

# Science and faith in organisations

John R Hudson

12 October 2019

Until the nineteenth century, there were no large organisations beyond armies; the largest civilian organisation mentioned in the ancient world is a factory of about 70 slaves run by one of the wealthiest men in Rome; but this was regarded as exceptional and no-one else ever copied him. The arrival of the railways heralded the growth of large organisations and, at the start of the twentieth century, the French mining engineer, Henri Fayol (1916), was one of the first people to write a guide to managing organisations. Since then, a great many people have written books on managing organisations but only he and Ricardo Semler (1993) share the distinction of having put their own money at risk in putting into practice what they recommend.

When Jesus commissioned his apostles (Mt 28:16–20), He simply told them what He wanted them to do and left them to get on it. He did later add Paul to the main group of apostles to take the message mostly to the Greek speaking communities of the Eastern Mediterranean (Ac 9:1–25) and He had explain to Peter that he was taking rather too narrow a view of the commission (Ac 10:9–16).

But He did not specify an organisation or, *pace* the Roman Catholics, a leader and by around ten years later His half-brother, James, was one of the acknowledged leaders of the church (Ac 15:13–21), someone who is only mentioned in passing in the gospels. In practice, there was very little beyond local organisation among the early Christian groups and formal structures involving multiple churches only emerge a couple of centuries later.

The references to bishops, elders, deacons and so on in the letters of Paul are often seized on to suggest that there was already some idea of a hierarchy among early Christian groups but there is no clear evidence to support this.

## 1 Managing groups

When Jesus left it up to the apostles to decide how they wanted to organise themselves, He was doing what would maximise their productivity. When Ricardo Semler decided to let his staff chose their own managers, he expected that they would choose middle-of-the-road managers. But they didn't; some chose very authoritarian managers, others chose very laid back managers but, at the end of the year, their productivity was the same. In other words, people are most productive when they are part of a workgroup in which they feel comfortable.

So the idea that there is a 'right' way of managing a group of workers which can be taught and applied to all groups of workers is a myth, albeit quite a lucrative one for those who claim to be able to 'teach' management or write 'self-help' books for managers. So why might different ways of managing a group of workers be successful for different groups of workers?

## 1.1 Teamwork through personal relationships

In a classic study of the Red Arrows Aerobatic Team, Hilarie Owen (1996) found that they spent the first six months getting to know each other as people before they started practising any of their hair-raising stunts. More recently, the 2017 TV series, *Saving lives at sea*, about the work of the Royal National Lifeboat Institution has brought out how important the personal relationships of lifeboat teams are to working together in the most hazardous conditions.

In effect, Owen debunked all the conventional theories about teamwork, replacing them with one which explained teamwork in terms of the personal relationships of team members; these relationships will be influenced by a wide range of factors including people's motivation, understanding of groups, culture, gender and expectations but, in the end, the personal relationships among team members are the most important factor in developing and sustaining teamwork.

## 1.2 Group composition

There is some evidence that successful groups contain people with different skills and approaches. Handy (1986) argues that all organisations require bureaucrats, fixers, developers and entrepreneurs. Bureaucrats are needed to do the basic organisation; fixers find solutions to problems which bureaucrats cannot solve and the two often do not see eye to eye but an organisation needs both of them to survive. Developers focus on the long term survival of the organisation, often by addressing the developmental needs of individuals and teams in the organisation and entrepreneurs look for new ways of working and new relationships which will benefit the organisation.

Honey and Mumford (1992) argue that people have different learning styles; some learn by active engagement, some by understanding the theory behind what they are doing, some by taking pragmatic approaches to situations and some by reflecting on situations. They argue that successful groups need to pay attention to each of these different learning styles if people are going to develop in a group.

My experience has been that, because these different skills and approaches to learning are generally not 'fixed' — though some people are reluctant to move out of their skill set and regular way of working, people who are skilled in particular areas can often develop skills in other areas and learn in ways which are different from their preferred style. So, as long as a group has enough members in it who are prepared to be flexible, even if not all are, it can function successfully.

## 1.3 Motivation

There have been many studies of motivation but it is pretty clear now that unexpected intangible rewards such as praise, a compliment, someone showing confidence in you, a discovery or an achievement are the most powerful motivators. Tangible rewards like pay will improve motivation but only if the person is earning less than £20–25,000 a year and regular rewards may have some effect the first few times but the effect soon wears off.

