Beyond Workplace Rituals: Voluntariness, Inclusion, And Psychological Safety in Meaning-Supportive HR Practices

Mr. Sudhir Mali[1], Dr. Anand B. Dadas[2]
[1]*Ph.D. Research Scholar, Neville Wadia Institute of Management Studies and Research (NWIMSR), Pune, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra, India.*
[2]*Director, Neville Wadia Institute of Management Studies and Research (NWIMSR), Pune, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Maharashtra, India.*

***Abstract*—Although workplace spirituality has been associated with meaning, community, and positive work attitudes, efforts by managers to formalize spiritual values may simultaneously endanger autonomy, marginalize minority identities, and transform personal meaning into an instrument of control. This exploratory integrative review addresses an insufficiently developed issue: the circumstances under which human resource (HR) practices that support meaning continue to be legitimate and inclusive within pluralistic industrial workplaces. Engaging critically with foundational and contemporary scholarship on workplace spirituality, self-determination theory, inclusion, psychological safety, organizational justice, meaningful work, and sustainable HRM, the review constructs a four-part framework consisting of voluntariness, worldview inclusion, psychological safety, and procedural safeguards. The synthesis delineates three tensions care versus control, shared purpose versus identity pluralism, and organizational commitment versus employees' right to withhold personal beliefs and advances six propositions for theory building. Instead of presuming that formal adoption yields benefits, the framework positions employees' perceived legitimacy of the practice as a central mechanism. The paper further offers an exploratory research agenda for Indian manufacturing contexts, encompassing multilevel designs, comparative qualitative inquiry, and measures that distinguish workplace meaning from religious expression and participation pressure. No new field data or effect estimates are presented. The contribution consists of a boundary-conditions account of how organizations may support meaning without mandating belief or deploying spirituality instrumentally.**

***Index Terms*—Workplace Spirituality; Meaningful Work; Strategic Human Resource Management; Autonomy; Religious Inclusion; Psychological Safety; Manufacturing; Integrative Literature Review.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Manufacturing workplaces depend on coordinated effort exercised within production targets, shift systems, safety requirements, and interdependent tasks. Within this setting, human resource management is increasingly confronted with two demands: maintaining performance and protecting employee dignity and well-being. Scholarship on strategic and sustainable HRM acknowledges that these two are not automatically congruent; practices that enhance immediate organizational outcomes may impose longer-term costs on employees (Guest, 2017; Kramar, 2014; Peccei & Van De Voorde, 2019; Van De Voorde et al., 2012). Consequently, approaches centered on meaning, ethical climate, compassion, and community have drawn attention, yet their appropriate institutional form remains contested.

Early scholarship on workplace spirituality differentiated the experience of an inner life and meaningful work from particular religious membership, while emphasizing community and value alignment (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Milliman et al., 2003). Spiritual leadership theory subsequently linked vision, hope, and altruistic concern to intrinsic motivation (Fry, 2003). Research conducted in Asian and Indian organizational contexts further demonstrated the importance of contextualizing definitions and measurement rather than treating Western assumptions as universally transferable

(Pandey et al., 2009; Petchsawang & Duchon, 2009). These contributions explain why organizations might value a human-centered approach, but they do not resolve how employees experience management-sponsored meaning initiatives.

An important counter-literature cautions that organizational spirituality can be instrumentalized: employees may be pressed to disclose private convictions, to take part in ostensibly voluntary rituals, or to align personal identity with managerial goals (Lips-Wiersma et al., 2009; Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009; Santori, 2026). Recent syntheses have urged a clearer separation among religion, spirituality, and meaning systems, along with greater attention to levels of analysis and practical inclusion (Dik et al., 2024). Empirical work on faith diversity further indicates that proactively inclusive organizational approaches can benefit employees both with and without a religious affiliation (Park & Martinez, 2022).

This article therefore addresses a question different from whether spirituality-based HR policies exist or correlate with employee performance: What institutional safeguards render meaning-supportive HR initiatives legitimate when employees differ in religious identity, personal philosophy, and willingness to participate? The inquiry is particularly useful for Indian manufacturing workplaces as a proposed setting for future investigation; the paper does not claim that all Pune manufacturers share the same practices. It offers a structured conceptual account of why the design and delivery of an initiative may matter as much as its stated intention.

