



Christian Virtues in the Workplace When Not Everyone is a Christian

Deborah Lin McCain Podolinsky
Regent University

Adding depth to the existing fruit of the Spirit (FOTS) instrumentation of Bocarnea et al. (2018), this study sought to explore differences in how Christians and non-Christians rate managers on the nine fruit of the Spirit scales. In this cross-sectional quantitative research that used an online survey, this study supported the reliability of Bocarnea et al.'s measure. Additionally, results supported the statistical difference in how the two groups of followers (Christian and non-Christian) rated their managers in six of the nine scales.

Keywords: Leadership, religious diversity, Christianity in the workplace, Christian virtues

Introduction

The United States has experienced a post-Christian paradigm shift that embraces value and ethical relativism (Impact 360, 2018). Many Generation Z respondents in a recent Barna study reported confusion about biblical values and culture today (Impact 360, 2018). In developing leadership models, researchers have stressed the importance of leaders' values on leadership (Farling et al., 1999; West, 2008). Designed to integrate Christian values in a 360-degree review, Bocarnea et al. (2018) developed an instrument theoretically grounded in the fruit of the Spirit of Galatians 5. When Bocarnea et al. ran validation studies in their development of the fruit of the Spirit instrumentation, 104 out of 115 of the participants self-reported as Christian. Bocarnea et al. did not report religious affiliation in the second validation study. Dean (2019) included Bocarnea et al.'s instrument, and the fruit of the Spirit as predictor variables for the workplace constructs of employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational spirituality. In this study, Dean "included age, gender, income, relationship tenure, and years of experience" (p. 45) as control variables but did not introduce religious affiliation in the study. Neither the initial validation studies during the development of the fruit of the Spirit instrumentation, nor Dean's (2019) study using the fruit of the Spirit analyzed the instrument with religious diversity. The purpose of this research was to explore the fruit of the Spirit within a broader cultural and religious

context as a means of gaining insight into the generalization of the fruit of the Spirit Instrument beyond the Christian culture. As the fruit of the Spirit instrument is relatively new, few studies have confirmed the validity of the measure, and no studies have explored its applicability cross-culturally. Given the lack of diversity of religious affiliation in the initial validation of the fruit of the Spirit scales, the question begged to be asked: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers in each of the fruit of the Spirit? This question was explored specifically with the following research questions:

RQ1: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' love?

RQ2: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' joy?

RQ3: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' peace?

RQ4: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' patience?

RQ5: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' kindness?

RQ6: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' goodness?

RQ7: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' faithfulness?

RQ8: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' gentleness?

RQ9: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' self-control?

Literature Review

Bocarnea et al. (2018) developed a fruit of the Spirit instrument with nine independent factors representing love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. Much research on the topic of value and virtue leadership, of which the fruit of the Spirit instrument fits as a tool for evaluating employee and manager performance, led up to the development of this instrument.

Development of a Fruit of the Spirit Measurement

Bhindi and Duignan (1997) developed an authentic leadership model that included a plea for the inclusion of spirituality in order to restore the significance of values, and at the same time honor a holistic approach to leader and follower needs. Barna (1997) specifically included the fruit of the Spirit as part of a Christological description of a Christian leader. Winston (2002), who was also one of the co-authors of the fruit of the Spirit instrument, focused a previous leadership study on values that align with agapao love, the beatitudes, the sermon on the mount, Proverbs 31, spiritual gifts, and other biblical values. In his work on authentic leadership, George (2003) highlighted an authentic leadership model that emphasized the importance of leaders who not only instill values within the operations and decisions of corporations, but who also represent those values down to their very core, as demonstrated by how they treat others. While George created an authentic leadership model that highlighted values, Patterson's (2003) servant leadership theory focused on the virtues of the servant leader. In this model, servant leadership included the construct of agapao love (Patterson, 2003), which is considered in the fruit of the Spirit measure (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Fry's (2003) spiritual leadership model also emphasized the self-awareness of the leader within the context of a values-based approach and posited that the spiritual leadership model could also stand as a distinct intrinsic motivational-based theory. Some of Fry's constructs of the spiritual leadership model are shared as constructs of the fruit of the Spirit instrument. The similarities overlap with the constructs of (a) patience, (b) kindness, and (c) self-control.

While the list of research on value and virtue leadership extends beyond this particular literature, Bocarnea et al. (2018) explored and defined the nine fruit of the Spirit within this leadership research framework. As Bocarnea et al. defined each construct, they presented exegetical biblical evidence from the context of Old and New Testament to operationally define each fruit. In turn, that helped them in the development of items for the scales, and practically apply the fruit of the Spirit to contemporary leadership and management theory.

Love

Love has increased in its application in scholarly research in leadership but is somewhat complex to define (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Leading to the development of their first item, Bocarnea et al. (2018) distinguished a loving leader as one who is able to balance organizational outcomes and follower needs. Loving leaders show their appreciation and commitment to followers by empowering the followers in the accomplishment of their assigned tasks (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Followers feel appreciated when a leader is loving (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Loving leaders also emphasize the growth and welfare of followers and create a culture where everyone shares in the success of the organization

(Bocarnea et al., 2018). These descriptions of loving leadership are the principal components of the five-item scale that Bocarnea et al. developed to measure love.

