

Romans 12 Motivational Gifts in the Military: An Exploration of Person-Job Fit, Job Performance, and Job Satisfaction

MATTHEW P. EARNHARDT
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

ABSTRACT: The study researches the Romans 12 motivational gifts and their relationship to person-job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance in the U.S. Air Force. Results of the study identified two clusters among U.S. Air Force personnel and found a positive relationship with person-job fit and job satisfaction — and no relationship with job performance. Several practical applications can be gleaned from the current research, especially in the area of motivation and training.

INTRODUCTION

In Romans 12:3-8, seven spiritual gifts given to the church are named, gifts that are relevant to individual and corporate Christian living. Suggesting that these gifts also incorporate ways individuals function ethically within an organization, DellaVecchio and Winston (2004) developed a seven-scale instrument that measured the Roman 12 gifts as (a) perceiving, (b) serving, (c) teaching, (d) encouraging, (e) giving, (f) ruling, and (g) mercy. DellaVecchio and Winston hypothesized that a relationship may exist between one's giftedness as measured by this instrument and person-job fit, which has several organizational implications. Following DellaVecchio and Winston's call for further research, McPherson (2008) utilized the Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument to explore person-job fit and job satisfaction based on profiles of motivational gifts in law enforcement. Tomlinson and Winston (2011) explored Romans 12 motivational gifts with professors. Both McPherson and Tomlinson and Winston found a relationship between the Romans 12 motivational gifts, person-job fit, and job satisfaction. Despite this previous research, however, no studies exist which explore the relationships between the Romans 12 motivational gifts, person-job fit, and job performance (Tomlinson & Winston, 2011).

Furthering the work of DellaVecchio and Winston (2004), McPherson (2008), and Tomlinson and Winston (2011), this research examines the relationship between person-job fit, job satisfaction, job performance, and the Romans 12 motivational gifts within a military context.

Davis-Blake and Pfeffer (1989) suggested that there is a need for "developing and testing models that are able to simultaneously examine the effects of both dispositions and organizational situations" (p. 396). Likewise, Bipp (2010) discussed the need for more research on job performance, and Tomlinson and Winston (2011) urged research regarding the Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument and job performance. The purpose of this study is to begin to fill this gap.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to adequately address the proposed hypotheses and subsequent research questions, one must start with reviewing the relevant research related to (a) the Romans 12 motivational gifts, (b) person-job fit (c) job satisfaction, and (d) job performance.

Romans 12 Motivational Gifts

The Apostle Paul declared that all members of the church body "have different gifts, according to the grace given us" (Romans 12:3-8, New International Version [NIV]). According to Winston (2009), although Paul wrote of various gifts in his epistles, the gifts described in Romans 12 are different from the gifts of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 12) and from Christ (Ephesians 4). Further, Paul did not make a claim in the letter to the Romans that there is a hierarchy of gifts or that one gift is better than another as he did in his letter to the church in Corinth. Paul's charge to the church in Rome was quite clear:

If a man's gift is prophesying [perceiving], let him use it in proportion to his faith. If it is serving, let him serve; if it is teaching, let him teach; if it is encouraging, let him encourage; if it 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. (Rom 12:6-8)

Using these gifts and acknowledging that "scripture . . . [is] a useful tool for day-to-day organizational life" (Winston, 2009, p. 118), DellaVecchio and Winston (2004) sought to develop an instrument to measure the gifts Paul identified in Romans 12:3-8. To this end, they used a tautological approach (developed by Siminitiras) to develop the 29-question, seven-scale instrument used in the current study. Siminitiras's (2000) definition of tautology:

The *validity* of a statement pattern can be merely proved by showing that every statement that is obtained from it is true, regardless of the truth-value of its premises. To state this differently, if one determines that a statement pattern is a tautology, s/he knows, by definition, that the statement is true (tautologies or logically valid sentential patterns are often referred to as "laws of logic"; p. 13).

DellaVecchio and Winston "recognized the unconventional nature of the tautological approach to scale development and contend that for a set of a-priori factors the approach is a logical choice" (p. 2).

Winston (2009) noted that though based on the Christian Bible, the Romans 12 motivational gifts apply to everyone, not only those of the Christian faith. "While it is logical to want to think that Christians have an advantage in the Romans 12 gifts, the text of Romans 12:1-8 does not support this" (Winston, 2009, p. 116). Paul's letter does not include language that limits the gifts to those receiving the letter. In other words, assuming the gifts only apply to Christians would be akin to saying that "if I lecture the gifts to a group of MBA students then the gifts are only for those in business" (Winston, 2009, p. 116). Walker (1991) concurred, noting that the Romans 12 gifts characterize basic motivations, namely "inherent tendencies that characterize each different person by reason of the Creator's unique workmanship of their initial gifting" (p. 2023). DellaVecchio and Winston (2004) noted, "If the gifts are God-given to everyone, then everyone, including non-Christians in secular organizations should be able to produce scores, and these scores should be consistent with reliability and validity measures" (p. 2). Therefore, in developing their instrument to measure these gifts, they intentionally

used nonreligious verbiage and designed it to measure frequency of behavior rather than attitude towards the gifts. Parolini and Winston (2006) supported their claim; using a sample of 319 non-Christians, Parolini and Winston confirmed that both Christians and non-Christians evidence the Romans 12 motivational gifts with the main difference between the groups being one of expression rather than possession.

Building on the work of DellaVecchio and Winston (2004) and Parolini and Winston (2006), McPherson (2008) studied the relationship between person-job fit and job satisfaction utilizing the Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument, an area of research which was suggested by DellaVecchio and Winston. McPherson utilized a convenience sample of 197 police officers with at least three years of job experience and "provided some empirical support, though preliminary, for DellaVecchio and Winston's position regarding the potential association between profiles of motivational gifts and person-job fit as well as job satisfaction" (p. 49).

