

4-11-1991

# Relationships Between Personality and Spiritual Gifts

Kenneth J. Stone

This research is a product of the Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) program at George Fox University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Stone, Kenneth J., "Relationships Between Personality and Spiritual Gifts" (1991). *Doctor of Psychology (PsyD)*. 267.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/psyd/267>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact [arolfe@georgefox.edu](mailto:arolfe@georgefox.edu).

Relationship between personality  
and spiritual gifts

by

Kenneth J. Stone

Presented to the Faculty of  
George Fox College  
in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Psychology  
in Clinical Psychology

Newberg, Oregon

April 11, 1991

PORTLAND CENTER LIBRARY  
GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY  
PORTLAND, OR. 97223



Approval

Relationship between personality  
and spiritual gifts

by

Kenneth J. Stone

Signatures:

James D. Fanta  
Committee Chairperson

Dwight E. Bauman  
Vice President  
Graduate and Continuing  
Studies

Wayne E. Colwell  
Members

Date: April 22, 1991

Randal Roberts

Date: 4/18/91



Relationship between personality  
and spiritual gifts  
George Fox College  
Newberg, Oregon  
Kenneth J. Stone

Abstract

Discovering one's spiritual gift has become the focus of many current books and seminars within the evangelical community. One popular method of uncovering one's spiritual gift is the use of questionnaires. However, existing validity research suggests that these spiritual gift inventories do not measure the number of unique gifts they claim. Variables that may be confounding these scales are discussed with personality identified as the most likely. To examine the relationship between spiritual gifts scales and personality factors, fifteen male and seventeen female adult members of a Baptist church were administered a demographic questionnaire, the Hocking (1975) Spiritual Gift Inventory, and a personality instrument, the NEO-FFI (Costa & McCrae,



1989). Post hoc findings suggest that personality factors accounted for about 50% of the shared variance. Further, two personality factors, (Openness and Extraversion) were significantly correlated with two of the three spiritual gift factors. It was suggested that the local church avoid the use of spiritual gift inventories to determine the believers' gifting. Also, it was recommended that the church reexamine their definition of spiritual gifts.





## Table of Contents

Approval Page.....	ii
Dissertation Abstract.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	vii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION:.....	1
Spiritual Gifts Defined and Analyzed.....	2
Spiritual Gift Inventories.....	23
Strategies in Scale Development.....	29
Validity of Spiritual Gift Inventories.....	34
Purpose Statement.....	45
Personality Factors.....	46
Statistical Considerations.....	54
Hypothesis.....	56
CHAPTER 2 METHODS:.....	58
Subjects.....	58
Materials.....	60
Demographic Questionnaire.....	60
Spiritual Gift Inventory.....	60
NEO-FFI.....	64
Procedure.....	65
Summary.....	67



CHAPTER 3 RESULTS:.....	69
Descriptive Statistics.....	69
Pearson <u>r</u> Correlations.....	74
Canonical Correlation and <u>F</u> -Tests.....	81
Post Hoc Findings.....	81
CHAPTER 4 DISCUSSION:.....	87
References.....	101
Appendices.....	111
Appendix A Spiritual Gifts Discovery	
Questionnaire.....	111
Appendix B Demographic Questionnaire.....	118
Appendix C Spritual Gift Inventory.....	120
Appendix D NEO-FFI.....	129
Appendix E Instructions and Overview of	
Study.....	134
Appendix F Raw Data.....	136
Appendix G Vita.....	142



## List of Tables

Table 1	Spiritual Gifts Lists of Various Authors....	6
Table 2	Tertullian's Categories of Gifts.....	10
Table 3	Bengel's Categories of Gifts.....	11
Table 4	Edwards' Categories of Gifts.....	12
Table 5	Thomson and Elwell's Categories of Gifts...	13
Table 6	McRae's Categories of Gifts According to Nature.....	14
Table 7	McRae's Categories of Gifts According to Duration.....	15
Table 8	Blanchard's Categories of Gifts.....	16
Table 9	Hocking's First Categories of Gifts.....	17
Table 10	Hocking's Second Categories of Gifts.....	18
Table 11	Currah's Categories of Gifts.....	19
Table 12	Bennett and Bennett's Categories of Gifts.....	20
Table 13	Baxter's Categories of Gifts.....	21
Table 14	First Factor Solution of SGI-L Variables..	35
Table 15	Rotated Oblimin for Three-Factor Solution of the SGI.....	41
Table 16	Brief Description of the NEO-PI Domains...	49
Table 17	Characteristics of High and Low Scores....	50



Table 18	Correlations of the NEO-PI with the MBTI..	53
Table 19	Description of the 14 Gifts of the SGI....	62
Table 20	Descriptive Statistics for Education and Age.....	70
Table 21	Frequency Distribution of Household Income.....	71
Table 22	Descriptive Statistics for the NEO-FFI....	72
Table 23	Descriptive Statistics for the SGI.....	73
Table 24	Correlations of the NEO-FFI with SGI.....	76
Table 25	Intracorrelations of the SGI.....	78
Table 26	Correlations of the NEO-FFI and the 3 Factors.....	83
Table 27	Univariate <u>F</u> -tests of the NEO-FFI.....	86





## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

A frequently asked question by contemporary Christians is "what is my spiritual gift?" Many purported ways to discover one's spiritual gift exist. One recently developed method is the use of a "test". Most of these questionnaires appear similar, in form, to instruments developed empirically. Unfortunately, these spiritual gift tests lack the psychometric rigors afforded the ones they resemble. When psychometric studies of reliability and/or validity are conducted, these gift tests exhibit deficiencies. The uncertainty over what is actually being measured has the great potential of misleading sincere believers searching for their spiritual gift.

An underlying factor in this confusion may also be a lack of clear consensus regarding spiritual gifts among experts. Controversies over the nature of gifts, which ones exist today, how they are manifested, and the number of gifts, have become a topic of hot debate over the past century. It must be

remembered, therefore, that each inventory arises from the author's own individual position on these specific issues.

The psychometric studies conducted on spiritual gift inventories indicate that something is being measured, but what? The question of what is being assessed is the focus of this study. Specifically, it is believed that these inventories are contaminated by personality traits which account for the large amounts of error variance. This error may be hiding the distinct gifts.

#### Spiritual Gifts Defined and Analyzed

No specific word exists in Scripture which can be translated "spiritual gift". Five Greek words are used, with "charismata" appearing most frequently. Many define this literally as "grace-gifts" (Bruce, 1971; Currah, 1972; Griffiths, 1978). The four other related terms are "domata"--people God gives for the benefit of the church (Griffiths, 1978), "diakonia"--"discharge of certain obligations in the community" (Beyer, 1964, p 88), "energema"--what is effected by the gifts (Bertram, 1964), and "pneumatika"--caused by or filled by the Spirit (Gingrich & Arndt, 1979).

Other definitions of spiritual gifts include that of Thomson and Elwell (1984), who described them as "gifts of God enabling the Christian to perform (sometimes specialized) service" (p. 1042). McRae defined spiritual gifts as a "divine endowment of a special ability for service upon a member of the body of Christ" (McRae, 1976, p. 18). According to Thayer (1889), spiritual gifts are "extraordinary powers, distinguishing certain Christians and enabling them to serve the church of Christ, the reception of which is due to the power of divine grace operating in their souls by the Holy Spirit" (p. 667). Blanchard (1983) defined a spiritual gift as a "supernatural gift of grace which is measured and given out by God to each true Christian as a stewardship for serving the church of Jesus Christ" (p. 16). According to Wagner (1979), spiritual gifts are a "special attribute given by the Holy Spirit to every member of the Body of Christ according to God's grace for use within the context of the Body" (p. 42).

Erickson (1986) made four observations from I Corinthians 12 and 14 regarding the nature of spiritual gifts. These observations are: (a) The gifts are given to the church for the benefit of the whole

body, (b) the gifts are given freely by the Holy Spirit to whom He wills, (c) no one individual has all the gifts, and (d) all the gifts are important and needed. Also, most have believed that spiritual gifts are given to Christians at the time of their conversion (Griffiths, 1978; Hocking, 1975).

Another commonality found among concepts of spiritual gifts is that spiritual gifts are not natural talents or personality traits (Blanchard, 1983; Gangel, 1983; Hocking, 1975; Ryrie, 1965; McRae, 1976). Gangel (1983) wrote "theologically we can say that spiritual gifts work in the spiritual realm and natural talents in the natural realm" (p. 11).

Sanders (1982), however, argued that spiritual gifts coincide with natural talents, but this is certainly a minority view in contemporary mainline evangelicalism. Others who hold this view include Bittlinger (1967, 1973), Griffiths (1978), Koenig (1978), and Stott (1976). John Stott (1976) wrote, ". . . would it not be more in harmony with the God of the Bible, whose plans are eternal, to suppose that his spiritual gifts dovetail with his natural endowments?" (p. 93). Likewise, Michael Griffiths (1978) believed that "God has been sovereignly at work

in our lives from the earliest beginnings. We see, therefore, both our initial genetic constitution and our subsequent spiritual endowments as sovereignly given and perfectly fitted together" (p. 71).

Blanchard (1983) believed the main difference between natural talents and spiritual gifts is that spiritual gifts come from a more pure motivation and that spiritual gifts are more effective than natural talents. He further stated that spiritual gifts ". . . may, in certain cases, seem similar to our natural talents . . . . However, the Scriptures clearly label a spiritual gift as a distinct, special present from the Holy Spirit upon which effective service in the church depends" (p. 16).

Contemporary authors addressing the study of spiritual gifts have been unable to agree over a number of issues, such as which gifts have existed, the number of them, and which ones exist today. Table 1 presents the views of ten contemporary authors on these issues. David Hocking has two entries, one from a booklet with no date and a second gleaned from his Spiritual Gifts Inventory (SGI), published in 1975.

Table 1

Spiritual Gifts Lists of Various Authors, Part 1

Author	Gifts						
	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Tea</u>	<u>Kno</u>	<u>Wsd</u>	<u>Exh</u>	<u>Fai</u>	<u>Dis</u>
Baxter (1983)				Apo	Apo	Yes	Yes
Bennett and Bennett (1970)	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
Blanchard (1983)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bridge and Phypers (1973)	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes
Currah (1972)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gangel (1983)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hocking (1975)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hocking (No date)	Apo	Yes	Apo	Apo	Yes	Apo	Apo
McRae (1976)	Apo	Yes	Apo	Apo	Yes	Yes	Apo
Ryrie (1965)	Apo	Yes			Yes	Yes	Apo
Wagner (1979)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note. Pre = Preaching; Tea = Teaching; Kno = Knowledge; Wsd = Wisdom; Exh = Exhortation; Fai = Faith; Dis = Discernment; Yes = believed available for today; Apo = believed available only during apostolic times; Left blank = author made no comment.

Table 1

Spiritual Gifts Lists of Various Authors, Part 2

Author	Gifts						
	<u>Hel</u>	<u>Ser</u>	<u>Adm</u>	<u>Rul</u>	<u>Mer</u>	<u>Giv</u>	<u>Hea</u>
Baxter (1983)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Apo
Bennett and Bennett (1970)							Yes
Blanchard (1983)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Apo
Bridge and Phypers (1973)					Yes	Yes	Yes
Currah (1972)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Apo
Gangel (1983)		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hocking (1975)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Hocking (No date)	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Apo
McRae (1976)	Yes	1	Yes	2	Yes	Yes	Apo
Ryrie (1965)		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Apo
Wagner (1979)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note. Hel = Helps; Ser = Serving; Adm = Administration; Rul = Ruling; Mer = Mercy; Giv = Giving; Hea = Healing; Yes = believed available for today; Apo = believed available only during apostolic times; Left blank = author made no comment; 1 = equated with helps; 2 = equated with ruling.



Table 1

Spiritual Gifts Lists of Various Authors, Part 3

Author	Gifts
	<u>Mir</u> <u>Ton</u> <u>Int</u> <u>Aps</u> <u>Eva</u> <u>P-T</u> <u>Prt</u>
Baxter (1983)	Apo Apo Apo Apo Yes Yes Apo
Bennett and Bennett (1970)	Yes Yes Yes
Blanchard (1983)	Apo Apo Apo Off Off Off Off
Bridge and Phypers (1973)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Currah (1972)	Apo Apo Apo Off Off Off Off
Gangel (1983)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Hocking (1975)	
Hocking (No date)	Apo Apo Apo 3 3 3
McRae (1976)	Apo Apo Apo Apo Apo Apo
Ryrie (1965)	Apo Apo Yes Yes
Wagner (1979)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

Note. Mir = Miracles; Ton = Tongues; Int = Interpretation; Aps = Apostleship; Eva = Evangelist; P-T = Pastor-Teacher; Prt = Prophet; Yes = believed available for today; Apo = believed available only during apostolic times; Left blank = made no comment; Off = seen as office; 3 = Not seen as a gift.

Table 1

Spiritual Gifts Lists of Various Authors, Part 4

Author	Gifts
	<u>Hos</u> <u>Cel</u> <u>Pov</u> <u>Mar</u> <u>Mis</u> <u>Pra</u> <u>Exo</u>
Baxter (1983)	
Bennett and Bennett (1970)	
Blanchard (1983)	
Bridge and Phypers (1973)	
Currah (1972)	
Gangel (1983)	Yes
Hocking (1975)	Yes
Hocking (No date)	
McRae (1976)	
Ryrie (1965)	
Wagner (1979)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

Note. Hos = Hospitality; Cel = Celibacy; Pov = Voluntary Poverty; Mar = Martyr; Mis = Missionary; Pra = Prayer; Exo = Exorcism; Yes = believed available for today; Left blank = author made no comment.

Table 1 suggests the wide diversity in current beliefs regarding spiritual gifts. It is from these various views that arise gift inventories. The lack of theoretical harmony is the basis for the diversity seen in spiritual gift inventories.

Another area of disagreement is in categorizing the gifts. Prior to the turn of this century, there was little emphasis upon categorizing the gifts. Perhaps the earliest attempt at categorization was done by Tertullian (207/1968), who divided the gifts into four classes (Table 2).

Table 2

Tertullian's Categories of Gifts

Understanding and Counsel	Religion and Fear of God	Might	Knowledge
Knowledge	Faith	Healings Miracles	Prophecy Discernment Tongues Interpretation

In the 18th century, Bengel (1795/1981) introduced three groups of spiritual gifts as found in I Corinthians 12:8-10 using, "to one, to another, to another" as the three grammatical breaks establishing the categories. His categories are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Bengel's Categories of Gifts

Intellectual	Special Energy	Tongues
Knowledge	Healing	Tongues
Wisdom	Prophecy	Interpretation
	Discernment	
	Faith	
	Miracles	

Beet (1889) suggested the same three categories.

Edwards (1886) expanded these three categories into five groupings (Table 4).

Table 4

Edwards' Categories of Gifts

Intellectual	Miraculous	Teaching	Critical	Ecstatic
Knowledge	Faith	Prophecy	Discern	Tongue
Wisdom	Healing			Interpret
	Miracle			

All of the above groupings are based on each author's exegetical work with I Corinthians 12:8-11. An exegetical method analyzes only one biblical passage, from which the categories are proposed, while a systematic approach uses most, if not all, of the Scriptures. Commentaries, by their very nature, will not likely attempt to systematically categorize spiritual gifts using the other gift passages, such as Romans 12:3-8, Ephesians 4:11, and I Peter 4:11.

The past twenty years have seen a proliferation of books on spiritual gifts. The authors of these books have been free to devise their own category system using either the exegetical or the systematic

approach. This has resulted in many views and disagreements.

