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ABSTRACT
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Problem

Recently, considerable interest in spiritual gifts has developed and many scholars have attempted to measure them. This study was to determine whether spiritual gifts distribution is related to a specific demographic profile, and discriminates between certain groups.

Method

The New Spiritual Gift Inventory provided scores for five spiritual gifts clusters, and three statistical procedures were employed to analyze the data gathered from 335 students.
Results

These results were obtained:

1. The clusters do not discriminate between students solely on the basis of academic classification.

2. Seminarians are stronger on the Teacher cluster than other students.

3. Males are stronger on the Teacher cluster and weaker on the Helper cluster than females.

4. Older students are stronger on the Teacher cluster than younger students.

5. A particular demographic profile is associated with a specific combination of gifts.

Conclusions

These differences among the groups suggest that believers should expect such differences in local congregations.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Spiritual gifts have always been a part of the heritage of the Christian church. In the Old Testament it is recorded that in certain situations the God of the Israelites gave to selected men talents and gifts which were necessary for the advancement of some stage of the church. Joseph received from God the ability to interpret dreams (Gen 40, 41). During the Babylonic exile of the Jews from BCE 586 to BCE 515, Daniel was able to distinguish himself by interpreting the dreams of the king. His actions not only saved the lives of the soothsayers but also provided the present generation with an advance account of the history of the world which biblical commentators agree could only come from God.

At his accession to the throne of Israel, the young man Solomon prayed for and received from God the gift of wisdom (2 Chron 1:7-12).1 Years later he gave evidence of

1All scriptural references are from the New International Version of the Bible, unless otherwise indicated.
this gift when he was called upon to settle a difficult dispute between two women (1 Kgs 3:16-28). When the Israelites were commissioned to build the Tabernacle, certain men were given varied gifts of craftsmanship to enable them to assist in the building (Exod 31:1-11).

Although several of these accounts can be found in the Old Testament, the doctrine of spiritual gifts is usually treated as a New Testament doctrine by those who comment upon it.

The writings of the Apostle Paul in the New Testament signal the development of a specific doctrine of spiritual gifts. However, it is difficult to understand why this doctrine was not discussed by the Church Fathers from the fifth century A.D onwards (Phoon, 1986, p. 3). Kinghorn (1976) suggests a few possible reasons. In an effort to combat the problems of "heresy and schism" with which it was faced shortly after the apostolic era, the church found it necessary to give great attention to institutional stability. During that period the church saw the development of its "creeds, its canon of scripture, and its clergy" (p. 10). It is not surprising that while the church focussed on its doctrine and structure, teachings about the inner work of the Holy Spirit received little attention.

Montanism was one reaction to the resultant loss of vitality. However, it was rejected by the church because of
its "dogmatism, emotionalism, and divisive ways" (p. 11).

Kinghorn (1976) states that

In rejecting Montanism, the church over-reacted. Christian leaders were inclined to suspect those who claimed to experience the direct working of the Holy Spirit. Church officials became fearful of spiritual excesses and unbridled enthusiasm. They preferred order to what they regarded as the chaos of Montanism. So official Christianity responded to Montanism by developing a priesthood, into which one entered only by the official laying on of hands. (p. 11)

As the church continued to focus on orthodoxy, stability, and order, it was almost inevitable that the work of the Holy Spirit within the Christian believer would be overlooked. As a result the doctrine of spiritual gifts was almost completely neglected.

The early church fathers did not attach any importance to the doctrine of spiritual gifts. Kinghorn (1976) suggests that "Augustine and the other church fathers were at best vague in dealing with the meaning and place of spiritual gifts in the church" (p. 12).

The sudden swelling of the ranks of the church after the conversion of Emperor Constantine in A.D. 313 gave rise to a need for definitive ways to instruct and guide these new converts. The result was a dependent and passive laity under the control of a powerful clergy. Monasticism flourished during those years, but it had no need for a theology of spiritual gifts since its orientation was essentially vertical and paid no attention to the horizontal aspects of the Christian faith. The closest the official
church came to a doctrine of spiritual gifts was in the views of the medieval theologian Thomas Aquinas who defined charisms (gifts) as "gratuitous graces," and equated spiritual gifts with inner virtues such as love and hope.

The Protestant Reformation signalled a rediscovery of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. The result was reawakened interest in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the gifts He gives to believers.

Statement of the Problem

Concomitant with a resurgence of interest in the doctrine of spiritual gifts in the twentieth century has been a desire to determine the number of gifts mentioned in the New Testament, and to link them specifically with methods for their identification. Several biblical scholars, including Wagner (1979), Flynn (1974), McRae (1976), and Griffiths (1979) have suggested that it is possible to identify between 20 and 25 spiritual gifts in the New Testament (Naden, Cruise, & Cash, 1982). Attempts have been made to develop instruments which would be useful in indicating and measuring the presence of some of these spiritual gifts. Generally, these instruments have approached the task from a doctrinal and theological viewpoint. Only The Spiritual Gifts Inventory (SGI) (Naden & Cruise, 1981), and the New Spiritual Gifts Inventory
(NSGI) (Naden, 1988) provide "psychometric reliability and validity data" (p. 8).

Although most Christian congregations believe in the priesthood of all believers, a concept which came out of the Protestant Reformation and considers all committed Christians to be on an equal footing before God (Clifford, 1961, p. 18), the Christian church still emphasizes the need for clergy to lead and direct the flock (1 Pet 5:2-4). While the Holy Spirit gives gifts to all believers and none of these gifts indicates any special prestige to be attached to any who is gifted, the Holy Spirit does endow the clergy of the church with special gifts which enable them to dispense their responsibilities (Clifford, 1961, p. 18).

In his letter to young Timothy, Paul first warns him not to "neglect your gift" (1 Tim 4:14), then admonishes him to "fan into flame the gift of God, which is in you through the laying on of my hands" (2 Tim 1:6). It can be plainly understood from this passage that, in the life of the diligent Christian, whatever gift has been passed on to him will become more intense with the passage of time.

Research has been done to clarify the relationships between the "psychological types" of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the 19 spiritual gifts identified by the Spiritual Gifts Inventory (SGI) (Ammon, n.d., and Phoon, 1986). No study appears to have been made utilizing the SGI or the NSGI to research whether those who are in the clergy
do have different gifts or clusters of gifts than do other members of the Christian communion. As a result, in this study, Seminary students, almost all of whom have had field experience and thus constitute a sample of Adventist clergy, are compared with students in other Schools of the University, who represent Adventist laity. It was not anticipated that the presence of pre-seminary students in the Arts and Sciences sample would significantly affect this classification because none of the classes in the randomly selected sample were required classes for pre-seminary majors.

**Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of the study is to compare the distribution of spiritual gifts of students at the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary and students in the other schools at Andrews University, using the *New Spiritual Gifts Inventory* by Roy C. Naden. This study also investigates the relationship between the distribution of spiritual gifts and age, gender, and academic classification.

**Research Questions**

1. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among Andrews University students related to the school in which they are enrolled?

2. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among
Andrews University students related to their level of academic achievement?

3. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among Andrews University students related to their gender?

4. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among Andrews University students related to their age?

5. Is gift distribution related to a linear combination of the above demographic variables.

Theoretical Framework

As noted earlier, spiritual gifts were known to the characters of the Old Testament, even though no word in the Old Testament for "spiritual gift" exists (Phoon, 1986, p. 9). As cited by Phoon, Hummel (1978, p. 119) notes that the Greek word charisma, meaning gift, "appears only twice in the Greek Septuagint". The word has only rare occurrence in the entire Bible and only appears in the New Testament "in the writings of the Apostle Paul with an echo in 1 Peter 4:10" (Phoon, 1986). Based on the writings of the Apostle Paul many Christians accept the doctrine of spiritual gifts as an inescapable fact.

