

SPIRITUALITY AMONG THE PROFESSORIAL AT A PRIVATE UNIVERSITY IN LIMA, PERU

ESPIRITUALIDAD ENTRE EL PROFESORADO EN UNA UNIVERSIDAD PRIVADA EN LIMA, PERÚ

Dirk C. Gootjes Kasel*
Argosy University, Sarasota

César H. Limaymanta Álvarez**
Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas, Perú

Recibido: 14/10/15

Aceptado: 27/11/15

ABSTRACT

This study examined the professorial view of spirituality at a private university in Lima, Peru. A two-phase, sequential mixed method was used. Two hundred forty professors completed Paloutzian and Ellison's (1982) Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS) for the quantitative phase. Five research questions exploring the professors' gender, general area of teaching (humanities vs. sciences), highest university degree earned, age, and total years of university teaching experience were analyzed to determine if any significant differences existed within those variables. Two non-parametric tests were used: the Mann-Whitney U test and the Kruskal-Wallis Test. It was discovered only gender showed a significant difference. Five surveyed professors participated in the focus group phase exploring significant gender difference on the spiritual well-being scores. Five questions explored this difference between males and females. Four themes emerged: gender role enculturation, biological motherhood, stress, and internal strength.

Keywords: spirituality, spirituality in academia, professorial spirituality, gender spirituality.

RESUMEN

Este estudio examinó la opinión del profesorado sobre la espiritualidad en una universidad privada en Lima, Perú. Se utilizó el enfoque mixto secuencial y abarcó dos etapas. Para la fase cuantitativa 240 profesores completaron la escala de Bienestar Espiritual (SWBS) de Paloutzian y Ellison (1982). Se analizaron cinco preguntas de investigación que exploran 5 variables. Para conocer si existían diferencias significativas dentro de esas variables se utilizaron las pruebas no paramétricas U de Mann-Whitney y Kruskal-Wallis. Sólo el género mostró una diferencia significativa en las puntuaciones de bienestar espiritual. La fase cualitativa se dio por medio de

*mexbuds1@yahoo.com

**halley.vida@gmail.com

[RIDU]: Revista Digital de Investigación en Docencia Universitaria
Dic. 2015 - Año 9 - Nro.2 | LIMA (PERÚ)

un grupo de enfoque y participaron cinco profesores para explorar la diferencia de género. La diferencia entre hombres y mujeres se exploraron mediante cinco preguntas y emergieron cuatro temas: enculturación de género, maternidad biológica, estrés y fuerza interna.

Palabras clave: espiritualidad, espiritualidad en el mundo académico, espiritualidad del profesorado, espiritualidad por género.

INTRODUCTION

Most modern educational systems worldwide were founded on two guiding principles: the first was the intellectual culture of the Enlightenment and the second was the economic circumstances of the Industrial Revolution (Robinson, 2010). The Enlightenment's intellectual model of the mind was logical, objective, and firmly entrenched in Cartesian scientific skepticism.

A number of researchers have pointed out that the current academic environment in higher education has overlooked the spiritual in favor of the more traditionally acceptable academic qualities mentioned above. Abu-Febiri (2011) argued that "this privileging of rational and objective knowledge, skills and attitude set and the denial or rejection of emotions, morals, and spirit has been the fundamental operating principle of formal education" (p. 47). Yihong (2002) stated that the "fragmentation of knowledge and alienation of people is the general picture you see in the academic world" (p. 4). Incorporating spirituality into teaching has gone against over 200 years of educational institutionalization of the positivistic model. Speaking up can cause stress and value conflicts; many educators have feared for their jobs and thus have kept their spirituality and spiritual practices out of sight at work (Churchman, 2006; Winefield, Gillespie, Stough, Dua, Hapuarachchi, & Boyd, 2003).

According to Lindholm and Astin (2008), "From a research standpoint, with few

exceptions (see Astin & Astin, 1999; Braskamp, 2003), the empirical research on spirituality that has been conducted in higher education institutions has focused primarily on students, ignoring completely the experiences, attitudes, expectations, and behaviors of faculty" (p. 201). For this reason, the faculty voice regarding spirituality in the academic workplace was the problem to be explored. The purpose of this study was to examine the professoriate view of spirituality at a private university in Lima, Peru. The significance of this study was to offer a distinct perspective on spirituality in academia and fill a literature gap because little research in this area has been done in South America.

Four areas in the literature emerged that shed light on the challenge of studying spirituality in the academic workplace, or spirituality in academia (SIA): (a) the development of spirituality in the twentieth century, (b) the conceptual ambiguity of the construct of spirituality, (c) the modern spirituality at work (SAW) or workplace spirituality (WS) movement, and (d) the recent burgeoning research area of SIA, which is a branch of SAW/WS.

The first area to explore is the development of spirituality, which for the sake of brevity will be limited to the twentieth century even though it is understood that its scope is much greater. Shahjahan (2010) explained that "the word 'spirituality' emerged

in 17th century European culture and originated from the Latin word *spiritualitas*—meaning the breath of life” (p. 475). In the second half of the twentieth century, the construct of spirituality displayed two main characteristics: the Romantic Movement’s rejection of materialism and institutional forms of religion, and the emergence of psychology as a science that promoted a nonreligious conception of spirituality (Carrette & King, 2005). These authors argued that “this changing view of spirituality in modern capitalistic societies led many traditions, including Christianity, to demythologize by replacing the older cosmological and disciplinary language with the interiorized and psychologically inflected language of spirituality” (p. 43).

As the twentieth century progressed, American psychology movements (e.g., the views of William James and the humanistic psychology of Abraham Maslow) further distanced spirituality from religion (Shahjahan, 2010). Maslow’s language facilitated a “clear break between ‘spirituality’ and its institutional moorings, opening the space for ‘spirituality’ to be seen as secular rather than uniquely as a religious phenomenon” (Carrette & King, 2005, p. 75). It has also been pointed out that there is a binary opposition between spirituality and religion (viewing religion as ‘bad’ and spirituality as ‘good’) that permeates spirituality literature (Carrette & King, 2005; Miller, 2007). Shahjahan (2010) argued that “such a binary conception ignores the fact that both religion and spirituality are socially constructed terms that vary, depending on their social and historical context” (p. 478).

A second major shift in the construct of spirituality occurred in the 1980s; this was the period that saw spirituality move toward the privatization of religion and become a consumer product (Carrette & King, 2005).

In her analysis of New Age spiritual thinkers, Rindfleish (2005) found that these New Age authors “align themselves with consumptive behavior by secularizing, homogenizing and over-simplifying scientific, social scientific and traditional religious discourse and practices into ‘social products’ for consumption” (p. 343).

The second area to explore is the conceptual ambiguity of the construct of spirituality. Three challenges to defining spirituality will be discussed. One challenge to defining spirituality is its metaphysical nature. Griffin (1988) stated that “spirituality also alludes to the otherworldly or metaphysical realms” (p. 1). One cannot touch or observe spirituality; it is not part of the material world that can be measured and labeled by empirical scientific methods. Beringer (2000) wrote: “Even if religion is rejected in delineating spirituality, this must not be coterminous with rejecting the metaphysical” (p. 159). A second challenge to defining spirituality is its two meta-characteristics (Izak, 2009). First, its *openness* means there are so many possible definitions of spirituality, it is almost impossible to refine the term down to one sufficiently narrow yet all-encompassing working definition (Astin, 2004; de Jager Meezenbroek, Garssen, van den Berg, van Dierendonck, Visser, & Schaufeli, 2012; Izak, 2009). Second, the very undefinable nature of spirituality makes it a very indefinite notion. This *indefiniteness* of spirituality was Izak’s (2009) second meta-characteristic of spirituality. A third challenge to defining spirituality is its meaning is not static, but rather dynamic (Estanek, 2006; Izak, 2009; Mahoney & Graci, 1999). For example, Estanek (2006) did a qualitative literature review of spirituality to find out in what direction its definition was heading. She discovered that “the new literature on spirituality can be considered a new discourse, and that no one

definition of spirituality informs this emerging discourse” (p. 272).