Thomson and Elwell (1984) divided the gifts into two groups according to their specific duties. The duties are preaching the word and exercising practical ministries (see Table 5). The authors utilized a systematic approach, since it included all the gifts they found in the various New Testament passages. Although not stated by Thomson and Elwell, their approach appeared to be based upon a two-fold

Table 5

Thomson and Elwell's Categories of Gifts

Gifts of the Spirit	Ministry of the Word of God	
Miracles	Apostleship	Teaching
Healing	Prophets	Exhortation
Helps	Discernment	Wisdom
Administration	Knowledge	Tongues
Faith	Interpretation	Evangelist
	Service	Giving
	Mercy	

interpretation of I Peter 4:11. This seems to be a popular, but by no means a majority approach to categorization of the gifts. For instance, McRae (1976) divided the gifts by nature into two groups similar to Thomson and Elwell (see Table 6). However, he also divided the gifts into three other groups: (a) sphere, (b) function, and (c) duration.

Table 6

McRae's Categories of Gifts According to Nature

Speaking		Serving	
Prophecy	Apostleship	Giving	Administration
Teaching	Pastor-Teacher	Mercy	Faith
Evangelist	Exhortation	Healing	Miracle
Tongues	Interpret	Helps	
Discernment			

McRae's second division was according to sphere. The gifts geographically may operate broadly or be limited to a certain locale. He did not specifically state which gifts belonged to each sphere. It is

unclear how any gift can operate solely in one sphere. McRae's third division was according to function. He divided the gifts into equipping gifts (apostle, prophet, evangelist, and pastor-teacher) and other gifts. The equipping gifts are to be used to prepare and repair the saints so they can use their other gifts. McRae's final category was according to duration. He believed gifts are either temporary or permanent. He further divided the temporary into foundational and confirmatory (see Table 7).

Table 7

McRae's Categories of Gifts According to Duration

Temporary		Permanent	
Foundational	Confirmatory		
Apostleship	Miracles	Faith	Giving
Prophecy	Healings	Teach	Mercy
Discernment	Tongues	Helps	Evangelist
Wisdom	Interpret	Exhort	Pastor-Teacher
Knowledge		Administration	



Blanchard (1983) categorized the gifts into two groups, the miraculous gifts and the natural gifts. The miraculous emphasize outward demonstrations which are clearly miraculous in nature while the natural are not so clearly miraculous (see Table 8).

Other authors have categorized the gifts into more than two groups. Hocking (no date) broke the gifts into three groups, speaking, serving, and supernatural (see Table 9). In another writing, Hocking (1975) forged four separate groups (Table 10).

Table 8

Blanchard's Categories of Gifts

Miraculous	Natural	
Healing	Prophecy	Administration
Tongues	Teach	Ruling
Interpret	Knowledge	Mercy
Miracles	Wisdom	Giving
	Exhort	Faith
	Discernment	Helps
	Serving	

Table 9

Hocking's First Categories of Gifts

Speaking	Serving	Supernatural
Prophecy	Helps	Faith
Teaching	Giving	Healing
Exhortation	Mercy	Tongues
Wisdom	Governments	Interpret
Knowledge	Discernment	Miracles

Table 10

Hocking's Second Categories of Gifts

Special	Speaking	Serving	Sign
Apostle	Prophecy	Serving	Tongues
Prophets	Teaching	Helps	Interpret
Evangelist	Exhortation	Leadership	Miracles
Pastor-	Wisdom	Administrative	Healings
Teacher	Knowledge	Giving	
		Mercy	
		Discernment	
		Faith	
		Hospitality	

Currah's (1972) three-category system is very similar to Hocking's first method (see Table 11).

Table 11

Currah's Categories of Gifts

Speaking	Serving	Sign
Prophecy	Ministry	Healings
Teaching	Ruling	Miracles
Exhort	Giving	Tongues
Wisdom	Mercy	Interpret
Knowledge	Faith	
	Discernment	
	Helps	
	Administer	

Bennett and Bennett (1970), coming from a more Pentecostal view, also devised three groups of spiritual gifts: inspirational or fellowship gifts (the power to say), gifts of power (the power to do), and gifts of revelation (the power to know) (see Table 12).

Table 12

Bennett and Bennett's Categories of Gifts

Inspirational	Power	Revelation
Tongues	Healing	Discernment
Interpret	Miracles	Knowledge
Prophecy	Faith	Wisdom

Finally, Baxter (1983) developed a 2 by 3 matrix to categorize spiritual gifts. Time was broken into two categories, past (fulfilled) and present (fulfilling), much like McRae's (1976) distinction. The fulfilled gifts were further divided into servant, service, and sign gifts. The fulfilling gifts were also broken into servant and service gifts, but instead of sign gifts, Baxter used serving (Table 13).

Table 13

Baxter's Categories of Gifts

Fulfilled Gifts (Temporary)		
Servant	Service	Sign
Apostle	Wisdom	Healing
Prophets	Knowledge	Miracles
	Discernment	Tongues
		Interpret
Fulfilling Gifts (Permanent)		
Servant	Service	Serving
Evangelist	Government	Exhort
Pastor	Ruling	Helps
Teacher	Ministry	Mercy
	Faith	Giving

A review of the literature on spiritual gifts indicates two things. First, much diversity exists in the field of spiritual gifts. There is no agreement on the number of gifts with claims ranging from 9 to 29 or more. Also, no two authors who divided the gifts into categories did so in the same exact way. Even when the groupings were similar, different gifts were placed in the proposed categories. Second, since there is no agreement as to the number of gifts, or even the number of categories of gifts, it may be that the scriptural lists exist, not as an inventory, but rather for another purpose.

Higgs (1982) believed that taking the spiritual gifts lists as literal was hermeneutically unsound. Higgs suggested that three of the four gifts lists were used by Paul as a literary device to make or emphasize a point by repetition. The fourth list (Ephesians 4:11) was intended to be a complete list of gifted people given to the church. Higgs argued it was never Paul's purpose to develop a complete list. Higgs stated that

an alternative to the treatment of spiritual gifts lists as comprehensive is to use them as examples of how spiritual gifts are to function

ideally in the church, and to use the various lists for the purpose of helping believers discover and use their spiritual endowments, rather than forcing the material on gifts into a rigid theological structure that will tend to frustrate church members rather than promote healthy church growth. (p. 45)

If Higgs is correct that the gift lists are samples, not comprehensive, then factorial studies of gifts will prove futile (i.e. the variance that accounts for the factors that emerge, if any, will not be gift related). This would include both the individual gifts and the different categories, since both of these are built upon the hermeneutical principle that the gift lists are literal.

#### Spiritual Gift Inventories

Many, if not all, spiritual gift inventories have been constructed in a similar manner. As Ledbetter and Foster (1989) pointed out, test items are "typically generated intuitively, referenced to biblical authority, and the items to be included are then selected on the basis of face validity" (p. 277). Face validity means that the test item "looks appropriate" (Lyman, 1986). Ledbetter and Foster went



on to discuss the problems inherent in test items that have only face validity, citing the many Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) items that do not have any rational basis (face validity) but do differentiate between two groups (criterion-related validity).

Ledbetter and Foster (1989) summed up the process and possible results well when they wrote:

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. (p. 277)

Most inventories have been home-made by church leaders and most have adequate face validity. Biblical passages were typically used as the rationale for the gifts to be measured by the scale, perhaps giving the illusion that, like the Scriptures, the

inventory is inerrant. The Spiritual Gifts Discovery Questionnaire is a good example (see Appendix A). This is a paper and pencil, 96-item inventory with a 5-point Likert scoring format. Twenty-four gifts are measured, each scale with four items. Items include, "I enjoy working behind the scenes, taking care of the little details" (Helps) and "When in a group I tend to recognize and approach those who are sitting or standing alone" (Hospitality). Those familiar with test construction will notice an inherent flaw in the wording of the items. Both examples are asking for more than one thing (a double barrelled question). The person who enjoys working behind the scenes, but not taking care of the little details, would find the first question impossible to answer.

A further, and much larger, difficulty in the Spiritual Gifts Discovery Questionnaire is that there was no attempt to control for response sets and styles, such as acquiescence and social desirability. According to Edwards (1957), people differ in the extent to which their responses are biased by an attempt to present themselves in a good light. These differences, rather than the measured construct, may determine scale scores.

Likewise, no reliability or validity data have been conducted on the Spiritual Gifts Discovery Questionnaire. Clearly, what is being measured, if anything, cannot be ascertained, yet thousands of believers have taken this test to discover their spiritual gift(s).

Unfortunately, the other spiritual gift inventories produced in local churches suffer from the same flaws. Further, these problems are not eliminated when one moves from these types of inventories to the professionally published ones. Again, the same difficulties are seen. Face validity, along with a host of biblical passages, combine to make the scales credible to the lay person.

Blanchard's (1983) Personal Assessment of Preferences and Tendencies has twenty-five questions, but with multiple possible responses on each one, ranging from two to eight. On most questions, you may respond to as many of the possibilities as you like (20 of the 25 questions fit this description). It is best to see this inventory as consisting of 100 dichotomous items which measure 13 distinct gifts. Each gift has 16 items. However, when examining the scoring sheet, you find that many items do not measure just one gift, but

multiple gifts (48 of the 100 fit this description). Some items measure as many as 8 of the 13 distinct gifts. This design will result in large correlations between Blanchard's proposed distinct gifts. In fact, many gifts share more items than they differ. For example, teaching and knowledge share 10 items. Ruling and administration also share 10 items. Of the possible 78 correlations, only 10 do not share any items. The mean number of shared items is 2.96. This high degree of shared variance would make it impossible to measure 13 distinct factors or gifts.

McMinn (1975), a counseling psychologist and one who should be familiar with test validity and reliability, has developed the Spiritual Gifts Inventory (SGI-McMinn). The SGI-McMinn measures 12 gifts and consists of 144 items stated four ways, yielding a total of 576 statements. Items were randomly placed into 192 triplets. Responders are asked to answer which statement is most and least like them. The test is scored using pre-determined weights, which accounted for certain items which were assigned to more than one subscale.

Because of the ipsative format of the SGI-McMinn, no norms could be developed. Profile sheets only tell

people that they described themselves as exhibiting certain behaviors associated with certain gifts more or less frequently. Assessing similarity to others is not possible from the SGI-McMinn. Further, predictive statements regarding what type of ministry one might find enjoyment and/or success in can not be made. To merely assume that the most endorsed gift was one's gift was not possible, for one could score high in a gift for which all Christians score high.

Fredrickson (1985) discussed further problems with the SGI-McMinn. First, it is a difficult to decide which items are most and least like the responder. Task difficulty can significantly influence test response (Hakel, 1968). Second, taking the test is time consuming. Research has shown that the length of tests can influence test taking attitudes and can lower reliability coefficients (Anastasi, 1988). Finally, the ipsative format made research very difficult.

Because of these limitations, Fredrickson (1985) modified the SGI-McMinn, which she called the Spiritual Gift Inventory-Research Version (SGI-L). This inventory utilized the original 144 behavioral statements and converted the responses into a four-

point Likert scale format. This reduced the problems of a difficult and time consuming task while also allowing the scales to be statistically analyzed (reliability and validity). Unfortunately, Fredrickson's modified inventory failed to find the twelve distinct gifts she had hoped for.

#### Strategies in Scale Development

Currently, three different strategies exist for creating new tests. These include the internal (factor analytic or inductive) method, the external (empirical or criterion group) method, and the intuitive (rational or deductive) method (Burisch, 1984).

The internal method seeks to find unknown factors which account for the most data. It attempts to reduce all of the data into the least, yet most comprehensive, factors. These factors are then analyzed and later labeled. The NEO-Personality Inventory (NEO-PI; Costa & McCrae, 1985) utilized this method. Costa and McCrae took hundreds of personality traits and reduced them into the least number of factors (in this case, five). They then looked at these five factors and labeled them

neuroticism, extroversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness.

The external method seeks to find test items that empirically discriminate between groups. The MMPI (Hathaway & McKinley, 1943) used this method. Hundreds of test items were given to various populations, such as schizophrenics and depressives. The items which most differentiated the various groups were incorporated into their test. Some items, as mentioned above, do not have a rational explanation for being able to differentiate the groups. Yet they are still included in the test.

The intuitive method begins with some construct and derives test items that seem to measure the construct. This is the method used by all of the spiritual gift inventories encountered and many other psychological inventories. An example of the intuitive method is the Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test (Bender, 1938). Gestalt psychology hypothesized that healthy individuals would respond to a given constellation of stimuli as a whole rather than a part. From this, nine geometric designs were chosen to measure this whole-part process. The designs were thought to progress from easy to difficult. Later

research has suggested that the easiest design (Item A) is more difficult than the next four despite the gestalt rationale that it was an "introductory figure" (Bender, 1938).

Burisch (1984) argued that all three test construction methods are equal in producing similar degrees of effectiveness for both reliability and validity.

Reliability is defined as the "consistency or stability of a measuring instrument" (Lyman, 1986, p. 164). An instrument with high reliability should produce the same results regardless of when or where one is tested. For example, a speedometer has high reliability. It will show the driver the speed whether it is day or night, or if one is driving in the desert or the mountains.

With tests good reliability is very important. Test reliability is measured in many ways. One relatively simple method is to measure the split-half reliability (Sheridan, 1979). In this method, half of the test items are measured against the other half. If both are measuring the same thing, then the two should be highly related (Sheridan, 1979).



Test validity has been defined by Lyman (1986) as "the extent to which a test does the job desired of it" (p. 165). It is usually divided into three major types: content, criterion-related, and construct validity.

Content validity (also known as logical validity, course validity, curricular validity, or textbook validity) looks at the content of the test to determine if it covers a representative sample of the domain to be measured (Anastasi, 1988). Like face validity, content validity is non-statistical, but unlike the former, the content is examined in greater detail.

Criterion-related validity is "based on a correlation coefficient between test scores and criterion variables" (Lyman, 1986, p. 160). As a general rule, all things being equal, the higher the correlation, the better the validity. However, several factors can influence this validity. For example, tests variables can easily differ. School grades are a good criterion for achievement tests (hence, high correlations), but what criterion does one use for anger, for example. In cases like this, high correlations should not be expected.

Construct validity is "based on a combination of logical and empirical evidence of the relationship between the test and a related theory; concerned with the psychological meaningfulness of the test" (Lyman, 1986, p. 159). Specific techniques used for construct validity are varied and numerous. One common method of measuring construct validity is factor analysis. Factor analysis seeks to identify the fewest number of variables yet account for the most variance.

Reliability and validity are some of the most important and beginning steps in test development. Without both one can never be sure what is being measured. Further steps, such as the development of norms for various populations, are built upon the assumptions that the test is both reliable and valid.

The spiritual gift inventories have usually been generated from an intuitive, or deductive, strategy. This is an acceptable approach, and has even been seen by some (Burisch, 1984) as the preferred approach. However, the authors have not subjected their instruments to the needed reliability and validity studies. Without these studies, it is unknown what they measure, if anything.

### Validity of Spiritual Gift Inventories

No known reliability studies have been conducted on any of the spiritual gift inventories. Only two studies have examined the construct validity of spiritual gift inventories and both of these used factor analysis (Fredrickson, 1985; Ledbetter & Foster, 1989).

Fredrickson (1985), as described above, developed a research version (SGI-L) of McMinn's Spiritual Gift Inventory (SGI-McMinn). The 144 items, utilizing a four-point Likert format, were thought to measure 12 distinct gifts. Scale level factorial analysis did not support this. Fredrickson identified three factors, with most loading on Factor 1 (see table 14). The three factors yielded eigenvalues of 5.5, 1.3, and 1.1, which accounted for 65.5% of the total variance.

