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Abstract

This study investigated the relationship between ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate organizational justice and organizational citizenship behavior and organization-based self-esteem and the organizational spirituality as the mediator variable in an industrial organization in Iran. The sample consisted of 400 employees of an organization who were selected using the multistage random sampling method. Subjects completed the ethical Leadership questionnaire developed by Brown et al, general transformational leadership questionnaire (GTL), ethical climate questionnaire developed by Hunt et al., organizational justice questionnaire developed by Colquitt, organizational spirituality questionnaire developed by Milliman et al, organizational citizenship behavior scale, and organization-based self-esteem scale. Evaluating the proposed model using the structural equation modeling (SEM) was performed. The results show the relatively good fitness of the model to the data. Variables of ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate, and organizational justice affect organizational spirituality and organizational spirituality affect the variables of organizational citizenship behavior and organization-based self-esteem. Moreover, variables of ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate, and organizational justice have indirect effect on the variables of organizational citizenship behavior and organization-based self-esteem and the organizational spirituality.
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Introduction

The present era is called the era of complexity and change (Yazdani et al., 2010) and these complexities and changes lead to the double workload. Spirituality decreases the stress (Khanka, 2013). Organizational spirituality is an emerging phenomenon (Ashmos and Duchon, 2000) that has been considered by many theorists on management and organizational issues at various levels (Yazdani et al., 2010). Organizational spirituality seeks to find an ultimate goal for working life in order to establish strong relationships between coworkers and compatibility between the individual beliefs and organizational values (Mitroff and Denton, 1999; quoted by Salajagheh and Farahbakhsh, 2010).

Organizational spirituality is defined as a set of organizational values that promotes the experiences of the employees, facilitates the working process, and improves the sense of enjoy while communicating with others (Marschke et al. 2009). Today, education and the promotion of ethics and employees'spirituality in the organizations is one of the most important issues of the managers and organizations (Salajegheh and Farahbakhsh, 2010). That is why the new research paradigm of the organizations and managerial boards has moved to the examining and explaining the dimensions and characteristics of the organizational spirituality and the factors influencing it or influenced by it (Karakas, 2010).

In recent years, spirituality in the workplace has been considerably discussed especially in spiritual management (Tourish and Tourish, 2010). Ethical leadership is one of the factors that causes organizational spirituality, solidarity of the employees, strong organizational foundations, organizational integration and positive organizational culture (Kinjerski and Skrypnek, 2006). Ethical leadership may be described as an attempt to spread justice, to show respect for idiosyncratic characteristics of othersand a combination of other characteristics such as honesty, trustworthiness, faithfulness, purity, democratic decision-making, participatory support, and compassion (Yilmaz and Bokeoglu, 2008). Ethical leaders create a kind of intrinsic motivation for themselves and extrinsic motivation for their followers using the indicators of the organizational or group spirituality using organizational spirituality (KhaefElahiet al. 2010). Such ethical managers show the ethical behavior and areas anorganization spiritual model. They arehonest in relationships with their employees and satisfy their working needs. They also reward the ethical behaviors and consider punishment for the unethical behaviors of the employees. On the other hand, employees trust them and thus spirituality is developed in the workplace.

Another factor that causes organizational spirituality is transformational leadership (Salmani and Moeinian, 2010). Transformational leadership means inspiring the followers to accept and participate in achieving the organizational goals presented by the leaders. Here, employees’ motivation is beyond the material exchanges and reward requests and lead to the intimate team working (Afshari, 2012). When managers use their personal power and aim to transform the organizations, employees obey them and help them to achieve the organizational goals. Moreover, the motivations for such an effort are beyond the material rewards, so employees find that growth and development of the organization is effective for them and success and failure of the organization lead to their success or failure. In other words, the organizational progress of is equal to the progress of all of them. These reasons lead to the good teamwork, because egocentric and material incentives are replaced by theethical incentives (Fawcett et al., 2008).
Ethical climate as the dominant interpretations of functions and routines of the organizations has ethical content or occupational dimensions that determine the components of the ethical behavior in the workplace (Victor and Cullen, 1988). As the common values, beliefs, and norms that affect the organizational members are developed, organizational spirituality is increased. In addition, in this strong ethical climate, organizational members have greater coherence and synergy (Robbins, 1990).