Because of these challenges, the researcher cautiously decided to approach spirituality not as a definition, but rather as a description for understanding professoriate spirituality. Because of its broad scope, Astin’s (2004) description of spirituality was chosen as the working construct for this study. Please note this description does not mention religion, but does not preclude the existence of God, nor does it affirm or deny any personal belief or non-belief system in a deity or deities. Astin (2004) explains his view of spirituality:

Since the term covers a lot of territory and means different things to different people, there’s little point in trying to develop a precise definition. Instead, let me simply lay out the general territory and range of things that the word suggests to me. To begin with, spirituality points to our *interiors*, by which I mean our subjective life (as contrasted to the objective domain of observable behavior and material objects that you can point to and measure directly). In other words, the spiritual domain has to do with human *consciousness*—what we experience privately in our subjective awareness. Second, spirituality involves our qualitative or *affective* experiences at least as much as it does our reasoning or logic. More specifically, spirituality has to do with the values that we hold most dear, our sense of who we are and where we come from, our beliefs about why we are here—the meaning and purpose that we see in our work and our life—and our sense of connectedness to each other and to the world around us. Spirituality can also have to do with aspects of our experience that are not

easy to define or talk about, such things as intuition, inspiration, the mysterious, and the mystical. Within this very broad umbrella, virtually everyone qualifies as a spiritual being, and it’s my hope that everyone—regardless of their belief systems—can find some personal value and educational relevance in the concept. (p. 1)

The third area to explore is the rise of the modern spirituality at work (SAW) or workplace spirituality (WS) movement. Starting in the 2000s, Ashmos and Duchon (2000) described workplace spirituality as “the recognition that employees have an inner life that nourishes and is nourished by meaningful work that takes place in the context of community” (p. 137). The key tenets here are inner life, meaningful work, and a sense of community. Charoensukmongkol, Daniel, and Chatelain-Jardon (2013) explained that these three factors “have been deployed extensively by previous studies to measure spirituality in the workplace” (p. 4). In addition, Hayden, Barbuto, and Goertzen (2008) advocated Ashmos and Duchon’s workplace spirituality description because it comes close to being a usable definition.

There are mixed reports in the literature concerning SAW/WS. Negative arguments will be examined first followed by positive ones.

The first negative argument some authors have claimed is that SAW/WS has faced an uphill battle for legitimacy in the business world because modern organizations function in accordance to Cartesian-Newtonian systems (Gotsis & Kortezi, 2008). Second, some researchers have called into question the scientific rigor of previous positive spirituality at work research, calling it highly hypothetical (Giacalone, Krahnke, & Jurkiewicz, 2003) and marked by scarcity of empirical results (Rego &

Pina e Cunha, 2008). Third, some research has suggested that spirituality can cause negative effects on employees. Some accounts in the literature have found that the introduction of spirituality in the workplace can be a disturbance (Smith, 1996); a source of pathologic behavior (Forray & Stork, 2002); a disciplinary, patriarchal influence on employees (Nadesan, 1999); or cause mental isolation of workers in a spiritualized organization (Pratt, 2000). Fourth, other accounts in the literature have reported workplace spirituality can negatively affect the culture and climate of an organization. Bell and Taylor (2004) suggested that workplace spirituality could cause several negative effects on an organization like exercising control over employees, manipulating meaning, managing communication channels, suppressing resistance against, and gaining employee's acceptance of some corporate policies. Fifth, there have been accounts in the literature suggesting spirituality in the workplace can be detrimental to the bottom line. It has been suggested that implementing new spirituality policies could come at emotional and economic costs because it would require new training and development efforts (Polley, Vora, & SubbaNarasimha, 2005).

There are also positive arguments about SAW/WS in the literature. The following two paragraphs will examine macro (organizational) and then micro (individual) positive arguments.

Research has shown that organizational culture at the macro level can benefit from SAW/WS. Dandona (2013) concluded that "workplace spirituality plays a significant role in establishing a strong, well understood and encouraging positive organizational culture" (p. 6). Other research has demonstrated that SAW/WS can have benefits for organizational performance. Empirical studies (e.g., Geigle,

2012; Krishnakumar & Neck, 2002) have found that spirituality in organizations is "positively associated with productivity, reduced turnover, employee satisfaction, team performance, organizational commitment, creativity, and organizational performance" (Banyhamdan, Harrim, & Yahya Al-Qutop, 2012, p. 78). Third, research has shown that SAW/WS has had a positive effect on the bottom line, or financial success of organizations. Lips-Wiersma and Nilakant (2008) mentioned many companies that had started to work with a spiritual mindset and showed superior performance in key financial parameters.

Research has also shown that SAW/WS can positively affect the organization at the micro level. One area that SAW/WS improves is the inner lives of employees. Krishnakumar and Neck (2002) stated research evidence suggests that spirituality at the workplace could lead to benefits in the areas of creativity, honesty, trust, personal fulfillment, and organizational commitment. Second, spiritual practices in the workplace can also have positive outcomes on workers' personalities. For example, Mohamed, Wisnieski, Askar, and Syed, as cited in Marques, Dhiman, and King (2007), reported "four interesting advantages in their review of employees who maintain a spiritual mindset" (p. 24). As a brief summary, these authors discovered that the spiritually minded worker was more tolerant, less susceptible to stress, more open to a democratic style of leadership, and more likely to exhibit altruistic behavior and citizenship. Third, a worker's values, or ethical standards, can also improve because of SAW/WS. Issa and Pick (2010) discovered that spirituality can positively influence ethical behavior. Their research gathered the opinions of 223 members of the Australian service sector and found that these individuals agreed that "aesthetic judgment, spirituality,

optimism, harmony and balance, contentment, truth telling, individual responsibility, and professionalism” (p. 613) were integral factors for developing an ethical mindset at work. Fourth, emotional intelligence (EQ) is linked to SAW/WS. Charoensukmongkol et al. (2013) discovered that “emotional intelligence is associated positively and strongly with all three dimensions of workplace spirituality (conditions for community, meaningful work, and inner life)” (p. 3). Fifth, spirituality is related to leadership. Korac-Kakabadse, Kouzmin, and Kakabadse (2002) claimed that spirituality in leadership is “conceived as an awareness with individuals of a sense of connectedness that exists with their inner selves and the world (other people and the environment)” (p. 173). Pawar (2013) conducted an empirical research project that collected data from over 170 participants of an executive post-graduate program at a management institute in India. The study findings indicated “the significance of a leader’s individual spirituality in accounting for the leader’s spiritual behaviors toward subordinates” (p. 451).

The fourth area to explore is spirituality in the academic work setting, or spirituality in academia (SIA). This section will explore the negative and positive arguments for SIA in the literature.

There are a number of arguments in the literature against SIA. One negative argument is SIA has been viewed as incompatible with the prevailing empirical scientific mindset of higher education institutions (Riley, 2010). This author claimed that “although higher education plays a formative role in student development, the holistic adult development of faculty is often overlooked, especially the integral aspect of their spirituality” (p. 16). Palmer (2007) argued that in higher education “emotions are inimical to

objectivity and must be suppressed” (para. 18). A second negative argument against SIA is obstacles and barriers to implementing spirituality in higher education (Palmer, 1997, 1998, 2003; Zajonc, 2003). Astin and Astin (1999) studied the importance of meaning and spirituality in the lives of 70 professors. In interviews, the faculty members stated they were eager to discuss meaning, purpose, and spirituality, but unwritten institutional barriers prevented them from doing it. A third negative argument against SIA is some academics considered it challenging to introduce spirituality in the classroom. Kirsch (2009) worried “exploring spirituality in the classroom can easily turn into an anti-intellectual enterprise that defies analysis, critique, and debate—the exact opposite of what higher education sets out to do” (p. W3). A fifth negative argument against SIA is economics based. Churchman (2006) argued academics ideally saw universities as places of high moral standards, but easily became discouraged with their daily work routines because the institutions focused more on profit-making and competition instead of on what gave them meaning in life.