Joy

A leader who leads with joy celebrates the successes of individual followers and also celebrates the synergistic effect of those individuals working together (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Further, a joyful leader also creates support structures for followers that help to address stress, especially during times of trials and tribulations. In turn, this increases morale and positivity (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Leaders who value and demonstrate joy also fashion an atmosphere through emotional intelligence that inspires positive attitudes and creativity in followers. In this, joyful leaders steer followers away from conflict and destructive emotions and instead communicate the value of positive organizational outlooks and outcomes (Bocarnea et al., 2018). The fruit of the Spirit instrument for joy is a five-item scale (Bocarnea et al., 2018).

Peace

Bocarnea et al. (2018) deconstructed leading with peace into a scale with five items. A leader leads with peace by binding followers in harmony through trust. Followers trust leaders and each other in order to together reach shared organizational goals. In reaching those organizational goals, every follower feels that their contribution matters as part of the team (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Valuing the contributions of each team member, the leader develops an atmosphere of collaboration that leverages the skills of all (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Orchestrating harmonious collaboration, the leader understands how to manage people – turning dysfunction into function, respectfully navigating relationships, and cohesively setting organizational goals that shape organizational identity (Bocarnea et al., 2018). From this collective identity, leaders encourage followers to increase participation in the shared goals of the organization (Bocarnea et al., 2018).

Patience

While patience seems counter to productivity in the hustle of contemporary contexts, leaders practicing patience are calm and collected in leading all followers, especially those who are growing and developing within their own roles, and those with whom may be difficult to work (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Patient leaders also exemplify calmness in waiting for the fruition and completion of organizational goals, as well as remaining calm in the completion of an individual follower's work (Bocarnea et al., 2018). The leader with patience is slow to be provoked by the action of others and instead remains focused on the outcome, trusting in the organizational policies and procedures (Bocarnea et al., 2018).

Kindness

Perhaps kindness has a weak connotation in the context of business profit and loss statements, balance sheets, and the hard decisions of a bottom line, but Bocarnea et al. (2018) recognized its place in contemporary leadership in righteous and upright fairness with each individual of the organization. Kind leaders demonstrate kindness by unselfish acts and decisions, and by maintaining concern for others through words and actions (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Leadership that demonstrates kindness mimics the care that God has for humanity (Bocarnea et al., 2018). The fruit of the Spirit scale for the fruit of kindness has five items (Bocarnea et al., 2018).

Goodness

The practice of goodness is a focus on others from their welfare to well-being (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Leading with goodness is about developing good in and for followers (Bocarnea et al., 2018). This impacts the followers' development and creates an atmosphere that develops follower trust and increases organizational commitment (Bocarnea et al., 2018). In turn, this leads to organizational success and follower performance (Bocarnea et al., 2018). In their scale for goodness, Bocarnea et al. (2018) developed a five-item measurement.

Faithfulness

Faithful leaders are authentic in that they are trusted by followers to act according to how they will say they will act. They also are trusted to do what is best for everyone within the organization (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Faithful leaders keep promises and are reliable, even when that poses to be a challenge (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Followers understand this about a faithful leader because the leader communicates consistently and has proven to be reliable. Faithfulness begets faithfulness, and the leader who leads with faithfulness, has followers who exemplify faithfulness in the organization (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Bocarnea et al.'s (2018) construct of the fruit of faithfulness is comprised of a five-item measurement scale.

Gentleness

Gentle leaders lead through persuasion rather than forcing followers to obey and comply (Bocarnea et al., 2018). While leaders have power, they use it in a way that leverages the freedom of followers to make their own choices to obey (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Even in the midst of aggressive situations and surrounded by others who are aggressive, the gentle leader is poised and peaceful, exercising restraint (Bocarnea et al., 2018). While leaders exercising gentleness will follow rules, policies, and procedures, they are appropriately lenient and refrain from being overly harsh with those who are difficult (Bocarnea et al., 2018). From these premises, Bocarnea et al. (2018) created a five-item scale for gentleness.

Self-control

Leaders who demonstrate self-control refrain from indulging on impulse and temptation (Bocarnea et al., 2018). This restraint comes from will rather than obligation, and the leader makes good decisions even without reward (Bocarnea et al., 2018). The leader remains in control without being controlling and keeps the interest of others foremost and above self-interest (Bocarnea et al., 2018). The leader who practices self-control also keeps a positive attitude focused on achieving goals rather than dwelling on discouraging thoughts like doubt and shortcomings (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Bocarnea et al. (2018) deconstructed leading with self-control into a scale with five items that embody these behaviors.

Initial Factor Analysis of the Fruit of the Spirit Scales

As they developed a scale for each fruit of the Spirit construct, Bocarnea et al. (2018) reported to have followed DeVellis' (2017) scale development guidelines. Procedurally, Bocarnea et al. defined each of the nine fruit through exegetical methods and created an item pool. For each item, they used a seven-point scale with a range of 1 - *Never True* to 7 - *Always True*, and then a panel of three experts reviewed the items for validity. They used Survey Monkey to create and format the survey and distributed the survey link on Facebook and LinkedIn. To see if the data were appropriate for factor analysis, the researchers used KMO and Bartlett's test for sphericity for all nine factors. For every fruit, they analyzed the eigenvalues from a principal component analysis to determine how many factors to use in the analysis (Green & Salkind, 2017). They reran the analyses and presented the Cronbach's alpha reliability analysis results and the factor loadings for every item. Bocarnea et al. (2018) explored the validity and reliability of the nine scales and presented the results. To check convergent validity, they checked the correlation with the Essential Servant Leadership Behaviors (ESLB) scale created by Winston and Fields (2015), and they checked discriminant validity in correlating it with the Intuition scale developed by Trauffer et al. (2010). In this, they were not able to establish discriminant validity, and called for further research of the discriminant validity of the scales. Bocarnea et al. (2018) recommended the use of the fruit of the Spirit scales for self-evaluation, and also as part of a 360-degree review process, where subordinates could help evaluate and give feedback to managers.