Organizational justice is another factor affecting organizational spirituality. Organizational justice represents employees' perceptions on the fair organization treatments (Campbell and Finch, 2004). Preliminary studies have emphasized on distributive justice, a sense of fairness on what are distributed among the employees. According to Adams (1965), distributive justice can be defined as individuals' perception of justice in the results of a social interaction or exchange. According to Adams (1965), fairness or justice is usually determined by evaluating the input and output, and then they compare this ratio of input and output with some reference criteria to determine whether the consequences of their efforts are fair or not. Distributive justice is realized where consequences were consistent with implicit norms of the allocation of benefits and resources (Colquitt et al., 2001). Thibaut and Walker (1975) and Leventhal (1980) are the most prominent scholars who worked on the procedural justice. They showed that in many cases, the procedures through which consequences are allocated are more important than the consequences so that if people receive unpleasant consequences, feel satisfaction with them, because they believe that procedures through which these consequences are allocated based on the justice and fairness (Ambrose, 2002).

In 1990s, literature focused on the social justice. This type of justice that is called interactional justice is defined as the interpersonal treatment that people receive when using the procedures (Bies and Moag, 1986). Interactional justice is implemented when decision-makers behave people with respect and sensitivity and fully explain the logical basis of the decisions. Greenberg (1993) classified interactional justice into two separate factors, interpersonal and informational. He suggested that the dimensions of respect and sensitivity of the interactional justice could be considered as the interpersonal aspects of distributive justice, because they modify their response to the consequences of the decision, (i.e. sensitivity may cause a better feeling towards the undesirable outcome) (Greenberg, 1993). Interpersonal justice is combined with respect, kindness and away from the politics in the organizations (Nabatchi et al., 2007). In addition, Greenberg (1993) suggested that the explanatory dimension of interpersonal justice can be considered as the informational aspect of the procedural justice, because the descriptions often provide the information required for evaluating the structural aspects of the procedures (Greenberg, 1993). Informational justice means to make clear decisions and providing the sufficient explanations about them (Nabatchi et al., 2007).

In an organization where justice is implemented, all members are fairly treated so that they feel they equally benefit from the organizational advantages. In such an organization, employees feel solidarity of the teamwork and realize that the organization satisfy their needs. They are also sure that their rights are not violated, so that everybody can benefit from his or her efforts with no conflict; this leads to the spread of the organizational spirituality and integrity.

Literature shows that organizational spirituality is interwoven with increasing the desired organizational consequences such as increased organizational citizenship behavior (Rastegar et al., 2012; Baroda et al., 2012). Organizational citizenship behavior is a kind of behavior
that aims to help the organization or co-workers by a person, and vice versa, intra-role behavior is not considered as an official behavior (Ashnek, 1991; quoted by Azarnoush, 2012). When employees experience the organizational integrity, they increase the scope of their activities beyond their tasks, because they feel if their organization achieves its goal, in fact, it is their success, and they are sure that their managers and co-workers will help them when encountering with the problems. Therefore, employees are satisfied while working in such an organization because they think that their organization respect their values and satisfy their needs.

Literature shows that organizational spirituality increases the organization-based self-esteem (Milliman et al., 2003). Organization-based self-esteem is a self-image as a member of an organization, People with high organization-based self-esteem feel that they are important, influential and valuable members (Pierce and Gardner, 2004); because organizational spirituality helps the employees to behave based on the organizational values and seek to improve the behaviors and activities based on the spiritual values. Thus, they can achieve a positive self-image as an influential and valuable member of their organization.

Examining the different studies showed that factors such as ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate and organizational justice through organizational spirituality as a mediator variable, enhances the consequences including the organizational citizenship behavior and organization-based self-esteem (Milliman et al., 2003).

Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2006), Tourish and Tourish (2010), Khaef Elahiet al (2010), Mayer et al. (2011), Moore (2011), Karimi et al. (2010), Narayan (2009), Nazaripour et al (2012), Yazdani et al (2010), cocoa et al. (2013), Pirouzfar (2013), Rastegar et al. (2012), Baroda et al. (2012), Buentello (2011), Rashvand and Bharvar (2013), Affeldtand McDonald (2011), Ahmadi and Khodami (2011), and Beheshtifar (2013) discussed the various factors affecting the spirituality. However, further studies are needed in order to examine the various factors affecting the spirituality that provide an appropriate combination of antecedents and consequences of the organizational spirituality. This study after reviewing the latest studies, a combined model of the antecedents and consequences of organizational spirituality has been designed and developed. Figure 1 shows the suggested model.
Figure 1 The final model of the present study