Tomlinson and Winston (2011) studied Romans 12 motivational gifts, person-job fit, and job satisfaction. Utilizing a snowball sample, Tomlinson and Winston conducted a survey of 89 college professors across several universities and identified two specific motivational gift profiles through their survey.

With these studies as a foundation, the present study uses military personnel to assess the relationship between Romans 12 motivational gifts, person job-fit, job satisfaction, and performance. To start, a more in-depth description of the seven motivational gifts identified by Paul in Romans 12:3-8 is necessary.

Perceiving. DellaVecchio and Winston (2004) summed up the gift of prophesy/perceiving as the "extraordinary ability to discern and proclaim truth" (p. 3). The secularized definition is "the ability to quickly and accurately discern good and evil and the ability to reveal truth for understanding, correction, or edification" (DellaVecchio & Winston, 2004, p. 3). The verbiage of perceiving rather than prophesying was utilized to avoid confusion with the 1 Corinthians 12 passage (Winston & DellaVecchio, 2004).

Serving. "The gift of serving is the God-given ability to identify the unmet needs involved in a task and to make use of available resources to meet those needs and help accomplish the desired goals" (DellaVecchio & Winston, 2004, p. 3). Winston (2009) declared, "This is not one-on-one or person-centered but task-oriented" (p. 121).

Here, the server chooses to serve and help accomplish the desired goals. The secularized definition of serving is “the ability to elevate any need for another (without concern for desired rank or recognition) that will help free that person to work more effectively” (DellaVecchio & Winston, 2004, p. 3).

Teaching. As stated by McPherson (2008), teaching is “the unusual ability to consider, evaluate, and present information in a way that adequately informs others” (p. 9). Therefore, teaching is taking information, understanding it, and then presenting it to others. According to DellaVecchio and Winston (2004), it is “the extraordinary ability to discern, analyze, and deliver information and truth so that others will learn” (p. 3).

Encouraging. “The gift of encouraging is a God-given ability to minister words of comfort, consolation, encouragement, and counsel in such a way that others feel helped and healed” (DellaVecchio & Winston, 2004, p. 4). Encouraging has two parts: “one is ‘a call’ and the other is ‘companionship.’ Together they mean to be with and for another” (Bryant, 1991, p. 77). The secularized definition is “the ability to call forth the best in others through encouragement and motivation” (DellaVecchio & Winston, 2004, p. 4).

Giving. DellaVecchio and Winston (2004) defined giving as “the God-given ability to understand the material needs of others and then meet those needs generously” (p. 4). Per Bryant (1991), giving is “the capacity to use one’s income, time, efforts, and skills to go beyond what is thought to be a reasonable standard” (p. 85).

Ruling. “The gift of ruling is the God-given ability to set goals in accordance with God’s purpose for the future and to communicate these goals to others in a way that they harmoniously work together for the glory of God” (DellaVecchio & Winston, 2004, p. 4). Winston (2009) defined ruling as “to be put in front of or placed as the head of; take a position of standing over one” (p. 129).

Mercy. Bryant (1991) defined mercy as “the extraordinary ability to feel and to act upon genuine empathy for others who suffer distressing physical, mental, emotional, social, and spiritual pain” (p. 114). Winston (2009) went further, saying feeling empathy for others goes beyond just feeling empathy for Christians; it is for “Christian and non-Christian, who suffer distressing physical, mental, or

emotional problems and translate that compassion into cheerfully done deeds” (p. 130). Mercy is the ability to feel and act in a genuine way toward the pain and suffering of others.

Having defined the Romans 12 motivational gifts, this study also addressed person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance, concepts defined as follows.

Person–Job Fit

Although person–job fit began with the early work of Parsons (1909), Williamson (1939), and Strong (1955), research into person–job fit has been ongoing for a number of years (Brkich et al., 2002; Hambleton, Kalliath, & Taylor, 2000). Person–job fit research has tended to follow dichotomous routes, specifically ability–demand versus desires–attributes fit and subjective versus objective fit. Therefore, Sekiguchi (2004) defined person–job fit as “the match between the abilities of a person and the demands of a job, or the desires of a person and the attributes of a job” (p. 179). Here, research into person–job fit has centered on the fit between employee desires (i.e., the person side of the fit index) and job requirements (i.e., the job side of the fit index) (Hambleton et al., 2000). Further, person–job fit can be evaluated both subjectively and objectively. Per Ehrhart (2006), subjective person–job fit refers to an individual’s perception of how well he or she fits with a particular job; whereas objective person–job fit refers to how well an individual’s reported preferences or characteristics correspond to the job’s characteristics. Edwards (1991) indicated that the person–job fit implies that the person and job work together for individual and organizational outcomes. Carless (2005) argued that person–job fit is the coupling of the objective measure of job demands with an individual’s subjective needs and desires.

Job Satisfaction

Harville (1992) defined job satisfaction as “a pleasurable emotional response to a person’s job or job experiences” (p. 152). Known as the “central construct in organizational psychology” (Cohrs, Abele, & Dette, 2006, p. 363), job satisfaction has been studied in the social sciences for more than 80 years (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Kallenberg, 1977). Job satisfaction has been associated with both positive and negative work-related outcomes. Theoretical conceptualizations of job satisfaction can be divided into several categories, including (a) situational, (b) dispositional, and (c) interactionist (Cohrs, Abele, & Dette, 2006). Further, “job satisfaction can be assessed as either overall job satisfaction

or via measuring five common individual facets: satisfaction with coworkers, pay, promotions, supervisor, and the work itself” (Guay, 2011, p. 64).

Several studies (Kilchyk, 2009; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; McPherson, 2008; Saks & Ashforth, 1997; Verquer et al., 2003) have specifically explored the relationship between person–job fit and job satisfaction. According to Hambleton et al. (2000), with few exceptions, most studies consistently have shown a positive relationship between person–job fit and work attitudes such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Kilchyk (2009) studied person–job fit with hotel front-desk employees and found “job satisfaction may accurately predict person–job fit in the front office personnel” (p. 54). The aforementioned studies (Kilchyk, 2009; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005; McPherson, 2008; Saks & Ashforth, 1997) found congruence with Verquer et al. (2003), McPherson (2008), and Tomlinson and Winston (2011).

