

Measuring Spiritual Giftedness: A Factor Analytic Study of a Spiritual Gifts Inventory

MARK F. LEDBETTER

*The Psychological Corporation
San Antonio, Texas*

JAMES D. FOSTER

*George Fox College
Newberg, Oregon*

The evangelical community has seen a recent proliferation of spiritual gifts inventories. These inventories resemble personality measures developed by psychologists and are designed to help individuals identify their spiritual gifts. This study examines the psychometric properties of one such inventory designed to measure 14 spiritual gifts. Thirty-one male and 41 female evangelical college-aged students were administered the Hocking (1975) Spiritual Gifts Inventory. In general, the subscales (i.e., spiritual gifts) showed poor to moderate reliabilities. Interscale factor analysis using an oblique rotation produced a three-factor solution and does not support the ability of this inventory to measure 14 unique gifts. The hermeneutical implications of the three-factor solution and the ethical concerns in using inventories that have not been validated but appear "scientific" are discussed.

The evangelical community has seen a recent proliferation of interest in spiritual gifts. This interest is grounded in the strong emphasis on spiritual gifts found

in the New Testament, where Christians are exhorted to discover and use their spiritual gifts (e.g., I Pet. 4:10; I Cor. 12:1-14; Rom. 12:3-8; Eph. 4:7-16). Mainstream evangelical theology teaches that each Christian possesses at least one "gift" or special ability that is to be used, in concert with other Christians' gifts, for the common welfare of the church. Additionally, specific qualifications and criteria are used in identifying individuals who possess these special gifts (e.g., Acts 6:3; I Tim. 3:1-11).

In order to help Christians identify their spiritual gift(s), inventories have been developed which purport to simplify the process of discovering an individual's spiritual gift or gifts (Blanchard, 1983; Hocking, 1975; McMinn, 1982). These inventories are being used to help Christians detect the presence or absence of spiritual gifts and thus purport to provide both examiner and examinee with relevant information that is accurate and useful. These inventories resemble psychological scales in procedures, format, and scoring, and in fact seem to be modeled on their psychological counterparts. On the surface, at least, it would appear that this would be an example of how psychological tools and theological constructs can be integrated. Unfortunately, these tests have not been subjected to the basic checks that normally accompany the development of new psychological instruments and yet are in widespread use. This article will examine the construct of spiritual gifts in general and the

The authors would like to thank Gale Roid, PhD, Assessment Research (Salem, Oregon)/Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, for his thoughtful reading of this manuscript and for his helpful suggestions and comments. Requests for reprints should be sent to Mark F. Ledbetter, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon 97215.

psychometric properties of one spiritual gifts inventory. We also consider the implications of using spiritual gift inventories which have not been properly developed and discuss how these results contribute to our understanding of spiritual giftedness.

The Construct of Spiritual Gifts

It is difficult to give one good definition of "spiritual gift" since there is no specific Greek word in the New Testament that corresponds clearly with spiritual gift. The Greek word which appears most frequently in the passages discussing gifts is "charismata." Charismata can be literally translated as "grace-gift" (Sanders, 1982). Sanders defined grace-gifts as "extraordinary powers/ enduements bestowed by the (Holy) Spirit upon individual believers as equipment for Christian service and the edification of the church. They are given sovereignly and undeserved" (p. 100). This is essentially what most evangelical Christians are referring to when they use the term spiritual gift.

The number of gifts that are available to Christians is a topic that is heavily debated (see Table 1). Bennett and Bennett (1971) argued for seven Old Testament gifts and two New Testament gifts. Hocking (1975) identified 14 spiritual gifts with his Spiritual Gifts Inventory. Baxter (1983) discussed a larger number of gifts but then identified 11 gifts that are available today. Twenty gifts, however, seems to be the most popular number of spiritual gifts. Gangel (1983) and Currah (1972) listed 20 spiritual gifts. Wagner (1979) identified 20 gifts in the three main New Testament gift lists but then added five more gifts found elsewhere in the New Testament (celibacy, voluntary poverty, martyrdom, hospitality, and missionary) and two from the Old Testament (intercession and exorcism). Wagner also noted, however, that his list of 27 may not be complete and that the gift lists should be open ended. Blanchard (1983) identified 22 gifts, although he suggested that at least two of the gifts listed in Scripture are the same gift with different names (helps and serving).

