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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present study is to attempt to validate the Loyola Seminarian Sentence Completion Test (LSSCT) on a group of Protestant seminarians. Basically this study is a pilot study attempting to determine whether or not the LSSCT might be a useful and effective tool with Protestant seminarians and whether or not further research is warranted.

The LSSCT is a sentence completion test (100 stems) used for determining adjustment of seminarians or their need for psychological counseling. It is most frequently used as a screening device. The LSSCT was originally developed specifically for use with Catholic diocesan seminarians (Gorman & Kobler, 1963) and was found to be quite helpful in screening even though at this time it was evaluated on an impressionistic basis only. Later Sheridan (1968) developed an objective scoring system for the LSSCT, very similar to the Rotter scoring system (1950), and established significant reliability and validity coefficients. Further validation studies using Sheridan's scoring system confirmed the test's usefulness as a measure of adjustment for Catholic religious (McLaughlin, 1969; Heinrich, 1967).

Based on past research, sentence completion tests have proved most effective when a specific instrument was created for a particular population and when they were designed to answer very limited, specific
questions (Sheridan, 1968). An objective scoring system further increases the utility of the sentence completion test. The LSSCT fulfills all of these requirements. It was created specifically for Catholic seminarians; it was designed to answer a very specific question, "Does the seminarian need psychological help?"; and it has an objective scoring system.

In attempting to use the test with Protestant seminarians, the last two requirements are still met—the specificity of purpose and the objective scoring system. The question is whether or not Protestant seminarians as a group are similar enough to Catholic seminarians as a group to uphold the effectiveness of the test.

For the purposes of this study, the LSSCT has been changed as little as possible in order to facilitate Catholic-Protestant comparisons. Some stems were changed in wording to make them more appropriate for use with Protestants, but every effort was made to keep the meaning of the stems the same. The manual has been left as is.

The basic hypothesis of this study is that the LSSCT is an effective measure of adjustment for Protestant seminarians, or, in other words, that it is able to differentiate seminarians in need of counseling from those not in need of counseling. The testing of this hypothesis requires that we evaluate the validity and reliability of the LSSCT when used with Protestants. More specifically, we must:

1. Test for congruent validity by correlating LSSCT scores with the criteria used in other studies, i.e., MMPI scores and supervisor ratings. The prediction is that the Total LSSCT score and the subscores will significantly differentiate
the two criteria groups, those in need of counseling and
those not in need of counseling.

2. Test interscore reliability. The prediction is that LSSCT's,
individually scored by two qualified scorers, will yield
significant reliability coefficients. Testing this is especi­
ally important when using a test with a new population.

Two other areas of investigation will be considered which do not
directly relate to the basic hypothesis. First, the LSSCT scores of
first-, second-, and third-year seminarians will be compared in order
to discover if significant differences in average LSSCT scores appear
with respect to length of stay in the seminary. No significant differ­
ences between average scores on the LSSCT are expected. Second, some
descriptive comparisons between Protestant and Catholic seminarians
will be made based on their LSSCT scores.
All three major religious groups, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, have increasingly employed psychological testing as part of their screening programs, but until recently each group worked primarily in isolation (Bier, 1970). One of the first attempts to bring the three groups together was in 1962 when a conference on psychological assessment of ministerial candidates was sponsored by the Board of Theological Education in the Lutheran Church in America. Dittes and Menges' book, *Psychological Studies of Clergymen*, published in 1965 (and Menges' supplement in 1967) also helped to increase inter-faith awareness of research on religious groups. The stage was set for a major effort towards a multi-faith, interdisciplinary approach to seminarian testing when in 1966 the Academy of Religion and Mental Health held a symposium on the topic. The result was a book, *Psychological Testing for Ministerial Selection*, edited by W. C. Bier (1970).

This review of the literature will focus first of all on the psychological assessment of Protestant seminarians; secondly, on the validation of the *Loyola Seminarian Sentence Completion Test*; and thirdly, on inter-faith studies, especially comparing Catholics and Protestants. Excellent reviews of the assessment of Catholic seminarians can be found in McCarthy (1970), Heinrich (1967), and McLaughlin (1969). Brown (1970) reviews the literature on testing for the
Rabbinate.

**Psychological Assessment of Protestant Seminarians**

Psychological tests of some kind are employed for screening purposes by approximately three-fourths of Protestant seminaries (Hunt, 1974). Most of the research in psychological testing has been done by those denominations which have the most clearly defined doctrines of church and ministry (e.g., Protestant Episcopal Church, United Presbyterian Church U.S.A., United Lutheran Church). In reviewing the research on Protestant seminarians it is important to keep in mind that Protestant seminarians are undoubtedly not as homogeneous a group as are Catholic seminarians. Protestant churches are often ethnic in character, may be liberal or conservative, liturgical or non-liturgical, and also differ greatly in size of membership.

Among the various Protestant denominations, the Protestant Episcopal Church has been the most active in the use of psychological testing for screening purposes. In 1949 the House of Bishops made it mandatory that all ministerial candidates undergo psychological examinations. The best-known psychological examiner in the church is George Booth who has had over 30 years of experience with Episcopal and other Protestant seminarians and clergymen, and as of 1962 had conducted more than 500 psychological examinations and had conducted therapy with some 230 clergymen (Booth, 1960, 1963).

Booth claims that his method of examination, although laborious, is very effective and practical. It includes a written self-examination including biographical data and attitudes toward the ministry; several
projective tests (Szondi, Rorschach, and drawings); and an interview. He stresses joint use of interview and testing.

Booth (1960) is very cautious in his conclusions about the potentials of candidates:

only rarely are candidates to be eliminated on the basis of serious pathology;
undesirable traits appear among the satisfactory candidates as well as among the unsatisfactory candidates;
the strength of undesirable traits cannot be measured accurately;
eliminatig candidates "on the basis of psychiatric classifications would deprive the church of some of its most valuable ministers."

The United Presbyterian Church U.S.A. developed one testing battery for "preliminary counseling" on the local level and a more extensive battery for applicants to denominational seminaries. Froyd (1956) found about 5% of those tested appeared to have personality and academic problems which made it inadvisable for them to enter the ministry. Since then the United Lutheran Church and the American Baptist Convention have used similar patterns for testing seminarians (Ashbrook, 1970).

Harrower (1963, 1964) has done extensive testing of Unitarian-Universalist seminarians. Her original battery included the Miala-Holsopple Sentence Completion Test, the Rorschach, TAT, DAP, Szondi, and Wechsler-Bellevue. A seven-year follow-up of 135 seminarians indicated that she was correct in picking out "unsuccessful ministers" but not correct in predicting "successful ministers."

Stern, Stein, and Bloom (1956) have demonstrated a very impressive method for assessment of seminarians using a small sample of students from a midwestern theological seminary of a liberal Protestant
denomination. These researchers had the seminary staff draw up a list of major characteristics they considered significant for a ministerial student in their school. The staff also chose three ideal or desirable students and three undesirable students from their student body. These six students were then given a battery of psychological tests, including the Wechsler-Bellevue, the Rorschach, TAT, and a sentence completion test. Using the model of an ideal seminary student set up by the staff, the assessors then had an assessment conference where they analyzed the psychodiagnostic materials and decided whether each student was desirable or not. Faculty evaluations of subjects were made known to the assessors only after the assessment was complete and they had revealed their decisions. There was complete unanimity regarding the disposition of all six cases. As the researchers concluded, "Although only six cases were employed in this study, the complete replication of the faculty's judgments by the assessors is statistically significant."

In 1961 the Ministry Studies Board carried out a survey of psychological testing in theological schools in the United States (Ashbrook, 1970). Of some 72 instruments that were being used, those most frequently used (starting with most frequent) were the MMPI, SVIB, Structured-objective Rorschach, Miller Analogies Test, and the Graduate Record Exam. No type of sentence completion test was listed at all in the top 13 tests. Since this time the list has changed and the Theological School Inventory (TSI) has become the most popular instrument used (Cardwell, 1974).

