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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

More and more in seminaries throughout the country efforts are being made to fulfill the spirit of the request made by his Holiness, Pius XII in 1954. At that time in his allocution on seminaries he urged Superiors to use every natural means available in assessing the students who were in their charge. He said that he wanted them to take advantage of all the psychological facilities to help determine worthiness of candidates and to help improve those who were continuing in the seminary.

The directive that the Holy Father issued has been a source of inspiration to seminary Rectors. Many Rectors and Superiors have and are utilising psychological means to help them to assess their students.

There had been some hesitancy among other Rectors in using these tools.

Another reaction was well summed up in this statement by Kinnane (1961, p. 343):

In examining the reasons for such a strong reaction, one can only conclude that they lie in a series of unvoiced assumptions: the religious or spiritual life has no psychological overtones; supernatural grace can be expected to do all things, rectify all defects of nature in the ordinary course of events. In its most extreme form one even encounters the strong view that the grace of Orders or of religious profession is ordinarily sufficient to overcome even the most severe pathological conditions to which human nature is subject in the psychological order. When it is suggested that professional psychological help might be of great benefit in such cases, the idea is often rejected.
Seminarians today come from varied backgrounds. Some come from homes with well-adjusted parents, others come from homes where one of the parents is dead or the parents are separated, others come from homes where parents pampered them and acceded to their every wish. Above and beyond this, the life they are proposing to enter is indeed a difficult one. Christ Himself called for perfection in the candidates. They are asked to take the three vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience. They are asked to give up satisfying three of the most powerful drives in the human personality. This requires a healthy emotional adjustment. Bier (1955) says that "Candidates to the religious life and priesthood should have stronger emotional resources than the average person in order successfully to cope with its psychological demands."

Through the foresight of a Rector of a Preparatory Seminary in the Middle West, a testing program has been initiated in the fourth and fifth years. A battery of inventories has been suggested in helping him and his aides to make a comprehensive assessment of the fourth and fifth year students who are about to enter the Junior College program. The results of this testing program are not definitive, only suggestive, only indicative. The results should not be used as the major argument for retaining or dismissing a student. The purpose is negative in that it can be of some help in determining those of poor intellectual or emotional resources; is positive in that it can be of assistance to a student in spotting areas in which he needs some help. Also this program, with appropriate counseling interviews, can be of great help to those many
students who decide to leave the seminary and almost immediately find themselves without the support of the seminary life and find it most difficult to adjust to an environment that is in reality foreign to them. Not only that, but a great amount of effort and time has been spent in developing such an individual as a tremendous potential force for the Church. In his new role as a layman he can exercise great influence on those around him throughout the rest of his life.

This is a pilot study with the thought firmly imbedded in the minds of the administrators that perhaps this is not the most adequate battery of tests or inventories.

A number of priests who are in the counseling program at Loyola University have stated from time to time that a counseling service was unavailable in the seminary. This was in no way a reflection on the disciplinary, scholastic, spiritual father departments in the seminary. They have made the reflection that they were given a physical exam upon entering the Major Seminary with recommendations for future medical care if required; they were asked to undergo a rigid scholastic discipline to determine their intellectual fitness. However, there was no objective test as to their personality integration, their problems, or their interests. These priests stated that there were certain personality problems they had, and would like to have discussed, if the door had been opened, as it were, in this area. It is with this approach in mind that this program is being offered for these first year college men.

A great number of Seminarians leave the seminary. In the author's
class some 385 boys began in the Minor Seminary and only twenty-three were ordained eleven years later. The majority of these students left the seminary in the High School program; about 175 after the first year; about 100 through the next three years. Of the 100 graduating from the Minor Seminary, only twenty-five percent were ordained. The other seventy-five students entered the Service before World War II. This was an unusual situation. Many of these young men who returned from Service still had some difficulty in adjusting to the lay life. As a priest through the years, the author has been in contact with exseminarians who experience great difficulty in adjusting. With the aid of this battery of inventories and counseling interviews it is hoped that the young man who finds himself in this position will have some help to adjust to the new way of life he is entering.

This battery of inventories with the counseling subsequent to it is not meant as a substitute for the Spiritual Director. The Spiritual Director is concerned with presenting the goal of the ideal in religious life through directive and moral re-educative means. The Spiritual Director is concentrating on the conscious and manifest activity of the individual. The Counselor is concerned with the total personality.

The Spiritual Director must be directive, must be informative, whereas the Counselor will be more client centered in his approach. The Spiritual Director is concerned with the supernatural integration whereas the Counselor is concerned with the natural personality integration.

It is hypothesized that this battery of inventories will assist in
determining eventually the suitability of candidates for the Diocesan
Priesthood. This battery should give some insight into the personality
integration, interests and problems of seminarians. This program marks
the beginning and it will only be after some years that its effectiveness
will be validated. It is further hypothesized that the results of these
inventories will compare favorably with the results of the Faculty Rating
Scale. Given that this Rating Scale is an extremely blunt instrument it
will reveal the Rector's acceptance or nonacceptance of the subjects.

It is further hypothesized that two groups will be differentiated:
one well adjusted and the other not as well adjusted.

It is further hypothesized in view of the companion thesis that there
will be no significant difference between the sample in this thesis and
the sample in the other thesis in the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality
Inventory (MMPI), the Kuder Preference Record (KPR), the Mooney Problem
Check List (MPCL), and the Faculty Rating Scale.

It is emphasized that this study is descriptive. In view of the fact
that this program is being initiated in the seminary, no judgment can be
made. Records for a number of years will be required. A retest on this
group five or seven years from now will be necessary.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A number of studies will be presented in this chapter that are somewhat, but not exactly, similar to the present study. The KPR, the MMPI, and the MPCL studies will be reviewed.

Kimber (1947, p. 225-33) reports on a study in which he administered the California Test of Personality, the MMPI, and the KPR. In speaking of the group he says, "In the light of the rigid selectivity of the student body and the theological position and discipline in effect, it was regarded as important to ascertain whether objective measurement would reflect deviations in personality traits or interests."