Table 14

First Factor Solution of SGI-L Variables

Factors with high-loading subscales	Factor loadings
Factor 1	
Administration	.875
Faith	.840
Ruling	.793
Wisdom	.777
Discernment	.755
Teaching	.741
Knowledge	.696
Giving	.688
Exhortation	.655
Factor 2	
Mercy	-.800
Preaching	.497
Factor 3	
Helps	.629

A varimax rotation of this three factor solution yielded similar results. Eigenvalues were 5.5, 1.2, and 1.1, which accounted for 65.5% of the total variance. Fredrickson (1985) then used a forced two-factor solution in an effort to see if support would be found for the two-categories approach proposed by some authors based on I Peter 4:11's speaking and serving gifts. The eigenvalues produced by this were 5.5 and 1.3, which accounted for 56.3% of the total variance. Basically, this solution just combined Factor 2 with Factor 3 from the first solution. A varimax rotation of the two-factor solution yielded very similar results and eigenvalues. A final, forced two-factor solution was obtained with an oblimin rotation of the data. This solution was almost identical to the above forced two-factor solution.

Fredrickson (1985) concluded that the data did not support the notion of the SGI-L measuring 12 distinct gifts and cast doubt on the construct validity of the SGI-L. She then analyzed the data to determine what might be measured.

Fredrickson (1985) believed the large Factor 1 may partly measure the "speaking" gifts as defined above. However, this factor appeared "to encompass

more than just speaking ability" (p. 82), and perhaps included leadership skills, planning abilities, or goal-orientation.

Factors 2 and 3 seemed to "encompass serving behaviors at opposite poles of an emotional continuum" (Fredrickson, 1985, p. 83), though this is questionable. For example, giving would seem to fit more with serving than speaking, while preaching would be just the opposite. Further, Fredrickson stated that the difference between mercy and helps is an empathy variable. However, it does not seem reasonable to believe that this factor alone would cause two apparently positively related gifts to be opposite poles of an emotional continuum.

One problem with the intuitive approach to scale development is the tendency for traits to be ill-defined "fuzzy sets" with high overlapping categories (Burisch, 1984). This certainly is the case with the SGI-L, which Fredrickson (1985) pointed out.

One possible contaminating variable causing these "fuzzy-sets" was gender. Males correlated with Factor 1 gifts, while females correlated with Factor 2 and 3. This gender difference is suspicious since none of the writers on spiritual gifts suggested that spiritual

gifts would be gender-specific. In fact, a few authors wrote that the gifts, including the traditionally male-dominated ones, are available to either sex (Griffiths, 1978; Malcom, 1982).

Further, an examination of the SGI-L shows that only a few items actually have a religious component. Most appear very similar to items on personality measures. For example, item #5 reads "I like to work alone." This would seem to be tapping introversion more than any spiritual gift. It may be that personality contributes much of the variance found in analyses of gift inventories.

A final possible contaminating variable is a general religious factor. Gorsuch (1984) suggested that there is a general Christianity factor which can be subdivided into second-order factors. This general factor "reflects an intrinsic commitment to a traditional, Gospel-oriented interpretation of the Christian faith . . . . This dimension can be measured with reasonable consistency by most scales concerned with creedal assent and related beliefs and attitudes" (p. 232).

Gorsuch further wrote that this general factor has been demonstrated to subdivide into more discrete

factors and cites the King and Hunt (1975) study which identified several second-order factors such as Creedal Assent, Church Attendance, and Growth and Striving. Gorsuch wrote that "although these can be distinguished, King and Hunt also report these factors all correlate positively, as is expected from a model that would suggest they share a general factor" (p. 232). If true, different items may have tapped both levels, hence, confusing the relationships. This may help explain the large Factor 1 (general Christianity) versus the smaller Factors 2 and 3 (second order). It may also help to explain how one factor is bipolar while the others are unidimensional.

The SGI-L does not appear to measure 12 distinct gifts as the author claims. What it does measure, if anything, is open to debate. It seems likely to be tapping various factors, including a speaking/serving gift, personality factors, traditional gender roles, and both a general and a second order Christianity factor.

Ledbetter and Foster (1989) conducted the only other validity study of a spiritual gifts inventory. An exploratory factorial analysis (construct validity) of Hocking's (1975) Spiritual Gift Inventory (SGI) was



conducted at the scale level. Seventy-two caucasian college-aged and career-aged members of a church were administered the SGI. An oblimin rotation provided the best simple structure (see Table 15), with eigenvalues of 3.9, 2.2, and 1.7, which accounted for 55.4% of the total variance. Three scales did not load on any factor (Giving, Hospitality, and Faith).

Table 15

Rotated Oblimin for Three-Factor Solution of the SGI

---

Factors with high-loading subscales	Factor loadings
<hr/>	
Factor 1	
Discernment	.74
Wisdom	.67
Prophecy	.57
Serving	-.52
Knowledge	.52
Teaching	.51
Exhortation	.46
Factor 2	
Helps	.83
Mercy	.57
Factor 3	
Leadership	.73
Administration	.72

---

Factor 1 was seen as a bipolar gift resembling the "speaking" gifts. One pole is thought to ". . . represent the person-oriented individual while the other end describes the task-oriented person" (Ledbetter & Foster, 1989, p. 279). Factor 2 was labeled "serving" gifts, while Factor 3 appeared to be tapping a leadership and administration factor.

These results suggest that the SGI does not measure 14 distinct gifts, as the author reported. Three distinct factors do emerge, however, which are not statistically correlated to each other. These three factors, though possibly showing a speaking/serving distinction, do not fit into any of the systems described earlier.

As with the SGI-L, the SGI used an intuitive, or deductive approach to test development. Burisch's (1984) point that such an approach may make "fuzzy-sets" with high overlapping categories was statistically demonstrated in Ledbetter and Foster's (1989) study. They reported that intrascale common factor solutions suggested that "only one gift . . . demonstrate(d) the presence of one unique underlying factor while the remaining 13 scales demonstrate(d) varying levels of scale complexity" (p. 280).

Ledbetter and Foster (1989) found that females were more likely to endorse the helps gift, while males were more likely to endorse the prophecy, teaching, knowledge, leadership, and discerning gifts. Four of these five male-dominated gifts loaded on Factor 1, with the other on Factor 3. The female-dominated gift loaded on Factor 2. Ledbetter and Foster believed that Factors 1 and 3 may represent the more traditional male roles (leadership and teaching), while Factor 2 may represent more traditional female roles, such as nurturance. Other explanations include "biases in the sample, cultural influences, uneven distribution of spiritual gifts, and bias in the scale itself" (Ledbetter & Foster, 1989, p. 281).

Like the SGI-L, most items from the SGI do not contain a religious component (79 of 126 items are nonreligious). Again, this would suggest that other variables, such as personality traits, are contaminating this scale. For example, item #100, "Do you usually organize your thoughts in a systematic way?" is designed to measure a teaching gift, but it may also be tapping a conscientiousness factor. The domain "conscientiousness", as described by the NEO-PI (Costa & McCrae, 1985) "assesses the individual's

degree of organization, persistence, and motivation in goal-directed behavior" (p. 2).

Ledbetter and Foster (1989) discussed the possibility that personality factors are contained in the gift inventories. They wrote:

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) than 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 extroversion-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. (p. 281)

Gorsuch's (1984) general Christianity factor mentioned above may also be a confounding variable in the SGI. As with the SGI-L, the SGI showed one large factor that accounted for more than 50% of the variance. This was not as extreme as with the SGI-L, which showed that the first factor contained more than 80% of the variance. Further, when looking at the gifts containing items with a religious component, Factor 1 gifts average four out of nine items with this religious component, while Factor 2 averages two items and Factor 3 averages one and one-half items. This would further suggest that a general religious factor may have influenced the results.

The conclusions reached concerning the SGI-L equally apply to the SGI. The SGI does not measure 13 distinct gifts. It seems to be tapping various factors, possibly including a speaking/serving gift, personality traits, traditional gender roles, and a general Christianity factor.

#### Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between spiritual gifts and one of the possible confounding variables, personality. It is thought that personality traits, as suggested by

Ledbetter and Foster (1989), account for so much of the variance that spiritual gifts cannot emerge.

Specifically, this study was designed to (a) determine whether spiritual gifts are distinct from personality factors, and (b) which personality factors account for the most variance.

#### Personality Factors

Theories of personality are varied and numerous. Schultz (1981), in his introductory textbook on personality theory, wrote that

there is a plurality of ways at looking at the topic. There is not one single theory . . . that you can turn to with absolute assurance of finding the ultimate answer to the riddle of personality. You will find . . . a lack of consensus . . . . There is no single conception. . . . It is even difficult to find agreement on the definition of personality. (p. 4)

For the purpose of this research, a trait theory of personality is assumed. The main reason for using a trait paradigm is that it lends itself to factorial analysis very easily. In fact, trait theories were developed with factor analysis (e.g. Raymond Cattell and his extensive work 1964; 1965; 1979).

Although trait theories of personality vary in the number of traits identified, two factors or domains are commonly identified. These factors have been labeled in different ways but have commonly been known as neuroticism and extroversion (Costa & McCrae, 1986; Wiggins, 1968).

A third factor was identified using cluster analysis of the 16 Personality Factor (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970; Costa & McCrae, 1976). Subsequent research has confirmed and described this factor as openness. Based on this three-factor approach, the NEO Inventory emerged with impressive validity and reliability studies (Costa & McCrae, 1980). The NEO Inventory seemed to encompass many traits within the three domains, but some traits, like persistence and generosity, did not fit well (Costa & McCrae, 1985).

Norman (1963) had identified five factors of personality which he labeled as neuroticism, extroversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and culture. Costa and McCrae (1985) interpreted Norman's "culture" factor as openness to experience. The other two factors, "agreeableness" and "conscientiousness", seemed to label some of the traits that the three-factor model missed.



Goldberg (1981), using long adjective lists, was able to consistently support five factors. Costa and McCrae (1985), impressed by this research, began to develop scales that tapped these other two domains. Costa and McCrae found a one-to-one relationship between their two new scales and two of Goldberg's factors.

Costa and McCrae (1985) expanded the NEO Inventory to include these two other factors, agreeableness and conscientiousness, and developed the NEO-PI. The NEO-PI is a 181 five-point Likert item inventory intended to be a concise measure of these five factors or domains. Table 16 gives a brief description of the five domains. Table 17 gives some characteristics of those who score high and low on the scales.

Table 16

Brief Description of NEO-PI Domains

Domain	Brief Description
Neuroticism	Assesses adjustment vs. instability. Identifies individuals prone to psychological distress, unrealistic ideas, excessive urges and maladaptive coping responses.
Extraversion	Assesses quantity and intensity of interpersonal interaction; activity level; need for stimulation; and capacity for joy.
Openness	Assesses proactive seeking and appreciation of experience for its own sake; toleration for and exploration of the unfamiliar.
Agreeableness	Assesses the quality of one's interpersonal orientation along a continuum from compassion to antagonism in beliefs, affect, and acts.
Conscientiousness	Assesses the individual's degree of organization, persistence, and motivation in goal-directed behavior. Contrasts dependable, fastidious people with those who are lackadaisical.

Table 17

Characteristics of High and Low Scores

High Score	Scale	Low Score
Neuroticism		
Worrying, nervous, hypo- chondriacal, inadequate, emotional, insecure		Calm, relaxed, secure, unemotional, hardy, self-satisfied
Extraversion		
Sociable, affectionate, talkative, person-oriented, optimistic, fun-loving		Reserved, sober, quiet, unexuberant, aloof, task- oriented, quiet, retiring
Openness		
Curious, broad interests, creative, untraditional		Conventional, narrow interests, down-to-earth
Agreeableness		
Soft-hearted, helpful, good-natured, forgiving		Cynical, uncooperative, rude, irritable, ruthless
Conscientiousness		
Organized, reliable, hard- working, punctual, self- disciplined, ambitious		Aimless, unreliable, lax, lazy, careless, weak- willed, hedonistic

Reliability and validity studies of the NEO-PI have been minimal, but adequate. Reliability coefficient alphas have ranged from .85 to .93 on the five domain scales (McCrae & Costa, 1983; McCrae & Costa, 1987). Six-month test-retest reliability scores ranged from .86 to .91 for the three domain scales (McCrae & Costa, 1983). No test-retest data have been conducted on the agreeableness and conscientiousness scales.

No single test of validity is possible when measuring personality constructs such as extroversion, neuroticism, or the other three domains. In cases like this, the most commonly employed form of validation is correlation with other established measures. The NEO Inventory and the NEO-PI have been correlated with various instruments; a few examples follow. The NEO Neuroticism scale was highly correlated with the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1964) Neuroticism scale ( $r = .75$ ,  $p < .01$ ) but not with the NEO Extraversion and Openness scales ( $r = -.18$  and  $r = .01$  respectively; Costa & McCrae, 1985). The EPI Extraversion scale correlated strongly with the NEO Extraversion scale ( $r = .69$ ,  $p < .01$ ) but exhibited mild to no correlation

with the NEO Neuroticism and Openness scales ( $r = -.05$  and  $r = .15$  respectively; Costa & McCrae, 1985). This pattern of correlations (high correlations in similar scales, low correlations in dissimilar scales) shows adequate convergent and discriminant validity for the NEO Inventory. This pattern is also found in the correlations between the NEO-PI and the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI; Myers & McCaulley, 1985), which are presented in Table 18. Dachowski (1987) noted similarities between the NEO-PI and the MBTI, citing the following findings: (a) Extraversion is similar in both instruments, (b) Openness is similar to Intuition, (c) Agreeableness corresponds to Feeling, and (d) Conscientiousness is parallel to Perceiving.

Table 18

Correlations of the NEO-PI with the MBTI

MBTI Scales	Correlations with				
	N	E	O	A	C
Males					
Introversion	.16	-.74	.03	-.03	.08
Intuition	-.06	.10	.72	.04	-.15
Feeling	.06	.19	.02	.44	-.15
Perception	.11	.15	.30	-.06	-.49
Females					
Introversion	.17	-.69	-.03	-.08	.08
Intuition	.01	.22	.69	.03	-.10
Feeling	.28	.10	-.02	.46	-.22
Perception	.04	.20	.26	.05	-.46

Note. Cited from Costa and McCrae (1989). N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness; MBTI = Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.

Correlations between validimax factors and corresponding domain scales were .94, .96, .92, .81, and .79 for Neuroticism (N), Extraversion (E), Openness (O), Agreeableness (A), and Conscientiousness (C), respectively (Costa & McCrae, 1989), which suggest that five distinct factors are being measured by the NEO-PI.

Consensual validation has also revealed these same five factors. For example, spouse and peer ratings correlated highly to self-reports (Costa & McCrae, 1985).

Further reliability and validity studies may be found in the NEO Personality Inventory Manual (Costa & McCrae, 1985) and in the NEO-PI/FFI Manual Supplement (Costa & McCrae, 1989).

#### Statistical Considerations

As stated above, the purpose of this study is to explore possible relationships between spiritual gift factors and personality factors. When two groups, each containing more than one variable, are to be correlated, the statistical technique of choice is canonical correlation analysis (Thompson, no date).

Canonical correlation analysis selects weighted sums of variables from each of two sets to form new

linear combinations: one from a combination of the predictor variables ( $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ ) and one from a combination of outcome measures ( $Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n$ ). It is arbitrary as to what set of variables is predictor or outcome. Harris (1975) described the final steps this way:

we take as our coefficients for these linear combinations those vectors  $a$  and  $b$  (of length  $p$  and  $q$ , respectively) which make the Pearson product-moment correlation between the two combined variables,  $u = a'X$  and  $v = b'Y$ , as large as possible. The value of the maximum possible Pearson  $r$  is known as the canonical correlation  $R_c$  between the two sets of variables. (p. 132)

The number of such linear combinations that can be found is either equal to the number of dependent variables or the number of treatment levels minus one, whichever is smaller (Barcikowski, 1983).

Thompson (no date) listed several research questions that the canonical correlation analysis is structured to investigate, two of which are implicit in this study and are:



1. To what extent can one set of two or more variables be predicted or "explained" by another set of two or more variables?

2. To what extent does a single variable contribute to predicting or "explaining " the composite of the variables in the variable set to which the variable does not belong?

