



journal of biblical
perspectives
in leadership

INTEGRATION OF CHRISTIAN VALUES IN THE WORKPLACE

Debra J. Dean

The research objective was to evaluate work outcomes of employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational spirituality with independent variables from the Fruit of the Spirit including love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. The study was conducted with 176 employees. For statistical purposes, correlation and multiple regression analyses were performed with the data using IBM SPSS Statistics version 21. Based on the findings, the Fruit of the Spirit are beneficial to workplace outcomes of employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational spirituality. Each of the nine fruits correlated to those four workplace outcomes, and specifically, this research found that love, kindness, and self-control can predict employee engagement; joy and gentleness can predict job satisfaction; love can predict organizational commitment; and love and peace can predict organizational spirituality.

I. INTRODUCTION

It has been recommended that “using the nine characteristics of the Fruit of the Spirit” to measure attitude in the workplace could be an effective way to prevent ethical failures (Erisman & Daniels, 2013, p.27). They indicated that although one can argue that the Fruit of the Spirit derive from scripture, secular workplaces can use them in relation to “ethical performance without explicitly referencing the biblical text” (Erisman & Daniels, 2013, p. 29). In their study, Erisman and Daniels (2013) gathered performance evaluation instruments and compared them to the nine fruits. They found that some businesses and non-profits did account for some of the fruits, but not all were accounted for. Namely, “faithfulness was commonly referenced and measured, while patience and self-control were rarely evaluated in performance reviews” (Erisman & Daniels, 2013, p.29). The authors spotlighted ethical situations such as Enron, banks, mortgage lenders, and British Petroleum. Sadly, since the publication of their article, many more unethical scandals could be added to the list.

Bocarnea, Henson, Huizing, Mahan, and Winston (2018) recommended conducting additional research to examine if the Fruit of the Spirit have an impact on organizational spirituality values (Kolodinsky, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2008). The scholars also recommended further testing of the Fruit of the Spirit with workplace outcomes. Since their scale was recently developed, it is expected that this study is the first of its kind, thus expanding the empirical research on their instrument. In their book, the authors wrote that “at present, no studies/books exist that provide statistically validated scales for the Fruit of the Spirit” (Bocarnea et al., 2018, p. 1). The text from Bocarnea et al. explained that “when organizational and relationship harmony is established there is a great potential for effective leadership” and furthered that such an “atmosphere provides a culture of commitment, participation, and collaboration” (p.48). Therefore, this study tests not only the relationship between the Fruit of the Spirit and the impact on organizational spirituality values, but also on employee engagement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Virtues and values are terms often used synonymously. According to Merriam Webster, virtues are (a) “conformity to a standard of right – *morality*” or (b) “a particular moral excellence.” Meanwhile, values, as defined by Merriam Webster is the “relative worth, utility, or importance.” Historically, the word ‘values’ referred to economics or the value/worth of something in terms of money. Crockett (2005) wrote that values are not always “good” and to distinguish between values and virtues, noted that virtues “are meant to be exercised in practical judgments, habitualized with frequent use and gradually adopted as a stable part of one’s character” (p. 199). For the purpose of this study, the term virtue will be used instead of value.

Synergy (2018) explains that “virtue is a characteristic of a person which supports moral excellence and collective well-being.” Virtue ethics was studied by classical philosophers such as Aristotle, Plato, and Socrates. Bessant (2009) paraphrased Aristotle as saying, “all human action is informed by ideas about what is good and bad and how we ought to act.” Aristotelian Virtue Theory, according to Neubert (2011), asserts that the purpose of life is to maximize flourishing and overall well-being. In scripture, virtue is addressed as “Add to your faith virtue and to virtue knowledge...” (2 Peter 1:5 KJV). Austin and Douglas (2013) explained that we as humans “cannot make ourselves good, but we have a role to play in God’s sanctification of our character as we work with him in the process of moral and spiritual growth” (p. 298). In this study, the virtues of the Fruit of the Spirit are examined (Galatians 5:22) by using the newly developed instrument from Bocarnea et al. (2018). Their instrument measures love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control.

Love

Love and leadership go hand-in-hand according to many scholars. Dean (2016) found that servant leadership variables of agapao love, altruism, empowerment, humility, serving, trust, and vision all correlated to employee engagement. Later, Dean (2017) found that spiritual leadership variables of altruistic love, sense of community, and meaningful work significantly predicted job satisfaction; meanwhile, altruistic love was also found to significantly predict organizational commitment. When discussing the findings of this research with leaders in secular workplaces, Dean was asked to coach and mentor staff to define love in the workplace and provide practical methods for displaying love, cultivating a sense of community, and clearly communicating the meaning of work. Specifically, for this research, the practical application of love in the workplace involved rather simple yet overlooked concepts. The main idea was to talk to employees every day, be real – *authentic*, and genuinely care. Some of her recommendations include (a) know the employee's name and the name of their spouse and child(ren); (b) ask about their lives outside of work; and (c) celebrate employee anniversaries, birthdays, and other occasions. Additionally, Dean would send a handwritten card to employees and that seemed to mean a lot.

Ah Ty (2016) reviewed ten of the 100 characteristics of top leaders provided by motivational speaker, Colleen Sweeney, RN. He wrote, “Kindness, thoughtfulness, sincerity, and caring for people are the true hallmarks for being a good leader” (p.52). In his article, Ty highlighted the following ten practical tips to help one become a good leader: (a) greet EVERYONE; (b) talk positively about others in the organization, (c) pick up trash, clean up the workplace daily, (d) take time off to rest, recharge, and rethink, (e) be a role model for the employee you want others to be, (f) park in the distance to allow space for others, (g) know names, be kind and personable, (h) hire empathetic employees, (i) choose to be positive, friendly, and engaged all the time, and (j) recognize staff.

When speaking of love and leadership, two leadership theories come to mind right away. The first is servant leadership and the second is spiritual leadership. Both theories are part of a movement known as workplace spirituality. Fry (2003) identified three dimensions related to workplace spirituality including altruistic love, hope/faith, and vision. According to Fry, the spiritual leadership characteristic of altruistic love includes courage, empathy/compassion, forgiveness, honesty, humility, integrity, kindness, patience, and trust/loyalty. And, Fry defined altruistic love as a “sense of wholeness, harmony, and well-being produced through care, concern, and appreciation for self and others” (p. 712).

