



---

## **Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment influence on job performance among academic staff**

AUTHOR(S)

James Campbell, Y S Hwa

PUBLICATION DATE

01-01-2014

HANDLE

[10536/DRO/DU:30069615](https://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30069615)

Downloaded from Deakin University's Figshare repository

Deakin University CRICOS Provider Code: 00113B

# DRO

Deakin University's Research Repository

## This is the published version

Campbell,JK and Hwa,YS 2014, Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment influence on job performance among academic staff, Jurnal pengurusan, vol. 40, pp. 115-123.

## Available from Deakin Research Online

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30069615>

Every reasonable effort has been made to ensure that permission has been obtained for items included in Deakin Research Online. If you believe that your rights have been infringed by this repository, please contact [drosupport@deakin.edu.au](mailto:drosupport@deakin.edu.au)

**Copyright:** 2014, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

## Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Commitment Influence on Job Performance among Academic Staff

(Pengaruh Kerohanian di Tempat Kerja dan Komitmen Organisasi terhadap Prestasi Kerja dalam Kalangan Staf Akademik)

James Kennedy Campbell  
(Faculty of Arts and Education, Deakin University)  
Yen Siew Hwa  
(School of Distance Education, Universiti Sains Malaysia)

### ABSTRACT

*This study examines the relationships between spirituality in the workplace, organizational commitment and job performance measured in terms of key performance indicators (KPIs) based on a sample of 376 academic staff at Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM). The methods used in the study are factor analysis and multiple regression analysis. Three factors are found to explain organizational commitment: affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment. Affective and normative commitments are positively influenced by workplace spirituality, which is explained by three factors: alignment between organizational and individual values; sense of enjoyment at work and contribution to community; and opportunity for inner life. The study also finds that neither high commitment nor workplace spirituality among academic staff necessarily manifest in high KPIs. Instead, other staff background variables appear to have more influence on job performance, such as gender, stream, age and rank.*

*Keywords: Workplace spirituality; job performance; key performance indicators; affective commitment; continuance commitment; normative commitment*

### ABSTRAK

*Kajian ini menguji hubungan antara kerohanian di tempat kerja dan komitmen organisasi dengan prestasi kerja yang diukur dalam bentuk indikator penilaian prestasi (KPIs) berdasarkan responden seramai 376 orang staf akademik di Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM). Kaedah kajian yang digunakan adalah analisis faktor dan analisis regresi berganda. Kami memperoleh tiga faktor yang menerangkan komitmen organisasi: komitmen afektif, komitmen berterusan dan komitmen normatif. Komitmen afektif dan komitmen normatif dipengaruhi secara positif oleh kerohanian di tempat kerja yang dapat diterangkan oleh tiga faktor: keselarasan antara nilai organisasi dengan nilai individu; keseronokan bekerja dengan sumbangan kepada masyarakat; dan peluang untuk mencapai kerohanian hidup. Dapatan kajian kami juga menunjukkan bahawa komitmen dan kerohanian yang tinggi di tempat kerja dalam kalangan staf akademik tidak semestinya akan menyumbang kepada KPIs. Sebaliknya, latar belakang staf seperti jantina, aliran, umur dan pangkat didapati mempunyai pengaruh yang lebih tinggi terhadap prestasi kerja mereka.*

*Kata kunci: Kerohanian tempat kerja; prestasi kerja; indikator penilaian prestasi; komitmen afektif; komitmen berterusan; komitmen normatif*

### INTRODUCTION

The desire of public policy makers to have available to them measurable and verifiable data concerning productivity and outcomes within their institutions has been a growing concern among managers and staff in universities worldwide. The trend towards audits and accountability that now dominates the higher education sector is part of the growth of an 'audit culture' and the increasing need of higher educational institutions to evaluate the productivity of staff (Anderson 1999). The desire to audit and evaluate performance has generated considerable debate within higher educational institutions about the hidden or unintended consequences of simply judging performance through easily measurable metrics and indices. Key performance indicators (KPIs) act as

motivational incentives for individuals in the workplace due to the perceived benefits and 'punishments' that are accrued by individuals as a result of their measured performance. Underpinning the performance culture is the ethos of individualistic competition (Deem 1998; Alexander 2000; Barnetson & Cutright 2000; Theil & Leeuw 2002; Blackman et al. 2006).