Method

The statistical population, sample and sampling method: The statistical population included all 3400 employees of an industrial organization in 2013, of whom, 400 employees were selected based on the Cochran formula and using the stratified random sampling method. After receiving the organizational charts with the number and names of employees in each section, samples were randomly selected from each part and were specified according to the number. The mean and SD of the subjects was equal to 31.55 and 5.26. In addition, the 77.2% were married employees and 22.8% were single employees. Moreover, 175 subjects (43.8% of the total sample) had diploma, 121 subjects (30.2%) had associate degree, 84 subjects (21%) had bachelor degree and the lowest frequency or 20 subjects (5%) had master degree. In addition, the mean and standard deviation of the record were 7.31 and 5.22, respectively.

Research instruments
Ethical Leadership Questionnaire: In the present study, the ethical leadership questionnaire of Brown et al (2005) was used in order to measure the ethical leadership. This 10-item questionnaire is scored based on the Likert five-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Brown et al (2005) reported the reliability of the questionnaire using the Cronbach's alpha as 0.95. Zahiri (2003) reported the reliability of the questionnaire using the Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability as 0.81 and 0.81, respectively and reported the construct validity using the correlated general question as 0.77 (P <0.01). In this study, the reliability coefficient of this scale was calculated using the Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability as 0.94 and 0.90, respectively.

Transformational Leadership Questionnaire: general transformational leadership questionnaire was used for measuring the transformational leadership. This questionnaire was
developed by Carless et al. (2000) and has seven items that are scored based on the five point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree). Afshari (2012) has used the Cronbach's alpha coefficients and split-half for assessing the reliability coefficients of the questionnaire and obtained 0.94 and 0.86, respectively. Confirmatory factor analysis was used by Afshari (2014) to validate the transformational leadership questionnaire on the items of this scale. In the present study, reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was calculated using the Cronbach's alpha and split-half as 0.90 and 0.86.

Ethical climate questionnaire: In the present study, the ethical climate questionnaire of Hunt et al (1989) was used in order to measure the ethical climate. This 5-item questionnaire is scored based on the Likert five-point scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). Hunt et al (1989) reported the reliability of the questionnaire using the Cronbach's alpha as 0.82. Zahiri (2003) reported the reliability of the questionnaire using the Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability as 0.89 and 0.75, respectively and reported the construct validity using the correlated general question as 0.66 (P <0.01). In this study, the reliability coefficient of this scale was calculated using the Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability as 0.37 and 0.30, respectively.

Organizational Justice Inventory: The questionnaire that has been developed by Colquitt (2001) and it was used to evaluate organizational justice in this study. It has 20 items for measurement of distributive justice, 7 items for measurement of procedural justice, 4 items for measurement of interpersonal justice and 5 items for measurement of informational justice. These items are scored based on the Likert five-point scale from 1 (very low) to 5 (very high). HashemiSheikhashabani (2007) obtained the reliability of the questionnaire using the Cronbach's alpha as 0.91 and 0.87, respectively, for the procedural justice as 0.79 and 0.77, respectively, for the interpersonal justice as 0.90 and 0.90, respectively and for the informational justice as 0.91 and 0.89. The validity of this scale was obtained by evaluating the correlation between distributive justice and utility-scale of r = 0.32 (P<0.0001), inter-scale of the procedural justice and group commitment r = 0.25 (P<0.0001), inter-scale of the interpersonal justice and pro-social behavior r =0.273 (P<0.0001), and informational justice and collective self-esteem r=0.304 (P<0.0001). Organizational justice scale has the criteria validity (Hashemi Sheikh Shabani, 2007). In this study, the reliability of this scale for general o justice was calculated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient and split-half, as 0.93 and 0.72, respectively.

Organizational spirituality questionnaire: In the present study, the organizational spirituality questionnaire of Milliman et al (2003) was used in order to measure the organizational spirituality. This 20-item questionnaire measures the three dimensions of meaningful work (6 items), a sense of solidarity (7 items), and alignment values in organizations (7 items) and the items are scored based on the Likert five-point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Mousavi (2008) in this study reported the reliability of the questionnaire through Cronbach's alpha as 0.87. In this study, the reliability coefficient of this scale was calculated using the Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability as 0.93 and 0.83, respectively.

