An Opportunity for Influence: Collaboration Among the Christian Business Faculty Association and Christian Business Faculty at Christian and Non-Christian Universities

Eric D. Bostwick
The University of West Florida
ebostwick@uwf.edu

Greg L. Lowhorn
Pensacola Christian College
glowhorn@faculty.pcci.edu

NOTE: The authors would like to thank Kent Saunders, CBAR editor; Steve Dolvin; participants at the 2011 CBFA annual conference; and three anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. An earlier version of this paper won the best theme paper award at the 2011 CBFA annual conference.

ABSTRACT: Few Christians would deny that greater Christian influence is needed on the campuses of non-Christian universities, and the Christian business faculty members already at these universities are the primary agents to exert such influence. Collaboration among the Christian Business Faculty Association (CBFA), Christian business faculty at Christian universities, and Christian business faculty at non-Christian universities presents a tremendous opportunity to introduce and enhance the influence of Christ not only on university campuses, but also throughout society. In this paper, we suggest several ways that Christ's influence can be extended through increased cooperation among those already serving him in their various spheres of influence. Among other suggestions, we encourage increased co-authorship among Christian faculty at Christian and non-Christian universities, as well as targeting of Christian and non-Christian journals with articles written from a Christian perspective. We also encourage the CBFA to operate to the full extent of its mission by leading the way to facilitate collaborative scholarship among faculty at Christian and non-Christian universities.

INTRODUCTION

In this article, we call for increased and intentional collaboration among the Christian Business Faculty Association (CBFA), Christian business faculty at Christian universities, and Christian business faculty at non-Christian universities to further the influence of Christ on the non-Christian university campus and on society at large. We begin by confirming the alignment of this objective with the foundational principles of the CBFA. Examining the CBFA's mission and vision we ask, why does the CBFA exist; whom does it serve; and how does it serve them? Next, we reinforce the core proposition of the CBFA and its members that vocation, specifically in the fields of business and business education, is service to God, and we apply this proposition to the activities of the CBFA as well as to Christian faculty at both Christian and non-Christian schools. Finally, we present several specific recommendations whereby the CBFA, CBFA journal contributors, and Christian business faculty at both Christian and non-Christian universities can unite their various callings to further the kingdom of God.

THE MISSION OF CBFA

If a colleague were to ask, "What is the Christian Business Faculty Association?" what would be the best

response? Lemler (2004) addressed this issue in terms of emphasis: is the CBFA the *Christian* business faculty association, the Christian *business* faculty association, the Christian business *faculty* association, or the Christian business faculty *association*? In truth, each of these emphases reveals a role of the CBFA. The CBFA is distinctly Christian by choice (not merely religious or moral, and distinct from other worldviews such as Humanist, Muslim, or Hindu). Further, it is focused on the subject area of business (as opposed to other disciplines and/or vocations), it is composed of faculty from various schools (excluding business leaders and students), and it is an association within which its members find fellowship and encouragement.

The CBFA (2011) website answers this question more explicitly, stating that "the mission of the CBFA is to assist and encourage Christian business faculty in the study, integration, teaching, and application of biblical truths in service to the academy, students, and the business community." The first phrase in the mission statement relates to *what* the CBFA seeks to do for its members: "to assist and encourage." Next, the mission statement identifies the constituency to be served: "Christian business faculty." Having expressed the *what* and the *who*, the mission statement identifies *how* the CBFA will assist and encourage its members: "in the study, integration, teaching, and application of biblical truths." This is a broad field of service that can include everything from very personal (study) to very public (teaching) understanding and expression of biblical truth. Finally, the external beneficiaries are identified: "the academy, students, and the business community." The body of educational knowledge, the students to whom this knowledge is taught, and the community served by such students should each benefit from the work of the CBFA.

Elaborating on the mission statement, the CBFA (2011) vision statement sets goals that the CBFA be recognized for its commitment to Christ as the focus of all its activities, for its leadership in faith-business integration, as the leading voice in faith-business integration scholarship, and as a community of support for Christians teaching business. It is noteworthy that the CBFA mission statement contains an implicit core proposition that "secular" work, specifically in the fields of business and business education, can and should be done in service to God.