Research question 1 is answered by interpreting a "pooled" canonical correlation ( $R_c^2$ ), while research question 2 requires considering the squared index coefficients. "Index coefficients represent the correlation between scores on one original, unweighted variable and the weighted and aggregated original variables, i.e., variate scores, for the variables in the other variable set" (Thompson, no date, p. 31). The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) converts the squared index coefficients into an univariate  $F$ -test statistic (Barcikowski, 1983).

### Hypothesis

Spiritual gift inventories have been used for years to discover one's spiritual gifts. Unfortunately, these inventories do not appear to measure the distinct gifts they claim. The problem is to what extent does personality confound these

inventories. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between spiritual gifts and personality. It is thought that personality will account for a significant percentage of the variance found in Hocking's (1975) Spiritual Gift Inventory. The question of most interest is to what extent can one set of two or more variables be predicted or explained by another set of variables.

The research hypothesis is that the personality factors, as measured by the NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), which is a shorten version of the NEO-PI, would account for a significant portion of the variance of the gift factors. With the alpha level set at .05, the research hypothesis is  $H_1: R_c^2 \geq .922$  ( $S = 5, M = 4, N = 3.5$ ) and the null hypothesis is  $H_0: R_c^2 < .922$  ( $S = 5, M = 4, N = 3.5$ ).

Of secondary interest is to what extent does a single variable contribute to predicting or "explaining" the composite of the variables in the variable set to which the variable does not belong. With the alpha level set at .05, the research hypothesis is  $H_1: F(14,13) \geq 2.56$  and the null hypothesis is  $H_0: F(14,13) < 2.56$ .

## CHAPTER 2

### METHODS

The methods chapter will be divided into four divisions. The first division will describe the subjects of this study. The second division will provide the materials used. The third division details the procedures used. The final division will summarize this chapter.

#### Subjects

Hocking (1975) believed spiritual gifts are given only to Christians concurrent with a conversion experience. Since Hocking's instrument is being used, the sample will be limited to only Christians claiming a conversion experience. Demographic question #6 was used to screen professing Christians from non-Christians.

The NEO-FFI is not normed for children or adolescents (Costa & McCrae, 1989). Therefore, only Christians age 18 and above were included in this study.

In theory, neither gender, educational background, nor socio-economic standing are believed to be factors in the five-domain model of personality (Costa & McCrae, 1985) or in spiritual gifts (Griffiths, 1978; McRae, 1976). However, Ledbetter and Foster (1989) did find a gender factor. Possible reasons for the gender difference were discussed earlier. Nonetheless, the sample was not limited to one sex.

Also in theory, both the personality domains and spiritual gifts are assumed to be universal in that geography should not be a factor. Unfortunately, pragmatics made it impossible to sample this large population. Therefore, the sample was limited by location to the Vancouver, Washington area.

Therefore, three Sunday school classes from one Baptist church from the Vancouver area were chosen for a one-time administration of the Spiritual Gift Inventory (SGI), the NEO-FFI, and a demographic questionnaire. Subjects were restricted to those from age 18 to 70 years of age who volunteered to participate. Individual feedback on the NEO-FFI and the SGI was promised. Of the 48 members of these three classes 47 persons volunteered. Forty-seven

demographic questionnaires and NEO-FFI were completed during the class hour. However, because of time constraints, only 5 were able to complete the SGI. The remaining 42 persons were provided with the inventory along with a stamped envelope. Twenty-seven of these were returned in the following three weeks, representing a 64% return rate.

### Materials

Demographic Questionnaire. A demographic questionnaire which requested information about subjects' age, gender, marital status, socio-economic standing, and education was administered. One question (#6) asked if the subject had a religious conversion experience. This item highly correlates with spiritual maturity and spiritual well-being (Brinkman, 1989) and was utilized as a screen to include only Christians. See Appendix B for a sample of the demographic questionnaire.

Spiritual Gift Inventory. The Spiritual Gift Inventory (SGI) was developed by David Hocking (1975) using the deductive approach. Relevant biblical passages were studied and behaviors thought to be associated with each gift were identified. These behaviors were then used as the basis for developing

## Personality and Spiritual Gifts

61

126 dichotomous items that measured the 14 unique gifts, with nine items per gift (Ledbetter & Foster, 1989). The 14 gifts measured are presented in Table 19.

Table 19

Description of the 14 Gifts of the SGI

Gift	Description
Prophecy	The ability to clearly proclaim God's truth in a comforting or convicting way.
Teaching	The ability to explain God's truth.
Exhortation	The ability to reassure and comfort others in time of need.
Wisdom	The ability to see people and situations in a way that the average person may overlook.
Knowledge	The ability to understand things others cannot.
Leadership	The ability to lead others in a personal, caring way.
Administration	The ability to make efficient and goal-oriented decisions.
Serving	Meeting the needs of others in a joyful way.

(table continues)

Table 19--continued

Gift	Description
Helps	The ability to relieve others' burdens by giving support or performing tasks.
Giving	The ability to joyfully and unselfishly give money or goods.
Mercy	The ability to show compassion to those suffering and joyfully meet their needs.
Hospitality	The ability to joyfully open your home.
Faith	The ability to trust God in difficult circumstances.
Discernment	The ability to immediately determine whether what was spoken was from God or Satan.

Note. Cited from Ledbetter and Foster (1989).



No reliability studies have been conducted on the SGI. One validity study (Ledbetter & Foster, 1989) revealed the SGI did not measure 14 distinct gifts, but did find three factors. This was discussed earlier. For a sample of the SGI, see Appendix C.

NEO-FFI. The NEO-FFI is a shortened version of the NEO-PI Form S (from 181 items to 60). It provides a brief, valid assessment of the five domains of personality described above. When correlated with the NEO-PI, the NEO-FFI scales showed correlations ranging from .75 to .89 (Costa & McCrae, 1989). Internal consistency, using coefficient alpha, for the NEO-FFI scales were .89, .79, .76, .74, and .84 for N, E, O, A, and C, respectively (Costa & McCrae, 1989). Correlations of the NEO-FFI with validity criteria (adjective factors) ranged from .56 to .62, which showed adequate convergent validity; none of the divergent correlations exceeded .20 (Costa & McCrae, 1989). According to Costa and McCrae (1989),

on the average, the NEO-FFI scales account for about 75% as much variance in the convergent criteria as do the full NEO-PI validmax factors. As is true in all cases where abbreviated scales

are formed, some precision is traded for speed and convenience. (p. 18)

See Appendix D for a sample of the NEO-FFI.

#### Procedure

Subjects volunteered to take the inventories during their Sunday school classes. Three adult classes from one local church were used. During the announcement section of the class, a short overview of the proposed study along with instructions was presented. See Appendix E for a sample of the instructions.

Volunteers were asked to take a packet which contained the demographic questionnaire, the SGI, and the NEO-FFI. Subjects were to complete as much as possible during the first 35 minutes of the class, beginning with the demographic questionnaire, then to the NEO-FFI, and finishing with the SGI. After 35 minutes, each participant was to score their own NEO-FFI. At this time, the NEO Summary Sheet was provided to each person. The final class time was used examine the feedback sheet and to give final instructions regarding the completion of the SGI.

Confidentiality of results was promised and ensured. No names were ever required.

In three weeks 27 of the 42 distributed SGIs had been collected. No follow-up calls or letters were sent to the participants who did not return their SGI.

Scoring of the SGI involved assigning a 1 to yes responses and a 0 to no responses. Instruments that contained missing responses were rejected. Four cases were rejected because of missing data.

Scoring of the NEO-FFI involved assigning the numbers 0-4 to each item response. This was done by hand, with the strongest response given a 4 and each lesser response given a 3, 2, 1, or 0, respectively. Instruments with missing data were rejected. No NEO-FFI needed to be discarded for this reason. At the end of the inventory, three final questions asked the respondent if he or she had responded to all of the statements, entered responses in the correct boxes, and responded accurately and honestly. If the respondent indicated that the responses were not entered in the correct boxes or were not answered honestly and accurately, then the test was considered invalid and was removed. No tests needed to be discarded for this reason.

Scoring of the demographic questionnaire was similar to the NEO-FFI. Age and education were

entered as is. Gender was scored 1 for male, 2 for female. Marital status was scored 1 for single, 2 for married, 3 for divorced, 4 for widowed, 5 for separated, 6 for living together, and 7 for other. Annual income was scored 1 for below \$5000, 2 for \$5000-9999, 3 for \$10000-14999, 4 for \$15000-19999, 5 for \$20000-29,999, 6 for \$30,000-39,999, 7 for \$40,000-59,999, and 8 for \$60,000 or more. The screening Christian question, item #6 (Do you profess to be a Christian?), was not scored. Rather, subjects who either responded with answer #1 (No) or #2 (Yes, I respect and attempt to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Jesus) or did not respond were discarded. No tests needed to be discarded because of this criteria.

### Summary

One Baptist church in the Vancouver, Washington area was chosen as the site for a one-time administration of the SGI, the NEO-FFI, and a demographic questionnaire. Participants volunteered to take part in the study during their adult Sunday school classes. Each participant was given a test packet to complete during the Sunday school hour. Only five of the 47 participants were able to complete

all three instruments. The remaining 42 were able to complete both the demographic questionnaire and the NEO-FFI, but were unable to finish the SGI. Each of these 42 participants were provided with a self-addressed stamped envelope to mail their completed SGI. Twenty-seven were returned in the following three weeks. Data that did not meet criteria as described above were considered invalid and rejected. Four cases were rejected because of missing data.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

The results chapter will be divided into four divisions. The first division will supply the descriptive statistics. The second division will provide relevant Pearson  $r$  correlations. The third section will present the canonical correlation and the univariate  $F$ -tests. The final division will offer some post hoc findings.

#### Descriptive Statistics

Fifteen males and seventeen females, ages 24 to 69, representing three Sunday school classes from one Vancouver, Washington church completed the demographic questionnaire, the NEO-FFI, and the SGI. Seventy-five percent of the participants had completed high school along with at least one year of college. Descriptive statistics of the group's educational level and age are presented in table 20.

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics for Education and Age

Label	Mean	Mode	Median	Std D	Min	Max
Education	14.74	16.00	14.00	3.00	10	24
Age	40.31	26.00	40.00	11.69	24	69

Note. N = 32.

Household income showed skewed results. Nine people endorsed the highest category (\$60,000 or more) which was greater than any other response. The median was between \$30,000 and \$39,999. Table 21 presents the frequency distribution of the household income item endorsed.

Table 21

Frequency Distribution of Household Income

Household Income	Frequency
Under \$5000	0
\$5000 to \$9999	1
\$10000 to \$14999	2
\$15000 to \$19999	4
\$20000 to \$29999	4
\$30000 to \$39999	6
\$40000 to \$59999	6
\$60000 or above	9

Note. N = 32.

Thirty-one of the participants were currently married; one was divorced. No other answer in the marital status category was endorsed.

All participants claimed to be professing Christians, either responding to question #6 of the demographic questionnaire with answer #3 (n = 3; belief in Christ as savior) or with answer #4 (n = 29;



belief in Christ as savior and attempt to follow his teachings).

Table 22 presents the means, modes, medians, standard deviations, and ranges for the five scales of the NEO-FFI.

Table 22

Descriptive Statistics for the NEO-FFI

Scale	Mean	Mode	Median	Std D	Min	Max
N	49.50	47.00	49.00	9.36	28	71
E	53.84	66.00	53.50	11.36	26	73
O	46.00	46.00	46.00	8.55	26	62
A	58.06	66.00	59.00	12.72	26	74
C	50.66	52.00	52.00	8.01	31	70

Note. N = 32. N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

Table 23 presents the means, modes, medians, standard deviations, and ranges for the fourteen scales of the SGI.

Table 23

Descriptive Statistics for the SGI

Scale	Mean	Mode	Median	<u>SD</u>	Range	
Prophecy	4.29	3.00	4.00	2.37	0	8
Teaching	4.45	4.00	4.00	2.68	0	9
Exhortation	5.39	8.00	5.00	2.11	2	9
Wisdom	4.79	3.00	5.00	2.27	1	9
Knowledge	3.38	0.00	2.50	2.99	0	9
Leadership	4.50	6.00	5.00	2.68	0	9
Administration	5.26	5.00	5.00	2.10	1	9
Serving	5.29	7.00	5.00	1.75	1	8
Helps	5.17	5.00	5.00	2.04	1	9
Giving	3.81	3.00	4.00	1.62	0	7
Mercy	3.25	2.00	3.00	2.08	0	8
Hospitality	4.59	1.00	4.00	2.71	0	9
Faith	4.59	2.00	4.00	2.30	1	9
Discernment	4.68	6.00	6.00	2.66	0	9

Note. N = 32.

### Pearson r Correlations

Two significant correlations within the demographic variables were found. Males were more likely to have achieved a higher educational level than females ( $r = -.4974$ ,  $p = .004$ ) and older subjects were more likely to have a higher household income ( $r = .5510$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Two significant correlations were found between the four demographic variables and the five NEO-FFI personality factors. Females were more likely to score higher on the Neuroticism scale ( $r = .3907$ ,  $p = .022$ ) and the higher the educational level, the higher the Conscientiousness score ( $r = .3334$ ,  $p = .045$ ).

Of the fifty-six correlations between the four demographic variables and the fourteen spiritual gift variables, nine were significant. Males were more likely to endorse the gift of knowledge ( $r = -.4196$ ,  $p = .015$ ) and the gift of giving ( $r = -.3651$ ,  $p = .031$ ). Educational level was positively correlated with the gift of teaching ( $r = .3668$ ,  $p = .030$ ) and negatively correlated with the gift of helps ( $r = -.3613$ ,  $p = .032$ ). Older subjects were more likely to endorse the gift of mercy ( $r = .3529$ ,  $p = .035$ ). Household income was positively correlated

with the gifts of exhortation ( $\underline{r} = .3632$ ,  $p = .031$ ), serving ( $\underline{r} = .5331$ ,  $p = .002$ ), mercy ( $\underline{r} = .3655$ ,  $p = .030$ ), and hospitality ( $\underline{r} = .4526$ ,  $p = .009$ ).

Table 24 presents the correlations between the NEO-FFI personality factors and the SGI scales. As can be seen, no clear pattern of correlations emerges, suggesting random effects.

Table 24

Correlations of NEO-FFI with SGI

SCALE	N	E	O	A	C
Prophecy	-.107	.260	.508*	.059	-.056
Teaching	-.140	.264	.593*	-.061	-.051
Exhortation	.000	.205	.104	-.150	-.274
Wisdom	-.022	.219	.254	-.196	-.346*
Knowledge	.125	.226	.447*	-.090	-.171
Leadership	-.136	.473*	.252	.013	.259
Administration	-.254	.354*	.182	.103	.027
Serving	-.160	-.176	-.141	-.123	.103
Helps	-.008	-.058	-.162	.087	.016
Giving	-.034	.043	-.112	.061	.025
Mercy	.337*	.062	.108	-.106	.208
Hospitality	-.165	.191	.125	.115	-.102
Faith	-.076	.257	.186	-.046	.282
Discernment	.011	.202	.340*	.029	-.208

Note. N = 28; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

\*  $p < .05$ , one-tailed.

Table 25 presents the intracorrelations of the SGI. The final column in this table (Total) lists the number of correlations that scale had with the other SGI scales. As can be seen, there were many intracorrelations. Of the 91 possible intracorrelations, 36 were significant. This is consistent with the Ledbetter and Foster (1989) study.