Complicating the debate over the number of gifts is a debate over whether or not spiri-

tual gifts are related to natural abilities. Some scholars have argued that spiritual gifts coincide with natural abilities (Sanders, 1982) and others have argued that spiritual gifts are divinely bestowed and are to be considered distinct from natural abilities (Blanchard, 1983).

Some authors take a different approach to spiritual gifts by suggesting that the gifts actually overlap and are best organized into categories. While this can get around questions about the number of spiritual gifts it still leaves disagreement over the number of categories. Suggested systems vary in number including two (Griffiths, 1978), three (Flynn, 1979) and four (Gangel, 1983). These classification schemes approach the gifts in various ways. For example, Griffiths divided the gifts into persons and functions while Blanchard (1983) grouped his 22 gifts into three categories, gifts of outward demonstrations (clearly miraculous in nature), gifts of office, and a large category of remaining gifts that are not as clearly miraculous but still "supernatural because God gives the ability, energy, and productivity for them" (p. 18). Horton (1971) divided nine gifts into "Gifts of Revelation" (word of wisdom, word of knowledge, and discerning of spirits), "Gifts of Power" (faith, the working of miracles, and gifts of healing) and "Gifts of Inspiration" (prophecy, diverse kinds of tongues, and interpretation of tongues) (pp. 32-33). The most popular classification, however, is a two-category approach (Bruce, 1971; Higgs, 1982; McRae, 1982; Sanders, 1982). Citing scriptural support (e.g., I Pet. 4:10-11), the primary gift lists are divided into "speaking" and "serving" gifts. Currah (1972) accepted these two categories but then added a third category of gifts involving intellect, faith, and tongues. In response to these attempts at categorizing other authors have argued that the gifts should not be grouped because of the danger of limiting and ignoring specific gifts (Bridge & Phipers, 1973).

The disagreement over whether the scriptural lists are to be seen as exhaustive or as overlapping categories is partially rooted in one's hermeneutical presuppositions. Ramm (1956) argued that the Bible can be accepted

Table 1
Spiritual Gift Lists

Baxter (1983)^a	Administration	The apostles	Giving
Governments	Ruling	The evangelists	Showing mercy
Ruling	Mercy	The pastors	Hospitality
Ministry	Giving	Gangel (1983)	Faith
Faith	Healing	Administration	Discernment of spirits
Exhortation	Miracles	Apostleship	Wagner (1979)
Helps	Speaking in tongues	Discernment	Prophecy
Mercy	Interpretation of	Evangelism	Service
Giving	tongues	Exhortation	Teaching
Evangelists	Apostle	Faith	Exhortation
Pastors	Prophet	Giving	Giving
Teachers	Evangelist	Healing	Leadership
Bennett & Bennett	Pastor	Hospitality	Mercy
(1971)	Teacher	Interpretation	Wisdom
Word of wisdom	Currah (1972)	Knowledge	Knowledge
Word of knowledge	Prophecy	Leadership	Faith
Faith	Teaching	Mercy	Healing
Healing	Exhorting	Ministering	Miracles
Miracles	Wisdom	Miracles	Discerning of spirits
Prophecy	Knowledge	Pastoring	Tongues
Discerning of spirits	Ministry	Prophecy	Interpretation of
Tongues	Miracles	Teaching	tongues
Interpretation of	Ruling	Tongues	Apostle
tongues	Giving	Wisdom	Helps
Blanchard (1983)	Showing Mercy	Hocking (1975)	Administration
Prophecy	Faith	Prophecy	Evangelist
Teaching	Discernment	Teaching	Pastor
Knowledge	Helps	Exhortation	Celibacy
Wisdom	Administrations	Word of wisdom	Voluntary poverty
Exhortation	Healing	Word of knowledge	Martyrdom
Faith	Miracle	Leadership	Hospitality
Discernment of spirits	Tongues	Administration	Missionary
Helps	Interpretations of	Serving	Intercession
Serving	tongues	Helps	Exorcism

^a Includes only gifts that are "available today"

as the inspired word of God and yet not "pledge the interpreter to a crude literalism" (p. 122). Higgs (1982) appeared to agree with Ramm's perspective when he argued that the gift lists are best understood as a literary device. Higgs believed that the gift lists in Scripture should not be interpreted as complete lists. Rather, Higgs argued that the lists are used in Scripture to support Paul's contention that the Spirit manifests itself diversely. Higgs wrote:

As an example of this diversity, he [Paul] cites several gifts which are given to the individual believer. Yet he always brings the reader back to the unity in which

these gifts are exercised. . . . Although it is possible that he desired to list all of the gifts for the Corinthians, it seems more plausible that he was using a list of gifts as a literary device to make and emphasize a point. (p. 34)

Higgs is suggesting that the gift lists are not exhaustive nor are the gifts separate or distinct. Similarly, John Stott (1976) noted the biblical context and also interpreted the variations in the gift lists as representing the diversity within Christ's church. Although diverse in its makeup and in terms of the gifts of the members, the church is still united in Christ. Currah (1972) also noted that the gift lists emphasize the "divine principle of unity

with diversity" (p. 33). These authors would argue that to take the spiritual gift lists as literal lists would be hermeneutically unsound.

The disagreement over the number of gifts, whether they overlap with natural abilities, whether they should be grouped into categories, and whether the gift lists are exhaustive, is well entrenched in theology and there appears to be little progress toward resolving the disagreements. The various positions taken on these issues appears to be related primarily to theological preferences and hermeneutical presuppositions.

The Construction of Spiritual Gift Inventories

One concern with the way spiritual gift inventories have been constructed involves the way items are generated and selected. Items for these scales are typically generated intuitively, referenced to biblical authority, and the items to be included are then selected on the basis of face validity. The problems inherent in generating test items solely on a rational basis (face validity) have been well documented. For example, in selecting critical MMPI items to discriminate between patients in crisis situations from a control group, Koss and Butcher (1973) found that 245 of the items which were selected on a rational basis did not significantly discriminate between the two groups. More importantly, Koss and Butcher could not find any apparent (rational) differences between face valid items that were empirically related to a crisis situation and those face valid items that were not. Even when a presumed scriptural foundation is used to generate the items for spiritual gifts inventories, the possibility of subjective bias in writing items makes validation critical.

Despite the widespread disagreement over the nature and number of spiritual gifts, the concept has had sufficient popular appeal to allow the construction and use of spiritual gifts inventories. These measures claim to help Christians identify their spiritual gift(s) by filling out a scripturally based questionnaire. The results are then tabulated and used to help individuals "discover" their spiritual gift or gifts, to determine how best to

serve the church, and even to give the person career direction. Those assessed by these inventories are sometimes elated, disappointed, and surprised by what the results purport to reveal about their spiritual gifts.

Unfortunately, few attempts have been made to investigate the psychometric properties of these instruments. In one of the few studies of spiritual gifts, Fredrickson (1985) was not able to support the construct validity of a widely used spiritual gifts inventory. Basic questions of reliability and validity have not been adequately addressed by inventory authors. The purpose of this study is to (a) investigate the internal reliability and construct validity of a spiritual gifts inventory, and (b) relate the results to the controversies surrounding the construct of spiritual gifts and to ethical issues that arise when these scales are used.

Method

Participants

The participants were 31 male and 41 female caucasian college-aged and career-aged members of a large evangelical church in central California. They ranged in age from 19-35 years, were predominantly unmarried, and represented a wide socioeconomic range. The participants volunteered to complete the Spiritual Gifts Inventory (SGI) (Hocking, 1975) in an effort to facilitate their personal spiritual growth.

Materials

The SGI is typical of paper-and-pencil tests written by clergy and church leaders to help Christians identify and understand spiritual gifts. According to the author (Hocking, 1975), each of the 14 subtests measure unique behavior domains and distinct spiritual gifts. The SGI was constructed by examining relevant biblical content, identifying behaviors associated with each gift, and then developing these into questions. The resulting 126 dichotomous items are used to identify 14 spiritual gifts. Each gift (or subtest) consists of nine questions. The questions include "would you describe yourself as an effective public speaker," "do you like to prove

and answer issues and questions,” and “when you give your money to someone or something, do you usually desire to avoid letting others know what you did?”