NON-ECCLESIASTICAL VOCATIONS AS SACRED SERVICE TO GOD

Vocation, from the Latin *vocare* or *vocatio*, can be understood in two distinct ways. First, vocation can refer to one's life work, or one's economic choice for wages (Hartung and Blustein, 2002). In this conception, one's work is a matter of personal choice, and that choice may or may not be influenced by factors such as health, education, family tradition, geographic location, and so on. In keeping with this focus on personality traits and environmental influences, Frank Parsons developed the Vocation Bureau in the early 1900s to help individuals align their skills, talents, and proclivities to a specific type of work. This was an early American attempt to recognize that individuals are often more suited to one type of work than another, but it left out a critical, non-quantifiable aspect of vocational choice — faith.

Another way to understand vocation is as one's faith-informed choice of life pursuit. This is a broadened conception of vocation in that it not only includes work done for pecuniary reasons but also includes endeavors done for non-pecuniary reasons, such as a life devoted to volunteerism or charitable functions, or being a stay-at-home parent. Thus, human choice and divine purpose unite to elevate mundane work to have both spiritual worth and eternal implications.

Jesus supported such a perception of vocation in his final commands to the disciples assembled at his ascension. The Great Commission (Matt. 28:18-20) contains a single command: "teach/make disciples of all nations." This command is surrounded by three participial phrases which can be translated as follows: "as you are going," "as you are baptizing," and "as you are teaching." Thus, Jesus taught that the making of disciples was not a unique calling for some, but an instruction to all who would follow him. Further, this instruction was to be carried out in the course of other activities: going, baptizing, and teaching. While God does grant gifts to some for vocational proclamation of his word (e.g., Romans 12:6-8), all Christians are called to be disciple-makers regardless of their vocational pursuit.

Within a few centuries of Jesus' teaching, however, Augustine had limited his view of vocation to specific ecclesial offices (Appold, 1998). Augustine believed that God communicated only to those whom he wanted engaged in his official work through the church. Therefore, serving as a pastor, administering the sacraments, serving in church leadership, and even living the contemplative life of a monk or nun would qualify as "sacred" service to God.

Martin Luther opposed this concept of vocation, teaching that all believers are priests: they are able not only to intercede for themselves in prayer, but also to have two-way communication with God (Wingren, 2004). Thus, man could speak directly to God, but more importantly, God could speak directly to man. The recovery of this

concept restored the cooperation of God and man within God's economy (Lowhorn, 2006), and it expanded "vocation" to once again include anything that God wanted a person to do, including non-ecclesiastical offices. Thus, the believer's work has purpose and meaning because it is sanctioned by God, himself, for his divine end. Now, the work of the believer who comes alongside and labors in the fields of the Lord becomes an act of worship and devotion to the Savior (Evans, 1991). Luther also recognized that individual circumstances differ (Wingren, 2004). Just as one's natural abilities differ, one's spiritual gifts will differ (Romans 12:3-8), and both natural abilities and spiritual gifts can be used in one's vocation. DellaVecchio and Winston (2004) and Winston (2009) posit that identification of one's spiritual gift can help with person-job fit.[1] Thus, Christians are free to use their natural and spiritual gifts harmoniously to serve God in vocations outside the church, and they need not limit themselves to church-based vocations to render service to God.

TEACHING AT NON-CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITIES AS SACRED SERVICE TO GOD

One example of service to God outside the ecclesial ranks is teaching business at the college level. Although it is widely acknowledged that most early colleges in the United States were founded for decidedly religious purposes (e.g., Harvard, Princeton, and Dartmouth were founded to train ministers and encourage mission work), over time colleges founded on religious ideals began to lose their unique mandate as they expanded their mission to include more "secular" studies. Charles Malik (1987) — noted diplomat, educator, and Orthodox Christian — warns us that in our rush to discover new things we have pushed aside our religious roots to the point where religion is now seen as inappropriate in most institutions of higher learning. Thus, institutions of higher learning can be segregated into non-Christian institutions where one does not expect to meet God and Christian institutions where it would be surprising not to meet him.