In the development of the scales, Bocarnea et al. (2018) presented little discussion of the need for the generalization, or external validity, of the appropriateness of the scales to different cultures. From their sampling, 104 out of the 115 participants in the first validation study self-reported as Christian, and they did not report religious affiliation for the 98 participants in the second validation study (Bocarnea et al., 2018).

Culture in Research

Schein (2009) defined culture as a pattern of ingrained shared assumptions that are taught and learned within a group that influence the identity, worldview, and responses of the group members. Furthering this definition, Schein (2009) divided culture into three levels: artifacts, espoused values, and shared tacit assumptions. Culture is difficult to define clearly as it covers broad concepts of what people have learned (Schein & Schein, 2017). There are also macro and micro cultures, as culture cannot only be defined by national or even corporate borders (Schein & Schein, 2017). As culture is shared, identity is formed, and cohesiveness and values are formed (Schein & Schein, 2017). With the formation of values, assumptions of the way things are or *ought to* occur within the group, and eventually, awareness of those assumptions decrease or are totally dropped (Schein & Schein, 2017). While often culture is easier to identify through the differentiation of behaviors, feelings, thoughts and perceptions are also all filtered through the lens of culture (Schein & Schein, 2017). With a similar approach, Alwin et al.'s (2006) definition of religion fits under the broader context of culture. Value and ethical leadership models, can be universally appropriate. Resnick et al. (2006) explored the four aspects of ethical leadership of character/integrity, altruism, collective motivation, and encouragement from data from the Global Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness (GLOBE) project. Their study supported universality of the dimensions of ethical leadership across cultures, but the degree that each dimension was endorsed in each culture differed. Subtleties existed across cultures (Resnick et al., 2006). Crossman (2007) argued that spirituality in the secular setting is an appropriate paradigm, but Crossman did not address the value system that is appropriate within the secular business world. While the Christian virtues of the fruit of the Spirit may be appropriate cross-culturally, the interpretation of those virtues may also have subtle cultural differences like with the dimension of ethical leadership. Though, as the teachings of the Bible are for all nations and people (Mark 16:15-16; Matthew 28:19-20; Acts 1:7-8), could the fruit of the Spirit Instrument be appropriate across cultures, even in the occurrence of differences of religious affiliation? While some could argue that the fruit are present only in those who have received the Holy Spirit, Erisman and Daniels (2013) posited that the fruit are universal concepts due to the concept of *Imago Dei*, or that all humans have been created in the image of God. The nine fruit of the Spirit are already conceptually found in various other secular performance appraisals, and therefore, should be applicable for all people, and not just those who identify as Christian (Erisman & Daniels, 2013). Bocarnea et al. (2018) emphasized the importance of *Imago Dei* as a presupposition of the fruit of the Spirit scale development, but their validation sampling lacked diversity in religious identity. With this lack of theoretical support to develop a research hypothesis, this research focused on the following research questions:

RQ1: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' love?

RQ2: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' joy?

RQ3: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' peace?

RQ4: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' patience?

RQ5: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' kindness?

RQ6: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' goodness?

RQ7: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' faithfulness?

RQ8: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' gentleness?

RQ9: Is there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' self-control?

Methods

This quantitative research was designed to investigate the fruit of the Spirit instrumentation cross-culturally with those who self-identify as Christian and those who identify as non-Christian. This section also includes the applicability and limitations of the proposed research design, the proposed sampling frame, how data was gathered, and the statistical methods used for the research analysis.

Research Design

The research design was a cross-sectional design using an electronic survey. Unlike a longitudinal design that observes the same individuals over a period of time, a cross-sectional study is a snapshot of data, collected at one point in time (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The study itself took place over a four-week period in February and March of 2020.

Population

Participation requirements were that participants were adults of ages 18 years or older, were employed, and had a manager. This study did not solicit at-risk populations.

Sampling

The nonprobability sampling technique of snowball sampling was used for this study. A disadvantage to using a nonprobability sampling technique was that bias could have been introduced into the sample and limited the generalizability of the study beyond the sampling (Cozby & Bates, 2018). Instead, generalization is often dependent on the replication of studies (Cozby & Bates, 2018). This study sought to further explore Bocarnea et al.'s (2018) fruit of the Spirit scales, and further generalization will depend on additional studies using these scales.

Using Cohen's guidelines for testing the mean difference between two independent means samples with significance set at $\alpha = .05$, power at .80, and .50 medium effect size, each group (Christians and non-Christians) in this study needed a minimum $N = 64$, with a total minimum sample size of $N = 128$ (Cohen, 1992).

Data Gathering Techniques

The data was collected through an online survey. Survey Monkey was used to create and distribute a web link for the survey. To reach adult participants, who were employed and had a manager, the survey was distributed electronically on Facebook, and Linked In through personal news feeds, various community boards, and on walls of religious organizations. The sharable survey link was also distributed through email to known religious leaders and organizations in the Greater Pittsburgh Area to be shared within their religious communities.