Table 25

Intracorrelations of the SGI

Scale	PRO	TEA	EXH	WIS	KNW
PRO	---	.7079*	.2409	.5091*	.5079*
TEA		---	.3395*	.7174*	.7026*
EXH			---	.4460*	.1740
WIS				---	.6371*
KNW					---
LEA					
ADM					
SER					
HLP					
GIV					
MER					
HSP					
FTH					
DSC					

(table continues)

Table 25--Continued

Scale	LEA	ADM	SER	HLP	GIV
PRO	.4230*	.3614*	-.4612*	.1986	.3374*
TEA	.4689*	.3297*	-.1404	-.0907	.3627*
EXH	.1955	.0421	-.0209	.1068	.2379
WIS	.3635*	.3049	-.2036	-.1873	.0070
KNW	.3918*	.2864	-.3036	-.0992	.2625
LEA	---	.6301*	-.2119	.2236	.0945
ADM		---	-.1423	.1383	-.0357
SER			---	.1178	-.0450
HLP				---	.4008*
GIV					---
MER					
HSP					
FTH					
DSC					

(table continues)



Table 25--Continued

Scale	MER	HSP	FTH	DSC	Total
PRO	.0462	.4363*	.2392	.6979*	9
TEA	.0881	.3113	.2697	.6748*	8
EXH	.3850*	.2556	.0932	.4814*	4
WIS	-.1254	.1877	.2145	.5582*	6
KNW	.0782	.0854	.2395	.5173*	5
LEA	-.0063	.3760*	.6007*	.3087	7
ADM	-.1786	.3338*	.4378*	.1591	5
SER	.2331	.1046	.0224	-.3260*	2
HLP	.3173	.4647*	.2455	.2918	2
GIV	.4275*	.1516	-.0710	.4621*	5
MER	---	.1995	.1822	.1462	2
HSP		---	.4440*	.3471*	6
FTH			---	.2495	3
DSC				---	8

Note. N = 28; PRO = Prophecy; TEA = Teaching; EXH = Exhortation; WIS = Wisdom; KNW = Knowledge; LEA = Leadership; ADM = Administration; SER = Serving; HLP = Helps; GIV = Giving; MER = Mercy; HSP = Hospitality; FTH = Faith; DSC = Discernment.

\*  $p < .05$ , one-tailed.

### Canonical Correlation and F-Tests

The question of primary interest in this study is the extent to which one set of variables can be explained by another set of variables. It was hypothesized that personality factors would account for a significant portion of the variance of the spiritual gift factors. Five linear combinations were extracted, with the greatest having a canonical correlation  $R = .903$  ( $S = 5$ ,  $M = 4$ ,  $N = 3.5$ ) which was not significant. Since the null hypothesis was not rejected, univariate  $F$ -tests, which would help determine which of the personality factors contributed most to the spiritual gift factors, were not performed.

### Post Hoc Findings

Although the a priori null hypothesis was not rejected, various post hoc analyses of the data does suggest that personality factors are a significant part of the SGI. A re-examination of Table 25 reveals multiple intracorrelations which would suggest that the SGI does not measure 14 distinct factors, as purported. Rather, it measures three factors (Ledbetter & Foster, 1989). Factor 1 contained the gifts discernment, word of wisdom, prophecy, serving,

word of knowledge, teaching, and exhortation. Factor 2 contained helps and mercy gifts, while Factor 3 contained the leadership and administration gifts (see Table 15). The three remaining gifts (Giving, Hospitality, and Faith) did not load on any of the factors. Taking the correlations of the NEO-FFI with the SGI (see Table 24) and reorganizing them in this three-factor solution reveals some interesting results (see Table 26).

The final row in each factor lists the correlation of each personality factor with the sum total of all of the SGI scales that are contained in that factor. For example, the final row under Factor 1 is the sum score of all the SGI scales in Factor 1, which includes prophecy, teaching, exhortation, word of wisdom, word of knowledge, serving, and discernment, and this sum total has been correlated with the five NEO-FFI scales.

Table 26

Correlations of the NEO-FFI and the 3 SGI Factors

Scale	Factor 1				
	N	E	O	A	C
Prophecy	-.107	.260	.508*	.059	-.056
Teaching	-.140	.264	.593*	-.061	-.051
Exhortation	.000	.205	.109	-.150	-.274
Wisdom	-.022	.219	.259	-.196	-.346*
Knowledge	.125	.226	.447*	-.090	-.171
Serving	-.160	-.176	-.141	-.123	.103
Discernment	.011	.202	.340*	.029	-.208
Sum of Factor 1	-.049	.277	.495*	-.104	-.220
Scale	Factor 2				
	N	E	O	A	C
Helps	-.008	-.058	-.162	.087	.016
Mercy	.337*	.062	.108	-.106	.208
Sum of Factor 2	.207	.004	-.030	-.014	.141

(table continues)

Table 26--Continued

Factor 3					
Scale	N	E	O	A	C
Leadership	-.136	.473*	.252	.013	.259
Administration	-.254	.359*	.182	.103	.027
Sum of Factor 3	-.205	.463*	.244	.057	.174

Gifts that did not load on any of the factors					
Scale	N	E	O	A	C
Giving	-.034	.043	-.112	.061	.025
Hospitality	-.165	.191	.125	.115	-.102
Faith	-.076	.257	.186	-.046	.282

Note. N = 28; N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

\*  $p < .05$ , one-tailed.

The results in table 26 suggest that specific personality traits can explain a significant portion of the spiritual gift factors. Many of the Factor 1 gifts significantly correlated with the Openness scale of the NEO-FFI and both of the Factor 3 gifts correlated with Extraversion. To examine this possibility statistically, a canonical correlation between the five NEO-FFI personality factors and the three SGI factors was now significant (canonical  $R = .777$ ,  $p < .05$ ;  $S = 3$ ,  $M = .5$ ,  $N = 9$ ). Univariate  $F$ -tests were used to reveal which of the personality factors contributed to the greatest variance. These results are listed in table 27.

Table 27

Univariate F-tests of the NEO-FFI

Scale	<u>F</u>	Significance of <u>F</u>
N	.444	.724
E	2.720	.067
O	3.123	.045*
A	.177	.911
C	1.117	.362

Note. N = 28; Degrees of Freedom (3, 24); N = Neuroticism; E = Extraversion; O = Openness; A = Agreeableness; C = Conscientiousness.

\*  $p < .05$ , two-tailed.

## CHAPTER 4

### DISCUSSION

Chapter 4 will begin by looking at the hypothesis that might account for the common variance between the SGI and the NEO-FFI. This will be followed by propositions about what the remaining unaccounted variance might contain. Included in this section are possible directions for future research. The next section will discuss the limitations of this study. This chapter will conclude with a consideration of possible implications for the local church.

The results of this study are conflicting. Technically, the a priori null hypothesis was not rejected, hence, not supporting the notion that personality is a major component of the SGI. However, adjusting the SGI from a 14-scale instrument into a three-factor tool yielded significant results.

In hindsight, interpreting the SGI as a three-factor instrument is psychometrically sounder (Anastasi, 1988). The previously discussed studies (Fredrickson, 1985; Ledbetter & Foster, 1989)



suggested that the spiritual gift inventories are not measuring 13 or 14 distinct gifts, but rather, are measuring two to three factors.

Since Factor 1 correlated significantly with the NEO-FFI Openness scale, it appears that this factor tapped a personality style that was open to new experiences. The definition of the NEO-FFI Openness scale also includes those who have broad interests and can be very imaginative. The spiritual gifts that significantly correlated with openness were prophecy ( $r = .5082$ ), teaching ( $r = .5928$ ), knowledge ( $r = .4467$ ), and discernment ( $r = .3398$ ) and were defined by Hocking (1975) in the following manner:

1. Prophecy is "the ability to proclaim God's truth to others without compromise or explanation, resulting in edification, exhortation, and comfort for the believer and conviction of the non-believer" (p. 70).

2. Teaching is "the ability to explain the meaning of God's truth to others so that there is understanding and application for both believer and non-believer" (p. 74).

3. Knowledge is "the ability to understand things which others do not know and cannot comprehend on their own" (p. 81).

4. Discernment is "the ability to give an immediate evaluation of what was spoken and the person who said it, as to whether it is of God or Satan" (p. 97).

All of these gifts seem to require some kind of cognitive exercise and may also be tapping the analytic or theoretically oriented individual. Individuals who are intellectually curious have been found to be more open-minded and tolerant of diverse values (Fiske, 1949).

The intellectual pursuits that these spiritual gifts tap suggest that perhaps educational achievement is being measured. However, the correlation of educational level with the Openness scale was not significant ( $r = .1852$ ).

The fact that the the correlations between the scales of the SGI and the NEO-FFI are in the moderate range ( $r = .30$  to  $.60$ ) suggest that the SGI is at best a poor measure of personality. The NEO-FFI correlates much higher ( $r = .56$  to  $.92$ ) with other personality inventories (see Table 18).

The SGI Factor 1 was bipolar, with Discernment, Word of Wisdom, Prophecy, Word of Knowledge, Teaching, and Exhortation loading positively on Factor 1, and Serving loading negatively (Ledbetter & Foster, 1989). Ledbetter and Foster suggested that SGI Factor 1 might be tapping a person versus task orientation, or an introversion-extroversion personality trait. Examining the bipolar nature of Factor 1 certainly could suggest this possibility. Further, the correlations do suggest that extraversion is a secondary factor accounting for some of the variance in Factor 1. Note that the six gifts that encompassed one pole of Factor 1 all correlated with Extroversion in the same general area ( $r = .2020$  to  $.2644$ ) with the whole Factor 1 accounting for about 7% of the total variance ( $r = .2771$ ). Perhaps a larger sample size would have found a significant correlation.

It certainly appears that the SGI Factor 1 is tapping the personality trait of openness and, to a lesser extent, extroversion. SGI Factor 2 is less clear. Factor 2 contains the gifts of Helps and Mercy. Hocking (1975) defined these two gifts in the following way:

1. Helps is "the ability to bring immediate support and help to someone in the performing of a task in order to relieve his burden and responsibilities" (p. 87).

2. Mercy is "the ability to have immediate compassion for those suffering physically, combined with great joy in meeting their needs" (p. 95).

Both of these gifts seem to require an ability to empathize or sympathize with a hurting person. The two were mildly, but not significantly, correlated ( $r = .3173$ ,  $p = .053$ ). Helps and Mercy combined did not correlate with any of the five NEO-FFI personality factors. It is unclear why this is so, especially since the two gifts seem to require such similar personality traits.

Helps did not correlate with any of the personality variables. Mercy, however, did correlate significantly with Neuroticism ( $r = .3374$ ). This personality style can be described as being sensitive, emotional, and prone to experience feelings that are upsetting (Costa & McCrea, 1989). Perhaps the difference between the two gifts is an ability to provide help. Note that Hocking's definition of mercy seems to focus on the affect while the definition of

helps focuses on the act of supportive help. The person characterized by "mercy", combined with a neurotic personality style, would feel the pain but might become immobilized. The person characterized by "helps" is not engulfed by the affect and is able to provide the support required. Further research would be needed to substantiate this possibility.

SGI Factor 3 consists of the gifts Leadership and Administration, both of which were significantly correlated with the personality trait of Extroversion ( $r = .4732$ ,  $r = .3538$  respectively, with the sum of Factor 3 correlating with Extroversion  $r = .4632$ ). This trait accounts for approximately 21% of the total variance in Factor 3. Hocking (1975) defined the two gifts in the following way:

1. Leadership is "the ability to lead others in meaningful endeavors that demonstrates personal care and concern to meet their needs and encourage their growth" (p. 90).

2. Administration is "the ability to give direction and to make decisions in behalf of others that results in efficient operation and accomplishment of goals" (p. 93).

Both of these gifts seem to tap an extroverted, outgoing, and active lifestyle with a preference to be around people. Ledbetter and Foster (1989) suggested that Factor 3 was tapping more of a governmental cognitive style. However, in hindsight, it seems likely that extroversion would be the personality trait one would find in the leadership of most churches.

One of the initial questions this study asked was what did the SGI measure, if anything. Previous studies have suggested that it is not the 14 distinct spiritual gifts the author(s) claimed it measured. However, it seems to be measuring something. The post hoc findings suggest that personality traits can account for a large part of the variance, perhaps as much as 50%. However, an additional 50% remains unaccounted for.

One possibility is that our notion of spiritual gifts is erroneous. Higgs (1982) developed the position that the gifts passages are literary devices and should not be interpreted literally. As such, any attempts to develop a gift inventory would prove futile. These inventories would then be merely tapping personality traits, gender differences,

achievement levels, intellectual potentials, talents and hobbies, and perhaps a host of other constructs. Research designed to determine whether these extraneous factors account for the remaining variance would be of interest.

It seems likely that if spiritual gifts do exist in the manner contemporary authors have reported, they should be measurable. However, the available validity checks of existing spiritual gifts instruments have suggested that they are not tapping spiritual gifts. It is likely that further validity studies on the SGI and other gift tests would prove just as ineffective and further support Higgs' (1982) position.

Another possibility is that spiritual gifts exist apart from personality, but that the spiritual gift inventories measure them poorly. While it seems certain that these inventories do not measure twelve or more distinct gifts as claimed, it is possible that they are measuring two general gifts, speaking and serving. A two-factor approach would be consistent with I Peter 4:11 which has been used to support a twofold classification of gifts. Using some of the test development and psychometric strategies psychologists are familiar with, one could transform

the SGI into an inventory that would limit itself to measuring two broad categories. The first step in this process would be to do an item analysis of the SGI to determine those items that best discriminated between people. A revised SGI that held on to the best 20 items could then be tested to see if it did divide subjects into two distinct groups on both the test scores and in the way they ministered in the church. However, this would be a large project. For example, such an item analysis of the SGI would require 630 subjects (the rule of thumb is five subjects for each item, Gorsuch, 1983). A more practical approach would be to assume a two-gift distinction and ask believers if they see more positive results when they serve or speak. Their answer to this question would be their spiritual gift. This method would not require any inventory to discover one's gift, nor would it frustrate the believer, for they would be using their gift in the area they see positive results.

It may also be that the SGI is tapping what Gorsuch (1984) described as a general religious factor. This general factor could mask more specific religious phenomena. It is possible that the 14



specific gifts are so saturated with this general religious factor as to be hidden from research. If true, one way to empirically distinguish the general factor from the specific factors is to give the SGI to a very large sample ( $N = 1000+$ ). In samples this large, second, third, and fourth order factors begin to emerge. To date, there are no studies with a sufficient sample size for this type of investigation.

Finally, the SGI may be subject to response set bias. A response set is a tendency to choose socially desirable responses (Anastasi, 1988). Many of the SGI items contain references to God, the Bible, or the church. It is possible that these items are responded to positively by Christians because they contain these references. One way to assess this possibility is to divide the SGI items into two groups; those that make these references and those that do not. A simple  $t$ -test between the two could determine if such a response set is confounding SGI data.

This study has several specific limitations. First of all, the research, as originally designed, did not reject the null hypothesis. Only after combining certain scales did significance emerge. As such, the post hoc findings must be interpreted

cautiously. Nonetheless, these results still strongly argue that what the SGI measures includes to a large degree personality traits. Also, a larger sample size may have yielded significant results.

Second, the sample size was not large enough to conduct its own factorial analysis to replicate Ledbetter and Foster's (1989) findings. The post hoc results assumed Ledbetter and Foster's three factors to represent true phenomena that could be generalized from a young single adult sample to a married middle age sample. There is no rational or empirical reason not to expect Ledbetter and Foster's sample to generalize to this sample.

A final limitation of this study was using all of the items in each of the SGI scales. According to Ledbetter and Foster (1989), "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 (p. 278)". However, extracting these items would be likely to increase the correlations between personality traits and the SGI and not decrease them. At the present time, the fourteen items in question cannot be

determined (M. Ledbetter, personal communication, February 7, 1991).

It is recommended that future research using the SGI should keep in mind the limitations of this study. Overcoming these deficiencies would require only simple design adjustments. Adjustments should include stating a priori that both the original fourteen scales and the three factor scales will be statistically analyzed for significance along with a larger sample size to replicate Ledbetter and Foster's (1989) three factors ( $N \geq 70$ ).