The 14 gifts which this inventory purports to measure are: (a) prophecy—the ability to clearly proclaim God’s truth in a comforting or convicting way; (b) teaching—the ability to explain God’s truth to believers and nonbelievers; (c) exhortation—the ability to reassure and comfort others in time of need; (d) word of wisdom—the ability to see people and situations in a way that the average person may overlook; (e) word of knowledge—the ability to understand things others cannot; (f) leadership—the ability to lead others in a personal, caring way; (g) administration—the ability to make efficient and goal-oriented decisions; (h) serving—meeting the needs of others in a joyful way; (i) helps—the ability to relieve others’ burdens by giving support or performing tasks; (j) giving—the ability to joyfully and unselfishly give money or goods; (k) showing mercy—the ability to show compassion for those physically suffering and joyfully meet their needs; (l) hospitality—the ability to joyfully open your home to others; (m) faith—the ability to trust God in difficult circumstances; and (n) discerning of spirits—the ability to immediately determine whether what was spoken was from God or Satan. The SGI was scored by assigning a value of 1 for a yes response and 0 for a no response. A person’s subtest score is the total number of yes responses.

Procedure

The SGI was distributed to members of two Sunday School classes. The participants filled out the questionnaire as part of a discussion of the concept of spiritual gifts. The participants were given 60 minutes to complete the scale and all participants completed the scale in the allotted time. The SGI was collected and scored according to the procedures described in the SGI manual.

Results

Descriptive statistics and internal reliabilities for each of the 14 subtests are presented in Table 2. Subjects scored highest on the

gift of exhortation and lowest on the gift of giving. To determine whether men’s and women’s responses statistically differed, *t*-tests were computed for each gift measure. Bonferroni’s *t* correction was used for making planned comparisons among means. As shown in Table 2, males scored significantly higher on the measures of prophecy, teaching, word of knowledge, leadership, and discernment while females scored higher on the helping dimension.

In general, the SGI gift subtests demonstrate low to moderate reliabilities (ranging from .44 to .86, $M=.67$). Ten of the 14 subtests had alpha coefficients less than .75 and item-total correlations revealed a number of poorly functioning items ($r<.20$) which were contributing to low subtest reliabilities. Deleting these flawed items increased the mean SGI reliability to .72 (ranging from .57 to .86), and the revised subtest reliabilities are shown in Table 2 along with the number of items used to calculate the revised alpha coefficients.

Point-biserial correlations were computed between each item and the 14 subtests. Fourteen items correlated higher with a subtest other than its own. Put another way, 11% of the SGI items were measuring gifts contrary to the author’s intention.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

A first-order partial correlation matrix (controlling for the effects of sex) was prepared by intercorrelating the 14 revised subtests of the SGI. The decision to factor analyze at the subtest level was made primarily because an item level solution dictated a sample size considerably larger than was available. The resultant matrix was analyzed by common factor analysis (principle axis factor analysis using the revised subtest reliabilities in the diagonal). Factors were examined using the suggestions of Gorsuch (1983) and included examining the scree plot, percentage of variance accounted for by each factor, and psychological meaningfulness.

The ratio of number of subjects to variables is a matter of debate in the literature. Gorsuch suggested that the minimum ratio should be five individuals for each variable

Table 2
Spiritual Gifts Scale Descriptive Statistics and Internal Reliabilities^a

	Combined Male/Female		Male		Female		Alpha	Revised Alpha	No. of Items ^b
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Prophecy	4.36*	2.10	5.45	2.10	3.59	1.67	.61	.75	6
Teaching	4.53*	2.42	5.90	2.14	3.56	2.13	.75	.75	7
Exhortation	6.60	1.98	6.41	2.16	6.73	1.86	.66	.66	6
Word of wisdom	4.87	2.25	5.28	2.19	4.59	2.27	.64	.72	6
Word of knowledge	3.41*	2.95	5.28	2.83	2.10	2.27	.86	.86	9
Leadership	4.84*	2.32	5.76	2.25	4.20	2.17	.70	.73	6
Administration	4.87	2.28	5.45	2.34	4.46	2.17	.73	.74	8
Serving	5.39	1.76	5.31	1.83	5.44	1.73	.44	.57	5
Helps	6.26*	1.99	5.34	2.35	6.90	1.39	.60	.65	7
Giving	3.53	1.70	3.59	1.64	3.49	1.76	.46	.60	6
Showing mercy	4.06	2.92	3.34	2.81	4.56	2.92	.84	.84	9
Hospitality	5.21	2.44	4.72	2.28	5.56	2.52	.75	.77	7
Faith	5.01	2.17	4.83	2.56	5.15	1.87	.65	.68	4
Discerning of spirits	5.49*	2.19	6.17	2.12	5.00	2.13	.68	.70	5