The reduction of the value of our work in organizations to individually accrued performance metrics arguably reinforces egotism and individual competition in the workplace. This is seen by the advocates of performance metrics as a key stimulus to productivity. Competition, which is generated by a desire to advance career and status through high KPI achievement, is viewed by supporters of the KPI culture as a way to overcome lethargy and generate productivity in the workplace

(Nickell 1996; Arokiasamy 2011; Marginson & Wende 2007). Such a view is encapsulated in Richard Cave's remark that "economists have a 'vague suspicion that competition is the enemy of sloth'" (Nickell 1996). KPIs are rapidly changing the value structure and ethos framework of higher educational institutions. Bleikle (1998: 308) makes the following argument in respect to this change:

...the notion of academic performance is redefined from one which emphasizes its 'inherent' quality to one in which measurable quantitative aspects are prominent. ... Performance indicators, such as number of candidates produced, books and articles published in respected journals, all provide simple standard information graspable by the meanest intelligence.

#### SPIRITUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE, ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND JOB PERFORMANCE

Interest in workplace spirituality as a scholarly topic has grown in recent years. Over the years, organizational studies have undergone a fundamental shift from a mechanistic paradigm that values rationality calculation and 'science' to a spiritual paradigm that values consciousness and understanding (Biberman & Whitty 1997). Is this contemporary interest in workplace spirituality informed by a genuine interest in understanding the importance and depth of the spiritual dimension of work? Or is it just another way to harness our deepest beliefs in the service of organizational productivity? (Kamoche & Pinnington 2012).

The spiritual paradigm essentially recognizes that people work not only with their hands, but also their hearts or spirit (Ashmos & Duchon 2000). Mitroff and Denton (1999) argue that people only bring their arms and brains to work, not their souls in many of today's organizations. The consequence of failing to recognize the spiritual side of individuals in the workplace is that organizations that fail to recognize such spiritual dimensions do not trigger the full creativity and potential of their employees. Employees, in turn, do not succeed in developing themselves as holistic human beings.

Spirituality at work is not necessarily about religion or about converting people to a specific belief system (Laabs 1995; Cavanagh 1999). Furthermore, spirituality does not necessarily involve a connection to any specific religious tradition, but can be based upon broader personal values and philosophy. The concept of spirituality focuses upon employees who view themselves as spiritual beings whose souls need nourishment at work; who experience a sense of purpose and meaning in their work; and a sense of connectedness to one another and to their workplace community (Mitroff & Denton 1999; Ashmos & Duchon 2000; Harrington et al. 2001; Milliman et al. 2003). The distinction between the realm of spirituality and religion, which characterizes the literature in this area, is problematic even though it allows theorists to focus on substantive feelings of spiritual engagement without engaging particular religious issues. Spirituality within

the current discourse of organizational management easily conflates with a Westernized ethos of self-expression and 'empowerment'; and secular spirituality (Toit 2006). Zinnbauer, Pargament and Scott (1999: 202) clearly identify the distinction drawn between spirituality and religion:

Religiousness and spirituality have acquired specific valences in popular and scientific writings. In effect, spirituality is credited with embodying the loftier side of life and the highest in human potential, whereas religiousness is denigrated as mundane faith or as institutional hindrances to these potentials.

However, other authors argue against the imposition of a distinction between spirituality and religion at workplace. Hicks (2003) claims that effective leaders should create an environment for employees to express their own religion and to respect the religious beliefs of others. DeJongh (2011) argues that the roots of spirituality lie primarily in religious traditions and, thus, views religion and spirituality as interconnected and overlapping. According to King (2008), removing religion from research on spirituality in the workplace is problematic.

Ashmos and Duchon (2000) conceptualize spirituality at work as involving recognition of the inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community. They also flag that a genuinely learning organization with a holistic understanding of the person at work will not only encourage the development of an individual's IQ and emotional intelligence, but also of the individual's spirit. Although no widely accepted definition of workplace spirituality exists (Kinjerski & Skrypnik 2006), there appears to be an emerging consensus that spirituality is a multifaceted construct concerned with finding a connection to something meaningful that transcends our ordinary lives (Mitroff & Denton 1999; Dehler & Welsh 2003; Tepper 2003). Organizations with a greater sense of workplace spirituality outperform those with little or no spirituality (Lloyd 1990). Additionally, such organizations grow faster; increase efficiencies; and have higher rates of return than organizations low in spirituality (Jurkiewicz & Giacalone 2004).

According to this line of argument, managers can promote organizational commitment and individual and organizational performance by improving the spiritual environment (Rego & Cunha 2008). As indicated above, this motivation, while understandable from the perspective of managers, is potentially troubling since it suggests that spirituality is only significant in as much as it aids work productivity. Surely spirituality is important in itself and not simply as a supporting element for organizational productivity.

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), commitment to an organization can be divided into three essential types: affective commitment, normative commitment and continuance commitment. Affective commitment develops when the staff recognizes the value and relevance of

their identities as an aspect of their association with the university (Mowday et al. 1974; O'Reilly & Chatman 1986). Identity in the present discussion is critical since affective commitments are strongly related to the sense of personal identity; and notions of who we are and what we value.