The development of the Theological School Inventory (TSI) has been the most distinctly Protestant research with seminarian screening.
First developed by Kling (1958) to determine the strength and type of motivation among seminarians, it is now widely used in many different types of Protestant seminaries. The TSI is not really a personality test but rather a self-report designed to draw out of the seminarian a description of his motives for entering the ministry, the history of his decision to enter the ministry, the nature of his call to the ministry, the definiteness of the decision, and his flexibility. The test yields seven ipsative scores in seven categories [(A) Acceptance, (I) Intellectual Concern, (F) Self-fulfillment, (L) Leadership Success, (E) Evangelical Witness, (R) Social Reform, and (P) Service to Persons] and five absolute or non-ipsative scores [(D) Definiteness, (NL) Natural Leading, (SL) Special Leading, (CC) Call Concept, (FL) Flexibility] (Theological School Inventory, 1972).

The norms of the TSI were based on a sample of 2300 seminarians in 53 theological schools (Dittes, 1964). Considerable research has been carried out on the TSI (Kling, Pierson, & Dittes, 1963; Dittes & DeWire, 1963; Dittes, 1963a, 1963b). The TSI is not to be thought of as a predictive instrument. Rather it is considered most useful in the guidance and counseling of students.

Recently Cardwell (1974) carried out a study to determine whether or not the TSI is outdated, especially in its concept of the "call." After surveying feedback from 315 students from a wide range of theological schools, she found the responses more positive than anticipated. She concluded that the TSI was still meaningful and needed no revision at present.

The acceptance of psychological testing for seminary students and
Psychology in general has been a slow process in many Christian churches, partly because of a misunderstanding of what psychological testing is all about. Psychology is still often viewed as a threat to Christianity and there is still widespread suspicion of psychological testing and its usefulness in assessing adequacy for the ministry. But as testing is increasingly being used in the context of counseling students rather than as a cold, impersonal screening technique, there seems to be more acceptance of it and less fear. Hunt (1974) tries to put psychological testing in proper perspective in his introduction to the TSI: "Tests, statistics, and computers are neither a secret pipeline to God nor a frivolous waste of time. In their proper place as servants they may be a useful tool to help you gain insight into your relation to God, your vocational choice, and your place in the world."

Validation of the Loyola Seminarian Sentence Completion Test

Before reviewing the literature on the LSSCT it would be valuable to review briefly the findings on sentence completion tests (SCT) in general. The SCT is one of the projective techniques reviewed in the Handbook of Projective Techniques (Murstein, 1965). After reviewing the articles on SCT's, Murstein writes in his introduction that "The Sentence Completion Method is a valid test, generally speaking, and probably the most valid of all the projective techniques reported in the literature." (p. 777) To support this statement Murstein points to a survey by Goldberg (1965) in which the validity findings of some fifty studies with the SCT are summarized and discussed. Although the fifty studies included many different SCT forms, a variety of scoring
methods, a variety of criteria, and a heterogeneity of populations, the data have nonetheless been consistently impressive.

In 1968 Goldberg again attempted to review the current status of sentence completion methods. Although the SCT ranked 6th in order of clinical usage, it was not the preferred test in any of 12 clinical tasks, but was viewed rather as a supplementary test by most clinicians. However, there was almost unanimous agreement that the SCT was useful in evaluating interpersonal attitudes and in assessing adjustment. It is precisely in this area of assessing adjustment that the supporting evidence for the sentence completion is most impressive, especially using the Rotter.

The Rotter and Rafferty Incomplete Sentence Blank (1950), designed specifically to detect college students in need of counseling, is probably the best known SCT and one of the only ones to have an empirical scoring system. The scoring system was derived by taking sample responses from records of individuals known to be grossly disturbed and of persons considered to be quite normal. There are separate manuals published for males and females. Interscorer reliability, with advanced clinical psychology graduate students as scorers, is reported as .96 for female records and .91 for male records. Churchill and Crandale (1965) report interscorer reliability of .94 and .95 using two seniors majoring in Psychology and a graduate with a B.A. in Psychology as scorers. These results seem to show the effectiveness and clarity of the ISB manual.

The ISB produces a total score only. The authors suggest a score of 135 as a good cut-off point to determine which college students are
in need of counseling. They point out that this is not a magic number and may have to be adjusted for different college populations. This cut-off was able, however, to identify 78% of the adjusted individuals and 59% of the maladjusted.

The scoring manual for the LSSCT has borrowed much from the Rotter ISB, including the use of scoring examples.

The original sentence completion stems of the Loyola Seminarian Sentence Completion Test, shown in Appendix A, were selected on the basis of face validity by Gorman and Kobler (1963) who had had much experience with the seminary population for whom the test was being created. This test was then used as a part of a whole battery of tests routinely administered to the seminarians involved and at this time was evaluated on an impressionistic basis only. It was found to be quite helpful.

The data accumulated over a number of years at these two diocesan minor seminaries formed the basis for Sheridan's attempt (1968) to develop an objective scoring system for the LSSCT and to establish validity and reliability coefficients using this scoring system. He modeled his scoring system after that of Rotter and Rafferty (1950), scoring each response on a seven-point, bipolar scale of adjustment. Number four represented a midpoint or neutral response with numbers one through three representing degrees of favorable responses and numbers five through seven representing degrees of unfavorable or poorly-adjusted responses. He also developed a scoring manual with examples for each of the one hundred stems. Scoring a protocol yields a total test score, representing overall adjustment, and six subtest scores
which reflect Attitude Toward Self, Attitude Toward Priesthood, Attitude Toward Family, Attitude Toward Women, Attitude Toward Others, and Attitude Toward Important Issues.

Sheridan tested for two kinds of reliability, interscorer reliability and test-retest reliability. To test for interscorer reliability and thereby to test the clarity of the manual and scoring procedures, two first-year graduate students in Psychology independently scored 30 LSSCT protocols. The resulting Pearson product moment correlation was .91, significant at the .01 level.

To test for test-retest reliability, Sheridan re-examined 30 subjects two months after they had taken the first test. This Pearson product moment correlation coefficient, .84, was also significant at the .01 level.

The specific purpose the LSSCT was designed for was to detect seminary students in need of psychological help. To measure the congruent validity of the LSSCT with regard to this purpose, two independent criteria were established for seminarians "in need of psychological help" and those "not in need of psychological help." These two criteria were MMPI scores and psychologists' ratings. More specifically, the "in need of psychological help" validation group was made up of students who scored above 70 on at least three MMPI scales and who were judged by both psychologists to be in need of counseling. The "not in need of psychological help" validation group consisted of students who did not score above 65 on any MMPI scale and who were judged by both psychologists not to be in need of counseling. There were 30 subjects in each group. To obtain a validity coefficient, the LSSCT scores of these two
groups were analyzed by the biserial correlational method. Sheridan found a highly significant relationship (0.88) between the total score on the LSSCT and the need for counseling criteria. The validity coefficients of subtests ranged from 0.59 to 0.82 with the exception of the Attitude Toward Women category. As a guide for those using the LSSCT in their screening programs, Sheridan determined cut-off scores both for the total score and for the subscores and suggested that any score on or above these scores should be investigated as possible signs of maladjustment. His cut-off scores were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Priesthood</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Important Issues</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, Sheridan attempted to test predictive validity, that is, the ability of the LSSCT to predict the perseverers and dropouts in the seminary. His two criteria groups were 30 who left the seminary within one year of taking the LSSCT and 30 who had remained in the seminary at least three years. His results indicated generally non-significant relationships between the LSSCT scores and perseverance. Only the Attitude Toward Priesthood yielded a significant correlation, but it was too low to really be useful. This finding is not too surprising in light of other findings on the ability of psychological tests to predict perseverance in seminary.

Sheridan's original sample was composed solely of diocesan minor seminarians. Heinrich (1967) attempted to cross-validate the LSSCT, using the manual created by Sheridan, on a group of religious seminarians. His sample of 50 was made up of all first-year college students from six different religious communities. He used the same basic
criteria for need of counseling as did Sheridan, but had to use prefects who knew the students well rather than psychologists as raters. Heinrich chose 400 as the total test cut-off score and found that this accurately detected 75% of the "in need of counseling" group and misdiagnosed only 8% of the adjusted group. However, as Sheridan points out, if Heinrich had used 390 as Sheridan suggested, he would have accurately detected 100% of the group in need of counseling and still only misdetected 8% of the adjusted group.