There are a number of arguments in the literature in favor of SIA. One positive argument for SIA is it has become more mainstream. By the early 1990s, spirituality was starting to become a central topic at many education conferences (Estanek, 2006). Zajonc (2003) also recognized spirituality in academia becoming more mainstream stating: “With increasing frequency they [faculty, staff, and academic administrators] are speaking openly about their interest in the contemplative and spiritual dimensions of higher education and are taking steps to explore ways to integrate them sensibly into their work” (para. 5). A second positive argument for SIA is more studies have been conducted focusing on how student/professor relationships are affected by spirituality. Riley (2010) stated research into

academic spirituality “is an emerging area of research and literature, especially with regard to such themes as life purpose, meaning, and authenticity and their role in the lives of both students and faculty” (p. 16). Other research (e.g., Lindholm, Astin, & Astin, 2005) has shown faculty who self-identify as spiritual were more likely to embrace student-centered approaches to undergraduate teaching. A third positive argument for SIA is that an important body of literature has emerged (see Astin & Astin, 1999; Chickering, Dalton & Stamm, 2006; Denton & Ashton, 2004; Dillard, 2006; Estanek, 2006; Kazanjian & Laurence, 2002; Nash, 2001; Palmer, 1998; Parks, 2000; Rendón, 2008; Tisdell, 2003; Tolliver & Tisdell, 2006).

There were five quantitative and one qualitative research questions for this study of professorial spirituality. Even though the research questions were chosen arbitrarily, they were crafted only after a review of the literature and discussing spirituality, spirituality at work, and spirituality in academia with a number of professors. The quantitative research questions were:

- Is there a significant difference in the scores between male and female professors?
- Is there a significant difference in the scores between professors in the humanities and professors in the sciences?
- Is there a significant difference in the scores between professors with bachelor’s and professors with master’s degrees?
- Is there a significant difference among the scores of professors in various age groups?
- Is there a significant difference among the scores of professors with various years of teaching experience?

The qualitative research question was:

- How does the professorial view spirituality at a private university in Lima, Peru?

METHOD

Research Design

The research design for this phenomenological study was a two-phase, sequential mixed method. The first phase was quantitative and data were gathered using a quantitative survey instrument. The second phase was qualitative and data were gathered using participant responses from a focus group. A sequential explanatory strategy was appropriate for this study for two reasons. First, Beringer (2000) warned about the difficulty of using traditional empirical scientific methods on the metaphysical construct of spirituality. He argued that “scientific skepticism about what is essentially a metaphysical phenomenon together with limited and limiting methods of scientific inquiry” (p. 158) called for a multifaceted approach to its study. Second, Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) reported the use of only quantitative data collection methods in spirituality research could limit the depth and quality of results.

Selection of Participants

The target population for this study included all full and part-time faculty members, with at least one year of post-secondary teaching experience at the university, who would be teaching there in 2015 and/or beyond. Because only access to the main campus was granted, the accessible population was limited to 1,410 full and part-time professors who taught there during the Fall 2014 semester, and of these 519 (36.8%) were female and 891 (63.2%) were male.

The sample size was 240 for the quantitative survey instrument. This represented 17.02% of the accessible population of 1,410 professors on the main campus. Using this final sample size, the researcher utilized the

Sample Size Calculator to generate a Confidence Interval of 5.76 and a Confidence Level of 95%.

There were two participant inclusion criteria for this study of professoriate spirituality at a private university in Lima, Peru. The first inclusion criterion was that this study focused only on the professoriate. This meant that only people who had a direct classroom teaching relationship with students were considered possible members of the participant pool. Members of the university's administrative staff or support staff were not eligible. The second inclusion criterion was to narrow the participant pool to only faculty members from the main campus. This was beyond the control of the researcher because access only to the main campus was granted.

Quantitative Sampling Procedures

The participants for the quantitative survey instrument were a purposeful sample of convenience taken from the main campus of a private university located in Lima, Peru. The researcher distributed 550 surveys during a four-week period. The participants handed in 261 surveys for a return rate of 47.45%. Twenty-one surveys were not used in the analyses because they were missing biographical items.

The sample's descriptive statistics are based on five variables from the cover page of the quantitative survey instrument packet. The gender distribution of the sample was 113 female (47.1%) and 127 (52.9%) male participants. The general area of teaching distribution of the sample was 141 participants in the humanities (58.75%) and 99 participants in the sciences (41.25%). The highest degree earned distribution of the sample was 121 participants with a bachelor's degree (50.42%), 109 participants with a master's degree (45.41%), and 10 participants with a

doctoral degree (4.17%). The age distribution of the sample ranged from 24 to 72 years. Three groups were formed for the purpose of analyses; 64 participants from 24 to 34.9 years of age (26.67%), 166 participants from 35 to 59.9 years of age (69.16%), and 10 participants from 60 to 72 years of age (4.17%). The mean age of the participant pool was 41.25. The total years of post-secondary teaching experience distribution of the sample was divided into three categories for the purpose of analyses; 84 participants with 1 to 4.9 years of experience (35%); 59 participants with 5 to 9.9 years of experience (24.58%), and 97 participants with 10 to 40 years of experience (40.42%). The mean number of years of post-secondary teaching experience was 9.46.

Qualitative Sampling Procedures

The focus group participants were purposefully chosen from the participants who completed the quantitative survey instrument. If a professor was willing to participate in the focus group, the professor wrote his or her university e-mail address in the space provided at the bottom of the survey instrument cover page.

Sixty-two of the 240 participants (25.8%) wrote their e-mail address on the cover page of the survey instrument. One of the 62 volunteers was eliminated because there was conflict of interest; it was the professor who became the statistics consultant.

The gender split of the remaining 61 potential focus group participants was 29 females and 32 males. The female and male surveys were stored in separate gender folders and assigned a number that was determined chronologically by the date the survey was received and entered into the quantitative data set. Using these focus group numbers, the researcher used an online random number generator to create two lists for contacting

potential participants, one female list and one male list. A total of six participants (two females and four males) was confirmed to participate in the focus group.

INSTRUMENTATION

Two instruments were used to gather data for this study: a self-administered, paper and pencil quantitative survey instrument to measure spiritual well-being that takes approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete and the second was an open ended focus group protocol.

Spiritual well-being scale. The quantitative survey instrument was the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS). It was designed in the late 1970s by Paloutzian and Ellison (1982). The items are laid out in a modified Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (numerical value of 1) to Strongly Agree (numerical value of 6) with no middle value. The items are equally phrased in positive and negative terms to reduce “response set bias” (D’Costa, 1995, p. 984). The survey generates three scores (Spiritual Well-Being or SWB, Religious Well-Being or RWB, and Existential Well-Being or EWB) that can be used for statistical analyses, but only one of the three scores was used in this study; i.e., the overall measure of the perception of the spiritual quality of life (SWB) that is generated from the total of 20 items.

Researchers have studied the reliability of the SWBS. Ellison (1983) found that “test-retest reliability coefficients obtained from 100 student volunteers at the University of Idaho were .93 (SWB), .96 (RWB), and .86 (EWB). Coefficient alphas were .89 (SWB), .87 (RWB), and .78 (EWB)” (p. 333). Bufford, Paloutzian, and Ellison (1991) stated these numbers show that “there is sufficiently high reliability and internal consistency” (p. 57). These authors reported the index of internal consistency and

coefficient alpha also showed high reliability across seven samples. The internal consistency coefficients ranged from .89 to .94 (SWB), .82 to .94 (RWB), and .78 to .86 (EWB).