Malik (1987) identifies this as a "war between Christ and anti-Christ in our minds, a war of world-views in which the university is going through an identity crisis" (Lowhorn, 2006, p. 5). Professors are simultaneously experiencing the same battle: challenges to their own world-view, the relationship of their world-view to their academic discipline, and the application of their world-view to teaching. Hughes (2001, p. 1) exposes the perception in academia that "religion is fundamentally dogmatic while the life of the mind requires openness, creativity, and imagination." The inference is that Christians think they have universal certitude and are, therefore, not open to new knowledge. However, Hughes asserts that although Christians do have assurance on Scriptural matters, the charge that Christians are not intellectually curious ignores the benefit of intellectual exploration based upon an unwavering foundation. Thus Christians experience intellectual freedom that others may not enjoy because they have a secure point of reference from which to conduct research, investigate problems, and offer solutions that address society's deepest needs. In short, Christians have an informed worldview from which to do high-quality research, and they can be confident that they have something worthwhile to say.

In addition, non-Christians often fear that Christians will impose their worldview on others. Hughes challenges this perception by pointing out that being informed by one's beliefs is not the same as imposing one's beliefs on others. Discussing Luther's view of God's sovereignty, Hughes writes, "His point is not that Christians should impose God's sovereignty on an unbelieving world. That would be an impossible absurdity" (2001, p. 86). Hughes goes on to explain that invoking God's sovereignty is an assertion that only he is sovereign, we are not; and, like any non-sovereign being, our knowledge is "fragmentary and incomplete" (2001, p. 86). Therefore, Christians have a mandate to explore the world of ideas to further understand God's creation, admitting all the while that they "see through a glass darkly" (1 Cor. 13:12). There is no license for personal dogmatism, but there is a call for discernment and articulation of faith-informed scholarship.

Christian scholars are sometimes unsure about whether to overtly state their findings in biblical terms, complete with Scripture quotations, or whether to state their findings without explicit reference to matters of faith. There is no one best answer to this question, and such decisions are best left to the scholar based on the nature of the work, the venue, and the receptivity of the audience. In any case, faith can still inform, and even drive, research and practice. Presenting a practical illustration of this truth, Lee, McCann, and Ching (2003) found that Christian business executives in Hong Kong actively lived their faith in a marketplace that was not in congruence with Christian values by implementing explicit faith-based frameworks to assist in ethical decision making. Even though they could not overtly make Christian claims, they could use Christian beliefs to guide their actions and thereby be a visual and cultural testimony to Christ. Just as these Chinese business executives worked in a cultural environment hostile to Christian expression, Christian faculty

teaching at non-Christian universities can find themselves in a culturally hostile environment (e.g. threat of lawsuits, charges of intolerance or lack of sensitivity to diversity). However, it is imperative that Christian professors, at both Christian and non-Christian universities, allow their faith to inform their understanding of their discipline and to let that understanding influence their teaching and expose their culture to Christian values.

CURRENT AIDS FOR CHRISTIAN FACULTY TEACHING AT NON-CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITIES

Perusing the articles from the J*ournal of Biblical Integration in Business* (*JBIB*) and the *Christian Business Academy Review* (*CBAR*) provides many resources for Christian business faculty within Christian educational institutions, and there are multiple assertions that Christians in the field of business are just as much God's servants as the preacher in the pulpit. They are just called (or led, or placed, whatever one's particular choice of phrasing might be) by God to a different field of ministry. However, in an editorial from the 2006 issue of *JBIB*, Martinez notes that practitioners are helping themselves more than they are being helped by members of the CBFA. Indeed, for at least a decade, practitioner books have abounded with biblical ideals, faith-integration models, and remonstrances of the sacred-secular duality in business (e.g., Burkett, 2006; Cook, 1997; Gruden, 2003; Novak, 1996; Peabody, 2004; Silvoso, 2009). But one must ask, should the CBFA focus its attention on external beneficiaries (e.g., practitioners, who seem to be meeting their own needs) before meeting the needs of all of its internal constituency, including Christian business faculty teaching at non-Christian universities?