II. REVIEW APPROACH AND ANALYTICAL SCOPE

This paper adopts an exploratory integrative literature review—a methodological approach appropriates for elucidating constructs and fostering theoretical linkages across research streams that only partially overlap (Snyder, 2019; Torraco, 2005). It is not intended as a systematic review, a meta-analysis, or an exhaustive bibliometric enumeration. Sources were purposively selected from foundational studies and recent peer-reviewed scholarship across organizational behavior, business ethics, HRM, vocational psychology, and diversity management. The review prioritizes clearly identifiable original journal articles, well-established theoretical contributions, and rigorous published reviews; practitioner commentaries and unverified thesis citations were excluded as evidence.

Selection was informed by conceptual relevance to four questions: (a) how spirituality and meaningful work are defined; (b) when organizational meaning interventions preserve autonomy; (c) how faith and non-faith identities are treated in group practices; and (d) how employees can voice concerns without penalty.

A contrastive synthesis weighed enabling against potentially coercive explanations, rather than tallying studies as if they had been randomly sampled. Accordingly, the propositions advanced here should be understood as deductions from theory-building rather than as empirically tested hypotheses. The paper refers to the user-supplied doctoral context solely to specify the manufacturing setting; no numerical results from that dataset are reused.

Table 1. Literature streams, foundational evidence, and unresolved questions

Research stream	Representative evidence	Gap addressed by this review
Spirituality and meaningful work	Ashmos & Duchon (2000); Milliman et al. (2003); Rosso et al. (2010); Dik et al. (2024)	Distinguish employee-generated meaning from employer-defined spirituality.
Motivation and work design	Deci & Ryan (2000); Gagné & Deci (2005); Allan et al. (2019)	Identify whether employee choice conditions the quality of participation.
Pluralism and inclusion	Shore et al. (2011); Nishii (2013); Park & Martinez (2022)	Include religious minorities and workers who identify with no faith.
Safety and procedural fairness	Kahn (1990); Edmondson (1999); Colquitt (2001); Frazier et al. (2017)	Explain freedom to decline, disagree, or avoid disclosure.
Critical and sustainable HRM	Lips-Wiersma et al. (2009); Guest (2017); Cooke (2025); Santori (2026)	Examine control, instrumentalization, and employee welfare trade-offs.

III. FOUNDATIONS OF THE EXPLORATORY SYNTHESIS

Workplace spirituality, religion, and meaning constitute interrelated yet conceptually separate facets of human experience, with each one shaping the ways in which individuals understand purpose, values, and belonging within organizational contexts. Differentiating these constructs is crucial for constructing an inclusive theoretical framework that acknowledges the varied beliefs of employees while also protecting individual autonomy and psychological well-being.

3.1. Spirituality, religion, and meaning are related but nonidentical

Research on workplace spirituality frequently treats meaningful work, a sense of community, and congruence with organizational values as its core dimensions (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Milliman et al., 2003).

An employee may nonetheless experience work as meaningful without cultivating a spiritual identity, and religious belief may be important without being openly displayed in the workplace. Spirituality as such can involve reflection, transcendence, compassion, or inner awareness. When these concepts are conflated, there is a risk that a single worldview is imposed through what presents itself as a neutral HR vocabulary (Benefiel et al., 2014; Dik et al., 2024).

Research on meaningful work provides a psychological vocabulary that is more differentiated. Rosso et al. (2010) situate meaning in sources including the self, others, the work context, and spiritual life; Steger et al. (2012) differentiate positive meaning, meaning-making, and greater-good motivation.

In a comparable way, Lips-Wiersma and Wright (2012) regard meaningfulness as multidimensional. The conceptual implication is that HR should foster employees' opportunities to make meaning while refraining from assuming that management is able to define what work ought to mean. This distinction likewise enhances construct validity when subsequent studies measure personal meaning, faith-related accommodation, and perceived managerial pressure as separate constructs.

