, institutional religion such as Islam or Catholicism. The various twelve-step programs, for example, represent a codified set of beliefs. Those articles that contend that spirituality can be developed independent of a system of belief (e.g., religion and values) have not taken the time to make explicit the many beliefs implicit in how they define spirituality. The integration of religion and spirituality offers researchers' provocative new vistas in developing leadership theory, particularly as it relates to mutual causality (Dent, 2003) of leaders’ values, belief systems, and their organizational policies and practices. Freshman (1999) contends that spirituality is a solitary phenomenon and therefore there is no single definition or application of spirituality.

**Spiritual leadership versus Spiritual leading**
The theory of spiritual leadership that is an emerging paradigm that has the potential to guide organizational transformation and development of organizations was developed from an intrinsic motivation model that incorporates hope/faith, vision, and altruistic love (Fry, 2003, 2005, 2008). Spiritual leadership taps into the fundamental needs of both leader and follower for spiritual wellbeing through (1) calling, or a sense that one’s life has meaning, purpose, and makes a difference, and (2) membership, or a sense that one is understood, appreciated, and accepted unconditionally. The purpose of spiritual leadership is to create vision and value congruence across the individual, empowered team, and organization levels and, ultimately, foster higher levels of organizational commitment and productivity whereby human well-being, corporate social responsibility, and organizational performance cannot only coexist, but be maximized (Fry and Slocum, 2008).
By impacting employee performance, and collectively, team and organizational performance, spiritual leadership provides the foundation for developing the learning, creativity, empowerment, and innovation required to drive organizational excellence in processes and outputs (Fry et al., 2010).
Referencing the fry model, the source of spiritual leadership is an inner life or spiritual practice that, as a fundamental source of inspiration and insight, positively influences development of (1) hope/faith in a transcendent vision of service to key stakeholders, and (2) the values of altruistic love. Inner life speaks to the feeling individuals is about the fundamental meaning of who they are, what they are doing, and the contributions they are making (Vail, 1998; Duchon and Plowman, 2005). Inner life includes individual practices (e.g., meditation, prayer, religious practices, yoga,
journaling, and walking in nature) and organizational contexts (e.g. rooms for inner silence and reflection) to help individuals be more self-aware and conscious from moment-to-moment and draw strength from their beliefs, is that a Nondual Being, Higher Power, God, or philosophical teachings (Fry and Kriger 2009). An important distinction we make in theorizing spiritual leadership is in differentiating leading and leadership. Spiritual leadership emphasizes this less leader-centric approach, focusing on engaging all group members to meet spiritual needs and enhance organizational commitment and performance. In this way, each person exercising positive influence enhancing the group’s calling, membership, and performance is considered a leader. Spiritual leadership is thus both a cause and effect as group members interact and various formal and informal leaders in the group emerge (Drath & Palus, 1998).

**Appraisal of Spiritual Leadership**

In calling for a scientific inquiry in workplace spirituality, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz, (2003) and Giacalone et al. (2005) identify several weaknesses that must be addressed if this newly emerging paradigm is to be a source of employee empowerment and achieve acceptance among the scientific community. Two of these, lack of a theory-based definition and inadequate measurement tools, are beginning to be addressed by research on spiritual leadership theory. Several articles suggest that workplace spirituality is measurable, although few attempt it. Most identify several issues with measurement but still believe it is possible. A few articles claim that the phenomenon cannot be adequately captured using traditional social science measurement methods. We begin with several examples of attempts to measure workplace spirituality. Ashmos & Duchon (2000) created a 34-question instrument with a 7-point Likert-type scale based on a review of the literature that led to the development of several dimensions of spirituality that could be broadly construed as contributing to inner life, meaningful work, and community. Bell & Taylor (2001), in a participant observation study during two workshop retreats at a Benedictine monastery, measured the dimensions of language and values spirituality (belief, journey, unity, higher power, and personal fulfillment) that surround the workplace. Perhaps the most comprehensive overview of measurement instruments is found in MacDonald, Kuentzel & Friedman (1999). They review ten different instruments purported to tap spirituality and related constructs. This range is from the Expressions of Spirituality Inventory (cognitive orientation toward spirituality, experiential/phenomenological dimension, existential wellbeing, paranormal beliefs, and religiousness) to the Psycho matrix Spirituality Inventory (awareness of higher power, spiritual activities or practices, use of healing practices, experience of physical and emotional trauma, body awareness, religious history, and current religious practices). An example of an instrument without reference to religion is Elkins et al. (1988) who developed a measure of humanistic–phenomenological spirituality (transcendent, meaning and purpose, mission, sacredness, spiritual values, altruism, idealism, awareness, and benefits). Researchers have also attempted to measure spirituality for purposes of comparison. Mitchell, Hastings, & Tanyel (2001) provided a self-administered questionnaire to American and South Korean Gen-Xers and discovered that the survey validated that both the American and South Korean groups appear to be caught up in a revival of spiritual values. Senger (1970) reports on the results of an empirical study of 244 West Coast corporate managers and their association with religious values.
Several of the authors believe that spirituality cannot be measured. Cacioppe (2000b), Fornaciari & Dean (2001), Waddock (1999) all reference Wilber’s (1997, 2000b) philosophy of ephemeral inner aspects such as emotions, values, beliefs, and community. Wilber (1997, 2000b) points out that these are not physical things, and, as such, cannot be empirically measured, touched, tasted, or seen. Cacioppe (2000b) points out that workplace managers are skeptical about spirituality because they see no equivalent scientific method to test its validity. He notes that while science may not be able to prove that the inner dimensions exist, others can experience them and know intuitively that they are woven into the fabric of the universe.

