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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The priesthood is a state of life unlike any other profession; for every priest is conscious of an office that sets him apart from the profane. Although his functions are many (see Botte, 1955 for a discussion of the nature of the priesthood) -- sacrificial, formative, social -- each office reminds him of a state of life that in Christian theology, and its forerunner, Jewish theology, has always been termed "sacred". Thus the priest has always been initiated into his work with a ceremony of anointing, by which he is set apart from the profane. The priest, therefore, envisions his life as a "calling," dedicated in the name of God to the service of man. St. Paul described him as a man "taken from among men, appointed for men, in the things pertaining to God". (Heb. 5, 1).

The priesthood bears with it, therefore, the difficulties peculiar to its nature. Because it necessitates a setting-apart for the sake of others, it requires of its candidates a renunciation of more self-centered goals, quite proper to other states of life. He is asked, therefore, to live in a spirit of poverty, chastity, and obedience in order that he might be the better dedicated to the service of others.
The priesthood is therefore, in its own way a demanding way of life. Each candidate must thus use his time of preparation wisely, to see if he is suited for just such type of life.

"Signs" of a vocation to the priesthood are certainly elusive. Theologically, the desire for the priesthood is explained as a "calling". Whatever the nature of such a calling might be, it is agreed that it should be evidenced by a positive attraction to such a state of life.

Obviously such a criterion is not without its dangers. Attraction to a particular state of life alone does not explain the nature of such a desire. We become more aware of the vagaries of human motivation every day -- we do act from motives that are not always obvious to ourselves. Certainly, then, a young man progressing year by year towards a life demanding great commitment ought to understand as well as he can, why he is undertaking such a life. It is not inconceivable that certain aspects of priestly life could prove attractive, for reasons even unconsciously based on the inadequacies of man's nature. Attraction to the priesthood must come from a true desire to be of service to others, rather than serve as a solution to the problems of personality.

Moore (1936), in fact, has shown that many breakdowns among religious came from among those who had personality problems previous to their entrance into religious life. It is obvious,
therefore, that each candidate must fully understand the nature of his attraction to the priestly life.

Failure in the priesthood, as in any vocation, can stem from man's unwillingness to fulfill the obligations of his state of life; to fulfill such obligations is each man's responsibility in life. But failure can also come from a lack of self-knowledge, from malformation of personality, or from an insufficient understanding of motivation. Therefore, precisely because the demands of the priesthood are great, and because the mysteries of the personality are so elusive, it is imperative that each student for the priesthood understand whether this personality is suited for this vocation. He ought not only to study this matter on his own; he should also make use of all available services which would serve to help him better understand his individual response to the calling he feels is his.

The Role of Psychological Testing in the Seminary

In the field of vocational guidance, it is the role of the psychologist to contribute what he can, through his scientific knowledge and his insights into human personality, to help the student know himself and his relationship to his chosen vocation. Thus the main contribution the science of psychology can make is to help the individual know himself.
There is a second area, however, where the psychologist can make a distinct contribution, though to a lesser degree; and that is in the field of screening. If it is difficult for a person to know himself, it is obviously more difficult for others to know him. Yet there is no greater obligation for the seminary rectors than that of knowing their students. Often the superior's greatest asset has been the critical judgements of the teaching faculty. Yet everyone in the field knows how difficult it is for a person to be fully understood by a superior or a teacher. Often, in a superior's experiences, he wishes that he could know so much more about a person and his background. Who really knows the potentialities of the person who stands before him for judgement? Because many students do not reveal themselves to any great extent, attempts at evaluation often lead only to frustration.

Because the knowledge of the human person is so limited through inter-personal relationships, the use of psychological testing has been introduced to help obtain this knowledge. This has been done, not without its problems. For example, psychologists are very aware of the dangers engendered by indiscriminate testing. The mature tester realizes that with that pencil, with that story, with that configuration he is initiating a relationship that is sacred. The client is exposing to the tester all that he is; and this is something
which no one has a right to know, except the one to whom the client has willingly entrusted such knowledge. If the tester is sympathetic, understanding, and communicative, testing may become an instrument for a fuller understanding of self.

Because the human word can so often come out so faltering and ambiguously -- and sometimes not come out at all -- a judicious testing program can become a great help in the inter-personal relationship. Certainly each seminarian has a right and duty to know himself well; no one has ever been happy in any vocation by deceiving himself. And the seminary rector has a duty to understand his students, so that he might assure the student, that as far as human knowledge can ascertain, he is judged capable of commitment to the priesthood. Thus, psychological testing has, through the years, earned its place in the field of vocational guidance by helping both student and superior obtain this necessary knowledge.

Psychological Testing of Seminarians and this Study

The present study has been undertaken in the hope that it will furnish evidence of how a special group, the seminarian population, can be better known through such testing. One test, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, was administered to a large group of seminarians. Results, both between seminarians and non-seminarians, and within the seminarian group were compared, so that differences might be found which could
prove useful in the guidance of seminarians. The study does not substantially differ from similar studies done with other occupational groups; a description of one of these studies might help in the understanding of the present one.

A test of preferences was administered to a group of engineering students. All their results were compared with the results of liberal arts students. Thus it was found how the two groups differed in their basic preferences. Furthermore, the test data of the engineering students were compared to successful engineers. The personality differences between engineering students and engineers already successful in their field, could be compared and hypotheses offered for the differences.

The present study proposes comparisons of a similar nature. Specifically, four hypotheses are to be tested.

It is hypothesized that seminarians of the level of the Junior College differ significantly in their personality profiles from students of the normative college group.

It is hypothesized that seminarians who remained in the seminary from the time of testing to the time of this study differ significantly from students who have since left the seminary.

Furthermore, it is hypothesized that seminarians from a so-called "high-group" (those who had scored above a desig-
nated cut-off point on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory -- approximately, a mean of 58 for all scores) differ significantly from those who scored in the normal range.

Finally, it is hypothesized that class personalities do exist, i.e., that individual classes do differ in their preference profiles.

In the light of the need that exists for both student and superiors to understand the nature and demands of the priesthood, it is hoped that this study can add to the growing knowledge of the personality of the seminarian, and at the same time add some strength to the growing conviction of the usefulness of testing programs in the selection and counselling of such specialized students.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Literature pertinent to this study will be divided into four distinct sections:

1. Literature regarding the validity and reliability of the EPPS.
2. Literature pertinent to the use of the EPPS.
3. Literature pertinent to the study of seminarians.
4. Literature pertinent to the psychological studies already conducted with the seminarian group tested in this study.

Literature regarding the validity and reliability of the EPPS.