Job Performance

According to Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001), performance is a multidimensional construct involving both task and contextual performance. While task performance involves proficiency in the formal aspects of one’s job, contextual performance relates to “organizational effectiveness in ways that shape the organizational, social, and psychological context” (Lauver & Kristof-Brown, 2001, p. 458). These tasks can include helping others, providing extra effort, and promoting organizational objectives that relate to formal aspects of the job. Chilton, Hardgrave, and Armstrong (2010) addressed the scant attention the relationship between person–job fit and job performance has received. Further, Hambleton et al. (2000) noted that the little research that does exist has not demonstrated a consistent positive or negative relationship between person–job fit and job performance. Li and Hung (2010) pointed out that past results identifying a link between person–job fit and job performance are mixed. They went on to say that research has shown only a “modest correlation with overall performance” (p. 308). This seems to be the rule rather than the exception with job performance research. For example, Lauver and Kristof-Brown (2001) did not find a significant relationship between job performance and person–job fit, while Werbel and Johnson (2001) did. The modest correlation at best in existing research requires more testing (Li & Hung, 2010). As Lawler and Hall (1970) suggested, the inconsistencies in the assessment of job performance could be due to

“people [being] . . . involved in their job for reasons that are not related to performance” (p. 311).

Research Hypotheses

- H1: The Romans 12 motivational gifts and person–job fit are positively related.
- H2: An individual’s person–job fit is positively related to job satisfaction.
- H3: An individual’s person–job fit is positively related to job performance.

METHOD

The purpose of the study was to explore person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance utilizing the Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument with a sample of U.S. Air Force personnel. The study utilized a sample of airmen in the U.S. Air Force in the Rocky Mountain Region to answer the following research questions:

- RQ1: Are there typical profiles of Romans 12 motivational gifts among U.S. Air Force personnel?
- RQ2: Is there a difference in person–job fit among the profiles of U.S. Air Force personnel?
- RQ3: Is there a difference in job satisfaction among the Romans 12 motivational gifts profiles with U.S. Air Force personnel?
- RQ4: Is there a difference in job performance among the Romans 12 motivational gifts profiles with U.S. Air Force personnel?

Research Design and Approach

The study’s methodological approach was quantitative in nature, utilizing a convenience sample of U.S. Air Force personnel to investigate the role of person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance through the use of DellaVecchio and Winston’s (2004) Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument. The study is cross-sectional with questionnaires as the primary means of data collection. A self-administered survey was passed out to individual airmen within two squadrons of U.S. Air Force personnel and included measures of Romans 12 gifts, person–job fit, and job satisfaction. Separately and in addition to the survey, the squadron commanders evaluated the airmen utilizing the Air Force Enlisted Performance Evaluation Report (AF Form 910). Although the discussion of person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance would be interesting to study for multiple services and other career fields within the U.S. Air Force, access to additional

squadrons or personnel was not permitted with the current study. Therefore, the current research endeavor used a convenience sample of Air Force personnel where access to the squadron commanders (and the evaluation on the airmen's performance) was feasible. The study looked at Air Force personnel at a base located in the Rocky Mountain region with the aim of generalizing the results from the sample to the population (Creswell, 2009).

Setting and Sample

The U.S. military is a unique American coalition, representing members from all walks of life and experience and all 50 states and U.S. territories. Military members pass several requirements for entry including (a) age, (b) physical, (c) educational, and (d) citizenship (Today's military, n.d.). Upon entry, service members undergo a rigorous screening process which indoctrinates them into the culture of the military, commonly known as boot camp. After successfully graduating boot camp, most enlisted service members attend service schools to learn a trade or skill that becomes part of their military job for the remainder of their career. In many ways, each branch of service is a community reflecting the larger community of America with diverse individuals coming together to use their skills toward a common purpose.

The U.S. Air Force's (2011) website outlines their mission as "to fly, fight and win . . . in air, space and cyberspace" (p. 2). Airmen of all ranks and ages are needed to accomplish the mission and capabilities of the U.S. Air Force; without their support, mission accomplishment would be impossible (Owsianka, n.d.). The culture of the U.S. Air Force demands that the airmen, "regardless of duty location, occupational specialty, or job position . . . must embody the warrior ethos, tough-mindedness, tireless motivation, an unceasing vigilance and a willingness by the military members to sacrifice their own lives for their country if necessary" (U.S. Air Force, 2006, p. 2). The military culture, specifically that of the U.S. Air Force, is not for everyone as studies on retention, a key component of mission accomplishment, showed Air Force retention rates at around 64 percent for first-time enlistees and 71 percent for second-term enlistees (Lancaster, Klein, & Wetzel, 2004).

Participants. For the study, a convenience sample of enlisted U.S. Air Force airmen from the intelligence field were used. The intelligence operational specialty of the U.S. Air Force is charged with performing acquisition, recording analysis, and reporting of assigned tasks as well

as threat warning support, mission planning, and participating in theater and tactical-level coordination (U.S. Air Force, 2011). All enlisted personnel that comprise the two selected squadrons of the U.S. Air Force were invited to participate in the survey. The survey and methodology was vetted through the researcher's university IRB. Additionally, the U.S. Air Force approved the study under their research guidelines.

Sample size and statistical power. Due to limitations with population access, the aim of the study was to obtain a sample size of 72, the largest sample size possible given the two squadrons asked to participate. There was a 100% participation rate among the enlisted personnel in both squadrons. The sample size is due to both limitation of access to the sample and the adequate number of participants to derive significant results. Therefore, the study conducted a cluster analysis as in previous studies (McPherson, 2008; Tomlinson & Winston, 2011). As the sample size is controlled by sample frame, it was not prudent to conduct a power analysis for the study.