As mentioned above, many scholars are finding positive benefits related to love and leadership. Workplace spirituality benefits (containing the aspects of altruistic love, hope/faith, and vision) include employee health and stress (Daniel, 2015; Kumar & Kumar, 2014), job involvement (Ghazzawi, Smith, & Cao, 2016; Kolodinsky, Giacalone, & Jurkiewicz, 2008; Van der Walt & Swanepoel, 2015), job satisfaction (Milliman, Czaplewski, & Ferguson, 2003), organizational commitment (Milliman et al., 2003; Rego & Pina e Cunha, 2008), organizational identification (Jurkiewicz, 2008; Kolodinsky et al., 2008), work rewards satisfaction (Kolodinsky et al., 2008), and work unit performance (Duchon & Ashmos-Plowman, 2005).

According to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), the virtue of love is the foundation of all other virtues and “is the source from which virtuous leadership comes” (p. 9). The Greek words for love include ἀγάπη or *agapē* (self-giving, goodwill, care) and *eros* (sexual). For the purpose of organizational leadership, the concept of *agapē* is used instead of *eros*. It is important to define love in order to appropriately conduct one's behavior. Halter (2006) found the following key characteristics of *agapē* leaders: concern (Mark 12:31, 1 Thess 5:23), support (Matt 6:34, 9:36, 14:14, 15:32; Mark 6:34; Luke 7:13, Eph 4:15, Rom 8:29), listening to and meeting needs (Matt 14:14, 15:32, James 2:15-17, Psalm 23:1), speaking to edify (Eph 4:29; Prov 12:18, 15:14; Is 42:3), considerate (2 Tim 2:24, 1 Cor 13:4-5), fair (Prov 18:17, James 2:13, Matt 12:7), humble (James 4:6, 1 Peter 5:5), open to feedback (Prov 15:22, 24:6; 2 Sam 12:1-12), exemplary (1 Tim 4:12, Titus 2:7), frugal stewardship (Matt 6:19-21, James 5:1-5, 1 Tim 6:18), noble goals (Phil 2:3-4, 4:8; Col 3:1-2), and socio-cultural implications (John 13:35) (pp. 67 – 78).

Erisman and Daniels (2013) spent a concerted effort to define the nine fruits in such a way as to communicate clearly to all people, including those that did not identify as a “person of faith or recognize the authority of Christian scriptures” (p.29). They defined love as “caring for others and making a strong unconditional commitment to their well-being.” Erisman and Daniels also mention Southwest Airlines, as their stock symbol is “LUV” bringing attention to the company's emphasis on the importance of love as a workplace attitude.

Joy

The Greek word for joy is χαρά or *chara* (joy, delight, celebration). According to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), the virtue of joy springs from love. Joyful leaders recognize the importance of celebrating not only “birthdays, anniversaries, and other social niceties” but to also celebrate “accomplishments, success, attained goals, and positively deviant behaviors” (p. 23). Erisman and Daniels (2013) wrote that “joy is characterized by feelings of great happiness or pleasure and is infectious in providing motivation for work and inspiration for others” (p. 29). In their article, they reference IKEA and the AES Corporation which both place emphasis on finding joy in work. Himot (2009) wrote that “many companies are beginning to understand that when their employees are happy, when they experience joy, they are also more productive” and practically recommended (a) encouraging staff to share their feelings, (b) finding time to be together, and (c) cultivating abilities of staff members (p.23).

Peace

The Greek word for peace is εἰρήνη or *eirēnē* (inner-wellness). According to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), “Positive organizational outcomes are dependent upon the leader's ability to create a harmonious working environment” (p. 37). The virtue of peace, according to Bocarnea, et al. includes an inner state of being where one has relational and inner harmony, safety in the workplace where one perceives physical safety and thus “illuminates how followers make decisions in the workplace”, and “peace with God extending to one's relationship with others” (p.39). Their research showed that practically demonstrating peace in the workplace involved building trust, establishing respect, the perception of support, and creating an atmosphere of

collaboration. Erisman and Daniels (2013) explained that when organizations have “freedom from destructive quarrels and disagreement” they can experience peace. The scholars were careful to explain they did not advocate for the lack of conflict since healthy conflict often spurs new ideas. McIntyre Miller (2016) wrote of the emerging movement of peace leadership. She explained that the first mention of peace leadership appeared in the 1960s during the American protest movement. The energy has grown recently with attention at the International Leadership Association (ILA) and creation of the Peace Leadership Affinity Group in 2012.

Patience

The King James Version of the Bible uses the word long-suffering instead of patience. The Greek word for patience is μακροθυμία or makrothumia (long-suffering). According to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), the virtue of patience is found to have positive effects in business including, but not limited to quality, long-term productivity, pleasantness, and ethical behavior. The scholars cautioned early dismissal of the importance of patience in a business world where hurried decisions can lead to unethical or unproductive consequences. And, explained that including patience in the climate of an organization “can have a significant effect on organizational members” (p. 62). Erisman and Daniels (2013) described patience as “the recognition of the need to consider the long term” (p.30). They used Toyota as an example as their LEAN methodology was designed to streamline and make organizations more efficient. Yet, Toyota “acknowledged that its focus on speed had contributed to [production failures in 2009 and 2010]” (Erisman & Daniels, 2013, p. 30).

Kindness

The King James Version of the Bible uses the word gentleness in lieu of kindness. The Greek word for kindness is χρηστότης or chrēstotēs (goodness, excellence, uprightness). Bocarnea, et al. (2018), wrote that “Kindness is a virtue motivated by the desire to do good to others or to manifest brotherly love” (p.71). The scholars recommended practical ways to show kindness in the workplace including acting benevolently, acting generously, acting in such a way as to meet the needs of others, being engaged as a manager (not disconnected), and practicing helpfulness towards others (p.79). Erisman and Daniels (2013) explained that the act of kindness may not have caught on in the contemporary workplace yet, but such actions stand out when an employee is struggling, and someone offers a helping hand, or a boss cuts a team member slack while they are dealing with a difficult circumstance.