3.2. Autonomy and the difference between participation and consent

Self-determination theory posits that autonomous motivation is qualitatively distinct from controlled compliance. Although behavior may appear outwardly identical, engaging because a practice aligns with one's personal values is not equivalent to engaging in order to avert disapproval or foregone opportunities (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gagné & Deci, 2005). This conceptual distinction is consequential for employer-sponsored meditation, reflection sessions, cultural celebrations, ethical discussions, and spiritually framed mentoring. A high rate of attendance may reflect enthusiasm, convenience, peer conformity, or a perceived absence of choice. Absent a measure of autonomy, attendance alone cannot determine which of these explanations is the more plausible.

The ethical risk involved is not merely hypothetical. Critical analyses caution that organizations may co-opt individuals' pursuit of purpose, converting it into an instrument of motivation (Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009; Lips-Wiersma et al., 2009). Bunderson and Thompson (2009) characterize meaningful callings as potentially double-edged, insofar as devotion may serve to normalize sacrifice. Santori (2026) goes further, asking whether spirituality preserves its intrinsic character once it is converted into an organizational tool for performance. The review accordingly regards genuine freedom to participate, to decline, or to select an alternative as an institutional precondition rather than as a post hoc indicator of satisfaction.

3.3. Inclusion across faith and non-faith identities

A climate of inclusion enables individuals to experience belonging while still preserving their distinctive identities (Shore et al., 2011). In a comparable manner, inclusive leadership rests on individuals being appreciated as whole persons rather than being absorbed into the dominant group identity (Randel et al., 2018). Where organizational practices incorporate religious symbols, sacred terminology, group prayer, or festival observances, employees may experience a tension between belonging and authenticity, even when those arranging such practices act with benevolent intent. Crossman (2015) demonstrated that disclosing one's spiritual identity may entail social risks; consequently, safeguarding

individuals necessitates both acknowledging plural identities and upholding the right to refrain from disclosure.

Drawing on survey and experimental evidence, Park and Martinez (2022) explain why institutional approaches to faith diversity warrant critical examination: workplaces that were proactively inclusive were linked to more positive experiences among employees of faith as well as among those with no religious affiliation. Nishii (2013) offers a corresponding insight drawn from research on inclusion climates: policies lessen the interpersonal costs of diversity when individuals are able to obtain resources and to contribute across boundaries. For manufacturing organizations, the implication is that providing universally accessible choices of well-being and reflection options should not be conflated with mandating a single ritual for all. An inclusive offering might encompass quiet space, secular counseling, voluntary cultural activities, and equivalent rights to abstain from participation.

3.4. Psychological safety, fairness, and managerial power

Psychological safety concerns the belief that interpersonal risk-taking will not lead to humiliation or punishment (Edmondson, 1999). Kahn (1990) similarly related personal engagement to psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability. These theories imply that authentic engagement with values-oriented practices presupposes freedom to ask questions, express disagreement, or refuse an activity. Where supervisors both encourage participation and control appraisal or shift allocation, the practical meaning of “voluntary” may be ambiguous. Frazier et al. (2017) provide broader meta-analytic support for psychological safety as an important feature of work environments, although that literature does not establish the specific mechanisms proposed here.

Organizational justice offers a complementary explanation. Procedural, interpersonal, and informational fairness shape whether employees perceive HR decisions as legitimate (Colquitt, 2001). Transparency about purpose, confidentiality, equal access, and non-retaliation thus becomes relevant to spirituality-informed activities even when there is no formal discrimination complaint. Safeguards should apply not only to different religions but also to nonreligious worldviews, private spiritual practice, and employees who prefer no participation. Protecting disagreement is part of ethical HR governance rather than evidence of managerial failure.

3.5. Well-being and the sustainable HRM boundary

Research on workplace spirituality has linked meaning and community to favorable work attitudes and well-being (Duchon & Plowman, 2005; Karakas, 2010; Milliman et al., 2003). Evidence from meta-analyses likewise connects meaningful work to engagement, job satisfaction, and other outcomes, although effect sizes vary according to outcome and study design (Allan et al., 2019). Such findings warrant additional research; they provide no basis for regarding spiritual initiatives as replacements for staffing, reasonable demands, safety engineering, or equitable treatment. Job demands–resources theory accounts for why workload and structural resources continue to be pivotal to exhaustion and engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017; Demerouti et al., 2001).