Through the years, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) has become more and more a recognized psychological testing instrument. This may seem somewhat surprising in view of the scarcity of investigations into the validity of the instrument. Its very advent was ushered in with caution by the reviewers engaged by Buros. Barron (Barron, 1959, p.47) lamented the fact that "the test is not ready for use" precisely because little had been studied about its validity. Gusted (Gusted, 1959, p.47) admitted that the test was intriguing and promising, but nevertheless insisted that it be stamped with a huge sign in red ink calling attention to the fact that it be only experimental! Thus, in deploiring the fact that no usable information regarding test validity had been included...
in the manual, Gusted felt that both author and publisher had fallen short of their responsibilities in publishing the test without this information.

Nevertheless, several studies have been conducted through the years which tend to substantiate at least some scales of the EPPS. Some of these studies will be reviewed in the following paragraphs.

Bernardin and Jessor (1957, pp. 63-67) determined a "dependent group" with scores composed of the deference (70th percentile or above) and autonomy (50th percentile or below) scales. They found that the dependent group performed less well on a maze learning task when they were subjected to critical comments from the experimenter; furthermore, when they were confronted with more difficult problems, they were more likely to ask for help. The authors thus felt that these two scales validly measured the dependent person.

Gisvold (1958, p. 445), defining conformity as the need not to be different, to follow the opinions and suggestions of others, and to conform to the group, used an Asch technique to determine the relationships of autonomy and deference to conformity. Gisvold felt that autonomy correlated negatively with conformity (− .54), significant at .02, although deference, correlating only .17, was not significant and could not predict conformity in a group situation.
Zuckerman (1958, p. 379) had sixty three nurses rate their own group on the following traits: submission, conformity, dependence and rebelliousness. After giving the group the EPPS, Zuckerman found that the rebellious group scored significantly lower than all others in deference, succorance and abasement, and higher in autonomy, dominance and aggression. Using this criterion of fellow-student ratings, he concluded that the measure of dependency and rebelliousness validated the above mentioned variables of the EPPS.

Izard (1960, pp. 437-44) experimented to see whether the EPPS could discriminate persons who were resistant to change, by having them estimate the distance of a light, and subject them to factors that might change their minds. Using twenty two male and seventeen female subjects, he divided them into those who yielded to and those who resisted change. He found that male autonomy, dominance, deference and abasement all scored in the proper direction, with autonomy and dominance being significant (.05) and abasement nearly so. The female scores were not significant; furthermore, the dominance score was puzzlingly negatively correlated, although the other scores were at least in the right direction. Except for the female dominance, all the scores seem to validate the measured scales, in an experiment that would seem most important to the understanding of human behavior, the understanding of the personality
resistant to change.

Mann (1958, pp. 267-68) conducted an interesting test with the EPPS and self-ratings. He listed and defined the fifteen variables, asking ninety-six graduate students to rate themselves, first as they thought they were, and then, as they wished to be. He then administered the EPPS, readministering it three weeks later. He concluded not only to test-retest reliability, but also found ten of the fifteen coefficients between the EPPS variables and self-ratings significant, and fourteen of them positive in one direction. With ideal self-ratings, however, he found only one correlated to the Edwards, and this was discarded since chance factors alone could account for this. Through this self-rating, he concluded that the EPPS has satisfactory reliability and validity, since it correlated with self-ratings and not with the ideal self-ratings.

Many studies have been conducted to test the fakability of the EPPS. An example of them is the work of Borislow (1958, pp. 22-27); working with only nineteen students, he formed three groups, one seeking the items which were most socially desirable, another the most personally desirable, and a third the control group. Comparing the results, Borislow concluded, as one would expect, that the EPPS can be faked, and that the consistency scores were an inadequate check in the detecting of simulated scores.
These are examples of validity studies still being conducted with the EPPS. One might sometimes question whether individual items are truly a measure of the variable in question, but on the whole the items do seem to possess face validity. Added to this are the studies such as those mentioned above that indicate the possible use of the EPPS as a useful instrument for the cautious tester.

**Literature Pertinent to the Use of the EPPS Among Selected Groups.**

The most important of all past studies are those which have tested groups of subjects, attempting to differentiate them by their EPPS profiles. It is important to know whether there exists a basic seminarian profile which can differentiate the seminarians from members of other groups. Similar studies among other groups give us an indication of what might be expected. It has been sought, for example, whether engineering students differ in their personality profile from liberal art students; or whether negro students differ from white students. Studies have been conducted with the EPPS among such diverse groups: teachers; psychiatric nurses and general nurses; high school students; college students majoring in various subjects; overachievers and underachievers; parents of children who stutter; Norwegian, Nisei and Near East students; volunteer and non-volunteer groups in research
projects; effective oral readers; finally, even among robbers, forgers and burglars! All of these studies show distinct "need" patterns among the various groups. The practical consequences of many such results are only too evident.

An article by Richard Walsh (1959, pp. 194-198) serves well to summarize the importance of such studies. Various studies have been and are at present being conducted relating the person to his work: seeking personality similarities among persons, whether employed in the same occupation, or seeking the same work, or engaged in the same college curriculum; other studies seek the relationship between job satisfaction and interest in work. All such studies are efforts to study the involvement of the personality in one's work. Walsh's hypothesis was that individuals will select as liked or disliked the specific duties as they correspond or do not correspond to any given need. He administered a job-description questionnaire, followed by the EPPS, to ninety-six male students on an introductory psychology course. Twenty-four job descriptions were contained in the questionnaire, with eight duties under each, to be marked as appealing or unappealing. When the needs were also assessed by means of the EPPS, Walsh was able to make the judgment that a person's job serves as a major outlet for his needs. He felt that, first, if a need is strong enough, the person will choose a job fitting the need;
second, that in a particular job, he will shape the job to fit his need; third, he will respond to different aspects of the same job according to his need.

It is a truism that people should be happy in their work. Job production, financial savings, optimum human relations depend heavily on job satisfaction. Too often, people are fitted to the job; only when the job is fitted to the person can there be maximum satisfaction. The more this is done, within, of course, the limits of the particular work to be done, the greater work will be accomplished, the happier the worker.

It is the task of psychology, then, to aid both employer and employee to understand the personalities involved, and their compatibility to the vocation sought. The studies reported upon in the following pages intend to designate the typical personality profile of various student and occupational groups, as reported in various EPPS studies. Understanding then the reported personality "needs" of such groups, the seminarian profile can be better seen in perspective.

The differences reported upon will always be the significant differences as found by the experimenters, usually through a "t" or analysis of variance technique. It will be deemed sufficient in this present study to indicate briefly the
differences found; the reader can refer to the original articles for an elaboration of the experiments. As the differences are reported, it is hoped that the needs singled out are meaningful for the particular group in question, demonstrating what was mentioned above, the involvement of the total person in the particular vocation sought.