Online surveys offer convenience so that many people can be reached relatively quickly. Rhodes et al. (2003) commended the ease of online surveys in quickly and inexpensively reaching large numbers of respondents while also reducing error and bias. On the other hand, Cozby and Bates (2018) listed the risks of online surveys in the uncertainty of obtaining proper consent and associated unknown ethical considerations. Limitations like literacy, access to internet and web-based media platforms also are challenges to using online surveys (Rhodes et al., 2003).

Instrumentation

The online survey comprised of Bocarnea et al.'s (2018) nine fruit of the Spirit. The scale for each fruit consisted of five items, totaling 45 questions evaluating fruit of the Spirit on a seven-point Likert scale. Using DeVellis' (2017) definition of content validity, Bocarnea et al. exegetically supported each item on the fruit of the Spirit scale,

grounded the concepts in their literature review, and also developed their scale with a review from a panel of experts (Bocarnea et al., 2018). They were unsuccessful in their attempt to determine discriminant validity, and therefore, did not report discriminant validity. Bocarnea et al. recommended further research to establish discriminant validity. To use this instrument, permission was requested and granted from the principal author before data was collected.

Love

For love, Bocarnea et al. (2018) optimized their original exegetically supported 12-item scale by narrowing items down to the highest five loading items. "The five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 4.35 that explained 86.9% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .96" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 19).

Joy

Bocarnea et al. (2018) optimized their original exegetically supported 12-item scale for joy by narrowing items down to the highest five loading items. "The five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 4.23 that explained 84.5% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .95" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 33).

Peace

By narrowing down to the highest five loading items, Bocarnea et al. (2018) optimized their original exegetically supported 12-item scale for peace. "The five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 4.45 that explained 89.0% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .97" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 49).

Patience

For patience, Bocarnea et al. (2018) optimized their original exegetically supported 12-item scale by narrowing items down to the highest five loading items. "The five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 4.03 that explained 80.50% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .94" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 64).

Kindness

Bocarnea et al. (2018) optimized their original exegetically supported 12-item scale for kindness by narrowing items down to the highest five loading items. "The five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 4.47 that explained 89.3% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .97" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 80).

Goodness

For goodness, Bocarnea et al. (2018) optimized their original exegetically supported 12-item scale by narrowing items down to the highest five loading items. "The five-item

scale had an eigenvalue of 4.40 that explained 87.9% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .96" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 94).

Faithfulness

By narrowing down to the highest five loading items, Bocarnea et al. (2018) optimized their original exegetically supported 11-item scale for faithfulness. "The five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 4.55 that explained 91.0% of the variance and had a Cronbach's alpha of .98" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 110).

Gentleness

When Bocarnea et al. (2018) explored the principal component analysis of their exegetically supported original 12-item scale for gentleness, they found two factors, but then removed 4 items that cross-loaded. They optimized this 10-item scale for gentleness by narrowing items down to the highest five loading items. "The five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 3.91 that explained 78.24% of the variance. The reliability analysis yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .92" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, pp. 127-128).

Self-Control

Bocarnea et al. (2018) explored the principal component analysis of their exegetically supported original 12-item scale for self-control, they found two factors, but then removed the 3 items in factor 2 that cross-loaded with the first factor. They optimized the remaining 9-item scale for gentleness by narrowing items down to the highest five loading items. The resulting "five-item scale had an eigenvalue of 3.53 explaining 70.74% of the variance and a Cronbach's alpha of .90" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 144).

Three demographic items about age, sex, and religious identity were also a part of the survey. For the purpose of this study, religious affiliation was synonymous with religious identity. Religious identity was divided into two groups: Christian and non-Christian. The informed consent and survey used for this study can be found in the Appendix.

Data Collection

The data was collected over a four-week timeframe in February and March of 2020. Upon distribution, an introductory explanation of the purpose and intended use of the survey was provided to all participants (Cozby & Bates, 2018). The study was also approved by Regent University's HSRB so as to meet ethical guidelines before data collection began (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Results

The sample minimums for each group (non-Christian and Christian) of $N = 64$, as prescribed by Cohen (1992) for mean difference analysis, were exceeded with a total of $N = 302$. Not all participants answered all items on the survey. Of the 302 participants, 76 were male, 224 were female, and two participants chose not to define their sex. The demographic of the participants by age group are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Participants Breakdown by Age Group

Age of participants	<i>N</i>
18-29 years old	83
30-49 years old	158
50-64 years old	53
65 years and over	7
Undefined	1
Total	302

Note. The number of participants that completed each scale varied, as presented in Table 2. Despite this variance, the minimum group participation of $N = 64$ was surpassed for each fruit of the Spirit scale.

Table 2

Participant Breakdown by Scale

Fruit of the Spirit scale	Non-Christian Participants	Christian Participants	Total Participants
Love	94	142	236
Joy	85	131	216
Peace	82	127	209
Patience	80	125	205
Kindness	79	125	204
Goodness	79	125	204
Faithfulness	78	125	203
Gentleness	78	124	202
Self-control	78	123	201

Reliability

Because of the newness of the scale, the reliability of the fruit of the Spirit scales was further assessed in this study. Reliability is a statistical measure that relates to the

consistency of the measure (Cozby & Bates, 2018). Cronbach's alpha measures internal consistency reliability, and, according to Cozby and Bates (2018), Cronbach's alpha should be greater than or equal to .80 to establish reliability in most studies. As with Bocarnea et al.'s (2018) initial findings, all nine of the fruit of the Spirit scales were found to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha (α) greater than .80. Any improvement in any of the scales with the deletion of items was negligible.