Broadly speaking, around one in six people are chiefly motivated by tangible rewards, about half of all women and a third of all men are chiefly motivated by relationships and about a half of all men and a third of women are chiefly motivated by achievements. So you cannot generalise about any group of workers other than to say that you are likely to get some people who are more motivated by relationships and some who are more motivated by achievements but you cannot split these on gender lines. And it seems likely that, if there are problems

about motivation, they may be related to people not finding the types of motivation which they are looking for in the group, perhaps because the others in the group are looking for a different type of motivation. In the end, people need to enjoy working in the group; if they do not enjoy working in the group for whatever reason, they are never going to give it their commitment.

## **2 Working groups**

No one ever achieves anything on their own in an organisation. At the very least they are reliant on those who supply things for them and in most cases on colleagues and others in the organisation — a point made to Moses when he was drawing on God's power to defeat the Amalekites but had to call on others to help him (Ex 17:8–13).

I once worked in an organisation which had a copy shop run by one man using lots of sophisticated equipment. I quickly found that he hated being rushed and so I always took my stuff to him in plenty of time and told him there was no rush. I almost always got it back in a couple of days and people used to be amazed that I always got even the most complicated orders done in a very short time. But all I had done was found out how he liked to be treated and treated him in that way.

In a study of programmers Coleman (2013) found that the most successful programmers were those who competed to write the best code and cooperated to ensure that others accepted it. Those who were unable to cooperate with others, however good they were as programmers, rarely got their code accepted. This is summarised in the programmers' saying, 'It's the community, not the code.' In other words, it does not matter how good your code is, if you are not paying attention to your relationships with others, you will get nowhere.

Collins (2001) found that the most successful leaders worked with a small team; none of them achieved what they did on their own but in cooperation with others.

### **2.1 Understanding of groups**

Broadly speaking, adults' understanding of groups goes through a number a stages; at the first they see the group as an collection of individuals and they relate to the members of the group as individuals. At the second, they recognise that they can relate to the group as a whole without relating to each individual separately; at the third they recognise and become able to manage relationships between different groups (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

In my experience, very few adults reach the second stage before their mid-twenties unless they have been immersed in groups for some reason before then; typically adults reach the third stage in their late thirties or early forties when they begin to take on supervisory or managerial jobs that involve managing relationships between groups.

So, at the first stage, they see cooperation as primarily a matter of cooperation between individuals, at the second as primarily about cooperation within the group and only at the third stage do they begin to think seriously about cooperation between different groups. But at each stage, any success they have had will have been affected by the quality of the relationships they have been able to make with individuals, within the group and with other groups.

## 2.2 Processes

Unless a group is unusually small and has a very simple task to complete, the group usually needs to make some decisions about how they will tackle the task and how they will communicate about progress with the task. This is something about which many books have been written but the key things to remember are that the processes should be as interesting as possible and make as good use as possible of the available relationships and that the communication channels should build on the relationships which naturally arise from the process.

Just over a century ago F. W. Taylor (1911) argued that work should be broken down into its smallest components so that people could work very quickly and earn more money. Though he was well-intentioned, he was wrong; people quickly get bored of simple tasks and work better when the tasks take some thinking about. Unfortunately, some people still think that dumbing down work is the way to go.

Similarly, people create the most elaborate organisation charts which take no account of the relationships which people need to have to do their jobs. Organisations should take a leaf out of the house builders who do not lay any paths down until people have made tracks across the grass and use those to guide them in where to put the paths. They should create organisation charts based on the real relationships which people need in order to do their work.

Finally, communication should be based on what people need to know in order to complete a task, for example, that someone is going on holiday or on maternity leave, and to maintain a relationship, for example, that someone needs sympathy or support because they have been through a difficult situation.

## 3 Organisational structure

The first record of a ‘management consultancy’ appears to be the one undertaken around 1447 BC when Moses’ father-in-law Jethro met Moses not long into his leadership of the Israelites on their journey out of Egypt towards Palestine. Moses, an Israelite adopted by and brought up in the Egyptian royal household who had been a successful general in a campaign on Egypt’s southern border before taking up the cause of the Israelites, was very much trying to do everything; Jethro’s advice: ‘Delegate’ (Exodus 18:13–26). Perhaps Moses had not really taken in the message about not trying to do everything on your own during the battle with the Amalekites!