High School Students

It is proper to begin the review with a profile found among high school students. Klett (1957, pp.68-72) found few differences among the students as he classified them according to several socio-economic groups. Comparing students from a large suburban school to those of a small country school, he found the suburban boys higher in achievement; the suburban girls were higher in autonomy, heterosexuality, and aggression, and lower in deference and abasement. In comparing the high school boys with the college normative group, he found the high school boys higher in exhibition, abasement, change, endurance and aggression, and lower in intraception, achievement, dominance and consistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>exh</th>
<th>aba</th>
<th>cha</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>agg</th>
<th>int</th>
<th>ach</th>
<th>dom</th>
<th>con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high school boys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college norm. male group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = significantly higher; - = significantly lower
There is no question that the high school student differs in profile from the college student. The interesting question is why: is this a function of age; or does progression become a selective process and depend upon a person's personality? The answer, it would seem, must include both possibilities. Nevertheless, it is important that we see in the variables selected the personality tendencies of the college student which differentiate him from his high school counterpart; a self-organization in which the needs for immaturish exhibition, change, and aggression, are somewhat diminished, and the more mature needs, such as the need to achieve, are augmented.

**College Achievement**

The college group can, of course be broken down in many ways. Of great interest is the division of achievers and non-achievers: can reason for failure or success be found in personality? Various studies have been conducted and the following are some of the results found.

Merill and Murphy (1959, pp.207-210) conducted their study with 101 students who were given a low predicted grade average (1.50 or below.) Of these, forty-nine students scored 2.00 or better and were classified as overachievers; fifty-two scored 1.00 or below, thus designated as underachievers. When the two groups were compared, it was found that the
overachievers were higher in dominance, deference and endurance, and lower in autonomy, exhibition, affiliation, and change. Comparing overachievers with the Edwards normative college group, the overachievers were higher in deference, order, abasement and endurance, and lower in autonomy, dominance, nurturance, heterosexuality, and aggression. The underachieving low ability group was then compared to the normative group, being found higher in deference, order, exhibition, affiliation, abasement, change and endurance, and lower in intraception, dominance, achievement, heterosexuality and aggression. It might be of interest to point out that the underachieving low group was quite similar to Klett's high school group when compared to the normative college group! One can see in the overachieving, low-ability student a determination that is lacking in the underachiever; in the underachiever, an outgoing personality is not too task-centered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dom</th>
<th>def</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>aut</th>
<th>exh</th>
<th>aff</th>
<th>cha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>predicted-low-average overachiever</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>predicted-low-average underachiever</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normative group</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pred-low-av underach</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normative group</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* + =significantly higher  - =significantly lower*
As the authors conclude, "Speculatively, the ambitious, conforming, deferring, persistent student of low ability is a better academic risk than his more gregarious, out-going counterpart."

Gebhart and Hoyt (1958, pp. 125-128) did a similar study but without similar results. The groups, however, were not equated, since the previously mentioned study was restricted to students who were allotted a low-predicted grade average; Gebhart and Hoyt's study involved any student who scored higher or lower than his predicted grade average. They found that overachievers scored higher in achievement, order, intraception, and consistency, and lower in affiliation, nurturance, and change. There is a resemblance in the variables in which the overachievers scored lower than the underachiever; once more, they were the out-going, less stable qualities. Although the variables are not altogether similar, the personality of the overachiever does seem to come out: the overachiever emerges as a determined task-centered person, in distinction to the less stable, other-centered underachieving student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ach</th>
<th>orde</th>
<th>int</th>
<th>con</th>
<th>aff</th>
<th>nur</th>
<th>cha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overachiever</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underachiever</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Krug (1959, pp.133-136) had found that his previous study was contradictory to that of Gebhart and Hoyt. He then equated the variables and found that the results then did substantiate the previous study. Krug felt that the very manner of predicting grade scores can be crucial to the test. Where students were given predicted grade scores from past performance, only achievement discriminated the overachiever from the underachiever. But when aptitude tests were used, overachievers were higher in achievement, order, and endurance, and lower in affiliation and heterosexuality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ach</th>
<th>ord</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>aff</th>
<th>hat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overachiever</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underachiever</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these studies should be of considerable interest to the college teacher and administrator, as well as, of course, to the counsellor. The successful student is a more ambitious person. His very personality, whether one might think it as determined or acquired, at the moment is orientated to successful accomplishment of the task. Note the variables that appear in the studies for the overachiever: dominance, achievement, order, endurance. These are strong qualities, without any reference to social needs. On the contrary, the underachiever goes elsewhere to satisfy his needs: exhibition, affiliation, change, heterosexuality. Profiles resembling these might well
be indicative of future success or failure. Certainly they seem to be signs of the mature college student whose vocation for the present is to learn.

**Nurses**

Many other studies have been performed with various groups. Navran and Stauffacher (1958, pp. 64-67) studied psychiatric and general medical nurses. They found that the general nurses scored higher than the female college group in order, deference, and endurance, and lower in affiliation, autonomy, succorance, exhibition and dominance. Such characteristics are hardly reassuring about the nursing profession. Totally lacking are the altruistic qualities one might hope to find in the nurse. Somewhat more assuring were their findings on the "good" nurse, who seemed less timid, more warm, and more stable than the "bad" nurse.

Comparing the neuropsychiatric nurse to the general nurse, the writers found that the neuropsychiatric nurse was higher in aggression, intraception, heterosexuality and dominance and lower in order, deference and abasement. This type of personality might be a function of the nature of the work in which the nurses are engaged. The authors felt that the neuropsychiatric nurse was then, more "work-orientated" than "patient-orientated."
Heist (1960, 240-253) administered the EPPS together with other personality tests to dental students. He found that the dental student, as compared to the normative college male group, scored higher in deference, order and endurance, and lower in autonomy, dominance and change. He thus concluded that the dental student was somewhat other-directed, inflexible, needing to live in an organized manner, persistent and not readily distracted from his tasks and goals.

Grossack (1957, pp. 125-131) studied negro students in a southern university. He found that the male negro student exceeded the normative college male in deference, order, abasement, endurance and scored lower in exhibition, affiliation, dominance, and heterosexuality. A marked inferiority seems to emerge from
such a profile. Here seems to be the type of person who seeks out opinions of others, is contrite about his own deficiencies, needs an established order to act, and must endure under the circumstances in which he is placed. There is no out-going need as might be found in affiliation or heterosexual relationships. A total lack of confidence, it would seem, could stem from such a personality. Grossack listed the negro's greatest needs as intraception, endurance, and achievement, his weakest as exhibition, autonomy and succorance. Although these scores were not significantly different from the college norm, (except for exhibition and endurance) once more they seem to indicate the negro college student's personality: a need to establish himself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>def</th>
<th>ord</th>
<th>aba</th>
<th>end</th>
<th>exh</th>
<th>aff</th>
<th>dom</th>
<th>het</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male negro student</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normative college male</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* + = significantly higher  - = significantly lower

Teachers

Jackson and Guba (1957, pp. 176-192) found that the male teacher was significantly above the male normative college group in deference, order and endurance, and lower in exhibition, intraception, succorance and heterosexuality. The author brings up the question --where are the social tendencies one would hope to find among teachers, such as nurturance, affiliation and
intraception?