Instrumentation. Following McPherson (2008) and Tomlinson and Winston (2011) as guides, a paper survey was created for the study. It was necessary to use a paper study due to the method in which the survey was administered to ensure accurate job performance data. The squadron commanders assigned a number to each airman and provided the airman with a numbered packet containing the survey. As each packet was turned in, the squadron commander completed the AF Form 910 for each airman, addressing job performance, and attached it to the results. This ensured confidentiality of each airman who agreed to participate in the study. The study utilized a questionnaire with four major sections: (a) Romans 12 motivational gifts, (b) person-job fit, (c) job satisfaction, and (d) demographic information. All variables, with the exception of job performance, were measured through this questionnaire.

The Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument. DellaVecchio and Winston's (2004) seven-scale instrument was developed and used in this study to measure the following gifts: (a) perceiving, (b) serving, (c) teaching, (d) encouraging, (e) giving, (f) ruling, and (g) mercy. DellaVecchio and Winston collected data from 4,177 participants between March 1, 2002 and October 25, 2002 by using word-of-mouth advertising at a Midatlantic U.S. University. Applying SPSS Release 11 to perform a clus-

ter analysis of the participants, 50 discrete clusters with ANOVA significance at the .000 levels were demonstrated, confirming the construct validity of the instrument (McPherson, 2008). Reliability for the instrument ranged from .647-.888 for each of the seven scales.

Person–job fit. The four-item Person–Job Fit Scale (Saks & Ashforth, 1997) was used to measure person–job fit in the study. To measure the participant’s measure of person–job fit, Saks and Ashforth (1997) constructed four questions on a five-point Likert-type scale, addressing the person–job fit from both dimensions of desires–supplies fit and demands–abilities fit (McPherson, 2008). Carless (2005) demonstrated Saks and Ashforth’s study had appropriate reliability with a Cronbach’s alpha of .83, while Saks and Ashforth demonstrated a reliability of .89.

Job satisfaction. To measure job satisfaction, the 20-item Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) short form, based on the MSQ long form, was included (D. Weiss et al., 1967). The MSQ was designed to measure an employee’s satisfaction and motivational behavior toward his or her job as well as his or her perception of occupational rewards (Lahoud, 2006). Its 20 items span the three categories of intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction (D. Weiss et al., 1967). Hoyt’s method of analysis of variance resulted in a reliability coefficient for 83 percent of the groups at .80 or larger and only 2.5 percent of the groups at less than .70, demonstrating appropriate reliability (Stemple, 2004).

Job performance. Separate from the survey given to enlisted members of each squadron, the AF Form 910 was used to measure each respondent’s job performance. As shown in Table 1, the form is comprised of seven questions employing a four-point scale ranging from inferior to superior and is used to “document performance under the Enlisted Evaluation System” (AFForm910.com, 2009, para. 1), focusing on performance by illustrating how an individual performs and the qualities he or she bring to the job. Additionally, the AF Form 910 is utilized to rate the enlisted ranks of E-1 through E-6 (Maurmann, 2007). E-1 through E-6 describe the enlisted ranks from very junior airmen to senior airmen who have not achieved the top three enlisted ranks in the U.S. Air Force.

Demographics. The demographics of age, rank, gender, and years of service were collected and used for the cluster analysis.

Table 1: AF Form 910 Categories

Item Number	Question
1	How well does the ratee perform assigned duties?
2	How much does the ratee know about primary duties?
3	How well does the ratee comply with standards?
4	How is the ratee’s conduct on/off duty?
5	How well does the ratee supervise/lead?
6	How well does the ratee comply with individual training requirements?
7	How well does the ratee communicate with others?

Data Collection Procedure

Data were collected with a paper survey, assuring confidentiality throughout the process and ensuring accurate performance data collection for each individual. Data collection utilized the squadron commanders of each participating squadron. The commanders agreed to distribute the survey to each enlisted airman and were provided with three separate boxes per squadron. Box 1 contained sealable envelopes with a survey and participant letter. Each envelope was numbered using a yellow sticker with P (for participant) and an individual number. The envelope contained both the participant letter and a survey in each envelope. Participants were instructed to complete the survey and then seal the envelope upon survey completion. Box 2 contained sealable envelopes with the AF Form 910 (performance survey). Each sealable envelope was numbered using a red sticker with a C (for commander) and an individual number. Commanders were instructed to seal the envelope upon completion of each AF Form 910. Box 3 contained larger sealable numbered envelopes. Commanders were instructed to put the participants’ completed sealed survey envelopes and their corresponding completed AF Form 910 envelope in each of the matching numbered larger envelopes.

To further explain the process, after receipt of the boxes, each respective Air Force commander distributed the participant’s envelope to each airman and recorded the number each airman received, keeping it confidential.

The Air Force commander, upon receipt of the sealed numbered envelope from each individual airman, then completed the AF Form 910 for each individual, ensuring the number of the participant's survey matched the AF 910 Form envelope the commander filled out. The commander then took each sealed envelope (e.g., both the participant's Number 1 envelope and the commander's Number 1 envelope) and put those in the larger envelope that was then returned to the researcher. Finally, the commander destroyed the numbered list of each participant after putting the surveys in the larger envelope and returning those envelopes to the researcher.

Data Analysis

A preliminary data analysis was conducted immediately following data collection. Specifically, responses were converted from raw scores to a percentage score, following the model established in previous research (McPherson, 2008; Tomlinson & Winston, 2011). A 100-point scale was used to grade each respondent for each motivational gift. Additionally, percentage scores were calculated for person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance. Additionally, reliability was checked for the Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument, MSQ, person–job fit scale, and the AF 910 form.

Profiles of the Romans 12 Motivational Gifts

To evaluate the first research question, utilizing previous studies (DellaVecchio & Winston, 2004; McPherson, 2008; Tomlinson & Winston, 2011), a cluster analysis was conducted on the data collected via DellaVecchio and Winston's instrument to measure gift profiles. As described by McPherson (2008), the aim of the cluster analysis was to identify a set of groups that both minimized within-group variation and maximized between-group variation. Since Ward's (1963) minimum variance clustering algorithm has been presented as "the best choice for clustering functional data" (Ferreira, 2007, p. 63), it was used in this study as a hierarchical cluster method. The results of the cluster analysis helped to determine the final cluster analysis which was used in additional analyses.

