

# **The Regent University Christian Business Practice Study: Some Preliminary Results**

A report presented to the CBFA, Buffalo NY, October 2000  
Michael A. Zigarelli, Associate Professor of Management and Project Leader

---

This report is a description and a preliminary analysis of data gathered by the Regent University School of Business from Christian managers and leaders in for-profit and not-for-profit organizations. These data were collected from June 15, 2000 to August 31, 2000.

## **I. Introduction**

The past two decades have witnessed a proliferation of books and magazine articles on how the Bible directs the Christian in the workplace. Managers, business owners, and ministry leaders have found these tools helpful, yet these resources remain predominantly theoretical and/or theological. Moreover, there is a dearth of academic studies that specifically examine the attitudes, behaviors or best practices of Christians operating in managerial or leadership roles. Herein lie the reasons for undertaking this study: to fill gaps in the academic and practitioner literature regarding how Christians actually operationalize scriptural principles in the workplace.

More specifically, we have three project objectives:

1. To identify the attitudes, behaviors, and best practices of Christians in managerial and leadership roles
2. To publish the results of the study as academic articles, popular press books, and practitioner and student training materials
3. To actively disseminate these resources so that business practitioners, ministry leaders and students alike will be better equipped to serve God in their work and career.

## **II. The Five Phases of the Research Project**

We've designed this project to have five phases of activity, scheduled to be implemented during a three- to five-year period of time. It is our belief that countless Christians in this and future generations will be able to benefit from this work, discovering God-honoring solutions to their management challenges and marketplace problems.

### Phase 1: Attitudes, Behaviors and Best Practices in Christian-Based Management

Phase One pursues questions about how Christians think and act in their managerial and leadership roles. Moreover, Phase One seeks to answer the “How do I do it?” question for those desiring to lead, manage, supervise, or interact with employees or customers using Christian principles. The long-term objective here is to collect advice from 1,000+ Christians about what they do and what works for them in the Christian-based management.

### Phase 2: Christian Owned and Operated: Benchmarking the Best in Christian-Based Business

This phase will offer an in-depth look at several for-profit, Christian-based firms and how they implement Scriptural principles throughout their business system.

### Phase 3: My Boss Changed My Life

Few things communicate as strongly as the personal testimony of how one life changes another. This phase will compile anecdotes from employees about how working for a Christian boss influenced the quality of their lives, both on and off the job.

### Phase 4: The Demographics of Christian-Based Business

This phase will (1) attempt to estimate the number of Christian-based businesses in the United States and (2) profile Christian business owners by identifying their corporate and personal objectives.

### Phase 5: Christian vs. Secular Management

This phase of the project is a long-term study of comparative performance outcomes. The primary research question asks: “What are the different stakeholder outcomes from Christian-based management relative to its secular counterpart?”

## **III. Preliminary Report on Phase One: The Survey Instrument**

### *How Did We Determine What To Ask?*

The primary instrument for collecting data in Phase One is a survey that is available in both hard copy and electronic formats (<http://www.regentstudy.org>). The survey was developed and distributed through grants from both the Provost’s office and the School of Business at Regent University.

I began by soliciting input from the entire School of Business faculty regarding research questions that they would like to pursue or see pursued in the field of Christian-based management and leadership. Equipped with this list of research questions, I structured the survey to solicit the data necessary to pursue many of these important, albeit somewhat disparate, interests of the faculty. Accordingly, the survey inquires about practices in areas of employee management, financial stewardship, servant-leadership, priorities of various stakeholders, business acumen, customer relations, community service activity, best practices, subordinates' perspectives, theological and spiritual maturity issues, and an array of demographic issues. The resultant instrument is longer than it would have been had it been designed to meet the interests of any one researcher.

The specific items on the survey are not written arbitrarily or cavalierly. Rather, they map to the book of Proverbs, to the Matthean Beatitudes (Matt. 5:3-12), and to the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22-23). The Proverbs' exegesis and application derived from *Management by Proverbs* (Moody Press, 1999). The Beatitudinal exegesis and application derived from two sources: *Be a Manager for God's Sake* (Regent University School of Business Press, 1999) and *Faith at Work* (Moody Press, 2000). The fruit of the spirit exegesis and application derived from consultation with various theologically conservative commentaries. The draft survey then went through several iterative edits by the faculty, culminating in an 88-item instrument that includes both quantitative and qualitative sections.