Tests indicate the group of students to have high social standards and a noticeable lack of interest in computational and clerical activities.

TABLE I
KPR Scores of Bible Institute Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Centile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>85.44</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>69.05</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>65.59</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>63.09</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>16.61</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>46.34</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>16.37</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational</td>
<td>30.53</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Persuasive Scale was higher in the Bible Institute study than in most seminary studies. These students do not have as long a period of training as do the students for Catholic Priesthood and they are not as rigidly disciplined over as long a period as the students in a Minor and Major Seminary program.

Cockrum in a study (1952, p. 28-32) administered the KPR to a group of 155 theology students. He found Social Service (98th percentile), Musical (81st percentile), Outdoor (58th percentile), and Literary (57th percentile). This pattern agreed with that of KPR National Clergymen norms although the students were considerably lower in their literary preference. Seminarians indicated a limited preference for computational and clerical areas (12th and 15th percentiles).

Reid's study (1951, p. 307-12) was given college freshmen at Westminster College in September, 1948. The KPR, Form BB was administered and repeated fifteen months later and the correlation was found to be high. The several data of this study indicate that the KPR-BB is a useful measure of interest. When employed with 145 young college students who were tested and retested fifteen months apart, the results confirm that for young adults as a group interests are fairly permanent. The obtained data suggests that constancy of pattern of interests varies greatly among individuals but that in many cases it is sufficient to prediction of subsequent interest patterns.

Bursch in a study (1952, p. 224-7) on the relationship between the MMPI and the KPR stated:
The hypothesis in this study was that those students whose KPR profiles were most characteristic would show the least amount of maladjustment and that the reverse was also true. This hypothesis was based on the assumption that MMPI scores are valid measures of adjustment. The following procedure was established:

1. All results were expressed in percentile scores.

2. Following the procedure indicated by the author all scores at or above the 75th percentile were recorded as "+", while all scores at or below the 25th percentile were recorded as "-"; MMPI results were expressed in "T" scores.

3. Following procedure all scores at or above 55 but below 70 were recorded as "A"; all scores at or above 70 were recorded as "+"; all scores at or below 45 but above 50 were recorded as "-"; all scores below 30 were recorded as "-".

4. Based on frequency tables rank orders were established.

The conclusions of this study were:

1. The experimental group has a characteristic profile on KPR.

2. Conformity to the pattern of tested interests is associated with less than the expected amount of disturbance as measured by the MMPI.

3. Non-conformity to the pattern of tested interests is associated with greater than the expected amount of disturbance as measured by the MMPI.

4. The hypothesis is supported by the data.

Fifty-nine men and twenty-six women with a median age of twenty-one participated in this study.

The results of this study do not coincide with the results we have on the "high" group and the normal group. The students in the "high" group had the same basic profile as the normal group. The ratings in a given scale for the "high" group might not be as high as in the normal group. The results of this will be forthcoming in a later chapter.
Sweeney (1954, p. 149-165) reported that among other inventories the KPR was given to 1,033 boys in Catholic High Schools. The scores of the present group differed significantly from the norms presented in the KPR Manual. The cause of the differences found was not implicit in available data but it was hypothesized that the training and experience of the present group may be explanatory factors. One may speculate that clerical or "white collar" work has a certain prestige value in view of the present group and that interest in clerical, literary and computational activities has been fostered by their experiences in school.

Percy and Shuttleworth (1949, p. 363-5) reported the KPR was administered to the entire freshman class (men and women of Jewish origin) of City College in New York. The authors were interested in the possibility of setting up local norms in testing the validity of KPR profiles for different degree objectives after choices of major fields were determined, and in repeated examinations of individuals after intervals of a year or two.

Degree objectives are free elections of students without benefit of vocational advice.

The data indicated that the great majority made degree choices in harmony with their interests. By the same token the data indicated that the KPR profiles have a large degree of validity in assisting students in the selection of educational and vocational objectives.

This study would confirm the findings in the present study with seminarians whose interests are in great harmony with the national norms in this field.
Silvey (1951, p. 494-502) indicated a high degree of stability in interest preference for both men and women by the KPR. There was no appreciable shift in measured interests of either men or women over the two year period. Therefore, it was the conclusion that, as a general rule, a high degree of stability can be expected in interest preferences as measured by the KPR.

This study was mentioned in connection with the two years involved in this seminary study. The KPR results indicated a high correlation between fourth and fifth year seminarians.

Howall (1949, p. 135-224), a comprehensive study of discouragement buoyancy among college freshmen using the MPCL found a similar number of problems checked by e.g. freshmen at Purdue University and freshmen at Ohio State University. The average for the former was 29.9 and 29.8 for the latter.

It was found in this study that the students who were less intelligent were much more discouraged. This low group had the largest number of problems. In our study we found that the "high" group had the largest percentage of problems and that among this group we had generally lower I.Q.

Cryns (1955) in reporting on three different religious groups of college students both male and female says that:

After making an item analysis of the number and types of problems checked, it was interesting to note that those most favorable in their religious attitude had on the average more problems than those unfavorable in their religious attitude but generally not of a serious nature, while those most antagonistic in their religious attitude checked fewer problems but generally of a more serious nature . . . . There is the possibility that
the higher one's standards the more problems one may have because of the difficulty of living up to these standards.

These hypotheses are not completely supported by the results of the present study where we are dealing with a completely Catholic population and supposedly more Catholic than the average Catholic population.

From a review of this literature there was no study found that was exactly the same. In the Annual Review Berdie (1958, p. 346) reported:

The frequency with which counselors use various tests was suggested in a paper by Silvania who surveyed tests used in 167 Counseling Centers approved by the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Check lists of 155 tests were returned by 141 Centers and reported that the KPR and Strong Vocational Inventory Blank were the two most popular tests for vocational interests, and the MMPI the most popular inventory for personality testing.