Peter Drucker (1955) has argued that organisations can be divided broadly into unit, mass or process production. In unit production, one thing is completed at a time, for example, a vase thrown by potter, a large office building or a service at a church. In fact, most of the things churches do come under the general heading of unit production because, normally, a service, a Boys Brigade session or Messy Church involves organising everything for one event.

Mass production involves assembling many things simultaneously from parts while process production involves producing something continuously. Most consumer goods from watches to cars are now made using mass production though there are specialist manufacturers who will produce one at a time for you. Process production is what goes on in chemical plants, most hospitals and prisons. Churches are relatively rarely involved in mass production unless they are running a soup kitchen or in process production unless they are running a night shelter or similar form of accommodation.

Using Drucker’s framework, Joan Woodward (1958) found that companies used a variety of ways of organising themselves but that those which were most successful used ways of organising

which matched the type of production. So unit production benefits from having someone who coordinates everything and to whom everyone relates; mass production benefits from having ways of coordinating the different aspects of the production process while process production benefits from management leaving the workers to get on with things and not interfering in the day to day running of the process.

One reason for the Three Mile Island accident in 1979 was that, even though nuclear plants involve process production, the workers were not allowed to run the plant; they had to refer things upwards and so they did not know what to do when the incident began. Similarly, many of the problems in the NHS can be blamed on top-down management by successive governments and a reluctance to let the workers directly involved with patients make the decisions.

Jesus never used top down management; He commissioned people to do particular jobs and then let them get on with it. He assumed, as when He sent the disciples to prepare the passover meal, that they would know how to do it (Mt 26:17–19). When the apostles asked the congregation to appoint some of their members to oversee the distribution of food to the needy, they did not appoint a leader; they appointed a group and let them organise themselves (Ac 6:1–6). Paul, in his account of the meeting in Jerusalem (Gal 2:6) refers to ‘those who seemed to be leaders’ who turn out to be Simon Peter and James, the half brother of Jesus (Ac 15:6–21).

So, imposing a single style of organisation on the various groups within a church is likely to be counterproductive; each group within a church needs to be free to decide how they are to be organised. The key issue is that at least one person in the group has reached the third stage in their understanding of group relationships; if there is no-one in the group who has reached that stage, the group is likely to focus on their own internal relationships to the detriment of their relationships with other groups in the church. Then a group might require someone from outside the group to facilitate their relationships with other groups.

## 4 Leadership

Modern ideas about leadership can be traced back to the 1920s when it was assumed that people were born with leadership qualities and all you had to do was to identify which of your staff had them — one reason why Hitler adopted the title ‘The Leader.’ The focus on personality traits continued into the 1960s and was only slowly displaced by the ideas that appraisal schemes based on performance might give a better way of evaluating leadership potential and that, if it didn’t rely on traits, it could probably be taught — and hundreds of books have been published and courses set up to teach ‘leadership skills.’

But the best possible advice to those wanting to be leaders was given by Jesus when he said, ‘Whoever wants to be first must be your slave’ (Mt 20:27) or, as Drucker (1955) says, the job of a manager is to serve those for whom they are responsible. In a study of the most successful US managers, Collins (2001) found that they:

- come from within the company,
- are humble people with no public profile,
- focus on what to do and what not to do,
- get the right people in place (*who* you pay is more important than *what* you pay),

- confront brutal facts and accept responsibility, and
- work for the company and not for themselves.

In other words, successful leadership relies more on the attitudes and values of the leader than on traits or skills or experience. That may help to explain why Semler (1993) found that the way you manage is not important; rather it is the confidence which those under you place in you which enables you to be a successful leader. And the confidence others place in you is often built on the quality of the relationships you have made with them.

## 5 Culture

In a study for IBM Geert Hofstede (1980) explored the ways in which culture might affect the ways in which people work. Broadly he found four dimensions which in various combinations differentiated cultures:

1. power distance (unequal vs equal)
2. uncertainty avoidance (rigid vs flexible)
3. individualism/collectivism (alone vs together)
4. work oriented/family oriented (tough vs tender).

Japan came out as the most work oriented culture but the UK was towards the work oriented end of the spectrum along with Germany and the US. Nearly twenty years later, Hofstede published a further book summarising the research which had explored the fourth dimension. Bear in mind that the research simply gives averages; individuals in a culture may hold very different values from the average in the culture. A summary of some of the findings is given in the [Appendix](#).