^a Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha

^b Number of items for revised alpha

* Means of sexes are significantly different ($p < .05$)

but no less than 100 subjects in any analysis. This sample satisfies the first criterion but falls short of his suggested minimum of 100 individuals. Because the second criterion was not met, precautionary measures were taken to adjust for potential sampling error. As suggested by Gorsuch, doubling the appropriate standard error is a rough test to insure that minimum salient loadings are significant. With our sample, the minimum significant correlation coefficient ($p < .05$) is approximately .22. Therefore, only factor loadings that were equal to or above the absolute value of .44 were interpreted in this study. Using this approach, three nontrivial factors were found. An oblique (oblimin) rotation provided the best simple structure, and the results are presented in Table 3. Percentages of variance accounted for by the three factors were 27.9, 15.7, and 11.8 respectively, yielding eigenvalues of 3.9, 2.2, and 1.7.

An examination of the factor correlation matrix for the three-factor model revealed that all correlations were statistically non-

significant ($p < .05$); that is, the three emergent factors in this study were not statistically correlated. Factor 1, a bipolar gift, resembles what many authors refer to as the "speaking gifts." An item content analysis revealed that one pole represents the person-oriented individual while the other end describes the task-oriented person. Factor 2 appears to represent a helping/serving construct. Helping others in time of need, supporting those in leadership, and comforting the sick are included in this behavior domain. Factor 3, consisting of the leadership and administration gifts, seems to describe a ruling or governing construct.

In addition to the interscale factor analysis, an intrascale common factor solution (using multiple R 's in the diagonal) was obtained for each of the 14 subtests. Nontrivial factors were extracted according to the same procedures used at the scale level and are presented, along with the first to second factor eigenvalue ratios, in Table 3. The ratio of first to second factor eigenvalues can be used to provide a measure of subtest unidi-

Table 3
Rotated Pattern Matrix for Three-Factor Solution and Intra-Scale Unidimensionality

	Interscale factors	Intrascale factors	
	Factor loadings	No. of factors	Unidimensionality
Factor 1			
Discernment	.74	2	1.80
Word of wisdom	.67	3	2.30
Prophecy	.57	4	2.02
Serving	-.52	5	1.44
Word of knowledge	.52	1	—
Teaching	.51	3	2.35
Exhortation	.46	4	2.14
Factor 2			
Helps	.83	4	1.80
Showing mercy	.57	2	3.85
Factor 3			
Leadership	.73	3	2.16
Administration	.72	4	2.22

mensionality. For example, examining the unidimensionality coefficient for prophecy reveals that the first factor eigenvalue is approximately two times greater than the second factor eigenvalue. Also, the mercy gift measure shows the first factor eigenvalue to be nearly 4 times greater than its second factor eigenvalue. Therefore, the gift of mercy appears to be measuring a more homogeneous construct than does the gift of prophecy. Only one gift (word of knowledge) demonstrates the presence of one unique underlying factor while the remaining 13 scales demonstrate varying levels of scale complexity.

Discussion

These results indicate that the SGI lacks the construct validity which its authors imply. In addition, the SGI does not demonstrate overall satisfactory internal reliability. Specifically, many gift reliabilities were low, and a number of items, written to measure a specific spiritual gift, were actually measuring another gift. Factor analytic techniques revealed, at best, the presence of three rather than 14 unique gifts. According to these results, the SGI is simply not measuring 14

unique spiritual gifts. In these findings, our results are similar to those of Fredrickson (1985), who factor analyzed a modified version of the McMinn (1982) Spiritual Gifts Inventory. Fredrickson concluded that the research form of the McMinn scale measures two factors which correspond roughly to speaking and serving. Fredrickson also concluded that the scale fails in its goal of measuring 12 distinct gifts.