The mission of the CBFA is to Christian business faculty in service to the academy, students, and the business community, and perhaps the order is more important than one might think at first glance: to faculty, then the academy, then students, then the business community. Although attention to practitioner-related issues is important, additional assistance for Christian faculty teaching at non-Christian universities would better serve the primary constituency of the CBFA. Practitioners may be helping themselves more than the CBFA is helping them, but this should not be true of the relationship between the CBFA and the Christian business faculty member, whether on the Christian or non-Christian university campus.

Martinez goes on to correctly recognize that the effect of faith on the skeptical world of real business is a tough sell, and he calls CBFA members to "present well-thought-out, interesting, and relevant ideas about business issues to an unbelieving world" (2006, p. 3). This "tough sell" is even stronger in the non-Christian university setting where secular humanism (not just capitalism or materialism) is well entrenched. In his study of bias against Jews in higher education, Gary Tobin, president of the Institute for Jewish and Community Research, found a pronounced bias not only against Jews, but also against evangelical Christians (Nothstine, 2007). According to Tobin's study, Christians were rated unfavorably 53 percent of the time by fellow academics across all fields of study. Academic administrators did not refute the results but instead tried to justify the faculty's actions and prejudices.

Yancey (2011) has also written on perceived bias in academia against both political conservatism and religious expression. His conclusions, although more pronounced in sociology and the social sciences, are consistent across academic disciplines: scholars are more liberal in political views and less likely to express a personal faith than non-scholars. He then contends that liberal political views and lack of personal faith make academics more likely to favor their own and to hire and recommend for promotion other professors who share similar views. The tendency to favor individuals similar to one's self is nothing new (Schneider, 1987; Schneider, Goldstein and Smith, 1995), but Yancey (2011) asserts that it is out of place in the academy because of academia's *de facto* advocacy of diversity, which is presumably not only for ethnic and gender diversity, but also for diversity of ideas.

Examples of academic bias against conservative and religious views are not hard to find. Political conservative and education advocate David Horowitz was banned from speaking at a church-affiliated school for allegedly disparaging Islam (Jaschik, 2009). According to university officials, they did not want to "be viewed as attacking another faith and seeking to cause derision on campus" (Jaschik, 2009, para. 3). Martin Gaskill was denied the directorship of a new observatory at a major state university, even though he had served as a consultant on the project (Luskin, 2010). According to reports, the other professors in his department were concerned that his views on theistic evolution would taint the program and subject it to ridicule. Even though Gaskill has repeatedly denied being a creationist, *per se*, that did not stop university faculty as branding him a creationist and therefore suspect as a future colleague (Luskin, 2010).

Although what some call "real" or "complete" faith integration (e.g., teaching management principles solely from biblical texts, use of the Bible as the final validation/

repudiation of business theories, authoritative application of biblical passages to business situations) often cannot be accomplished in the non-Christian classroom, the actual experiences of individual faculty members at non-Christian universities will vary due to differences in the perspective of colleagues, the openness of the university to alternative viewpoints, the presentation skill of the faculty member, and not least of all the tenured or non-tenured status of the faculty member. Other factors will also affect these opportunities, but the introduction of biblical concepts, stated as such, in the non-Christian classroom faces more obstacles than the presentation of the same information in the same way in the Christian university classroom. Thus, the Christian educator in the non-Christian classroom faces challenges and opportunities akin to a missionary on a foreign field.

Having said this, we are not advocating that every lecture be a Bible lesson, but we are advocating that our faith should inform our scholarship and teaching. Drawing from one's faith is no more unusual than drawing from any other reservoir of personal experience, knowledge, and/or emotion. To say that those who hold strong beliefs (e.g., atheists, Buddhists, democrats, republicans, environmentalists, human rights activists, members of the ACLU, NRA, PETA, Greenpeace, etc.) are not influenced by their worldview is naïve at best and disingenuous at worst. Orr (2007) believes the Christian belongs in public life. The Christian's views are as valid as anyone else's views, and they are more needed since biblically informed scholarship has the ability to remedy many of society's maladies. Therefore, the challenge to all Christian academics, particularly those in seemingly hostile territory, is to engage the academy and learners with their faith. It is at this point that Martinez's call for high-quality Christian scholarship should resonate with Christian business faculty in all university settings. As we respond to this call, Christian business faculty (as well as Christian faculty from other disciplines) at Christian and non-Christian universities will benefit from mutual support, encouragement, and collaboration. There are impediments to expressing faith in the non-Christian university classroom, but there are similar hindrances in the field of business. And yet the belief that the field of business is a sacred calling is espoused and extolled. A mature perspective of faith-integration allows that Christian educators in the non-Christian realm are also able to live their faith completely without the explicit expressions more easily practiced at Christian universities.

SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE BIBLICAL INFLUENCE IN BUSINESS EDUCATION

For the CBFA

Our challenge for Christian business education is four-fold. First, the CBFA can embrace the full mandate of its mission by actively supporting Christian faculty at non-Christian universities. One suggestion would be to start a sectional meeting at the annual conference for those who teach at non-Christian universities (similar to the sectional meeting that already exists for female faculty). Another suggestion would be to facilitate an exchange of ideas via a section of the CBFA website dedicated to sharing Christian-themed methods, projects, etc., that have worked in the non-Christian university classroom. A similar website section for ideas that have been successful in the Christian university classroom would also be appropriate and may give rise to creative ways to apply the same concepts in the non-Christian classroom.

With respect to CBFA publications, Martinez (2006) notes that CBFA scholarship has failed to gain national or international recognition, but this is not all that surprising. The non-Christian world will seldom support or reward a Christian worldview — whether in the office, the factory, or the classroom. Christ, himself, taught that the unbelieving world hates his words (John 15:18-25), and Paul reminds us that the words of Christ are foolishness to those who lack the Holy Spirit (I Cor. 2). Why then would those with a non-Christian worldview reward what they perceive to be foolishness? Christian scholarship ought to be excellent because it represents Christ, but seeking the recognition of an unbelieving world for spiritual work will often be frustrating (at best) or futile. Instead, the CBFA could support the type of scholarship it values; perhaps even providing modest stipends to doctoral candidates (especially at non-Christian universities) who are working on religious-themed dissertations. The CBFA budget has contained a modest surplus for several years, and this surplus could be used to support two or three competitively awarded annual grants of $1,000 or so to support Christian research at the dissertation stage. This aligns with the mission of the CBFA since these students will become the next generation of business faculty.

However, if Christian publications are never read by anyone outside Christian circles, their influence will be limited. Thus, to improve the external influence of high-quality Christian research, the CBFA should continue to coordinate its meetings with groups such as the Accreditation Council of Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) and the International Assembly for Collegiate

Business Education (IACBE). Additional benefits would also accrue from joint meetings with other Christian faculty associations (e.g., Christian Finance Faculty Association, Association of Christian Economists) and/or with Christian organizations based on non-Christian university campuses (e.g., InterVarsity Christian Fellowship). To increase opportunities for collaboration among like-minded faculty at Christian and non-Christian universities, CBFA meetings might also be coordinated with non-religious organizations such as discipline-specific business associations (e.g., American Accounting Association, American Marketing Association) or the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB). Thus, the opportunity for the CBFA to position itself as the premier support organization for all Christian business faculty is great and the possibilities are numerous.

For CBFA Contributors

Secondly, we encourage those who contribute to CBFA journals to explicitly consider the application of their contributions within the non-Christian university classroom. Cooling (2010) advocates what he calls transformational Christian teaching where Christian reason is used to frame all truth. For example, teaching ethical standards of accurate financial reporting could include the biblical principles of just weights, keeping one's word, not bearing false witness, fidelity to our employer, and the principle of stewardship without explicit reference to a biblical source. Most secular curricula give approximately equal weight to all ethical perspectives, and adding an often omitted biblical dimension to the discussion benefits and broadens student perspective. Although not every concept or conceptualization can be applied in this venue, authors should consider how the concept might be reframed to keep it within the realm of acceptability for the non-Christian classroom. Perhaps our fellow professors in the field of law could also write articles (or a regular *JBIB* or *CBAR* column) on do's and don'ts for faculty in both Christian and non-Christian academia.