This statement reinforced our position in the choice of these inventories for the seminary population.

Wauck (1957) used the KPR and the MMPI with the Group Rorschach.

Wauck made a valuable point in quoting Burke's study (Personality Traits, Catholic University of America Press, p. 38): "Earlier in the selection process, in the years of the Minor Seminary, it is unquestionably true that intelligence and academic ability play a much more important role. This was brought out clearly in Burke's study wherein he indicates that 'the Minor Seminary does function selectively as far as intelligence goes'."

His statement will be well worth watching as the comparison is made between the results of the Faculty Rating Scale and the results of the MMPI, the KPR and the WPCL in this study. Wauck (1957) continued: "It may be observed that only two of the nine Kuder Interest Scales are significantly related to the Faculty Rating Scale."
Following are the results that Mauck obtained with the seminary population at St. Francis in Milwaukee. It is to be noted this sample of 206 students was from the Major Seminary and the mean age was 21.60:

TABLE II
Mauck's Study on the KPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>62.61</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>55.71</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>63.17</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>42.64</td>
<td>14.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary</td>
<td>53.09</td>
<td>15.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>98.32</td>
<td>17.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>45.27</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mauck's percentile scale compared favorably with the scale in this study. He lists Social Service and Literary as two of the strongest interests with the relatively least dispersion. This was even more true in the present study:

It tends to support the prevalent notion that the clergyman is interested in doing things for the welfare of others, and he is interested in the world of concepts and ideas. . . . . Apparently a seminarian should possess this interest pattern but the mere possession of this pattern is no guarantee of successful seminary adjustment.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Interests in ideas and in helping people may be a condition for becoming a successful diocesan priest; they will not in themselves cause him to be such.
Bauci reinforced the investigator's thoughts in this matter that the interest inventory did not diagnose the capabilities of the seminarian for a successful ministry. However, it certainly seemed to have value for the counselor if the seminarian wasn't high enough in certain scales. Again, it was only indicative.

Bier (Welsh, 1960, p. 586-609) desired to know what psychological factors made for adjustment in the specialized form of life in a seminary. He compared 171 seminary students, 208 medical students, 121 dental students, 55 law students, and a college group of 369 on the MMPI. In this study there was confirmed the fact that the older the age group, the higher the scores on the MMPI. College groups as a whole scored higher than the general population as is shown in Bier's study. It was also shown that the seminary group was the most deviant of the population:

"The seminary group has the highest percentage of abnormal scales, whether we consider the percentage of individuals having one or more scales in the abnormal range (and this for the seminary group is 40 percent), or whether we consider the percentage of abnormal scales directly."

The bottom and top 20 percent of the groups were cut off to show the good and poor adjustment. It was found that the standard deviation of the good group is smaller than for the total population. However, with the poorly adjusted population only three out of the nine scales have standard deviations smaller than those found for the total groups. Bier concluded that the norms for personality adjustment established for the population at large were applicable to seminary populations: "The seminarian does not
present a substantially different picture of good and satisfactory, or poor and unsatisfactory adjustment from that given by the members of the other occupational groups studied."

Bier in this study said he thought a modified form of the MMPI would be more adaptable for seminarians and did an item analysis to reinforce his statement. Rice's study (1960) seems to confirm the fact another scale should be added for seminarians. The modified form of the MMPI would necessarily make it impossible to compare groups one with another. Some groups would use the total MMPI scales and other groups would not.

The Stanford Binet Intelligence Quotient was used to determine the intellectual level of the group in this study. The mean for this sample was 113.5.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Part One of this chapter will be devoted to a description of the instruments used in this study.

In this thesis the KPR, the MMPI, the MFCL, the Stanford Binet Intelligence Test, and the Faculty Rating Scale will be described.

The KPR is one of two vocational preference inventories that is widely used today. Its popularity as a clinical instrument is matched by its appeal to research workers who are interested in determining its scientific value. The 1951 KPR Manual has 158 References. Buros Fourth and Fifth Book of Tests and Measurements contain even larger lists. Fowler in Buros (1955, p. 742) says:

The reported research includes studies of reliability and validity of the Record, comparative studies designed to assess the particular strengths and weaknesses of this instrument in competition with other interest inventories, and a wide variety of investigations to determine the value of the preference scores in special situations.

Fowler goes on to say that the authors are continuously trying to improve the KPR to keep it up to date, and to provide necessary interpretive data.

The first research was done during the scholastic year 1934-1935 when Kuder asked five hundred students of Ohio State University to rank in order
of preference five activities in each of forty groups.

The 1961 edition of the Manual (1960, p.2) states the specific uses of the KPR, Form C in a guidance program are:

1. To point out occupations for further study.
2. To check on a person's choice of vocation.

The Kuder is particularly valuable for discovering whether a person's choice of occupation is consistent with the type of thing he ordinarily prefers to do. If the occupation is not made up of activities he usually enjoys, the choice may well be a poor one. -- Manual.

Sometimes an adolescent selects his career on the basis of superficial qualities or for reasons unrelated to the occupation because his friends did, because he once knew someone in that field, or because prestige is usually associated with the occupation.

The Preference item has certain advantages and disadvantages. In this present program it would seem to have a definite advantage because it makes the student in some instances choose between two activities both of which are liked or both disliked. It will give the counselor a more complete picture of the seminarian.

There are separate reliability estimates for each of the ten scoring categories for each of four different groups: one thousand men, one hundred women, one hundred boys, and one hundred girls. The reported reliabilities are approximately .90, with a low of .84, and a high of .95.

One of the weaknesses mentioned by the reviewers some eight or nine years ago is the lack of adequate norms developed on sufficiently large groups.

Carter (Buros, 1955, p. 742) says: "The claims for the Kuder Prefer-
ence Record are reasonable."