Sustainable HRM shifts the analysis past a purely instrumental conception of human resources (Kramar, 2014). Guest (2017) and Peccei and Van De Voorde (2019) stress employees' well-being as an outcome valuable in its own right, whereas Van De Voorde et al. (2012) document potential tensions between organizational performance and health-related well-being. Cooke (2025) carries the debate further toward common-good HRM. The practical implication is that initiatives supporting meaning ought to complement rather than obscure protective work design, worker voice, and fair employment conditions.

IV. INTEGRATIVE FINDINGS: THREE UNRESOLVED TENSIONS

The integration of spirituality-informed HR practices presents a fundamental tension between genuine organizational care and the potential use of such initiatives as mechanisms of behavioral control. While these practices may promote employee well-being, belonging, and meaningful engagement, their implementation can undermine individual autonomy when participation becomes implicitly compulsory or organizational expectations prioritize conformity over personal choice.

4.1. Care versus behavioral control

An organization might sponsor mindfulness sessions in order to assist employees in recuperating from stress, or it might instead employ such sessions to render unreasonable workloads appear normal. The practice looks comparable on the surface, yet its governance and the way employees construe it are not the same. Favorable treatments foreground community, meaningful activity, and supportive leadership (Fry, 2003; Karakas, 2010); by contrast, critical treatments caution against seduction, manipulation, and the management of meaning (Lips-Wiersma et al., 2009; Santori, 2026). This differentiation implies that well-being programs ought to be assessed in conjunction with working conditions, authentic alternatives, and whether taking part exerts any influence on performance appraisal.

4.2. Shared purpose versus worldview pluralism

A coherent organizational purpose is capable of coordinating action, yet that same purpose turns exclusionary once it is rendered into a compulsory moral or religious vocabulary. Inclusion theory acknowledges belonging and distinctiveness as needs that operate simultaneously (Shore et al., 2011; Randel et al., 2018). Scholarship on faith diversity advises against restricting legitimacy to the majority tradition or treating the absence of religion as equivalent to the absence of ethics (Park & Martinez, 2022). The exploratory inference drawn here is that the design principle ought to consist of shared work values dignity, safety, mutual respect, and integrity while refraining from prescribing shared metaphysical beliefs.

4.3. Organizational visibility versus personal privacy

When managers gather detailed reports concerning spiritual attitudes, attendance, or self-disclosure, they risk eroding the very psychological safety that the initiative is intended to cultivate. Crossman (2015) pinpoints vulnerabilities entailed in public spiritual self-disclosure, whereas Edmondson (1999) and Colquitt (2001) indicate why speaking up and fair process are consequential. An ethical approach gauges program accessibility, opportunity, satisfaction with the option offered, and protections against coercion, rather than the depth or sincerity of an employee's private convictions. Research designs ought to distinguish employee experience explicitly from managerial interpretations, thereby minimizing common-source bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

V. A VOLUNTARY AND INCLUSIVE MEANING-SUPPORTIVE HR FRAMEWORK

Drawing together the literature reviewed above, this paper advances the Voluntary and Inclusive Meaning-Supportive HR (VIM-HR) framework. Four design conditions voluntariness, worldview inclusion, psychological safety, and procedural safeguards are theorized to determine whether employees regard an HR initiative as legitimate. It is posited that perceived legitimacy comes before either authentic engagement or sustained nonparticipation without penalty. The framework is exploratory and normative in nature: its components are not validated constructs, its pathways are not estimated, and the propositions are meant to be assessed empirically in later work.



Figure 1. Proposed VIM-HR conceptual architecture (editable text framework)

Note. The diagram represents a proposed explanatory structure, not statistical mediation coefficients or established causal relationships. Nonparticipation without disadvantage is a legitimate endpoint, not an adverse outcome.

5.1. Theory-building propositions

Proposition 1.