Table 3

Reliability of the Fruit of the Spirit Scales

Fruit of the Spirit Scale	α
Love	.916
Joy	.933
Peace	.926
Patience	.932
Kindness	.933
Goodness	.920
Faithfulness	.942
Gentleness	.881
Self-control	.890

Distribution

Distribution of the data helped to determine the analysis tool selected. Because the data was not normally distributed, and instead had a negative skew by visual inspection, an independent sample *t*-test was not selected to analyze the mean difference of how Christian and non-Christian followers rated managers. Instead, its nonparametric equivalent, the Mann-Whitney *U* test, was used to analyze medians of the data.

Analysis of Mean Differences

IBM SPSS Statistics 25 was used to analyze the data. The mean of the five items for each fruit of the Spirit scale was calculated for each participant. These means were then analyzed as the dependent variables with the Mann-Whitney *U* test, which evaluates the statistical difference in medians. The independent variable was religious identity that was split into the two groups of Christian and non-Christian. Both the overall mean scores for each group, and the *p* value from the Mann-Whitney *U* tests are reported here for each dependent variable.

Love

RQ1 asked if there is a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' love. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for love was 5.16, with a standard deviation of ± 1.41 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 4.91, with a standard deviation of ± 1.29 . The result of the Mann-Whitney

U test for love was $U = 5782.5, p = .082 > .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' love was not supported.

Joy

RQ2 asked if there is a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' joy. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for joy was 4.97 with a standard deviation of ± 1.59 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 4.76 with a standard deviation of ± 1.34 . The result of the Mann-Whitney *U* test for joy was $U = 4841.0, p = .105 > .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' joy was not supported.

Peace

RQ3 asked if there is a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' peace. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for peace was 5.18 with a standard deviation of ± 1.53 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 5.01 with a standard deviation of ± 1.26 . The result of the Mann-Whitney *U* test for peace was $U = 4600.5, p = .155 > .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' peace was not supported.

Patience

RQ4 asked if there is a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' patience. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for patience was 5.51 with a standard deviation of ± 1.36 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 5.16 with a standard deviation of ± 1.31 . The result of the Mann-Whitney *U* test for patience was $U = 4030.0, p = .019 < .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' patience was supported.

Kindness

RQ5 asked if there is a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' kindness. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for kindness was 5.66 with a standard deviation of ± 1.25 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 5.28 with a standard deviation of ± 1.26 . The result of the Mann-Whitney *U* test for kindness was $U = 3899.0, p = .011 < .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' kindness was supported.

Goodness

RQ6 asked if there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' goodness. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for goodness was 5.62 with a standard deviation of ± 1.23 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 5.27 with a standard deviation of ± 1.16 . The result of the Mann-Whitney U test for goodness was $U = 3903.0$, $p = .012 < .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' goodness was supported.

Faithfulness

RQ7 asked if there is a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' faithfulness. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for faithfulness was 5.49 with a standard deviation of ± 1.31 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 5.13 with a standard deviation of ± 1.36 . The result of the Mann-Whitney U test for faithfulness was $U = 4040.0$, $p = .040 < .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' faithfulness was supported.

Gentleness

RQ8 asked if there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' gentleness. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for gentleness was 5.47 with a standard deviation of ± 1.28 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 5.13 with a standard deviation of ± 1.17 . The result of the Mann-Whitney U test for gentleness was $U = 3857.5$, $p = .015 < .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' gentleness was supported.

Self-control

RQ9 asked if there a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' self-control. The Christian followers' mean rating of managers for self-control was 5.24 with a standard deviation of ± 1.17 , and the non-Christian followers' mean rating of managers was 4.69 with a standard deviation of ± 1.17 . The result of the Mann-Whitney U test for self-control was $U = 3607.5$, $p = .003 < .05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis could be rejected, and a significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' self-control was supported.

Discussion

While Christian followers' mean ratings of their managers were higher than the ratings of non-Christian followers across all nine fruit of the Spirit, The Mann-Whitney U test

indicated that the medians of those ratings were only significantly higher for seven values: (a) patience, (b) kindness, (c) goodness, (d) faithfulness, (e) gentleness, and (f) self-control. There was not a significant difference between how Christian and non-Christian followers rated their managers in (a) love, (b) joy, and (c) peace.

Love, Joy, and Peace

As love is central to the teaching of Christian values (John 3:16; John 13:34-35), one could argue an expectation that love would be a primary distinguishing value between Christian and non-Christians. But, Bocarnea et al. (2018) emphasized the transcendence of love, and gave the example of the relationship of Jonathan and David in the Old Testament of the Bible to support their claim of the transcendence of love across “boundaries, social conventions, and human limitations” (p. 15). While they also exemplified the sacrifice of Christ in their love argument, the biblical example of love in Jonathan and David’s relationship pre-dated the Christian church. The pre-Christian Church example of Jonathan’s sacrificial love for David aligned with this study’s results of no significant difference in distribution between how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers’ love, as Jonathan showed *agapao* love in waiving his inherited and legitimate right to leadership in recognizing David. Further, these results support the concept of *Imago Dei* as a presupposition of the fruit of the Spirit scale development for the value of love (Bocarnea et al., 2018).

