

***NISHKAMA KARMA IN THE BHAGAVAD GITA: ITS RELEVANCE TO
ETHICAL DECISION-MAKING IN MODERN LIFE***

VEDANT MIHIRBHAI DAVE

Research Scholar

Surendranagar University, Wadhwan, Surendranagar

Abstract

This paper examines the concept of *Nishkama Karma* in the *Bhagavad Gita* and explores its relevance to ethical decision-making in modern life. *Nishkama Karma* refers to performing one's duty sincerely without selfish attachment to the results of action. The study explains how this principle combines duty, self-control, equanimity, service, and concern for the welfare of society. It argues that non-attachment does not mean indifference to consequences; rather, it encourages individuals to act responsibly without allowing personal reward, fear, praise, or failure to influence moral judgement. The paper also relates *Nishkama Karma* to contemporary areas such as leadership, education, professional ethics, workplace behaviour, civic responsibility, and environmental action. Drawing upon the *Bhagavad Gita* and modern philosophical and organisational studies, the paper concludes that *Nishkama Karma* can provide a practical ethical framework for responsible action, provided that it is supported by justice, human dignity, accountability, and concern for consequences.

Keywords: *Nishkama Karma*, *Bhagavad Gita*, Ethical Decision-Making, *Karma Yoga*, *Dharma*, Equanimity, Moral Responsibility, Modern Ethics

Introduction

Modern ethical decisions are frequently made in environments that reward visible results: profit, promotion, grades, votes, rankings, or public approval. Results matter because responsible agents must consider the foreseeable effects of what they do. Yet exclusive attachment to results can also distort judgment. It can encourage manipulation, short-termism, fear of failure, concealment of error, and the treatment of other people as instruments. The *Bhagavad Gita* addresses a closely related crisis. Arjuna knows that action is unavoidable, but he is overwhelmed by the personal, familial, and political consequences of acting. Krishna's response is not a command to stop caring. It is a discipline of action that joins duty, self-command, practical judgment, and freedom from possessiveness toward outcomes.

This discipline is commonly called *niṣkāma karma*, or action performed without selfish desire for its fruits. The expression does not itself function as a simple slogan in the *Gita*; it names a teaching developed across the text's discussions of karma yoga, equanimity, sacrifice, and the welfare of the world. Properly interpreted, nishkama karma is neither passivity nor indifference. It asks an agent to identify a justified duty, examine motives, act competently for a good larger than the ego, and accept uncertain results without allowing success or failure to corrupt moral purpose. This paper argues that nishkama karma remains relevant to modern ethical decision-making as a practice of detached engagement. Its value lies in restraining self-interest while strengthening responsible action, but its use must be limited by attention to consequences, justice, human dignity, and institutional accountability.

The argument uses textual analysis of the *Bhagavad Gita* together with an integrative review of philosophical, psychological, and management research. The modern literature is useful because it converts an ancient ethical ideal into testable concepts such as duty orientation, equanimity, service consciousness, moral motivation, and workplace spirituality. At the same time, this paper treats empirical associations cautiously: self-report studies cannot prove that the *Gita* alone causes ethical conduct, and findings from particular Indian organizational samples cannot automatically be universalized.

Conceptual Foundations: Action, Duty, and Nonattachment

The central statement of karma yoga appears in 2.47-48. Krishna tells Arjuna that his authority extends to action, not ownership of its fruits, and then connects disciplined action with equanimity in success and failure (*Bhagavadgita* 2.47-48). The passage is sometimes reduced to “ignore the result,” but the surrounding argument rejects both result-obsession and inaction. Chapter 3 states that no one can remain completely inactive and that necessary action should be performed without attachment (*Bhagavadgita* 3.5, 3.8-9). In 3.19, the agent is therefore instructed to do the work that ought to be done, precisely without clinging to its reward. Nishkama karma is thus an orientation within action, not an escape from it.

Three connected ideas give this orientation ethical content. First is *dharma*: a justified obligation arising from one's relationships, role, capacities, and place in a moral order. Second is *samatva*, the steadiness that prevents pleasure, pain, gain, loss, victory, or defeat from controlling judgment. Third is *lokasaṃgraha*, the sustaining or welfare of the world. Krishna's exemplary person acts not merely for private liberation but to prevent social disintegration and to guide others through responsible conduct (*Bhagavadgita* 3.20-25). These concepts qualify one another. Duty without equanimity may become anxious or self-

serving; equanimity without duty may become withdrawal; and role-duty without concern for the wider world may defend harmful conventions.