In this context Jesus comes out as someone who never sought power distance, insisted that there would always be uncertainty about certain things, generally took a collectivist approach and came down very much in the middle of the work oriented/family oriented dimension. So trying to be ‘like Christ’ may be more difficult for people from some cultures than it will be for people from other cultures and may mark them out more clearly as ‘different.’ For example, in the work oriented culture of the UK, taking a more family oriented approach in a group may be seen as ‘odd’ or even ‘difficult’ either within the group or when discussing things with other groups.

Jesus shows on many occasions that He understands the significance of culture and, in calling Paul to be an apostle, He chooses someone from outside the Palestinian Jewish culture of the remaining disciples who both understands the Palestinian Jewish culture, having studied under Gamaliel (Ac 22:3), and can relate to non-Jewish cultures, a good example being Paul’s address to the Athenians (Ac 17:16–34). Other notable non Palestinians include Barnabas, Priscilla and Aquila and Luke; indeed, Luke’s gospel is notable for its inclusion of many of the women in Jesus’ life and ministry about whom the other, Jewish, gospel writers say very little.

Much later, William Carey was heavily criticised for trying to understand Indian culture in order to preach the gospel to Indians and James Hudson Taylor for adopting Chinese dress and customs in his efforts to preach the gospel to Chinese people; but, in calling Paul and Luke, Jesus underlined the importance of cultural understanding in presenting the gospel.

## 6 Gender

While Jesus did not have any women within the apostles, He certainly had women in his entourage and spoke to some of them after His resurrection before He spoke to any of the apostles (Mt 28:9–10). He also advocated equality for women in theological discussion (Lk 10:41–42; Jn 11:20–27), something which Dan Taylor drew on when he argued that women should have the same rights in church as men (Jones, 2017). And, in spite of the apparent misogyny in some of Paul’s letters, he had no problem with women taking leadership roles in congregations (Rom 16:1, 3, 6, 12, 15; Col 4:15). Women in general are at least as good at being leaders as men (Burke and Mattis, 2005) and possibly slightly better in more work oriented cultures where they bring more family oriented values to the organisation, thus redressing any imbalance in the organisation. There are therefore no scientific reasons for excluding women from leadership positions and, as Dan Taylor argued, no scriptural ones either.

## 7 Standards of performance

In her account of the Red Arrows, Owen (1996) stresses the need for, among other things, standards of performance which are also reflected in the personal standards of each member of the group. How these standards evolve and come to be accepted by the group may vary widely among groups but the important thing is that all members own the standards and put them into practice. As Jesus says, ‘Let your Yes be a Yes and your No a No’ (Mt 5:37).

As a teenager I worked for a greengrocer who was scrupulously honest and very successful — which was quite a surprise to me as I had been told that only people who cheated could be successful. Since then mathematical game theory has shown that the only reliable way to win a game in the long term is to be honest; those who cheat may gain a short term advantage but in the long term they always lose out (Cole, 1998). So the long term survival of any group is likely to depend in part on how honest its members are among themselves and with others.

If someone fails to meet the standards, the most effective way of dealing with this is to praise them for the standards they are meeting and avoid criticising them for failing to meet other standards unless this is harming others. Very often people who are failing to meet standards lack confidence and so anything which undermines their confidence is likely to be unhelpful.

### 7.1 Expecting perfection from sinners

Perfection in this world is impossible (Deming, 2000); the translators of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek chose the Greek word which means ‘missing the mark’ for sin. Science, particularly twentieth century science, has confirmed the Christian message that we are all sinners in the sense that we will all miss the mark in whatever we seek to do. So expecting people to do anything perfectly is unrealistic; the best that anyone can do is to move a little closer to perfection each time by trying to do something a little better the next time they do it.

### 7.2 Changing the way we think about things

A key way in which we can address our own missing the mark is to ‘change the way we think about things’ — which is what the word normally translated ‘repentance’ means. We have to acknowledge that we will always miss the mark and stop thinking that we have the power to achieve things on our own.