A spiritual gift has been defined as a divinely given ability or capacity to perform a specific ministry for God under the direction of the Holy Spirit (Naden, et al, 1982, p. 8; Walvoord, 1973, p. 38). To quote Clemens (1975):
By definition a spiritual gift is the ability given by God for a special type of service. It is not a place of service, nor is it a ministry to a particular age group. It is rather, the ability itself, such as teaching or pastoring. (p. 314)

A distinction needs to be made between natural talents, which many exhibit, and spiritual gifts. Although all talents ultimately are traceable back to man's original creation, spiritual gifts hold a special place as abilities given to a believer by the Holy Spirit to enable the building up of the body of Christ. This can variously be the enhancement of natural talents after conversion or a bestowal of previously unknown ability in the individual for use in the church. No consensus of opinion exists among scholars as to which manifestations in the New Testament can be identified as spiritual gifts and the lists vary between 20 and 25 spiritual gifts (Laurentin, 1978; Naden, et al, 1982; Wagner, 1979; Wallenkampf, 1978; cited by Phoon).

This study uses the list of five gift clusters identified in the New Spiritual Gifts Inventory (SGI) (Naden, 1988). Naden did not include the "sign" gifts of "healing, miracles, tongues, interpretation of tongues, celibacy, voluntary poverty, and exorcism" in the inventory, since they are of such a spectacular nature that "those who have them do not need [the help of an instrument] in recognizing the fact" (Naden, 1988, p. 8).
Significance of the Study

Andrews University and the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary are operated by the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Andrews University was established in order to "prepare church leaders, laity, and other responsible citizens to fulfill the Gospel Commission,"¹ and the Seminary has the task of "training candidates for effective leadership in ministry and teaching for the Seventh-day Adventist Church"².

Included among the stated purposes of the University are:

1. to enable its students intelligently to dedicate their lives to spiritual leadership and selfless service for God and mankind

2. to guide in the formation of character marked by integrity, self-discipline, responsibility, tolerance, and loyalty to God, one's nation, and humanity.

Since the Seventh-day Adventist Church is a fundamentalist Christian denomination and holds the Bible as its only rule of "faith and practice" (SDA Baptismal Vows), Seventh-day Adventists believe that God provides the abilities necessary for the development of the church. The clergy is a focal part of the church's operations, although it holds to the Protestant teaching of the priesthood of all believers. God provides the necessary gifts and individuals

¹SDA Theological Seminary Bulletin 1988-89, p. 11.
²Ibid., p. 15.
are elected to clerical positions when the church recognizes that an individual has received the "call from God."

It is anticipated that this study will provide evidence regarding the spiritual gifts distribution of the several student groups within the University. It also explores relationships within groups from different genders, ages, areas of academic interest (broadly defined), and academic standing/classification.

The biblical doctrine of spiritual gifts teaches that God gives spiritual gifts to all believers, but all do not have the same gifts.

There are different kinds of gifts, but the same Spirit. There are different kinds of service, but the same Lord. There are different kinds of working, but the same God works all of them in all men. Now to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good. . . . All these are the work of one and the same Spirit, and He gives them to each one, just as He determines. . . . Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Do all work miracles? Do all have gifts of healing? Do all speak in tongues? Do all interpret? (1 Cor 12:4-11, 27-30).

One would expect, then, that those in the clergy would tend to have a common specialized gifts cluster, which would not be the case with believers in general.

**Definition of Terms**

The following are brief definitions of the terms used in the study.

**Cluster** refers to a combination of related spiritual gifts.
Believer is defined as one who has been "born again" and has surrendered his or her life to Jesus Christ.

Gift of administration is defined as the ability "to establish objectives and direct affairs for the larger geographic units of the Lord's work; to promote unity and enthusiasm; and cheerfully to accept responsibility for decisions made" (Naden, Cruise, & Cash, 1982, p. 8).

Gift of apostleship is the ability "to raise up and organize congregations; to ordain their leadership; and to define and defend the faith" (p. 8).

Gift of discernment is the ability "to identify motives in people's actions; the primary source of motivation--the Lord or Satan; and the genuineness of appeals made to the church family" (p. 8).

Gift of evangelism is the ability "regularly and without difficulty to lead people to surrender their lives to the claims of Jesus Christ and to join in fellowship with the church" (p. 9).

Gift of exhortation is the ability to "express comfort to the hurting, problem-resolving advice to the troubled, and to present encouragement and admonition to walk in the ways of the Lord" (p. 9).

Gift of faith is evidenced in one who has an "unwavering confidence in the promises and providences of God and will move ahead implementing plans for His kingdom, even when the way is not clear" (p. 9).
Gift of giving is manifested in one who "gives consistently, generously, and spontaneously to those who need help" (p. 9).

Gift of helps is evidenced in one who "consistently and happily gives assistance to any who need assistance" (p. 9).

Gift of hospitality is seen in one who "reaches out to offer friendship, food, and/or shelter to those who need such assistance" (p. 9).

Gift of intercession is manifested in one who "prays regularly and at some length for the specific needs of others" (p. 9).

Gift of knowledge is manifested in one who "is comfortable discovering the Bible's teachings—especially as they relate to the plan of salvation—and answering Bible questions" (p. 9).

Gift of leadership is evidenced in one who is able to develop and model local congregational programs of nurture and outreach; to deal with personal problems equitably; and to show insights that resolve organizational challenges" (p. 9).

Gift of martyrdom occurs in one who "is willing to lay down his/her life willingly, without fear, in order to promote the kingdom of God" (p. 9).

Gift of mercy is manifested in one who "has a highly developed sense of compassion and willingly ministers to
those in need, including those considered 'outcasts' by society" (p. 9).

*Gift of mission service* is demonstrated in one who "can leave friends and family to work in a foreign country, willingly adapting to a new culture in order to share the gospel" (p. 9).

*Gift of pastoring* is shown in one who is "committed to the tender nurture of a congregation through preaching, home visitation, and one-to-one contacts" (p. 9).

*Gift of prophecy* is the ability "to speak for God to comfort and encourage the inquiring, the troubled, and the hurting; and to give instruction regarding the Christian's life and responsibilities" (p. 9).

*Gift of teaching* is demonstrated by one who "presents and applies biblical teachings and principles in any of a wide variety of teaching settings" (p. 9).

*Gift of wisdom* is evidenced in one who "is perceptive in giving practical counsel to individuals or groups, foreseeing the probable, practical outcome of counselled courses of action" (p. 9).

The *Teacher* gifts cluster includes the gift of knowledge and the gift of teaching.

The *Shepherd/Evangelist* gifts cluster includes the gifts of evangelism, pastoring, prophecy, mission service, and apostleship.
The Helper gifts cluster includes the gifts of hospitality, helps, intercession, giving, and mercy.

The Counselor gifts cluster includes the gifts of discernment, exhortation, and wisdom.

The Leader gifts cluster includes the gifts of leadership, faith, and administration.

Clergy refers to that cadre of individuals within the church who have received a "call" from God and are involved in various professional roles of leadership within the church.

Ministry denotes all the functions of the church carried out by various members.

Delimitations of the Study

The population of this study was limited to Seventh-day Adventist students at Andrews University. Consequently, generalization must be restricted to this population.

The study is also delimited to the following variables:

1. The five spiritual gifts clusters identified in the New Spiritual Gifts Inventory -- Shepherd/Evangelist, Teacher, Helper, Counselor, and Leader. The instrument is composed of 20 items which cover only these five gift clusters.

2. Individual data of academic status, age, gender, and school.
Assumptions

In this study it is assumed that God, through the agency of his Holy Spirit, endows each individual with extraordinary abilities or enhances naturally inherited abilities for the purpose of assisting in the development of the church. These endowments are commonly termed spiritual gifts.

Organization of the Study

This study is subdivided into five chapters. Chapter 1 is composed of the introduction, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions, the theoretical framework, the significance of the study, definition of terms, delimitations of the study, limitations of the study, and basic assumptions.

The review of the literature is found in Chapter 2. It is set out in two main sections: ministry in the Christian church and spiritual gifts. The first section involves a brief historical sketch of the development of an "official" clergy within the Christian community and its relationship to other believers of the Christian faith. The second section includes a brief historical background of the study of spiritual gifts, a word-study of spiritual gifts as found in the Old and New Testaments, the fruit of the Spirit and spiritual gifts, natural talents and spiritual gifts,
the classification of spiritual gifts, and the discovery of spiritual gifts.

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology, the type of study, the population and sample, the procedures followed in the collection of data, instrumentation (The New Spiritual Gifts Inventory), the null hypotheses, and the statistical analyses.