Affective commitment among academic staff is accentuated when the staff feel that the organization respects and supports them. The development of affective commitment is reinforced and expressed through social interactions; social recognition; and day-to-day functioning of social capital in the workplace. Normative commitment develops and is inculcated when the staff internalize the university's norms and values through day-to-day socialization and engagement. Through socialization in the workplace, certain benefits are received by staff – some tangible and others intangible – that incline the staff to feel the need to reciprocate and internalize the values and norms of the organization. Continuance commitment places emphasis on staff recognition of the costs of staying with or leaving the university and basing their commitment solely on this calculation (Rego & Cunha 2008). Existing studies demonstrate the significant impact of commitment to performance (e.g., Siders et al. 2001; Brown et al. 2011; Qaisar et al. 2012).

The critical question that arises from the above discussion concerns how spirituality actually impacts commitment and fundamental performance cultures in an organization. Spirituality is recognized as potentially contributing to organizational stability and sustainability of performance through the manner in which it influences affective and normative commitments to an organization. How individuals relate to each other within an organization is also based upon affective and normative commitments. Spirituality has important effects on commitment, which effects trust and cooperative culture within an organization.

Spirituality is an expression of human experience at its deepest level. Spirituality can reduce stress; conflict; absenteeism; enhance work performance (Krahnke et al. 2003); employee well-being; and quality of life (Karakas 2010). Spirituality is connected to various issues, including finding meaning in work; honesty; trust; shared vision; integrity; and interconnectedness with other employees and the organization (Mitroff & Denton 1999; Burack 1999; Butts 1999). Workplace spirituality is meaningful at both the individual and the organizational levels of analysis (Kolodinsky et al. 2008; Pawar 2008). At the individual level, spirituality is an affective and cognitive experience: an employee feels and believes in a spiritual connection to work and the work place. At the organizational level, spirituality can be seen as a reflection of values that is part of the organization's culture and is thus used to inform behavior; decision-making; and resource allocation (Kolodinsky et al. 2008). Furthermore, the findings of Kolodinsky et al. (2008) support the existence of relationships between spirituality at work and satisfaction, employee feelings of frustration,

job involvement and organizational identification in the workplace. Moreover, Pawar (2008, 2009) suggests that workplace spirituality can be encouraged at both the individual and organizational levels.

The spill-over effect from workplace spirituality into personal/family life may be expected to enhance satisfaction with family, marriage, leisure activities and social interactions, which enable people to live integrated lives (Pfeffer 2003). The ability to live and integrated life may, in turn, improve the organizational commitment and work performance of the individual (Bromet et al. 1990; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone 2004). Duchon and Plowman (2005) find that work unit performance at medical units is associated with work unit spirituality. Fry and Slocum (2008) argue that workplace spirituality can produce positive outcomes for employees (e.g., better health and psychological well-being) and the organization (e.g., employee commitment and greater productivity). Workplace spirituality is also found to have a positive influence on affective commitment among nurses and nurses' performance outcomes (Kazemipour, Mohamad Amin & Pourseidi 2012). Other studies demonstrating that workplace spirituality contributes to commitment and organizational performance include Milliman et al. (1999); Benefiel (2003); Sanders, Hopkins and Geroy (2003); Garcia-Zamor (2003); and Rego et al. (2007).

The objective of the present study is to examine the influence of workplace spirituality and organizational commitment on job performance. From literature reviewed and the assessment of contemporary research, the present study expects to find higher spirituality at work to increase normative and affective commitment. The study also examines whether higher organizational commitment leads to higher job performance, which is measured in the form of KPIs.

## METHODS

The present study involves 376 academic staff from three campuses of Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM): the Main Campus, the Engineering Campus and the Health Campus. The sample size of 350 is chosen based upon the population size at a precision level of 5% and confidence interval (CI) of 95%. The random stratification of academic staff is performed based upon the number of academic staff at each campus and further sampling within the schools is considered based upon rank (e.g., the classification of an academic as a professor, associate professor, senior lecturer or lecturer).

As shown in Table 1, the mean age among the academic staff at USM is 43.2 years, while the minimum age is 24 years and the maximum is 65 years. Approximately 54 percent of the academic staff are male. Meanwhile, 62.8 percent of the academic staff are from the Science stream and 37.2 percent are from the Arts stream. About 25.7 percent of the total academic staff interviewed has been working at the university for more than 16 years;

36.7 percent less than 5 years; 26.3 percent between 6 to 10 years and 11.3 percent between 11 and 15 years. The majority of the staff are senior lecturers (56.6%), while 6.9 percent are professors; 25.2 percent are associate professors; and 11.3 percent are lecturers.