The Greek word for ‘repentance’ has no religious connotations; it can be applied to any situation where a person ‘changes the way they think about something’ and this is ultimately the way in which groups will succeed as new opportunities and new relationships arise. Just as Christians need to recognise that they cannot obtain salvation on their own but only through Jesus Christ, so people in organisations need to recognise that they cannot achieve anything worthwhile in the organisation on their own but only through cooperating with other people in and outside the organisation. Once they do that and start to behave differently, they will be more likely to achieve something for the organisation.

Science tells us that, if we do not confirm our new way of thinking about the world in our actions, it is likely to fade. So thinking about the world in a new way, whether about something which is nothing to do with faith or as part of gaining a new faith, involves both a new way of thinking about things and a new way of behaving based on that new way of thinking about things. As James (2.17) says, ‘Faith without actions is dead in itself.’

### **7.3 Dealing with different ways of thinking about things**

One difficulty within organisations is that people do not always move together at the same pace; so one person in the group may have changed the way they think about their working situation but the rest of the group have not; as long as the difference between the views of the working situation is not too great, this can lead to creative tension in the group which eventually leads to the whole group moving forward, not necessarily to the same position as the person who changed their view first but perhaps to a different viewpoint which none of them held before. The key to achieving this can be summarised in five principles:

1. Avoid *arguing* for your own individual judgements.
2. View differences of opinion as *helpful* rather than as a hindrance in decision making.
3. View any initial agreement with suspicion.
4. Avoid changing your mind *only* to reach agreement and avoid conflict.
5. Avoid conflict reducing techniques such as majority votes, averaging or trading in reaching decisions.

However, reaching consensus decisions can be difficult because there are differences between cultures in the value they put on cooperation and on competition and because cooperation always takes more effort than competition. To cooperate, you have to put effort into sustaining relationships; you can compete while putting less effort into sustaining relationships.

## **8 Most problems are situational**

It is commonplace to describe problems between people as ‘personality clashes’ but most relationship problems are situational and the best and simplest way to resolve the problem is to change the situation, not the person. In some cases, for example, of immaturity, sexism or bullying, a person may need to change their behaviour but the key to all behaviour change is changing the situation and thus the relationships which are available to a person in the situation.



## 9 Stress

Stress is a result of the built-in protective mechanisms of the body; it is normally a warning sign that we need to change our behaviour (including escaping from a stressful situation) and, if it is ignored, there can be fatal consequences.

The key findings in the second half of the twentieth century are that

- stress is not ‘all in the mind;’ feelings of stress arise from the actions of the chemical systems in our bodies which then affect the ways in which we think and the ways in which we think about the stress affect the production of the chemicals which then affects our feelings of stress;
- dealing with stress involves
  - changing the ways in which we think about the situations in which we find ourselves so that we begin to think about them positively which encourages the chemical systems to reduce the amount of chemicals they are producing,
  - exercise to expel the stress chemicals from our bodies, and
  - keeping our heart rate stable and a little lower than normal, if possible.

Stress may not be pleasant when we are experiencing it but, without it, we would fall prey to all sorts of dangers and we would never develop as people.

Almost every ‘treatment’ for stress other than a change in the way someone thinks about the situation, adequate exercise and a slight reduction in our ‘normal’ heart rate has little effect — the only exception being severe stress where interventions to lessen the impact of the stress can enable people to get to a point where it becomes more like moderate stress and they can begin to deal with it. This often involves changing the situation in which the person finds themselves so that, even if the stress has not gone away, they have the resources to deal with it.

While severe stress can have adverse effects on us, from which in some cases we may never recover, moderate stress can be a motivator to change the ways in which we think about the world and so to develop ourselves — which is why some people become Christians as a result of a stressful experience.

Note that a stress-free life is not wholly desirable; people who have had relatively little stress in their lives are less able to deal with stress when they encounter it; moderate stress actually makes us more prepared for stress in the future. And Jesus never promised that being a Christian would be a bed of roses (for example, Mt 5:11–12).

In other words, the mechanisms which God gave us to become aware of potential harm to ourselves are no different from any of the other faculties which God gave us; if we don’t use them constructively, we lose them and in some cases we kill ourselves by ignoring the messages which they are giving us.

### In summary

1. There is no one form of organisation that will suit every group.
2. People work best when they have satisfying relationships at work.
3. Teams work better when the members bring a variety skills to the team.