The Differences in Person–Job Fit Among Profiles of the Romans 12 Motivational Gifts

To evaluate the second research question, a *t* test was performed to determine the differences between person–job fit and the Romans 12 motivational gift cluster profiles, employing Saks and Ashforth's (1997) Person–Job Fit Scale.

The Differences in Job Performance Among Profiles of the Romans 12 Motivational Gifts

To evaluate the third research question, a *t* test was performed to determine the differences between job performance and the Romans 12 motivational gifts cluster profiles, employing the AF 910 Form "to document performance under the Enlisted Evaluation System" (AFForm910.com, 2009, para. 1).

The Differences in Job Satisfaction Among Profiles of the Romans 12 Motivational Gifts

To evaluate the fourth research question, a *t* test was performed to determine the differences between job satisfaction and the Romans 12 motivational gifts cluster profiles, employing the 20-item MSQ short form which measures intrinsic, extrinsic, and general job satisfaction (D. Weiss et al., 1967).

ANALYSIS

Descriptive Analysis Results

The paper survey received a total of 72 responses from enlisted members of the U.S. Air Force located in Colorado. The survey also asked for age, rank, gender, and years of service. The mean age of the participants was 27.17 (*SD* = 6.14). The mean rank for the participants was 4.38 (*SD* = 1.38), which means the average participant was a noncommissioned officer with a rank of E-4 (junior enlisted). Of the 72 participants, 86 percent were male, and the average number of military service for the participants was 6.11 (*SD* = 5.55).

Using the raw scores provided, the reliability of the Romans 12 motivational gifts, person–job fit, job satisfaction, job performance data were assessed using the reliability coefficient. Regarding the Romans 12 motivational gifts, the results show the following Cronbach's α : (a) perceiving = .706, (b) serving = .484, (c) teaching = .645, (d) encouraging = .756, (e) giving = .663, (f) ruling = .719, and (g) mercy = .766. Cronbach's α for person–job fit = .909. Cronbach's α for intrinsic satisfaction = .868, extrinsic satisfaction = .821, and general satisfaction = .922. Cronbach's α for job performance = .853.

Cluster Analysis Results

Following the previous research studies of McPherson (2008) and Tomlinson and Winston (2011), a cluster analysis was used to group participants. Participants were grouped based on the Romans 12 motivational gifts devel-

Table 2: Independent Sample *t* test Cluster 1 versus Cluster 2 for Seven Motivational Gifts

Characteristic	Cluster 1 (<i>N</i> = 34)		Cluster 2 (<i>N</i> = 38)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Giving	28.82	11.68	48.02	15.53	-5.87	.000
Ruling	48.23	12.42	74.86	9.11	-10.44	.000
Serving	56.91	10.80	71.84	9.11	-6.36	.000
Teaching	45.58	14.96	68.15	13.01	-6.84	.000
Mercy	33.29	15.11	44.84	17.15	-3.01	.004
Perceiving	48.97	12.53	71.84	13.32	-7.48	.000
Encouraging	45.88	18.23	65.92	14.65	-5.16	.000

oped by DellaVecchio and Winston (2004). Following DellaVecchio and Winston's initial work and replicated in both McPherson and Tomlinson and Winston's study, each participant's percentage score instead of a raw score was used for each of the seven gifts. As stated by McPherson (2008), this was used to "avoid any potential complication due to the unequal number of items across the seven gifts" (p. 42).

Research Question 1 and Demographics

Simply put, the first research question asked if there are profiles of Romans 12 motivational gifts among U.S. Air Force personnel. A *t* test was run for the seven motivational gifts (see Table 2). Using a hierarchical cluster analysis, two distinct clusters emerged by examination of the hierarchical cluster dendrogram. Additionally, Table 3 shows demographic information related to the two motivational gifts profiles.

Upon completion of the *t* test, where mean percentages were determined, DellaVecchio and Winston's (2004) labels were used which converted cluster centers into three categories: high (labeled as 3) identified cluster

centers above 67 percent, medium (labeled as 2) identified cluster centers above 33 percent but less than 67 percent, and low (labeled as 1) identified cluster centers less than 33 percent. The initial cluster centers and subsequent category rankings are annotated in Table 4, showing that overall respondents in Cluster 1 scored lower than Cluster 2. Cluster 1 showed a low level on giving and a profile of medium on the remaining scales (ruling, serving, teaching, mercy, perceiving, and encouraging). Cluster 2 showed medium in three scales (giving, mercy, and encouraging) and high in the remaining scales (ruling, serving, teaching, and perceiving).

Table 4: Cluster Centers of the Seven Motivational Gifts Using High, Medium, and Low

Characteristic	Cluster 1	Cluster 2
Giving	Low	Medium
Ruling	Medium	High
Serving	Medium	High
Teaching	Medium	High
Mercy	Medium	Medium
Perceiving	Medium	High
Encouraging	Medium	Medium

Table 3: Cluster 1 versus Cluster 2 Demographic Information

Demographic	Cluster 1 (<i>N</i> = 34)		Cluster 2 (<i>N</i> = 38)	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	24.82	4.47	29.26	6.71
Years of service	4.18	4.39	7.84	5.95

Research Question 2

The second research question asked if there is a difference in person–job fit the Romans 12 motivational gifts profiles of U.S. Air Force personnel. Saks and Ashforth (1997) described person–job fit as "matching an applicants'

Table 5: Cluster Membership and Person–Job Fit and Job Performance

	Cluster 1 (<i>N</i> = 34)		Cluster 2 (<i>N</i> = 38)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
Person–job fit	54.70	17.63	66.84	15.05	-3.15	.002
Job performance	78.67	13.52	79.41	12.82	-.23	.812