Nonattachment also concerns moral psychology. In 3.30, Krishna asks Arjuna to dedicate action, relinquish possessiveness, and act without the fever of egoistic anxiety. Chapter 5 compares the unattached agent to a lotus leaf untouched by water, suggesting participation without inward contamination by greed or pride (*Bhagavadgita* 5.10-12). This is not emotional numbness. It is freedom from the claim that “my” success, reputation, or reward must determine what is right. Such freedom can create space for attention, courage, and correction because the agent has less need to defend a preferred self-image.

Bina Gupta's philosophical analysis clarifies that the *Gita* cannot be classified as duty ethics alone. The text joins obligation to the cultivation of stable excellences of character, so that right action becomes an expression of the kind of person one has learned to be (Gupta 395). Sandeep Sreekumar complicates the picture further by interpreting Krishna's ethics as a form of rule-consequentialism oriented toward liberation and *lokasamgraha*, rather than as a system in which consequences are irrelevant (308-10). Together these readings support a balanced interpretation: nishkama karma removes egoistic ownership of consequences, but it does not remove the duty to deliberate about public good and foreseeable harm.

A Comparative Ethical Interpretation

Viewed through modern ethical categories, nishkama karma combines insights that are often separated. Its deontological element is clearest in the demand to do what ought to be done even when reward is uncertain or personal cost is high. This protects integrity against bribery, popularity, and convenience. Yet a purely deontological reading is insufficient because the *Gita* does not present duty as mechanical rule-following. Arjuna must transform the fear, attachment, and confusion through which he perceives his obligation. The quality of intention matters alongside the external form of the deed.

The virtue-ethical element concerns this transformation of the agent. Repeated practice of nonattachment cultivates steadiness, courage, self-restraint, humility, and practical wisdom. Gupta's account is useful because it shows why the *Gita*'s ethics cannot be exhausted by the question “Which rule applies?” (373-95). Ethical decision-making also asks, “What kind of person can recognize and carry out the right action without being captured by fear or pride?” Equanimity is therefore not merely a coping strategy after a decision; it is a virtue that keeps deliberation open to evidence and makes faithful action possible under pressure.

The consequential element appears in the concern for *lokasamgraha*. Sreekumar's interpretation emphasizes that Krishna's teaching directs action toward liberation and the

maintenance of a shared moral world (308-10). Lehtonen likewise argues that nonattachment permits purposeful pursuit of common benefit while excluding selfish appropriation of that benefit (457-71). The synthesis can be stated as a distinction between outcome responsibility and outcome possession. Ethical agents remain responsible for gathering evidence, anticipating harm, choosing proportionate means, and evaluating effects. What they surrender is the fantasy of total control and the claim that a favorable result belongs to the ego. This distinction is especially relevant in medicine, public policy, education, and environmental action, where decisions must be outcome-aware even though no individual can guarantee the result.

Review of Related Literature

The organizational literature first tried to operationalize karma yoga through duty orientation and absence of desire for rewards. Zubin Mulla and Venkat Krishnan's early conceptualization connected the ideal with conscientious obligation while distinguishing it from achievement striving driven by personal gain ("Karma Yoga" 36-41). Their later work developed a three-part model: duty orientation, indifference to rewards, and equanimity. This model is ethically significant because it links recognition of obligation, motivation that is not captured by reward, and the character required to persist when moral action becomes costly.

Other researchers have challenged the stability of that model. Ashish Rastogi and Surya Prakash Pati argue that previous studies disagreed about karma yoga's dimensions and sometimes used measures with weak reliability. Their qualitative account defines it instead as a persistent positive state characterized by absorption in work and service consciousness, with sense control and equanimity as prerequisites (51-63). Rastogi, Pati, Pankaj Kumar, and Jitendra Kumar Dixit later developed and validated a six-item instrument built around absorption and service consciousness (359-62). The disagreement is productive rather than merely technical. It shows that detachment should not be measured as apathy: credible models pair it with deep attention to the task and concern for those served.

Several studies relate karma yoga to moral and prosocial capacities. In a study of postgraduate management students, Mulla and Krishnan found that karma yoga was associated with empathic concern especially when personal distress was low. They conclude that a karma yogi resembles an altruistically motivated person who understands another's need without becoming emotionally disabled by it ("Indian Work Ideal" 44-45). In a later survey of 459 employees from two Indian organizations, the same authors found relationships among aspects of karma yoga and moral sensitivity, moral motivation, and moral character ("Indian Model" 339-51). These results support the idea that equanimity can enable care

rather than suppress it. Nevertheless, both studies depend substantially on self-reports and culturally specific measures, so they establish promising associations rather than a universal causal law.