TABLE 1. Descriptive Statistics

Age (n = 365)	Mean = 43.2 years	Minimum	Maximum
		24 years	65 years
		Frequency	Percent
Gender (n = 370)	Male	201	54.3
	Female	169	45.7
Stream (n = 376)	Arts	140	37.2
	Science	236	62.8
Rank (n = 373)	Professor	26	6.9
	Assoc. Professor	94	25.2
	Senior Lecturer	211	56.6
	Lecturer	42	11.3
Years Working (n = 373)	Less than 5 years	137	36.7
	6-10 years	98	26.3
	11-15 years	42	11.3
	more than 16 years	96	25.7

## FACTOR ANALYSIS

Organizational commitment is measured based upon a modified version of an instrument previously developed and validated by Rego and Souto (2004). The instrument includes 11 items with five-Likert scales, instead of the 14 seven-point scales provided in the original instrument that measure effective, normative and continuance commitment. A factor analysis is performed to test

the three-factor model. The spirituality at workplace dimension is measured by 18 items on a five-Likert scale and is based upon various sources, including Rego and Cunha (2008) and Milliman et al. (2003). The major indicators emphasized by Rego and Cunha (2008) are sense of community; alignment with organizational values; sense of contribution to society; enjoyment at work; and opportunities for inner life. Milliman et al. (2003) place emphasis on sense of community, organizational values and meaningful work, which are very much aligned with the first three indicators of Rego and Cunha (2008). An earlier study by Ashmos and Duchon (2000) analyzes spirituality at workplace on three levels: individual, work-team and organization. At the individual level, the factors include conditions for community; meaning at work; inner life; block to spirituality; personal responsibility; and positive connections with other individuals. At the work-team level, the factors extracted are work-unit community and positive work-unit values, whereas organizational values and individual and the organization are extracted for the organizational level. The analysis factors out three indicators: alignment with organizational values; sense enjoyment at work and contribution to community; and opportunities for inner life.

The 11 commitment items and 18 workplace spirituality items are subjected to principal component analysis (PCA) after the suitability of data for factor analysis is tested. The correlation matrix amongst the items showed most of the coefficients are 0.3 and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin values are 0.778 for commitment components and 0.898 for spirituality at workplace components, which exceed the recommended

TABLE 2. Commitments (factor loadings and communalities)

	Affective	Component Normative	Communalities	Continuance
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this school.	.860			.749
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this university.	.830			.706
I have a strong affection for this school.	.865			.767
I have a strong affection for this university.	.796			.679
I feel like "part of the family" at my school.	.758			.666
I feel like "part of the family" at my university.	.666			.567
Even if it were to my advantage, it would not be right to leave my university now.		.846		.768
I would not leave my university right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.		.865		.797
If I got another offer for a better job elsewhere, I would not feel it was right to leave my university.		.850		.767
I remain in this university because I feel that it would not be easy to enter into another organization.			.839	.719
I remain in this university because leaving it would imply great personal sacrifices.			.842	.728
KMO and Bartlett's Test for Commitment Components				.778
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy				.898
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square			2330.743
	Df			55
	Sig.			.000

value of 0.6 (Kaiser 1970, 1974). Furthermore, the Barlett’s test for commitment components and spirituality components are also significant (Bartlett 1954), which supports the factorability of the correlation matrix.

PCA indicates three components for both models with Eigen values greater than 1. Varimax rotation is used to facilitate the interpretation of factor loadings and coefficients are used to obtain factor scores for the selected factors.

The items are selected to explain the components in Tables 2 and 3 after removing other items with loadings less than 0.4; and those items with cross loadings. For all commitment items are maintained, while 6 social capital items are removed. Item communalities are considered ‘high’ if they are all 0.8 or greater, but such values are difficult to obtain in relation to real data (Velicer & Fava 1998). In social science studies, moderate communalities values of 0.5640 and 0.70 are common and acceptable. A communality value of less than 0.40 may suggest that the item does not relate to the other items in the same factor. Communalities for both commitment and spirituality at workplace components are within the range of 0.40 to 0.80, which indicates that all of the items in each factor are related.

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Table 4 presents the results of the regression analyses indicating how the three organizational commitments

components can be explained by the spirituality at workplace components. Alignment with organizational values; sense of enjoyment at work; contribution to community; and opportunities for inner life tend to contribute to greater affective and normative commitments. Sense of enjoyment at work and contribution to community appear to have a significant negative impact on continuance commitment. However, the ‘alignment between individual and organizational values’ component is found to have a significant positive impact on continuance commitment. The significance of affective and normative commitment to organizational performance over the long term is an important aspect of organizational theory and research. Affective commitment relates to emotional aspects of commitment, while normative commitment related to the feelings of obligation towards the organization. Extant literature strongly supports the link between these two indicators of organizational commitment and overall and long term job performance.