Chapter 4 presents the analyses of the data, and Chapter 5 provides a summary of the study, discussion of the results, implications of the findings, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Ministry in the Christian Church

Most churchmen agree that there is biblical basis for professional clergy in the church today, even if there is some disagreement as to their role and function. Several views concerning this subject are presently held, but there seem to be "three more deeply rooted beliefs about the church and its ministry" (Clifford, 1961, p. 11). The view with the longest history is that of the Roman Catholic, Orthodox, and Anglican communions, which is centered around the episcopacy. According to that belief, the church is dependent on the clergy, "the latter being conceived as the apostolate, conferred by our Lord Himself and transmitted to succeeding generations by episcopal ordination" (p. 11). Various views of this basic concept exist. Catholics hold that "the very existence of the church depends upon an episcopally ordained ministry, and those who fail to acknowledge the latter are automatically excluded from the former" (p. 11).
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Some Anglicans lean towards a second view called "the argument from expediency." While they reject the exclusive claims of Catholics, they advocate it "in virtue of its continuity throughout the centuries and its manifest value as an organ of unity" (p. 12). Anderson (1965, p. 14) rejects the "argument from expediency," holding that "the ministry is based on something more significant than expediency. It grows out of . . . the Great Commission" (p. 14).

The third position on the ministry is outlined in the *Historic Episcopate* (ed. Kenneth M. Carey, 1954). This position argues that the "episcopacy belongs to the fullness of the church, without which Christians are not entering into the completeness of the heritage which it is God's purpose for them to enjoy" (cited by Clifford, 1961, p. 12).

The basis for the Jewish and Christian concepts of the presbyterate is found in the establishment of a college of 70 elders by Moses (Mohler, 1970, p. 2).

From the time of the Exodus, Yahweh had directed his people through Moses, his appointed one. However, when Moses complained that the responsibility of leading the people was too much for him, the Lord made this response to his complaint:

> Gather for me seventy men of the elders of Israel, whom you know to be the elders of the people and officers over them; and bring them to the tent of the meeting, and let them take their stand there with you. And I will come down and talk with you there, and I will take some of the spirit which is
upon you and put it upon them, and they shall bear the burden of the people with you, that you may not bear it yourself alone. (Numbers 11:16-17, RSV)

This pattern was maintained after the monarchy and the exile, and "by the time of the Roman occupation every Jewish community in Palestine and in the diaspora had its own sanhedrin of zeqēnim, elected by the people to administer the community affairs" (Mohler, 1970, p. 3). Although these Jewish presbyters of the Roman era were "ordained with a laying on of hands" (p. 3), no divine call is associated with their office. Nevertheless, they were considered to be men of certain authority within the community and fulfilled specific roles.

In the New Testament the "Christian ministry is first discipleship to the rabbi Jesus of Nazareth and then apostleship with the delegated authority of the master" (Mohler, 1970, p. 11). As Jesus sent out his disciples, he gave to them the power they needed to accomplish the tasks he had set out for them. They were given the power over unclean spirits, the power to heal and power to preach the gospel (Matt 10:1; Mark 6:7; Luke 9:1, 2). Later Paul was personally commissioned by the risen Christ as an apostle to preach the gospel (Gal 1:11-16; 1 Cor 15:8-10).

As the church has developed, it has recognized that God has continued to provide human leadership for his church. These individuals, while they are seen as
authorities within the church, do not have any advantage before God over other Christians.

Hanson clarifies that the ministry which Jesus established is not the kind of ministry which is practiced in Christian denominations today. Modern ministry generally consists of "officers appointed to fill official posts in the church who have themselves succeeded officers filling these posts before them and who will in course of time be succeeded by other officers who will fill their posts when they retire or leave or die" (Hanson, 1979, p. 8).

The available evidence seems to suggest that Jesus did not intend to establish a clergy above and separate from the rest of the church. Rather he appears to have called all believers to the work of the ministry he had defined for the church. Quite naturally, he endows these with the skills and talents necessary for the building up of the church. These endowments are called "spiritual gifts."

As noted earlier, Paul introduced the doctrine of spiritual gifts, which is, in effect, the doctrine of the ministry of the church. Never in his letters does he speak of an official clergy. He makes the point repeatedly that the gifts of ministry were given to all members of the body of Christ.

There are different kinds of gifts, but the same Spirit. There are different kinds of service, but the same Lord. . . . Now to each one the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good. To one there is given through the Spirit the message of wisdom, to another the message of
knowledge by means of the same Spirit, . . . All these are the work of one and the same Spirit, and He gives them to each one, just as He determines. (1 Cor 12:4-11, emphasis supplied)

As if he intends to clarify the group of which he is speaking, he "goes on to develop his famous image of Christians as the body of Christ, each member contributing his part for the benefit of the whole and himself sustained by the sympathy and common experience of the whole" (Hanson, 1979, p. 13). He then says:

Now you are the body of Christ and each one of you is a part of it. And in the church God has appointed first of all apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, also those having gifts of healing, those able to help others, those with gifts of administration, and those speaking in different kinds of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Do all work miracles? Do all have gifts of healing? Do all speak in tongues? Do all interpret? But eagerly desire the greater gifts. (vss. 27-31)

In Romans 12 Paul speaks further on his doctrine of ministry:

For by the grace given me I say to every one of you: Do not think of yourself more highly than you ought, but rather think of yourself with sober judgement, in accordance with the measure of faith God has given you. Just as each of us has one body with many members, and these members do not all have the same function, so in Christ we who are many form one body, and member belongs to all the others. We have different gifts, according to the grace given us. If a man's gift is prophesying, let him use it in proportion to his faith. If it is serving, let him serve; of it is teaching, let him teach; if it is encouraging, let him encourage; if it is contributing to the needs of others, let him give generously; if it is leadership, let him govern diligently; if it is showing mercy, let him do it cheerfully. (vss. 3-8)
Since Paul includes in this list ministries which it could not plausibly be said are the domain solely of official ministries, it is believed that he was speaking, in this passage and other similar ones, to the broader Christian family.

Among communions which accept the teaching of the priesthood of all believers, the practice of an official clergy is widespread. The clergy is viewed as having received a "call" from God. Along with that call the clergy is expected to have also received the appropriate gifts from God to dispense that "call." Paul's statement in 2 Tim 3:17 "That the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work" is loosely held to be especially aimed at the modern clergy.

Bridge (1974) holds that the Scriptures do not ignore the question of church leadership which would naturally include the idea of an official clergy. He writes:

Sometimes Scripture describes the gifts themselves (1 Corinthians 12:8-10) while at other times it lists the individuals who exercise the gifts (Ephesians 4:11). This . . . raises the issue of church government. (p. 34)

It would appear that Jesus Christ did not intend that his church be left without an identifiable body of leadership. Not only did he give gifts to the church; he first gave "gifted men" to the church (Baxter, 1983, p. 33, Bryant, 1973, p. 66, Walvoord, 1978, p. 164). While it is
true that no one is accorded any special privileges in the church, without a recognition of the role to be played by the clergy, the result would be chaos and confusion (Anderson, 1965 p. 14). Anderson further suggests that the clergy is a "divinely instituted office" (p. 13), and that the clergy of today's church is called in a manner similar to that by which the High Priest of ancient times was called. Anderson and Jones (1978) are of the view that clergy have

heard the call to assume special roles within local churches. They are the people who have been trained to give leadership to one of society's primary social institutions. . . . They are to be prophets, priests, and teachers. They have the responsibility of interpreting God's will for his people. (pp. 7, 8)

Today's clergyman is "uniquely endowed" (Cothen, 1981, p. 8) with gifts which would enable him to carry out his special functions within the church. He is seen as an overseer and in that capacity is expected to

Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers. Be shepherds of the church of God, which He bought with his own blood. (Acts 20:28)

**Spiritual Gifts**

**An Historical Background Study of Spiritual Gifts**

While it has been established that spiritual gifts are endowments by the Holy Spirit for the people of God, the modern Christian church did not place much emphasis on this important phenomenon until the 'glossolalia' experience
became widespread and forced the church to take note. Some individuals were skeptical concerning this manifestation, while practitioners claimed it as a gift from God. The resultant interest is well described by Purkiser (1975), who noted:

While Christians throughout the centuries have used spiritual gifts, it has only been in recent years that the church has given much attention to this aspect of its ministry of the Holy Spirit [and] we have been made more aware of the importance of spiritual gifts by the very confusion and misunderstanding that has grown up around them. (p. 16)

Gift of the Spirit and Spiritual Gifts

Two similar phrases occur in the New Testament between which difference should be made. Paul speaks of the "gift" of the Spirit (Acts 2:38; 10:45; 11:17); then he makes mention of certain "kinds of gifts" in 1 Cor 12:4. At the moment one receives salvation, he also receives the gift of the Holy Spirit. Merrill Unger (1978) is correct when he says:

The term "gift of the Spirit," therefore, does not refer to some experience subsequent to salvation but to salvation itself. Nor does the phrase refer to a gift to be received today. It was received over nineteen centuries ago at Pentecost and has been the permanent deposit of the church ever since and the heritage of each believer, the moment he trusts Christ and experiences salvation. (p. 135)

Baxter (1983) agrees and in support he quotes from Acts 19:2 where Paul makes inquiry as to the spiritual condition of "certain disciples" at Ephesus. Paul was not asking whether they had received the Holy Spirit since they believed, as
the King James Version translates the question.\(^1\) Modern translations are more correct when they render the text thus: "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" Paul was not trying to find out whether the brethren had received the Holy Spirit since their salvation. Rather he was trying to determine whether they had been saved or not. "If they had received 'the gift' they were saved; if they had not, they were not saved" (Baxter, 1983, p. 26).

Criswell (1967) makes the difference clear when he states that

the 'gift' (singular) is the indwelling of the Holy Spirit whereby He comes to take up residence in the heart of the believer the moment [he] accepts Christ as Saviour. . . . The 'gifts' (plural) are imparted to the saved by the Holy Spirit for service in the church. The child of God is to stir up, to kindle his gift and not to neglect it (2 Tim. 1:6). (p. 41)

The obvious conclusion is that spiritual gifts cannot be manifested in the life of an individual without the presence of the gift of the Holy Spirit in that person's life. The Holy Spirit is the one who makes the difference in the life of the believer. Without the Holy Spirit the believer is spiritually barren. He is, as Bryant notes, "the source of all other gifts" (1973, p. 68).

\(^1\)Marvin R. Vincent explains that: "The two verbs are in the aorist tense, and therefore denote instantaneous acts. The A.V. therefore gives an entirely wrong idea, as there is no question about what happened after believing; but the question relates to what occurred when they believed" (1975, p. 551).
Fruit of the Spirit and Spiritual Gifts

It is also necessary to clarify the difference between the "fruit of the Spirit" mentioned in Gal 5:22,23 and "spiritual gifts." The difference, as Sanders (1979) puts it, is that

A gift may be imparted from without, and may remain separate and distinct. Fruit, however, is not an extraneous addition to a tree, but the issue of its life, and is produced from within. (p. 10)

Fife (1978) is in agreement with Sanders but presents his case in a slightly differently way. He says:

Fruit is a product of life, and it is only as the life-giving power of the Holy Spirit lives fully in us that genuine fruit will appear in our lives. This process of fruit-bearing also takes time. A spiritual gift may make its presence known immediately, but fruit bearing cannot be hurried. (p. 118)

In the same sense Owen (1971) believes that

Although God does not ordinarily bestow [spiritual gifts] on flagitious persons, nor continue them with such as after the reception of them become flagitious, yet they may be in those who are unrenewed. . . . (p. 849)

Thus, it can be concluded that the presence of the "fruit of the Spirit" is a better indicator of spiritual maturity than is the exercise of any or all of the gifts of the Spirit (Baxter, 1983; Fife, 1978; Sweeting, 1962). As Bridge (1974) puts it:

Holiness and maturity may often be associated with the exercise of gifts, but God may sometimes display His sovereignty and grace by endowing quite young and inexperienced Christians with quite startling gifts for a particular purpose. (p. 22)
Natural Talents and Spiritual Gifts

The literature reveals differing views on the relationship between natural talents and spiritual gifts. Some scholars believe that spiritual gifts represent a supernatural phenomenon and as a result cannot be associated with natural talents (Barth, 1969; Baxter, 1983; Bryant, 1973; Flynn, 1974; Hay, 1947; Hesselgrave, 1980; Howard, 1973; Ironside, 1950; Owen, 1971; Pentecost, 1970; Simpson, 1896). The exercise of a spiritual gift does not depend on the presence or absence of any natural talent in the individual before conversion. Simpson (1896) puts the case this way:

'It is not splendid talent, it is not deep culture, that constitute efficiency in the body of Christ, it is simply and absolutely the power of the Holy Spirit. It is a divine ministry and must have a divine equipment.' (p. 123)

On the other side is the view that spiritual gifts are the same as natural talents. At conversion these natural talents are redirected and intensified and become the individual's spiritual gifts (Barnette, 1965; Griffiths, 1979; Lindsell, 1975; Mains, 1971; Naden, et al, 1982; Schweizer, 1961; Stott, 1964). Stott poses the question:

'Is it not apriori unlikely that God will give a spiritual gift of teaching to a believer who in preconversion days could not teach for taffy?' (p. 93)

Mains (1971) suggests that it is not all the Spirit's doing. He believes that to a great extent the transformation from
natural talent to spiritual gift depends on the believer. He says:

In those areas where I have natural abilities, such as a facility for public speaking, the difference between their being talents or gifts of the Holy Spirit is found in my attitude. If I recognize the talent as from God, and in prayer and continual dedication commit it to Him to be used in ministry in a special way, it becomes a gift of the Holy Spirit with supernatural expression. The proof of this is seen in the gradual way God increases this gift for His service. (p. 62)

Listing and Classification of Spiritual Gifts

There is no consensus among scholars regarding the listing and classification of spiritual gifts. Lists of spiritual gifts are given in four places in the New Testament: 1 Cor 12:8 - 10; 1 Cor 12:28; Rom 12:6 - 8; Eph 4:11. Due to overlap in these lists and other singular mentions in other parts of the New Testament, scholars have come up with different lists. Many suggest that between 20 and 27 gifts are identifiable (Baxter, 1983; Laurentin, 1978; Naden, et al, 1982; Wagner, 1979; Wallenkampf, 1978). There are others who suggest smaller numbers of gifts. Walvoord (1978, p. 168) and McRae (1976, p. 87) have listed 16; and Gangel, 18 (1975, p. 11).

While it is generally agreed that the long list of gifts can be divided into fewer typical groupings (Criswell, 1967; Sanders, 1979; Stover, 1962), there is not the same agreement on the identity of the groupings. Sanders speaks of gifts which "qualify their possessors for the ministry of
the Word," and "gifts which equip their possessors to render services of a practical value" (p. 110). Criswell identifies his classifications as Charismatic gifts and Ministering gifts which he subdivides into gifts for: (1) Enlightenment of Mind, (2) Sympathy of Heart, (3) Practical Administration, and (4) Sublimity of Faith (1967, pp. 59-74). Baxter also identifies two broad divisions which he calls fulfilled and fulfilling gifts. Each of these divisions is sub-divided into three groups: servant-gifts, service-gifts and sign-gifts (1983, p. 84). Kinghorn prefers a three-fold division: enabling gifts, serving gifts, and the gifts of tongues and the interpretation of tongues (1976, p. 41).

This study uses the New Spiritual Gifts Inventory (Naden, 1988) which measures five clusters from the 19 gifts which were used in The Spiritual Gifts Inventory (Naden & Cruise, 1981). (The gift of martyrdom is not included in any of the five clusters). Naden recognizes a sixth cluster--the Sign gifts cluster. This cluster is not included in the instrument because "these gifts are so obvious that those who are gifted in these ways hardly need the help of an instrument to recognize that fact" (Naden, 1988, p. 8). The five clusters measured are the Teacher cluster, the Shepherd/Evangelist cluster, the Helper cluster, the Counselor cluster, and the Leader cluster, which are comprised of the following gifts: Teacher--
knowledge, teaching; Shepherd/Evangelist--apostleship, evangelism, mission service, pastoring, prophecy; Helper--giving, helps, hospitality, intercession, mercy; Counselor--discernment, exhortation, wisdom; Leader--administration, faith, leadership.