Goodness

The Greek word for goodness is ἀγαθωσύνη or agathōsunē. According to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), the virtue of goodness “is a simple virtue that manifests generosity and overall concern for others’ well-being” (p. 93). Erisman and Daniels (2013) use the phrase generosity instead of goodness. The Biblia Sacra Vulgata, known as the official Bible of the Roman Catholic Church in 1545, lists 12 fruits instead of nine, including generosity. Erisman and Daniels explained that when people in the workplace are only looking out for themselves, the selfishness “stifles collaboration and creativity” (p.30). Instead, the scholars recommend forming a habit of giving freely without expecting anything in return.” This notion of living generously is also referred to as emulating God’s goodness. Danker (2000) considered generosity as a possible translation for goodness.

Faithfulness

The Greek word for faithfulness is πίστις or pistis. According to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), the virtue of faithfulness is an “implicit requirement of successful organizational outcomes” (p. 97). The scholars explained that “without faithfulness, leaders and followers quickly devolve into an uncertain relationship of untrustworthiness that eats away at any long-term organizational sustainability” (p. 98). Erisman and Daniels (2013) defined faithfulness as “sticking with the task to completion, keeping one’s word..., or simply showing up...” (p. 31).

Gentleness

The King James Version of the Bible uses the word meekness in lieu of gentleness. The Greek word for gentleness is πραΰτης or prautēs. The terms gentleness and humility are often used synonymously and according to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), this can cause confusion when one considers either word as a response. The scholars explained that “humility is the right use of self-esteem (seeing oneself as one truly is), with narcissism being its abuse; gentleness is the right use of power, with severity being its abuse” (p.115). The virtue of gentleness was described by Bocarnea, et al. in the Greco-Roman context as a person that is “not rough, hard, violent, angry, brutal, bad-tempered or brusque” (p. 118). Erisman and Daniels (2013) described gentleness as “true humility that does not consider itself too good or too exalted” and stated that “if gentleness is not exhibited in the workplace, long-lasting loyalty and trust are not developed and change is impeded” (p.31). The scholars expanded to state that “gentleness is humility practiced in spite of a position of power, allowing for communication and trust. A blog posted by the Wharton School of Business (2001) reinforced that “leaders of great companies have genuine humility.”

Self-Control

The King James Version of the Bible uses the word temperance in place of self-control. The Greek word for self-control is ἐγκράτεια or enkrateia (mastery). According to Bocarnea, et al. (2018), the virtue of self-control is perhaps “the test of true

leadership” (p. 140). Bocarnea, et al. describes the act of self-control in terms of enhancing trust, making effective decisions, and remaining composed. They labeled traits of a self-controlled person as one focused on virtuous values, organized, one good with planning, that proactively uses their time, purposefully cares for their body, practices self-denial, and is structured (p. 139). Erisman and Daniels (2013) wrote that “without self-control, workplaces self-destruct” and described this virtue as the “ability to control one’s emotions, behavior, and desires” (p.31). The scholars stated that self-control is necessary for a healthy workplace.

III. METHODOLOGY

The following instruments were used for this research: (a) Bocarnea et al., (2018) Fruit of the Spirit Scale, 45-items; (b) Kolodinsky et al., (2008) Organizational Spirituality Values, 20-items; (c) Mowday, Steers, and Porter’s (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, 15-items; (d) Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist’s (1967) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short Form, 20-items; and (e) Wiley’s (2013) Employee Engagement survey, 4-items.

Research Question and Hypotheses

The research question for this study was documented as follows: Do Fruit of the Spirit relate to employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational spirituality, and if so, can the fruits predict such desired workplace outcomes? The hypotheses are enumerated in Table 1.

Measuring the Fruit of the Spirit

When Bocarnea, et al. (2018) developed the Fruit of the Spirit scale, they presented the nine Fruit of the Spirit as described in the Book of Galatians, in three sections including (a) relationship to God (love, joy, peace), (b) relationship to others (patience, kindness, goodness), and (c) relationship to self (faithfulness, gentleness, self-control). Their scale consists of 45 questions.

Measuring Organizational Spirituality Values

Kolodinsky, Giacalone, and Jurkiewicz’s (2008) explained that in an era when workers are “expected to do whatever it takes to keep up the pace and positively affect the organizational bottom-line” their need for “connectedness, meaning, purpose, altruism, virtue, nurturance, and hope is at an all-time high” (p.465). The scholars further explained that “The need for organizational leaders to devote attention to spiritual values has likely never been greater” (Giacalone & Jurkiewicz, 2003). In their study, Kolodinsky et al., (2008) found that organizational spirituality was positively related to work outcomes of job involvement, organizational identification, and work rewards satisfaction. They also found that organizational spirituality was negatively related to organizational frustration. For this research, the Kolodinsky, et al., (2008) Organizational Spirituality Values scale was used. The scale consists of 20 items.

Measuring Employee Engagement

Gallup's 2013 State of the Global Workplace reported that only 13 percent of employees globally say they are engaged at work. Bhuvanaiah and Raya (2014) explained that employee engagement is an emerging concept gaining attention from employers as it relates to absenteeism, attrition, business productivity, customer loyalty, customer satisfaction, individual performance, profitability, and resilience. Gallup (2014) recommends the following five steps to improve engagement: (a) use the right employee engagement survey, (b) focus on engagement at the local and organizational levels, (c) select the right managers, (d) coach managers and hold them accountable for their employees' engagement, and (e) define engagement goals in realistic, everyday terms. For this survey, the Employee Engagement Index (Wiley, 2013) was used. The scale consists of four items.

Measuring Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is generally recognized within the field of organizational behavior as "the most important and most frequently studied attitude" (Akehurst, Comeche, & Galindo, 2009, p.5). To analyze job satisfaction, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was used. The scale consists of 20 items. According to Lester and Bishop (2000), the MSQ is "one of the most frequently used instruments to measure job satisfaction." The MSQ includes subscales of intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction.