Researchers have also studied the validity of the SWBS. In an evaluation of the SWBS in the *Mental Measurements Yearbook* (MMY), Ellison (2006) concluded that “construct validity appears to be one of the strong points of this instrument” (p. 7). In another MMY evaluation of the SWBS, D’Costa (1995) reported “the SWBS has good reliability, reasonable validity, and a sound conceptual basis” (p. 984) for populations studied, which have been almost entirely adult populations. Paloutzian and Ellison (2009) reported that,

Research has shown that the items cluster as expected, into the RWB and EWB subscales. Research has also shown that the SWBS is a good general indicator of well-being, and is especially sensitive to lack of well-being. SWB, RWB, and EWB are correlated positively with a positive self-concept, sense of purpose in life, physical health, and emotional adjustment. (p. 4)

Because the SWBS has been extensively used on other adult populations to measure general spiritual well-being, its use with an adult population in this study seemed germane.

For this study, the researcher used the Spanish version of the SWBS as part of a three-page survey packet in Spanish. The first page was a cover letter briefly explaining the nature of the study into professoriate spirituality—that did not view religion and spirituality as coterminous—asking for five items of biographical information that were used to formulate the quantitative research questions, and providing an area for the professors to write down an email address if they were possibly

willing to volunteer for the focus group. The second page was the SWBS. The third page was the informed consent letter that had to be signed by the participant.

Focus group protocol. The Focus Group Protocol was designed around any unusual, surprising, or unexpected results; it was designed to explore and inform these results. The only surprise in the quantitative analyses was one independent variable (gender) that showed a statistically significant difference on the SWB scores. As a result of this finding, the purpose of the Focus Group Protocol was to explore the differences between the SWB scores based on gender.

To examine the gender differences of the SWB scores, a frequency distribution of the male and female scores was generated. With the frequency distribution created, two criteria were used to look for items that could be used as topics for the Focus Group Protocol. The first criterion was to assume that if at least 66+ percent of a gender group responded in the same direction, it constituted a perception of that group. This is known as the C. Robert Pace 66+ Rule (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2011). The second criterion was at least a 15-point difference between the genders in the frequency distribution percentages. An item was explored as a possible source of a focus group question if at least one of the criteria was met.

A review of the distribution frequencies revealed nine items from the SWBS that met at least one or both of these criteria.

- Item 1: I do not find much satisfaction in private prayer with God
- Item 3: I believe that God loves me and cares about me
- Item 7: I have a personally meaningful relationship with God
- Item 9: I do not get much personal strength and support from my God
- Item 13: I do not have a personally satisfying relationship with God
- Item 15: My relationship with God helps me not to feel lonely
- Item 16: I feel that life is full of conflict and unhappiness
- Item 17: I feel most fulfilled when I am in close communion with God
- Item 19: My relation to God contributes to my well-being

After further review, five of the nine items were eliminated due to redundancies and being less aligned to Astin's (2004) description of spirituality. A fifth question about the professors' understanding of spirituality in academia was added to the Focus Group Protocol because Lindholm and Astin (2008) stated that "qualitative follow-up research that is aimed at understanding how faculty view their spirituality's role in interactions with students and colleagues would be especially useful" (p. 202).

The researcher translated the Focus Group Protocol in English to Spanish and he asked three colleagues whose native language is Spanish to check the translation for grammar errors and comprehensibility. Next, the Focus Group Protocol was pilot tested with two survey participants (one female and one male) who did not volunteer for the focus group. Spanish was the language used to conduct the pilot test (and the focus group). The participants responded to the questions, suggested follow-up questions, and critiqued the researcher's performance as a focus group moderator. The pilot test of the Focus Group Protocol lasted 40 minutes.

PROCEDURES

There were quantitative data collection procedures. The three-page survey instrument packet was folded and stuffed into a white envelope. While handing out the surveys, the researcher introduced himself, mentioned the survey was for doctoral research, requested the professors complete the survey within a few days, and explained the survey turn-in procedure. The secretaries of the teachers' lounge were made available to collect the completed surveys.

There were qualitative data collection procedures. The focus group was held in a small meeting room on the main campus. Tables were set up in a circle and the audio recording device was placed in the center. This table arrangement allowed each participant to be equally close to the recording device and it allowed face-to-face communication. When five of six participants had arrived 20 minutes after the scheduled start-up time, the researcher decided it was time to begin. This left two female and three male focus group participants. The researcher acted as the moderator. The focus group lasted just over 70 minutes.

Quantitative Data Analyses

There were five quantitative research questions generated from five independent variables. These variables were: 1) gender, 2) general area of teaching, 3) highest university degree earned, 4) age, and 5) total years of post-secondary teaching experience. After the initial SWB scores were analyzed for normal distribution, it was determined that the statistical analyses had to be done using non-parametric tests as the assumptions for using parametric tests were not met. Accordingly, the data were analyzed using one of the following non-parametric tests: a Mann-Whitney U test or a Kruskal-Wallis test. An alpha level of ($\alpha = .05$) was used for this study.

Qualitative Data Analyses

The first task was the translation from Spanish to English and simultaneous transcription of the data from the focus group audio file. A native speaker of Spanish helped translate and transcribe to English the 70-minute audio file. To increase the credibility and trustworthiness of the transcription, the researcher asked an independent translator to verify the quality of the transcription. The translator commented, "Last night I listened to the audio while reading the transcript. I can say that the translation is mostly accurate and faithful to the original. There are some nuances of oral Spanish that have been neutralized, but I think none of these have led to false or counter meanings" (Villanueva, personal communication, December 2, 2014).

Question 4 on the Focus Group Protocol had too many comments from the moderator that may be construed as leading the participants. Question 5 on the Focus Group Protocol had several examples provided by the moderator. In an abundance of caution, focus group questions 4 and 5's transcript data were not included in the analyses to prevent any criticism of researcher bias.

The analyses were designed to develop themes from the answers given to the first three focus group questions. A theme was defined as repeated thoughts that a minimum of two participants shared. In addition, these repeated thoughts needed to be about why the focus group participants believed the women from the SWBS survey had feelings about the survey items that differed from the men's.

The researcher developed themes one focus group question at a time. He read and re-read a focus group question's participant responses, took notes, and highlighted repeated thoughts that were directly related to why the

focus group participants believed the women from the SWBS survey had thoughts about the survey items that differed from the men's. The researcher looked for key repeating words and phrases. From these, the researcher created the final theme names that reflected the essence of the participants' responses.

RESULTS

Quantitative Results

Using the Spiritual Well-Being (SWB) scores from the survey instrument, a Cronbach's coefficient alpha was calculated to estimate the SWBS's reliability. The internal consistency coefficient was .92 (SWB), which in a general sense means the participant answers to the 20 items on the SWBS demonstrated sufficiently high reliability and internal consistency. Even though the RWB and EWB scores were not

used individually in the analyses of this study, they are worth noting. The internal consistency coefficients for these were .96 (RWB) and .81 (EWB). These data add to the literature because no reliability data for the SWBS were found for professors in Latin America.

Research question 1 (RQ1). This research question explored if the professors' gender had an effect on the spiritual well-being scores. The mean, standard deviation, and range for female professors were 100.68, 15.930, and 65 (from 55 to 120), respectively. The mean, standard deviation, and range for male professors were 93, 20.236, and 95 (from 25 to 120), respectively. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the data related to RQ1. The results were significant at the .05 level (see Table 1). In a general sense, with a significance level of 5%, there is a difference in the scores between male and female professors.