Bordin (Buros, 1953, p. 742) says:

When the Strong approaches the measurement problem by developing scales representing the constellations of preferences which distinguish one occupational group from another, the Kuder purports to isolate the important independent dimensions of vocational interests. It is assumed that given these dimensions one can then identify and devise the constellations which distinguish diverse occupational groups. This is the theoretical orientation of the factor analysis approach in psychological measurement. Though they approach the problem from opposite directions it would appear that the two tests arrive exactly at the same point. That they are in fact transmutable has not yet been adequately demonstrated. This test indentifies broad areas of vocational interest and proceeds to translate them into specific occupations (through mean profiles for occupational groups and regressive equations).

The Kuder is criticized for the small number of cases on which many of the mean profiles are based.

Jones (Buros, 1959) says:

In summary a fair current appraisal of the Kuder Preference Record would seem to be that it is an excellent inventory for preliminary surveys of interests in counseling and in school guidance and occupational instruction. Immediate attention ought to be devoted to providing more representative occupational group norms and a more comprehensive edition of the Manual (which has now been done) including newer data on the stability of scores and on validity in terms of particular criteria.

In the area of the seminarians' problems the MPCL was administered. The original purpose of this Check List was to help high school students determine their problems and also the general area of their problems. It was planned with the idea that it could be of some help to counselors in initiating interviews with the students. Mooney (1950, p. 3) has this to say:
Mooney Problem Check Lists were developed during the early 1940's to help students express their personal problems. The procedure is simple. Students read through the appropriate Problem Check List -- High School or College Form -- underline the problems which are of concern to them, circle the ones of most concern and write a summary in their own words.

This Check List is not a test. No test score is obtained. This List will give an inventory of the students' problems limited by his own awareness and his desire to reveal these problems. Mooney continues: "The usefulness of the Problem Check List approach lies in its economy for appraising the major concerns of a group and for bringing into the open the problems of each student in the group."

There are five broad reasons for administering the MPCL and they are all of moment in the present study of the first year college seminarian entering into the Junior College program. It facilitates counseling interviews; it helps to make group surveys leading to plans for individualized action; it assists in group guidance; it increases teacher understanding; and gives an idea of the problems of the seminarian at this level.

The Check List was devised by Mooney by gleaning 380 simple phrases from the free writing of four thousand students who were asked to describe briefly the problems which were worrying them most. This list was given to different groups of college students throughout the United States and revised. It was revised in 1950 in order to improve the utility and reliability of the instrument.

The 1950 Revision of the Problem Check List contains 380 problems classified into eleven areas. Each area contains thirty problems. The
eleven areas are:

HPD Health and Physical Development
FLP Finances, Living Conditions, and Employment
SRA Social and Recreational Activities
SPR Social-Psychological Relations
PPR Personal Psychological Relations
HF Home and Family
MR Morals and Religion
ACW Adjustment to College Work
FVE The Future: Vocational and Educational
CTP Curriculum and Teaching Procedures
GSM Courtship, Sex, Marriage

There are three steps to be followed in this self-administered List on machine form. The first step is to read over an item slowly and if it suggests something that is troublesome, the number of the item is underlined. The second step is to review the underlined numbers and of these circle the most troublesome item. The third step is to answer the summarizing questions on the back of the sheet.

Klugman (Buros, 1953) says:

The Mooney Problem Check List is not a test and therein lies its strength. Psychologists, Guidance Workers, Industrial Personnel Workers, and Educators have been searching for years for a simple way to evaluate personality . . . .

The Mooney Problem Check List is a form of simple communication between the counselor and the counselee designed to accelerate the process of understanding the student and his real problems.

The authors point out the usual criteria for validity and reliability do not obtain in the use of this type of instrument. Objectivity is not emphasized in this instrument.

The Mooney Problem Check List is a valuable aid in guidance for adjustment if used in conjunction with the interview.

McIntyre (Buros, 1959) says:

The problem of determining the validity of the Mooney Problem
Check List was attacked by computing the mean number of problems checked in particular problem areas by a group of high school students who were classifiable into various discrete groups. This study was founded on the assumption that the essential test of the validity of an instrument of this kind consists in determining whether or not the students can recognize their own problems, find these problems represented on the Check List and record them. If these three criteria are met, the mean number of problems checked in particular areas by various groups should differ significantly in a reasonable and predictable way. Hence, seven such differences were hypothesized on rational grounds. That is, because of the sociological and psychological characteristics of particular groups it was not predicted that some groups would check more problems in certain areas than other groups provided the three criteria of validity specified above were met by the Check List. Of the seven differences hypothesized, six were found.

The seven hypotheses were:

1. The less intelligent students would have more problems than the more intelligent in the area of adjustment to school work.

2. Seniors, more problems than those in lower grades in the area of the future — vocational and educational.

3. Students from broken homes would have more problems in the area of home and family than those from intact homes.

4. Boys would have more problems than girls in the area of adjustment to school work.

5. Boys would have more problems than girls in the area of the future — vocational and educational.

6. Negroes would have more problems than whites in the area of finances, living conditions and employment.

7. Girls would have more problems than boys in the area of courting and marriage.

Bedell (Buros, 1949) in reviewing the MPCL says:

The lists do not purport to represent some internal capacity or trait or to make categorical predictions. They do give
students a chance to express their problems. The average number of problems marked by students in most groups is thirty; twenty-five percent checked forty or more; a group of one hundred students will mark about ninety-five percent of the different problems on the list.

The WPCL is not a diagnostic instrument but is descriptive and somewhat analytical. The lists have the advantage of filling the gap between the use of more precise diagnostic instruments and the skill of a naive counselor.

Lents (Burco, 1949) says he knows of no alternative or comparable instrument designed for the same purpose: "This is a unique contribution to counseling aids and techniques. As it stands the instrument is highly commendable to the serious practitioner of guidance or research scientist in social psychology."