The Discovery of Spiritual Gifts

The Apostle Paul teaches, in 1 Cor 12:11, that the Holy Spirit gives spiritual gifts to "each one, just as He determines." Phoon (1986) cites Webb (1883) as contending that the Holy Spirit can teach what these special gifts are and aid in their development (p. 41). While he agrees that God probably expects believers to be aware of the gifts which have been given to them, Pentecost (1970) warns that Spiritual gifts are not to be sought by man. A man does not receive a spiritual gift because he prayed for it, because he sought, coveted it, trained for it. Spiritual gifts are a sovereign bestowal apart from the will or the inclination of the individual. (p. 169)

Edgar is also cautious. He believes that

The present emphasis on specific gifts, knowing one's gift, and utilizing it in specific ministries may well go beyond the proper Biblical emphasis. (p. 12)

This view is also shared by Gene Getz (1976) who at first emphasized the discovery of spiritual gifts but later became convinced that there is no exhortation in any of the three gift chapters [1 Cor 12, Rom 12, and Eph 4] for Christians to "look for or try to discover their spiritual gift or gifts" (p. 9).
Notwithstanding these arguments, the position is taken by many scholars (Baxter, 1983; Criswell, 1967; Fife, 1978; O'Connor, 1971; Owen, 1971; Pentecost, 1970; Schramm, 1982; Wagner, 1979) that gift discovery is crucial to the life of the church and of the Christian. It is only as the believer becomes aware of the presence of his gift that he desires to exercise it in ministry.

Baxter has proposed six steps which should aid the believer in discovering his gift or cluster of gifts: (1) Put the Lord first in your life; (2) put emphasis on God's will for your life; (3) know the Scriptures; (4) ask God to reveal His particular gifts to you; (5) expect confirmation from others; (6) and be prepared to face responsibility (pp. 67-74).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter is concerned with the nature of the study, the description of the population and the sample, the instrumentation, the procedure, and the statistical analyses utilized.

Type of Study

Since the purpose of the study was to investigate differences between groups and to determine the relationship between a profile of demographic variables and a profile of the gift clusters, the type of study indicated was a multivariate analysis of variance and discriminant-analysis research design, and a canonical correlation design. The five scores derived from the SGI were used as the dependent variables for the analysis of variance design.

Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in Andrews University during the winter quarter of the 1988-1989 school year.
The required sample size was based on the recommendation by Maurice Kendall to have "at least ten times as many observations as variables (1975)." This recommendation is also supported by other multivariate analysts like Gorsuch (1983). Although there are 20 items in the NSGI, the analysis is to be conducted on the five summative scores indicated by the instructions which are a part of the instrument. Consequently, the study is concerned with these five variables along with four demographic variables which are the independent variables of the study: Level of academic achievement, the school in which the subject is enrolled, the subject's gender, and the subject's age, resulting in a total of nine variables. The following formula yields 90 subjects:

\[(5 + 4) \times 10 = 90.\]

Multivariate analysis is based on the correlations between the variables being analyzed, and Guertin (1970) suggests that an N of 200 is the minimum acceptable to give reliable correlation coefficients. In order to be more confident of the stability of the correlation matrix and obtain more reliable results a larger sample size was sought. Based on these figures it was planned to sample at least 300 individuals.
Instrumentation

As was noted in Chapter 2 the New Spiritual Gifts Inventory measures scores on five gift clusters based on the 19 gifts measured in the earlier Spiritual Gifts Inventory. The original instrument consisted of 57 inventory statements on three pages and could be completed in approximately 15 minutes (Phoon, 1986, p. 63). The New Spiritual Gifts Inventory is also self-scoring, but it consists of only 20 statements on two pages and can be completed in approximately 5 minutes. The Spiritual Gifts Inventory reports test-retest group reliability coefficients for the 19 original gifts ranging from .664 to .878 (Naden, Cruise, and Cash, 1981, p. 18). This study represents the first time the NSGI is being used in a research study and no validity nor reliability data are available for it.

Procedures for Collecting Data

On February 21, 1989, a letter was sent to the Andrews University Human Subjects Review board requesting permission to conduct the research project among the students of the University and requesting that the project be treated as no risk research; therefore, it was not subject to review (see Appendix D). Shortly thereafter a letter was sent to the instructors of 50 classes which had been randomly selected from the listing of the classes being offered during the winter season. This letter (see Appendix
D) requested permission to conduct the study in the selected classes. Fifty classes were chosen to make allowances for overlap due to a student being enrolled in several classes, and 10 classes were selected from each of the five schools represented in the *Schedule of Classes*. The instrument was administered in the 24 classes for which permission was granted to conduct the survey, with adequate representation of the five schools of the University. The distribution is shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**

**SUMMARY OF CLASSES SAMPLED IN STUDY BY SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>335</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few days later the researcher personally administered the instruments in the classes for which permission had been granted. Data collection was carried out over a two-week period.
Attached to the New Spiritual Gifts Inventory was a demographic data form which requested information concerning the school in which the respondent was registered, academic status, gender, and age range. To ensure strict anonymity, names were not requested.

**Hypotheses and Statistical Analysis**

The hypotheses tested in this study are here stated in null form.

1. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by academic classification.

2. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between Seminary students and students in the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Technology, the School of Business, and the School of Education.

3. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between males and females.

4. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by age.

5. There is no significant relationship between spiritual gift distribution and a linear combination of academic classification, school of enrollment, gender, and age.
Statistical treatment of the data was carried out with SPSS/PC+ and BMDP statistical software:

1. **BMDP6M**— was used to perform canonical correlation analysis between the demographic variables and the five gift clusters to determine whether any significant correlation existed between the two sets of variables. This analysis was used to perform the tests of significance on hypothesis 5.

2. **SPSS MANOVA AND DSCRIMINANT**— was used to perform multivariate analysis of variance and discriminant analysis between the demographic variables and the five gift clusters to ascertain if there were any significant differences in each of the demographic variables on the gift cluster variables. This analysis was used to perform the tests of significance on hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4.

As a first step towards performing the required statistical analyses, five new variables were generated utilizing the summative instructions which come with the New Spiritual Gifts Inventory:

1. Teacher cluster
2. Shepherd/Evangelist cluster
3. Helper cluster
4. Counselor cluster
5. Leader cluster.

The final demographic question in the instrument was not used in any of the analyses due to inadequate and
doubtful responses. A few of the items of the Inventory were left blank by the respondents, and after consultation with the author of the instrument these items were given a neutral score of 3.

Summary

Chapter 3 has presented the research design and methodology of a comparative study between students in the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary and students in the other schools of Andrews University, based on the *New Spiritual Gifts Inventory*. A description of the population/sample was presented and instrumentation, procedures for selecting the sample, gathering the data, and conducting the statistical analyses were also explained.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter reports the results of the statistical analyses conducted on the data collected. The appropriate statistical analyses are presented for each of the hypotheses tested in order.

Subjects Used in This Study

The subjects used in this study were students at the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary and students in the other schools of Andrews University enrolled during the 1988-89 winter quarter. The survey instrument, the New Spiritual Gift Inventory, with the demographic data sheet attached, was administered in 24 classes and yielded 335 responses. Eleven subjects did not give complete information for the Inventory, but they were left in the data file as explained in Chapter 3. Table 2 represents the percentage distribution of the responses, based on the information received from the demographic variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>43.76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>32.33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21 years</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 29 years</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39 years</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more complete breakdown of the sample distribution is found in Appendix A.

**Analysis of Data and Testing of Hypotheses**

The New Spiritual Gifts Inventory yields five scores for each respondent, one for each of the gift clusters: the Teacher cluster, the Shepherd/Evangelist cluster, the Helper cluster, the Counselor cluster, and the Leader cluster. All statistical analyses were performed using these variable transformations.
All hypotheses were tested using an alpha level of 0.05. Only the first significant discriminant functions (when there were two) were interpreted since other functions proved difficult to interpret.