Leadership research adds a relational dimension. A study of 205 leader-follower pairs found that leaders' duty orientation was associated with charisma and inspirational motivation, particularly when followers strongly endorsed an Indian philosophical worldview (Mulla and Krishnan, "Do Karma-Yogis" 181). A separate study of 329 executives reported that transformational leadership related positively to followers' duty orientation and indifference to rewards, with stronger effects in longer and more frequent leader-follower relationships (Mulla and Krishnan, "Transformational Leadership" 85-117). Smriti Agarwalla, Bhargavi Seshadri, and Krishnan further found that karma yoga enhanced transformational leadership under a *sattvic* rather than a *rajasic* condition, warning that the same vocabulary of action can operate differently when character is dominated by egoistic energy (18-20). Collectively, these studies suggest that ethical orientation is learned through example and relationship, not merely through private reflection.

Research also connects the ideal with broader organizational outcomes. Ajinkya Navare and Ashish Pandey report three studies associating their karma yoga measure with mindfulness, self-transcendence, thriving, psychological capital, flourishing, and lower burnout (285-95). The findings make psychological sense: when self-worth is not tied completely to external results, setbacks may become information rather than personal defeat. Yet detachment must not be used to romanticize excessive workloads or deny employees fair compensation. A spiritualized demand to "work without reward" would contradict service consciousness by shifting benefits upward while asking workers alone to renounce them.

The wider workplace-spirituality literature offers indirect support while also marking a boundary. John Milliman, Andrew Czaplewski, and Jeffery Ferguson found that meaningful work, a sense of community, and value alignment were associated with several positive work attitudes (436-43). Lilian Otaye-Ebede, Samah Shaffakat, and Scott Foster later found that workplace spirituality related to ethical climate, prosocial motivation, and moral judgment, while branch-level ethical climate related to helping behavior and service performance (619-23). These studies do not demonstrate the truth of nishkama karma or prove that religious language belongs in every workplace. They do show that meaning, community, and ethical climate can connect inner orientation with outward conduct.

Finally, the scholarship extends karma yoga beyond individual performance. Balakrishnan Muniapan and Biswajit Satpathy interpret *dharma* and *karma* as an "inside-out"

basis for corporate responsibility: individual responsibility should widen into corporate and global responsibility (184-85). Tommi Lehtonen's analysis of nishkama karma through the prisoner's dilemma likewise argues that desireless action is best understood as purposeful cooperation for common benefit, not arbitrary indifference (457-71). His analysis is especially useful for modern ethics because it separates personal nonattachment from outcome-blindness: an agent may aim at collective welfare while refusing to treat personal advantage as the reason for acting.

Nishkama Karma as a Decision-Making Discipline

The literature and the *Gita* together support a six-part discipline for ethical choice. The first task is to identify the duty at stake. A person should ask what is legitimately owed to affected people, professional standards, law, promises, and the purpose of the role. Duty orientation research similarly defines obligation in relation to members, missions, and moral codes, and finds it positively related to ethical behavior (Hannah et al. 220-38). The adjective “legitimately” is essential: obedience to an authority is not ethical when the command itself violates justice or basic rights.

Second, the agent should map stakeholders and foreseeable consequences. Nishkama karma rejects appropriation of the fruit; it does not abolish practical intelligence. A doctor must still compare risks, a manager must anticipate effects on employees and customers, and a public official must consider public resources. The question becomes, “Which outcome serves the common good, and which benefit am I tempted to reserve for myself?” This connects *dharma* to *lokasamgraha* and prevents narrow role performance from becoming morally blind.

Third, the agent should examine attachment. Relevant questions include whether fear of blame, desire for praise, financial interest, loyalty to an in-group, or the need to “win” is distorting perception. Detachment is not the absence of a goal; it is the refusal to make egoistic gain the measure of right action. This step is particularly valuable under conflicts of interest. Disclosure, recusal, independent review, or transparent criteria can institutionalize what nishkama karma seeks inwardly: separation of judgment from private reward.

Fourth, one should select means consistent with the duty and act with full competence. The *Gita* describes yoga as skill in action and repeatedly condemns inaction disguised as renunciation (*Bhagavadgita* 2.50, 3.4-8). A detached professional therefore prepares carefully, seeks relevant evidence, consults people who may be harmed, and documents the reasoning. Process excellence is not a substitute for ethical purpose, but ethical purpose without competent execution is incomplete.