Measuring Organizational Commitment

Fares and Noordin (2016) wrote that "organizational commitment is one of the most widely examined variables in literature" (p.30). The Mowday, et al. (1979) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) was used to examine the dependent variable of organizational commitment. The scale consists of 15 items. Meyer and Allen (1991) identified three forms of organizational commitment, including (a) affective commitment, (b) normative commitment, and (c) continuance commitment. According to Meyer et al., (2012), affective commitment is the "emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization" (p.226). Normative commitment is the "sense of obligation to remain." Continuance commitment calculates the perceived cost of leaving the organization. Affective and normative commitment in an organization has been linked to decreased absenteeism and turnover as well as increased job performance (Cooper-Hakim & Viswesvaran, 2005; Riketta, 2002).

Control Variables

To enhance internal validity, Creswell (2009) recommended isolating control variable effects; therefore, this research investigated the effect of age, gender, income, relationship tenure, and years of experience on the dependent variables. Creswell reminded researchers to consider variables found in the literature that may have an impact on the predicted relationships. For the purpose of this study, control variables were investigated in order to test for their effect on the dependent variables. The literature reviewed for this study showed significance with age, gender, income, relationship tenure (how many years an employee has worked with the same manager), and organizational tenure (how many years an employee has worked for the same company) on the dependent variables. Support for each control variable is itemized below.

Control variables of age, gender, tenure, and job level were used in the Yoerger, Crow, and Allen (2015) study on employee engagement. Their findings indicated that job level significantly correlated with employee engagement. Owens et al., (2016) controlled for gender, race, age, tenure, and perceived social support when examining employee engagement and job performance; they recommended additional research to include relationship tenure.

Saadati, et al., (2016) found that age, education, gender, and type of employment have a positive and significant correlation to job satisfaction. The researchers also indicated a significant relationship between job satisfaction and their control variables of income and gender (Ghazzawi, Smith, and Cao). Marschke, Preziosi, and Harrington (2011) controlled for age and gender in their study on workplace spirituality and job satisfaction where they found that age did influence the relationship; however, gender did not.

Supangco (2015) found that age and tenure were significant when examining organizational commitment. Jernigan, Beggs, and Kohut (2016) also examined the influence of age and tenure on organizational commitment and found a positive relationship. Daniel and Chatelain-Jardon (2015) controlled for age, education, and gender in their study, which found a positive relationship between individual spirituality and organizational commitment. Rego and Pina e Cunha (2008) investigated the relationship of workplace spirituality on organizational commitment; the researchers noted that “age and tenure correlate with commitment” (p. 64).

IV. ANALYSIS

This research was conducted with a snowball sample via the internet. The only requirements were for the participants to be 18 years old or older, have a job, and have a manager. The survey was compiled in Survey Monkey and sent via an email link and through social media (Facebook and LinkedIn). When using multiple regression analysis, Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) recommended 15 – 20 participants per predictor variable. This research had nine independent variables; therefore, 180 participants were needed. A sample size of 107 according to GPower 3.0 is the minimum size for linear multiple regression: fixed model, R^2 increase or, a sample size of 166 when using linear multiple regression: fixed model, R^2 deviation from zero. When Bocarnea, et al. (2018) developed the Fruit of the Spirit scale, they referred to

DeVellis (2017) guidelines for scale development who recommended at least five participants per item. Their sample consisted of 81 total participants, with 67 completed surveys. For this study, there were 272 people in the participant pool, and 176 completed the survey. Correlation and multiple regression analyses were performed with the data using IBM SPSS Statistics version 21.

Reliability of Scales

Pallant (2010) wrote that the most commonly used tool for the reliability of a scale is Cronbach's alpha (α). Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson, and Tatham (2006) stated that scores above .70 are generally agreed upon as a lower limit for Cronbach's alpha. For this research, Cronbach's alpha was measured for all scales. Specifically of interest for this study was the reliability measurement for the Fruit of the Spirit scale since it is so new. All subscales scored above the recommended .70; therefore, the Fruit of the Spirit Scale is considered reliable. The subscale of love scored .95, joy measured .95, peace measured .96, patience scored .96, kindness scored .96, goodness scored .97, faithfulness measured .97, gentleness measured .94, and self-control scored .94. The Employee Engagement Index measured .95. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form scored .95, the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) measured .94, and the Organizational Spirituality Values (OSV) scale measured .95. Therefore, all scales used in this researched are deemed reliable.

Correlation

The first step in the analysis was to examine the relationship between the control variables, independent variables, and dependent variables. Each of the control variables correlated with at least one other variable. Age positively correlated to each of the other variables except patience and gender negatively correlated with age. Income positively correlated to age, organizational tenure, and love; income negatively correlated with gender. Relationship tenure positively correlated to age, organizational tenure, goodness, and self-control. Organizational tenure positively correlated to age, income, and relationship tenure. Furthermore, gender negatively correlated to age, income, patience, and faithfulness.

All the Fruit of the Spirit positively correlated with each other and the dependent variables. The strongest relationships for employee engagement were job satisfaction (.81**), organizational spirituality (.78**), love (.68**), self-control (.67**), joy (.65**), and peace (.65**). The strongest relationships for job satisfaction were organizational commitment (.82**), employee engagement (.81**), organizational spirituality (.80**), love (.77**), joy (.76**), and self-control (.75**). The strongest relationships for organizational commitment were employee engagement (.89**), job satisfaction (.82**), and organizational spirituality (.82*). Meanwhile, the Fruit of the Spirit rank-ordered with organizational commitment as love (.64**), joy (.61**), peace (.60**) and self-control (.60**). Organizational Spirituality also had a strong relationship with organizational commitment (.82**), job satisfaction (.80**), employee engagement (.78**), and self-control (.67**). See tables 2 – 6 for correlation specifics. See Table 11 for more details regarding correlation of the control variables to each of the fruits.