Job performance measured in terms of KPIs in the present study measures the tangible outputs produced by the academic staff. Such output includes publications; supervision of post graduate students; research; innovation; and consultancy. As shown in Table 5, the analysis indicates that KPIs are not dependent upon any of the commitment dimensions or spirituality at workplace. The finding contradicts existing research that shows a significant influence of those dimensions

TABLE 3. Spirituality at workplace (factor loadings and communalities)

	Alignment between Organizational & Individual values	Components Sense of Enjoyment at Work & Contribution to Community	Opportunity for Inner Life	Communalities
I feel that the colleagues of my school care about each other.	.879			.810
I feel that the colleagues of my school support each other.	.843			.790
People in my school feel as if they were part of a family.	.814			.715
I feel that the colleagues of my school are linked by a common purpose.	.811			.672
My school promotes the creation of a spirit of community.	.778			.635
I feel positive about the values prevailing in my university.	.671			.556
People feel good about their future with the university.	.613			.401
I experience joy in my work.		.830		.733
Most days, I feel joy when coming to work.		.826		.664
When working, I feel helpful for the whole society.		.808		.732
I see a connection between my work and the larger social good of my community.		.806		.716
My work is connected with what I think is important in life.		.788		.715
In my workplace, there is room for my spirituality.			.897	.804
My spiritual values are valued in my workplace.			.848	.782
I enjoy a work/life balance in my current job.			.741	.570
KMO and Bartlett’s Test for Spirituality at Workplace				
Components				
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy				.898
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity		Approx. Chi-Square		4778.492
		Df.		153
		Sig.		0.000

TABLE 4. Regression analysis: how spirituality at workplace explains organizational commitment

Predictive variables	Criterion Variables		
	Affective Commitment	Normative Commitment	Continuance Commitment
Alignment between Org. & Individual values	0.450*** (0.000)	0.295*** (0.000)	0.143*** (0.008)
Sense of Enjoyment at Work & Contribution to Community	0.428*** (0.000)	0.103** (0.046)	-0.127** (0.020)
Opportunity for Inner Life	0.247*** (0.000)	0.127** (0.013)	0.042 (0.433)
Stream	0.002 (0.966)	0.024 (0.646)	-0.013 (0.814)
Age	0.040 (0.503)	0.056 (0.457)	-0.033 (0.681)
Gender	0.031 (0.467)	-0.082 (0.124)	0.101 (0.072)
Prof	-0.002 (0.971)	0.109 (0.078)	-0.010 (0.879)
Assoc. Prof	0.045 (0.374)	0.063 (0.322)	0.036 (0.592)
Working Experience			
6-10 years	0.034 (0.480)	-0.016 (0.791)	-0.010 (0.879)
11-15 years	-0.034 (0.477)	-0.023 (0.695)	-0.066 (0.295)
More than 16 years	0.052 (0.460)	-0.157 (0.076)	0.052 (0.577)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.465	0.156	0.056
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.448	0.128	0.026
F	26.497	5.637	1.823
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.049
Tolerance	0.322 – 0.977	0.322 – 0.977	0.322 – 0.977
VIF	1.023 – 3.107	1.023 – 3.107	1.023 – 3.107

Note: Asterisks \*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.

on job performance (e.g., Sanders et al. 2003; Garcia-Zamor 2003; Rego & Cunha 2008; Allen & Meyer 2000). Instead of commitment components or spirituality at workplace, staff background variables appear to have more influence on KPIs, such as gender, age, stream, rank and years of working with the university. Model B

in Table 5 indicates that male academic staff have 21.6% higher KPIs compared to female staff. Academic staff in the Arts stream produce 18% higher KPIs than Academic staff from the Science stream. The outcome contradicts the common belief that staff from the Science stream are able to more easily publish than staff from the Arts

TABLE 5. KPIs model

Predictive Variable: LnKPIs	Criterion Variables (Model A)	Criterion Variables (Model B)
Affective Commitment	-0.036 (0.623)	0.017(0.672)
Normative Commitment	-0.025 (0.675)	0.006 (0.885)
Continuance Commitment	-0.073 (0.166)	-0.068 (0.951)
Alignment between Organizational & Individual values	0.066 (0.326)	-
Sense of Enjoyment at Work & Contribution to Community	0.056 (0.367)	-
Opportunity for Inner Life	-0.021 (0.704)	-
Stream (Arts/Science)	-0.121** (0.024)	-0.180** (0.026)
Age	-0.179** (0.019)	-0.020*** (0.003)
Gender	-0.152*** (0.005)	-0.216*** (0.007)
Professor	0.233*** (0.000)	0.596*** (0.001)
Assoc. Professor	0.339*** (0.000)	0.448*** (0.000)
Work Experience:		
6-10 years	0.127** (0.041)	0.183* (0.076)
11-15 years	0.040 (0.507)	0.205 (0.141)
More than 16 years	0.132 (0.145)	0.342** (0.022)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.190	0.157
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.154	0.125
F	5.256	5.140
p-value	0.000	0.000
Tolerance	0.319 – 0.942	0.323 – 0.979
VIF	1.061 – 3.139	1.021 – 3.099

Note: Asterisks \*, \*\* and \*\*\* indicate significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels, respectively.



stream. The finding could be attributable to the fact that 75 of the respondents are from the medical schools and are categorized under Science stream.