Table 6: Cluster Membership and Satisfaction

Satisfaction	Cluster 1 (<i>N</i> = 34)		Cluster 2 (<i>N</i> = 38)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	Sig.
General	72.58	13.79	81.28	9.67	-3.12	.003
Intrinsic	72.44	14.07	80.57	9.85	-2.82	.006
Extrinsic	72.05	9.85	82.36	11.44	-3.16	.002

knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) to job requirements” (p. 395). Saks and Ashforth’s Person–Job Fit Scale was used to determine differences between person–job fit and the Romans 12 motivational gifts profiles utilizing a *t* test. In other words, respondent scores on Saks and Ashforth’s Person–Job Fit Scale were used to compare the two significant clusters previously found and determine differences between them. The results (see Table 5) show a relationship between person–job fit and the Romans 12 motivational gifts profile Cluster 2. Respondents in Cluster 2 had a mean score of 66 percent person–job fit, while Cluster 1 respondents had a mean score of 55 percent.

Research Question 3

To answer the third research question which asked if there is a difference in job performance among the Romans 12 motivational gifts profiles of U.S. Air Force personnel, a *t* test was performed. Performance data were assessed utilizing the standard performance rating system of the U.S. Air Force, the AF 910 Form. The AF 910 form focuses on performance by illustrating how an individual performs and the qualities he or she bring to the job (AFForm910.com, 2009). Specifically, supervisors ranked respondents on a one-to-four scale on seven specific questions (see Table 1). Scores were then summed and changed to a percentage score for consistency with the other tests, at which time, a *t* test was performed. Results show there is no difference between the motivational gifts profiles and job performance (see Table 5).

Research Question 4

The fourth research question asked if there is a difference in job satisfaction among the Romans 12 motivational gifts profiles of U.S. Air Force personnel. An independent *t* test was performed. Specifically, the MSQ short form developed by D. Weiss et al. (1967) was used to measure satisfaction. “The MSQ is designed to measure the degree of an employee’s satisfaction and motivational behavior toward his or her job” (Lahoud, 2006, p. 49). Specifically, intrinsic, extrinsic, and general satisfaction were measured. Results show a relationship between the motivational gifts profiles and satisfaction (see Table 6). Cluster 1 scored 73 percent in general job satisfaction, while Cluster 2 scored 81 percent.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to answer the call for further research by DellaVecchio and Winston (2004), McPherson (2008), and Tomlinson and Winston (2011) by examining the relationship of Romans 12 motivational gifts, person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance. The results of this study support DellaVecchio and Winston’s, McPherson’s, and Tomlinson and Winston’s research and further validated DellaVecchio and Winston’s instrument. The study also answers Winston’s (2009) appeal for “more studies such as McPherson’s in which specific groups of employees complete the Romans 12 gift test and we look for pat-

terns of the gift profiles” (p. 134). The findings from the study offer several implications for the field of leadership, including specifically the areas of Romans 12 motivational gifts, person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance.

The current research study explored Romans 12 motivational gifts with a U.S. military sample and identified two separate gift profiles. The military sample ($N = 72$) was comprised of U.S. Air Force enlisted personnel in the intelligence career field from two squadrons in Colorado. Cluster 1 showed a low level on giving and a profile of medium on the remaining scales (ruling, serving, teaching, mercy, perceiving, and encouraging). The average age for Cluster 1 is 25, and the average years of service is four years; this can be compared to the average age of 29 and an average of seven years of service for Cluster 2. It was interesting to note the low giving rating among Cluster 1 participants. With the reason for that unknown, future studies exploring the low giving score are suggested. Cluster 2 showed overall higher levels of gifts than Cluster 1 with the exception of encouraging and mercy which were equal. Cluster 2 showed medium in three scales (giving, mercy, and encouraging) and high in the remaining scales (ruling, serving, teaching, and perceiving). It is important to note that Cluster 2 respondents reported over 3 ½ more years of service and are more than four years older than those in Cluster 1. Respondents in Cluster 2 have generally completed their first enlistment and have reenlisted to remain in the military for another four to six years. Given that the Romans 12 motivational gifts instrument measures frequency of responses, it is possible that airmen may have been responding to the current study relative to job context and not personal life behaviors. In a study of Air Force cadets, J. M. Smith (2010) found that “character evolves as people interact and gain a sense for how their behavior influences the trust and respect they receive from others” (p. 136). Additionally, the organizational culture of the military promotes cohesion and esprit de corps; the longer a military member is in the culture, the more he or she fits in (Anderson, 2008). In the intelligence field specifically, cohesion is critical and a significant part of the organizational culture as many individuals stay very close to those with whom they work. Due to the highly classified nature of the intelligence field, it is not surprising that individuals scored higher in ruling, serving, teaching, and perceiving. Future studies addressing motivational gift profiles among other military occupations is recommended.

Though the current study did not find a relationship between job performance and the motivational gifts,

conclusions can be drawn from the data. Overall, the respondents were rated high regardless of cluster (high 70th percentile). This is consistent with Cunningham’s (2006) findings that the majority of U.S. Air Force personnel receive high ratings. This study confirms that high ratings seem to be the rule rather than the exception in the U.S. Air Force. This study indicates the current method for assessing Air Force personnel needs work and adds strength to Cunningham’s assertion that a 360-degree assessment may be valuable to the Air Force rating process. U.S. Air Force leadership may want to use the results of this article to assess the current direction of their rating system.

There is a positive relationship between the Romans 12 motivational gifts and job satisfaction. Similarly, there is a positive relationship between Romans 12 motivational gifts and person–job fit. Booppanon (2008) found that supervision was the highest indicator of job satisfaction among Air Force recruiters. As the military promotes increasing responsibility to personnel the longer they are in the military, it is not surprising that Cluster 2 reported higher levels of satisfaction than Cluster 1. Additionally, Cluster 2 reported higher levels of person–job fit than Cluster 1. Again, this is not surprising given the military’s promotion of cohesion and esprit de corps (Anderson, 2008).