Multiple Regression

The control variables included age, gender, income, relationship tenure, and years of experience. Tables 7 – 10 show the multiple regression analyses for each of the dependent variables. Three hypotheses were supported for employee engagement as H1a (love) showed a p -value of .04, H1e (kindness) showed a p -value of .02, and H1i (self-control) showed a p -value of .01. Two hypotheses for job satisfaction were accepted including H2b (joy) with a p -value of .04 and H2h (gentleness) with a p -value of .05. One hypothesis was supported for organizational commitment including H3a (love) with a p -value of .01. Two hypotheses were also supported for organizational spirituality including H3a (love) with a p -value of .00 and H3c (peace) with a p -value of .00.

V. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL CONTRIBUTION

In their book, Bocarnea, et al. (2018), wrote that “at present, no studies/books exist that provide statistically validated scales for the Fruit of the Spirit” (p. 1). Their valiant efforts exegetically, theoretically, and statistically provided the scale used for this research. Since their scale was recently developed, it is expected that this study is the first of its kind, thus expanding the empirical research on their instrument. The scholars recommended conducting additional research to examine if the Fruit of the Spirit have an impact on organizational spirituality values (Kolodinsky et al., 2008). Therefore, this study tests not only the relationship between the Fruit of the Spirit and the impact on organizational spirituality values, but also on employee engagement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Practically speaking, this research leads to the verification of what some leader’s term soft skills. In a world where so much emphasis is placed on the financial bottom line, it often seems out of scope for a leader to have concern or demonstrate virtuous behavior with their followers.

The findings of this research affirm that the Fruit of the Spirit are beneficial to workplace outcomes of employee engagement, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational spirituality. Each of the nine fruits correlated to those four workplace outcomes, and specifically, this research found that love, kindness, and self-control can predict employee engagement; joy and gentleness can predict job satisfaction; love can predict organizational commitment; and joy and peace can predict organizational spirituality. Practically speaking and returning to the research of Erisman and Daniels (2013), it is believed that the performance review process will benefit from evaluating these virtues. Additionally, organizations desiring higher levels of such workplace outcomes may benefit from coaching, mentoring, and training employees on the appropriate and beneficial usage of love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control.

VI. CONCLUSION

Erisman and Daniels (2013) wrote that “a growing literature is recognizing that businesses need to do a better job of moving beyond technical expertise to encouraging and embracing ethical values in its employees and leaders” (p.29). Research has shown that virtues from the Fruit of the Spirit can have a positive impact on workplace

outcomes. And, incorporating the nine fruits into performance reviews would be a good way to measure such virtuous behavior for all employees.

As recommended by Bocarnea, et al. (2018) future research might include evaluation of the Fruit of the Spirit scale with the Human Spirituality scale (Wheats, 1991), the Spiritual Transcendence scale (Piedmont, 1999), and the Spirituality scale (Delaney, 2005). They also recommended longitudinal studies to show the impact of leadership development and training efforts. Based on the findings of this research, it would be interesting to see the results of longitudinal studies that train leaders and followers on love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. It is also recommended to continue studies on workplace outcomes such as absenteeism, intention to quit, and turnover as well as examining the relationships between the Fruit of the Spirit with other ethical and entrepreneur variables.

About the Author

Debra J. Dean, Ph.D. is President & CEO of Dean Business Consulting. She is also an adjunct professor. She served as Director, Business Transformation of an international financial firm where her research efforts elevated employee engagement to some of the highest levels in the company. She was nominated as Operational Excellence Leader of the Year and top female leader. Her latest notable conference participation includes OPEX Week: Business Transformation World Summit, The Faith at Work Summit, Academy of Management MSR Consortium Planning, Academic Oasis, and the Regent University Roundtable. Dr. Dean's most recent research efforts include the following: (a) *Integration of Christian Values in the Workplace: An examination of employee engagement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment*, (b) *Religion and Spirituality in the Workplace: A quantitative evaluation of job satisfaction and organizational commitment*, and (c) *A Correlation Study of Employee Engagement and Servant Leadership*. She also contributed to the Routledge Companion to Management and Workplace Spirituality.

Debra Dean

Dean Business Consulting

drdebra@drdebradean.com

VII. REFERENCES

- Akehurst, G., Comeche, J., & Galindo, M. (2009). Job satisfaction and commitment in the entrepreneurial SME. *Small Business Economics*, 32(3), 277-289.
- Bessant, J. (2009). Aristotle meets youth work: A case for virtue ethics. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 12(4), 423-438. doi:10.1080/13676260902866843.

- Bocarnea, M., Henson, J., Huizing, R., Mahan, M., & Winston, B. (2018). Evaluating employee performance through Christian virtues. Palgrave Macmillan. Switzerland.
- Bhuvanaiah, T., & Raya, R. P. (2014). Employee engagement: Key to organizational success. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, 11(4), 61.
- Cooper-Hakim, A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131, 241-259.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Crockett, C.: 2005, The Cultural Paradigm of Virtue, *The Journal of Business Ethics* 62, 191-208.
- Daniel, J. (2015). Workplace spirituality and stress: evidence from Mexico and US. *Management Research Review*, 38(1), 29. doi:10.1108/MRR-07-2013-0169.
- Daniel, J. L., & Chatelain-Jardon, R. (2015). The relationship between individual spirituality, organizational commitment and individual innovative behavior. *Management Research and Practice*, 7(1), 5-13.
- Danker (2000). A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Revised and Edited by Frederick William Danker. 3rd ed. Chicago, Il: University of Chicago.
- Dean, D. (2016). A Correlation Study of Employee Engagement and Servant Leadership. *Journal of Strategic and International Studies*, XI(2), 32-43.
- Dean, D. (2017). *Religion and spirituality in the workplace: A quantitative evaluation of job satisfaction and organizational commitment* (Order No. 10260968). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1881834070).
- Delaney, C. (2005). The Spirituality Scale: Development and Psychometric Testing of a Holistic Instrument to Assess the Human Spiritual Dimension. *Journal of Holistic Nursing*. 23. 145-167. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0898010105276180>.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2017). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Duchon, D., & Ashmos-Plowman, D. (2005). Nurturing the spirit at work: Impact on work unit performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, (5), 807.
- Erisman, A., & Daniels, D. (2013). The Fruit of the Spirit: Application to performance management. Retrieved from https://issuu.com/houstonbaptistuniv/docs/full_journal.
- Fares, D., & Noordin, K. (2016). Islamic spirituality, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior: A proposed conceptual framework. *Middle East Journal of Business*, 11(2), 28-37.
- Fry, L. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), 693. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001.
- Gallup (2013). How employee engagement drives growth. Retrieved from: <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/236927/employee-engagement-drives-growth.aspx>.
- Gallup (2014). Five ways to improve employee engagement now. Retrieved from: <https://www.gallup.com/workplace/231581/five-ways-improve-employee-engagement.aspx>.