### ***Scaling and Validity Issues***

For most items, I chose a 6 point scale: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Moderately Disagree, (3) Mildly Disagree, (4) Mildly Agree, (5) Moderately Agree, and (6) Strongly Agree. There is no neutral middle point. The assumption here is that Christians who take the time to complete this survey would likely have at least some leaning on the issue raised in each individual survey item. By compelling respondents to at least mildly agree or disagree with each item, we eliminate the possibility of respondents relying on a neutral middle point because of intellectual fatigue or laziness when completing the survey.

There were four other strategies employed to increase the validity of the data. First, there is a prominent caution at the beginning of the survey that reads:

PLEASE READ THIS FIRST

The information that you provide on this survey is CONFIDENTIAL so please be candid in your responses. To do sound research, we need you to share with us your actual workplace attitudes and behaviors, rather than the attitudes and behaviors that you think should be reflected in a Christian manager. Thank you for taking the time to participate in what may prove to be a landmark study.

Second, items are worded to ensure that the “socially desirable” response is not always agreement with the statement. An example is the following juxtapositions of items:

2. I consider it to be part of my job to quickly resolve conflicts among my employees
3. It is not my responsibility to reduce the work-related stress level of my employees

The goal here is to minimize any sequencing bias – the tendency to keep circling, say, 5s all the way down a column to just get through the survey expediently.

Third, some narrative items are worded to legitimize both agreement and disagreement with the statement, hence reducing the social desirability of either end of the spectrum. An example of this technique would be:

10. Some people make it a high priority to praise their employees for their efforts and achievements. Others do not, sometimes because they do not consider praise to be a useful business practice, sometimes because they are too overworked to spend time praising employees. About how often would you say you deliver some sort of praise to an employee?

Fourth, we pilot tested the survey with many of our EMBA students and some friends of the faculty members to fine tune questions for clarity.

### ***Format Issues***

To enhance response rate, the survey was color printed in 8x11 booklet form, accompanied by a business reply envelope and a four-color brochure explaining the research agenda, and mailed out in a 9x12 envelope. Moreover, we have made the survey available on the web for the convenience of those who might prefer to complete it in that format. The web-based form has also permitted us to efficiently publicize the survey and collect data from that publicity in a cost-effective manner. Thus far, Life @ Work Journal, Scruples.org, and the 700 Club have found the research to be newsworthy enough to produce segments on it for their readers / viewers.

## **IV. Preliminary Report on Phase One: Data and Analysis**

### ***Distributing and Receiving the Survey***

We compiled the primary mailing list for this survey by accessing the many Christian business directories freely available on the internet and by identifying managers and leaders in the Regent University business student and alumni databases. We made a significant effort to balance the sample geographically. The internet-generated database

included 1,201 names and addresses and the Regent database included 750 names and addresses. In total, we sent out 1,951 surveys on June 15, 2000.

Of the 1,951 surveys distributed, 98 came back because of an outdated or inaccurate address. Twenty-seven of these were resent with corrected addresses, bringing the total distribution to 1,880 surveys. Of these, 162 had been returned as of August 31, 2000 for a current response rate of 8.6 percent.

This response rate is low, most likely because of the length of the survey. It is therefore possible that those responding are somehow different from both the target sample of 1,880 as well as from Christians generally in the workplace.

On the former question, we have no reason to believe that our respondents differ from the target sample, except insofar as they may be more committed to seeing the research completed. One could speculate that these people have more time available than those who did not respond, or that they are more comfortable with the application of their faith in the workplace and therefore are willing to make public their perspectives, but this is at present, mere conjecture.

On the latter question of whether our respondents differ from Christians generally in the workplace, they probably do insofar as they are more theologically conservative and more interested in applying faith issues in daily life. I reach this conclusion based on the fact that the mailing list is comprised exclusively of christians who are (1) affiliated with christian-business organizations, (2) willing to list themselves as christian leaders or managers in business directories, or (3) current or former attendees of a Christ-centered business school. Therefore, the results should be interpreted in the context of these limitations.