Employees will perceive meaning-supportive HR initiatives as more legitimate when they can freely participate, decline, or select equivalent alternatives without professional disadvantage.

Proposition 2.

The relationship between an organization's declared values-oriented practices and employee trust will be stronger when faith, non-faith, and privately held worldviews receive comparable recognition.

Proposition 3.

Psychological safety will help explain why employees can express authentic preferences about value-laden HR activities rather than providing socially desirable compliance.

Proposition 4.

Transparent implementation procedures, confidentiality, and non-retaliation will strengthen perceived legitimacy, independently of the frequency of workplace spirituality activities.

Proposition 5.

Where high work demands coexist with low employee choice, employer-sponsored spirituality initiatives may be experienced as behavioral control rather than well-being support.

Proposition 6.

Perceived initiative legitimacy will be a more informative proximal indicator of ethical implementation than either formal policy presence or raw participation rates.

VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR MANUFACTURING HR RESEARCH

Manufacturing provides relevant research setting because its standardized work procedures, hierarchical structures, shift schedules, and diverse workforce arrangements may influence employees' access to voluntary workplace initiatives. However, such disparities within Pune's manufacturing sector require empirical verification. Future exploratory research could employ semi-structured interviews with shop-floor employees, supervisors, contract workers, and HR managers to examine differing perceptions of voluntariness, inclusion, and psychological safety. Subsequent quantitative investigations could assess autonomy support, procedural justice, meaningful work, and perceived inclusion using established measurement frameworks (Colquitt, 2001; Edmondson, 1999; Lips-Wiersma & Wright, 2012; Steger et al., 2012). Context-specific instrument validation and direct employee participation would strengthen measurement validity, while collecting data from multiple sources could reduce common-method bias and improve the robustness of empirical findings (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

Table 2. Exploratory research agenda and defensible future designs

Investigation	Indicative indicators	Recommended design / caution
Is consent genuine?	Opt-out clarity; presence of alternatives; perceived consequences for refusal	Employee interviews followed by anonymous survey; do not infer consent from attendance.
Are diverse worldviews included?	Equivalence for faith/non-faith employees; belonging; disclosure privacy	Comparison across identity positions with voluntary disclosure and minimum-cell protections.
Can employees safely disagree?	Voice climate; non-retaliation confidence; managerial power	Multilevel team data; separate frontline and managerial reports.
Do initiatives complement good work design?	Workload, rest time, physical safety, job resources	Longitudinal mixed methods; avoid causal claims from one cross-section.
Is legitimacy maintained over time?	Perceived fairness, trust, authentic choice, subsequent uptake	Repeated measures; track changes without treating participation as success alone.

VII. DISCUSSION, CONTRIBUTION, AND LIMITATIONS

The theoretical contribution of this study resides in relocating the central concern away from asking whether organizations offer spirituality-based

activities and toward clarifying the conditions under which such initiatives honour employees' autonomy, personal beliefs, and freedom either to construct or to withhold meaning. This conceptual repositioning brings together the conventionally affirmative workplace spirituality literature (Ashmos & Duchon, 2000; Duchon & Plowman, 2005; Karakas, 2010) and critical organizational perspectives that foreground individual autonomy, organizational power, and the possible instrumentalization of spirituality (Lips-Wiersma & Morris, 2009; Lips-Wiersma et al., 2009; Santori, 2026). By treating voluntariness, inclusion, and psychological safety as foundational conditions rather than as marginal organizational features, the proposed framework advances existing theoretical understanding of spirituality-informed human resource management. In addition, grounded in self-determination theory, it distinguishes authentic employee engagement from participation driven by organizational expectations, conformity, or perceived pressure (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Gagné & Deci, 2005). This perspective advances the elaboration of a more inclusive and ethically grounded conception of workplace spirituality within strategic HRM.