- Ghazzawi, I., Smith, Y., & Cao, Y. (2016). Faith and job satisfaction: is religion a missing link? *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications & Conflict*, 20(1), 1-29.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, N.J: Pearson Prentice Hall, c2006.
- Halter, S. A. (2006). *Agape leadership: Developing selfless love in Christian leadership*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Himot, O. (2009). Achieving results through joy. *Leadership in Action*, 28(6), 23.
- Jernigan, E., Beggs, J. M., & Kohut, G. (2016). An examination of nurses' work environment and organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications & Conflict*, 20(1), 112-131.
- Kolodinsky, R., Giacalone, R., & Jurkiewicz, C. (2008). Workplace values and outcomes: exploring personal, organizational, and interactive workplace spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, (2), 465.
- Kumar, V., & Kumar, S. (2014). Workplace spirituality as a moderator in relation between stress and health: An exploratory empirical assessment. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 26(3), 344-351.
- Lester, P., & Bishop, L. (2000). *Handbook of tests and measurement in education and the social sciences*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Marschke, E., Preziosi, R., & Harrington, W. (2011). How sales personnel view the relationship between job satisfaction and spirituality in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications & Conflict*, 15(2), 71-110.
- McIntyre Miller, W. (2016). Toward a scholarship of peace leadership. *International Journal of Public Leadership*, 12(3), 216-226. Retrieved from <http://eres.regent.edu:2048/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.regent.edu/docview/1905750692?accountid=13479>.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1(1), 61-89. doi:10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z.
- Milliman, J., Czaplewski, A., & Ferguson, J. (2003). Workplace spirituality and employee work attitudes: An exploratory empirical assessment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 16(4), 426-447. Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.regent.edu/docview/197604194?accountid=13479>.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- Neubert, M. (2011). Introduction: the value of virtue management and organizational theory and practice. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 28(3) 227-230.
- Owens, B. P., Baker, W. E., Sumpter, D. M., & Cameron, K. S. (2016). Relational energy at work: Implications for job engagement and job performance. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101(1), 35-49. doi:10.1037/apl0000032.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual* (4th ed.). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.
- Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? spiritual transcendence and the Five-Factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 67(6), 985-1013. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00080.

- Rego, A., & Pina e Cunha, M. (2008). Workplace spirituality and organizational commitment: an empirical study. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1), 53-75. doi:10.1108/09534810810847039.
- Ricketta, M. (2002). Attitudinal organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23, 257-266.
- Saadati, M., Saadati, A., Asghari, A., Bidgoli, M., Ghodsi, A., & Bidgoli, A. (2016). The Relationship between perceived organizational justice, organizational commitment and job satisfaction. *Health, Spirituality & Medical Ethics Journal*, 3(1), 10-17.
- Supangco, V. (2015). Explaining employee intentions to stay in organizations: the case of MBA students. *Journal of International Business Research*, 14(3), 83-96.
- Synergy (2018). The difference between a value and a virtue. Retrieved from: www.synergygroup.net.au/difference-value-virtue.
- Van der Walt, F., & Swanepoel, H. (2015). The relationship between workplace spirituality and job involvement: A South African study. *African Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 10(1), 95-116.
- Wharton School of Business (2001). Good Vs. Great Leaders: The Difference is Humility, Doubt and Drive. Retrieved from <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/good-vs-great-leaders-the-difference-is-humility-doubt-and-drive>.
- Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., & England, G. W. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. *Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation*, 22, 120.
- Wheat, L. W. (1991). *Development of a scale for the measurement of human spirituality*.
- Wiley, J. W. (2013). Using Employee Opinions about Organizational Performance to Enhance Employee Engagement Surveys: Model Building and Validation. *People & Strategy*, 36(4), 38-49.
- Yoerger, M., Crowe, J., & Allen, J. A. (2015). Participate or else! The effect of participation in decision-making in meetings on employee engagement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 67(1), 65-80. doi:10.1037/cpb0000029.

VIII. APPENDIX

Table 1: Hypotheses

Employee Engagement	Job Satisfaction	Organizational Commitment	Organizational Spirituality
H1a: Love (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2a: Love (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3a: Love (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4a: Love (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1b: Joy (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2b: Joy (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3b: Joy (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4b: Joy (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1c: Peace (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2c: Peace (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3c: Peace (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4c: Peace (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1d: Patience (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2d: Patience (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3d: Patience (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4d: Patience (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1e: Kindness (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2e: Kindness (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3e: Kindness (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4e: Kindness (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1f: Goodness (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2f: Goodness (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3f: Goodness (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4f: Goodness (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1g: Faithfulness (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2g: Faithfulness (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3g: Faithfulness (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4g: Faithfulness (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1h: Gentleness (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2h: Gentleness (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3h: Gentleness (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4h: Gentleness (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).
H1i: Self-control (IV) significantly predicts employee engagement (DV).	H2i: Self-control (IV) significantly predicts job satisfaction (DV).	H3i: Self-control (IV) significantly predicts organizational commitment (DV).	H4i: Self-control (IV) significantly predicts organizational spirituality (DV).