Novice teachers were found to differ from experienced teachers, once again posing the question if experiences change the personality profile, or if personality profile dictates the type of person who remains in a profession. Jackson and Guba do see that their findings "appear to fit the stereotypic model of the teacher as sexually impotent, obsequious, eternally patient, painstakingly demanding and socially inept": but they also warn the reader to be careful about the statistics, especially in view of the fact that the comparison group was the younger college group.

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{def} & \text{ord} & \text{end} & \text{exh} & \text{int} & \text{suc} & \text{het} \\
\hline
\text{male teachers} & + & + & + & - & - & - \\
\text{male normative college group} & - & - & - & + & + & + \\
\text{+ = significantly higher} & - = \text{significantly lower} \\
\end{array}
\]

A somewhat similar study was conducted by Lang (1960, pp.101-104), with 101 elementary and 87 high school female teachers, administering the EPPS along with a questionnaire on motivation for teaching. The author suggests that teaching serves as a distinct outlet for certain needs, and these differ for individuals who elect to teach on the elementary or secondary level. Since nurturance was highly significant for elementary level teachers, (and their Lang Scale of motivation bore this out) the author felt that his hypothesis was validated, namely, that elementary
teachers emphasized motives relating to the mothering aspect of teaching; and since achievement was significant for the secondary teachers, Lang felt that such teachers emphasized the academic and intellectual facets of teaching as borne out by the questionnaire and stated by the hypothesis.

Such studies are very significant, in that they bring attention to the motivation of teachers that are to be employed in any given teaching assignment.

Cook, Linden, and McKay (1961, pp. 865-871) also studied teachers, and supported the above findings. One hundred and ninety-six sophomores who studied Educational Psychology as teacher trainees were given the Guilford Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the EPPS. Using factor analysis, they found that six factors predominate in the teacher profile: docility, dependency, authoritarianism (status, prestige, desire to manipulate and control others), compulsive conformity, introversion, and avoidance (superficial investment of self in many varied vocational, avocational and social activities.) Once more the results are disconcerting, and the authors suggest a real discrepancy between the idealized and the observed personality characteristics of teachers.

Engineering students

The final study to be reported is in some ways the most
interesting, in that it compares engineering students not only with liberal arts students, but also with successful engineers. Izard (1960, pp. 332-335) found that engineers scored significantly higher than the male normative group in achievement, deference, order, dominance, and endurance, and lower in affiliation, intraception, succorance, abasement, nurturance, and heterosexuality. These findings, the author felt, were quite in keeping with the expected personality of an engineer, who seems primarily related to objects and processes, rather than to people. When Izard studied engineering students, it was found that they scored significantly higher than liberal arts college students in order and endurance and lower in intraception, nurturance, and affiliation, (.06). Izard found that the engineer students scored in the opposite direction from the engineers in dominance and aggression. The question then arises once more, whether students lacking these qualities drop out of engineering, or if they acquire these qualities as they grow proficient in their field. Izard states that authors have found that engineers become more confident and less socially reticent with increasing maturity. Because this study compares the student with other students it is valuable for a reference; it finds even greater merit since it compares the student to the successful engineer. In finding ten of the variables in the same direction, one begins to see the relationship between the
student and the accomplished success, keeping an eye on the differences and thus hoping to find in such profiles indication of future vocational success or failure.

Literature Pertaining to the Study of Seminarians

The psychological testing of seminarians is a comparatively new field. As has been previously indicated, testing a person in regards to his personal life is a delicate undertaking; not everyone has a right to do this; and often those with the right can be seriously hampered by an inadequate understanding of the test results before him. It is only natural that superiors have been cautious in regards to such testing, and have only gradually allowed experimentation, carefully planned and strictly supervised.

Because, however, a fuller understanding of the relationship of grace to nature has gradually evolved in theology, many involved in the training of seminarians have seen fit to attempt to understand better this nature of man. Much of the impetus has come from the works of Dom Vener Moore of Catholic University, who wrote extensively on the occurrence of mental disorder among the members of religious life. It is common now to notice that religious who develop neurotic and psychotic tendencies had shown some signs of a problem in their personality years previous to final vows or ordination. It has been noticed that some candidates come from psychologically poor backgrounds: broken
homes, mothers who do not know how to love properly, etc.
Motivation is certainly a serious problem in many such cases: just what is the reason for which a person would embrace religious life? There are seminarians who insist their motivation is the love of God and souls, and nevertheless consistently get into trouble, or have serious moral problems, or are lost in the crowd. There are reasons for such behaviour, reasons that have too often been brushed aside with comments such as "He'll get over this stage", or "It's part of growing up". Sometimes it is. But sometimes tragedy is the end result. What must be clearly avoided is the possibility of a person seeking the priesthood, consciously or unconsciously, for the satisfaction of self-centered basic needs. Any experimentation which would lead to a better understanding of one's self would be ultimately an act of kindness to the candidate, and even a potential cause of growth which would help in the refining of motivation.

Such is the purpose of the work going on today at some of America's Catholic universities. Earliest studies have come from Catholic University, Fordham and Loyola University of Chicago. Studies from Loyola have recently been compiled in a book called Screening of Candidates for the Priesthood and the Religious Life. The work of Magda Arnold with sequential analysis of the TAT is presented here. Arnold feels that it is imperative to
capture the basic positive or negative attitude of a person: "instead of discovering hidden personality dynamics, this method of interpretation (of the TAT) reveals the way in which a man deals with his emotions; how he reacts to adversity, how he thinks success can be achieved, how he goes about creating good relations with other people. These attitudes are action tendencies from which we can predict whether he will act in a constructive manner." (p. 61). Here Arnold presents her views that positive orientation to life is requisite for successful living and vocational maturity. Certainly such testing for a positive outlook would seem to be an asset in the work of guidance and assessment of candidates for the priesthood. Also in the book are studies by Hispanicus and Weisgerber on the use of the MMPI with seminarians and a summary of the work done with interest tests by D'Arcy.

McCarthy (1959, p.39) found that people in religious life have specific personality characteristics and interests, although on some characteristics, wide differences are found. He believed that personality is changed by living in religious life, as is to be expected and in some ways hoped for, since the striving for ideals is essential to religious life.

Bier(1950, 589-604) compared major seminarians with students in dental, law and liberal arts groups on the MMPI. He felt that the seminarians "manifested the same deviant tendencies
as the general population of the study, though in a more marked degree." The seminary group proved to be the most deviant portion of an already deviant population.

Benko and Nuttin (1956, pp.101-102) on a revised edition of the MMPI for their own French culture, felt that the Psychasthenia, schizophrenia, and hypochondriasis scales discriminated well between well-adjusted and poorly adjusted seminarians, and that seminarians who scored abnormally high on two scales give indication of serious lack of vocational adaptation. Most authors explain elevation in seminarian's scores as due to situational anxiety. The Mf scales have been recently seen as an indication of interests, such as those dealing with people, language and ideas, the type of interests found more frequently among college students, although characterized in the test as feminine (see Cottle, 1953, p.67).