Heinrich found that agreement between raters' judgments and the MMPI criteria was rather low as was the correlation between raters' judgments and high scores on the LSSCT. However, the correlation between LSSCT total score and mean MMPI score was .88 while the subtest scores on Attitude Toward Family and Attitude Toward Self correlated .85 and .80 respectively with the mean MMPI score. The other subtests showed lower correlations.

Finally, Heinrich compared the LSSCT scores of first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year seminarians and found that the means for the total test score and for each of the subscores were quite stable through the four years. This is an important finding in the light of the fact that others (Murray, 1958; Hakenewerth, 1964) have found that MMPI scores tend to rise over the years spent in seminary. Murray suggested that this may be directly related to the type of life seminary requires and encourages. Heinrich's finding is also important in the light of the author's present study since it suggests that age is not an important factor in the stability of LSSCT scores. The subjects of this present study are all college graduates and older than the
subjects in either Sheridan or Heinrich's study. Heinrich's results suggest that this may not be a crucial factor in our findings.

A further cross-validation study of the LSSCT was carried out by McLaughlin (1969) who used 60 seminarians from two diocesan minor seminaries in Chicago. His subjects took the LSSCT during their twelfth grade of school. Using the same criteria of adjustment as the above studies, he compared 30 subjects "in need of counseling" and 30 subjects "not in need of counseling" and determined biserial correlations of LSSCT scores and the need for counseling. He found a .83 correlation between total test score and the need for counseling, significant at the .01 level. This compares with Sheridan's coefficient of .88. There was considerable divergence between subtest correlations and the criteria in this study and in Sheridan's study. The longest of the subtests, the Attitude Toward Self subtest which contains 33 items, is the only one that yielded almost identical correlations in this study (.81) and in Sheridan's (.82). The most obvious reason for the differences in the other correlations is that the other subtests are shorter which tends to make them less reliable and hence less valid. This points to the importance of not making decisions based on any one subtest, but looking at the overall pattern.

In comparison to Sheridan's cut-off score of 390, and Heinrich's 400, McLaughlin found 380 to be the most useful cut-off score, detecting 93% of those in need of counseling and misdetecting 17%. He suggests using a range of scores (380-400) rather than a single score. His own choice of 380 misdetects a fair percentage of the adjusted group. When setting up cut-off scores one must determine what kind of errors in
detection are more important or are more to be avoided in the situation where the test is being used. If it is crucial to detect as many of the maladjusted as possible, it may be inevitable that more adjusted ones are also misdiagnosed. But if one only wishes to screen out the worst, errors may be made in the other direction. Here the purpose of the test and the way the screening is done must be taken into consideration.

McLaughlin also tested inter-scorer reliability and found a correlation coefficient of .91, the same as found in Sheridan's study. This further indicates support for the usefulness and clarity of the objective scoring system and the manual developed by Sheridan. The two graduate students who acted as scorers were not experienced in scoring sentence completion tests nor had they been given any special training.

Mary Sheehan (1971) attempted to construct and validate a similar sentence completion blank for priests or clergymen. The resulting Loyola Sentence Completion Blank for Clergyman (LSCBC) consisted of 72 sentence stems, 12 stems in each of six areas: self-perception, interpersonal relations, psychosexual maturity, church-faith, priesthood, and job satisfaction. Using a scoring technique similar to Rotter and Rafferty's (1950) she, too, developed a manual of scoring examples. Scoring a protocol results in an overall adjustment score and a subscore in each of the six areas listed above. Sheehan's LSCBC has a refinement that Sheridan's does not have, namely an equal number of stems in each category.

To determine the congruent validity of the LSCBC, biserial correlations were run using the LSCBC scores and (1) an MMPI criterion of
adjustment, (2) psychologist's ratings based on interviews, and (3)
these two criteria in combination. All three correlations were signi-
ficant, the joint criteria giving the highest correlation ($r_{bis} = .86$).
The total score was a more adequate indicator of adjustment than were
the individual subtests.

To determine inter-scorer reliability, two judges independently
scored LSCBC's. The resulting Pearson $r$'s ranged from a low of .84 on
the Self-perception subtest to .96 on the total score. Thus the test
is quite reliable.

Sheehan, too, determined cut-off scores and found that an overall
score of 274 correctly identified 87% of the subjects on the basis of
adequate versus inadequate adjustment. She found the subtests were not
accurate indices of adjustment when used by themselves, but were better
used as clinical indicators when they deviate at least eight or ten
points from the mean.

Since her original study, Sheehan has used the LSCBC with American
Catholic bishops (Sheehan & Kobler, 1976). Assuming that the LSCBC was
a valid measure of adjustment for bishops, she compared the psychological
development of bishops with that of priests and found that "the bishops
showed a more positive psychological development than the priests on all
of the subtests of the LSCBC." Eighty-four per cent of the bishops were
in the adequate adjustment category whereas only 64% of the priests were
in the adequate adjustment category.

Regarding the use of the LSCBC with groups of clergymen other than
Catholic, Sheehan suggests that "though some of the items may be couched
in terminology more usual for Roman Catholics than for other sects and though some items may not apply so personally (e.g., #49, "Celibacy. . . .") the test as a whole seems adaptable for non-Catholic clergymen as well as Catholic clergymen."

**Catholic-Protestant Comparative Studies**

As mentioned before, research has indicated that the sentence completion technique is most effective when used with the population for which it was created—or one very similar to it. Using a "valid" test on a different population may show the test ineffective with this new population. For example, Rotter and Rafferty (1950) created the Incomplete Sentence Blank (ISB) to screen college students in need of counseling. But when Dean (1957) used the ISB on a different population, blind subjects, the test did not discriminate and his results were not significant. The same thing was true of Rotter and Willerman's study (1947) which found the ISB an ineffective measure of adjustment when used with Army Air Force convalescent hospital patients.

The LSSCT was originally created for a specific minor seminary and later validated on religious as well as diocesan seminarians. Sheehan suggested that her instrument for Catholic priests could probably be adapted quite easily for use with Protestant clergymen, but to date no such studies on Protestants have been carried out. The question we need to consider is whether or not the Protestant seminarians are similar enough to the Catholic seminarians for which the LSSCT was created.

There are, of course, not only some very obvious differences between Catholic and Protestants, but there is very wide variation within
the Catholic Church itself and even more so in the Protestant Church with its many denominations. In general, however, formal training for the religious life is a much longer process in the Catholic Church than in most Protestant denominations, and the decision to enter religious life comes at an earlier age, although this is beginning to change. Most Protestant seminaries are comparable to graduate school and the decision to enter the ministry need not come until near the end of one's college career or even later, depending on the requirements of the seminary in question. Protestant seminarians often require three or four years of theological training.

Another very obvious difference between Protestant seminarians and Catholic seminarians is regarding marriage and celibacy. Most Protestant seminarians are married or will soon be married while Catholic religious must choose celibacy. And the Catholic seminarian's freedom to associate with women in general is usually much more restricted. Many Protestant seminaries now allow and encourage female students in their classes and training programs.

Also, of course, there are religious and cultural differences, but these also vary extensively among Protestant denominations themselves, some being much more similar to Catholics than others. Lenski (1961) attempts to describe some of the differences between Protestant and Catholic clergymen in terms of background, class origin, and church factors.

Schroeder (1963) made a survey of some 800 church members, both Catholic and Protestant, as to their expectations of their leaders,
either priests or ministers. As far as the three components of leadership which he considered, (1) administrative, technical competence; (2) emotive or social skills with people; and (3) religious or spiritual qualities, he found that both Protestant and Catholic laymen preferred ministers who can get along with people rather than either highly spiritual or technically skilled ministers. Catholic expectations indicated that the role of a priest was more well-defined and more sharply delineated than that of a Protestant minister. Also, Roman Catholics tended to expect less of their ministers than did Protestants. With these exceptions, the expectations of leaders were very similar for both Catholic and Protestant laymen. This study, however, says nothing about the actual psychological differences or similarities between Protestant and Catholic seminarians which is what we are primarily interested in in this study.