Organizational citizenship behavior questionnaire: this questionnaire in the present study was used to measure organizational citizenship behavior that was developed byPodsakoff et al., (1990). This questionnaire has 24 items that scored based on the five point Likert scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The questions in this scale measuresfive
aspects including conscientiousness, courtesy, altruism, sportsmanship, and civic virtue. Podsakoff et al. (1990) calculated the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha coefficients for conscientiousness as 0.83, courtesy as 0.97, altruism as 0.81, sportsmanship as 0.87 and civic virtue as 0.77. Shekarshekan et al. (2001) reported its reliability as 0.59 (Azarnoush, 2002). Validity of this scale is acceptable and its construct validity was obtained by correlating with a general question as 0.49 at the significant level p<0.01 (Podsakoff, 1990). In the present study, reliability coefficient of this questionnaire was calculated using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient and split-half as 0.78 and 0.63.

**Organization-based self-esteem questionnaire:** In this study, the 10-item questionnaire developed by Pierce et al. (1989) was used. They reported reliability coefficient of this questionnaire in their study using the Cronbach's alpha as 0.89. Damiri (2011) in their study reported the reliability coefficient of this questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha coefficient and split-half as 0.88 and 0.82, respectively. They used a general researcher-developed question that showed the general rate of the organization-based self-esteem on a seven point scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) to measure the validity and obtained the validity coefficient as 0.60 (P<0.001). In this study, the reliability coefficient was obtained using Cronbach's alpha and split-half as 0.88 and 0.76.

**Results**

The mean, standard deviation and correlation coefficient between the variables are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. The mean, standard deviation and correlation coefficients between the variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0.68*  -  

*0.53  **0.44* -

*0.45  **0.48  **0.46* -

*0.32  **0.26  **0.30  **0.17* -

*0.50  **0.45  **0.56  **0.47  **0.25  -

*0.27  **0.25  **0.34  **0.24  **0.20  **0.73  -

*0.40  **0.42  **0.43  **0.39  **0.17  **0.71  **0.31  -
As shown in Table 1, the correlation coefficient between variables of ethical leadership, transformational leadership, organizational climate and organizational justice as an antecedent variable with the organizational spirituality, and organizational spirituality with variables of organizational citizenship behavior and organization-based self-esteem as the consequent variables is significant at p<0.01. Moreover, correlation coefficient between the precedent variables and consequent variables are significant at p<0.01.

For evaluating the proposed model, structural equation modeling was used. The proposed model fitness based on a combination of fitness metrics for determining the adequacy of the proposed model fitness to the data was used. The proposed model fitness to the data based on fitness indicators including chi-square \((\chi^2)\), as an indicator of absolute fitness were reported in Table 2. As the chi-square value is greater than zero, model fitness is decreased. Significant chi-square shows the significant difference between the observed and shows given and observed covariance. However, because the chi-square formula includes the sample size, its values swollen in large samples and is usually statistically significant. For this reason, many researchers compare the chi-square with the degree of freedom (normed \(\chi^2\) measure; \(\chi^2/df\)) and usually use 2 ration (2 numerical values), as an thumb indicator of fit goodness of (Arbuckle, 1997; quoted by Colquitt 2001). Moreover, other important parameters such as goodness of fit index (GFI), adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI), incremental fit index (IFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), the comparative fit index (CFI), and normed fit index (NFI) is also reported in Table 2. In these indexes, fit value above 0.9 is considered acceptable. Another index is theroot – mean – square error of approximation (RMSEA) index that determined above 0.08 as acceptable value and for the very good model, 0.05 or less is acceptable (Cudeck and Browne, 1993; quoted by Breso et al., 2007). Initial model fitness was evaluated based on the fitness indexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indices</th>
<th>(\chi^2)</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>(\chi^2/df)</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>AGFI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed model</td>
<td>547.30</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final model</td>
<td>396.37</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 2, in the final model, indices such as GFI, AGFI, IFI, TLI, CFI and NFI should be improved because their values are smaller than 0.90. As a result, after two improvements, indices were more fitted.

Table 3 shows the direct routes and their standardized coefficients in the final model. As shown in Table 3, all of the coefficients in the final model are significant. Accordingly, all direct research hypotheses were approved.

Table 3. Structural model of the direct routes and their standardized coefficients in the final model of this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>route</th>
<th>organizational spirituality</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the indirect routes and their standardized coefficients in the final model. As shown in Table 4, all indirect routes and their standardized coefficients in the proposed model is significant. Accordingly, all indirect hypotheses were confirmed.