The implications for the church are three-fold. First, and foremost, it is recommended that any spiritual gift inventory be used only for research purposes until that particular instrument has shown basic psychometric validity and reliability. The limited studies that have been conducted with these inventories all seriously question the validity of these tests. It is thought that the inventories that have not been tested will fare no better. Further, it is doubtful that revising the gift tests would be worthwhile. Fredrickson (1985) concluded her study by stating that further modifications of the SGI-R would be fruitless. Similarly, it appears that attempts to

alter the SGI into an instrument capable of measuring 14 specific factors would be difficult due to the high intracorrelations among scales.

The second implication for the church deals with how to help people discover their spiritual gift(s). If spiritual gifts exist in the literal form described by contemporary authors, the best method of discovery seems to lie in a trial and error process. One serves, or teaches, and then looks for the subsequent results. This method assumes mistakes and that gifts will need to be learned and developed. This method also requires a patient and tolerant leadership. However, such a method avoids over reliance on "scientific" instruments of dubious value.

A final implication for the church is that there is a need to re-examine its belief in spiritual gifts. If gifts do exist, they should be measurable, yet studies show they are not being measured. It may be that Higgs' (1982) suggestion that the gift lists are literary devices is the more proper understanding of the biblical passages.

The church was able to function for some 1900 years without each member being tested for their specific gift. This quest for discovering one's gift

through testing seems to be a twentieth century phenomenon and a by-product of our fascination with science. The twentieth century, Western mind-set focuses on the individual as paramount and demands empirical evidence to validate subjective experience. Perhaps it is this world-view that is the source of the widespread interest in discovering one's spiritual gift through scientific-looking tests. Being aware of these possible social influences, one should be less inclined to externally validate one's own internal spiritual experiences.

References

- Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological testing (6th ed.).  
New York: Macmillan.
- Barcikowski, R. S. (1983). Computer packages and  
research designs: SPSS and SPSSX (Vol. 3).  
Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Baxter, R. E. (1983). Gifts of the Spirit. Grand  
Rapids, MI: Kregel.
- Beet J. (1889). A commentary on St. Paul's epistle to  
the Corinthians. New York: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Bender, L. (1938). A visual motor gestalt test and  
its clinical use. New York: The American  
Orthopsychiatric Association.
- Bengel, J. A. (1981). Bengel's New Testament  
commentary (Vol. 2), (C. T. Lewis & M. R.  
Vincent, Trans.). Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel.  
(Original work published 1795)
- Bennett, D., & Bennett, D. (1970). The Holy Spirit  
and you. Plainfield, NJ: Logos International.

- Bertram, G. (1964). Ergon, ergazomai, ergates, ergasia, energeis, energeia, energeo, energema, euergesia, euergeteo, euergetes. In G. W. Bromiley (Ed. and Trans.), Theological dictionary of the New Testament (Vol. 2, pp. 635-655). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Beyer H. W. (1964). Diakoneo, diakonia, diakonos. In G. W. Bromiley (Ed. and Trans.), Theological dictionary of the New Testament (Vol. 2, pp. 81-93). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Bittlinger, A. (1967). Gifts and graces: A commentary on 1 Corinthians 12-14. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Bittlinger, A. (1973). Gifts and ministries. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Blanchard, T. (1983). A practical guide to finding and using your spiritual gifts (rev. ed.). Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House.
- Bridge, D., & Phypers, D. (1973). Spiritual gifts and the church. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

- Brinkman, D. D. (1989). An evaluation of the Spiritual Well-Being Scale: Reliability and response measurement (Doctoral dissertation, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 2201B.
- Bruce, F. F. (1971). 1 and 2 Corinthians. Greenwood, SC: Attic.
- Burisch, M. (1984). Approaches to personality inventory construction: A comparison of merits. American Psychologist, 39 (3), 214-227.
- Cattell, R. B. (1964). Personality and social psychology. San Diego: Knapp.
- Cattell, R. B. (1965). The scientific analysis of personality. Baltimore: Penguin.
- Cattell, R. B. (1979). Personality and learning theory. New York: Springer.
- Cattell, R. B., Eber, H. W., & Tatsuoka, M. M. (1970). The handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1976). Age differences in personality structure: A cluster analytic approach. Journal of Gerontology, 31, 564-570.



- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Still stable after all these years: Personality as a key to some issues in adulthood and old age. In P. B. Baltes & O. G. Brim, Jr. (Eds.), Life span development and behavior (Vol. 3, pp. 65-102). New York: Academic.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). The NEO Personality Inventory manual. Odessa FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1986). Major contributions to the psychology of personality. In S. Modgil & C. Modgil (Eds.), Hans Eysenck: Consensus and controversy (pp. 63-72, 86-87). London: Falmer Press.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1989). NEO PI/FFI manual supplement. Odessa FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Currah, G. J. (1972). The New Testament spiritual gifts defined and described. Unpublished master's thesis, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, OR.
- Dachowski, M. M. (1987). A convergence of the tender-minded and the tough-minded? American Psychologist, 42, 886-887.

- Edwards, A. L. (1957). The social desirability variable in personality assessment and research. New York: Drydan.
- Edwards, T. C. (1886). A commentary on the first epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Armstrong and Son.
- Erickson, M. J. (1986). Christian theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1964). Manual of the Eysenck Personality Inventory. London: University Press.
- Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from different sources. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 44, 329-344.
- Fredrickson, S. E. (1985). The construction and preliminary validation of the Spiritual Gift Inventory (Doctoral dissertation, Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 3723B.
- Gangel, K. O. (1983). Unwrap your spiritual gifts. Wheaton, IL: Victor.

- Gingrich, W. F., & Arndt, W. F. (1979). Greek English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature (rev. 2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Language and individual differences: The search for universals in personality lexicons. In L. Wheeler (Ed.), Review of personality and social psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 141-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1983). Factor analysis (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gorsuch, R. L. (1984). Measurement: The boon and bane of investigating religion. American Psychologist, 39 (3), 228-236.
- Griffiths, M. (1978). Grace-gifts. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Hakel, M. D. (1968). Task difficulty and personality test validity. Psychological Reports, 22, 502.
- Harris, R. J. (1975). A primer of multivariate statistics. New York: Academic.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1943). Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

- 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.
- Hocking, D. L. (No Date). Spiritual gifts: Their necessity and use in the local church. Long Beach, CA: Sounds of Grace.
- King, M. B., & Hunt, R. A. (1975). Measuring the religious variable: National replication. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 14, 13-22.
- Koenig, J. (1978). Charismata: God's gift for God's people. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Ledbetter, M. F. & Foster, J. D. (1989). Measuring spiritual giftedness: A factor analytic study of a spiritual gifts inventory. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 17 (3), 274-283.
- Lyman, H. B. (1986). Test scores and what they mean (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Malcom, K. T. (1982). Women at the crossroads. Dowers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1983). Joint factors in self-reports and ratings: Neuroticism, extroversion, and openness to experience. Personality and Individual Differences, 4, 245-255.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 81-90.
- McMinn, G. (1975). Spiritual gift inventory.  
(Available from Dr. Gordon McMinn, Route 2, Box 380, Forest Grove, OR, 97116).
- McRae, W. J. (1976). The dynamics of spiritual gifts. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Norman, W. T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66, 574-583.

- Ryrie, C. C. (1965). The Holy Spirit. Chicago: Moody.
- Sanders, J. O. (1982). The Holy Spirit and his gifts (rev. ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Schultz, D. (1981). Theories of personality (2nd ed.). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Sheridan, C. L. (1979). Methods in experimental psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Stott, J. R. W. (1976). Baptism and fullness. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Tertullian (1968). Tertullian against Marcion. In A. Roberts & J. Donaldson (Ed.), The ante-Nicene fathers (Vol. 3, pp. 445-447). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. (Original work published in 207).
- Thayer, J. H. (1889). Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament. New York: American Books.
- Thompson, B. (no date) "Canonical Correlation Analysis". Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Application in the Social Sciences, 07-047. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Thomson, J. G. & Elwell, W. A. (1984). Spiritual gifts. In W. A. Elwell (Ed.), Evangelical dictionary of theology (pp. 1042-1046). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.
- Wagner, C. P. (1979). Your spiritual gifts can help your church grow. Glendale, CA: Regal.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1968). Personality structure. In P. R. Farnsworth, M. R. Rosenzweig, & J. T. Polefka (Eds.), Annual Review of Psychology (Vol. 19, pp. 293-350). Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Appendix A

Spiritual Gifts Discovery Questionnaire



SPIRITUAL GIFTS DISCOVERY QUESTIONS

1. I enjoy working behind the scenes, taking care of little details.
2. I usually step forward and assume leadership in a group where none exists.
3. When in a group I tend to recognize and approach those who are sitting or standing alone.
4. I have the ability to recognize a need, and get the job done, no matter how trivial the task.
5. I have the ability to organize ideas, people and projects to reach a specific goal.
6. People often say I have good spiritual judgment.
7. I am very confident of achieving great things for the glory of God.
8. I am asked to sing or play a musical instrument at church functions.
9. God has used me to communicate the gospel in a language unknown to me.
10. Through my prayers God has made the impossible possible.
11. I have an ability to use my hands in a creative way to design and build things.
12. I have seen my prayers heal people.
13. I enjoy giving money to those in serious financial need.
14. I enjoy ministering to people in hospitals, prisons, or rest homes to comfort them.
15. I often have insights that offer practical solutions to difficult problems.
16. I have understood issues or problems in the church and seen answers when others didn't.
17. I enjoy encouraging and giving counsel to those who are discouraged.
18. I have an ability to thoroughly study a passage of scripture, and then share it with others.
19. I presently have the responsibility for the spiritual growth of one or more young Christians.
20. Other people respect me as an authority in spiritual matters.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS DISCOVERY QUESTIONS

21. I have an ability to learn foreign languages.
22. God often reveals to me the direction He desires the body of Christ to move.
23. I enjoy spending time with non-Christians, especially with hopes of telling them about Jesus.
24. Whenever I hear reports on the news or in conversation about needy situations, I am burdened to pray.
25. I would like to assist the Pastors or other leaders so they will have more time to accomplish their essential and priority ministries.
26. I don't mind asking others to accomplish an important ministry for the church.
27. I enjoy entertaining guests and making them feel "at home" when they visit.
28. I enjoy serving others, no matter how simple or little the task.
29. I am a very organized person who sets goals and makes plans to reach them.
30. I am a good judge of character, and can spot a spiritual phony.
31. I often step out and start projects that other people won't attempt, and the projects are usually successful.
32. I believe I could sing well in the choir.
33. Praying in tongues is personally meaningful to me in my prayer life.
34. God has used me to make things happen which were far beyond human means.
35. I enjoy doing things like woodworking, crocheting, sewing, metal work, stained glass, etc.
36. I enjoy praying for those who are physically and emotionally ill, for God to heal them.
37. I joyfully give money to the church well above my tithe.
38. I feel compassion for people who are hurting and lonely, and like to spend considerable time with them to cheer them up.
39. God has enabled me to choose correctly between several complex options in an important decision, when no one else knew what to do.
40. I enjoy studying difficult questions about God's Word, and I am able to find answers easier and quicker than others.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS DISCOVERY

41. People often tell me their problems, and I encourage them.
42. When a question arises from a difficult Biblical passage, I am motivated to research the answer.
43. I like to give of my own free time to meet other's needs.
44. I would be willing and excited to start a new church.
45. I can adapt easily to culture, language, and life-style, other than my own, and would like to use my adaptability to minister in foreign countries.
46. I will always speak up for Christian principles even when what I say isn't popular and people think I'm narrow-minded or hard-headed.
47. I find it easy to invite a person to accept Jesus as their Savior.
48. I believe prayer is the most important thing a Christian can do.
49. I enjoy relieving others of routine tasks so they can get special projects done.
50. I can guide and manage a group of people toward achieving a specific goal.
51. I enjoy meeting new people and introducing them to others in the group.
52. I am very dependable for getting things done on time, and I don't need much praise and thanks.
53. I easily delegate significant responsibilities to other people.
54. I am able to distinguish between right and wrong in complex spiritual matters, that other people can't seem to figure out.
55. I trust in God's faithfulness for a bright future, even when everything looks bad.
56. I enjoy singing, and people say I have a good voice.
57. I have been overwhelmed by the Holy Spirit during prayer or worship, and began to speak in tongues.
58. God has blessed my prayers so that supernatural results have come from otherwise impossible situations.
59. I find satisfaction in meeting people's needs by making something for them.
60. God regularly speaks to me concerning people's illnesses, so that I can pray for them.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS DISCOVERY QUESTIONS

61. I wouldn't mind lowering my standard of living to give more to the church, and others in need.
62. I want to do whatever I can for the needy people around me, even if I have to give up something.
63. People often seek my advice when they don't know what to do.
64. I have an ability to gather information from several sources to discover the answer to a question, or learn more about a subject.
65. I feel a need to challenge others to better themselves, especially in their spiritual growth, without condemning them.
66. Others listen and enjoy my teaching of scriptures.
67. I enjoy working with people, and desire to help them be the best person they can for the Lord.
68. I am accepted as a spiritual authority in other parts of the country or world.
69. I would like to present the gospel in a foreign language, in a country whose culture and life-style is different than my own.
70. I feel a need to speak God's messages from the Bible so people will know what God expects of them.
71. I would like to tell others how to become a Christian, and give them the invitation to receive Jesus in their life.
72. Many of my prayers for others have been answered by the Lord.
73. I enjoy helping others get their work done, and don't need a lot of public recognition.
74. People respect my opinion and follow my direction.
75. I would like to use my home to get acquainted with newcomers and visitors to the church.
76. I enjoy helping people in any type of need, and feel a sense of satisfaction in meeting that need.
77. I am comfortable making important decisions, even under pressure.
78. People come to me for help in distinguishing between spiritual truth and error.
79. I often exercise my faith through prayer, and God answers my prayers in exciting ways.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS DISCOVERY

80. I believe the Lord could use me in the choir to deliver a message through song.
81. I have spoken in a language unknown to me, that when interpreted, brought a blessing to those who heard.
82. God uses me to work miracles for the glory of His kingdom.
83. People say I am gifted with my hands.
84. People often seek me out to pray for their physical healing.
85. When I give money to someone I don't expect anything in return, and often give anonymously.
86. When I hear of other people without jobs, who can't pay their bills, I do what I can to help them.
87. God enables me to make appropriate application of Biblical truth to practical situations.
88. I can recognize difficult Biblical truths and principles on my own, and I enjoy this.
89. People will tell me things they won't tell anyone else, and say I am easy to talk to.
90. I am organized in my thinking and systematic in my approach to presenting Bible lessons to a group of people.
91. I help Christians who have wandered away from the Lord find their way back to a growing relationship with Him.
92. I would be excited to share the gospel and form new groups of Christians in areas where there aren't many churches.
93. I have no racial prejudice, and have a sincere appreciation for people very different from myself.
94. I find it relatively easy to apply Biblical promises to present day situations.
95. I have a strong desire to help non-Christians find salvation through Jesus Christ.
96. Prayer is my favorite ministry in the church, and I spend a great deal of time at it.