Viewed practically, the proposed framework carries substantial implications for HR professionals, organizational leaders, and policymakers, especially within culturally diverse manufacturing settings. Organizations ought to prioritize voluntary participation, transparent communication, accessible secular alternatives, and safeguards against adverse consequences for employees who elect not to take part in spirituality-related activities. Consultation with employees, inclusive policy formulation, and adequate protection of personal beliefs should form indispensable elements of implementation strategies. Moreover, organizational effectiveness should be assessed through multidimensional indicators that encompass psychological safety, employee well-being, perceived inclusion, workplace dignity, and employee satisfaction, instead of depending solely on productivity-related outcomes. An approach of this kind is consistent with the principles of sustainable and employee-centred human resource management (Guest, 2017; Cooke, 2025). The framework thus urges organizations to acknowledge meaningful work as a significant dimension of employee experience while safeguarding individuals' freedom to determine their own spiritual, religious, or philosophical orientations.

Notwithstanding these conceptual and practical contributions, the research carries certain methodological and contextual limitations. As an exploratory, literature-based investigation, the reviewed sources were purposively synthesized rather than selected through a fully reproducible systematic review process. As a result, the research does not establish pooled effect sizes, publication prevalence, or statistically generalizable relationships. In addition, several theoretical connections have been drawn from adjacent scholarship on self-determination, organizational inclusion, and psychological safety, and these require further empirical examination within spirituality-informed HRM contexts. The proposed conceptual framework and six research propositions remain theoretically derived and have not undergone direct statistical validation. Moreover, employees' experiences may differ according to cultural background, religious orientation, organizational hierarchy, employment status, and occupational responsibilities. Such differences may affect the framework's applicability across industrial sectors and geographical regions. Accordingly, the findings should be read as exploratory theoretical contributions rather than as conclusive evidence of causal relationships.

The scope for future research extends toward investigating the organizational, psychological, and ethical mechanisms through which spirituality-informed HR practices shape employee experiences. Future research could examine the interplay among voluntary participation, inclusive organizational settings, psychological safety, employee voice, and perceived organizational support in generating authentic engagement. Research comparing manufacturing industries, organizational sizes, occupational categories, and geographical regions could yield valuable understanding of contextual variations in implementation and in how employees respond. Future studies might additionally examine the experiences of shop-floor workers, administrative staff, supervisors, and senior managers in order to establish whether organizational hierarchy affects perceptions of voluntariness and inclusion. Special consideration could be given to manufacturing clusters in Pune and other industrial areas of India, where

workforce diversity and operational demands offer pertinent contexts for investigating these relationships. Investigations of this kind could help to refine the conceptual framework and to identify further organizational conditions required for responsible spirituality-informed HRM.

Future empirical work should employ rigorous quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods designs in order to validate and extend the proposed framework. Exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis could be used to develop and establish dependable measurement instruments for voluntariness, inclusion, psychological safety, perceived coercion, and authentic employee engagement. Structural equation modelling could then be applied to test the proposed theoretical relationships, including the possible mediating function of psychological safety and the moderating effects of organizational hierarchy, leadership behaviour, and workforce diversity. Longitudinal and multilevel research designs could yield deeper understanding of how these relationships develop over time and function at both individual and organizational levels. Qualitative interviews and organizational case studies could additionally uncover employee experiences that standardized survey instruments may fail to capture adequately. Taken together, these future directions constitute a systematic research agenda for converting the exploratory framework into an empirically validated model. In the final analysis, the research stresses that the effectiveness of spirituality-informed HR practices should be judged not simply by their presence or frequency within the organization but by their ability to support meaningful work while protecting employee autonomy, dignity, inclusion, and psychological well-being.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This exploratory study furthers knowledge of spirituality-informed human resource management by demonstrating that the organizational worth of meaning-supportive HR practices rests not solely on their formal adoption but rather on the ethical and psychological circumstances that shape how they are implemented. Through an integrative synthesis of extant scholarship, the analysis identifies voluntariness, worldview inclusion, psychological safety, and procedural fairness as mutually interconnected underpinnings for cultivating authentic employee engagement while protecting individual autonomy and dignity. By bringing together affirmative and critical viewpoints on workplace spirituality, the study calls into question the presumption that spiritual activities promoted by the organization inevitably yield positive employee experiences. Rather, it draws a conceptual distinction between authentic meaning-making and compliance-driven participation, underscoring that meaningful work environments arise when employees are supported in expressing their personal values without facing pressure to disclose beliefs, conform to prescribed practices, or take part in organizationally endorsed spiritual activities.