It is not surprising that professors contribute approximately 59.6% higher KPIS compared to senior lecturers and lecturers. Meanwhile, associate professors contribute approximately 44.8% higher KPIS compared to senior lecturers and lecturers. The conclusion can also be drawn that professors contribute approximately 15% higher KPIS compared to associate professors. As for the influence of number of years working with the university on KPIS, staff with 6-10 years and 11-15 years of work experience do not appear to have a significant influence on contribution to KPIS compared to staff who have only served 5 years or less. Staff that have served 16 years or more contribute approximately 34.2% higher KPIS compared to staff that have only served 5 years or less. However, the finding does not mean that older staff could contribute more. As shown in Table 5, age is negatively related to KPIS, indicating that KPIS reduce as academic staff get older.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The findings show a significant positive relationship between all the three spirituality components with normative and affective commitment. The results also indicate a negative relationship between sense of enjoyment at work and contribution to community with continuance commitment. These results support findings in extant literature from a diverse range of researchers. For example, Rego and Cunha (2008: 68-69) find that:

People denote higher affective and normative commitment and lower continuance commitment when they experience a sense of community in their work teams, feel that their values are aligned with those of the organization, consider that they do meaningful and helpful work, experience enjoyment at work and consider that the organization gives them opportunities for their inner life.

The positive impact that spirituality appears to have on normative and affective commitment in the present study does not significantly challenge the mainstream literature in the field. However, several interesting aspects of the present study stand out. First, inner life is positively correlated with affective and normative commitment, but has no significant effect on continuance commitment. Second, a potentially interesting aspect of the results relates to the negative relationship between sense of enjoyment at work and contribution to community and continuance commitment. This is the point where the empathy oriented component of spirituality is most at odds with the instrumental and calculative values that underlie continuance commitment. In other words, the social empathic dimension of spirituality and the personal sense of joy people get from their work seems most at odds with purely calculative norms that underpin

continuance commitment. If continuance commitment is desired to be reduced in higher educational institutions, it may be useful to take a close look at increasing the sense of enjoyment at work and the sense of engagement with the community among the academic staff.

The key point to be made is that the community or empathic oriented components of spirituality have a negative correlation with the purely calculative continuance commitment. Finally, alignment with the values of the organization has a positive correlation with affective, normative and continuance commitment. The fact that a positive correlation between alignment with organizational norms is found and all three factors of commitment tends to indicate that no necessary diminution of affective and normative commitment exist even given the positive correlation with continuance commitment. In regards to alignment with organizational values, no crowding out of affective and normative commitment by strong showing of continuance commitment exists. This may be due to the fact that alignment with organizational values is potentially a more superficial spiritual dimension than personal enjoyment and community contribution dimensions. One can have a superficial sense that one's values and the values of the organization are aligned. However, the substantive meaning of work to individuals may be found at the deeper more embedded level of personal enjoyment and a genuine sense of contribution to real community.

The findings suggest that no relationship exists between gaining high KPIS and the levels of spirituality in the workplace and commitment. There are limits to what KPIS actually measure and the difficulty of measuring intangibles, such as spirituality and commitment, in regards to performance does not necessarily mean that intangible values in the workplace are unimportant. Reducing the understanding of performance to quantifiable and numerically KPIS may manifest in an easy dismissal of the intangible values in the spiritual dimension and commitment to work. High spirituality and commitment among USM staff may be critical to understanding long term organizational growth and stability, despite both factors not manifesting in measurable performance indicators. The generation of sustainable values within an organization can only be realized through normative and affective commitment among the staff. Therefore, the interest in spirituality and commitment is part of a deeper and more fundamental interest in the overall nature of organizational work and productivity. Normative and affective commitment generates loyalty in an organization. Performances that draw upon these factors have a deeper and 'thicker' characteristic that reinforces long term organizational health. Extant research tends to support such an argument (e.g., Cote & Latham 2006; Beer 2009). To what extent does an organization rely on the generation of strong commitments and values as bases for long term development of performance? This issue is significant,

especially given the public oriented value system and philosophy of USM (Razak 2009; Campbell 2010).