# Personality and Spiritual Gifts

117

## SPIRITUAL GIFTS DISCOVERY ANSWER SHEET

Select the value from 0-4 that the statement is true in your life

- 0 - Not at all
- 1 - Little
- 2 - Moderately
- 3 - Considerably
- 4 - Strongly

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Phone \_\_\_\_\_

ANSWERS				TOTAL	ROW	GIFT
1	25	49	73		A	
2	26	50	74		B	
3	27	51	75		C	
4	28	52	76		D	
5	29	53	77		E	
6	30	54	78		F	
7	31	55	79		G	
8	32	56	80		H	
9	33	57	81		I	
10	34	58	82		J	
11	35	59	83		K	
12	36	60	84		L	
13	37	61	85		M	
14	38	62	86		N	
15	39	63	87		O	
16	40	64	88		P	
17	41	65	89		Q	
18	42	66	90		R	
19	43	67	91		S	
20	44	68	92		T	
21	45	69	93		U	
22	46	70	94		V	
23	47	71	95		W	
24	48	72	96		X	

Appendix B

Demographic Questionnaire

## Personality and Spiritual Gifts

119

1. What is your gender? (Circle the appropriate number)

1. Male
2. Female

2. How many years of formal education have you completed (use 12 years for high school degree; 16 for a 4 year college degree)

\_\_\_\_\_ Years

3. What is your age as of your last birthday?

\_\_\_\_\_ Years of Age

4. What was your total family income from all sources in the last year? (Circle the appropriate number)

1. Less than \$5000
2. \$5000 to \$9999
3. \$10,000 to \$14,999
4. \$15,000 to \$19,999
5. \$20,000 to \$29,999
6. \$30,000 to \$39,999
7. \$40,000 to \$59,999
8. \$60,000 or more

5. Which of the following best describes your current living situation?

1. Never married
2. Married
3. Divorced
4. Widowed
5. Separated
6. Living together
7. Other: Specify \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do you profess to be a Christian? (Mark the number which best describes your response)

1. No
2. Yes, I respect and attempt to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ.
3. Yes, I have received Jesus Christ into my life as my personal Savior and Lord.
4. Yes, I have received Jesus Christ as my personal Savior and Lord and I seek to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ.



Appendix C

Spiritual Gift Inventory

# SPIRITUAL GIFTS

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

YES NO

- |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1. Would you describe yourself as an effective public speaker?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2. Do you find it relatively easy and enjoyable to spend time in intense study and research of the Bible?            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3. Do you enjoy sharing the personal and emotional problems of people?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4. Do you find yourself more concerned with how to apply God's Word than in simply trying to understand its message? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5. Have you sensed that God has given you a special ability to learn and acquire knowledge concerning His Word?      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 6. Do you enjoy motivating others to various tasks and ministries?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 7. Would other people describe you as a person who makes decisions easily?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 8. Do you seem to concentrate more on practical things that need to be done rather than on why they should be done?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 9. When you hear of someone who needs help, do you immediately offer your services if it is possible?                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10. Would you rather give money to help than perform some manual task?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 11. Do you enjoy visiting people who are sick or disabled?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 12. Is your home the kind that most people feel comfortable in and will often drop by to visit with you unannounced? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 13. Do you find that you have the ability to believe things that other believers cannot seem to accept or see?       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 14. Have other believers told you that you seem to always know whether something is right or wrong?                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 15. When situations are not right, do you feel a burden to speak up about them in order to correct them?             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 16. Do you like to prove and answer issues and questions?  |

- | YES                      | NO                       |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 17. Have you found that people often seek you out to have your advice about their personal problems?                                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 18. Do you find that you often know immediately what to do in a situation where other believers are not clear as to what should be done?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 19. Do you find that people will often come to you with difficult problems and questions from the Bible, seeking your understanding?       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 20. Do you find yourself setting goals and objectives for yourself and your ministry as a believer?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 21. Do you sense a great deal of responsibility to make decisions in behalf of others?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 22. Do you usually have a great deal of joy in just "doing things" that need to be done no matter how small or trivial the task?           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 23. Do you sense a special ministry to help other people to become more effective in their work?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 24. When you hear of someone in need, do you immediately think of sending them some money?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 25. When you hear of someone in the hospital, does it challenge you to bring them some encouragement and cheer?                            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 26. Do you feel that something is really missing in your life when you cannot have guests into your home?                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 27. When people say that something cannot be done or is impossible, do you feel the burden to believe it and trust God for it?             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 28. Do you seem to have an understanding of people and their motivations that proves to be correct, even though you do not know them well? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 29. Do you have a tendency to speak up when issues are being dealt with in a group, rather than remain silent and listen?                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 30. When you hear a question or problem, are you anxious to both find and give an answer?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 31. Would you rather talk personally with someone about their problems rather than sending them to someone else for help?                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 32. Do people often seek your advice in difficult situations as to what you would do or how you would handle it?                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 33. In your study of God's Word have you observed that new insights and understanding of difficult subjects seem to come easy to you?      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 34. When someone is not doing a job well, do you feel concerned to help him become more effective in what he is doing?                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 35. Do you sense a moral responsibility when giving direction and guidance to others, always thinking of how this will affect others?      |

# Personality and Spiritual Gifts

123

YES NO

- |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 36. Do you seem to have more satisfaction in doing a task than in what others thought of what you did?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 37. Do you see yourself more in a supportive ministry to others than in being in a place of leadership?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 38. Do you find yourself looking for opportunities to give your money without hearing any appeals?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 39. Do you find it easy to express joy in the presence of those who are suffering physically?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 40. Do you love to entertain people in your home regardless of how well you know them?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 41. Do you find that you usually feel opposed to anyone who expresses that something cannot be done or accomplished?                           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 42. Do you sense often that what is being said is produced by the devil rather than God, and has your judgment proven to be correct?           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 43. Have you sensed that people feel conviction about wrong practices or doctrinal error when you share with them what the Bible says?         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 44. Have people often said to you that you have an ability to explain difficult problems to them, usually giving reasons for what you believe? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 45. Do you really get much joy out of encouraging people who are going through personal problems and trials?                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 46. Do you find that people usually ask you what you think about a situation with the belief that you will always know what to do?             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 47. Have you noticed that you have the ability to understand difficult teachings of God's Word without a great volume of research and study?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 48. Would you rather show someone else how to do a task than do it yourself?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 49. Do you enjoy giving direction to others and making decisions for them?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 50. Is it true of you that when you are asked to do a particular task that you usually feel no pressure or obligation?                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 51. Do you feel a special burden to relieve others of their duties in order to free them to do their most important work?                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 52. Do you find yourself responding immediately to financial needs by giving your money without a great deal of planning to do so?             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 53. Is it easy for you to talk with those who are suffering physically and to experience response on their part?                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 54. Do you consider your home as a real place of ministry to others?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 55. Have you discovered that you do not have to wait for clear evidence and direction before you make a decision?                              |

YES	NO	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	56. Do you find that you often evaluate people and the things they say as to whether it is right or wrong?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	57. When you speak God's Word do you usually think of how this is going to challenge and motivate those to whom you are speaking?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	58. Have people expressed to you how much they appreciate the way you explain things from the Bible?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	59. Do you find it easy to deal with people who are depressed or discouraged, experiencing a certain joy in what can be accomplished?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	60. Have other believers referred to decisions you have made or advice you have given as being the right thing to do and the best for everyone?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	61. Do you seem to understand things about God's Word that other believers with the same background and experience don't seem to know?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	62. Do you have a special concern to train and disciple other believers to become leaders?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	63. Do you find yourself constantly thinking of decisions that need to be made in giving overall direction to a group or organization?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	64. Would you rather do a job yourself than work with a group in trying to accomplish it?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	65. Do you believe that you would help almost anyone who had a need, if it was possible for you to do so?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	66. Do you sense a great deal of joy in giving, regardless of the response of the one to whom you gave?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	67. Do you often think of ways to minister and help those who are suffering physically?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	68. Would you like to have a regular ministry of entertaining people in your home regardless of who they are?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	69. Do you feel that you are able to trust God in difficult circumstances without hesitation or indecision?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	70. Do you feel a great responsibility toward God whenever you sense that something is not right which other believers do not seem to understand?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	71. Have other believers shared with you that you have the ability to communicate God's Word with great effectiveness?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	72. Do people come to you often, seeking your answers to specific questions or problems from the Bible?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	73. Do you sense a great deal of love and compassion for people having personal and emotional problems?
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	74. When you give your advice to someone, do you seem to emphasize more in the area of "how" it should be done, rather than "why" it should be done?

# Personality and Spiritual Gifts

125

YES NO

- |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 75. Have other believers frequently pointed out to you that you have an ability to know and understand the things of God's Word?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 76. Do you have a special concern for people in helping them to reach their goals and objectives in their lives?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 77. Do people seem to depend upon you to make the major decisions for the group or the organization?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 78. When you hear of a specific job that needs to be done, are you anxious to do it yourself?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 79. Are you satisfied more with how a person has been helped by what you did, than by simply doing it?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 80. When you give your money to someone or something, do you usually desire to avoid letting others know what you did?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 81. Would you enjoy a regular ministry to those who are suffering physically?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 82. Do you look at having people into your home as an exciting ministry more than the fact that you have a responsibility to do this?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 83. Have other believers often shared with you that you seem to have the ability to trust God in difficult situations?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 84. Have people often asked your opinion of someone or something that has been said as to whether you thought it was right or wrong?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 85. Do you believe that you are gifted in communicating to others?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 86. Would you rather explain the meaning of a word than simply share a verse by quoting it to someone?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 87. Do you usually desire to hear others share their personal problems rather than being able to share yours with someone else?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 88. Do other believers seem to follow your advice in difficult situations?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 89. Have you found in study of God's Word that you seem to know what a passage is saying before other believers discover it, even though you are studying it at the same time? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 90. Do you usually take the leadership in a group where none exists?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 91. Do you usually feel morally responsible for the long-range effects of your decisions?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 92. Would you rather do a particular job than spend time talking with people about their problems and needs?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 93. When someone asks for your help, do you have great difficulty in saying "no" to that person?   |

- | YES                      | NO                       |   |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 94. When you give some money to someone, do you find that you do not expect any appreciation in return?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 95. Do you feel a great deal of compassion upon those who are suffering physically that makes you want to help them in some way?                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 96. Do you find that you can easily have people into your home without being overly concerned about how it looks?                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 97. Do you feel a burden to encourage people to trust God when you see them defeated and discouraged?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 98. Have you felt a special responsibility to protect the truth of God's Word by exposing that which is wrong and sinful?                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 99. Would you rather speak God's Word to others without much explanation than taking the time to explain every detail?                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 100. Do you usually organize your thoughts in a systematic way?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 101. When you hear of some believer who has "sinned" or "fallen away," are you anxious to go to them immediately and try to help them?          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 102. Have the decisions and the advice you have given in difficult situations proven to be the right thing to do in most cases?                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 103. Do you have a great desire to share with other believers what the meaning of a difficult verse or passage is?                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 104. Do you sense a great deal of joy in a leadership position, rather than frustration and difficulty?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 105. Have you had experience in being responsible to make decisions in behalf of a group or organization that would affect everyone?            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 106. Do you find that you enjoy doing things that need to be done without being asked to do them?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 107. Do you find yourself looking for opportunities to help other people?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 108. Do you see the matter of giving money as a tremendous spiritual ministry and one which you believe God has given to you?                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 109. Do you find that when visiting those who are suffering physically that it brings you joy rather than depressing you?                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 110. Have other believers often referred to your ability to have people in your home and to the way God has used you in this?                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 111. Have you seen God do mighty things in your life that other believers said could not be done but which you believed He would do?            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 112. Do you feel that you are helping other believers when you discern that something is wrong, and have they readily accepted your evaluation? |

# Personality and Spiritual Gifts

127

YES NO

- |                          |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 113. When an opportunity is given to you to speak to other believers do you find that you would rather share verses than to share your personal experiences?                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 114. Have other believers told you often that you should have a regular teaching ministry and have you felt the same?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 115. Do you enjoy a person to person ministry more than ministering to a group?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 116. Have you sensed a special ability in your life to know what to do when dealing with difficult problems and situations?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 117. When you see other believers confused and lacking in understanding about some difficult teaching of the Bible, have you sensed a responsibility to speak to them about what it means? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 118. Do you seem to know how to meet people's needs, goals, and desires without too much study and planning?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 119. Do you enjoy being the "final voice" or the one with the overall responsibility for the direction and success of a group or organization?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 120. Do you find that it is not necessary for you to have a "job description" when you are asked to do a particular task?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 121. Have people often expressed to you how you have helped them in doing a particular job that relieved them of that responsibility in order to do something else?                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 122. Are you really excited when someone asks you to help financially in some worthwhile project, seeing this as a great honor and privilege?  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 123. Are you willing and eager to spend time, money, and resources, in order to help those who are suffering physically?   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 124. Do you find a great joy in having people into your home rather than sensing that it is a burden or responsibility that will entail too much work?                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 125. Have you discovered an effective prayer ministry in your life with many wonderful answers to prayer that from a human point of view seem impossible or unlikely?                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 126. Have you often made an evaluation of someone or something that was said that others did not see but yet proved to be correct?   |



# ANSWER SHEET

## Spiritual Gifts Test

NAME _____				DATE _____	
<u>PROPHECY</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #59	<input type="checkbox"/> #117	<input type="checkbox"/> #50	<input type="checkbox"/> #122	<input type="checkbox"/> #41
<input type="checkbox"/> #1	<input type="checkbox"/> #73	<u>LEADERSHIP</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #64	<u>SHOWING MERCY</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #55
<input type="checkbox"/> #15	<input type="checkbox"/> #87	<input type="checkbox"/> #6	<input type="checkbox"/> #78	<input type="checkbox"/> #11	<input type="checkbox"/> #69
<input type="checkbox"/> #29	<input type="checkbox"/> #101	<input type="checkbox"/> #20	<input type="checkbox"/> #92	<input type="checkbox"/> #25	<input type="checkbox"/> #83
<input type="checkbox"/> #43	<input type="checkbox"/> #115	<input type="checkbox"/> #34	<input type="checkbox"/> #106	<input type="checkbox"/> #39	<input type="checkbox"/> #97
<input type="checkbox"/> #57	<u>WORD OF WISDOM</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #48	<input type="checkbox"/> #120	<input type="checkbox"/> #53	<input type="checkbox"/> #111
<input type="checkbox"/> #71	<input type="checkbox"/> #4	<input type="checkbox"/> #62	<u>HELPS</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #67	<input type="checkbox"/> #125
<input type="checkbox"/> #85	<input type="checkbox"/> #18	<input type="checkbox"/> #76	<input type="checkbox"/> #9	<input type="checkbox"/> #81	<u>DISCERNMENT</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> #99	<input type="checkbox"/> #32	<input type="checkbox"/> #90	<input type="checkbox"/> #23	<input type="checkbox"/> #95	<input type="checkbox"/> #14
<input type="checkbox"/> #113	<input type="checkbox"/> #46	<input type="checkbox"/> #104	<input type="checkbox"/> #37	<input type="checkbox"/> #109	<input type="checkbox"/> #28
<u>TEACHING</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #60	<input type="checkbox"/> #118	<input type="checkbox"/> #51	<input type="checkbox"/> #123	<input type="checkbox"/> #42
<input type="checkbox"/> #2	<input type="checkbox"/> #74	<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #65	<u>HOSPITALITY</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #56
<input type="checkbox"/> #16	<input type="checkbox"/> #88	<input type="checkbox"/> #7	<input type="checkbox"/> #79	<input type="checkbox"/> #12	<input type="checkbox"/> #70
<input type="checkbox"/> #30	<input type="checkbox"/> #102	<input type="checkbox"/> #21	<input type="checkbox"/> #93	<input type="checkbox"/> #26	<input type="checkbox"/> #84
<input type="checkbox"/> #44	<input type="checkbox"/> #116	<input type="checkbox"/> #35	<input type="checkbox"/> #107	<input type="checkbox"/> #40	<input type="checkbox"/> #98
<input type="checkbox"/> #58	<u>WORD OF KNOWLEDGE</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #49	<input type="checkbox"/> #121	<input type="checkbox"/> #54	<input type="checkbox"/> #112
<input type="checkbox"/> #72	<input type="checkbox"/> #5	<input type="checkbox"/> #63	<u>GIVING</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #68	<input type="checkbox"/> #126
<input type="checkbox"/> #86	<input type="checkbox"/> #19	<input type="checkbox"/> #77	<input type="checkbox"/> #10	<input type="checkbox"/> #82	
<input type="checkbox"/> #100	<input type="checkbox"/> #33	<input type="checkbox"/> #91	<input type="checkbox"/> #24	<input type="checkbox"/> #96	
<input type="checkbox"/> #114	<input type="checkbox"/> #47	<input type="checkbox"/> #105	<input type="checkbox"/> #38	<input type="checkbox"/> #110	
<u>EXHORTATION</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #61	<input type="checkbox"/> #119	<input type="checkbox"/> #52	<input type="checkbox"/> #124	
<input type="checkbox"/> #3	<u>SERVING</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> #66	<u>FAITH</u>		
<input type="checkbox"/> #17	<input type="checkbox"/> #75	<input type="checkbox"/> #8	<input type="checkbox"/> #80	<input type="checkbox"/> #13	
<input type="checkbox"/> #31	<input type="checkbox"/> #89	<input type="checkbox"/> #22	<input type="checkbox"/> #94	<input type="checkbox"/> #27	
<input type="checkbox"/> #45	<input type="checkbox"/> #103	<input type="checkbox"/> #36	<input type="checkbox"/> #108		

Appendix D

NEO Five-Factor Inventory

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

1. I am not a worrier.
2. I like to have a lot of people around me.
3. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.
4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.
5. I keep my belongings clean and neat.
6. I often feel inferior to others.
7. I laugh easily.
8. Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it.
9. I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers.
10. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.
11. When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces.
12. I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted."
13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.
15. I am not a very methodical person.
16. I rarely feel lonely or blue.
17. I really enjoy talking to people.
18. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.
21. I often feel tense and jittery.
22. I like to be where the action is.
23. Poetry has little or no effect on me.
24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions.
25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.
26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
27. I usually prefer to do things alone.
28. I often try new and foreign foods.
29. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
30. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.
31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.
32. I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.
33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.
34. Most people I know like me.
35. I work hard to accomplish my goals.
36. I often get angry at the way people treat me.
37. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.
38. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.
39. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.
40. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.