Multivariate Analysis of Variance

To test Hypotheses 1 to 4, the relationship between the four demographic variables and the combined gift clusters, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) test was conducted using a full factorial design. MANOVA investigates the difference between groups on a number of dependent variables. The SPSS program uses three tests of significance to test the differences between the group means: (1) Pillai's test of significance, (2) Hotelling's test of significance, and (3) Wilk's test of significance. All the tests gave equivalent results, but only the results of Hotelling's test are reported.

Due to the presence of several empty cells (a function of the design), no test for significant interaction was conducted. All the effects were main effects. Table 3 presents the results of the analysis for each effect. Only the effects due to school, gender and age show significant difference.

Discriminant Analysis

Discriminant analysis was performed to identify the particular difference for effects where the MANOVA gave
significant results and to test hypotheses 1 to 4 individually.

In determining how to interpret the results of the discriminant analysis tests, the researcher decided that only the variables which had standard discriminant function coefficients which were at least one half as large as the largest coefficient for the function under consideration would be included. Group means and standard deviations are reported in the Appendix B.

### TABLE 3

**HOTELLING'S TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>T-squared Value</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Signif.(F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.1095</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>20,986</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>.2868</td>
<td>3.535</td>
<td>20,986</td>
<td>.000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.0604</td>
<td>2.997</td>
<td>5,248</td>
<td>.012 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.1187</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>15,740</td>
<td>.016 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates significant difference at .05 level)

### Hypothesis 1

There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by academic classification.

Based on results shown in Table 3 the null hypothesis is retained. No linear combination of the
spiritual gifts clusters significantly discriminates solely by academic classification.

**Hypothesis 2**

There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between Seminary students and students in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Technology, the School of Business, and the School of Education.

The test of significance for the single discriminant function displayed in Table 4 yielded a chi-squared of 247.472 with 20 degrees of freedom. This chi-squared is significant with $p < .0001$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by age. A person who scores high on this function tends to be strong on the Teacher gifts cluster.

On the basis of the value of the function at the group centroids reported in Table 5 someone from the Seminary ranks above one from the School of Education. The other Schools are positioned lower on the scale.

**Hypothesis 3**

There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between males and females.
TABLE 4
STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS
OF SPIRITUAL GIFT CLUSTERS WHICH DISCRIMINATE
BETWEEN GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Cluster</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1.0688 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>.0213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>-.2704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>-.1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>.0209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates cluster(s) which will be interpreted)

TABLE 5
DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION EVALUATED AT GROUP MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Function Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>-.6328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>-1.1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>-.9880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.0548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>1.3878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The test of significance for the single discriminant function displayed in Table 6 yielded a chi-squared of 43.865 with 5 degrees of freedom. This chi-squared is significant with \( p < .0001 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by gender. One who scores high on this function tends to be very strong on the Teacher cluster and very weak on the Helper cluster.

On the basis of the value of the function at the group centroids reported in Table 7 males rank above females.

**Hypothesis 4**

There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by age.

The test of significance for the first discriminant function yielded a chi-squared of 126.392 with 15 degrees of freedom. This chi-squared is significant with \( p < .0001 \).

The second function yielded a chi-squared of 17.065 with 8 degrees of freedom. This chi-squared is significant with \( p < .05 \). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by age. The results are displayed in Table 8.
TABLE 6

STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS
OF SPIRITUAL GIFT CLUSTERS WHICH DISCRIMINATE
BETWEEN GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Cluster</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.9678 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>-.1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>-.7010 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>.0664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>.2571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates cluster(s) which will be interpreted)

TABLE 7

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION EVALUATED AT GROUP MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Function Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.6328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-1.1248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS OF SPIRITUAL GIFT CLUSTERS WHICH DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gift Cluster</th>
<th>1st Fcn Coefficient</th>
<th>2nd Fcn Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.9196 *</td>
<td>-1.0278 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>.1027</td>
<td>1.3513 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>-.3013</td>
<td>-.0647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>.0906</td>
<td>-.2931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>.1100</td>
<td>.4284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates cluster(s) which will be interpreted)

### TABLE 9

DISCRIMINANT FUNCTIONS EVALUATED AT GROUP MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1st Fcn Value</th>
<th>2nd Fcn Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 21</td>
<td>-.8118</td>
<td>.1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 29</td>
<td>.0159</td>
<td>-.2502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>.8608</td>
<td>.1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>.9571</td>
<td>.2787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
person who scores high on the first function tends to be strong on the Teacher cluster.

On the basis of the value of the first function at the group centroids reported in Table 9 the age groups are ranked in order, with the older ones at the top of the scale and the younger at the bottom. The second function is not interpreted due to difficulty of clear interpretation.

Discussion and Summary

The test of the four null hypotheses by Multivariate Analysis of Variance and Discriminant Analysis resulted in Hypothesis 1 being retained and Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 being rejected. Seminarians are more likely to be strong on the Teacher gifts cluster than individuals from the School of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and the College of Technology. Males are stronger on the Teacher gifts cluster and weaker on the Helper gifts cluster than are females. Older individuals tend to be stronger on the Teacher gifts cluster than are younger individuals.

Hypothesis 5

There is no significant relationship between spiritual gift distribution and a linear combination of academic classification, school of enrollment, gender and age.
Hypothesis 5 was tested with canonical correlation analysis, which analyzed the data to determine the correlation which existed between the set of four demographic variables and the five spiritual gift clusters. Since canonical analysis requires at least ordinal measurement the nominal variable, School, was transformed into four dummy variables to account for the five values of that variable.

Tables 10 and 11 present the results of the canonical correlation analysis. Bartlett's test of significance indicates two significant canonical functions. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant relationship between spiritual gifts distribution and a linear combination of academic classification, school of enrollment, gender and age.

Including only those variables with coefficients which are at least one half as large as the largest coefficient for that function, the interpretation of the functions is as follows: On the first function, strength on the Teacher and Shepherd/Evangelist gifts clusters are associated with older graduate students, who are more likely to be in the Seminary.

On the second function, strength on the Helper and Shepherd/Evangelist gifts clusters is associated with female students of lower academic classification (freshmen or sophomores) who are not in the School of Business.
### TABLE 10
CANONICAL CORRELATION AND BARTLETT'S TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Chi-Squared</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Signif</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5504</td>
<td>.7419</td>
<td>299.14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.0000 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0921</td>
<td>.3035</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.0027 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0311</td>
<td>.1763</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.2993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0167</td>
<td>.1294</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.4935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0064</td>
<td>.0815</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates significant canonical correlation)

### TABLE 11
CANONICAL CORRELATION OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND SGI VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1st Function</th>
<th>2nd Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Set</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>.812 *</td>
<td>-.296 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>-.356</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>-.463 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>.921 *</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.442</td>
<td>.522 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.684 *</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Set</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>.970 *</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>.665 *</td>
<td>.590 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.710 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* indicates variables included in the interpretation)
Discussion and Summary

The significant canonical correlation between the demographic variables and the NSGI clusters indicates that a significant relationship exists between the two sets of variables. Spiritual gifts distribution appears to be associated with one's demographic profile.

General Summary

Chapter 4 has presented the results of statistical analyses of the data relevant to the discrimination between sexes, academic standing, academic area of concentration, and age, and the correlation between these variables and the spiritual gifts distribution among Andrews University students. These results indicate that there are significant differences between the groups of students analyzed.

Individually, school, gender, and age are significantly related to the distribution of spiritual gifts among the students. However, academic level of achievement does not appear to significantly affect the distribution of spiritual gifts.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is organized into three sections. The first section contains a brief summary of the problem, methods, and findings of the study. The second is a discussion of the results of the study. Based on the findings, the conclusions and recommendations are given in the final section.

Summary

Statement of the Problem

Among Christians the issue of spiritual gifts is an important one. It touches upon the role of the Holy Spirit in planning the growth of the church. Christians generally believe that God, through the agency of the Holy Spirit, has given to selected believers particular gifts which are to be used in the ministry of the church. It is also believed that there is a need for professional clergy in the church, and that the Holy Spirit has equipped these individuals with special gifts which enable them to dispense their responsibilities.
The purpose of this research was to determine how the distribution of spiritual gifts among Seminary students, who represent the official ministry of the church, compares with the distribution of spiritual gifts among students in four other Schools of Andrews University: Arts and Sciences, Business, Technology, and Education, who represent the lay membership. A further purpose was to determine whether a significant relationship existed between the demographic profile of students and their allocation of spiritual gifts.