While 14 distinct gifts cannot be supported in this analysis the results may lend support to those who argue that the gifts overlap and should be organized into a smaller number of categories. Our analysis, like that of Fredrickson (1985), suggests that, thus far, spiritual gifts inventories are not capable of distinguishing large numbers of distinct spiritual gifts. While the Fredrickson analysis of the McMinn scale suggested a two-factor solution, our analysis produced three distinct factors. Two of these factors appear to correspond well with the popular distinction between "speaking" and "serving" that is frequently used to categorize spiritual gifts (e.g., Bruce, 1971; McRae, 1976; Sanders, 1982). The third factor, "ruling" or "governing" is made up of leadership and administration.

The three factors identified in this analysis do not correspond well with spiritual gift classifications proposed by other authors. McRae (1976), who used a two-classification system, did identify a gift he calls administration but classified administration as part of the serving gifts. Currah's (1972) three-category system included the serving and speaking categories but then added a category of gifts involving the intellect, faith, and tongues. Currah's third category does not appear to be describing the same set of abilities as our Factor 3 abilities of leadership and administration. Blanchard (1983) identified a set of gifts he calls "gifts of office" which, at least on the surface, appears to correspond with Factor 3. Unfortunately, Blanchard's remaining two gifts, which are distinguished by how miraculous the gifts are, do not clearly correspond to Factors 1 and 2. In reviewing various category approaches and classification schemes we could not find one scheme that clearly matched the three-factor solution. However, it is difficult to compare a gift or a category of gifts by the labels and descriptions that have been attached to them by their authors.

The inability of this analysis to find numerous distinct spiritual gifts may also lend empirical support to those who argue that the spiritual gift lists are an example of a literary device. This device, common in Scripture, uses lists to illustrate a point. In the case of spiritual gifts the gift lists may not be meant to be a literal list of all spiritual gifts but instead be intended to emphasize that there is unity in diversity (Higgs, 1982). This analysis shows that spiritual gifts, as measured by Hocking's (1975) inventory, appear to be somewhat redundant, suggesting that indeed a much longer list of gifts could be created and that the lists could be considered to represent diversity. Additionally, the obvious overlap of item content between subtests, as evidenced by the items Hocking generated, argues for combining gifts into categories. The number of categories that would be appropriate is still in question.

The discovery of sex differences is interesting in that it may suggest an uneven distribution of spiritual gifts. Males scored signifi-

cantly higher on prophecy, teaching, word of knowledge, leadership, and discernment, while females scored significantly higher on helps. Four of these male gifts loaded on Factor 1 and the fifth on Factor 3. The female gift of helps loads on Factor 2. Factor 2 seems to represent the "traditional" female trait of nurturance. Factors 1 and 3 could be interpreted as representing more "traditional" male characteristics such as leadership, administration, and other traits that put them in the forefront (teaching, prophecy, word of knowledge). Few authors on the subject of spiritual gifts have addressed the question of whether the gifts are evenly distributed among the sexes. McRae (1976), however, specifically referred to the issue and wrote:

What is your image of a pastor-teacher? An administrator? Or an evangelist? Isn't it true that our minds quickly match these gifts with males and leave the gifts of showing mercy and helps for the women? Yet the New Testament makes no such distinction. Nowhere are gifts classified according to sexes, limiting some for the husbands and others for the wives. . . . Why couldn't a woman have the gift of administration or exhortation? (p. 86)

The sex differences in these results can be explained in many ways, including biases in the sample, cultural influences, uneven distribution of spiritual gifts, and bias in the scale itself. While this issue cannot be resolved in this study it nevertheless suggests a need for future research.

These results may also relate to the issue of whether natural abilities overlap with spiritual gifts. If spiritual gifts parallel natural abilities (i.e., personality traits) then one would expect spiritual gift factors to roughly coincide with personality factors. Relating the three gift factors in this study to personality factors suggests that Factor 1 may be measuring extraversion-introversion (i.e., person oriented vs. task oriented). Factor 2 could be said to be measuring the personality trait of agreeableness (i.e., soft hearted, helpful, compassionate). Factor 3, while not readily fitting into a personality scheme, may represent more of a governmental cognitive style. The relationship between personality traits and spiritual gifts has yet to be explored in the literature and suggests the need for further research in this area.