Many researchers have attempted to discover a common personality among seminarians by looking for a common MMPI pattern. Kobler (1964) compared 1152 religious (Catholic) MMPI's with 5000 college students and found peaks at Pt and Sc for the religious. Sandra (1957) reported that MMPI scores of candidates for the religious life were significantly higher than those of college students on the following scales: D, Hy, Pt, Pa, and Sc. Bloom (1971) surveyed the MMPI literature (both Protestant and Catholic) and concluded that "seminarian and pulpit profiles tend to peak at Mf." Often K is also high, he adds. Bijkerk (1967) came to the same conclusion when he found that the MMPI profiles of the pre-seminarians at the seminary now under study tended to peak at Mf, then at K.
One very valuable comparative study on the MMPI was carried out by Cardwell (1967). She collected MMPI profiles of seminarians from the Christian Theological Seminary, mostly Disciples of Christ and Methodists, and compared these to the profiles of three other groups of seminarians studied by other researchers: (1) a Catholic group studied by Bier (1956); (2) United Presbyterian seminarians studied by Davis (1963); (3) students from Southern California School of Theology, mostly Methodists, studied by Fielder (1964). Berecz (1974), in reviewing this study, concludes that the most important finding of this study "is the similarity of MMPI profiles found among seminary students from different religious and geographical backgrounds. Although there are some differences, for example, between Protestants and Catholics, the similarities are by far the outstanding feature."

Nauss (1973) does an even more extensive review of the research on the personality of seminary students. In a collection of the major studies using the MMPI with seminarians he concludes that seminarians reveal "an amazing similarity on each of the scales. The uniformity of scores exists across nine Protestant and two Catholic studies." He indicates that possibly Catholic seminarians are more introverted (maybe due to more seminary isolation), but that on the whole Catholic and Protestant seminarians are remarkably similar. He also suggests that there may be more interdenominational differences among Protestants. But, in general, the pattern for the average seminarian, Protestant or Catholic, was as follows:

Hy, Pd, Pa, Pt, Sc, Ma are regularly between one-half to one
standard deviation above the mean
Hs, D between the mean and one-half standard deviation above
the mean
K, Mf are slightly more than one standard deviation above the
mean
Si is within one standard deviation below the mean

Although there are some differences of opinion among researchers, broad surveys such as Cardwell's or Nauss' suggest similarity between the personalities of Protestant and Catholic seminarians at least as measured by the MMPI.

Another comparative study, especially important in the light of this author's present study, Weisgerber's (1971) attempt to use the Theological School Inventory (TSI) with Catholic novices. As reviewed earlier, the TSI is a test which provides a description of the motivations for the ministry. Although the TSI was developed specifically for use with Protestants, Weisgerber felt that it could be used with Catholics without major revision and that using the present form would allow for better Catholic-Protestant comparisons. The subjects for his study were 67 novices from a religious order. In his results, he found that novices as a group tended to be less flexible or more conservative than Protestant seminarians. They also tended to think less of their vocation as one of "divine calling." However, his overall conclusion was that "this group of Catholic seminarians does not appear to be radically different from Protestant seminarians on the variables measured." He suggests that the TSI can be used as is with Catholic groups, but that if it is to be required of all candidates, some revision will probably be necessary.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE

Subjects

All subjects were volunteers from a population of approximately 150 full-time students at a midwestern Protestant seminary. Forty-two male students and 2 female students participated. Because of the small number of female subjects, the data collected on them was not analyzed in this study. When arranged by class or year in seminary, there were 24 first-year students, 14 second-year students and 4 third-year students. The men ranged in ages from 21 to 31, the exact mean age being 25. Sixty-nine per cent of the men were married.

The seminary from which the subjects were drawn is made up of a rather homogeneous student body. Ninety-five per cent of the students are men and although not all are married now, most will eventually marry. The primary vocational goal is the ministry in a specific denomination, reformed in character. All students are college graduates and most come from a similar background and heritage.

Description of Original and Adapted LSSCT

Before discussing the Protestant adaptation, a review of the original form is in order (Appendix A).

The Loyola Seminarian Sentence Completion Test (LSSCT) is a semi-projective technique designed to elicit, in the seminarian's own words,
his attitude toward Self, Priesthood, Family, Women, Others, and Important Issues. The 100 sentence completion stems were selected on an a posteriori or face validity basis by Gorman and Kobler (1963) who had had extensive experience in working with the psychological problems of the seminary students for whom the test had been created. Originally, the test was only evaluated on an impressionistic basis by a psychologist who was working with a given student, and only used when a student was in need of counseling. It was not until Sheridan's work that an attempt was made to establish an objective scoring system.

The scoring system developed by Sheridan is modelled after that of Rotter (1950) except that a seven-point scale is used rather than a six-point scale. Number four represents the mid-point or "neutral" response; number one represents the most favorable or well-adjusted response; number seven represents the most unfavorable or maladjusted response. Each response is rated on the scale from one to seven.

A scoring manual was devised by Sheridan which contains empirically-determined scoring examples for each stem, as well as general principles for scoring. The LSSCT, then, provides a total adjustment score as well as six subtest scores in these categories: Self, Priesthood, Family, Women, Others, and Important Issues. Brief descriptions of each category are presented below.

Attitude Toward Self (33 stems)

This subtest measures the feeling and regard an individual has for himself. The stems are constructed to elicit information pertaining to the individual's feelings about his past and present life as well as his expectations for the future. Specific instances, e.g., the person's regard for his ability to meet new
situations, are also tapped here. The subject's self-concept is further measured in terms of how he handles his anger, sexual life, and how adequate he perceives his own abilities to be.

**Attitude Toward Priesthood (16 stems)**

This subtest measures the individual's attitude toward his current seminary experiences and toward the priesthood in general. It also taps critical interest areas like theological studies and prayer.

**Attitude Toward Family (14 stems)**

This subtest measures a subject's attitude toward each parent and sibling, and toward the family as a whole. It also examines feelings about leaving home and about parental expectations.

**Attitude Toward Women (7 stems)**

The subject's attitude toward women, toward marriage, and toward the fact of experiences with women being limited, are measured. Further, feelings which occur in the presence of women, and attitudes toward involvement with women are also included.

**Attitude Toward Others (14 stems)**

This category measures an individual's attitude toward a variety of persons outside his family, such as friends, fellow students, strangers, or an audience. The focus is on the quality and degree of interaction between the subject and these various other people.

**Attitude Toward Important Issues (16 stems)**

This subtest measures an individual's attitude toward important life situations he must confront. Included are attitudes toward authority, personal ambition, sports participation, independence with regard to money and use of time, and resolution of significant conflicts.

To adapt the LSSCT for use with Protestants, several minor changes were made in the stems (Appendix B). In the following stems the words "priest" or "priesthood" were changed to "minister" or "ministry": 3,
38, 52, 68, 78, 95, and 100. Stem 20, "The thought of getting married . . .", was changed to "The thought of getting married or being married . . ."; stem 70, "When I go to Niles Seminary, I will miss. . ..", was changed to "When I leave this seminary, I will miss. . .."; in stem 83 the word "Niles" was dropped; and stem 100, "Being a secular priest in Chicago. . ..", was changed to "Being a (name of denomination) minister . . ..". The changes were made on a subjective basis with the intent of remaining as close as possible to the original meaning of the stem.

The LSSCT protocols were scored using Sheridan's manual. Although some items tended to elicit quite different responses from Protestants than from Catholics, an attempt was made to score them following Sheridan's procedure and examples as closely as possible.

Administration

All subjects were volunteers, but, due to the difficulty of obtaining subjects, the circumstances under which the test was taken was different for different subjects.*

The first attempt at gaining volunteers was made during class time during the absence of a professor but only about half of the students showed up for class. A second attempt to sample the whole student body was made by stuffing letters of explanation and LSSCT forms in the students' mailboxes and thus asking for volunteers. This met with very

*The seminary under study is the equivalent of a graduate school and the work load is very heavy. The students have little or no free time during school hours and since they all live off-campus, it is impossible to get them together after hours.
poor response. The author then attempted to recruit volunteers on an individual basis by talking to the students in the coffee shop. Some took the test right there and many others took it home with the promise of returning it within the week. There was little return on these promises. A reminder was put in the school newsletter but with no response. Finally, one last attempt was made to recruit volunteers when the author and three other Psychology students attempted to contact seminarians on a 1:1 basis. Again, several promises were obtained but only one actually followed through. So, although the author had hoped to obtain 75-100 subjects, only 45 were finally obtained.