Fifth, the agent receives the result with equanimity. Success should not produce arrogance or retrospective moral certainty; failure should not produce paralysis, concealment, or revenge. Equanimity preserves the capacity to learn. It helps a decision-maker admit an error because identity is not fused with the outcome. It also supports moral courage when a justified action is unpopular or when its benefits appear only in the long term.

Sixth, detachment must end in accountability, not escape from it. After acting, the decision-maker should compare actual and intended effects, repair avoidable harm, revise procedures, and remain answerable to those affected. This final step distinguishes nishkama karma from fatalism. Human beings do not control every consequence, but they remain responsible for reasonable foresight, chosen means, honest reporting, and corrective action.

Applications in Modern Life

In professional life, this discipline can reduce both corruption and defensive decision-making. Consider a procurement officer choosing among vendors. A nishkama-karma approach requires attention to the public purpose of the purchase, transparent criteria, disclosure of relationships, and a decision independent of gifts or career advantage. Nonattachment does not mean indifference to price or quality; it means that personal benefit does not own the decision's fruit. If later evidence reveals a defect, equanimity supports prompt correction rather than concealment.

For leaders, the principle shifts the center of leadership from image to stewardship. A manager facing layoffs should not use detachment to become emotionally distant. The relevant duty is to weigh organizational survival alongside employees' dignity, distribute burdens fairly, communicate truthfully, and consider alternatives. The leader then acts without making applause, share price, or personal security the sole criterion. Research linking karma yoga with duty-oriented and transformational leadership is suggestive here, but organizational checks, worker voice, and legal protections remain necessary.

Nishkama karma also applies to education and ordinary personal decisions. A student can pursue mastery rather than treating a grade as the entire value of study; a researcher can report inconvenient results rather than protecting a desired hypothesis; and a social-media user can speak responsibly without measuring truth by likes. Process-focused action can reduce anxiety, but the aim is not simply private calm. It is truthful and socially responsible participation under conditions where outcomes are partly uncontrollable.

In civic and environmental action, nonattachment can sustain effort when problems exceed one person's control. Voting, conserving resources, reporting wrongdoing, or serving a community may not yield immediate visible results. The logic of *lokasamgraha* gives such

action meaning without promising personal victory. Lehtonen's cooperative interpretation is important: the rational alternative to self-interested competition is not helplessness but disciplined contribution to collective goods.

Limits and Ethical Safeguards

The first danger is that *svadharma*, or one's own duty, can be interpreted as rigid submission to inherited social roles. A modern application cannot assume that every traditional or organizational role is just. Duties must be tested against non-harm, equal dignity, human rights, professional ethics, and democratic law. When a role demands discrimination, deception, or abuse, resistance or conscientious refusal may be the more faithful form of duty.

The second danger is exploitation. Employers may praise selfless work while concentrating rewards and decision power in themselves. Nishkama karma concerns the agent's freedom from greed; it does not cancel another person's obligation to pay fairly, provide safe conditions, or recognize labor. Voluntary spiritual discipline must never become a managerial technique for silencing legitimate claims.

Third, detachment can be confused with emotional suppression or neglect of consequences. Ethical decision-making requires empathy, data, consultation, and impact assessment. The empirical literature is strongest when equanimity appears beside service consciousness and empathic concern, not when it is isolated. Likewise, spirituality in a plural workplace should be offered in inclusive language—integrity, service, process focus, and stewardship—rather than imposed as a religious commitment.

Finally, nishkama karma cannot replace institutions. Personal virtue is vulnerable to self-deception, especially when power is unequal. Transparent rules, audits, appeals, conflict-of-interest policies, and independent oversight make detachment publicly verifiable. The best modern use of the ideal is therefore dual: cultivate an inward freedom from selfish reward and construct outward systems that expose decisions to evidence and accountability.

Conclusion

Nishkama karma offers modern ethics a demanding middle path between outcome obsession and withdrawal. The *Bhagavad Gita* asks people to act because action is unavoidable, to ground action in duty, to direct it toward the welfare of the world, and to release the ego's claim over success and reward. Philosophical scholarship shows that this ethic contains duty, virtue, and concern for consequences; organizational research translates it into duty orientation, equanimity, absorption, service consciousness, moral motivation, and ethical leadership.