The author recommends two major subdivisions of function: (a) aid to individual interview, and (b) group projects to furnish guidance for students' personal agencies, administrators, teachers, and research workers. In this second major division the administered list and tabulated results yield scores per item and per area regarding the group, class or campus as a whole. There is no set score for the individual.

The WPCL seems to be a valuable instrument to help a student in the review of his problems. It will aid him in obtaining an objective view of himself. It is also a valuable adjunct for counseling interviews.

The WPCL was designed by Hathaway and McKinley of the University of Minnesota. This is a psychometric instrument designed ultimately to provide in a single test scores on all the more important phases of personality.
There are 550 statements in the inventory classified rather arbitrarily under twenty-six headings which will be listed elsewhere.

Personality characteristics may be assessed on the basis of scores on nine Clinical scales originally developed for use in the inventory. The scales are divided as Validity and Clinical scales:

The Validity Scales:

1. The Question (?) Scores is a validating score consisting simply of the total number of items put in the "cannot say" category. This score was not used in this study.

2. The Lie Scores is a measure of the degree to which the subject may be attempting to falsify his scores by always choosing the response that places him in the most acceptable light socially.

3. The Validity Score or F Scores is not a personality scale but serves as a check on the validity of the whole record. A low F score is a reliable indication that the subject's responses were rational and relatively pertinent.

4. The K Scores is a correction factor to sharpen the discriminatory power of the clinical variables measured by the inventory.

The Clinical Scales:

1. The Hypochondriasis (Hs) Scale is a measure of the amount of abnormal concern about bodily functions. It is characteristic of the hypochondriac that he is immature in his approach to adult problems tending to fail with inadequate insight.

2. The Depression (D) Scale is a measure of the depth of the clinically recognized symptom or symptom complex depression. This depression may be the chief disability of the subject, or it may accompany or be the result of other personality problems.

3. The Hysteria (Hy) Scale is a measure of the degree to which the subject is like patients who have developed
conversion-type hysteria symptoms.

4. The Psychopathic Deviate (Pd) Scale: is a measure of the similarity of a person to a group of persons whose main difficulty lies in their absence of deep emotional response, their inability to profit from experience, and their disregard of social mores. (Except by the use of an objective instrument of this sort, their trend toward the abnormal is frequently not detected until they are in serious trouble.)

5. The Interest (Mf) Scale: is a measure of a tendency toward Masculinity or Femininity of interest pattern. In either case a high score indicates a deviation of the basic interest pattern in the direction of the opposite sex.

6. The Paranoia (Pa) Scale: is a measure of how much the subject is similar to a group of clinic patients who were characterized by suspiciousness, oversensitivity and delusions of persecution with or without expansive egotism.

7. The Psychoaesthesia (Pt) Scale: is a measure of similarity of subject to psychiatric patients who are troubled by phobias or compulsive behavior. The phobias include all types of unreasonable fear of things or situations as well as overreaction to more reasonable stimuli.

8. The Schizophrenia (Sc) Scale: is a measure of similarity of subject responses to those of patients who are characterized by bizarre and unusual thoughts or behavior.

9. The Hypomania (Ma) Scale: is a measure of the personality factor characteristic of persons with marked overproductivity in thought and action. The word hypomania refers to a lesser state of mania.

An additional scale called the Social Interest (S|) Scale was used in this study. This scale aims to measure the tendency to withdraw from social contact with others.
The journals were replete with articles on the MMPI. Someone estimated that on the average one hundred articles appear each year on this inventory.

Rosen (1957, pp. 489-61) reported on the reliability of the MMPI. In his study, forty male, veteran, psychiatric hospital patients were given the individual form of the MMPI on an average of three days after admission to the hospital and again on the average of four days after the initial test. He concluded that for the Clinical scales in common use, the test-retest stability coefficients were almost always between .80 and .85.

There was an overall tendency for reduction in the MMPI scores and an increase in defensiveness during the first few days of hospitalization before much, if any, therapy was attempted.

Nachover and Anderson (1955, pp. 142-46) have submitted an interesting article on the test-retest form of the MMPI. In their study the MMPI was administered to fifty psychiatric patients. The scores on this experimental form of the Pd scale were compared with the scores obtained by the same subjects on the Pd scale when administered on the standard form. They found a co-relation of .79. Therefore, they concluded the out-of-context paper and pencil Pd scale may be said to be valid. They go on to show how the availability of a separate paper and pencil form of the MMPI permits more efficient and flexible use of this test.

Honey, (1955, pp. 142-46) has done an interesting study on the relationship between the MMPI and Personality. A group of ninety-seven student
nurses in practice training had been given the MMPI and during their training period the supervisors made notes relating to personality characteristics of each student. Tetrachoric and $X^2$ were applied to ascertain any relations between high scores and low scores on the various MMPI scales, and observed personality characteristics. Impromptu notes made by the supervisors showed more significant relationship with the MMPI scales scores than did ratings made of the Rating scales. Individual scores on most scales showed up as more meaningful than general elevation of the profile. Some traits of positive value as well as ones of negative value were found to be associated with elevation of various scales, and some negative traits were related to low scores.

In other words, potential for emotional maladjustment may carry along with it some positive personality characteristics.

Taulbee (1957, pp. 415-17) reported on a "Configurational Analysis of the MMPI Profile of a Psychiatric Group." A technique of objective configurational analysis was applied to 210 MMPI profiles (two groups of Schizophrenics, three groups of neurotics). Sixteen scale pairs were obtained from 16 (profiles) which significantly differentiated two criterions, and three validating groups of psychiatric patients; cut-off ranges are presented which identify them at a very high level of confidence.

Application of the analysis was shown to exceed the differentiating efficiency of three experienced clinical psychologists and two advanced psychology trainees.
Undoubtedly, the MMPI is an extremely valuable instrument. As Anastasi (1954, p. 549) pointed out, it is in sharp contrast to such inventories as the Thurstone Temperament Schedule which concentrated upon individual differences among relatively normal persons. The MMPI deliberately sets out to assay those traits that are commonly characteristic of disabling psychological abnormality.