**Test Validity**

To determine congruent validity, MMPI protocols and ratings on need for counseling were collected on as many subjects as possible. With the students' permissions, MMPI's were obtained from their psychological files at the seminary. Most of these were recent protocols (less than one year old). Because of the high test-retest reliability of the MMPI and because of the difficulty obtaining new MMPI's, no new MMPI's were obtained. Each subject was rated by two professors who were familiar with him or her and who felt qualified to rate him or her. Sample rating instructions can be found in Appendix C. All subjects were rated except for three, two who wrote their tests anonymously and one who was unknown to the raters. MMPI's were available for 37 subjects. So 37 subjects have both MMPI's and ratings, 6 subjects have just ratings, and 3 subjects had neither. Only the 37 were used in determining test
validity.

**Test Reliability**

To determine interscorer reliability, a random sample of 20 LSSCT protocols were selected and scored separately by two separate scorers, one an experienced psychologist, the other an undergraduate psychology major. Neither scorer had any contact with the other scorer. Upon being presented the Sheridan manual for scoring, the scorers were given no other verbal instructions in scoring except to follow the manual as closely as possible. To further check interscorer reliability, the scores of the above scorers were each separately correlated with the author's scores.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Data of the current study were analyzed with appropriate correlational techniques. The results are presented in terms of the two hypotheses regarding congruent validity and interscorer reliability. Finally, the inter-class relationships and inter-subtest relationships are examined.

Congruent Validity

Congruent validity was examined in terms of the relationship between subjects' subtest and total scores on the LSSCT and the combined criteria of MMPI performance and professors' judgments as to the need of counseling. The "not in need of counseling" group was made up of all subjects who were judged "not in need of counseling" by both judges and whose MMPI protocols did not show three scales above 70 or a mean above 58. Eighteen subjects fell into this category. No subject fulfilled both of the requirements of the "in need" group. Only one subject had three MMPI scales greater than 70. This subject plus all nine subjects who were rated by at least one rater to be in need of counseling were put into the "in need of counseling" group. In reviewing the following results, therefore, it should be kept in mind that although the "not in need of counseling" criteria were the same as in Sheridan's study, the "in need of counseling" criteria were less stringent due to the lack of
subjects who fell into this category.

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations for the performance of the two criterion groups on the LSSCT. A brief inspection of Table 1 indicates higher means for the subjects judged to be in need of counseling than for the subjects not in need of counseling. In general, the somewhat higher standard deviations (in all but the Ministry and Important Issues subtests) for the group in need of counseling suggests somewhat greater variability of performance for that group.

The relationship between scores on the LSSCT and the membership in either criterion group was analyzed by the biserial correlational technique. Table 2 presents the biserial coefficients for the six subtests and total test score for the LSSCT with need for counseling and no need for counseling. The significant positive correlations indicate that, in general, high scores on the LSSCT are related to high MMPI performance or professors' judgments regarding need for counseling. On the other hand, low LSSCT scores coincide with MMPI performance within normal limits and professors' judgments not to be in need of counseling. The Women subtest shows the least significant correlation.

Figure 1 shows a scattergram representing the relationship between total score and membership in either criterion group. Inspection of the range of performance suggests that the placement of a cut-off score at 370 would be a more appropriate lower limit of detection for seminarians in need of counseling, at least for this population, than either Sheridan's cut-off of 390 or McLaughlin's 380. According to Figure 1, a cut-off score of 370 would correctly identify 9 out of 10 or 90% of those
Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Scores, 18 Subjects Not in Need of Counseling and 10 Subjects in Need of Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>127.22</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>20.72</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Issues</td>
<td>58.44</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Test</td>
<td>352.83</td>
<td>23.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

Biserial Correlations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Scores with Need for Counseling or No Need for Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>r_BIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>.57**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.64***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important Issues</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Test Score</td>
<td>.84***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at .01 level  
**Significant at .05 level  
*Significant at .06 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSSCT</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>per cent (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430-439</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420-429</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410-419</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-409</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390-399</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380-389</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370-379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360-369</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-359</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340-349</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-339</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-329</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18
N=10

Fig. 1. Scattergram of total test score and membership in need of counseling group and not in need of counseling group.
judged to be in need of counseling while also identifying four false positives, namely, the four individuals in the "not in need of counseling" group who scored above 370. If Heinrich's cut-off score of 400 were used, no false positives would be identified. However, this cut-off score would only detect 50% of those in need of counseling. The cut-off score most appropriate depends on the purpose of the test and the importance of false negatives and false positives.

Figure 2 presents the scattergram which depicts the correlation between the Attitude Toward Self subtest and the criteria. Examination of Figure 2 indicates that Sheridan's cut-off score of 140 detects 60% of those in need of counseling while only two of the "not in need of counseling" group were falsely detected.

A scattergram of performance on the Attitude Toward Ministry subtest is shown in Figure 3. Placement of a cut-off at a score of 60 correctly identifies 8 of 10 or 80% of the subjects in need of counseling, while misdetecting 5 of 18 or 28% of those not in need of counseling.

Figure 4 indicates the spread of scores on the Attitude Toward Family subtest. Sheridan used a cut-off score of 60 on the Attitude Toward Family subtest and detected 40% of those in need of counseling. A cut-off score of 60 here detects only 2 of the 10 or 20% of those in need of counseling and points out one false positive. Using a cut-off score of 50, as shown in Figure 4, 7 of 10 or 70% of those in need of counseling were detected, but five false positives were also misdetected.

The Attitude Toward Women subtest scores are presented in Figure 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Self LSSCT</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>per cent (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165-169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155-159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-139</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-134</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-129</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115-119</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110-114</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18

N=10

Fig. 2. Scattergram of attitude toward self score and membership in need of counseling group and not in need of counseling group
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Ministry LSSCT</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>per cent (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18                               
N=10

### Fig. 3

Scattergram of attitude toward ministry score and membership in need of counseling group and not in need of counseling group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Family LSSCT</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>per cent (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65–69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35–39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18                          
N=10

Fig. 4. Scattergram of attitude toward family score and membership in need of counseling group and not in need of counseling group
### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Women LSSCT</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>percent (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>N=18</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 5. Scattergram of attitude toward women score and membership in the need for counseling group and not in need of counseling group*
Because the range of scores in this subtest is so limited, Sheridan was not able to determine a feasible cut-off score. McLaughlin suggested a cut-off score of 25 which detected 22 of 30 or 73% of those in need of counseling and falsely detected 23% of those not in need. Figure 5 shows that a cut-off score of 25 detects 60% of those judged to be in need of counseling and misdetects 11% of those not in need of counseling. The usefulness of a cut-off score on this subtest is still questionable.

Figure 6 presents the scores of both criteria groups on the Attitude Toward Others subtest. A cut-off score of 50 correctly identifies 70% of those in need of counseling and only misdetects one of those not in need.

The scores on the Attitude Toward Important Issues subtest are presented in Figure 7. If a cut-off score of 60 is used, as Sheridan suggested, 60% of those in need of counseling are detected but 8 of 18 or 44% of those not in need are misdetected. However, for this group of subjects there does not appear to be a better or more discriminatory cut-off score.

In Figure 8 the individual performance of the subjects in need of counseling are more closely examined. For each of these subjects the frequency of scores above the cut-off points for the subtest and total scores are presented.