This has several positive implications for training and recruitment. Airmen who measure high in giving or low in the other motivational gifts, for example, may find that they do not fit into the military culture, and they can be screened prior to joining the service. Respondents who measure low in a particular gift may find that the military is not right for them at that present time. Beyond entry recruiting, military recruiters can use the motivational gifts to identify potential leaders or individuals to complete special assignments in the military (e.g., respondents who measure high in several categories similar to Cluster 2). Additionally, the military could develop training around the motivational gifts to raise awareness of an individual’s gift profiles. This could be similar to the numerous psychological and personality profiles the military already gives that are used to strengthen the military member’s self-concept and awareness.

Christian managers and Christian business faculty can find several practical applications from the study. First, the study contributed to validating a scale that can be applied to non-Christian military personnel. This adds further support for McPherson’s (2008) and Tomlinson and Winston’s (2011) studies that showed motivational gifts have application among non-Christian samples (law enforcement, professors, and military). As noted by

Winston (2009), there is “no limit of these studies since there are so many profiles that could be examined” (p. 134). The current study shows moderate support for the gifts as a screening tool for both secular and faith-based organizations. The more studies that are conducted, the stronger the content and discriminate validity will be (Winston, 2009). In addition, the current study shows that Paul’s motivational gifts have proven accurate in multiple settings including the secular military. As stated by Tomlinson and Winston:

In the end, one must recognize the wisdom and relevance of Scripture even in today’s society. Even though Paul’s letter was addressed to the early Christians in Rome, the acknowledgement of the inerrancy of Scripture means the Holy Spirit, through Paul, was reaching out to everyone, regardless of faith, for all time. Paul provided us a template of motivational gifts that have proven accurate in multiple settings to date. The gifts described in Romans 12:3-8 are just one example of the never-ending guidance and understanding that can be found in scripture. (p. 55)

Another application that Christian managers and business faculty can find through the current study is to see if the present occupation matches the gift mix. For example, in McPherson’s (2008) study of law enforcement professionals, of the three clusters found, the cluster with the highest scores for each of the Romans 12 motivational gifts also showed the highest person–job fit and job satisfaction. This cluster’s gift mix was perceiving, ruling, serving, and encouraging. Likewise, Tomlinson and Winston’s (2011) study using college professors found two distinct clusters with the gift of teaching showing the highest percentage in each (followed by encouraging and serving, respectively). Christian managers can use this information in hiring and recruitment. For example, given the strategic role of executive leadership, one could propose a gift mix of perceiving and ruling for an organization’s CEO. Likewise, one could assume a gift mix of mercy, giving, and serving for those called to work with the needy. Furthermore, Christian business faculty can use this tool to help counsel students in choosing business careers or majors.

Limitations

There are several limitations associated with the current research study. First, due to data collection limitations, a convenience sample was used for the current study. As stated by Creswell (2009), a nonprobability

sample is less desirable, and the participants “are chosen based on their convenience and availability” (p. 148). As the study needed specific access to performance data, the researcher had to use a convenience sample to have access to all data needed. Second, a relatively small number of Air Force personnel were used from one base; therefore, care should be taken generalizing the results of the study. Furthermore, due to the small sample size of the population, only two distinct clusters could be determined. It is not clear whether a larger sample size would have yielded additional or different cluster profiles. In previous research, McPherson (2008) was able to develop three distinct clusters ($N = 197$) with law enforcement personnel. Third, the use of self-reported surveys could be affected by social desirability biases (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986) both from the respondents and the commanders evaluating respondents’ job performance. Commanders could have inflated job performance data knowing that performance data would be assessed in the current study. Additionally, though the AF 910 tries to remove subjectivity from the performance process, subjectivity is still part of the evaluation process, potentially skewing performance results.

In conclusion, this research examined the relationship of Romans 12 motivational gifts, person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance with military personnel. The findings of the current study show several practical applications for both the field of leadership and, specifically, the U.S. Air Force. The results of the current study could be used as a recruiting tool and a special program selection tool for potential Air Force members. Additionally, the results of the performance data seem to confirm Cunningham’s (2006) findings and suggest that an overhaul of the current Air Force evaluation process is needed. Finally, the current study increases the body of research in the areas of Romans 12 motivational gifts, person–job fit, job satisfaction, and job performance and increases the growing body of knowledge on gift profiles and organizations.

REFERENCES

- AFForm910.com. (2009). *AF Form 910 definition and purpose*. Retrieved from <http://afform910.com/definition.htm>
- Anderson, G. B. (2008). *Amazons or butterflies in the wild blue yonder: Gender perceptions of organizational effectiveness in the United States Air Force, 1991-2001* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3351841)