The following research questions formed the basis of this study:

1. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among Andrews University students related to the school in which they are enrolled?
2. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among Andrews University students related to their level of academic attainment?
3. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among Andrews University students related to their gender?
4. Is the distribution of spiritual gifts among Andrews University students related to their age?

To answer these questions, the following null hypotheses were posed:

1. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by academic classification.
2. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between Seminary students and students in the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Technology, the School of Business, and the School of Education.

3. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between males and females.

4. There is no linear combination of the spiritual gifts clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by age.

5. There is no significant relationship between spiritual gift distribution and a linear combination of academic classification, school of enrollment, gender, and age.

Methodology

An ex-post facto design was used to assess the relationship between five spiritual gift clusters as measured by the New Spiritual Gift Inventory and the following demographic variables: school of enrollment, academic level, gender, and age.

The population for this study consisted of all students taking classes on the campus of Andrews University during the 1988-89 winter quarter. A stratified random sample of 50 classes was selected for this study. Twenty-four classes participated in the survey, yielding 335
responses. The data from the survey were entered into a data file for subsequent statistical analysis and individual cases could not be identified other than by the demographic information requested.

Multivariate analysis of variance analysis was used to test Hypotheses 1 to 4. Since the null hypotheses were rejected, Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 were further subjected to discriminant analysis to identify the differences. Hypothesis 5 was tested by canonical correlation analysis.

Findings of the Study

Hypothesis 1

There is no linear combination of the spiritual gift clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by academic level.

This hypothesis was retained. It was not necessary to interpret the discriminant functions.

Hypothesis 2

There is a linear combination of the spiritual gift clusters which discriminates between Seminary students and students in the College of Arts & Sciences, the College of Technology, the School of Business, and the School of Education.

A comparison of the groups indicated that Seminary students are stronger on the Teacher gifts cluster than students from the School of Education. The other Schools
are lower on that scale. It is interesting to note that the Shepherd/Evangelist gifts cluster, which includes all the gifts one would naturally associate with clergy, is not more dominant in Seminary students than students in the other Schools.

Hypothesis 3

There is a linear combination of the spiritual gift clusters which discriminates between males and females.

A comparison of the groups indicated that males are stronger on the Teacher cluster and weaker on the Helper cluster than are females, even though more females than males choose teaching as a vocation. This must be viewed in light of the fact that the NSGI measures spiritual teaching rather than vocational teaching, and that the Seminary sample was almost exclusively male. On the other hand it would appear that the helping ministries of the church are presently being served more by women.

Hypothesis 4

There is a linear combination of the spiritual gift clusters which discriminates between groups of students classified by age.

A comparison of the groups indicated that older students are stronger on the Teacher gifts cluster than younger students. It seems plausible that this result
illustrates the fact that the gifts develop as time progresses.

**Hypothesis 5**

There is a significant relationship between a linear combination of the demographic variables and spiritual gifts cluster distribution.

Canonical correlation analysis revealed that two significant functions exist between the two sets of variables. The first function indicated that strength on the Teacher and Shepherd/Evangelist gifts clusters are associated with students from the Seminary. The second function indicated that strength on the Helper and Shepherd/Evangelist gifts clusters is associated with female students on the lower levels of the academic scale (freshmen and sophomores) who are not in the School of Business. It would be worthwhile to investigate the implication that more educated women do not perceive themselves as being so involved in the helping and nurturing ministries.

**Conclusions**

From the examination of the above findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Distribution of spiritual gifts is not related to one's level of academic achievement when considered separately.
2. Students from the Seminary and the School of Education are stronger on the Teacher gifts cluster than students from the other Schools of the University, but of the two, unpredictably, seminarians rank higher. This perhaps supports the view that "pastors and teachers" mentioned by Paul in Eph 4:11 is a compound gift -- pastors who teach (Bridge, 1974, p. 47; McRae, 1976, p. 59; Walvoord, 1978, p. 170). In view of the fact that Education students rank behind Seminary students, it should be noted that the Inventory measures this cluster as spiritual teaching rather than vocational teaching. Thus, this does not disregard the influence of training in the area of Education. It should be noted that students in the School of Education ranked above students in the other Schools who tended to be on the same level on the scale.

3. Males are stronger on the Teacher gifts cluster than are females. The presence of the predominantly male Seminary sample could possibly account for this difference. However, it must be borne in mind that the Inventory measures spiritual teaching which does not necessarily correlate with vocational teaching. Females are stronger on the Helper gifts cluster than are males, but on the other gifts clusters there is apparently no significant difference between genders except for the canonical correlation. We find that males tend to combine the Teacher and
Shepherd/Evangelist clusters while females combine the Helper and Shepherd/Evangelist clusters.

4. Older persons are stronger on the Teacher gifts cluster than are younger persons. The other gift clusters do not discriminate on the basis of age.

5. The Teacher and Shepherd/Evangelist gifts clusters are associated with older students from the Seminary. The association of the Teacher and Shepherd/Evangelist combination with the Seminary sample is theoretically expected. The age factor may support the concept of gift development.

6. The Counselor and Leader gifts clusters do not discriminate between any of the groups. When studied separately no group of believers has any greater apportionment of these clusters than the others.

Discussion and Implications

The following implications are supported by the findings of this study:

1. Academic level can never be used as a guide in determining the usefulness of any individual in the Christian church. Any gift can be given to any believer notwithstanding his education. This supports the view that there is not a high relationship between academic qualifications and spiritual gifts. One may receive a gift which he may not appear to be academically qualified to hold.
2. The students at the Seminary tend to be better equipped to teach the gospel than to evangelize. This may be due to the fact that the undergraduate curriculum and the Seminary curriculum do not help students develop their gift of evangelism. These results suggest that seminarians can be counted on to securely ground the membership in the doctrines and truths of the church, even if they may not be very strong in the work of evangelism. The findings also suggest that the popular term, pastor/evangelist, which implies pastors should have the abilities both to teach and to evangelize, does not apply to this Seminary sample.

3. Males are more oriented toward the Teacher gifts cluster and less oriented than females to the Helper gifts cluster. This findings tends to indicate that the Teacher cluster is essentially "male," while the Helper cluster is essentially "female." Considering the finding that seminarians are strong on the Teacher cluster one must consider the probability that the presence of a predominantly male seminary sample has biased the results.

4. Generally, older individuals are stronger on the Teacher cluster than younger individuals. Since the instrument reflects individuals' appraisal of themselves, this difference may be due to experience rather than age.

5. Gifts in the Counselor and Leader gifts clusters seem to be evenly distributed among all groups. One implication for the church is that it is not necessarily a
good approach to expect the pastor to bear the administrative burden, since seminarians do not exhibit any greater apportionment of the Leader gifts cluster than other groups of students. Strength on the Shepherd/Evangelist cluster should not be associated with strength in the Leader cluster. The church should not always look towards its clergy to fill administrative positions.

This also supports the present practice in some churches where other individuals apart from the pastor are encouraged to get involved in personal counseling of members who need it.

**Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made:

**For Practice**

1. Establish an atmosphere in the churches in which members of lesser academic achievement are encouraged to utilize their several gifts in the ministry of the church.

2. Clergy should recognize that the authority to teach and guide does not necessarily mean that they should attempt to lead out in all areas of church life.

3. Place emphasis not only on a few special gifts, but encourage all members to discover the gifts which have been given to them by the Holy Spirit and provide them the
opportunity to utilize them in the broader ministry of the church.

For Research

1. Conduct a study with a stratified random sample of only graduate-level students. This would reduce the incidence of empty cells and permit an investigation of the interaction effects. It would also clarify the differences attributed to age and gender.