As it has been pointed out, one of the novel and very helpful features of this test are the "validity scales".

The MMPI was constructed using a normative sample of seven hundred hospital visitors in Minnesota. It is important to use other normative populations in the interpretation of scores. To prove this, Anastasi (1954, p. 552) mentioned the fact that in one study of six hundred college students, thirty-nine percent received scores above 70 on one or more scales. This same study also indicated the need for more data on the reliability of the Clinical scales. The reliabilities in the Manual, derived from both normals and abnormals, range from .50 to .90.

The Manual and all the authors are careful to point out that this inventory was designed to be used by experienced clinicians. A great deal of training is required for the correct administration and interpretation.

The ways in which the MMPI have been utilized and evaluated may be summarized under four categories:

1. As a general screening instrument for psychological abnormality.
2. A diagnostic indicator on the separate scales. These are not to be used by themselves, but the pattern must be considered.

3. The Configural Aspects of score pattern or profiles.

4. A rich pool of items for empirical development of an endless number of scales.

Cronbach (1960) said approximately the same thing as Anastasi in his evaluation of the MMPI. He stressed the point that "even though the MMPI scales use psychiatric language, they are descriptions of personality patterns rather than direct diagnosis." There is no single translation from MMPI information into descriptive terms. The user of the test must build up a repertoire of information from the Atlas, from other studies scattered through the literature, and from his own experience.

He restates the fact that although the MMPI was designed with psychiatric diagnoses as a criterion, the authors early abandoned claims that the test had great power as a discriminant.

Cronbach (1960, p. 476) commenting on the ability of the MMPI to differentiate the types of psychopathology said, "one is forced to conclude that analysis of MMPI scores, whether impressionistic or actuarial, is at best a source of hypotheses about diagnosis to be checked by other methods. In this role, it can best be of assistance in the clinic.

In conclusion, we might say that the MMPI, if used by trained clinicians and interpreted by trained personnel, is probably the finest instrument we have to establish profiles of abnormality. It is, therefore, a very valuable adjunct to the professional interview.
This study was initiated as a pilot study purely descriptive in character.

The material for the study was as follows: The population that was used in this study was 135 students of a fifth year Preparatory Seminary class. This was a psychologically naive group. This was the first time this battery of tests had been given in this Minor Seminary. The fifth year group is equivalent to a first year college group with a mean age of 18.75 years. These were day students from the metropolitan area of a large midwestern city and who were almost half way through their training in point of years.

About one day prior to the actual taking of the inventories these students were advised by the administrators of the tests that they would participate in this program. They were told that just as they undergo a physical exam to determine their fitness for entrance into the Major Seminary, so also they were being asked to participate in this program in order to assess their personality integration. They were told that each student would have a code number and that the only ones who would be aware of their identity and the results of these tests would be the administrators and the Rector of the seminary on request. About three of this group had taken the MMPI before at another school. They were not given any other advice on that day except that they were told they could leave the school as soon as they finished the last inventory.

On the day of the testing the administrator went in order to the three home rooms of these students. He gave each student his code number. The
MMPI booklet was distributed and the instructions from the first page of the booklet were read aloud. Each class was advised they could take as long as they wished though the average finishing time was either sixty or ninety minutes after testing began. No questions were asked during the testing.

The KPR was given to two rooms about ten minutes after completion of the MMPI. The MPCL was given to the other two rooms after completion of the MMPI. The students then went to lunch. After they returned they did the third inventory and were able to leave as soon as they completed it. The average time for the MMPI was one hundred minutes. The average time for the KPR was fifty minutes. The average time for the MPCL was twenty minutes.

In addition to their identification number the students were asked to fill in the required information on the answer sheets.

There were monitors, a faculty member, in each of the rooms. The administrators answered all questions prior to the start of each inventory.

These inventories were administered to the students at the first year college level when they are in a period of transition from the Minor Seminary to the Junior College — a new department. Transition from the Minor to the Major Seminary has always been a threatening experience and a momentous milestone in the seminarian's career. This is additionally so this year because of the new department. This is a good period in which the seminarian can receive adequate counseling during his junior college and theology years.

In making a judgment on a student the members of the faculty used a Rating scale prepared specifically for this purpose. This scale was de-
vised by Corman, the Rector, the Dean of Studies, and this author. There were a number of interviews reviewing how faculty members in the past have described students and their suitability for the Diocesan Priesthood. The terms used in the Rating scale have in the main been suggested by the faculty. The terms were not necessarily exclusive of each other. Admittedly this was a blunt instrument but it expressed what the Rector and the Faculty think about a given student at this level of his career.

These students, except fifteen, all have spent their high school career at this Preparatory Seminary. The fifteen, so called special students, have come from other high schools or colleges and in a period of a year or two are attempting to make up subjects that were lacking in their former curricula.

These tests were machine scored by Testscor and hand scored.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Profiles and tables have been constructed for a description of the study on the MMPI, KPR, MPCL, and the Faculty Rating Scale. It is again emphasized that this was a descriptive study. It was not an attempt to interpret, nor to diagnose. This was a pilot study in view of a long range testing program for the population involved.

In the MMPI T scores were used throughout in determining the mean, the standard deviation, the standard error of difference of the mean, and in construction of the profiles. In the KPR raw scores were used for the mean, for the standard deviation, and in construction of the profile. In the KPR percentiles were studied in the "high" group in order to assess any significant differentiation in the scales themselves. In the MPCL the total number of problems for the sample in the various areas was determined and percentages for the group were made.

The raw scores of the MMPI were converted into T scores so that the following profiles could be presented. The first profile was a description of the entire sample of this study. One of the first reactions to this profile was that the mean scores on the various scales were higher than the scores for the general population. However, in a study by Bier (1960, p. 536) of Catholic college groups with seminarians, it was shown
very conclusively that college populations have a higher profile than non-college populations.