- Bipp, T. (2010). What do people want from their jobs? The big five, core self-evaluations and work motivation. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 18(1), 28-39.
- Booppanon, S. (2008). *Factors leading to job satisfaction among United States Air Force squadron recruiters* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3296774)
- Brkich, M., Jeffs, D., & Carless, S. A. (2002). A global self-report measure of person-job fit. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 18(1), 43-51.
- Bryant, C. (1991). *Rediscovering our spiritual gifts*. Nashville, TN: Upper Room Books.
- Carless, S. A. (2005). Person-job fit versus person-organization fit as predictors of organizational attraction and job acceptance intentions: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 78(3), 411-429.
- Chilton, M. A., Hardgrave, B. C., & Armstrong, D. J. (2010). Performance and strain levels of IT workers engaged in rapidly changing environments: A person-job fit perspective. *The Database for Advances in Information Systems*, 41(1), 8-35.
- Cohrs, J. C., Abele, A. E., & Dette, D. E. (2006). Integrating situational and dispositional determinates of job satisfaction: Findings from three samples of professionals. *Journal of Psychology*, 140(4), 363-395.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, J. A. (2006). *Perceptions of the impact of 360-degree feedback on United States Air Force personnel* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3223882)
- Davis-Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 385-400.
- DellaVecchio, D., & Winston, B. E. (2004). *A seven scale instrument to measure the Romans 12 motivational gifts and a proposition that the Romans 12 gift profiles might apply to person-job fit analysis*. Unpublished manuscript, Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Edwards, J. R. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review and methodological critique. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6, 283-357.
- Ehrhart, K. H. (2006). Job characteristic beliefs and personality as antecedents of subjective person-job fit. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 21(2), 193-226.
- Ferreira, L. A. (2007). *Clustering functional data: A comparison of hierarchical clustering methods* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1463710)
- Guay, R. P. (2011). *Igniting the fire between leaders and followers: The impact of having the right fit* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3461387)
- Hambleton, A. J., Kalliath, T., & Taylor, P. (2000). Criterion-related validity of a measure of person-job and person-organization fit. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 29(2), 80-85.
- Harville, D. L. (1992). Person/job fit model of communication apprehension in organizations. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 6(2), 150-165.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 267-407.
- Kallenberg, A. L. (1977). Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42, 124-143.
- Kilchyk, I. (2009). *A study of person-job fit in front office employees in Midwestern hotels* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 1469987)
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Jansen, K. J., & Colbert, A. E. (2002). A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups and organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(5), 985-993.
- Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job fit, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, 58, 281-342.
- Lahoud, H. A. (2006). *Job satisfaction among network administrators in North Carolina: An analysis based on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3229508)
- Lancaster, A. R., Klein, R. M., & Wetzel, E. S. (2004). *U.S. Department of Defense retention trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.internationalmta.org/Documents/2004/2004036P.pdf>

- Lauver, K. J., & Kristof-Brown, A. L. (2001). Distinguishing between employees' perceptions of person–job and person–organization fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(1), 454-470.
- Lawler, E., III, & Hall, D. T. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54(4), 305-312.
- Li, C., & Hung, C. (2010). An examination of the mediating role of person–job fit in relations between information literacy and work outcomes. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 22(5), 306-318.
- Maurmann, S. F. (2007). *Air Force instruction 36-2406*. Retrieved from <http://www.e-publishing.af.mil/shared/media/epubs/AFI36-2406.pdf>
- McPherson, C. (2008). *A consideration of the relationship of the Romans 12 motivational gifts to job satisfaction and person–job fit in law enforcement* (Doctoral Dissertation). Available from Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.
- Owsianka, D. (n.d.). AETC leaders hold Airman's call at Luke. *Air Force Base News*. Retrieved from <http://www.aerotechnews.com/lukeafb/mainnews/AETC-leaders-hold-Airman-s-call-at-Luke>
- Parolini, J. L., & Winston, B. E. (2006). *Investigating the use of the Romans 12 gifts in religious and non-religious communities*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation*. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Management*, 12, 531-544.
- Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). A longitudinal investigation of the relationships between job information, sources, applicant perceptions of fit and work outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 395-426.
- Sekiguchi, T. (2003). *The role of person–organization fit and person–job fit in managers' hiring decisions: The effects of work status and occupational characteristics of job openings* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3102714)
- Sekiguchi, T. (2004). Person-organization fit and person-job fit in employee selection: A review of the literature. *Osaka Keidai Ronshu*, 54(6), 179-196.
- Simintiras, A. C. (2000). The role of tautological equivalence in cross-cultural sales negotiations. EBMS Working Paper EBMS/2000/5 European Management School Singleton Park, Swansea, UK. Retrieved from <http://www.swan.ac.uk/ebms/research/working%20papers/EBMS%202000%205.pdf>
- Smith, J. M. (2010). *Character development at the United States Air Force Academy: A phenomenological case study of graduates' perceptions* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3404653)
- Stemple, J. D. (2004). *Job satisfaction for high school principles in Virginia* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3123726)
- Strong, E. K., Jr. (1955). *Vocational interests eighteen years after college*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Today's military. (n.d.). *Review military entrance requirements*. Retrieved from <http://www.todaysmilitary.com/before-serving-in-the-military/military-entrance-requirements>
- Tomlinson, J. C., & Winston, B. E. (2011). Romans 12 motivational gifts and college professors: Implications for job satisfaction and person–job fit. *Christian Higher Education*, 10, 45-56.
- U.S. Air Force. (2006). Leadership and force development. *Air Force doctrine document 1-1*. Retrieved from http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/service_pubs/afdd1_1.pdf
- U.S. Air Force. (2011). Career descriptions. Retrieved from <http://www.airforce.com/careers/detail/airborne-intelligence-surveillance-reconnaissance-operator/>
- Verquer, M. L., Beehr, T. A., & Wagner, S. H. (2003). A meta-analysis of the relations between person–organization fit and work attitudes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 63, 473-489.
- Walker, P. (1991). Holy spirit gifts and power. In J. W. Hayford, J. Horner, & S. Middlebrook (Eds.), *Spirit filled life Bible* (pp. 2018-2026). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Ward, J. H. (1963). Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58(1), 236-244.
- Weiss, D., Dawis, R., England, G., & Lofquist, L. (1967). *Manual of the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire*. Minneapolis, MN: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota.
- Weiss, H. M. (2002). Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations, beliefs and affective experiences. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 173-194.

Werbel, J. D., & Johnson, D. J. (2001). The use of person–group fit for employee selection: A missing link in person–environment fit. *Human Resource Management*, 40(3), 227-240.

Williamson, E. G. (1939). *How to counsel students*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Winston, B. E. (2009). The Romans 12 gifts: Useful for person–job fit. *Journal of Biblical Perspectives in Leadership*, 2, 114-134.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Dr. Matthew Earnhardt is an assistant professor with Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University-Worldwide. Prior to joining Embry-Riddle, Earnhardt taught at several universities and in addition had a career in military intelligence and with Lockheed Martin Corporation. Matthew

has a Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership from Regent University. He can be reached at earnharm@erau.edu.