More and more work is being done with seminarians, the above being but brief indications of all the research that has been and is presently being conducted on the seminarian personality. For, speaking theologically, grace, the relationship that exists between God and man, builds upon man's nature. In studying this nature, we become more gradually aware of the typical seminarian profile, and especially of the aberrations from this profile. We begin to look for the positive personality, the
emotionally balanced personality, the socially adjusted person, the student with satisfactory home relationships. When deviations from such normal profiles are found, questions should be asked, reasons sought, doubts answered by action. Such are the contributions offered and continually sought for by those in the field of psychological testing — the better understanding of the seminarian's self.

Literature Pertaining to Studies Previously Conducted with the Same Group Tested in this Study with the EPPS

A final look at previous work done with seminarians confines itself to two studies done with the same group now being tested with the EPPS. It is thus possible to better know the present group under study by reviewing the previous profiles as recorded in these studies.

The seminarian group of the present study is divided into three groups, A, B, and C, according to classes. Groups A and B had taken the MMPI, the Kuder Preference Record and the Mooney Problem Check List one year previous to the present study on the EPPS. The results of those tests were subject of Masters of Arts theses submitted by John Gorman (1961) and Andrew McDonough (1961) of Loyola University. Both Gorman (working with Group B) and McDonough (working with Group A) found that the MMPI profile on the entire group indicated a well-adjusted personality. The groups scored lower on all scales of the
MMPI than most other college populations.

Gorman reported that Group B, then a fourth-year high school group soon to be graduated, scored lower than the normative college group on all scales except on schizophrenia, which was slightly higher. McDonough, reporting on Group A, the group a year older in first year college, found that scores in Hs (Hypochondriasis), D (Depression), Pa (Paranoia), Ps (Psychasthenia) and Sc (Schizophrenia) were all higher in the seminary group than the college normative group. The two groups had similar profiles though the older group scored higher in every scale, significantly so (.05 level of confidence) in hypochondriasis, depression, hysteria, paranoia and psychasthenia. Gorman felt that age was a possible major determining factor in the score differences. Nevertheless, since all scores approximated the college mean, both concluded that the seminary population was a well adjusted group according to their MMPI findings.

Both Gorman and McDonough, by empirically determining a cut-off point, selected a "high group" of thirty eight students. It was hoped that such a process might distinguish the adjusted from the non-adjusted students within a group. Their profiles were mainly extensions of the entire group profile, although Gorman noticed a disproportionately elevated depression scale for his high group. Both writers felt that this high group should be worked with and given the opportunity to have greater
"balance in their lives." (Gorman, p. 98). It is these groups which will be taken into comparison in this study, showing how those who remained in the seminary scored on the EPPS, taken one-half year later.

As a result of their Kuder findings, both writers concluded that the seminarians were very high, as is proper, in social service and literary interests, but surprisingly, also in computational interests. Both found a low persuasive score quite provocative. On the Mooney Check List, the seminarian scored slightly below the average number of problems found among the college male group. The greatest number of problems was found in ACW (Adjustment to College Work), which was also true for all college students. The high groups, however, scored a far greater percentage of both ordinary and serious problems than the remaining group of seminarians (total group minus the high group). This was a significant finding for the author, attributing great value then, to the cut-off score of the MMPI. The mean IQ for Group A was 113.17, for Group B, 115.4. Approximately six months later, these same two groups would take the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, except for a number of dropouts.
CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURE

Part one of this chapter will be devoted to a description of the instrument used in this study, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

"The EPPS was designed primarily as an instrument for research and counselling purposes, to provide quick and convenient measures of a number of relatively independent normal personality variables." (Manual, p. 5). The test is designed to measure fifteen personality variables:

- Ach Achievement
- Def Deference
- Ord Order
- Exh Exhibition
- Aut Autonomy
- Aff Affiliation
- Int Intracception
- Suc Succorance
- Dom Dominance
- Aba Abasement
- Nur Nurturance
- Cha Change
- End Endurance
- Het Heterosexuality
- Agg Aggression

Besides these variables, the author provides a sixteenth score, a check for test consistency (con) by comparing the number of identical choices made in two sets of the same fifteen items, thus adding to the fifteen variables a consistency
The author makes no attempt to define the fifteen variables except in terms of the particular test items that appear under the variable. On a page entitled "The Manifest Needs associated with each of the Fifteen Variables" the author lists abbreviated forms of the test items under each variable, serving thus as a descriptive definition. For example, some needs will be here listed to indicate the meaning of the variables:

**achievement:** to do one's best; to be a recognized authority to do a difficult job well.

**deference:** to get suggestions from others; to praise others; to accept leadership of others.

**order:** to keep things neat and orderly; to have work, files, meals, trips organized.

**exhibition:** to be the center of attention; to say witty and clever things.

**autonomy:** to be able to come and go as desired; to be independent of others in making decisions; to criticize those in authority.

**affiliation:** to be loyal to friends; to do things for friends.

**intraception:** to analyze one's motives and feelings; to observe others; to understand how others feel about problems.

**succorance:** to have others provide help when in trouble; to seek encouragement from others.

**dominance:** to be a leader in groups; to make group's decisions.
abasement: to feel guilty when one does something wrong; to feel the need for confession of errors.
nurturance: to help friends when they are in trouble; to forgive others; to be generous with others.
change: to do new and different things; to travel; to forgive others; to be generous with others
endurance: to keep at a job until it is finished; to work hard at a task.
heterosexuality: to get out with members of the opposite sex; to be in love; to kiss; to participate in discussions about sex; to read books, tell jokes about sex; to become sexually excited.
aggression: to attack contrary points of view; to criticize others publicly; to become angry; to blame others when things go wrong.

Each of the fifteen variables is paired twice with each of the other variables. For example:

I like to help my friends when they are in trouble.
I like to do my very best in whatever I undertake.

Here, two traits, that of nurturance and achievement, are matched one against the other, a preference of one item over another indicative of the presence of that particular personality trait. Among the 225 comparisons, each variable will have appeared twenty-eight times. Thus a person can have chosen a particular variable as little as no times, and as often as twenty-eight times. These raw scores then can be compared to normative groups' raw scores, and a person can see in what percentile he falls for each particular trait. Obviously a raw score of zero would indicate the absence of the trait, and scores in between
some place along the continuum.