# Personality and Spiritual Gifts

131

41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.
42. I am not a cheerful optimist.
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.
44. I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes.
45. Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be.
46. I am seldom sad or depressed.
47. My life is fast-paced.
48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.
50. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.
51. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.
52. I am a very active person.
53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.
54. If I don't like people, I let them know it.
55. I never seem to be able to get organized.
56. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.
57. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others.
58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.
59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.
60. I strive for excellence in everything I do.

Enter your responses here—remember to enter responses *across the rows*.  
SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

1 SD D N A SA	2 SD D N A SA	3 SD D N A SA	4 SD D N A SA	5 SD D N A SA
6 SD D N A SA	7 SD D N A SA	8 SD D N A SA	9 SD D N A SA	10 SD D N A SA
11 SD D N A SA	12 SD D N A SA	13 SD D N A SA	14 SD D N A SA	15 SD D N A SA
16 SD D N A SA	17 SD D N A SA	18 SD D N A SA	19 SD D N A SA	20 SD D N A SA
21 SD D N A SA	22 SD D N A SA	23 SD D N A SA	24 SD D N A SA	25 SD D N A SA
26 SD D N A SA	27 SD D N A SA	28 SD D N A SA	29 SD D N A SA	30 SD D N A SA
31 SD D N A SA	32 SD D N A SA	33 SD D N A SA	34 SD D N A SA	35 SD D N A SA
36 SD D N A SA	37 SD D N A SA	38 SD D N A SA	39 SD D N A SA	40 SD D N A SA
41 SD D N A SA	42 SD D N A SA	43 SD D N A SA	44 SD D N A SA	45 SD D N A SA
46 SD D N A SA	47 SD D N A SA	48 SD D N A SA	49 SD D N A SA	50 SD D N A SA
51 SD D N A SA	52 SD D N A SA	53 SD D N A SA	54 SD D N A SA	55 SD D N A SA
56 SD D N A SA	57 SD D N A SA	58 SD D N A SA	59 SD D N A SA	60 SD D N A SA

Have you responded to all of the statements? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
 Have you entered your responses in the correct boxes? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
 Have you responded accurately and honestly? \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

Sum the COLUMNS to obtain raw scores for N, E, O, A, and C.

Plot raw scores on facing page to obtain T scores.

1 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	2 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	3 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	4 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	5 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)
6 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	7 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	8 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	9 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	10 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)
11 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	12 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	13 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	14 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	15 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
16 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	17 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	18 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	19 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	20 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)
21 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	22 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	23 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	24 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	25 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)
26 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	27 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	28 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	29 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	30 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
31 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	32 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	33 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	34 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	35 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)
36 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	37 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	38 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	39 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	40 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)
41 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	42 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	43 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	44 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	45 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
46 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	47 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	48 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	49 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	50 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)
51 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	52 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	53 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	54 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	55 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)
56 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	57 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	58 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)	59 (4) (3) (2) (1) (0)	60 (0) (1) (2) (3) (4)

N= \_\_\_\_\_

E= \_\_\_\_\_

O= \_\_\_\_\_

A= \_\_\_\_\_

C= \_\_\_\_\_

Have you responded to all of the statements?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

Do not score if this response is marked "No."

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

Do not score if this response is marked "No."

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

# Personality and Spiritual Gifts

133

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## NEO Five-Factor Inventory Profile Form S

		Male				
		N	E	O	A	C
T Score	Very High	-	40	-	-	-
		-	-	40	-	-
		-	-	-	-	45
		30	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-
	High	-	35	-	-	-
		-	-	35	35	-
		-	-	-	-	40
		25	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-
T Score	Average	-	30	-	-	-
		20	-	-	30	35
		-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-
	Low	-	-	-	25	-
		10	-	-	-	-
		-	20	-	-	-
		-	-	20	-	25
		-	-	-	-	-
T Score	Very Low	5	-	-	20	-
		-	15	-	-	-
		-	-	15	-	20
		0	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-

		Female				
		N	E	O	A	C
T Score	Very High	-	-	-	-	-
		40	-	-	-	-
		-	40	-	40	-
		-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	45
	High	35	-	40	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-
		-	35	-	-	-
		30	-	-	35	-
		-	-	35	-	40
T Score	Average	-	-	-	-	-
		25	-	-	-	-
		-	30	-	-	-
		-	-	30	-	35
		-	-	-	-	-
	Low	20	-	-	30	-
		-	-	-	-	-
		-	25	-	-	-
		-	-	25	-	30
		-	-	-	-	-
T Score	Very Low	-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-
		-	-	-	-	-
		-	15	15	-	20
		-	-	-	20	-

Appendix E

Instructions and Overview of Study

Instructions

You have been asked to participate in a study of personal spiritual life. The purpose of this study is to gain insight into personal spiritual life.

The first section asks for biographical information; the remainder of the questions involve how you see yourself and your relationship to God. Please answer each of the questions as accurately as you can. Any comments which you wish to include may be written in the margins or at the end of the questionnaires. To insure confidentiality, please do not place your name on any of the materials.

This study will make a valuable contribution to better understanding of personal spiritual life. A summary of the group results will be made available within the next few weeks. Thank you for your participation.

Kenneth J. Stone, M.A.  
George Fox College



Appendix F

Raw Data

Explanation of Raw Data

Row 1

Column 1: Identification Number

Column 2: Sex: 1 = Male  
2 = Female

Column 3: Education in Years

Column 4: Age in Years

Column 5: Socioeconomic Status:  
1 = Less than \$5000  
2 = \$5000 to \$9999  
3 = \$10000 to \$14999  
4 = \$15000 to \$19999  
5 = \$20000 to \$29999  
6 = \$30000 to \$39999  
7 = \$40000 to \$59999  
8 = \$60000 or more

Column 6: Marital Status:  
1 = Never married  
2 = Married  
3 = Divorced  
4 = Widowed  
5 = Separated  
6 = Living together  
7 = Other: Specify \_\_\_\_\_

Column 7: Profess to be a Christian:  
1 = No.  
2 = Yes, I respect and attempt to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Jesus.  
3 = Yes, I have received Jesus Christ into my life as my personal Savior and Lord.  
4 = Yes, I have recieved Jesus Christ as my personal Savior and Lord and I seek to follow the moral and ethical teachings of Christ.

Explanation of Raw Data-continued

Row 1

Column 8: NEO-FFI Neuroticism Score (T-Score)  
 Column 9: NEO-FFI Extraversion Score (T-Score)  
 Column 10: NEO-FFI Openness Score (T-Score)  
 Column 11: NEO-FFI Agreeableness Score (T-Score)  
 Column 12: NEO-FFI Conscientiousness Score (T-Score)  
 Remainder of Row 1: Items #1-22 of the SGI:  
                             1 = Yes  
                             2 = No  
                             9 = No response

Row 2: Items #23-76 of the SGI:  
             1 = Yes  
             2 = No  
             9 = No response

Row 3: Items #77-126 of the SGI:  
             1 = Yes  
             2 = No  
             9 = No response

Appendix F

Raw Data

```

-----
01 1 14 43 8 2 4 50 47 43 54 55 2219111122222111122211
    1221111191111121221222112112221121122121121922211211
    2212122121211121112122121121211121222122212111221122

02 2 16 43 7 2 4 60 44 49 56 45 2211212112222212122221
    2221212211121212222211112112222211121221221122212211
    2122112221211122121122112121222191222922112121122222

03 1 16 43 8 2 4 42 65 45 66 57 2122111121211212122211
    2222211222211211221111121121122112122212121222212222
    21121122212111211211211121212211211121212121122221

05 2 12 32 5 2 4 60 66 56 72 54 2211111112111112122122
    1211111211212211212111221121211222122211121111211121
    212211122111112211111211212111112211211211211121112

07 2 15 36 7 2 4 66 44 56 49 46 2111122122112121122121
    121211222111111111112211121221212212122111221222111
    11111221121122211111212211211222222122112122112211

09 1 13 40 6 2 4 34 66 26 71 50 2222221222221111112222
    121211222111111111112211121221212212122111221222111
    2222112221211111121111112221211111222212111221122122

10 1 24 39 6 2 4 47 60 52 60 52 1121111221211222111112
    1211221121111122211211211122222122112121122121111122
    11122221111111112212112211111112111121211211122112

11 2 12 49 8 2 4 43 54 51 36 52 1111211211211212222111
    1112121212211112111211112221222211222122222212122212
    1111212122211222111211212121221112212212121121211112

12 1 12 50 8 2 4 53 63 43 66 52 221121212222222222221
    222111221221111221112222222122222122222221121122212
    22222121222112221111112212922112222222122221221122

13 1 14 46 7 2 3 45 48 26 66 37 2221221112212222222221
    1222122222221112212222222221222111212222211121122211
    2222112122221222111111221221222122112222122221222122
    
```

14 1 16 47 8 2 4 50 45 50 54 55 2212221112111121121221  
 1121221111211112221112111121121212211112112111221  
 1211111211211211211221122222111211211211121122211112

16 1 16 41 6 2 3 53 63 34 35 70 221111112212211222211  
 1211121112111112122212122222121121222221221112112222  
 212111222222221111111121111211122122222222111212

17 2 14 38 6 2 4 71 35 40 45 43 2211222121112212122221  
 221212222222121222222212212121221121122121122212212  
 222211222222222121212121222222112112222122222122222

19 2 12 40 3 3 3 47 49 46 58 54 111222212111112212111  
 1221111121211121211112222212112111112222111122111112  
 2122122111122212121121121111211212222121111212121122

20 2 10 24 7 2 4 49 51 49 58 48 2112111112211112112211  
 1221111112121112112211112221121111121111211111112212  
 211211212111112122212211221122112211122112222122111

22 1 20 38 7 2 4 56 52 59 48 57 1121121122122221111221  
 221121111212122122222111122122211111212221222221122  
 12212122211121121122122121212111212211111222212211

23 1 18 47 8 2 4 28 73 55 74 63 1112111212211211112121  
 1212111111111122222111112221221111111122221122111212  
 211211211111112112211111212121112111122111212111111

24 2 16 50 8 2 4 46 66 45 74 57 2111222112111112122121  
 2211112111211211122112122222222121121221121111112212  
 2122211122111222121212112111222111212222122221221121

25 2 13 38 6 2 4 47 61 54 63 49 1211121122211111112112  
 1221211221211212212212122112211111112112111122111222  
 11221121212111111121221112111211122111121212122122111

26 2 12 51 4 2 4 61 47 35 45 52 2211121122121122212221  
 2212122222222212222222222222222222222222211122221212  
 22222222122222222211212222222122222222122221222222

32 2 14 26 4 2 4 52 30 46 74 48 2221222222211211222221  
 2111222122211111222122222222212221222212221112112222  
 2222112222221222111112111222222112222212122221221222

35 2 13 68 4 2 4 49 26 40 61 52 2221129212221111222221  
 9121222122221112222222221222122222122212211112212219  
 2222112222291222112112111222222121122292211222221212

36 1 99 69 4 2 4 35 66 62 71 49 1111122212221211211121  
 222121211212112122221112122222221112212221122111112  
 2222112121111112111222212121121112122211221221222121

37 1 15 56 8 2 4 50 55 46 60 42 1112211112111111111211  
 11111111111111121111111121211111111111211111111211  
 111111111111111111111112111111111112121111121111

41 2 13 24 5 2 4 47 70 46 58 60 2211211112211222222111  
 221212222221111212122212221222121222122212222122221  
 211122221222222111211122212211122221222212211222112

42 2 16 35 8 2 4 41 42 41 49 35 2211221111212211212222  
 222121111121111222122111222122221122122221122222211  
 21111222211112111122122222122212212222211211222121

43 2 17 45 7 2 4 45 53 51 72 58 121221111221222222121  
 2211122222211122211222122122222112222222111221222212  
 2112112122121221111212121121211112211221222221122112

44 1 16 26 3 2 4 39 50 48 74 55 112121122222212221111  
 122222111221111122222112222212222212222112222122222  
 22112122112211211211212121211122222212222212122222

45 2 15 26 2 2 4 60 56 49 41 48 1211112222221111111122  
 111211111111122222121111111222221111111112222111121  
 112112211111111112112211212111112222112121112222222

46 1 20 30 5 2 4 43 63 39 66 53 1211221121211221122221  
 211222211112121122222212112121122122111221222222211  
 221211222221122112221222212211112112222211212122222

52 1 11 26 5 2 4 58 60 53 56 31 1211111221221111211212  
 122121111111222212111111121222222111112112111211212  
 1112112121111211121211112211121221222221121122122121

53 2 12 24 6 2 4 57 53 37 26 42 1211211121212211122122  
 211221111121111221212112211121221111122221121211112  
 1221122121111121121111122121221122211122111121111121

---

Appendix G

Vita

Kenneth J. Stone  
301 S.W. Lincoln #807  
Portland, Or 97201

- EDUCATION: M.A. in Clinical Psychology, with Honors, 1988. Western Conservative Baptist Seminary, Portland, Or.
- B.S. in Biblical Education, 1985. Multnomah School of the Bible, Portland, Or.
- EXPERIENCE: Psychological Service Center, 511 SW 10th, Portland, Or, 97205: Intern. September 1990 to present.
- Portland Adventist Medical Center, 10010 S.E. Main, Portland, Or, 97220: Intern. July 1989 to July 1990.
- George Fox College, Newberg Or, 97132-2697: Graduate Fellow. May 1989 to present.
- Counseling Center of Vancouver, 521 East 33rd St., Vancouver, WA, 98663: Registered Counselor. January 1989 to July 1989.
- Gladstone Elementary Grade School, 645 Chicago Ave, Gladstone, Or 97027: School Counselor. August 1988 to June 1989.
- Woodland Park Hospital, Christian Therapy Group, 10300 NE Hancock, Portland, Or 97220: Recreational Therapist. July 1988 to November 1988.
- Portland Counseling Center, 6910 SE Lake Rd. Milwaukie, Or 97222: Counselor. January 1988 to May 1988.
- dePaul Adolescent Program, 4411 NE Emerson, Portland, Or 97213: Counselor. August 1987 to December 1987.