### ***Who are the Respondents?***

Table 1 presents the demographics of the study thus far. The average age is 44.3 years and they have on average 15.2 years of management experience. Approximately 64 percent work in for-profit organizations and 44 percent work in Christian organizations. A majority (62 %) are business owners or in top management positions (vice-president level or higher). The median number of direct reports and work unit employees under them is 6 and 12 respectively. Eighteen percent of the respondents are female.

The respondents are predominately white (90% of those who indicated race) but come from a broad cross-section of the United States. In this analysis 31 states and the District of Columbia are represented, the largest concentrations coming from California (15%), Florida (9%) and Virginia (15%). Web respondents comprised 7.4 percent of the sample.

Theologically, the respondents represent various denominational backgrounds with the largest percentage (37.2%) labeling themselves "Non denominational." Almost all (98%)

“strongly agree” with the statements “I believe in the divinity of Jesus” (item 63) and “Jesus was crucified, died, was resurrected and is spiritually alive today” (item 64). On average, with of course some variance, they report that they have “significant familiarity with the Bible” (item 70), they read the Bible “every few days” (item 68), and believe that: “The Bible is the inspired word of God. It contains no errors, but some verses are to be taken symbolically rather than literally” (item 69). Their theology typically embraces the notion that “people are inherently sinful, but sometimes do good things” (item 55) and rejects the notion that “The more consistent I am in doing things right, the more acceptable I am to God” (item 62).

### ***In General, What Do the Respondents Say about their Business Practices and Priorities?***

Table 2 presents summary statistics for many of the items in the survey. In general, respondents say that they are very employee-oriented, making it their job to serve employees, to be approachable, to provide positive feedback frequently, to resolve conflicts quickly, to reduce employee stress and to develop employee careers. However, as a group, they “moderately disagree” with the notion that: “It is appropriate to hire someone who is not the most qualified applicant for a job if that person needs the job more than the other applicants.”

When determining how much of a raise to give an employee, they order five decision-making criteria as follows (items 11-15):

Criterion	Average Ranking (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being the most important criterion)	Standard Deviation
Employee performance	1.30	0.57
Employee effort	2.45	0.95
Importance of retaining the employee	3.04	1.03
The inflation rate	4.03	1.20
The employee’s family need	4.10	0.92

Paired sample t-test of lowest to highest ranking (performance to family need):  $p=0.000$

When asked to compare the relative importance of the needs of seven stakeholders (items 26-32), customers’ needs clearly came out on top, followed by the needs of employees. The complete juxtaposition looks like this:

Stakeholder	Average Ranking (on a scale of 1-7 with 1 being the most important stakeholder)	Standard Deviation
Customers	1.52	0.74
Employees	2.68	1.20
Immediate Boss (those without a boss not included)	3.12	1.49
Stockholders (data from those in for-profit companies only)	4.15	1.88
Community in which the organization operates	4.97	1.57
Creditors	5.13	1.51
Suppliers	5.32	1.22

Paired sample t-test of lowest to highest ranking (customers to suppliers):  $p=0.000$

Other noteworthy results from Table 2 include the following:

- Respondents “**Mildly Agree**” that “Verbally sharing Christ is a priority for me at work” and on average (with a lot of variance), they say that they verbally share Christ at work “Two or three times a month.”
- Respondents “**Moderately Agree**” that “Profit is a means, not an end” and that “It is a priority to me to use my position to give something back to the local community.”
- Respondents **moderately to strongly agree** that “I make it a priority to pay all work-related bills on time,” “It is important to me to avoid overselling what my product or service can do,” “At work, I consider the financial resources at my disposal to really be God’s resources,” “At work, I consider God to be my ultimate Boss,” and “The Bible is a useful management tool.”

### ***Do the Respondents Say that they Exhibit the Fruit of the Spirit?***

There are 15 items in the survey that inquire into how the respondent perceives he or she is viewed by his or her co-workers (items 33-47). Nine of these items map to the fruit of the spirit. The other six are basic business acumen dimensions (i.e., the people around me at work would say that I am an intelligent person, efficient person, organized person, a person who can get results, a budget conscious person, a person who can solve problems). Overall, respondents say that they are doing well in most of these areas. There is some intriguing variance, though. The averages for the fruit of the spirit questions and for the business acumen questions were as follows:

Fruit of the Spirit Dimension	N	Mean ***	Standard deviation
Faithful (item 38)	159	5.53	0.63
Self-control (item 42)	159	5.28	0.69
Goodness / generosity (item 43)	159	5.16	0.73
Inner peace (item 45)	157	5.10	0.91
Kindness (item 40)	157	5.08	0.89
Loving (item 47)	155	4.99	0.88
Joyful (item 35)	159	4.93	0.80
Gentle (item 34)	160	4.73	0.97
Patient (item 37)	161	4.65	1.12

\*\*\* 6=strongly agree, 5=moderately agree, 4=mildly agree

Paired-sample t-test, highest to lowest (faithful to patient): p=0.000

Perceived Business Acumen	N	Mean ***	Standard deviation
A person who can solve problems (item 46)	159	5.60	0.55
A person who can get results (item 39)	159	5.48	0.63
An intelligent person (item 33)	160	5.37	0.57
An efficient person (item 36)	160	5.24	0.84
A person who is sensitive to budgetary constraints (item 41)	157	5.15	0.87
An organized person (item 44)	160	5.11	0.96

\*\*\* 6=strongly agree, 5=moderately agree, 4=mildly agree

Paired-sample t-test, highest to lowest (solve problems to organized): p=0.000

Indeed, there are many questions we will pursue with these data. However, one broad question we have begun to explore is whether Christians report doing *as well* on the fruit of the spirit as they do on business acumen. This is directly testable here since the 9 fruit of the spirit items collapse into one latent construct with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.810, and the six the business acumen items collectively produce an alpha of 0.675. I therefore transformed the data to create these two constructs (interpreted as the average of nine items and the average of six items, respectively) and performed a t-test to compare whether there are significant differences in the self-reported fruit of the spirit and business acumen. Interestingly, the results indicate that respondents report doing less well on displaying the fruit of the spirit than on displaying business and productivity skills:

	Mean Difference	Standard Deviation of Difference	t-statistic	Degrees of freedom	p-value
Paired difference: Business acumen construct minus Fruit of the Spirit construct	0.288	0.627	5.452	140	0.000

### ***What are Some of the Other Latent Constructs in the Study?***

Factor analyses pointed to some other data reduction possibilities. In particular, I have identified the following constructs in the data:

An active and growing relationship with God. Seven items collapse into this factor, producing an alpha of 0.835. The seven items appear to reveal the extent to which the respondent has a genuine commitment to God and an active, growing relationship with Him. Those items are:

- 52. I consider prayer to be a useful “management tool”
- 53. I would describe myself as a Christ-centered person
- 54. I have made a personal commitment to Jesus Christ that is still important in my life today
- 59. My faith is the most important influence in my life
- 60. I seek God’s will through prayer
- 61. I believe that God is at work in my life today
- 65. I am making a deliberate effort to grow into a deeper relationship with God

A God-focus in the workplace. The factor analysis indicated that two items may be part of the same latent construct: “At work, I consider the financial resources at my disposal to really be God’s resources” (item 21) and “At work, I consider God to be my ultimate boss” (item 48). The alpha for these two is 0.673.

Planning, vision, and goals measurement. The factor analysis pointed to another measure of business skill: the trio of items 22, 23 and 24. The alpha for these three is 0.655.

- “I have a clear, long-term (3-10 year) vision for where I’d like to take my work group, department, or organization” (item 22)
- “‘Planning’ – identifying and selecting goals and courses of action – is a high priority for me at work” (item 23)
- “I have good measures of how well my work group, department, or organization is meeting its goals” (item 24)

Recognition and empowerment. Lastly, although the employee management variables do not neatly collapse into well-defined factors, there are two variables that apparently fit together well: “. . .About how often do you seek input from your employees for the decisions you have to make (whether by one-on-one conversation, group meetings, email, phone, or any other means)?”(item 9) and “. . .About how often would you say you deliver some sort of praise to an employee?” (item 10). The alpha for these two is 0.701.

## ***What are Some of the More Interesting Relationships Surfacing in the Data?***

With approximately 80 quantitative variables in the study there are a plethora of relationships to explore in the data. We at Regent will likely be mining this data set for years to come. Below, however, are some of the initial findings with respect to correlational and possibly causal connections among constructs.