As encouraged by Dyck (1999), collaboration between Christian faculty at Christian and non-Christian universities would expand the perspective of research contributions and potentially improve the service rendered to both groups. With respect to CBFA publications, *JBIB* appears to be the outlet for external engagement on faith-integration issues while *CBAR* appears to be focused on issues specific to Christian universities (although this division between the two publications is not maintained at all times). In keeping with this focus, *JBIB* has published several articles authored or co-authored by faculty from non-Christian universities. However, most of these articles are written in such a way that they could be applied only in a Christian university classroom — a classroom, oddly enough, with which authors at non-Christian universities often have little contact. To engage faculty from non-Christian universities, article topics and instructional applications need to consider a readership composed, at least partially, of non-Christian university professors. Looking at these two publications in a broader context, it might be beneficial to exchange their focuses for greater influence among non-Christian faculty. Although verbally counterintuitive, a non-Christian audience would probably engage with a publication whose title contains the word "Christian" more readily than they would with a publication whose title contains the word "biblical."

For Christian Faculty at Christian Universities

Thirdly, when Christian university faculty have the freedom to be intentionally Christian in classroom instruction and/or in their professional pursuits, *they should do so!* While those wanting "complete" faith-integration may deride activities such as *merely* opening class with prayer or *just* living a Christian testimony before one's students as token religious rites within the Christian university classroom, such opportunities should be neither squandered nor taken for granted. When an institution defends and supports freedom of explicit faith expression, to limit one's self to a silent witness or a 30-second opening prayer should cause one to be ashamed to leave additional opportunities untaken. Every Christian faculty member should be as intentionally Christian as permissible, and for those in the Christian university classroom, every opportunity should be taken to be especially so.

Since most of the scholarship within the CBFA will come from those at Christian universities (Martinez, 2006), Christian university writers need to consider how their writing will influence and affect their fellow Christians teaching at non-Christian universities. Such seemingly small things as disparaging merely praying to start class can ostracize those who are prohibited from even this small act. If Christian faculty at non-Christian universities cannot satisfy even this small expectation, then why would they look to CBFA journals for leadership on other things that they cannot do? Particular forms or actions cannot be dogmatically espoused as the only service worthy of being called "really faith-integrated."

Yet none of this will make a difference and Christian scholarship will not be able to be recognized (either internally or externally, whether of excellent quality or not) unless authors at Christian universities bring their writing

to the point of publication. In an anecdotal exchange at a CBFA conference, a CBFA member from a Christian university told one of the authors of this paper that his university valued presenting at the CBFA conference just as much as publishing in a CBFA journal. We are not calling upon Christian universities to raise their expectations, but if this situation is representative of scholarship standards across Christian universities, it greatly reduces the incremental benefit of converting a conference paper into publishable form (and of subjecting one's self to the more rigorous scrutiny of the peer-review process). Nevertheless, we strongly encourage faculty at Christian universities to expend the additional effort necessary to polish their conference papers into articles lest the opportunity for Christian research to show its excellence and to exert an external influence be lost (or, at the very least, greatly diminished).

For Christian Faculty at Non-Christian Universities

Finally, we invite and encourage Christian faculty teaching at non-Christian institutions to actively participate in Christian scholarship. Over ten years ago in *JBIB*, Dyck (1999) raised this standard, but it seems that there have been few who have rallied behind it. Dyck (1999) suggested that the efforts of Christian and non-Christian university business faculty be combined with the work of theologians to devise a Christian theology of accounting, of marketing, of management, etc. But what has been the result? Christian university faculty rarely have the time or resources to write, and non-Christian university faculty have little encouragement or support for such writing. Nevertheless, Christian faculty at Christian and non-Christian universities can seek out opportunities for co-authorship on Christian-themed articles for publication in CBFA journals and elsewhere.

Along these lines, we propose that Christian business faculty in non-Christian institutions make a conscious choice to devote some of their research efforts to Christian outlets. One might consider it like a tithe of one's research efforts, recognizing that the time for, ability in, and success from all such pursuits comes from God. This will also open doors of opportunity for discussion, and perhaps for criticism or censure, too. Such publications do not have to be the first line on one's *curriculum vitae*;[2] but including them may give opportunities to explain why one is a member of the CBFA, to explain why one contributes to CBFA journals, or most importantly to introduce someone else to the God for whom we live our lives.