Bocarnea et al. (2018) used Old Testament examples of celebration and rejoicing to mark joy. These joyous occasions were central to Jewish celebration, and they gave examples in the books of Esther, Ruth, and Nehemiah. As the value of joy is rooted in literature beyond New Testament support, finding no significant difference in how Christian followers and non-Christian followers rate their managers on the joy in their leadership is understandable.

Interestingly, Bocarnea et al. (2018) emphasized that “loving leaders are joyful leaders. Joy springs from love” (p. 23), and “joyful leadership is rooted in loving leadership” (p. 30). If joy, as a separate factor than love, is related to the celebration of loving leaders, as Bocarnea et al. suggested, further study of the interrelation of joy and love in leadership may lead to valuable discourse and understanding of the fruit of the Spirit in leadership.

As with love and joy, Bocarnea et al. (2018) grounded their literature for peace in Old Testament scripture. Again, Bocarnea et al. returned to the story of Jonathan and David. David and Jonathan’s relationship relied on harmony, respect, trust, and mutual support. These characteristics, as exemplified within their relationship, were foundational in developing a sense of vulnerability within the relationship that paved the way for collaboration, the development of an understanding between one another, and a high level of participation within the relationship.

Similar to their conversation on joy, Bocarnea et al. (2018) posited that “loving leaders are peaceful leaders” (p. 37). In the development of the fruit of the Spirit scales, they determined that love, joy, and peace were separate factors; however, further study of the relationship between love and peace could help scholars better understand the interrelation of love, joy, and peace within the context of leadership, as Bocarnea et al. described these three values as “the triad of early Christian virtues” (p. 47).

The results of this study indicated support that there is not a significant difference in how Christian followers rate their managers on love, joy, and peace, but, perhaps, this observation is symptomatic of an interrelation of the virtues of love, joy, and peace, especially within the concept of *Imago Dei*. Are these three virtues more integral to *Imago Dei* than the other six fruit of the Spirit? If so, are the cultural understandings of these three virtues more universal than the other six? Or, could these three virtues require less nurturing, practice, or maturity within a Christian cultural context to define or obtain than the other six fruit? Further research could address these questions.

Cultural Difference in the Understanding of Six Virtues

The statistical significance of this study indicated that Christians and non-Christians rate their managers differently in (a) patience, (b) kindness, (c) goodness, (d) faithfulness, (e) gentleness, and (f) self-control.

The topic of patience in scripture is rather limited, and is often associated as a “characteristic of God” (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 53). While it is “something to be sought and emulated” (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 53); it is not often attained, or even wanted, as it emerges from the lessons of trails and hardship. Patience is more regularly listed on Christian virtue lists than other culturally-oriented lists (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Because of this, Christians may culturally view patience differently than non-Christians, which would explain the significant difference between Christians and non-Christians rating managers’ patience in this study.

Kindness also has very few direct references in Old and New Testaments (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Most biblical reference to kindness is centered in God’s kindness to humans (Bocarnea et al., 2018), and specifically, in the New Testament, that kindness is shown in “God’s grace to allow men to be saved” (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 73). This nuance of self-sacrificing kindness could induce different cultural expectations of acts of kindness between Christians and non-Christians, and explain the significant difference supported in this study.

As with the virtues of patience and kindness, goodness also has an infrequent mention in both New and Old Testament scripture. Bocarnea et al. (2018) highlighted the New Testament account of the rich man, who sought to understand the path to salvation. The man called Jesus good, and Jesus questioned him in this and said that only God is good

(Mark 10:18). In Jesus' response, goodness comes from self-sacrificing generosity, like the goodness found in salvation. While goodness can be practiced by non-Christians, as with the Good Samaritan example, the cultural understanding of goodness may be different. A Christian may view goodness through the lens of salvation or self-sacrifice, whereas non-Christians may not have this same lens, thus explaining the findings of this study of the ratings of Christian and non-Christians.

Bocarnea et al. (2018) highlighted the difference between a contemporary understanding of faithfulness and the understanding of faithfulness from a Judeo-Christian perspective. The contemporary view of faithfulness likens the virtue to authenticity. In this definition, one is faithful by being authentic to oneself and is consistent in this faithfulness. Faithfulness from a Christian perspective is grounded in an acceptance of Christian teachings and centered in a relationship with God (Bocarnea et al., 2018). This difference in definition could explain how Christians and non-Christians rated their managers' faithfulness.

Gentleness is not often studied in leadership as it is contradictory to the secular American cultural understanding of leadership (Bocarnea et al., 2018). In the American leadership paradigm, gentleness is associated with weakness. On a similar note, Old Testament scripture, people may have been described as gentle, but God was not. Gentleness was a descriptor for those of low socio-economic or of the servant class (Bocarnea et al., 2018). The ancient Greco-Roman understanding of gentleness rested in someone who had power, but could grant leniency (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Jesus demonstrated gentleness by a combination of these other definitions. While Jesus had the power of God and could offer leniency, He also took the position of meek servanthood and demonstrated that with his entrance into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday (Bocarnea et al., 2018). His gentleness did not make him weak as He defeated death in His resurrection and the salvation of man (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Jesus' actions on Earth went "beyond the expectation of either Jew or Gentile. His gentleness, displayed by Himself in the midst of His trial and suffering, is to be extended not only to other believers, but to non-believers as well" (Bocarnea et al., 2018, pp. 119-120). Thus, the gentleness that Christians are to demonstrate is embedded in the example of Jesus, which is different than a non-Christian perspective. This helps to explain the significant difference in this study of the Christian and non-Christian ratings of managers' gentleness.