### Is There a Profile of the “Fruit of the Spirit” Manager?

As one might expect, a correlation analysis (not included here) shows that those who report that they are doing well on the fruit of the spirit also are significantly higher on responses like:

- “My employees would say that they can talk to me about anything” (item 1)
- “When correcting employees, I work hard to criticize with care” (item 5)
- “Profit is a means, not an end” (item 18)
- “I make it a priority to pay all my work-related bills on time” (item 19)
- “At work, I consider the financial resources at my disposal to really be God’s resources” (item 20)

Fruit of the Spirit managers also tend to be older respondents, they deliver praise to employees more often than do other managers (item 10), and they report having more business skills than do other respondents (i.e., clearer long-term vision, better measures of goal attainment, greater business acumen in others’ eyes, and a strong customer focus). Therefore, there may be a “model manager” profile in the data – a person who ranks high on both faith and managerial dimensions.

The next logical question, then, is “What predicts whether one will display the fruit of the spirit at work?” The answer may be elemental theology. Regression 1 indicates that the chief (and only statistically significant) predictor is *the extent to which one has an active and growing relationship with God*. Age is significant at the 10 percent level, suggesting that fruit may accompany years. Note, though, that the number of years *as a christian* is not a significant predictor.

### Managers in Christian Organizations Appear to Have Fewer Business Skills

Examining at the newly constructed variable regarding the long-term vision, planning as a high priority, and measurement of goal attainment (items 22, 23, 24), it seems that Christian managers and leaders in Christian organizations lag those in non-Christian organizations. Not only does this surface in the correlation matrix (correlation between

Christian organization and vision/planning/goals measures = -0.182,  $p = 0.033$ ), but in a regression analysis as well (Regression 2).

In plain English, there appears to be evidence that, even controlling for things like gender, age, years of management experience, number of direct reports, and employee management style, those working in Christian organizations report significantly less facility with these important business skills. (Note that “for-profit organization” was dropped from the independent variable list to examine the effect of “Christian organization” without regard for the for-profit status). The p-value does not quite reach the .05 level of significance, but at .07 this is a relationship we intend to watch closely as we gather more data.

#### Those with Many Direct Reports Tend to Disagree that “Profit is a means, not an end”

A regression analysis of the item “profit is a means, not an end” yielded some noteworthy relationships. Regression 3 indicates that respondents who have more direct reports are less likely to agree with this statement. The same is true of female respondents in this sample. Conversely, and logically, those respondents who make it a “high priority to serve employees” are more likely to say they view profit as a means. Also interesting is that the spiritual maturity constructs do not correlate with this dependent variable.

#### Long-time Christians May Resist Making a Priority of Giving Back to the Community

This is a counter-intuitive result. Regression 4 uses the dependent variable “It is a priority to me to use my position to give something back to the local community” (Item 25). It suggests that although older managers lean toward using their position to give back to the community, those who have many years in the faith are not inclined to do this. The p-values are not yet significant here ( $p=0.12$ ), but they are close enough to warrant continued inspection of this relationship.

Also telling is that the construct “Active and growing relationship with God” is moving toward significance here ( $p=0.14$ ). Those who report this spiritual growth may be more likely to make community a priority in their jobs. Further bolstering this conclusion is Regression 5 which uses Community Need Ranking (item 30) as the dependent. (This is a reversed-scored variable, with 1 being the highest rank among stakeholders and 7 being the lowest rank). In this model, those with an active and growing relationship with God say that the local community is a higher priority among competing stakeholders than do those who report a less active relationship with God.

The juxtaposition of these two models points to the possibility that there are many long-term christians who have a stagnant relationship with God. One possible consequence of this stagnation might be a greater reluctance on their part to use their (usually high-level) position and organizational resources to care for the local community. There may be many other consequences we have yet to uncover.

### Long-time Christians May Also Be Less Likely to Witness

A similar model, Regression 6, looks at who is more likely to make verbal witnessing a priority in their jobs. As expected, those in Christian organizations report this to be a priority. Unexpectedly, though, long-time Christians may not be as willing to witness on the job. Holding constant organizational, maturity, gender, and business skill variables, “long time Christian” is close to significance here, suggesting continued inspection of this relationship.

No other variables in this model are statistically significant. However, one variable is moving in that direction: as one might expect, those with an active and growing relationship with God may be more likely to verbally witness at work.