The problem of social desirability (sd) is found in every personality test. If all the items of a test were listed in a simple check list, and a person were asked to check the items that were descriptive of himself, the probability of endorsement would rise with the social desirability of the statement. Edwards had given a list of 140 statements to 140 students; he found that a statement such as "I like to be loyal to my friends" was endorsed by 98% of the students. (one in fact might wonder about the two percent who did not endorse the statement as characteristic of themselves!). Even when the tests were taken anonymously, there was a definite correlation between probability of endorsement and social desirability. To counteract this tendency, Edwards constructed the sd scale, giving each statement a scale value, based on the opinions of a group of judges. From these he would choose nearly equivalent (in sd) statements to form a forced choice inventory. Thus Edwards was departing from two previously tried efforts to control sd. Some inventories contained statements that were subtle or neutral in respect to sd. The MMPI used special scales, such as K to measure a tendency of the person to score sd items. Edwards hoped to construct a test in which the subject would be forced to choose between two items equal in sd, thus indicating a true
preference, coming not from the item's sd, but from definite personality characteristics. It can be seen that the two statements given above as an example pose a real problem to most people; both items are approximately equally desirable socially; a choice would seem to have to come from the person's personality.

The system is not without its critics. Some have felt (Cohen, Feldman, Corah, Grueh, Meadow, Ringwall, 1958) that the sd of an item changes when paired with another item. They believed they had discovered a definite hierarchical pattern emerging when subjects were asked to choose the more socially desirable item -- achievement over succorance and heterosexuality, order over aggression, and abasement over heterosexuality. Using eighty-one subjects in one experiment and fifty-five in another, they concluded to the definite presence of sd as an important factor still remaining in the EPPS. Others (vid. Kelleher, 1959, p. 100) deny that sd plays any significant role.

That sd is still a factor is not really too surprising. It is a factor not to be forgotten in the administration of this (and many) tests. Edwards himself admits that all pairings were not perfectly matched. Nor does the very fact of sd invalidate a test -- if that were so, most inventories would be in jeopardy. The fact that a subject chooses an item which is the more socially desirable does not necessarily deny any honesty on the
subject's part -- perhaps besides the most socially desirable, it might also be the more characteristic of the subject. An important argument to be remembered is the very frustrating task of taking the test. The items are so well matched, that choice, for most subjects, is almost exasperating. Many subjects admit to being worn out by the test, a fact not too praiseworthy in itself, but certainly indicative of the careful matching of the items. Social desirability as a factor remains. It is nevertheless to the credit of the author in working out an inventory which, notwithstanding, cuts down the measure of personal bias in the test.

The personality variables sought by the inventory are taken from a list of manifest needs as theorized by Henry A. Murray. The author does associate the variables with "manifest needs" when he lists and describes them, but does not elaborate any further on this relationship. He in fact seems to assiduously avoid the term "need" in favor of the term "personality variable". We may assume then, that the test is intended to be no more than an assessment of personality characteristics, without intending to restrict the concept to the term "need" which of itself could bear certain clinical connotations not found in the simple term "variable."

The subjects are given the test consisting of 225 forced choices. Although the author claims most college students finish
the test by the end of fifty minutes, there is no limit as to time. The choices are marked on answer sheets, which can be scored by hand or by machine, although machine scoring requires a special scoring sheet. Results may then be plotted on a profile chart found on the reverse side of the scoring sheet, with percentiles already marked for simple scoring. The Manual has percentile charts for normative groups of College students and General Adult Groups, male and female, as well as T scores for College students, male and female.

The College sample was taken from high school graduates with some college training. The sample consisted of 749 college women and 760 college men, enrolled in day or evening liberal arts classes at various universities and colleges. Their ages varied from a few in the teens to a very few in the forties and fifties, although the great majority were bracketed in the 20-24 age group.

The General Adult sample was taken by a "nation-wide sample of male and female household heads who are members of a consumer purchase panel used for market surveys." The sample covered counties in the forty-eight states, completed by 4031 males and 4932 females in 5105 households. The author found highly significant differences between the adult and college groups, although all differences between sex groups for both groups were in the same direction.
As previously mentioned, Edwards provides a check to see whether or not the subject had carefully thought out his answers. There are fifteen items which are repeated. Chance alone would provide for 7.5 similar responses. Edwards has determined that eleven or more identical responses could occur by chance only six times out of a hundred and considers eleven as indicative of a significant departure from chance. Actually, 75% of the normative college group scored eleven or better in the consistency score (con), and only two percent scored eight or below, an obvious indication that most subjects took the test with some degree of care.

Part two of this chapter is devoted to the method of presentation. The main purpose of the study was to ascertain the profile of a seminary population by the use of the EPPS, comparing it then to a normative college group. The same seminarian group had previously been tested, as mentioned above, with the MMPI, the Kuder Preference Record, and the Mooney Problem Check List.

A total of 408 college seminarians were tested, the grand total of the three groups that had attended a newly-founded Junior College. The first group (N:85) and the second group (N:143) were tested together upon entrance into the college; a year later, the third group (N:180), the incoming freshman group, was tested.
was tested.

The tests were administered by a qualified psychologist. There was a minimum of structuring, in accordance with the directions of the manual. Although the seminarians had taken previous psychological tests, the taking of the EPPS caused a number of students a serious problem. They desired to distinguish certain of the choices, indicating that "like" can mean several things. For example, a person can "like" to do one thing by nature, but prefer another through learning. The students were merely told to refer to the printed instructions on the test, without any further structuring. Results should take into account this difficulty encountered in the test.

The seminary population is the Junior College division of the seminary system. The students had finished four years of high school at the Minor Seminary, and were to follow up with six years at the Major Seminary after their two years at the Junior College. The scores were checked, re-checked, and compiled under the supervision of a qualified psychologist.

Four comparisons are made:

The seminarian (Junior College level) compared to the normative college student.

The seminarians who remained in the seminary since testing with those who had since left.

The seminarians of the "high-group" (those who scored high on the MMPI) compared to the remainder of the group.

The seminarians of each class compared with each other.
The bases used to distinguish the groups were the variables which were significantly different at the .05, .01 or .001 level. The main purpose of the study is to be descriptive, so that interpretation of the results will be minimal. Each comparison is treated separately.
CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS

The Seminarian and the Normative College Student

The EPPS scores of 408 Junior College seminarians were compared to the scores of the 760 men who comprised the college sample as given in the EPPS manual. As Table I shows, the seminarians scored significantly higher in affiliation, succorance, abasement, nurturance, and aggression (as well as in achievement (.02)), and lower in order, autonomy, intraception, dominance, and heterosexuality.
TABLE I

A Comparison of Seminarians with the Normative College Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sem. Mean Raw Score</th>
<th>Col. Mean Raw Score</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>level of sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>16.30*</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deference</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>10.23*</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhibition</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>autonomy</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>14.34*</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliation</td>
<td>16.24*</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intraception</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>16.12*</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>succorance</td>
<td>13.06*</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>17.44*</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abasement</td>
<td>14.50*</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nurturance</td>
<td>16.23*</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endurance</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heterosexuality</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>17.65*</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggression</td>
<td>14.00*</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constancy</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 408 760

NS = Not significant
Table II shows how the two groups differed according to their personality variables. Table II shows the order of importance of the variables according to the mean number of times the variable was chosen:

**TABLE II**

**Ranking of Choices According to the Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seminarian Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>College Normative Group Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. dominance</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>1. heterosexuality</td>
<td>17.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. achievement</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>2. dominance</td>
<td>17.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. nurturance</td>
<td>16.23</td>
<td>4. achievement</td>
<td>15.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. change</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>5. change</td>
<td>15.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. exhibition</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>6. affiliation</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. abasement</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>7. exhibition</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. aggression</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8. autonomy</td>
<td>14.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. autonomy</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>10. aggression</td>
<td>12.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. succorance</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>11. endurance</td>
<td>12.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. endurance</td>
<td>12.93</td>
<td>12. abasement</td>
<td>12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. heterosexuality</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>13. deference</td>
<td>11.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. deference</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>14. succorance</td>
<td>10.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. order</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>15. order</td>
<td>10.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics of Table I were quite surprising, in that they showed so many differences between the seminarian and his college counterpart. Table II helps us to evaluate these differences in a better light. Most noticeable is the difference in rank order of heterosexuality. Because the average collegiate will choose the heterosexual value at least five times more in a test than the seminarians, the results for the remaining
variables will be somewhat distorted. It would be interesting to know how the results would have turned out if all heterosexual items had been eliminated in this comparison. As it is, there nevertheless remain indications of the students' preferences.

A look at Table II shows that in many ways, the young men are quite similar. Certain "needs" are ranked high by both groups, and others ranked low. Some observations can now be made.

1. Certain needs are universal to the college-age student. Dominance, achievement and change are ranked among the first five by both groups.

2. Certain needs are universally low, compared to the other variables. Succorance, endurance, deference and order are among the last five in each group.

3. Certain differences can be seen among the highly-ranked variables. The results of the heterosexual scores, are, at first, quite surprising. The first thought that could present itself is that the seminarian is perhaps a totally different person than the college student. There are indications, however, that suggest that such a conclusion should be modified. For it is entirely plausible that the seminarian, quite heterosexually inclined by nature, has trained himself to prefer other values of a more altruistic nature. For example, when the EPPS was administered to the seminarian, pairings which included heterosexual items provoked the
greatest number of questions; the seminarian was obviously puzzled as to how he should answer such questions -- according to his natural tendencies, or according to his acquired preferences? Furthermore, in view of the life of celibacy to which he intends to dedicate himself, the seminarian constantly endeavors to sublimate his natural heterosexual inclinations. It is therefore possible to believe, without disregarding the possibility of other explanations, that the cause of the great discrepancy in the heterosexual score can be attributed to training rather than to any innate disposition.

The dominance score should also be noted; for although it ranked first for the seminarians, the score was nevertheless significantly higher for the college student. It will be shown later that the high ranking for the dominance score of seminarians was effected by the weight of the scores of seminarians who were soon to leave.

Not so easily explained is the seminarians' low score for intraception. Why seminarians, supposedly interested in understanding the motivation and feelings of themselves and others, scored so low is a problem which would merit further research.

4. The seminarians' scores are distinguished by high social needs. Affiliation and nurturance rank high for the seminarian, for his life is to be dedicated to others; and his
social needs are to be filled by his friends, rather than through heterosexual relationships. At first, one might not only question the low intraception score, but also wonder why the nurturance score was not even higher. It shall be later shown, however, that the total seminarian score had been adversely affected by the scores of those within the seminarian population who soon were to leave the seminary.

5. While most of the differences are consistent with personalities expected (e.g., it is logical that the seminarian be sensitive to his faults; thus the high score on abasement) it is open to question why the seminarian scored significantly higher on aggression. Should it happen that all seminarians score consistently higher in aggression than other groups, it would be a matter of great concern to discover what factors (in seminarian life?) cause this to occur.

Briefly, the test seems to say this about seminarians:

While in many ways they resemble their college brothers in universally striving for dominance, achievement, and change, they do bear certain distinguishing characteristics. The seminarian has a greater desire to be loyal and do things for friends; on the other hand, he is also quicker to seek help and encouragement from others when in need. Besides his close relationship to
friends, he is quicker to help all people, somewhat more inclined to be kind and sympathetic towards others. He has a deeper sense of abasement, accepting blame and feeling guilty in wrong-doing. Perhaps surprisingly to some, he is quicker to criticize, become angry and aggressive. Finally, he has a somewhat greater desire to achieve.

On the other hand, the college student is more independent, possessing a greater need to say what he thinks and do what he wants. He also has a greater need for dominance, seeking to supervise and lead. His need for order is greater than the seminarians'. Quite surprisingly, he is more intraceptive, more concerned with the problems and feelings of others, trying to understand and analyze them. Finally, as to be expected, he is much more eager to seek out the other sex.

The Seminarian and the Ex-Seminarian

The second comparison paired the seminarians who had left the Seminary since they took the EPPS with the seminarians who persevered. It is often debated whether the personality of students who leave differs significantly from the personality of those who remain. Using the EPPS as a guide, certain differences were established. Table III lists the variables in rank, order according to preference, designating the variables which are higher to a significant degree.
TABLE III

Comparison of the Mean Scores of Seminarians who have left the Seminary with Seminarians who have Persevered, on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>1. Nurturance</td>
<td>16.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change</td>
<td>16.32*</td>
<td>2. Affiliation</td>
<td>16.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affiliation</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>5. Change</td>
<td>15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exhibition</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>7. Abasement</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Abasement</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>10. Succorance</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly greater * .05  
** .01  
*** .001
The differences become immediately apparent. The former seminarians' needs for change and heterosexuality are significantly greater than the same needs for the seminarians who persevere. The fact that change and heterosexuality rank second and third immediately indicate the tension that was present when they took the test as seminarians. A high change and heterosexuality score, would certainly seem an indication of a future dropout from the seminary, especially in regards to the heterosexuality score, which ranked third for the seminarians who left and fourteenth for those who remained. It might be noticed that the dropout has not the same need for endurance as has the seminarian who perseveres (although the difference is short of significance.) It seems that the seminarian who left had already shown a marked desire to change his present status when he had taken the EPPS.

The scores for the seminarians who remained are just as revealing. Ranking nurturance and affiliation first and second, the seminarian who perseveres shows himself primarily to be other-directed. That he be of service to others is primary in his desires, to a degree significantly greater than for the seminarian dropout. Furthermore, his social ties must exist with his friends rather than through heterosexual relationships; again to a significant degree. Thus the seminarian who perseveres
is marked out by his nurturance and affiliation scores. Absence of a high nurturance and affiliation score in a seminarian profile could be a cause of wonder for both candidate and superior.