4. Most people are motivated by intangible things like relationships and achievements rather than money.
5. Cooperation, both within the group and with other groups, is the key to successful groups.
6. Group structure is best organised round the people in the group.
7. The type of work can influence the best relationships for a team to have.
8. Delegate!
9. Leadership always involve service — to those who do the work and to the organisation.
10. Jesus expressed some preferences about the sort of team culture He was comfortable with.
11. There are no scientific or scriptural reasons for excluding women from leadership positions.
12. Perfection is impossible and should never be expected, only improvement.
13. Willingness to change the way we think about the world is an advantage to us all.
14. Most problems are situational.
15. Stress affects both body and mind and can be alleviated by changing the way we think about things, exercise and a lower heart rate.

## References

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, R. J. and M. C. Mattis (2005). Advancing women’s careers: small wins but unfinished business. In R. J. Burke and M. C. Mattis (Eds.), *Supporting women’s career and advancement: challenges and opportunities*, Chapter 1, pp. 1–9. Cheltenham: Elgar.
- Cole, K. C. (1998). *The universe and the teacup: the mathematics of truth and beauty*. London: Little Brown.
- Coleman, E. G. (2013). *Coding freedom: the ethics and aesthetics of hacking*. Princeton/Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great: why some companies make the leap — and others don’t*. London: Random House.
- Deming, W. E. (2000). *Out of the crisis: quality, productivity and competitive position*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Drucker, P. F. (1955). *The practice of management*. London: Heinemann.

- Fayol, H. (1916). Administration industrielle et générale. In *Bulletin de la Société de l'Industrie minérale*. Paris: Dunod.
- Handy, C. B. (1986). *Gods of management: the changing work of organisations*. London: Souvenir.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values*. London: SAGE.
- Hofstede, G. (1998). The cultural construction of gender. In G. Hofstede (Ed.), *Masculinity and femininity: the taboo dimension of national cultures*, Chapter 5, pp. 77–105. London: SAGE.
- Honey, P. and A. Mumford (1992). *The manual of learning styles* (Third ed.). Maidenhead: Peter Honey.
- Jones, K. (2017, 25 March). New Connexion, New Ecclesiology? Paper delivered at the The Centre for Baptist History and Heritage and the Baptist Historical Society conference *What was New about the New Connexion?*
- Owen, H. (1996). *Creating top flight teams*. London: Kogan Page.
- Semler, R. (1993). *Maverick! The success story behind the world's most unusual workplace*. London: Century. Translation of *Virando a própria mesa*.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York/London: Harper & Bros.
- Woodward, J. (1958). Management and technology. In *Problems of progress in industry*, Number 3, pp. 37ff. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.

## Appendix

Table 1: Differences in cultural values (Hofstede, 1998, p. 103)

<i>Family oriented cultures</i>	<i>Work oriented cultures</i>
Modesty norm	Assertiveness norm
Tender values	Tough values
Stress on who you are	Stress on what you do
Self-effacing norm	Ego boosting norm
Smaller gaps between norms and values for women and men	Wider gaps between norms and values for women and men
In developed countries, more women in management positions	In developed countries, fewer women in management positions
In developed countries, more women elected in parliaments	In developed countries, fewer women elected in parliaments
In developed countries, more female ministers in governments	In developed countries, fewer female ministers in governments
In developed countries, job opportunities for both genders rated as more equal	In developed countries, job opportunities for both genders rated as less equal
In developed countries, family affects careers	In developed countries, career takes precedence over family
National gender stereotypes similar to universal gender stereotypes	National gender stereotypes specific to country
More adjectives associated specifically with either women or men	Few adjectives associated specifically with either women or men
Women describe themselves in different terms from men	Women describe themselves in the same terms as men do
Senses of responsibility, decisiveness, liveliness and ambition are also for women	Senses of responsibility, decisiveness, liveliness and ambition are only for men
Caring and gentleness are also for men	Caring and gentleness are only for women
Women use the same criteria for husbands and boyfriends	Women want boyfriends who have personality, affection, intelligence, and sense of humour; and husbands who are healthy, wealthy, and understanding
Industriousness as important or unimportant for grooms as for brides	Men prefer industrious brides; women do not prefer industrious bridegrooms
Chastity is unimportant or important for both genders	Men prefer chaste brides; women do not prefer chaste bridegrooms
Woman has a say in the number of children she bears	Male choice prevails in matters of family size

The document is licensed under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/)