Table 2: Pearson Product-moment Correlations between Measures of Desired Work Outcomes and Control Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Employee Engagement	1.00	0.81**	0.89**	0.78**	0.23**	0.10	0.20**	0.07	-0.03
2. Job Satisfaction	0.81**	1.00	0.82**	0.80**	0.23**	0.20**	0.16*	0.00	-0.06
3. Organizational Commitment	0.89**	0.82**	1.00	0.82**	0.22**	0.08	0.16*	0.06	-0.01
4. Organizational Spirituality	0.78**	0.80**	0.82**	1.00	0.14	0.12	0.13	-0.03	-0.06
5. Age	0.23**	0.23**	0.22**	0.14	1.00	0.27**	0.25**	0.34**	-0.18
6. Income	0.10	0.20**	0.08	0.12	0.27**	1.00	0.01	0.19*	-0.24
7. Relationship Tenure	0.20**	0.16*	0.16*	0.13	0.25**	0.01	1.00	0.54**	-0.04
8. Organizational Tenure	0.07	0.00	0.06	-0.03	0.34**	0.19*	0.54**	1.00	-0.11
9. Gender	-0.03	-0.06	-0.01	-0.06	-0.18	-0.24	-0.04	-0.11	1.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 3: Pearson Product-moment Correlations between Measures of Employee Engagement and Fruit of the Spirit

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Employee Engagement	1.00	.68**	.65**	.65**	.51**	.59**	.61**	.61**	.63**	.67**
2. Love	.68**	1.00	.91**	.92**	.74**	.87**	.84**	.84**	.85**	.86**
3. Joy	.65**	.91**	1.00	.94**	.74**	.83**	.81**	.83**	.83**	.83**
4. Peace	.65**	.92**	.94**	1.00	.75**	.85**	.83**	.88**	.84**	.86**
5. Patience	.51**	.74**	.74**	.75**	1.00	.82**	.77**	.76**	.89**	.82**
6. Kindness	.59**	.87**	.83**	.85**	.82**	1.00	.94**	.87**	.91**	.90**
7. Goodness	.61**	.84**	.81**	.83**	.77**	.94**	1.00	.85**	.88**	.88**
8. Faithfulness	.61**	.84**	.83**	.88**	.76**	.87**	.85**	1.00	.86**	.88**
9. Gentleness	.63**	.85**	.83**	.84**	.89**	.91**	.88**	.86**	1.00	.91**
10. Self-Control	.67**	.86**	.83**	.86**	.82**	.90**	.88**	.88**	.91**	1.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 4: Pearson Product-moment Correlations between Measures of Job Satisfaction and Fruit of the Spirit

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Job Satisfaction	1.00	.77**	.76**	.74**	.64**	.71**	.71**	.70**	.74**	.75**
2. Love	.77**	1.00	.91**	.92**	.74**	.87**	.84**	.84**	.85**	.86**
3. Joy	.76**	.91**	1.00	.94**	.74**	.83**	.81**	.83**	.83**	.83**
4. Peace	.74**	.92**	.94**	1.00	.75**	.85**	.83**	.88**	.84**	.86**
5. Patience	.64**	.74**	.74**	.75**	1.00	.82**	.77**	.76**	.89**	.82**
6. Kindness	.71**	.87**	.83**	.85**	.82**	1.00	.94**	.87**	.91**	.90**
7. Goodness	.71**	.84**	.81**	.83**	.77**	.94**	1.00	.85**	.88**	.88**
8. Faithfulness	.70**	.84**	.83**	.88**	.76**	.87**	.85**	1.00	.86**	.88**
9. Gentleness	.74**	.85**	.83**	.84**	.89**	.91**	.88**	.86**	1.00	.91**
10. Self-Control	.75**	.86**	.83**	.86**	.82**	.90**	.88**	.88**	.91**	1.00

** $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

Table 5: Pearson Product-moment Correlations between Measures of Organizational Commitment and Fruit of the Spirit

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Organizational Commitment	1.00	.64**	.61**	.60**	.45**	.56**	.58**	.56**	.57**	.60**
2. Love	.64**	1.00	.91**	.92**	.74**	.87**	.84**	.84**	.85**	.86**
3. Joy	.61**	.91**	1.00	.94**	.74**	.83**	.81**	.83**	.83**	.83**
4. Peace	.60**	.92**	.94**	1.00	.75**	.85**	.83**	.88**	.84**	.86**
5. Patience	.45**	.74**	.74**	.75**	1.00	.82**	.77**	.76**	.89**	.82**
6. Kindness	.56**	.87**	.83**	.85**	.82**	1.00	.94**	.87**	.91**	.90**
7. Goodness	.58**	.84**	.81**	.83**	.77**	.94**	1.00	.85**	.88**	.88**
8. Faithfulness	.56**	.84**	.83**	.88**	.76**	.87**	.85**	1.00	.86**	.88**
9. Gentleness	.57**	.85**	.83**	.84**	.89**	.91**	.88**	.86**	1.00	.91**
10. Self-Control	.60**	.86**	.83**	.86**	.82**	.90**	.88**	.88**	.91**	1.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 6: Pearson Product-moment Correlations between Measures of Organizational Spirituality and Fruit of the Spirit

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Organizational Spirituality	1.00	.65**	.66**	.62**	.53**	.63**	.64**	.58**	.64**	.67**
2. Love	.65**	1.00	.91**	.92**	.74**	.87**	.84**	.84**	.85**	.86**
3. Joy	.66**	.91**	1.00	.94**	.74**	.83**	.81**	.83**	.83**	.83**
4. Peace	.62**	.92**	.94**	1.00	.75**	.85**	.83**	.88**	.84**	.86**
5. Patience	.53**	.74**	.74**	.75**	1.00	.82**	.77**	.76**	.89**	.82**
6. Kindness	.63**	.87**	.83**	.85**	.82**	1.00	.94**	.87**	.91**	.90**
7. Goodness	.64**	.84**	.81**	.83**	.77**	.94**	1.00	.85**	.88**	.88**
8. Faithfulness	.58**	.84**	.83**	.88**	.76**	.87**	.85**	1.00	.86**	.88**
9. Gentleness	.64**	.85**	.83**	.84**	.89**	.91**	.88**	.86**	1.00	.91**
10. Self-Control	.67**	.86**	.83**	.86**	.82**	.90**	.88**	.88**	.91**	1.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 7: Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Employee Engagement (N = 176)