To date, the theory of spiritual leadership (Fry 2003, 2005, 2008, and 2010) has been studied, tested, and validated in a diverse array of organizations including secondary schools, a university, military units, city governments, police, profit organizations, and for Cordon Bleu-Tomasso Corporation.

Results so far support a significant positive influence of spiritual leadership through spiritual well-being on employee life satisfaction, organizational commitment and productivity, various measures of work unit performance, and sales growth (Malone and Fry 2003; Fry et al. 2005; Fry and Matherly 2006; Fry and Slocum 2008; Fry et al. 2010).

Most researchers describe the tremendous care with which measurement must proceed. It is, perhaps, most accurate to say that spirituality may not be measurable, but that there are closely correlated manifestations of spirituality which can. The primary challenge, then, is one of ensuring that appropriate proxies are selected that come extremely close to revealing the phenomenon of spirituality. The articles describing survey instruments are all possibly subject to a self-fulfilling prophecy flaw. Factor analysis is the best-practice technique for determining the suitability of items for a survey instrument.

Although there are several definitions of spirituality, this paper discusses it as a cultural phenomenon that might influence organizational behavior.

Although the literature has provided ample interpretations for spirituality, the definition used in this article, in a broad sense, refers to people’s values and meanings, which sometimes might incorporate religious beliefs as well. Further, this premise also infers that spirituality might carry strong cultural connotations.

**Study method & survey of spirituality in Iranian organizations**

In regard to survey of literature review and appraisal done from past observation & scientists views of various fields about spirituality & management in organization, suggest two basic deduction for this research. First this research aided to derivation of influence able specifications of spirituality in management that outcome of this research was offering of a meta model and the second was showing the conceptual difference between spirituality and religion in the various people perspective that results to be equality between this two concept in cultural and Islamic literature for researcher.

Therefore, the other things involve is with approach that is similarity between spirituality concept and religion concept in Islam view that has similarity functions and applications for managers in advancing of their goals.

Given the pervasive influence of characteristics of spirituality who been output of extractive Meta model, the surveying of all these factors is difficult.
Therefore, the first six factors extracted from Meta model in consultation with experts, and selected to examine in Iranian organizations. Then launched standard questionnaire for each of the indexes that introduced 6 questionnaires, also prepared a questionnaire to measure religious orientation between managers on the agenda.

The sample was selected from the community of Iranian managers that distributed 7 prepared questionnaires among them in the form of a completed questionnaire. The results were collected and After analysis of variance test for measuring the relation of outputs to religion oriented in the organization, we determined output of a questionnaire that is symbol for evaluating of each spirituality management indexes in Iranian organizations and terminal conclusion is the final model as a model of spiritual leadership that presented in the end of article. The detailed description of the measures taken in this study is presented, and finally has been discussed.

**Determining of indexes and the questionnaire**

As was mentioned, Indexes, are output of a questionnaire that was presented to the experts And they were asked to determine more important indexes from large number of indexes on spiritual management (in the literature review) who can be investigated in Iranian organizations.

In this regard and according to expert's opinion, the following six criteria were selected for study:

- **Willing to planning**
- **Self controlling**
- **Ready to evolution**
- **Exchange of leader & employees**
- **Organizational justice**
- **Organizational innovation**

According to being standard questionnaire about measuring of the above indexes in organization, we do not redesign another questionnaire and then chose the required questionnaires (as in Table 1) to measure these indexes in the organization.
Table1: standard questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of questions</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final report of the research project , preparing and evaluating measures of religiosity in different strata of society at provincial centers ( Executive: khodayaryfard)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Religious orientation between managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational behavior book , written by Robert Kreitner and Anjelokinicki</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Self controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational behavior book , written by Robert Kreitner and Anjelokinicki</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ready to evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational behavior book , written by Robert Kreitner and Anjelokinicki</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Exchange of leader &amp; employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational behavior book , written by Robert Kreitner and Anjelokinicki</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each questionnaire has been explaining expressions for how to measure the outcomes and outputs. Also A standard questionnaire-based survey conducted in Tehran University use for existence of religion and spirituality among executives and managers to focus on Iranian organizations has been used that the source profile is presented in Table 1.