Conclusion

In 2 Timothy 3:16 Paul declares that all Scripture is inspired by God. One's interpretation of Scripture, however, is governed by a variety of factors including theological orientation, hermeneutical presuppositions, and even subjective human error and bias. Even when the author of a spiritual gifts inventory assumes that there is a clear scriptural basis for a specific gift, the items generated may reflect personal perceptions of how to measure the gift. These results question the existence of 14 distinct spiritual gifts or at least the ability of the SGI to measure 14 distinct gifts. Further, these results suggest that a crude literal hermeneutic approach to the gift passages may not be appropriate and lends support to those theologians who argue for organizing spiritual gifts into a small number of categories.

This analysis also illustrates the dangers of superficial integration. Those not working in the field of test construction may not be aware of the psychometric issues involved in test construction. Psychological scales like the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, or the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis, may appear to the authors of spiritual gifts inventories to be a simple set of subjectively derived questions, but in fact the questions on the scales have been carefully selected and have survived numerous checks of reliability and validity similar to those in this study. *Tests in Print II* (Buros, 1974) lists, for each of these tests, numerous references that deal with the test's construction, use, and validity. The three tests listed above, all popular scales, each have hundreds of references. While it is not necessary for a scale to have a record of review as extensive as these before use, there should be at least minimal checks of reliability and validity. Proper theological/psychological integration requires psychologists to have more than a superficial understanding of Scripture and theologians to have more than a superficial understanding of psychology and its research methodology.

The SGI's similarity to psychological scales exacerbates the problem by making the inventory more acceptable to those being

counseled with it. Because the SGI resembles psychometric instruments in format, procedure, and scoring, it appears "scientific" and is likely to have an aura of credibility and respectability. Consequently, the results from the SGI are likely to be taken at face value, which could result in the unintentional deception of the person who accepts the results of the inventory.

REFERENCES

- Baxter, R.E. (1983). *Gifts of the Spirit*. Grand Rapids: Kregel.
- Bennett, D., & Bennett, R. (1971). *The Holy Spirit and you*. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.
- Blanchard, T. (1983). *A practical guide to finding and using your spiritual gifts* (rev. ed.). Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House.
- Bridge, D., & Phipers, D. (1973). *Spiritual gifts*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Bruce, F.F. (1971). *I and II Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Buros, O.K. (1974). *Tests in print II*. Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon.
- Currah, G.J. (1972). *The New Testament spiritual gifts defined and described*. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, OR.
- Flynn, L. (1979). *19 gifts of the spirit*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Fredrickson, S.E. (1985). *The construction and preliminary validation of the Spiritual Gift Inventory, research version*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, OR.
- Gangel, K.O. (1983). *Unwrap your spiritual gift*. Wheaton, IL: Victor.
- Gorsuch, R.L. (1983). *Factor analysis* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.
- Griffiths, M. (1978). *Grace-gifts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Higgs, M.N. (1982). *Lists as literary devices: An investigation of the nature and purpose of the spiritual gifts lists*. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, OR.
- Hocking, D.L. (1975). *Spiritual gifts*. Long Beach, CA: Sounds of Grace Ministries.
- Horton, H. (1971). *The gifts of the Spirit*. Nottingham, England: Assemblies of God Publishing House.
- Koss, M.P., & Butcher, J.N. (1973). A comparison of psychiatric patients' self-report with other sources of clinical information. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 7, 225-236.
- McRae, W.J. (1976). *The dynamics of spiritual gifts*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

McMinn, G. (1982). *Spiritual gift inventory*. (Available from Dr. Gordon McMinn, Route 2, Box 380, Forest Grove, OR 97226).

Ramm, B. (1956). *Protestant biblical interpretation*. Boston: Wilde.

Sanders, J.O. (1982). *The Holy Spirit and his gifts* (rev. ed.). Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Stott, J.R.W. (1976). *Baptism and fullness*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Wagner, C. (1979). *Your spiritual gifts can help your church grow*. Glendale, CA: Regal.

AUTHORS

LEDBETTER, MARK F. *Address*: Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Oregon 97215. *Title*: Research Assistant, The Psychological Corporation; Graduate Student, Western Seminary. *Degree*: BA, California State University. *Specializations*: Clinical psychology, intelligence research, psychology and religion.

FOSTER, JAMES D. *Address*: Department of Psychology, George Fox College, Newberg, Oregon 97132. *Title*: Associate Professor. *Degrees*: MA, PhD, The Ohio State University. *Specializations*: Development, learning, integration of psychology and religion.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.