In general, the hypothesis regarding validity predicted that the LSSCT total and subtest scores would significantly differentiate those seminarians, judged by two criterion measures, in need of counseling from seminarians judged not in need of counseling. The significant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Others LSSCT</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>per cent (cumulative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18                       N=10

Fig. 6. Scattergram of attitude toward others score and membership in need for counseling group and not in need of counseling group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Important Issues LSSCT</th>
<th>Not in Need of Counseling</th>
<th>In Need of Counseling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (cumulative)</td>
<td>Frequency (cumulative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=18  
N=10

Fig. 7. Scattergram of attitude toward important issues and membership in need of counseling group and not in need of counseling group
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Above Cut-off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cut-off</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Frequency of scoring on or above cut-off points on subtests and total LSSCT for 10 seminarians judged in need of counseling.
biserial correlations, presented in Table 2 and depicted in Figures 1 through 8, indicate support for this hypothesis for the subtests (except possibly the Attitude Toward Women subtest) and total test scores. Seminarians judged in need of counseling, both by three elevated MMPI scales and professors' ratings, scored significantly higher on the LSSCT than seminarians judged, by the same criteria, not in need of counseling.

**Reliability Measures**

The second hypothesis concerned interscorer reliability for the LSSCT. For this interscorer reliability, 20 randomly selected LSSCT protocols were independently scored by an experienced psychologist and by an undergraduate psychology major. The Pearson product moment correlation for interscorer consistency was .73, significant at the .01 level. To further check the consistency of interscorer reliability, the scores of the above scorers were each separately correlated with the author's scores, yielding the following Pearson r's: .73 (author and psychologist) and .81 (author and student). These, too, were significant at the .01 level. Although these correlations were somewhat lower than the r of .91 obtained by both Sheridan and McLaughlin, they are still fairly high and quite consistent.

A further post hoc reliability study was carried out with author to author correlation. A small sample of three randomly selected LSSCT protocols were independently scored and rescored by the author six months apart. The resulting Pearson r was .89, much closer to Sheridan's .91. This suggests that an experienced scorer may be able to score LSSCT protocols with greater consistency than more inexperienced scorers.
Inter-class Comparisons

To attempt to explore the effect of class or year in seminary on performance on the LSSCT, the inter-class relationships were examined. The prediction was that there would be no significant differences between the LSSCT scores of first-, second-, and third-year seminarians. Table 3 presents the overall means and standard deviations on the LSSCT total and subtest scores of all male subjects who participated in this study. Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations of the 24 first-year students on the LSSCT; Table 5 presents the same for the 14 second-year seminarians; and Table 6 presents them for the 4 third-year seminarians who participated in the study.

A brief inspection of the tables indicates some tendency for the scores to rise with increased stay in the seminary. However, when t-tests were run between inter-class sample means, only two of the resulting t's were significant. The means of both the second- and third-year students on the Attitude Toward Ministry subtest (67.25, 63.35 respectively) were found to be significantly different ($p < .01$) from the mean of the first-year students on the same subtest (56.08).

LSSCT Intercorrelations

To evaluate the individual contributions of subtest to the total test score and the relationships among the subtests, inter-test correlations were computed. Table 7 presents these correlations.

Examination of the intercorrelations in Table 7 indicates fairly low intercorrelations among the subtests and moderately substantial correlations with the total test score. The correlations on the whole tend to
Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Scores for All Male Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>129.33</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>59.57</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>44.73</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Issues</td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>359.85</td>
<td>31.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Scores for 24 First-year Seminarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>127.16</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>56.08</td>
<td>8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>45.04</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>43.62</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Issues</td>
<td>57.33</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>350.62</td>
<td>29.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Scores for 14 Second-year Seminarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>132.64</td>
<td>14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>63.35</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>47.14</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>45.35</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Issues</td>
<td>59.35</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370.21</td>
<td>31.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Score for Four Third-year Seminarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>130.75</td>
<td>7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>67.25</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Issues</td>
<td>58.75</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>379.00</td>
<td>26.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Intercorrelations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be slightly lower than those reported by Sheridan and McLaughlin. However, they still approach the standards suggested by Thorndike (1949) who said the best combination of subtests is where no subtest's content is duplicated by another subtest (indicated by a relatively low correlation) and where no subtest is so highly correlated with the total test as to be a possible replacement for the entire battery.
Sampling Procedure and Problems

Several points warrant discussion in regard to the sampling procedure and difficulties encountered in this study. All results must be viewed with these points kept in mind.

The author met with rather strong resistance and, in general, a negative attitude toward the study on the part of the seminarians, although, of course, this was not true of all. Some resistance was expected but the strength of it was a surprise to this author. The resistance took many forms: avoiding class; verbal resistance; not taking the test seriously; failing to follow through on promises to complete the test; lying about having taken it; and refusal to participate.

Had the test been administered and required as part of the screening process, many of the problems would have been eliminated. However, the attitude being what it was really made the author question the appropriateness and effectiveness of using psychological tests as part of the screening process. Perhaps some other approach (maybe more individualized) to screening would be more suitable and acceptable to seminarians and reduce their suspiciousness. But as it was, in this study there was considerable resistance and as a result the sample was much smaller than was desirable.
A second problem regarding the sample is that the subjects in this study were already a select group, having previously gone through the screening process. This fact, along with the small sample size made it impossible to obtain a sufficiently large group of subjects for the two criterion groups, in need of counseling and not in need of counseling. So the criteria for in need of counseling had to be changed slightly (made less stringent) so that a group could be obtained. Ideally, the LSSCT would be administered to all pre-seminarians during the actual screening process and adequate criterion groups could be drawn from the larger sample.

A third factor that may have affected the representativeness of the sample is the fact that all subjects were volunteers. Some researchers (e.g., Rosenthal & Rosnow, 1969, 1975) have emphasized that "volunteer biases" may seriously jeopardize the validity of some research interpretations. However, Kruglanski (1973), after examining the arguments and evidence available, concluded that neither logical considerations nor the empirical evidence available warrant much concern about volunteer artifacts.

Another factor to keep in mind is that the subjects took the test under varying circumstances, some during class time, some in the coffee shop, some at home.

All in all, the sample obtained was not the ideal sample. Results will be discussed with this in mind.

Reliability

Interscorer reliability was examined to test the objectivity and
clarity of the manual. Sheridan and McLaughlin both report an interscorer reliability coefficient of .91. This is consistent with that reported by Rohde (1957), Churchill and Crandall (1965), and Rotter, Rafferty, and Schachtitz (1965). For sentence completion tests used specifically with seminarians, Vaughan (1956) reported interscorer reliability as .89 and Fehr (1958) as .92. The interscorer reliability coefficients obtained in this study ranged from .73 to .81, all significant but considerably lower than those reported in the literature. However, the intra-scorer reliability coefficient, obtained by having the author score and rescore protocols six months apart, was .89, much closer to those reported in the literature.

What these results suggest is that for untrained and inexperienced scorers the manual may be less useful and less clear when it comes to scoring Protestant responses and more of the scorer's subjective judgment may be called upon. For example, fewer Protestant responses are found in the examples listed for each stem. Also the reported time taken to score a single protocol (25-30 minutes) is considerably longer than the 15 minutes reported by Sheridan. But for a more experienced scorer (this author), reliability increases significantly, suggesting that more experience and perhaps some initial training may be needed to increase the consistency and reliability of scoring. To create an even more reliable scoring system, the whole process of forming a manual by having various psychologists rate Protestant responses would have to be carried out.

Validity

Validity was examined to test whether or not the LSSCT can detect
seminarians in need of counseling. As shown in Table 2, the results indicate a highly significant relationship (.84) between total score of the LSSCT and the need for counseling, in spite of the fact that the criteria were less stringent than in Sheridan's study. This coefficient compares positively with the coefficients reported in the literature. Sheridan reports a slightly higher correlation, .88. Rohde (1957) obtained coefficients of .78 for high school girls and .82 for boys, using teachers' ratings as the criterion. Rotter et al. (1949) obtained correlations of .64 and .77 for women and men respectively with the ISB and teacher and counselor judgments of adjustment. Finally, Barry (1950) used the ISB with college students in counseling and found a .67 correlation with adjustment.

Also shown in Table 2 are the LSSCT subtests which yielded validity coefficients ranging from .50 to .74, with the exception of the Attitude Toward Women subtest. This subtest, also the shortest subtest, appears to be the least discriminatory between subjects in need of counseling and not in need of counseling. The Attitude Toward Self, Attitude Toward Family, and Attitude Toward Others subtests appear to be the most discriminatory, as well as the total score.