2. Conduct this study with a much larger sample to verify the results of this study.
APPENDIX A

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS
IN THE SAMPLE
### Legend:
- **Fresh**: Freshmen
- **Sopho**: Sophomores
- **Junior**: Juniors
- **Senior**: Seniors
- **Grad**: Graduates
- **NR**: No response

- **Under 21**: Less than 21 years of age
- **21 to 29**: Older than 20 and less than 30 years of age
- **30 to 39**: Older than 29 and less than 40 years of age
- **40 plus**: Older than 39 years of age

#### TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO GENDER AND CLASS STANDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Fresh</th>
<th>Sopho</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO CLASS STANDING AND SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Fresh</th>
<th>Sopho</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Grad</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 14
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO GENDER AND SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 15
**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO GENDER AND AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21 to 29</th>
<th>30 to 39</th>
<th>40 plus</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 16
**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO CLASS AND AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21 to 29</th>
<th>30 to 39</th>
<th>40 plus</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td>21 to 29</td>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>40 plus</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE SAMPLES
### TABLE 18
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE TOTAL SCHOOL SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>12.006</td>
<td>5.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>11.417</td>
<td>3.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>14.492</td>
<td>2.988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>14.081</td>
<td>3.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>14.934</td>
<td>3.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 19
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE ARTS & SCIENCES SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.884</td>
<td>4.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.512</td>
<td>3.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td>3.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14.035</td>
<td>3.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14.221</td>
<td>3.348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 20
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE BUSINESS SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>3.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.824</td>
<td>3.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.853</td>
<td>2.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.853</td>
<td>2.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.118</td>
<td>3.043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 21
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE TECHNOLOGY SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>8.492</td>
<td>4.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9.509</td>
<td>3.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.136</td>
<td>2.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.271</td>
<td>3.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.627</td>
<td>3.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 22
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES OF THE EDUCATION SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.356</td>
<td>4.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.667</td>
<td>3.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>2.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.156</td>
<td>3.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.867</td>
<td>3.094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 23
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES OF THE SEMINARY SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16.776</td>
<td>2.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.916</td>
<td>2.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14.673</td>
<td>3.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14.608</td>
<td>2.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>16.196</td>
<td>2.186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
### TABLE 24
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE TOTAL GENDER SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>11.969</td>
<td>5.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>11.362</td>
<td>3.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>14.466</td>
<td>2.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>14.052</td>
<td>3.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>14.926</td>
<td>3.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 25
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE MALE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>13.014</td>
<td>5.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>11.735</td>
<td>3.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>14.202</td>
<td>2.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>14.173</td>
<td>2.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>15.279</td>
<td>3.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 26

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES OF THE FEMALE SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10.127</td>
<td>4.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10.703</td>
<td>3.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14.932</td>
<td>3.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>13.839</td>
<td>3.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>14.305</td>
<td>3.483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 27

**MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES OF THE TOTAL AGE SAMPLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>12.040</td>
<td>5.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>11.423</td>
<td>3.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>14.495</td>
<td>2.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>14.100</td>
<td>3.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>14.976</td>
<td>3.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 28
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE LESS THAN 21 YEARS SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8.625</td>
<td>3.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.969</td>
<td>3.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14.385</td>
<td>2.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>13.375</td>
<td>3.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14.073</td>
<td>3.634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 29
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES
OF THE 21 TO 29 YEARS SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12.122</td>
<td>4.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.892</td>
<td>3.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>14.277</td>
<td>2.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>14.101</td>
<td>2.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>14.750</td>
<td>3.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 30
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES OF THE 30 TO 39 SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.617</td>
<td>3.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.850</td>
<td>3.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.850</td>
<td>3.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14.783</td>
<td>2.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.217</td>
<td>2.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 31
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE GIFT SCORES OF THE 40 YEARS AND OVER SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.080</td>
<td>3.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.320</td>
<td>2.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helper</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.360</td>
<td>3.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsel</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.240</td>
<td>2.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.800</td>
<td>2.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT USED IN DATA COLLECTION
SPIRITUAL GIFTS STUDY DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FORM
---------------------------------------------
Please check all which apply to you!

STATUS:
--------
Freshman [ ]
Sophomore [ ]
Junior [ ]
Senior [ ]
Graduate [ ]
Seminary [ ]

SCHOOL:
--------
Arts and Science [ ]
Business [ ]
Technology [ ]
Education [ ]

GENDER:
-------
Male [ ]
Female [ ]

AGE AT LAST BIRTHDAY:
Less than 21 [ ]
21 to 29 [ ]
30 to 39 [ ]
40 and over [ ]

INSTRUCTIONS
-------------

The following 20 questions are part of a new research instrument developed at Andrews University. It is being used as part of a Master's Degree research project. Your assistance is highly valued.

Read each question below, then circle the numeral which indicates the degree to which it has been true or false in your life:

If it is ALWAYS FALSE, circle 1
If it is USUALLY FALSE, circle 2
If it is OCCASIONALLY FALSE OR TRUE, circle 3
If it is USUALLY TRUE, circle 4
If it is ALWAYS TRUE, circle 5
If you are undecided circle 1.

THIS SECTION FOR GRADUATE AND SEMINARY STUDENTS
How many quarters of study have you completed?
## The 20 Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. I greatly enjoy teaching a Bible class for church members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. I like to ask people to give their hearts to the Lord Jesus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. When I meet people who need &quot;a helping hand&quot; I help them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. When I counsel people in trouble they tell me they feel comforted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. When I'm leading out, I don't shrink from making the tough decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. I enjoy studying as I prepare to teach a Bible class for church members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. I look for people who need transportation to church and arrange it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. When I meet people in need, I reach out spontaneously to help them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. When I counsel people, I can predict the results of their various options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. When I lead out, I don't hesitate to delegate responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. When I teach a church Bible class, the members tell me I make the Scriptures plain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. I spend much time praying for people who especially need God's help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. I go out of my way to help the handicapped.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. When I counsel people, I can make clear their options.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. I bring order to complex organizational problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. When I teach a Bible class at church, members tell me I draw them closer to Jesus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Church members count on me to make visitors feel welcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. I don't hesitate to give to people who can't provide for themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. When people in trouble seek my counsel, I can understand the reasons for their problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. As a leader, I consider my integrity is more important than popularity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Copyright © 1998, N. associates, Berrien Springs, MI 49103
Dear Sir,

This letter is to request approval for a research project to be conducted on the campus of Andrews University. The study is described in the attached Research Protocol. I am confident that this survey meets the review exemption requirements of the Andrews University Human Subjects Review Board as set out in the November 1987 printing of the Board's manual, Section G, page 5, and I hereby request such exemption.

Yours truly

Darius Lecointe
Masters Degree Candidate
Research and Statistical Methodology
School of Education
This research project is being undertaken as part of the requirements for the Master's Degree in Research and Statistical Methodology in the School of Education.

My research proposal has been approved by my faculty advisor, Dr. Jerome Thayer. The purpose of the study is to compare the spiritual gift factor structure of students at the Seventh-day Adventist Seminary and that of students in other schools at Andrews University. The instrument I intend to use is the Spiritual Gifts Inventory developed by Dr. Roy Naden and Dr. Robert Cruise, both of whom are on the faculty of Andrews University, along with a demographic data sheet.

Subjects for the survey will be part of a random cluster sample from the Andrews University Class Schedule, vol. 77, no. 2, 1988-1989. Instructors for the selected classes will be requested to give their permission for the instrument to be administered (or distributed) in their classes. This method assures anonymity since no identification marks will need to be placed on the instruments.

This instrument has been administered on the campus before and in view of the nature of the study and the areas it covers, I believe that the decision by a student to accept the instrument and fill it can serve in the stead of a formal written informed consent form.
February 21, 1989

Dear Instructor,

As part of a research project to meet the requirements for the Master's Degree, your class "F1" has been randomly selected as a sample unit from the Andrews University Schedule of Classes, 1988-1989.

I am requesting your kind permission to come to your class, before the quarter ends, on a day selected by you to administer the instrument for the research project. The instrument is the Spiritual Gifts Inventory, developed by Drs. Roy Naden and Robert Cruise of Andrews University, along with a brief demographic data sheet. The instrument has only 20 items and less than fifteen minutes are required to complete both forms. I believe it would be advantageous to have the instrument administered during part of one class session.

I will contact you on Monday February, 27 to find out what day and time you have selected and the size of your class so I can take a sufficient number of forms with me.

You may call me at 3473 (9:30 - 11:30 daily) or leave a message at 6975, if you wish to contact me.

Yours truly

Darius Lecointe
Master's Degree Candidate
Research and Statistical Methodology
School of Education
APPENDIX E
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