The central scholarly contribution consists in developing the VIM-HR framework, which offers an ethically grounded perspective on spirituality-informed HRM and sets out six exploratory propositions to guide subsequent empirical inquiry. This framework enriches existing theoretical debate by conceptualizing employee autonomy, inclusion, and psychological safety as constitutive conditions of responsible HR practice rather than as peripheral organizational concerns. For manufacturing organizations, its relevance consists in providing a conceptual basis for designing inclusive HR interventions while acknowledging workforce diversity, hierarchical structures, and the complexities of implementation. Although empirical validation is still required, the framework delineates a distinctive research agenda for investigating the mechanisms through which meaning-supportive practices may foster sustainable employee well-being and organizational effectiveness. In the final analysis, the study concludes that the definitive criterion of responsible spirituality-informed HRM is not an organization's capacity to institutionalize spirituality, but rather its ability to facilitate meaningful work without eroding employees' freedom of belief, dignity, and psychological safety.

REFERENCES

[1] B. A. Allan, C. Batz-Barbarich, H. M. Sterling, and L. Tay, “Outcomes of meaningful work: A meta-analysis,” *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 500–528, 2019, doi: 10.1111/joms.12406.

[2] D. P. Ashmos and D. Duchon, "Spirituality at work: A conceptualization and measure," *Journal of Management Inquiry*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 134–145, 2000, doi: 10.1177/105649260092008.

[3] A. B. Bakker and E. Demerouti, "Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward," *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 273–285, 2017, doi: 10.1037/ocp0000056.

[4] M. Benefiel, L. W. Fry, and D. Geigle, "Spirituality and religion in the workplace: History, theory, and research," *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 175–187, 2014, doi: 10.1037/a0036597.

[5] J. S. Bunderson and J. A. Thompson, "The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work," Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 32–57, 2009, doi: 10.2189/asqu.2009.54.1.32.

[6] J. A. Colquitt, "On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure," Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 386–400, 2001, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.386.

[7] F. L. Cooke, "From strategic HRM to sustainable HRM? Exploring a common good approach through a critical reflection on existing literature," Human Resource Management, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 1381–1399, 2025, doi: 10.1002/hrm.22318.

[8] J. E. Crossman, "Being on the outer: The risks and benefits of spiritual self-disclosure in the Australian workplace," Journal of Management & Organization, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 772–785, 2015, doi: 10.1017/jmo.2015.6.

[9] E. L. Deci and R. M. Ryan, "The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior," Psychological Inquiry, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 227–268, 2000, doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.

[10] E. Demerouti, A. B. Bakker, F. Nachreiner, and W. B. Schaufeli, "The job demands–resources model of burnout," Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 86, no. 3, pp. 499–512, 2001, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499.

[11] B. J. Dik, D. Daniels, and A. J. Alayan, "Religion, spirituality, and the workplace: A review and critique," Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, vol. 11, pp. 279–305, 2024, doi: 10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-110721-041458.

[12] D. Duchon and D. A. Plowman, "Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance," The Leadership Quarterly, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 807–833, 2005, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.07.008.

[13] A. Edmondson, "Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams," Administrative Science Quarterly, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 350–383, 1999, doi: 10.2307/2666999.

[14] M. L. Frazier, S. Fainshmidt, R. L. Klinger, A. Pezeshkan, and V. Vracheva, "Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension," Personnel Psychology, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 113–165, 2017, doi: 10.1111/peps.12183.

[15] L. W. Fry, "Toward a theory of spiritual leadership," The Leadership Quarterly, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 693–727, 2003, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001.

[16] M. Gagné and E. L. Deci, "Self-determination theory and work motivation," Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 331–362, 2005, doi: 10.1002/job.322.

[17] D. E. Guest, "Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework," Human Resource Management Journal, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 22–38, 2017, doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12139.

[18] W. A. Kahn, "Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work," Academy of Management Journal, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 692–724, 1990, doi: 10.2307/256287.