Predictor	Employee Engagement				R^2
	Perceived Group Cohesion				
	B	SE	β	Sig. (p)	
Constant	.53	.27		.000**	.54
Love	0.30	0.15	0.33	0.04	
Joy	0.10	0.15	0.11	0.51	
Peace	0.05	0.16	0.06	0.75	
Patience	-0.15	0.10	-0.17	0.14	
Kindness	-0.42	0.18	-0.47	0.02	
Goodness	0.16	0.15	0.19	0.28	
Faithfulness	-0.03	0.11	-0.04	0.79	
Gentleness	0.25	0.17	0.28	0.13	
Self-Control	0.40	0.15	0.42	0.01	
Age	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.44	
Income	-0.02	0.16	-0.01	0.89	
Relationship Tenure	0.05	0.12	0.03	0.70	
Organizational Tenure	0.13	0.10	0.09	0.20	
Gender	0.90	0.82	0.06	0.28	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 8: Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction ($N = 176$)

Predictor	Job Satisfaction				R^2
	Perceived Group Cohesion				
	B	SE	β	Sig. (p)	
Constant	25.00	5.17		.000	.66
Love	0.44	0.29	0.21	0.13	
Joy	0.61	0.30	0.31	0.04	
Peace	-0.07	0.32	-0.04	0.82	
Patience	-0.16	0.19	-0.08	0.42	
Kindness	-0.38	0.35	-0.19	0.28	
Goodness	0.13	0.28	0.07	0.65	
Faithfulness	-0.04	0.22	-0.02	0.85	
Gentleness	0.65	0.32	0.32	0.05	
Self-Control	0.52	0.30	0.24	0.08	
Age	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.51	
Income	0.52	0.31	0.09	0.10	
Relationship Tenure	0.13	0.23	0.03	0.57	
Organizational Tenure	0.05	0.20	0.01	0.82	
Gender	2.05	1.61	0.06	0.20	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 9: Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Organizational Commitment ($N = 176$)

Predictor	Organizational Commitment				R^2
	Perceived Group Cohesion				
	B	SE	β	Sig. (p)	
Constant	17.43	8.61		.000	.47
Love	1.24	0.49	0.45	0.01	
Joy	0.55	0.49	0.21	0.27	
Peace	-0.30	0.53	-0.12	0.57	
Patience	-0.46	0.32	-0.18	0.16	
Kindness	-1.00	0.58	-0.37	0.08	
Goodness	0.68	0.47	0.27	0.15	
Faithfulness	0.02	0.37	0.01	0.97	
Gentleness	0.47	0.54	0.17	0.38	
Self-Control	0.70	0.50	0.24	0.16	
Age	0.09	0.12	0.05	0.47	
Income	-0.26	0.52	-0.03	0.62	
Relationship Tenure	-0.05	0.39	-0.01	0.90	
Organizational Tenure	0.43	0.33	0.10	0.19	
Gender	3.13	2.68	0.07	0.24	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 10: Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Variables Predicting Organizational Spirituality ($N=176$)

Predictor	Organizational Spirituality				R^2
	Perceived Group Cohesion				
	B	SE	β	Sig. (p)	
Constant	31.42	6.80		.000	.72
Love	31.42	6.80		0.00	
Joy	0.34	0.38	0.15	0.37	
Peace	1.13	0.39	0.52	0.00	
Patience	-0.71	0.42	-0.35	0.09	
Kindness	-0.34	0.26	-0.16	0.19	
Goodness	-0.10	0.46	-0.04	0.83	
Faithfulness	0.32	0.37	0.15	0.39	
Gentleness	-0.34	0.29	-0.17	0.24	
Self-Control	0.43	0.42	0.19	0.31	
Age	0.98	0.39	0.41	0.01	
Income	-0.05	0.09	-0.04	0.57	
Relationship Tenure	0.15	0.41	0.02	0.71	
Organizational Tenure	0.14	0.31	0.03	0.66	
Gender	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.99	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 11: Pearson Product-moment Correlations between all Measures

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Age	1.00	.27**	.25**	.34**	-.18*	.22**	.21**	.17*	.13	.16*	.17*	.181*	.18*	.18*
2. Income	.27**	1.00	.01	.19*	-.24**	.19*	.14	.13	.12	.14	.11	.05	.13	.09
3. Relationship Tenure	.25**	.01	1.00	.54**	-.04	.12	.10	.10	.08	.13	.18*	.13	.11	.16*
4. Organizational Tenure	.34**	.19*	.54**	1.00	-.11	-.05	-.07	-.09	-.08	-.07	-.07	-.08	-.07	-.08
5. Gender	-.18*	-.24**	-.04	-.11	1.00	-.12	-.12	-.14	-.16*	-.10	-.10	-.16*	-.12	-.11
6. Love	.22**	.19*	.12	-.05	-.12	1.00	.91**	.92**	.74**	.87**	.84**	.84**	.85**	.86**
7. Joy	.21**	.14	.10	-.07	-.12	.91**	1.00	.94**	.74**	.83**	.81**	.83**	.83**	.83**
8. Peace	.17*	.13	.10	-.09	-.14	.92**	.94**	1.00	.75**	.85**	.83**	.88**	.84**	.86**
9. Patience	.13	.12	.08	-.08	-.16*	.74**	.74**	.75**	1.00	.82**	.77**	.76**	.89**	.82**
10. Kindness	.16*	.14	.13	-.07	-.10	.87**	.83**	.85**	.82**	1.00	.94**	.87**	.91**	.90**
11. Goodness	.17*	.11	.18*	-.07	-.10	.84**	.81**	.83**	.77**	.94**	1.00	.85**	.88**	.88**
12. Faithfulness	.18*	.05	.13	-.08	-.16*	.84**	.83**	.88**	.76**	.87**	.85**	1.00	.86**	.88**
13. Gentleness	.18*	.13	.11	-.07	-.12	.85**	.81**	.84**	.89**	.91**	.88**	.86**	1.00	.91**
14. Self-Control	.18*	.09	.16*	-.08	-.11	.86**	.83**	.86**	.82**	.90**	.88**	.88**	.91**	1.00

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$