Where opportunity and ability allow, another option would be to submit faith-based research to non-Christian journals. Mainstream business journals often address topics that can be approached from a faith-based perspective (e.g., ethics, social and cultural justice, morality, student cheating and honor codes, spirituality in the workplace, work-life balance, principled leadership, vocational choice). By targeting respected journals with quality research from a Christian perspective, researchers will both enhance the reputation of Christian scholarship (and perhaps their own reputation) and introduce a primarily non-Christian audience to Christian principles. We stress, however, that opportunity *and* ability (and perhaps necessity) must combine for this type of scholarship to be *spiritually* effective because such research requires mature understanding, adherence to the truth, and inoffensive presentation.

Besides research, Christian faculty at non-Christian universities can get involved on their campuses in other ways, such as by supporting a faith-based campus ministry.[3] This is not always possible given time constraints, but when possible, it is an opportunity to point students to a student-led, institutionally approved, Christian ministry. Beyond student organizations, perhaps there is a campus-based Christian faculty association to join, or perhaps one could be started. There are few Christians who would deny that the influence of Christ is greatly needed on the campuses of non-Christian universities, and Christian faculty already in place at these universities are primary agents who could exert and extend such influence.

Ultimately, one of the most valuable witnesses is life-testimony. What ethic is demonstrated through interactions with students and colleagues? Does one's witness lead others to see Christians as honest, brash, harsh, fair, mean-spirited, gruff, open, congenial, encouraging, etc.? An honest self-evaluation (which could apply to faculty in any area and/or setting) might well begin by asking whether or not the fruit of the spirit is demonstrated in one's life (Galatians 5:22-23: love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance), as well as by considering whether or not one has "put off" the things Paul admonishes be "put off" (Colossians 3:8-9: anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication, and lying). This is not "lifestyle evangelism" in the sense that one demonstrates Christian character without ever saying anything about the purpose for living in such a way even when asked a direct question, but it is "life evangelism" in the sense that the life God has given is used to evangelize the particular part of his world to which he has assigned each of his children (I Cor. 9:19-23).

CONCLUSION

This paper encourages cooperation among Christian business faculty across their various spheres of influence, and it invites the CBFA to take the lead in facilitating such collaboration. Among other suggestions, we see benefit in a CBFA special-interest section for faculty teaching at non-Christian universities, in consideration of non-Christian classroom applications for faith-based instructional aids, in the extension of conference presentations by faculty at Christian universities into journal article submissions, and in increased co-authorship among faculty at Christian and non-Christian universities. Future research should identify, summarize, and analyze what has been and can be accomplished in this regard through the work of CBFA members and other Christian faculty at non-Christian universities to serve as a guide to others. A unique opportunity lies before us: the opportunity to combine the various abilities, opportunities, and spiritual gifts that God has granted to his business faculty teaching at both Christian and non-Christian universities to advance the kingdom of God in harmony of purpose and unity of heart. Let us boldly accept this challenge and walk through the door that has been opened unto us (I Cor. 16:9).

ENDNOTES

[1] One limitation of this study is the assumption that most of the respondents (N = 4177) were presumed to be Christians since the primary audience of their gift test have been members of Christian organizations, students at Christian universities, or recipients of electronic Christian publications. DellaVecchio and Winston are expanding their work to include more diverse respondents and have published an online, self-scoring version at *www.gifttest.org*.

[2] Publications in Christian outlets do not have to be shown on one's *curriculum vitae* at all, but intentional omission of these items introduces other issues which are beyond the scope of this paper.

[3] This challenge could also extend to faculty members at Christian institutions since there are probably worthy student organizations on these campuses that could also use faculty support. Since life is ministry, ministry must extend beyond the walls of the classroom or the office into the cafeteria, the parking lot, the practice field, etc.

REFERENCES

Appold, K. G. (1998). *Abraham Calov's Doctrine of Vocation in its Systematic Context*. Tubingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

Burkett, L. (2006). *Business by the Book: Complete Guide of Biblical Principles for the Workplac*e. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Christian Business Faculty Association (CBFA). (2011). *Mission, Vision and Values*. Retrieved from: http://www.cbfa.org/html/mission__vision__and_values.html.