Table 1
Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences Based on Gender

Mann-Whitney U	5614.000
Z	-2.909
Significance (two-tailed)	.004*

Note: * $p < .05$

Research question 2. This research question explored if the professors' area of teaching (i.e., the humanities or the sciences) had an effect on the spiritual well-being scores. The mean, standard deviation, and range for professors in the humanities were 95.33, 19.580, and 95 (from 25 to 120), respectively. The mean, standard deviation, and range for professors in

the sciences were 98.46, 17.291, and 64 (from 56 to 120), respectively. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the data related to RQ2. The results were not significant at the .05 level (see Table 2). In a general sense, with a significance level of 5%, there is not a difference in the scores between professors in the humanities and professors in the sciences.

Table 2
Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences in Area: Humanities vs. Sciences

Mann-Whitney U	6437.000
Z	-1.025
Significance (two-tailed)	.305

Note: $p > .05$

Research question 3. This research question explored if the professors' highest degree earned (i.e., bachelor's, master's, or doctorate) had an effect on the spiritual well-being scores. The mean, standard deviation, and range for professors with bachelor's degrees were 95.48, 19.230, and 95 (from 25 to 120), respectively. The mean, standard deviation, and range for professors with

master's degrees were 97.94, 18.150, and 80 (from 40 to 120), respectively. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the data related to RQ3. The results were not significant at the .05 level (see Table 3). In a general sense, with a significance level of 5%, there is not a difference in the scores between professors with bachelor's degrees and professors with master's degrees.

Table 3
Mann-Whitney U Test for Differences in College Degree Level

Mann-Whitney U	6099.500
Z	-0.983
Significance (two-tailed)	.326

Note: $p > .05$

Research question 4. This research question explored if the professors' age had an effect on the spiritual well-being scores. The mean, standard deviation, and range for young adult professors (24 to 34.9 years) were 93.39, 20.909, and 95 (from 25 to 120), respectively. The mean, standard deviation, and range for adult professors (35 to 59.9 years) were 97.29, 17.931, and 80 (from 40 to 120), respectively.

The mean, standard deviation, and range for older adult professors (60 to 72 years) were 106.20, 11.980, and 41 (from 77 to 118), respectively. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to analyze the data related to RQ4. The results were not significant at the .05 level (see Table 4). In a general sense, with a significance level of 5%, there is not a difference among scores of professors in various age groups.

Table 4
Kruskal-Wallis Test for Differences in Age Groups

Chi-square	3.792
df	2
Significance (two-tailed)	.150

Note: $p > .05$

Research question 5. This research question explored if the professors' years of university teaching experience had an effect on the spiritual well-being scores. The mean, standard deviation, and range for low experience professors (1 to 4.9 years) were 93.52, 20.177, and 95 (from 25 to 120), respectively. The mean, standard deviation, and range for medium experience professors (5 to 9.9 years) were 97.73, 17.997, and 64 (from 56 to 120),

respectively. The mean, standard deviation, and range for high experience professors (10 to 40 years) were 98.63, 17.587, and 80 (from 40 to 120), respectively. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to analyze the data related to RQ5. The results were not significant at the .05 level (see Table 5). In a general sense, with a significance level of 5%, there is not a difference among the scores of professors with various years of teaching experience.

Table 5
Kruskal-Wallis Test for Differences in Years of Teaching Experience

Chi-square	2.093
df	2
Significance (two-tailed)	.351

Note: $p > 0.05$

Qualitative Results

The analyses were designed to develop themes from the answers given to the first three focus group questions. The construct of theme for this study was defined previously.

Focus group question 1. The first Focus Group Protocol question was designed around item 7 of the SWBS survey: I have a personally meaningful relationship with God. Focus Group Question 1 was: If we assume that at least a 15 percentage point difference in female and male responses is large enough to explore, why do you think more women feel they have a personally meaningful relationship with God than men?

Four of five participants shared thoughts in response to this question. Using the definition of theme given above, two themes seemed evident: Gender Role Enculturation and Biological Motherhood. The females spoke approximately twice as many words as did the males (i.e., a ratio of 1.99:1), which is the third largest difference of the Focus Group Questions.

Gender role enculturation. Rider (2005) defined gender roles as “culturally prescribed behaviors and traits that dictate how males and females should act” (p. 21). Kim and Abreu (2001) defined enculturation as “a process of socialization (or re-socialization) into and maintenance of the heritage culture norms” (p. 399). Male Participant 1 (MP1) expressed thoughts that were categorized under the theme of Gender Role Enculturation. He stated:

I believe there is a cultural tradition that associates women also, you know, I believe unconsciously associates women more with God and religion than men. Men (pause) I don't know if I'm right or wrong. *Machismo* might have something to do with it too. There are still traces of machismo in our society.

Female Participant 1 (FP1) concurred with MP1 about it being cultural and added further information about how children are raised in her culture:

I believe it's cultural and how we have been educated (pause). Then it comes from the education and how different roles are assigned to a person. I am a woman because logically, I was born a woman biologically. I was born a woman so I was educated distinctly as compared to my brother, right? My brother got a bigger piece of chicken and I got a smaller one. I was born into this and saw it as normal.

Near the end of the discussion on focus group question 1, FP2 reminded the researcher that there were “also educational/childrearing factors” that might have helped explain why women felt they had a more personally meaningful relationship with God than men.

Biological motherhood. Both female participants were mothers. They talked about how becoming a mother might affect why women had different feelings toward the personal meaningfulness of their relationship with God as compared to men. FP1 stated that:

...a second important point is that we women are made to be mothers. And this marks a difference as compared to men. Because during the nine months our bodies prepare themselves, and for motherhood we prepare ourselves and this makes a spiritual change in you. Inside of you something new is happening. It's marvelous. It's a miracle. Truly, it really is a miracle. It's something greater than or eludes biology and everything, or cloning. It's magical. So this magic is not how it is drawn up by man; it has to do with God, with this divine being that is working within you.

Motherhood was also important for FP2. She added:

...it is the woman who engenders life. We are the ones who experience this magic of life, you know, to know how it feels to have a life inside of you. In your mind, what she [the previous respondent] said happens. You start to question internally not only on a logical level or manner, but also something that goes beyond and you start to see and know from a different perspective. And this, because I am also a mother, I also think exactly there was a spiritual 'before' having my child and later an 'after'.

Focus group question 2. The second Focus Group question was designed around item 15 of the SWBS survey: My relationship with God helps me not to feel lonely. Focus Group Protocol Question 2 was: If we assume that at least a 15 percentage point difference in female and male responses is large enough to explore, why do you think there are more women than men whose relationship with God helps them feel 'not as lonely'?

Four of five participants shared thoughts in response to this question. Using the definition of theme given above, no themes were evident. There was no theme because there was no commonality in the comments focused on the question asked. Such commonality as there was, all focused on other non-question issues. The females and males spoke approximately the same number of words (i.e., a ratio of 1.08:1), which is the smallest difference of the Focus Group Questions.

Focus group question 3. The third Focus Group question was designed around item 16 of the SWBS survey: I feel that life is full of conflict and unhappiness. Focus Group Question 3 was: If we assume that at least a 15 percentage point difference in female and male responses is large enough to explore, why do you think more women disagree that life is full of conflict and unhappiness than men do?

All five participants shared thoughts in response to this question. Using the definition of theme given above, two themes seemed evident: Stress and Internal Strength. It is interesting to note that Stress was an exclusively male theme and Internal Strength was an exclusively female theme. The females spoke more than four times as many words as did the males (i.e., a ratio of 4.42:1), which is the largest difference of the Focus Group Questions.

Stress. All the male participants mentioned stress in their brief responses. As soon as the question was asked, MP2 started the responses stating:

Ah, well, maybe speaking of, it has to do with social patterns. Sometimes, eh, men tend to have more responsibility, you know? It may not be true but they may think they have more responsibilities. So this implies perhaps some things won't turn out as planned, being or not a moment of stress for them.