Inter-class Relationships

Inter-class relationships were examined to test whether or not year in seminary has an effect on the LSSCT scores. Several authors have reported a tendency for MMPI scores to rise over the years spent in seminary (Murran, 1958; Hakenewerth, 1964). Heinrich (1967), however, found
that LSSCT scores were quite stable throughout the four years in seminary. The results in Tables 4, 5, and 6 indicate some tendency for LSSCT scores to rise with increased year in seminary, but the only significant differences were of the Attitude Toward Ministry subtest where both the second- and third-year seminarians scored significantly higher than the first-year seminarians. We cannot, however, on the basis of this study conclude that seminarians become more maladjusted or that their attitude toward the ministry becomes more negative with increased time in seminary. For one thing, the sample sizes vary and there is no way of knowing whether or not the samples (especially the second- and third-year groups) are representative or not. A longitudinal study using a representative sample would be the best way to confirm or deny the trend that appears in the results. Meanwhile, it appears that total LSSCT scores do not change significantly over the years.

Protestant-Catholic Comparisons

Statistical comparisons were not computed due to the fact that the average means and standard deviations were not available for Catholic seminarians. Both McLaughlin and Sheridan studied the two extreme groups (criterion groups) and obtained no mean score representing the average Catholic seminarian. Heinrich studied a group of 50 first-year college, religious seminarians, volunteers from six separate religious communities and did obtain an average score for this group. Although this group may not be representative of all Catholic seminarians, comparisons will be made using the data collected on this group and shown in Table 8.
Table 8
Means and Standard Deviations of LSSCT Subtest and Total Scores, 50 Catholic Seminarians and 42 Protestant Seminarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Catholic Mean</th>
<th>Catholic SD</th>
<th>Protestant Mean</th>
<th>Protestant SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>135.7</td>
<td>(Not available)</td>
<td>129.33</td>
<td>31.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priesthood (Ministry)</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.57</td>
<td>8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.26</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.73</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. Issues</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Test</td>
<td>375.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>359.85</td>
<td>31.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief inspection of Table 8 indicates that all the Protestant means are slightly lower than the Catholic means. However, it should be noted that Heinrich found his group of subjects to be slightly higher on the MMPI than either Sheridan's or McLaughlin's group. If this trend is also true in the LSSCT it may account for some of the differences in Table 8.

One comparison of interest is on the Attitude Toward Women subtest. The Protestants scored lower (more positively) on this subtest, suggesting less anxiety about women and a more positive attitude toward women. This is as expected since many of the Protestant seminarians are married and, in general, have more normal contact with women.

A second area of interest is the Attitude Toward Priesthood or Ministry subtest. The Protestants did score slightly lower on this subtest although the difference is undoubtedly not significant. An interesting fact to note is that Sheridan's cut-off score for this scale is 60 and both the Protestant and Catholic means are very close to this, which, according to Sheridan, would suggest a problem area, namely a negative or critical attitude toward ministers or priests and their role. It is the author's subjective impression—based on the Protestant protocols—that there is considerable criticism of ministers and their role and an uncomfortable feeling about the expectations placed on seminarians and ministers because of their role rather than because of their individual humanness.

As noted before, the overall mean of the Protestant group is some 15 points lower than the mean of Heinrich's Catholic group. This may be
due to the specific Catholic group studied or due to the fact that the Protestant group is older and has already gone through the screening process before entering the seminary.

It is the author's judgment that any actual differences in psychological adjustment or need for counseling between Protestant and Catholic seminarians is minimal. Kennedy and Heckler's study of priests (1972), which found them essentially not much different from the average American male, would tend to confirm this.

The differences, however, in culture, religion, and background still remain and affect the use of psychological tests such as the LSSCT and TSI which were created for a specific group. On the basis of this pilot study the author feels that the LSSCT test and manual can be profitably used with Protestant seminarians as is (with the minor verbal changes used in this study). It is felt to be more appropriate for seminarians than is the Rotter ISB used by many seminary screening programs today. For individual impressionistic interpretations it is excellent.

However, if it were desirable to use the LSSCT on a wide-scale basis and require it of all Protestant seminarians, it would be desirable and profitable to change some of the items which are slightly foreign to Protestants and to recreate a new scoring manual. This is essentially the same advice given by Weisgerber (1971) about using the TSI with Catholic seminarians.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present study was an attempt to cross-validate the Loyola Seminarian Sentence Completion Test (LSSCT) on a group of 42 seminarians from a midwestern Protestant seminary. The normative data for the LSSCT was assembled over a period of four years using Catholic seminarians from St. Mary's diocesan seminary, Niles, Illinois. These data, the formulation of a scoring manual and essential information regarding interscorer reliability are reported in Sheridan's (1968) doctoral dissertation.

Minor changes in wording were made in the stems of the LSSCT to adapt the test for use with Protestants. All protocols were scored using Sheridan's manual.

The basic hypothesis of this study was that the LSSCT is an adequate and effective measure of adjustment for Protestant seminarians. The two major steps in testing this hypothesis were testing the validity and reliability of the LSSCT with Protestant subjects.

To test for interscorer reliability, three scorers independently scored 20 protocols. The resulting Pearson $r$'s were .73, .81, and .73, fairly consistent but considerably lower than the $r$ of .91 obtained by both Sheridan (1968) and McLaughlin (1969). As a post hoc study, an author to author reliability coefficient was computed by having the
author score and rescore protocols six months apart. The resulting \( r \) was .89 which suggests that an experienced scorer can score Protestant LSSCT's with high consistency. Perhaps experience and some initial training may be necessary for reliable scoring of Protestant responses since the manual is not as clear and helpful as when Catholic responses are scored. To obtain higher reliability the empirical process used to develop Sheridan's manual would have to be repeated using Protestant responses.

To determine if the LSSCT is valid with Protestant seminarians, that is, gives a measure of adjustment congruent with other measures of adjustment, biserial correlations were run using the LSSCT scores and a combination of an MMPI criterion of adjustment and professors' ratings of adjustment. The criteria for the in need of counseling group was of necessity less stringent than that used in Sheridan's study. The LSSCT total score correlated .84 with need for counseling or no need for counseling, significant at the .01 level. The subtests were not as adequate indicators of adjustment as was the total score. Of the subtests, Self, Family, and Others were most discriminatory between the two criterion groups while the Women subtest was the least discriminatory.

From these results, several conclusions follow. The LSSCT does give a useful indication of adequate versus inadequate adjustment for Protestant seminarians. The subtests, although not as accurate when used alone, do give some indication of how the seminarian is operating in a particular area. Taken as a whole, the LSSCT gives a useful clinical picture of the person's style of living, his problematic areas,
his strengths, his likes and dislikes, his hopes and fears.

Another goal of this study had to do with comparisons between the LSSCT scores of first-, second- and third-year seminarians. The only significant different found was that both the second- and third-year seminarians scored significantly higher than the first-year seminarians on the Attitude Toward Ministry subtest. Caution was suggested in interpreting these results since the samples were not necessarily representative of the class as a whole. It does not appear that the overall LSSCT scores changed significantly with increased time in the seminary.

A final goal of this study was to make some descriptive comparisons between Catholic and Protestant seminarians based on their LSSCT scores. This was difficult to accomplish because of the difficulty of obtaining an average score representative of Catholic seminarians as a whole. Heinrich's (1967) averages for first-year college, religious seminarians were used due to the lack of data of a more representative nature. Although the Protestant group of this study did score slightly lower on the total LSSCT and all of the subtests, it was concluded that actual differences in adjustment are probably minimal.

In conclusion, the LSSCT appears to be a fairly reliable and valid measure of adjustment when used with Protestant seminarians. It can be used as is (with only the minor changes made in this study) with most Protestant groups and can be an effective clinical instrument even when used impressionistically. However, if the LSSCT were to be required of all Protestant seminarians, some revision of the test and the creation of a new manual would probably be necessary.
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THE LOYOLA SEMINARIAN SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST

Code Number ___________________________ Date ________________

Please finish off the following "incomplete" sentences with any conclusion you wish. Since the aim of this exercise is to help you attain some added understanding of yourself, try to express notions that have real meaning for you.