The Pt scale was the high scale, indicating a rather anxious group. There were several reasons why this scale was high. This sample was the first group exposed to psychological testing in the seminary, and furthermore, they had no choice in taking this inventory. This group had reached a critical stage in their seminary career. Leaving fifth year, they were making a complete break from their families for the first time and they were entering upon the Major Seminary program which had traditionally strong overtones for them. They had heard of many students before them who, having succeeded quite well in the Minor Seminary, were totally unable to cope with the problems of the Major Seminary. Though it is true that they were not entering the Major Seminary because of the new Junior College department, they had been living these past five years with this thought in mind. Historically, many students remain in the Minor Seminary until this time, and then, at this level, make their decision concerning their career, judging whether they should continue.

The mean of 57.800 on the Ms scale is typical of a seminary population. Fowler (Suors 1955, p. 743) in his study showed the Ms scale is higher for college populations. The mean of 57.985 on the Sc scale compares favorably with a study on male college students done by Goodstein (1960, p. 576). In Goodstein's study the eight regional groups had a score 1. lower on the Sc scale.
FIGURE I

MMPI Profile for Entire Group
### TABLE III

**MMPI Scales for Entire Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>58.541</td>
<td>10.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>57.935</td>
<td>9.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>57.900</td>
<td>8.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>56.230</td>
<td>9.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy</td>
<td>55.022</td>
<td>7.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>54.585</td>
<td>8.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>55.176</td>
<td>10.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>53.170</td>
<td>8.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>52.768</td>
<td>10.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>51.141</td>
<td>8.554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next step in this study was to examine the profile on the Kuder for the entire sample. According to the norms in the Kuder Manual, clergymen generally will be high in the areas of Social Service and Literary. This fact has been verified in this study. The Persuasive scale has been subjected to much speculation in this study. The group stands around the 30th percentile. It would be presumed that students for the priesthood, considering the Apostolic nature of the work, would be high on the Persuasive. In connection with this speculation Fowler (1953, p. 745) says:

The Record scores have in general positive but low correlations with measures of achievement such as school grades and objective test scores, and they show only a low relationship with measures of ability which means that counselors must consider both abilities and preferences in suggesting vocational choices.
Because the group is low on the Persuasive scale this does not mean they lack this ability. The KPR is an interest inventory and does not necessarily include ability. Of interest to the individual studying the Kuder would be the fact that a new approach has been utilized in reference to mathematics in general at the seminary. Also, many extra-curricular activities along this line have been sponsored at the seminary. The mean percentile rank is higher in computational than the rank for clergymen in general.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>53.400</td>
<td>13.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary</td>
<td>25.392</td>
<td>7.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational</td>
<td>26.231</td>
<td>9.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>44.511</td>
<td>7.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>39.437</td>
<td>9.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>41.592</td>
<td>12.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>21.978</td>
<td>8.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>34.096</td>
<td>9.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>39.281</td>
<td>12.762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>32.978</td>
<td>11.584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The 380 items in the MPCL are divided into eleven areas:

**TABLE V**

MPCL Listings for Entire Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Average per Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGW</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVE</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,862</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table related the total number of problems marked by the students in the "some" category as opposed to the "most serious" problems. This table gave the total for each scale or area and also told the average number of problems for each student in each scale or area. The
average number of problems per subject for all the areas was slightly below the average of other samples provided in the chapter on Related Literature. (Howall, 1969, p. 185-243.)

The average I.Q. for this sample was 113.7.

In the study on the MMPI the attempt was to make a discrimination between the entire group and what was called the "high" group. In order to determine the "high" group all the subjects from the highest to the lowest were ranked according to the mean of all the scales in the MMPI. As the subjects from the highest to the lowest were ranked, note was made of every T score 70 or above. Then, through an empirical study, a cutting point was established. In this study the cutting point was the mean score of 57.3. The cutting point was obtained in this manner: this was the first point where there were more than two students who had no scale above 70. Actually, there were five scales above 70 after this point, but they were widely scattered throughout the remaining ninety-two subjects of the sample. There was only one if scale above 70 below the cutting point. There were three subjects who had mean scores above the cutting point but no individual scale above 70. However, these three subjects remained in the "high" group because of the "high" mean score. There were forty-three subjects of this sample in the "high" group.
FIGURE 3

"High" Group on the MMPI
In comparing the entire sample with the "high" sample the difference in the profile was significant. There was a minimum of four point and a maximum of ten points in comparing the scales. Following is a rank order listing of the scales with the mean and standard deviations:

**TABLE VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>68.302</td>
<td>8.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>66.744</td>
<td>8.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>62.442</td>
<td>7.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>60.930</td>
<td>10.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>60.814</td>
<td>8.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>60.814</td>
<td>7.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy</td>
<td>59.442</td>
<td>6.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs</td>
<td>57.828</td>
<td>9.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>56.256</td>
<td>8.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>65.140</td>
<td>12.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is worthy of note that practically the same rank order of the scales was maintained in the "high" group as was maintained in the entire group. In the "high" group there were eight subjects who ranked over 70 in the Pt and Sc scales.
In the section on faculty rating there is a discussion of the "high" group. The KPR profile for the "high" group was shown on the preceding page.

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Centile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>55.465</td>
<td>11.406</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>24.721</td>
<td>7.497</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu</td>
<td>14.046</td>
<td>6.004</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.512</td>
<td>8.070</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23.651</td>
<td>9.009</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>36.488</td>
<td>11.415</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>37.674</td>
<td>9.973</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>39.960</td>
<td>12.796</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>38.349</td>
<td>12.952</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me</td>
<td>33.442</td>
<td>10.669</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparing the "high" group in the Kuder with the entire group, the first two scales in rank order remain the same. In the "high" group there is a noticeable centile drop in the computational, clerical, and scientific categories; and there is a noticeable centile increase in the Persuasive and Artistic categories.