## **V. Where is this research going?**

This fall we will be continuing to collect data through the survey instrument, employing Ph.D. Fellows, other doctoral students, and masters-level graduate assistants to identify individuals who would be willing to complete the survey. Moreover, because the majority of respondents have indicated a willingness to be personally interviewed about their management style and best practices, we will begin collecting qualitative data through personal conversation with dozens of Christian managers and leaders. We will also be contacting employees of these leaders to inquire into how working for a value-centered boss can positively affect one’s life.

It is also our hope to look more deeply into how Christian firms implement scriptural principles throughout their business; thus, we will continue to seek Christian owned and operated firms who are willing to be “benchmarked” as best practices organizations.

From all of this information, we anticipate producing several academic articles, as well as some books, training materials, and perhaps a case study series. As noted in our project objectives, the central goal here will then be to actively disseminate these resources so that business practitioners, ministry leaders and students alike will be better equipped to serve God in their work and career.

## Table 1: Demographics

### 1A. Basic Demographics

Item Number	Item Name	n	Mean	Standard Dev.
75	Top management position	147	62%	
77	Years of management experience	140	15.2	9.7
79	For profit organization	147	64%	0.48
80	Christian organization	146	44%	0.50
84	Age	145	44.3	10.5
85	Years as a Christian	135	28.7	12.4
87	Male	153	82%	
16	Direct reports (median)	157	6.0	18.1
17	Work unit employees	156	12.0	131.9

### 1B. Racial Composition of the Sample

Race	Frequency	Percent
Black	5	3.3
White	136	90.7
Asian	5	3.3
Hispanic	2	1.3
Other	2	1.3

### 1C. Denominational Composition of the Sample

Denomination	Frequency	Percent
Non-denominational	54	37.2
Baptist	25	17.2
Other	16	11.0
Presbyterian	15	10.3
Assembly of God	15	10.3
Roman Catholic	8	5.5
Methodist	6	4.1
Lutheran	3	2.1
Anglican / Episcopalian	2	1.4
Mennonite	1	0.6

**Table 2: Summary Statistics**

<b>Item Number</b>	<b>Item Name</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Dev.</b>
1	Employees can talk to me about anything	150	5.12	0.75
2	Resolve employee conflict quickly	146	5.43	0.83
3	Not my job to reduce stress	150	1.84	1.15
4	Career development is not my job	148	1.71	0.98
5	I criticize with care	153	5.72	0.70
6	Performance review is a waste of time	152	1.48	0.86
7	Okay to hire not most qualified	150	2.08	1.34
8	High priority to serve employees	152	5.37	0.88
9	How often seek input	147	4.78	1.30
10	How often praise employees	154	4.65	1.31
18	Profit is a means	147	4.95	1.20
19	Pay all bills on time	153	5.76	0.62
20	Avoid overselling	147	5.51	0.87
21	Financial resources are God's	160	5.45	0.91
22	Clear long term vision	157	4.96	1.23
23	Planning a high priority	160	5.32	0.92
24	Good measures of goal attainment	158	4.94	1.00
25	Give back to the community	150	5.07	0.97
48	God is my boss	161	5.73	0.63
49	Bible a useful tool	161	5.67	0.64
50	Gospels a useful tool	159	5.47	0.83
51	Proverbs a useful tool	160	5.55	0.85
52	Prayer a useful tool	161	5.70	0.61
53	Christ centered	162	5.58	0.64
54	Personal commitment to Jesus	162	5.94	0.26
55	People are inherently sinful	158	4.91	1.48
56	People are inherently good	159	2.71	1.83
57	I do things because they are God's will	160	4.78	1.28
58	Christianity has all the answers for successful life	160	5.46	0.95
59	Faith is the most important influence in my life	162	5.67	0.60
60	Seek God's will through prayer	161	5.57	0.70
61	God is at work in my life	160	5.85	0.36
62	Doing right makes me acceptable to God	158	2.91	1.89
63	Believe in the divinity of Jesus	162	5.97	0.19
64	Crucified died resurrected alive	162	5.97	0.19
65	Deliberate effort to grow in relationship	160	5.70	0.67