1. When the odds are against me
2. I could be happy if
3. It seems to me that priests
4. Strangers
5. When I think of women
6. The fellows I like least
7. Living away from home
8. At times I worry
9. I take pride in
10. Being away from girls
11. I wonder if I have the ability to
12. Some people in authority
13. I feel uneasy with people who
14. My conscience
15. When I see that others are doing better than I
16. I wish I could decide
17. I become sad
18. Performing in public
19. When I am alone
20. The thought of getting married
21. My vocation
22. What I dread most about the seminary
23. When it comes to spending money
24. It makes me self-conscious
25. I know it is silly, but I feel nervous whenever
26. Of all the things about myself, I wish I could improve
27. At times I have felt ashamed
28. My fellow students
29. If I did not go to the seminary
30. I can't make up my mind
31. Compared with others, I
32. Sometimes I am suspicious of
33. My father hardly ever
34. My (brother)(sister) and I
35. When I am about to face a new situation
36. When I was a child, my family
37. When I feel sexual impulses
38. I wish that priests
39. My parents think that I
40. If someone gets in my way
41. When I am not around, my friends
42. My mother and I
43. The thought of so much praying
44. My secret ambition in life
45. The fellows I tend to hang around with
46. If my parents had only
47. The turning point in my life
48. My father and I
49. At night I
50. What I have to do now is
51. I wonder whether the seminary regulations
52. When I am with priests
53. My health
54. It makes me mad
55. I most like
56. The people I find it hardest to get to know
57. When I meet girls
58. I like working with people who
59. I am apt to get discouraged when
60. My feelings about married life
61. I was never happier than
62. I resent
63. People who work with me usually
64. Most of my friends don't know what makes me nervous
65. I suspect that my greatest weakness
66. The girl I
67. I wish
68. Getting to know a priest
69. Any trouble I have with studies
70. When I go to Niles Seminary, I will miss
71. When I have trouble with someone
72. People whom I consider my superiors
73. Deciding on my vocation
74. Nothing is harder to stop than
75. What I think will be my biggest problem
76. I wonder whether seminary studies
77. I feel particularly guilty about
78. I wonder if a priest
79. Because of my parents
80. I wonder if the spiritual life
81. The seminarian's attitude toward girls
82. My family
83. What I look forward to most at Niles Seminary
84. I wonder if one of my motives
85. If my father would only
86. I think that sports
87. When I sense that the person in charge is coming
88. Compared with most families mine
89. I get tense whenever
90. When I want out of life
91. I wonder if I am weaker than many others in
92. I hesitate
93. Compared with my mother, my dad
94. Things I have done
95. The greatest difficulty facing a priest
96. I feel closest to

97. Children

98. I think of myself as

99. I suffer most from

100. Being a secular priest in Chicago
APPENDIX B
THE LOYOLA SEMINARIAN SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST (As Modified)

Code Number ___________________________ Date ______________________

Please finish off the following "incomplete" sentences with any conclusion you wish. Since the aim of this exercise is to help you attain some understanding of yourself, try to express notions that have real meaning for you.

1. When the odds are against me

2. I could be happy if

3. It seems to me that ministers

4. Strangers

5. When I think of women

6. The fellows I like least

7. Living away from home

8. At times I worry

9. I take pride in

10. Being away from girls

11. I wonder if I have the ability to

12. Some people in authority

13. I feel uneasy with people who

14. My conscience

15. When I see that others are doing better than I

16. I wish I could decide

17. I become sad

18. Performing in public

19. When I am alone

20. The thought of getting married or being married
21. My vocation
22. What I dread most about the seminary
23. When it comes to spending money
24. It makes me self-conscious
25. I know it is silly, but I feel nervous whenever
26. Of all the things about myself, I wish I could improve
27. At times I have felt ashamed
28. My fellow students
29. If I did not go to the seminary
30. I can't make up my mind
31. Compared to others, I
32. Sometimes I am suspicious of
33. My father hardly ever
34. My (brother)(sister) and I
35. When I am about to face a new situation
36. When I was a child, my family
37. When I feel sexual impulses
38. I wish that ministers
39. My parents think that I
40. If someone gets in my way
41. When I am not around, my friends
42. My mother and I
43. The thought of so much praying
44. My secret ambition in life
45. The fellows I tend to hang around with
46. If my parents had only
47. The turning point in my life
48. My father and I
49. At night I
50. What I have to do now is
51. I wonder whether seminary regulations
52. When I am with ministers
53. My health
54. It makes me mad
55. I most like
56. The people I find it hardest to get to know
57. When I meet a girl
58. I like working with people who
59. I am apt to get discouraged when
60. My feelings about married life
61. I was never happier than
62. I resent
63. People who work with me usually
64. Most of my friends don't know that it makes me nervous
65. I suspect that my greatest weakness
66. The girl I
67. I wish
68. Getting to know a minister
69. Any trouble I have with studies
70. When I leave this seminary, I will miss
71. When I have trouble with someone
72. People whom I consider my superiors
73. Deciding on my vocation
74. Nothing is harder to stop than
75. What I think will be my biggest problem
76. I wonder whether seminary studies
77. I feel particularly guilty about
78. I wonder if a minister
79. Because of my parents
80. I wonder if the spiritual life
81. The seminarian's attitude toward girls
82. My family
83. What I look forward to most at this seminary
84. I wonder if one of my motives
85. If my father would only
86. I think that sports
87. When I sense that the person in charge is coming
88. Compared with most families mine
89. I get tense whenever
90. What I want out of life
91. I wonder if I am weaker than many others in
92. I hesitate
93. Compared with my mother, my dad
94. Things I have done
95. The greatest difficulty facing a minister
96. I feel closest to

97. Children

98. I think of myself as

99. I suffer most from

100. Being a (name of denomination) minister
APPENDIX C
You are requested to rate each seminarian who participated in this research on the following question. . . "whether I believe this seminarian is in need of psychotherapy (professional student counseling) at this time" (Y) . . . or, "I do not believe this study is in need of psychotherapy at this time" (N).

The following is simply a checklist of behavioral items which may assist in this judgment. This judgment will be held confidential and does not represent an opinion about the student's probable perseverance in the ministry. Any one of the following indicators would suggest possible need of counseling or psychotherapy. If two or more indicators are present, it would seem safe to assume the person is in need of some help.

(N.B. This list is not exhaustive. There may be other reasons which might suggest the need of professional counseling.)

1. Bizarre or eccentric behavior which distinguishes this seminarian from the rest of the group.

2. Presence of squinting, stammering, stuttering.

3. History of nervous breakdowns.

4. Persistent fears, nightmares, obsessions.

5. Frequent behavior problems, e.g., truancy, disobedience, negativism.

6. Difficulty with hostility towards peers or superiors; temper tantrums, etc.

7. Excessive withdrawal; poor social contact.

8. Extreme passivity; lengthy daydreams; little emotional reactivity; excessive sleeping.

9. Hyperactivity; overtalkative; frequent mood swings.

10. Somatic disorders; frequent migraines, ulcers, over-eating, etc.

11. Instability in undertakings (or lack of perseverance in undertakings).

12. Sex problems: overconcern with sex topics, habitual masturbation, homoerotic tendencies.

13. Admitted strong feelings of apprehension, isolation, guilt, or anxiety.

15. Extreme emotional or ideational rigidity, inflexibility.

Please list student's name (or code number if known) and circle "Y" if you believe he is in need of psychotherapy; "N" if not in need of professional counseling or psychotherapy.

Y  N  1. ________________________________
Y  N  2. ________________________________
Y  N  3. ________________________________
Y  N  4. ________________________________
Y  N  5. ________________________________
Y  N  6. ________________________________
Y  N  7. ________________________________
Y  N  8. ________________________________
Y  N  9. ________________________________
Y  N 10. ________________________________
Y  N 11. ________________________________
Y  N 12. ________________________________
Y  N 13. ________________________________
Y  N 14. ________________________________
Y  N 15. ________________________________
Y  N 16. ________________________________
Y  N 17. ________________________________
Y  N 18. ________________________________
Y  N 19. ________________________________
Y  N 20. ________________________________
Y  N 21. ________________________________
Y  N 22. ________________________________
Thank you very much. Your judgments will be held in complete confidentiality.
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