Its relevance is greatest when detachment is understood as disciplined freedom rather than indifference. A modern decision-maker should clarify legitimate obligations, consider stakeholders and foreseeable harm, examine selfish attachments, act competently, meet results with equanimity, and remain accountable for learning and repair. With safeguards against hierarchy, exploitation, fatalism, and religious coercion, nishkama karma becomes neither a relic nor a productivity slogan. It becomes a practical ethic of responsible action in an uncertain world: wholehearted effort without possessiveness, moral courage without self-righteousness, and service without dependence on applause.

REFERENCES

- Agarwalla, Smriti, Bhargavi Seshadri, and Venkat R. Krishnan. "Impact of Gunas and Karma Yoga on Transformational Leadership." *Journal of Human Values*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2015, pp. 11-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685815569590>.
- The Bhagavadgita in the Mahabharata*. Edited and translated by J. A. B. van Buitenen, U of Chicago P, 1981.
- Gupta, Bina. "Bhagavad Gītā as Duty and Virtue Ethics: Some Reflections." *Journal of Religious Ethics*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2006, pp. 373-95. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9795.2006.00274.x>.
- Hannah, Sean T., et al. "Duty Orientation: Theoretical Development and Preliminary Construct Testing." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 123, no. 2, 2014, pp. 220-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.10.007>.
- Lehtonen, Tommi. "Niṣkāmakarma and the Prisoner's Dilemma." *Sophia*, vol. 60, 2021, pp. 457-71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11841-020-00780-x>.
- Milliman, John, Andrew J. Czaplewski, and Jeffery Ferguson. "Workplace Spirituality and Employee Work Attitudes: An Exploratory Empirical Assessment." *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2003, pp. 426-47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810310484172>.
- Mulla, Zubin R., and Venkat R. Krishnan. "Do Karma-Yogis Make Better Leaders? Exploring the Relationship between the Leader's Karma-Yoga and Transformational Leadership." *Journal of Human Values*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2009, pp. 167-83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097168581001500207>.

- Mulla, Zubin R., and Venkat R. Krishnan. "Karma Yoga: A Conceptualization and Validation of the Indian Philosophy of Work." *Journal of Indian Psychology*, vol. 24, nos. 1-2, 2006, pp. 26-43.
- Mulla, Zubin R., and Venkat R. Krishnan. "Karma-Yoga, the Indian Work Ideal, and Its Relationship with Empathy." *Psychology and Developing Societies*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2008, pp. 27-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097133360702000102>.
- Mulla, Zubin R., and Venkat R. Krishnan. "Karma-Yoga: The Indian Model of Moral Development." *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 123, no. 2, 2014, pp. 339-51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1842-8>.
- Mulla, Zubin R., and Venkat R. Krishnan. "Transformational Leadership and Karma-Yoga: Enhancing Followers' Duty-Orientedness and Indifference to Rewards." *Psychology and Developing Societies*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2012, pp. 85-117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/097133361102400104>.
- Muniapan, Balakrishnan, and Biswajit Satpathy. "The 'Dharma' and 'Karma' of CSR from the Bhagavad-Gita." *Journal of Human Values*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2013, pp. 173-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685813492265>.
- Navare, Ajinkya, and Ashish Pandey. "Karma Yoga: Scale Development and Studies of the Impact on Positive Psychological Outcomes at the Workplace." *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, vol. 22, no. 2, 2022, pp. 271-99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14705958221111239>.
- Otaye-Ebede, Lilian, Samah Shaffakat, and Scott Foster. "A Multilevel Model Examining the Relationships between Workplace Spirituality, Ethical Climate and Outcomes: A Social Cognitive Theory Perspective." *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 166, no. 3, 2020, pp. 611-26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04133-8>.
- Rastogi, Ashish, Surya Prakash Pati, Pankaj Kumar, and Jitendra Kumar Dixit. "Development of a 'Karma-Yoga' Instrument, the Core of the Hindu Work Ethic." *IIMB Management Review*, vol. 32, no. 4, 2020, pp. 352-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iimb.2019.10.013>.
- Rastogi, Ashish, and Surya Prakash Pati. "Towards a Conceptualization of Karma Yoga." *Journal of Human Values*, vol. 21, no. 1, 2015, pp. 51-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685815579985>.
- Sreekumar, Sandeep. "An Analysis of Consequentialism and Deontology in the Normative Ethics of the Bhagavadgītā." *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 40, no. 3, 2012, pp. 277-315. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-012-9154-3>.