The profile for the "high" group flattens out but does not seem to have any significant difference in interests. Bursch (1952, pp. 224–7) hypothesized that those students whose profiles were most characteristic
would show the least amount of maladjustment, and that the reverse was also true. This hypothesis does not seem to be borne out in the present study.

In this section the MPCL offers information on the more serious problems and also provides us with percentages for problems for the "high" group.

TABLE VIII

MPCL "High" Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Most Serious</th>
<th>Average per Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLE</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPR</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPR</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACW</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FVE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the MPCL twenty-three of the "high" group had ten or more serious problems. In other words, 54 percent of this group had ten or more serious problems. Twenty-seven out of the "high" group had thirty or more ordinary problems. In other words, 58 percent of this group had thirty or more or-
ordinary problems.

The Normal group for the MMPI had the following mean scores and standard deviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mf</td>
<td>55.650</td>
<td>8.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>54.086</td>
<td>9.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>55.978</td>
<td>7.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>55.891</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy</td>
<td>52.956</td>
<td>6.451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>51.684</td>
<td>7.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>51.163</td>
<td>8.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs</td>
<td>51.086</td>
<td>7.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>49.554</td>
<td>7.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>48.750</td>
<td>7.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In determining the rank order of the scales a great difference appeared not only with the entire group, but as was expected a great difference with the "high" group.
FIGURE 5

Normal Group on the MMPI
The results of the Faculty Rating Scale are now presented. The Faculty Rating Scale was admittedly a very blunt instrument used by the Rector and Dean of Faculty.

### TABLE X

Faculty Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Normal</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Entire</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Boy but doesn't belong</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td><strong>135</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the final profile the normal, the "high", and the entire sample on the MMPI is presented. (The long barred line represents the "high" group; the unbroken line represents the entire sample; the dotted line represents the normal group.)

The Pt scale was the high scale for the "high" and entire groups. It is theorized that the reason for this fact was that the sample was characteristicly and historically anxious.
FIGURE 7
Combined Profile on the MMPI
A comparison of fourth and fifth year students on the MMPI, the KPR, and the MPCL is presented. The following profile includes the "high" group and the entire group for both years. (The "high" group is indicated by the broken line and the entire group is shown with the unbroken line. The red lines are for the fifth year and the green lines for the fourth year.)

The standard error of the difference of the means indicates a significant difference for these scales: Hs, D, Hy, Pa, Pt for the entire groups. This difference was at the .05 level of confidence. Fifth year had the higher profile, due, no doubt, to the fact that they were older, they were more intense, and they were aware of the great changes about to happen in their way of living.

In the high sections of both groups, they were the same except for the Sc and Ma scales. There was a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence.

The next profile is for fourth and fifth year on the Kuder. There was a remarkable similarity of interests throughout.

The percentage of problems on the MPCL was practically the same for both groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hs</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Hy</th>
<th>Pd</th>
<th>Mf</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Pt</th>
<th>Sc</th>
<th>Ma</th>
<th>Si</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Red - 5th year — — — — High

Green - 4th year — — — — High

Entire

FIGURE 8
Fourth and Fifth Year on the MMPI
Red - 5th Year
Green - 4th Year

Fourth and Fifth Year Entire Group on the KPR
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A descriptive study was made on a given battery of tests with a seminary population. The following tests or instruments were used: Minnesota Multichasic Personality Inventory, Kuder Preference Record, Mooney Problem Check List. A Faculty Rating Scale was used for purposes of comparison with the results of the above inventories. The inventories were administered to 135 seminarians on the first year college level.

The Profile on the entire group for the MMPI indicated a well-adjusted seminary population. The Profile showed this group better adjusted than other college populations and other seminary populations. The Pt scale was the highest which indicated a somewhat anxious, tense, highly concerned population.

The Profile on the Kuder for the entire group was very characteristic. It coincided well with the National Clergymen norms. The seminarians were interested in people, in literary and computational areas. They were low on the Persuasive scale. This factor might be significant for the faculty in an assessment of what they should contribute to the student in this area.

The results of the MPCL indicated that this population had less prob-
blems, both "some" and "most", than comparative college populations. The ACW area, as was to be expected, showed as the most active area for problems.

The Faculty Rating scale indicated that most of this population was acceptable to the seminary authorities. These students have been screened for the most part over a period of the last five years. If this instrument was not so blunt, we presume that there wouldn't have been the apparent diversity between its results and the inventories' indications.

The Profile for the "High" group on the MMPI indicated that they were higher on every scale. It indicated that they were less well adjusted and could use some counseling. They would bear watching.

The Profile for the "High" group on the Kuder indicated approximately the same picture as the entire group. The Profile was flatter indicating the group to be less characteristic.

The "High" group on the MPCL showed a much greater percentage of the group to have more than the average "some" and the average "most" problems.

The Profile for the Normal group on the MMPI gave indications of an extremely well adjusted population, as also did the Kuder Profile.

In comparing this Sample with the Sample used by Gorman in his thesis we find that basically they were homogeneous groups. The differences noted on the MMPI scales were to be expected. Both groups were well adjusted and their interests were very similar.

Also, these two Samples had similar percentages on "most" and "some" problems on the MPCL.
The Faculty rating approved both groups with the Fifth Year group having eighty-seven percent approval as compared to eighty-two percent for the Fourth Year.
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APPENDIX

FACULTY RATING SCALE

Student's Name ____________________________ Class ____________

I. IMPRESSION HE GIVES AS A SEMINARIAN:

Excellent ____________________________
Very Good ____________________________
Average ______________________________
Fair, probably will improve ________
Good lad, but doesn't belong here __________

II. DISPOSITION:

Cheerful _________ Ordinary _________ Sensitive _________
Cooperative _________ Tense _________
Reliable ___________ Delicate _________
Manly _____________ Too Quiet _________
Effeminate _________ Personality _________
Problem _________
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