MP1 immediately added:

I see it like this; I believe there are studies, both psychological and physiological; women's tolerance to frustration is higher than men's. It could also be for this type of associated factor that identifies, like somebody said, how much conflict and unhappiness they still believe is their responsibility and this creates high levels of stress.

MP3 joined in saying, "Seeing high levels of stress also surprised me and maybe the men didn't understand the question." [General laughter all around] There are two points about the responses of the males that are worth mentioning. First, it could be argued that MP1's comment relates to the following theme because having a higher tolerance to frustration could be understood as an internal strength. Second, MP3's comment about the males not understanding the question could have merit because the males said very little after this, leaving the females to do the majority of the talking during Focus Group Question 3.

Internal strength. The females coalesced around this theme. FP2 started by stating, "Because women are stronger, on the interior, not physically." FP1 agreed and added, "But on the inside women are really strong. It's an internal strength. What do you think?" FP2 elaborated:

Like FP1 was saying, it's all about even in those very difficult moments, to see the bright side, right? Well, I don't know. Even when you get sick, you thank it wasn't worse. Thank goodness you didn't have to be hospitalized. Oh, look, your husband lost his job, but look, maybe there is a better possibility out there. Women are always trying at all times to be the heart of our homes, right? She is the emotional support of the home. And

also as the emotional support, she is like a light. While the husband can't find a new job or his plate is full and he's stressed out, supposedly we should be the heart, that light of the home. And it's this positivism/optimism that she transmits to her children and husband. I think it is right here why more women disagreed with this item because we always try to see the bright side of things even if there is no job or things aren't going as planned or expected, or we are not as healthy as we'd like to be.

DISCUSSION

There was a significant difference between female and male professors as evidenced by scores on the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. A focus group, in which three males and two females participated, was used to explore these gender differences. Four themes emerged from the focus group participant answers that could help in exploring these gender differences. These themes were Gender Role Enculturation, Biological Motherhood, Stress, and Internal Strength. This discussion will briefly cover how this study's results fit into the literature.

As pointed out earlier, most early research into spirituality in academia focused on student spirituality (Lindholm & Astin, 2008). Nonetheless, research that has focused on the faculty is emerging. For instance, Riley (2010) studied spirituality's place in the adjustment of new faculty members during transitional years at a public research university. Shahjahan (2010) studied the role of spirituality among faculty of color teaching for social justice. Lindholm and Astin (2008) investigated faculty spirituality and the use of student-centered approaches to undergraduate teaching. Tolliver and Tisdell (2006) argued for engaging spirituality in the transformative

higher education classroom. Ecklund and Long (2011) researched how faculty scientists at 21 top U.S. research universities understood spirituality and its relation to religion and science. Their findings showed a “largely areligious spirituality among scientists” (p. 258) and that this group of academicians tended to have an *identity-consistent* spirituality, which means that scientists “show a spiritual impulse that is marked by a search for truth compatible with scientific method, a coherence that unifies various spheres of life, and, for some, engagement with the ethical dimensions of communal life...” (p. 258). The researcher was unable to find any study that took into account gender and its relation to professorial spirituality. It is significant that the results of this study fill this gap in the spirituality in academia literature.

Not limiting the view to only spirituality in academia, there are mixed results concerning spirituality and gender in the literature.

Some studies have found gender-based distinctions concerning personal spirituality. Research into spirituality and gender has indicated that societal gender roles might cause men to shy away from religious/spiritual acts because they are socialized to avoid feminine activities (Mahalik & Lagan, 2001). Citing the results of these authors, Simpson, Cloud, Newman and Fuqua (2008) stated that “Based on these findings they suggested the masculine gender role may restrict men from living more ‘authentic lives’” (p. 43). In this study, it appears this attitude was evident in the participant responses in the Gender Role Enculturation Theme, especially when one male participant mentioned how the gender difference in spirituality might be due to his culture’s prevailing *machismo*. In a qualitative research study that interviewed almost 50 Orthodox Jewish men and women about their

personal spirituality, Sands, Robyn and Rivka (2007) found that “Both men and women talked about their spirituality and community, but the women embraced the terms whereas the men endorsed the concepts but were uncomfortable with the terms” (p. 539). As evidenced by the greater number of words spoken by the women during the focus group compared to the men, coupled with the moderator’s observations of the participants’ comfort levels during the focus group, the same might hold true for this study’s results. Finally, in an empirical study of 3,680 college students that examined gender differences on 13 spiritual characteristics, Bryant (2007) discovered that “...women scored higher than men did on dimensions related to spirituality, spiritual quest, and self-rated spiritual/religious growth” (p.840). Likewise, the female survey participants in this study also showed statistically significant higher scores on their spiritual well-being (SWB) scores than did the males.

In contrast, other studies have not found gender-based distinctions concerning personal spirituality. In their empirical study of 190 Christian adults focusing on sex and gender differences in religiousness and spirituality, Simpson et al. (2008) discovered the following: “The current findings indicate men and women, as well as masculine, feminine, and androgynous types are capable of being aware of a personal relationship with God” (p. 51). In fact, regardless of sex/gender, humans may be hardwired to be spiritual or have a connection to the Transcendent. For example, brain imaging in a study by Newberg, D’Aquili and Rause (2001) suggested,

Evidence of a neurological process that has evolved to allow us humans to transcend material existence and acknowledge and connect with a deeper, more spiritual part of ourselves perceived

of as an absolute, universal reality that connects us to all that is. (p. 9)

Finally, Simpson et al. (2008) make a valid point saying,

Such potentially equal engagement could decrease the marginalization of men as 'less spiritual' or 'less religious' by shifting the emphasis away from gender differences and toward the general relational nature of humanity and facilitate a deeper spiritual formation for everyone in the community. (p. 51)

CONCLUSIONS

There are two conclusions based on the results of this study. First, it can be concluded there was a significant difference between female and male professors as evidenced by scores on the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. A focus group, in which three males and two females participated, was used to explore these gender differences. Four themes emerged from the focus group participant answers that could help in exploring these gender differences. These themes were Gender Role Enculturation, Biological Motherhood, Stress, and Internal Strength. The females spoke approximately twice as many words as the males spoke (i.e., a ratio of 1.99:1) in focus group question 1, which yielded the first two themes above and the females spoke more than four times as many words as the males spoke (i.e., a ratio of 4.42:1) in focus group question 3, which yielded the last two themes above. Second, based on the results of this study, it can be concluded there were no significant differences in scores on the Spiritual Well-Being Scale related to general area of teaching, highest university degree earned, age, or total years of post-secondary teaching experience of the professors. Implications for practice for this conclusion are difficult to discern, but will be addressed at least indirectly under the next heading.

Implications for Practice

It is challenging to write implications for practice based upon the results of this study for two reasons. First, due to spirituality's elusive meta-physical nature, it is inherently difficult to study and perhaps even more difficult to hew out implications from the very specific findings. Second, the university under study has no formal rules or policies in place concerning spirituality. In sum, there is no current "practice" of spirituality, which means there is nothing to change, add, or delete to the current system.

Being that spirituality in academia does not exist at the university on any official level, the researcher thinks there are two implications for practice. First, the university could ignore the results of the study, either informally by refusing to give the researcher audience to present his results or formally by giving the researcher audience, but rejecting the implications he would be asking for permission to present. Second, the university could use the results of the study to begin a dialogue about spirituality in academia, either officially by forming a committee or board to explore spirituality at the university or unofficially by allowing some type of discussion forum at which students and professors could discuss issues related to spirituality in academia.

While there were few implications related to the differences between females and males arising from the first conclusion, this difference will be reflected in the Recommendations for Research. But that still leaves implications for practice related to the second conclusion (i.e., there were no differences in scores between males and females on the Spiritual Well-Being Scale related to general area of teaching, highest university degree earned, age, or total years of post-secondary teaching experience). The nature of the finding of no differences stymies

attempts to write implications for practice for a university with no official spirituality practices.