Cook, W. B. (1997). *Business Buy the Bible: Financial Wisdom of the Ancients*. Seattle, WA: Lighthouse Publishing Group, Inc.

Cooling, T. (2010, spring). Transforming Faith: Teaching as a Christian Vocation in a Secular, Worldview-Diverse Culture. *Journal of Education and Christian Belief*, 19-32.

DellaVecchio, D. and B. Winston. (2004). A Seven-Scale Instrument to Measure the Romans 12 Motivational Gifts and a Proposition that the Romans 12 Gift Profiles Might Apply to Person-Job Fit Analysis. *Regent University School of Leadership Studies Working Paper Series*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University. Retrieved from http://www.regent.edu/acad/global/publications/working/DellaVecchio-Winston%20Romans%2012%20gift%20test%20and%20profiles%20manuscriptdv.pdf.

Dyck, B. (1999, fall). A Modest Proposal for a Bold Initiative: Reflections from a Public University. Journal of *Biblical Integration in Business,* 169-173.

Evans, R. R. (1991, autumn). Leadership as a Calling. *Business Quarterly*, 76-77.

Gruden, W. (2003). *Business for the Glory of God: The Bible's Teaching on the Moral Goodness of Business*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.

Hartung, P. J. and D. I. Blustein. (2002, winter). Reason, Intuition, and Sacred Justice: Elaborating on Parson's Career Decision Making Model. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 41-42.

Hughes, R. T. (2001). *How Christian Faith Can Sustain the Life of the Mind.* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Jaschik, S. (29 September 2009). Saint Louis U. Blocks David Horowitz Event. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2009/09/29/slu.

Lee, K., D. P. McCann, and M. Ching. (2003, March). Christ and Business Culture: A Study of Christian Executives in Hong Kong. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 103-110.

Lemler, B. (29-30 October 2004). Christian Business Faculty Association: How are we and how should we be Preparing Students for Careers in Business, and what are the Implications for how we Organize and Administer our Programs? *CBFA Conference Proceedings*. San Antonio, TX. Retrieved from http://www.cbfa.org/Lemler1.pdf.

Lowhorn, G. L. (22-25 June 2006). A Call to Service in the Kingdom Economy. *The Two Tasks: National Faculty Leadership Conference Proceedings*. Alexandria, VA.

Luskin, C. (13 December 2010). Astronomer Denied Job at University of Kentucky due to Perceived Sympathy for "Creationism." *Evolutions News and Views*. Retrieved from http://www.evolutionnews.org/2010/12/astronomer_denied_job_at_unive041611.html.

Malik, C. (1987). *A Christian Critique of the University*. Waterloo, Ontario, Canada: North Waterloo Academic Press.

Martinez, R. J. (2006, fall). What's Wrong with the Christian Business Faculty Association? *Journal of Biblical Integration in Business*, 1-9.

Nothstine, R. (13 August 2007). College Professors Biased against Christians? *Acton Institute PowerBlog*. Retrieved from http://blog.acton.org/archives/1863-college-professors-biased-against-christians.html.

Novak, M. (1996). *Business as a Calling*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Orr, R. D. (2007, May-August). The Role of Christian Belief in Public Policy. *Christian Bioethics*, 199-209.

Peabody, L. (2004). *Serving Christ in the Workplace: Secular Work is Full-Time Service*. Fort Washington, PA: CLC Ministries.

Silvoso, E. (2009). *Anointed for Business*. Venture, CA: Regal Books.

Schneider, B. (1987, autumn). The People Make the Place. Personnel Psychology, 869-891.

Schneider, B., H. W. Goldstein, and D. B. Smith. (1995, winter). The ASA Framework: An Update. *Personnel Psychology*, 747-773.

Wingren, G. (2004). *Luther on Vocation*. (C. C. Rasmussen, tr.). Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, Publishers.

Winston, B. (2009, summer). The Romans 12 Gifts: Useful for Person-Job Fit. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 114-134.

Yancey, G. (2011). *Compromising Scholarship: Religious and Political Bias in American Higher Education*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.