Spirituality is a critical and centrally important dimension to workplace commitment and well-being. The fact that contemporary performance metrics do not capture intangible dimensions does not suggest that intangibles, such as spirituality, are irrelevant, but demonstrates the rather limited and overly narrow focus of the performance metrics. Finding ways to embed intangibles into how performance is understood is central to sustaining and recognizing the spiritual and moral dimensions to work. Organizations that recognize and value the spiritual dimension to work provide a more meaningful, humane and sustainable environment for staff. These holistic characteristics should provide a more balanced measure to judge 'performance' in an organization.

#### REFERENCES

- Alexander, F.K. 2000. The changing face of accountability: Monitoring and assessing institutional performance in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education* 71: 411-31.
- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. 1990. The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63: 1-18.
- Anderson, P. 1999. *The Origins of Postmodernity*. London: Verso.
- Arokiasamy, A.R.A. 2011. An Analysis of globalization and higher education in Malaysia. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research* 1: 73-81.
- Ashmos, D.P. & Duchon, D. 2000. Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 9: 134-44.
- Barnetson, B. & Cutright, M. 2000. Performance indicators as conceptual technologies. *Higher Education* 40: 277-92.
- Bartlett, M.S. 1954. A note on the multiplying factors for various chi square approximations. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society* 16: 296-98.
- Beer, M. 2009. *High Commitment, High Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Benefiel, M. 2003. Mapping the terrain of spirituality in organizations research. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 16(4): 367-77.
- Biberman, J. & Whitty, M. 1997. A postmodern spiritual future for work. *Journal of Organizational Change and Management* 10: 130-38.
- Bleiklie, I. 1998. Justifying the evaluative state: New Public management ideals in higher education. *European Journal of Education* 33: 299-316.
- Bromet, E.J., Dew, A. & Parkinson, D.K. 1990. Spillover between work and family: A study of blue-collar working wives. In *Stress Between Work and Family*, edited by J. Eckenrode & S. Gore, 133-52. London: Plenum.
- Brown, S., Jolian, M., Robert, M. & Karl, T. 2011. Workplace performance, worker commitment and loyalty. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* 20(3): 925-955.
- Burack, E.H. 1999. Spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Change Management Science* 12: 280-91.
- Butts, D. 1999. Spirituality at work: An overview. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12: 328-31.
- Campbell, J. 2010. Universiti Sains Malaysia and looking to Malaysian tradition for guidance. *Bulletin of Higher Education Research* 15: 4-6.
- Cavanagh, G.F. 1999. Spirituality for managers: Context and critique. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12: 186-99.
- Cote, J. & Latham, C.K. 2006. Trust and commitment: Intangible drivers of interorganizational performance. In *Advances in Management Accounting* 15, edited by J.Y. Lee & M.J. Epstein, 293-325. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Deem, R. 1998. New Managerialism' and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education* 8: 47-70.
- Dehler, G.E. & Welsh, M.A. 2003. The experience of work: Spirituality and the New workplace. In *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*, edited by R.A. Giacalone & C.L. Jurkiewicz, 108-122. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- DeJongh, E. 2011. *Responding to the Situation: A Study of Spirituality in Organizations*. Leidschendam, Netherlands: Quist Publishing.
- Duchon, D. & Plowman, D.A. 2005. Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly* 16: 835-862.
- Fry, L.W. & Slocum J.J.W. 2008. Maximizing the triple bottom line through spiritual leadership. *Organizational Dynamics* 37(1): 86-96.
- Garcia-Zamor, J. 2003. Workplace spirituality and organizational performance. *Public Administration Review* 63(3): 355-63.
- Harrington, W.J., Preziosi, R.C. & Gooden, D.J. 2001. Perceptions of workplace spirituality among professionals and executives. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal* 13: 155-63.
- Hicks, D.A. 2003. *Religion and the Workplace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jurkiewicz, C.L. & Giacalone, R.A. 2004. A values framework for measuring the impact of workplace spirituality on organizational performance. *Journal of Business Ethics* 49: 129-42.
- Kaiser, H. 1974. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika* 39: 31-36.
- Kaiser, H. 1970. A second generation little jiffy. *Psychometrika* 35: 401-15.
- Kamoche, K. & Pinnington, A.H. 2012. Managing people 'spiritually': A bourdieusian critique. *Work Employment and Society* 26: 497-513.
- Karakas, F. 2010. Spirituality and performance in organizations: A literature review. *Journal of Business Ethics* 94: 89-106.
- Kazemipour F., Mohamad Amin S. & Pourseidi, B. 2012. Relationship between workplace spirituality and organizational citizenship behavior among nurses through mediation of affective organizational commitment. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship* 44(3): 302-310.
- King, J.E. 2008. (Dis)missing the obvious: Will mainstream management research ever take religion seriously? *Journal of Management Inquiry* 17: 214-224.
- Kinjerski, V.M. & Skrypnek, B.J. 2006. Creating organizational conditions that foster employee spirit at work. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 27: 280-95.
- Kolodinsky, R.W., Giacalone, R.A. & Jurkiewicz, C.L. 2008. Workplace values and out-comes: Exploring personal,