[19] F. Karakas, "Spirituality and performance in organizations: A literature review," Journal of Business Ethics, vol. 94, no. 1, pp. 89–106, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0251-5.

[20] R. Kramar, "Beyond strategic human resource management: Is sustainable human resource management the next approach?" The International Journal of Human Resource Management, vol. 25, no. 8, pp. 1069–1089, 2014, doi: 10.1080/09585192.2013.816863.

[21] M. Lips-Wiersma and L. Morris, "Discriminating between 'meaningful work' and the 'management of meaning'," Journal of Business Ethics, vol. 88, no. 3, pp. 491–511, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0118-9.

[22] M. Lips-Wiersma and S. Wright, "Measuring the meaning of meaningful work: Development and

validation of the Comprehensive Meaningful Work Scale (CMWS)," Group & Organization Management, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 655–685, 2012, doi: 10.1177/1059601112461578.

[23] M. Lips-Wiersma, K. L. Dean, and C. J. Fornaciari, "Theorizing the dark side of the workplace spirituality movement," Journal of Management Inquiry, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 288–300, 2009, doi: 10.1177/1056492609339017.

[24] J. Milliman, A. J. Czaplewski, and J. Ferguson, "Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment," Journal of Organizational Change Management, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 426–447, 2003, doi: 10.1108/09534810310484172.

[25] L. H. Nishii, "The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups," Academy of Management Journal, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 1754–1774, 2013, doi: 10.5465/amj.2009.0823.

[26] A. Pandey, R. K. Gupta, and A. P. Arora, "Spiritual climate of business organizations and its impact on customers' experience," Journal of Business Ethics, vol. 88, no. 2, pp. 313–332, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s10551-008-9965-z.

[27] L. S. Park and L. R. Martinez, "Fifty shades of pray: Faith diversity management approaches impact employee satisfaction, support perceptions, and turnover," Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 1103–1120, 2022, doi: 10.1002/job.2626.

[28] R. Peccei and K. van De Voorde, "Human resource management–well-being–performance research revisited: Past, present, and future," Human Resource Management Journal, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 539–563, 2019, doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12254.

[29] P. Petchsawang and D. Duchon, "Measuring workplace spirituality in an Asian context," Human Resource Development International, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 459–468, 2009, doi: 10.1080/13678860903135912.

[30] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, J.-Y. Lee, and N. P. Podsakoff, "Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies," Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 88, no. 5, pp. 879–903, 2003, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879.

[31] A. E. Randel, B. M. Galvin, L. M. Shore, K. H. Ehrhart, B. G. Chung, M. A. Dean, and U. Kedharnath, "Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness," *Human Resource* Management Review, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 190–203, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.002.

[32] B. D. Rosso, K. H. Dekas, and A. Wrzesniewski, "On the meaning of work: A theoretical integration and review," Research in Organizational Behavior, vol. 30, pp. 91–127, 2010, doi: 10.1016/j.riob.2010.09.001.

[33] P. Santori, "Against spiritual leadership in (for-profit) organizations," Journal of Business Ethics, 2026, doi: 10.1007/s10551-026-06264-1.

[34] L. M. Shore, A. E. Randel, B. G. Chung, M. A. Dean, K. H. Ehrhart, and G. Singh, "Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research," Journal of Management, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 1262–1289, 2011, doi: 10.1177/0149206310385943.

[35] H. Snyder, "Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines," Journal of Business Research, vol. 104, pp. 333–339, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.

[36] M. F. Steger, B. J. Dik, and R. D. Duffy, "Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI)," Journal of Career Assessment, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 322–337, 2012, doi: 10.1177/1069072711436160.

[37] R. J. Torraco, "Writing integrative literature reviews: Guidelines and examples," Human Resource Development Review, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 356–367, 2005, doi: 10.1177/1534484305278283.

[38] K. Van De Voorde, J. Paauwe, and M. Van Veldhoven, "Employee well-being and the HRM–organizational performance relationship: A review of quantitative studies," *International Journal of Management Reviews*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 391–407, 2012, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00322. x.