Table 4. Structural model of the indirect routes and their standardized coefficients in the final model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>route</th>
<th>Organizational citizen behavior</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate</td>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate</td>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational spirituality</td>
<td>Organizational citizen behavior</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and Conclusion

The results of structural equation modeling confirm the positive effect of the ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate, and organizational justice on organizational spirituality. These results are consistent with the findings Kinjerski and Skrypnek (2006), Tourish and Tourish (2010), Divine KhaefEllahi et al (2010), Mayer et al. (2011), Nazaripour et al (2010), Stoenet al. (2012), Mohammadi et al. (2003), Rastegaret al. (2010), Salmani and Moeinian (2010), Krishnan (2008), the Mazloumi and Shahtalebi (2010) Fawcett (2008), Robbins (1990), Moore (2011), Karimi et al. (1389), Baderi Narayan (2009), Yazdani et al (2010), and cccc (2013). Ethical leaders create a kind of intrinsic motivation for themselves and extrinsic motivation for their followers using the indicators of the organizational or group spirituality using spirituality in the organization or group (KhaefElahi et al. 2010). Such ethical managers show the ethical behavior and are as a spiritual model in the organization. When managers use their personal power and aim to transform the organizations, employees obey them and help them to achieve the organizational goals. Moreover, the motivations for such an effort are beyond the material rewards, so employees find that growth and development of the organization is effective for them and success and failure of the organization lead to their success or failure. In other words, the organizational progress of is equal to the progress of all of them. In addition, in this strong ethical climate, organizational members have greater coherence and synergy (Robbins, 1990). Influential managers show their employees how to behave and move towards the spiritual values of the organizations. In an organization where justice is implemented, all members are fairly treated so that they feel that all of them equally benefit from the organizational advantages. In such an organization, employees feel a special bond among themselves and realize that the organization satisfy their needs. They are also sure that their rights are not violated, so that everybody can benefit from his or her efforts with no conflict; this leads to the spread of the organizational spirituality and integrity.

Results show that these hypotheses confirm the effects of the organizational spirituality on the organizational citizen behavior and organizational self-esteem. These findings are consistent with those of the Pirouzfar (2013), Rastegar et al. (2012), Baroda et al. (2012), Bntloo (2011), Rashvnd and Bharvar (2013), Affeldtand McDonald (2011), Ahmadi and Khodami (2011 ), Beheshtifar (2013), Milliman et al. (2003), Laei fan (2008). Results show that spirituality helps employee to behave based on the spiritual patterns and in this way they can control their behaviors, voluntarily play their role, are not under the pressure of their organizations, and experience a sense of empowerment. Due to the internal motivation of their behaviors, they try to satisfy their internal needs and in this way, they are more committed to do their organizational tasks. They help their co-workers in their problems and have spiritual goals for working instead of material ones and in this way, they feel self-value.
The results of this research confirm the hypotheses that ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate, and organizational justice have an indirect effect on the consequences of the organizational spirituality (organizational citizenship behavior and organization-based self-esteem). These findings are consistent with those of Bentlou (2011), Piklo et al. (2010), Yazdani et al. (2010), Stoen et al. (2012), Nazaripour et al. (2012), Attafaret al. (2013), Labharz (2014), Milliman et al. (2003), Mayer et al. (2011), Okar and Otken (2010), Yaghoubi et al. (2010), Lee (2013), Timothy et al. (2011), Gay Vance (2012), Mazloumi and Shahtalebi (2010), Karimiet al. (2010), Seattle (2012), Taheri and Soltani (2013), Khodaparast et al. (2012), Nickpour et al. (2011), Raminmehr et al. (2009), Kadarkhan (2012), Sayed Javadin et al. (2013), and Khorasani and KanaaniNayeri (2011), Ganglyng (2011), Rader (2012). These results show that if there is ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate and organizational justice in an organization, organizational spirituality is promoted and employees can identify and develop their ability and this leads to the job satisfaction and commitment. Employees in this organization satisfy their needs and feel valued.

Some limitations of this study include:

1- Using the self-report questionnaires for collecting data that these tools have their limitations.
2- This study used the structural equation modeling and cross-sectional measurements that does not prove the causation. Although the use of structural equation modeling approach provides the ability to obtain the causal references, but in this case cautious should be considered.

Therefore, this study recommends that organizational managers develop the organizational spirituality using the ethical leadership, transformational leadership, ethical climate, and organizational justice in an organization and increase the organizational citizenship behavior and organization-based self-esteem. Therefore, for selecting the employees, their spiritual and ethical features should be considered.
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