66	Verbal witnessing a priority	161	4.29	1.26
67	How often do you witness	142	3.16	1.65
68	How often do you read the Bible	162	4.87	1.35
69	Liberal view of the Bible	162	1.74	0.56
70	Little or no Bible knowledge	162	2.01	0.61
--	Fruit of the spirit construct	148	5.05	0.54
--	Business acumen construct	149	5.33	0.44
--	Active and growing relationship with God construct	153	5.74	0.38
--	God focus at work construct	154	5.63	0.63
--	Recognize and empower construct	143	4.73	1.13
--	Vision, planning and goals construct	151	5.09	0.81
--	Survey completed on the web	162	7.4%	

**Regression Analysis**  
(standard error in parentheses)

	<b>Regress. 1: fruit of the spirit</b>	<b>Regress. 2: vision, planning and goals</b>	<b>Regress. 3: Profit is a means</b>
Male	-0.048 (0.155)	-0.102 (0.214)	0.905 ** (0.396)
Age	0.014 * (0.008)	0.013 (0.012)	0.015 (0.020)
Number of years as a Christian	0.003 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.007)	0.006 (0.011)
Years of management experience	-0.009 (0.008)	0.006 (0.012)	-0.013 (0.021)
Employed in a for-profit organization	-0.043 (0.121)	---	0.232 (0.297)
Employed in a Christian organization	-0.041 (0.128)	-0.291 * (0.160)	-0.061 (0.308)
Liberal view of the Bible	0.058 (0.109)	---	-0.248 (0.258)
High priority to serve employees	0.018 (0.059)	0.008 (0.089)	0.321 ** (0.140)
Direct reports	0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.004)	-0.033 *** (0.011)
Recognize and empower employees construct	0.029 (0.051)	0.215 *** (0.068)	-0.085 (0.128)
Perceived business skill construct	0.128 (0.132)	0.404 ** (0.182)	0.353 (0.326)
Vision / planning / goals construct	0.022 (0.070)	---	-0.098 (0.172)
Fruit of the Spirit construct	---	---	0.163 (0.249)
God focus at work construct	-0.030 (0.141)	---	-0.015 (0.326)
Active and growing relationship with God construct	0.674 *** (0.248)	---	0.635 (0.598)
n	101	110	91
R-square	0.218	0.203	0.249
Adjusted R-square	0.091	0.131	0.099

\* significant at the .10 level

\*\* significant at the .05 level

\*\*\* significant at the .01 level

### Regression Analysis (Cont.)

	<b>Regress. 4: High Priority to Give Back to the Community</b>	<b>Regress. 5: Communit y Needs Ranking (reverse scored)</b>	<b>Regress. 6: Verbal Witnessing a Priority</b>
Male	0.096 (0.270)	0.654 (0.406)	0.277 (0.343)
Age	0.027 (0.015)	-0.035 (0.022)	0.008 (0.019)
Number of years as a Christian	-0.013 (0.008)	-0.028 (0.013)	-0.017 * (0.010)
Years of management experience	-0.002 (0.015)	0.027 (0.022)	-0.016 (0.019)
Employed in a for-profit organization	-0.150 (0.208)	0.622 ** (0.320)	-0.290 (0.271)
Employed in a Christian organization	-0.029 (0.216)	-0.483 (0.335)	0.899 *** (0.282)
Liberal view of the Bible	0.038 (0.187)	0.319 (0.287)	-0.284 (0.242)
High priority to serve employees	0.179 * (0.101)	-0.112 (0.156)	-0.026 (0.131)
Direct reports	0.000 (0.004)	-0.016 ** (0.007)	-0.047 (0.006)
Recognize and empower employees construct	0.068 (0.087)	0.445 *** (0.133)	0.111 (0.113)
Perceived business skill construct	-0.278 (0.239)	0.284 (0.348)	-0.230 (0.293)
Vision / planning / goals construct	0.369 *** (0.118)	-0.359 ** (0.183)	-0.132 (0.154)
Fruit of the Spirit construct	-0.069 (0.185)	0.375 (0.284)	0.114 (0.239)
God focus at work construct	0.295 (0.247)	0.666 * (0.369)	0.419 (0.311)
Active and growing relationship with God construct	0.696 (0.469)	-1.316 ** (0.678)	0.817 (0.572)
n	96	100	100
R-square	0.379	0.344	0.364
Adjusted R-square	0.262	0.227	0.250

\* significant at the .10 level

\*\* significant at the .05 level

\*\*\* significant at the .01 level