Obviously, because of previously validated of above 7 questionnaires, we did not validate them with alpha cronbach and suppose that their validity has been confirmed and assumed rigid.

Most questionnaires used Likert-based spectrum (5 options), and in one case (2 options), and in another case be 3 options. Finally, a questionnaire with 121 questions (total questionnaire) were summarized and presented.

Sampling

by Considering that the aim of the present study is the measuring of affecting of management indexes in Iranian organizations, we Selected range of managers, supervisors, project managers, department managers and then the questionnaires distributed at paper base and electronically between 302 managers and the result has been returned and accepted 197 questionnaires.

The sample been the managers of private and public sectors that among them, 34 percent of respondents been at public sector, 41.6 percent of respondents were managers of the private sector and 24.4% of respondents were managers of semiprivate organizations.

Also, 72.6 percent of male respondents were male and 27.4% were women.

All respondents to the questionnaire were converted to Islam as a religion that 2.5 percent were sonni and other was Shi'a.
Analysis of results and management model Meta based on religion and spirituality

After collecting the questionnaires using the instructions for each questionnaire, results were analyzed and summarized and finally, in the case of each of its output was presented in the Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P. value</th>
<th>Religious orientation effect</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Good ability in planning</td>
<td>Willing to planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>Middle self -controlling</td>
<td>Self-controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>Relative ready for evolution</td>
<td>Ready to evolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>high relation between employee and manager</td>
<td>Exchange of leader &amp; employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>Relative justice</td>
<td>Exchange of leader &amp; employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>Relative high in innovation</td>
<td>Organizational innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, using analysis of variance and with assuming normality, the relationship between religion and spirituality claim that the proof in this area and is based on literature studies. Then, as for result showing in table, we can confirm this hypothesis that management of religious and spiritual leadership has a direct relationship. Beside, determining of measurement of effecting of each of these factor which represents an increase of indexes in this area which is shown at below model that call spiritual leader model in Iranian organizations (Figure 1).

The following is made up of three parts:
- Meta-model of relationship between religion and spirituality management
- The conceptual model in Iran organizations
- Outcome of measures

In fact, the religious and spiritual management in Iranian organizations moreover, it has been adequate on the six evaluated indicators. At least in two indicators willing to planning and exchange of leader & employees are completely in increasingly and in relation to 4 indexes:
- Self controlling
- Ready to evolution
- Organizational justice
- Organizational innovation

Are increasingly affect but in middle level.

So the general conclusion that can be harvested is that using of religious management and spiritual leadership in the Iranian organizations could improve organizational indexes.
Figure 1: The spirituality leadership Meta model
Discussion
In this paper, we made effort to exhibit output of effecting religious managers and spiritual leaders on organizational indexes. In this respect, we peruse output of relation of these indexes with religion management that was Emphasis on previous studies.
First, whatever is considerable is Correlation between religious spirituality as one of the Islamic teachings that cannot denote between these two areas.
Secondly, there are indexes in organization that are dependent to style of religious managers and this type of style of management is affective on these organizational indexes. The third important result is that the Managers who lead their organizations with religious approach affect positively on indexes of studied organization.
Finally, the results presented in the model that these indexes in Meta model are outputs of management based on religion and spirituality.
At a higher level, conceptual model is presented in Iranian organizations; including six main indexes that output of these indexes are last levels of this model that are output of proposed model that presented from researchers.
However, extent of religion is extremely extensive that its relation to human and organization can be imagined more expensive than present search that study & search in this field require indecision and time to achieve to its details.
In this paper the effects of management on the basis of religion and spirituality on organizational leadership was measured; Therefore, organizations who use this approach can clearly see that its effects.
Although the sample is Iranian organizations, But it seems the results in other countries (maybe with slightly different results) to be repeated.
Understanding the effects of this approach can considerable help to plans of changes in the organization.
While the broad dimensions of organizational behavior as worthy of this type of research could well use.

Recommendations
Although, research on the impact of spirituality in the workplace has been lacking, future studies should consider a number of important issues. Future investigations should focus on the implications of spirituality for organizational behavior for example. Another important topic would be the study of spirituality as a cultural phenomenon. Further, it could be appropriate to examine the relationship between spirituality and personality or between spirituality and organizational commitment.
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