- organizational, and interactive workplace spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics* 81: 465-80.
- Krahnke, K., Giacalone, R.A. & Jurkiewicz, C.L. 2003. Point-counterpoint: Measuring workplace spirituality. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 16: 396-405.
- Laabs, J.J. 1995. Balancing spirituality and work. *Personnel Journal* 74: 60-69.
- Lloyd, T. 1990. *The Nice Company*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Marginson, S. & Wende, M.V.D. 2007. Globalisation and higher education. In *Secondary Globalisation and Higher Education*, edited by Secondary, 1-85. Paris.
- Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A.J. & Ferguson, J. 2003. Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 16: 426-47.
- Milliman, J., Ferguson, J., Trickett, D. & Condemni, B. 1999. Spirit and community at Southwest Airlines: An investigation of a spiritual values-based model. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 12(3): 221 - 233
- Mitroff, I.A. & Denton, E.A. 1999. A study of spirituality in the workplace. *Sloan Management Review* 40: 83-84
- Mowday, R., Porter, L. & Durbin, R. 1974. Unit performance, situational factors and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 12: 231-48.
- Nickell, S.J. 1996. Competiton and corporate performance. *The Journal of Political Economy* 104: 724-46.
- O'Reilly, C. & Chatman, J. 1986. Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification and internalization on prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 71: 492-99.
- Pawar, B.S. 2008. Two approaches to workplace spirituality facilitation: A comparison and implications. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 29: 544-67.
- Pawar, B.S. 2009. Workplace spirituality facilitation: A comprehensive model. *Journal of Business Ethics* 90: 375-86.
- Pfeffer, J. 2003. Business and the spirit: Management practices that sustain values. In *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*, edited by R.A. Giacalone & C.L. Jurkiewicz, 29-45. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Qaisar Muhammad Usman, Muhammad Safdar Rehman & Muhammad Suffyan. 2012. Exploring effects of organizational commitment on employee performance: Implications for human resource strategy. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 3: 248-55.
- Razak, D.A. 2009. USM Apex university status: Transforming higher education for a sustainable tommorrow. *Malaysian Journal of Medical Sciences* 16: 1-6.
- Rego, A. & Cunha, M.P.E. 2008. Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: An empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 21: 53-75.
- Rego, A., Cunha, M.P.E. & Solange, S. 2007. Workplace spirituality, commitment, and self-reported individual performance. *Management Research* 5: 163-83.
- Rego, A. & Souto, S. 2004. Comprometimento organizacional em organizações autênticas (organizational commitment in authentic organizations)”, *Revista de Administração de Empresas (Brasil)* 44(3): 30-43.
- Sanders, J.E. III, Hopkins, W.E. & Geroy, G.D. 2003. From transactional to transcendental: toward and integrated theory of leadership. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 9: 21-31.
- Siders, M.A., George, G. & Dharwadkar, R. 2001. The relationship of internal and external commitment foci to objective job performance measures. *Academy of Management Journal for General Philosophy of Science / Zeitschrift für allgemeine Wissenschaftstheorie* 44: 570-79.
- Blackman, T., Greene, A., Hunter, D.J., McKee, L., Elliott, E., Harrington, B.E., Marks, L., & Williams, G. 2006. Performance assessment and wicked problems: The case of health inequalities. *Public Policy and Administration* 21: 66-80.
- Tepper, B. 2003. Organizational citizenship behavior and the spiritual employee. In *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*, edited by R. Giacalone & C. Jurkiewicz, 181-192. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Theil, S.V. & Francis L.L. 2002. The performance paradox in the public sector. *Public Performance & Management Review* 25: 267-81.
- Toit, C.W.du. 2006. Secular spirituality versus secular dualism: Towards postsecular holism as model for a natural theology. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 62: 1251-68.
- Velicer, W.F. & Fava, J.L. 1998. Effects of variable and subject sampling on factor pattern recovery. *Psychological Methods* 3: 231-51.
- Zimbauer, B.J., Kenneth I.P. & Allie B.S. 1999. The emerging meanings of religiousness and spirituality: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Personality* 67: 889-919.

James Kennedy Campbell  
Faculty of Arts and Education  
Deakin University  
Melbourne, AUSTRALIA.  
E-Mail: jamesca@deakin.edu.au

Yen Siew Hwa (corresponding author)  
School of Distance Education  
Universiti Sains Malaysia  
11800 USM Penang, MALAYSIA.  
E-Mail: shyen@usm.my