A Christian understanding of self-control is rooted in the Jewish tradition that was demonstrated in the self-control of Joseph in Genesis and Eleazaros in Maccabees (Bocarnea et al., 2018). This tradition implies that self-control is a type of restraint (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Even Greek philosophers addressed self-control as a type of restraint. While New Testament teaching aligns in a similar way, it specifically aligns self-control as a maturation of a believer as a follower of Christ (Bocarnea et al., 2018). Rather than refraining from decadent action, the self-control described in the New

Testament is centered in the pursuit of God (good) rather than a restraint of bad. This difference of cultural understanding of self-control could explain the significant difference found in this study of Christian and non-Christian ratings of their managers' self-control.

Limitations

While the results and discussion of this study offer insight into the cross-cultural use of Bocarnea et al.'s (2018) fruit of the Spirit scales with Christian and non-Christian followers, limitations of this study were apparent. Because of the length of the survey, some participants only partially completed the entire survey, and, in particular, I had less respondents as the survey advanced in its questions. The size and design of this study also limited the generalization of the results. Generalization will be dependent on the repetition of the fruit of the Spirit instrument across diverse populations (Cozby & Bates, 2018). Another limitation rested in the scope of the study. This study did not break down the demographic of the non-Christian population. This research decision did not allow for inter-cultural comparison of specific and diverse religious identities. This decision could have biased the results of the non-Christian responses. Additionally, the study did not take into account the level of spirituality of those who identified as Christian and those who identified as non-Christian. Further, this study did not explore the managers' religious identity, and how that impacted the followers' responses.

Future Research

In addition to replication and extending the generalization of this research, further research could help to better understand the role of a managers' religious identity in the followers' rating of managers on Bocarnea et al.'s (2018) fruit of the Spirit scales. Additionally, future research could specifically divide and define the non-Christian population into those of other faiths or religious identities. Lastly, because love, joy, and peace were identified in this study as virtues without significant difference in how Christians and non-Christian followers rated their managers, additional research could focus on those three virtues to better understand what Bocarnea et al. (2018) coined as "the triad of early Christian virtues" (p. 47). Is there an interrelation between these three virtues in leadership in exegetical theory and in practice?

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to see if there was a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rated managers' fruit of the Spirit virtues of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. The intended outcome of the study was to better understand the use of Christian virtues in evaluating managers in the workplace, and also to provide support as to the reliability of Bocarnea

et al.'s relatively new fruit of the Spirit measure. The results of the study supported that, indeed, Christian followers rate their managers differently than non-Christians in some ways. This distinction did not hold for all nine fruit of the Spirit, but only six of the fruit. Additional research is warranted to understand why Christians and non-Christians differed in rating managers on the three fruit of the Spirit of love, joy and peace, and determining the possible interrelation of those three virtues. When using Bocarnea et al.'s (2018) fruit of the Spirit measure, it is important to note that Christian and non-Christians may use the scale differently.

About the Author

Deborah Lin McCain Podolinsky is a third-year Ph.D. student at Regent University, where she is studying organizational leadership. She has more than 17 years of leadership experience in business, non-profit and ministry settings. Her research interests include calling, complex adaptive systems, learning organizations, inclusion, psychology of leadership, neuroleadership, authentic leadership, professional development, and followership.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Deborah Lin McCain Podolinsky at debopod@mail.regent.edu.

References

- Alwin, D. F., Felson, J. L., Walker, E. T., & Tufis, P. A. (2006). Measuring religious identities in surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70(4), 530-564.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfl024>
- Barna, G. (Ed.). (1997). *Leaders on leadership*. Regal Books.
- Bhindi, N., & Duignan, P. (1997). Leadership for a new century: Authenticity, intentionality, spirituality and sensibility. *Educational Management and Administration*, 44(2), 117-132.
- Bocarnea, M. C., Henson, J., Huizing, R. L., Mahan, M., & Winston, B. E. (2018). *Evaluating employee performance through Christian virtues*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155-159.
- Cozby, P. C., & Bates, S. C. (2018). *Methods in behavioral research* (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.
- Crossman, J. (2007). The spirit of business: Spiritualising otherwise secular work and learning contexts. *International Employment Relations Review*, 13(2), 1-10.

- Dean, D. J. (2019). Integration of Christian values in the workplace. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 9(1), 35-55.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Erisman, A., & Daniels, D. (2013). The fruit of the Spirit: Application to performance management. *Christian Business Review*, 27-34.
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B.E. (1999). Servant leadership: Setting the stage for empirical research. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 6(1), 49-72.
- Fry, L.W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001>
- George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. Jossey-Bass.
- Green, S. B., & Salkind, N. J. (2017). *Using SPSS for Windows and Macintosh: Analyzing and understanding* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Impact 360 Institute. (2018, January 23). *Who is Gen Z? Live Conference* [Webcast]. <http://www.whoisgenz.com/live>
- Patterson, K. A. (2003). *Servant leadership: A theoretical model*. (Publicaion No. 3082719) [Doctoral dissertation, Regent University]. ProQuest Information and Learning.
- Resnick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63(4), 345-359. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-3242-1>
- Rhodes, S. D., Bowie, D. A., & Hergenrather, K. C. (2003). Collecting behavioural data using the world wide web: Considerations for researchers. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 57(1), 68-73.
- Schein, E. H. (2009). *The corporate culture survival guide* (Rev. ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H, & Schein, P. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Wiley & Sons.
- Trauffer, H., Bekker, C., Bocarnea, M., & Winston, B. (2010). A three-factor measure of discernment. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* 31(3), 263-284.
- West, G. R. (2008). *Implications for leadership in the evaluation of Scripture: An ideological review of Matthew 8:5-13*. Paper presented at the 2008 Biblical Perspectives in Leadership Research Roundtable, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.