Recommendations for Research

There are nine recommendations for research arising from this study and the results from these future studies could contribute new insights to the literature and would add credibility to this study's results. First, it is recommended that this study be replicated with more participants completing the quantitative survey instrument. It is possible a larger sample size would produce significant differences in the variables studied (i.e., gender, general teaching area, highest university degree earned, age, and total years of post-secondary teaching experience) that were not evident from the sample size used in this study. Second, it is recommended that this study be replicated with more participants in the qualitative focus group phase. Having a number of focus groups would produce not only a larger number of answers, but likely a greater variety of answers from which researchers could better explore and understand whatever significant quantitative findings are discovered. Third, it is recommended that this study be replicated in more for-profit universities. Fourth, it is recommended that this study be replicated in non-profit universities. Fifth, it is recommended that this study be replicated in universities in other Spanish speaking countries. Sixth, it is recommended that this study be replicated in universities in countries where neither Spanish nor English is the primary language. Seventh, a study ought to be conducted which focuses on developing a new quantitative survey instrument. Even though the Spiritual Well-Being Scale was adequate for this study, perhaps making two modifications could result in different findings in other studies of spirituality in academia. As the first modification, the word

"God" should be removed to eliminate confusion between the constructs of religion and spirituality. As the second modification, words like 'meta-physical' and 'transcendent' ought to be included to promote a deeper exploration of personal spirituality. Eighth, a study ought to be conducted which focuses on how gender roles influence personal spirituality of both sexes. It would be of value to make cross-cultural comparisons of how and whether gender affects the sexes' perceived socio-gender norms for exploring and expressing personal spirituality. Ninth, a study ought to be conducted which is designed to explore the differences in the number of words spoken by females and males in focus groups. Does a difference in the number of words spoken by males and females happen in all focus groups? On a larger scale, would the same difference in the number of words spoken by females and males during focus groups be evidenced cross-culturally?

Limitations

There were four limitations to this study of professorial spirituality at a private university in Lima, Peru. The first limitation was the subjective nature of spirituality. Quantitative data were not enough to examine spirituality because spirituality is not a topic easily understood solely through statistics. The second limitation was the lack of an appropriate quantitative instrument to measure professorial spirituality. In the limited time the researcher had, the SWBS was chosen over some other possible survey candidates. An obvious weakness to this study is the SWBS—or any other available survey that measures spirituality (see de Jager Meezenbroek et al., 2012, for a review and comparative analysis of current spirituality questionnaires)—does not specifically measure professorial spirituality. In other words, a validity issue is Astin's (2004)

description of spirituality used as the construct for this study was perhaps not being accurately measured by the survey instrument employed. The quality of the data collected from the focus group was the third limitation. The researcher explored any unusual, surprising, or unexpected survey results in a 70-minute long focus group. The limited amount of time, the development of the focus group discussion questions, researcher bias, and the researcher's moderation of the focus group could have limited the quality of data collection. In an abundance of caution, two out of five focus group questions were not included in the qualitative data analyses due to this limitation's concerns. The study taking place at a private university in Lima, Peru represented the fourth limitation. There were limitations on the transferability to public universities and to universities that were not in a Spanish-speaking culture.

Significance of the Study

There are four areas of significance for this study. One, this study offered a distinct perspective on spirituality in academia. Two, this study has opened doors to the spirituality in academia movement in South America. Three, considering how technology is changing the landscape of higher education (i.e., on-line learning, mobile learning, game-based learning, and Massive Open On-line Courses or MOOCs,), this study reminds us that we must prepare for these new realities without neglecting the fundamental tenets of workplace spirituality: inner life, meaningful work, and building a sense of community. It will be vital to remind professors their work is just as meaningful even though they may not be standing in front of a room full of students. Finally, the overarching future significance of this study could be summed up by Burke (2014) when he stated that "Haywood asserts, and rightly so, that within the framework of 21st century learning

we must face up to the existential human condition and offer an inclusive set of values and ideas that embody intercultural awareness and spirituality" (p. 47).

REFERENCES

- Abu-Febiri, F. (2011). Inviting emotions, morals and spirit into our classrooms: A sociological perspective on the human factor model of education. *Review of Human Factor Studies*, 17(1), 40-89.
- Ashmos, D. P., & Duchon, D. (2000). Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(2), 134-145. doi:10.1177/105649260092008
- Astin, A. W. (2004). Why spirituality deserves a central place in liberal education. *Spirituality Higher Education Newsletter*, 1(1), 1-12.
- Astin, A. W., & Astin, H. S. (1999). *Meaning and spirituality in the lives of college faculty: A study of values, authenticity and stress*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Banyhamdan, K. T., Harrim, H., & Yahya Al-Qutop, M. (2012). Transforming an organization into a spiritual one: A five-pathway integrated framework. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 7(11), 74-86. doi:10.5539/ijbm.v7n11p74
- Bell, E., & Taylor, S. (2004). From outward bound to inward bound: The prophetic voices and discursive practices of spiritual management development. *Human Relations*, 57(4), 439-466. doi:10.1177/0018726704043895
- Beringer, A. (2000). In search of the sacred: A conceptual analysis of spirituality. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 23(3), 157-165. doi:10.1177/105382590002300307

- Braskamp, L. A. (2003). *Fostering student development through faculty development: A national survey of chief academic officers at church-related colleges*. Chicago: Loyola University Chicago.
- Bryant, A. N. (2007). Gender differences in spiritual development during the college years. *Sex Roles, 56*(11-12), 835-846. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9240-2
- Bufford, R. K., Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1991). Norms for the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 19*(1), 56-70.
- Burke, L. (2014). Twenty-first century learning from a third century BC perspective. *International Schools Journal, 33*(2), 47-57.
- Carrette, J., & King, R. (2005). *Selling spirituality: The silent takeover of religion*. New York: Routledge.
- Charoensukmongkol, P., Daniel, J. L., & Chatelain-Jardon, R. (2013). Enhancing workplace spirituality through emotional intelligence. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship, 18*(4), 3-17.
- Chickering, D., Dalton, J., & Stamm, L. (2006). *Encouraging authenticity and spirituality in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Churchman, D. (2006). Institutional commitments, individual compromises: Identity-related responses to compromise in an Australian university. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 28*(1), 3-15. doi:10.1080/13600800500283676
- Dandona, A. (2013). Spirituality at workplace and job satisfaction. *International Journal of BioSciences, Alternative and Holistic Medicine, 4*(1), 1-9.
- D'Costa, A. (1995). Review of the spiritual well-being scale. In C. Conoley (Ed.), *Mental measurement yearbook* (12th ed.). (pp. 983-984). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, University of Nebraska Press.
- De Jager Meezenbroek, E., Garssen, B., van den Berg, M., van Dierendonck, D., Visser, A., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Measuring spirituality as a universal human experience: A review of spirituality questionnaires. *Journal of Religion and Health, 51*(2), 336-54. doi:10.1007/s10943-010-9376-1
- Denton, D., & Ashton, W. (Eds.). (2004). *Spirituality, action, and pedagogy: Teaching from the heart*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Dillard, C. B. (2006). *On spiritual strivings: Transforming an African American woman's academic life*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Ecklund, E. H., & Long, E. (2011). Scientists and spirituality. *Sociology of Religion 2011, 72*(3), 253-274. doi: http://dx.doi.10.1093/socrel/srr003
- Ellison, C. W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11*(4), 330-340.
- Ellison, L. (2006). A review of the Spiritual Well-Being Scale. *News Notes, 44*(1).
- Estanek, S. M. (2006). Redefining spirituality: A new discourse. *College Student Journal, 40*(2), 270-281.
- Forray, J. M., & Stork, D. (2002). All for one: A parable of spirituality and organization. *Organization, 9*(3), 533-545. doi:10.1177/135050840293014
- Geigle, D. (2012). Workplace spirituality empirical research: A literature review. *Business and Management Review, 2*(10), 14-27.
- Giacalone, R.A., & Jurkiewicz, C.L. (2003). Toward a science of workplace spirituality. In R.

- A. Giacalone & C. L. Jurkiewicz (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace spirituality and organizational performance* (pp. 3-28). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Giacalone, R. A., Krahnke, K., & Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2003). Point-counterpoint: Measuring workplace spirituality. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(4), 396-405. doi:10.1108/09534810310484154
- Gotsis, G., & Kortezi, Z. (2008). Philosophical foundations of workplace spirituality: A critical approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78(4), 575-600. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9369-5
- Griffin, D. R. (1988). Introduction: Postmodern spirituality and society. In D. R. Griffin, (Ed.), *Spirituality and society: postmodern visions* (pp. 1-31). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hayden, R. W., Barbuto, J. E., Jr., & Goertzen, J. E. (2008). Proposing a framework for a non-ideological conceptualization of spirituality in the workplace. *Proceedings of the Midwest Academy of Management*, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Issa, T., & Pick, D. (2010). Ethical mindsets: An Australian study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96(4), 613-629. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0487-0
- Izak, M. (2009). Spirituality in organization: A dubious idea (?). *Tamara Journal*, 8(2), 73-88.
- Kazanjian, V. H., & Laurence, P. L. (Eds.). (2002). *Education as transformation: religious pluralism, spirituality, and a new vision for higher education in America*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kim, B. S., & Abreu, J. M. (2001). Acculturation measurement. *Handbook of multicultural counseling*, 2.
- Kirsch, G. E. (2009). From introspection to action: Connecting spirituality and civic engagement. *College Composition and Communication*, 60(4), W1-W15.
- Korac-Kakabadse, N., Kouzmin, A., & Kakabadse, A. (2002). Spirituality and leadership praxis. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(3), 165-182. doi:10.1108/02683940210423079
- Krishnakumar, S., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The "what", "why" and "how" of spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 17(3), 153-164. doi:10.1108/02683940210423060
- Lindholm, J. A., & Astin, H. S. (2008). Spirituality and pedagogy: Faculty's spirituality and use of student-centered approaches to undergraduate teaching. *Review of Higher Education*, 31(2), 185-207.
- Lindholm, J. A., Astin, H. S., & Astin, A. W. (2005). *Spirituality and the professoriate*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Lips-Wiersma, M. & Nilakant, V. (2008). Practical compassion: Toward a critical spiritual foundation for corporate responsibility. In J. Biberman & L. Tischler (Eds.), *Spirituality in Business: Theory, Practice, and Future Directions* (pp. 51-72). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mahalik, J. R., & Logan, H. D. (2001). Examining masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to religious orientation and spiritual well-being. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 2, 24-33. doi:10.3149/jms.1401.27
- Mahoney, M. J., & Graci, G. M. (1999). The meanings and correlates of spirituality: Suggestions from an exploratory survey of experts. *Death Studies*, 23(6), 495-519. doi:10.1080/074811899200867
- Marques, J., Dhiman, S., & King, R. (2007) *Spirituality in the workplace: What it is, why it matters, how to make it work for you*. Fawnskin, CA, USA: Personhood Press.

- Miller, D. W. 2007. *God at work: The history and promise of the faith at work movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nadesan, M. H. (1999). The discourses of corporate spiritualism and evangelical capitalism. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 13(1), 3-42. doi:10.1177/0893318999131001
- Nash, R. J. (2001). *Religious pluralism in the academy: Opening the dialogue*. New York: Peter Lang.
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2011). In Remembrance. Retrieved from http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE_2011_Results/pdf/NSSE_2011_AnnualResults.pdf
- Newberg, A., D'Aquili, E., & Rause, V. (2001). *Why God won't go away: Brain science and the biology of belief*. New York: Ballantine.
- Palmer, P. J. (1997). The heart of a teacher: Identity and integrity in teaching. *Change Magazine*, 29(6), 14-27. doi:10.1080/00091389709602343
- Palmer, P. J. (1998). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Palmer, P. J. (2003). Teaching with heart and soul: Reflections on spirituality in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(5), 376-385. doi:10.1177/0022487103257359
- Palmer, P. J. (2007). A new professional: The aims of education revisited. *Change Magazine*, (no pages given). Retrieved from <http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/November-December%202007/full-new-professional.html>
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C.W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being and the quality of life. In L.A. Peplau and D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy*. New York: Wiley, pp. 224-237.
- Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (2009). *LifeADVANCE: Manual for the spiritual well-being scale*. Retrieved from <http://www.lifeadvance.com/products.html>
- Parks, S. D. (2000). *Big questions, worthy dreams: Mentoring young adults in their search for meaning, purpose, and faith*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pawar, B. S. (2013). Leadership spiritual behaviors toward subordinates: An empirical examination of the effects of a leader's individual spirituality and organizational spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122, 439-452. doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1772-5
- Pratt, M. (2000). Building an ideological fortress: The role of spirituality, encapsulation, and sensemaking 1. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 6(1), 35-69. doi:10.1080/10245280008523537
- Polley, D., Vora, J., & SubbaNarasimha, P. N. (2005). Paying the devil his due: Limits and liabilities of workplace spirituality. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 13(1), 50-63. doi:10.1108/eb028997
- Rego, A., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2008). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: An empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1), 53-75. doi:10.1108/09534810810847039
- Rendón, L. (2008). *Sentipensante pedagogy: Educating for wholeness, social justice, and liberation*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Rider, E. A. (2005). *Our voices: Psychology of women* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Riley, A. T. (2010). *Striving to breathe and balance on the brink: Spirituality*

- in the lives of new faculty in transition.* (Order No. 3403010, The University of Oklahoma). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 273-n/a. Retrieved from <http://searchproquest.com/docview/305217300?accountid=43860>. (305217300).
- Rindfleish, J. (2005). Consuming the self: New Age spirituality as “social product” in consumer society. *Consumption, Markets and Culture*, 8(4), 343-360. doi:10.1080/10253860500241930
- Robinson, K. (2010). Changing paradigms in education. [Webinar sponsored by the Renaissance Society of America]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=brJNOKZGaLE>
- Sands, R. G., Robyn, R. S., & Rivka, A. D. (2007). Gender differences in the construction of spirituality, work, learning, and community by baalei teshuvah. *Sex Roles*, 57(7-8), 527-541. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9286-1
- Shahjahan, R. A. (2010). Toward a spiritual praxis: The role of spirituality among faculty of color teaching for social justice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 33(4), 473-512. doi:10.1353/rhe.0.0166
- Simpson, D. B., Cloud, D. S., Newman, J. L., & Fuqua, D. R. (2008). Sex and gender differences in religiousness and spirituality. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 36(1), 42-52. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/223670316?accountid=43860>
- Smith, C. (1996). Correcting a curious neglect, or bringing religion back in. In C. Smith (Ed.), *Disruptive religion*. London: Routledge.
- Tisdell, E. J. (2003). *Exploring spirituality and culture in adult and higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tolliver, D. E., & Tisdell, E. J. (2006). Engaging Spirituality in the Transformative Higher Education Classroom. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, 2006(109), 37-47. doi:10.1002/ace.206
- Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dua, J., Hapuarachchi, J., & Boyd, C. (2003). Occupational stress in Australian university staff: Results from a national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10(1), 51-63. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.10.1.51
- Yihong, F. (2002). *From holistic worldview to holistic education: Cross-boundary journeys of educators toward integrative learning and integral being.* (Order No. 3056222, University of Massachusetts Amherst). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/275597513?accountid=43860>. (275597513)
- Zajonc, A. (2003). Spirituality in higher education: Overcoming the divide. *Liberal Education*, 89(1), 50-58.