http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/bpc_proceedings/2008/west.pdf

Winston, B. E. (2002). *Be a leader for God's sake: From values to behaviors*. Virginia Beach, VA: School of Leadership Studies, Regent University.

Winston, B. E., & Fields, D. (2015). Seeking and measuring the essential behaviors of servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 36(4), 413-434. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2013-0135>

Appendix

Informed Consent

The purpose of this research is to see if there is a difference in how Christian and non-Christian followers rate managers' fruit of the Spirit virtues of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. The intended outcome is to better understand the use of Christian virtues in evaluating managers in the workplace. This survey is anonymous, and participation in this research poses no more risk than those risks ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Deborah Lin McCain Podolinsky, a researcher graduate student at Regent University is conducting a study in Christian virtues in the workplace when not everyone is a Christian. Deborah Lin McCain Podolinsky has explained to me the purpose of this research and the intended outcome. I understand that I will be asked to answer 48 survey questions. My participation in this study should take a total of about 15-20 minutes. I understand that my anonymity will be preserved and that my name will not be associated with any results of this study. I know that I may refuse to answer any question asked and that I may discontinue participation at any time. Potential risks resulting from my participation in this project have been described to me. I am aware that I may seek further information about this study by contacting **Deborah Lin McCain Podolinsky** at **debopod@mail.regent.edu**.

I am aware that I must be at least 18 years of age to participate. My completion of the survey signifies my voluntary participation in this project.

Survey

Demographics

1. What is your age?

18-29 years old

30-49 years old

50-64 years old

65 years and over

2. What is your sex?

Male

Female

3. Are you a Christian?

Yes

No

Love (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 19)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

4. My manager effectively balances organizational outcomes and the needs of his/her followers.
5. My manager demonstrates his/her appreciation for me by empowering me to accomplish assigned tasks.
6. My manager makes me feel appreciated.
7. My manager goes above and beyond to promote the welfare and growth of his/her followers.
8. My manager creates a culture where everyone shares credit for the success of the organization.

Joy (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 34)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

9. My manager creates a culture of celebration whereby individuals are recognized for their efforts.
10. My manager creates a culture of celebration whereby individuals are encouraged to work together.

11. My manager brings his or her followers together for mutual support.
12. My manager inspires positive emotions in his or her followers.
13. My manager creates a climate that effectively communicates the relationship between our responsibilities and positive organizational outcomes.

Peace (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 49)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

14. My manager garners a sense of trust among his/her followers.
15. My manager makes me feel like a part of the team.
16. I feel that my manager creates an atmosphere of collaboration among his/her followers.
17. My manager understands how to manage people.
18. My manager inspires his/her followers to high levels of participation.

Patience (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 65)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

19. My manager is calm and collected, even while dealing with the most difficult employees.
20. My manager is calm about his/her team's progress toward production goals.
21. My manager seems calm while waiting for my work results.
22. When someone provokes my manager, my manager maintains his/her calm.
23. Even though my manager's supervisor may place pressure on his/her, my manager interacts peacefully with his/her own team.

Kindness (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 80)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

24. My manager demonstrates concern for others in his/her actions.
25. My manager acts with his/her followers' good in mind.
26. My manager is giving.
27. My manager does good to others.
28. My manager is kind.

Goodness (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 94)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

29. My manager is concerned with the welfare of others.
30. My manager is concerned for people.
31. My manager tries to bring about good for people.
32. My manager is interested in my well-being.
33. My manager uses his/her prosperity to benefit others.

Faithfulness (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 110)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

34. My manager can be trusted to do what he/she says he/she will do.
35. My manager can be depended on to do what is best for everyone associated with the organization.

36. My manager consistently keeps his/her promises to followers, even when it is not easy to do so.

37. My manager has shown him-/herself to be reliable.

38. I can trust what my manager says because he/she has consistently communicated to me in the past.

Gentleness (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 128)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

39. My manager has power but does not abuse it.

40. My manager radiates peace even when others are being aggressive.

41. My manager follows policy but does so with appropriate lenience.

42. My manager refrains from being harsh even with those who cause him/her trouble.

43. I am willing to do what my manager wants, even when I don't want to, because I feel like he/she has given me freedom to make my own choice.

Self-Control (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 143)

Seven-point format for measurement: 1-Never true, 2-Rarely true, 3-Sometimes but infrequently true, 4-Neutral, 5-Sometimes true 6-Usually true, 7-Always true

44. My manager chooses to control his/her appetite for good things.

45. When my manager shows restraint, it seems to be out of a sense of freedom rather than duty.

46. My manager acts upon my best interests rather than his/her own.

47. My manager is able to make difficult decisions even if it does not hold any reward.

48. My manager is able to shift his/her attention away from thoughts that may discourage accomplishment of his/her goals.