It is interesting to see how the problems, brought up by the comparison of seminarians with the normative college group, are in some degree answered by the second comparison. The reason why dominance and achievement outranked affiliation and nurturance in the over-all seminarian score is now seen as due to weight of the scores of those who were to leave the seminary within the year. Without the scores of those who were to leave, nurturance and affiliation rank first and second for seminarians, as one would think most proper. Furthermore, the score for intraception is brought to a more respectable level for seminarians with the exclusion of the dropouts' scores, although still far behind the level of the college normative group. The intraception score includes items that concern the analysis of both one's own and others' motives and behaviour. It would seem that the dropout would be intraceptive about his own behaviour; but perhaps his own self-consciousness excludes concern for others to the extent that the intraception score would be low. Whatever the reason for the low intraception score for the dropout, a higher intraception score for the seminarians who stay seems desirable; for the future priest cannot be sympathetic to the problems of
others unless he begins to learn a sensitivity to them. A high intraception score seems to indicate the presence of just such a sensitivity.

The aggression score is higher for the dropouts than for either the seminarians or the normative group! The score seems to indicate a dissatisfaction, perhaps with their present state of life. Although the score affects the seminarians' aggression score, it alone cannot account for the high total score, since the aggression score for seminarians who remain stays high. The problem, therefore, remains, why seminarians, even those who remain, score so much higher than the normative group of college students in aggression.

In summary, the difference between seminarians who leave and those who remain are apparent. While the dropouts are concerned with change and heterosexuality, the seminarians think in terms of helping others and being with friends. Furthermore, the seminarians who remain are more intraceptive. The scores not only differentiate the two groups, but serve to explain some of the problems which arose when the total seminarian population was considered in contrast to the normative group.

The "High Group"

In the studies conducted by Gorman and McDonough (vid. McDonough, 1961, p. 59) a discrimination was made between the "high" group and the rest of the seminarian group. The subjects
were ranked according to their mean scores of all the MMPI scales. Note was made of every score 70 or above. Finally, a cutting point of 57.3 was established by McDonough and 58.5 by Gorman in their respective studies as the first point going from highest to lowest mean, where there were more than two students who had no scale above 70. Included in the study were several students who had no scores of 70 or above, but included in the "high" group because of their high average.

Gorman and McDonough felt that the scores of the High group "indicated that they were less well adjusted and could use some counselling." (p. 54) Furthermore, this same group showed a much greater percentage of problems when taking the Mooney Problem Check List.

Because the authors felt that this group was worthy of special study, the same high group (with a high group of Class C added according to the same criteria) was included for the third of this study's comparisons. This part of the study tries to answer whether the high group will show a distinct personality profile when taking the EPPS. Table IV shows the results.
**TABLE IV**

Comparison of the Mean Scores achieved on the EPPS between Seminarians who scored High on the MMPI and all other seminarians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>High Group (N:48) Mean</th>
<th>All other Seminarians (N: 360) Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>1. Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Affiliation</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>3. Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Succorance</td>
<td>15.38***</td>
<td>5. Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exhibition</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>8. Intraception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intraception</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>10. Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Endurance</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>13. Heterosexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>15. Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly greater **.01  
***.001
Only two significant differences were established. The high group scored significantly higher in succorance, while the more average group scored higher in endurance.

The results, to some degree, seem to confirm the sensitivity one might expect to find in the high group. They scored significantly lower in the need for endurance, which seems to indicate a lack of drive and a tendency toward distraction in their work. The high group scored higher in the need to achieve and the need for self-abasement, but both scores fell short of significance in this study (although it is conceivable, that, maintaining a similar standard deviation, these variables, as well as a lower need for dominance, would become significant in a study entailing a greater number of high group members.) Most impressive of all is the score on succorance, in which the high group definitely showed a marked need to be helped by others. Succorance seldom ranks high in any list; yet for the high group, it ranks fifth, even ahead of the need for dominance which ranks so highly among all other college groups. The fact that dominance just barely fell short of significance for the average group seems to verify the fact that the high group shies away from leadership and looks to others for encouragement and understanding. Succorance definitely seems to epitomize the high group; perhaps no other variable could better characterize this group.
More research with a greater number of high group students is needed to further substantiate what McDonough and Gorman have been led to believe by their MMPI findings: that the "high group" is a less-well adjusted group. Certainly the EPPS profiles help to indicate their distinct characteristics, and cause one to wonder whether their sensitivities will eventually help or hinder them in the pursuit of their vocation.

The Three Seminarian Classes

A final comparison involves the three individual classes which comprise the total seminarian group. While it has been seen that seminarians do differ from college students in their personality profiles, it has been hypothesized that seminarians, grouped according to classes, might to some slight degree, differ among themselves. This would lend itself to what has often been referred to as "class personality." Professors will often state that one class is so very different from another class; it is now sought whether such differences can be discovered through psychological testing.

Table V shows the rank order of variables as chosen by individual classes.
TABLE V

Comparison of Mean Scores of Three Individual Classes Within The Seminary Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Class A</th>
<th>Class B</th>
<th>Class C</th>
<th>A/B</th>
<th>A/C</th>
<th>B/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>15.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deference</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>13.37</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intracception</td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>13.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasement</td>
<td>13.96</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>14.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>17.49</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 85 143 180
A study of the results shows that seminarians in any given class essentially do score the same. Four of the five highest scores are always nurturance, dominance, achievement, and affiliation, while succorance, heterosexuality, deference, and order quite consistently are found at the end of the list.

Nevertheless, in each of the three classes there is at least one striking difference, a difference which might well lend itself to establishing a "class personality". This study does not intend to conclude to such a personality. It merely presents the profile as the statistics seem to indicate. Further research could well establish the objective presence of the personality seemingly indicated by test results.

The seminarian classes seem very similar in their seminarian-like characteristics: nurturance and affiliation are always close to the top of the list. There are, thus, the desires to help people, to be loyal to friends, as well as the tendencies to be a leader and make decisions, and to be successful. It has been noted that this profile tends to differ from the normative collegiate's profile to a marked degree, for among seminarians, nurturance, achievement, dominance, and affiliation always dominate the selections.

Nevertheless there does seem to be a difference in the scores among the classes. The first-ranked variable was always
significantly higher than this same variable for the other classes.

Group A, the older group (by a year) at the time of testing (and the smallest, N:85) was much more other-centered in that they more strongly sought to be of service to others, more intraceptive (observing the feelings and behaviour of others) and much less desirous of autonomy. Group B, however, seemed much more of a driving class, strongly desirous for dominance; their desires for achievement and aggression were also higher, though not significantly so. Group C also showed a trait peculiarly strong, that of the desire for change. Thus it might be hypothesized that this group would be the most restless of the three classes.

In summary, the differences might be seen in this manner: Classes score basically the same in their seminarian profiles. Yet individual classes seem to maintain some aspect of individuality: Class A, older by a year was much more other-centered, being more desirous to be of service to others, and intraceptive of others' feelings and behaviour; Group B was more self-centered and aggressive, scoring higher in dominance, and higher (though not significantly) in aggression and achievement. Group C seemed to be the most restless of the groups, desirous of change more than the other groups. The statements of faculty members consulted seemed to bear out this profile. Further research would have to be done to verify the findings of the test scores.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A descriptive study of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule was made with a seminary population at the level of the Junior College. A total of 408 seminarians were administered the test. Four hypotheses were made: first that seminarians differ significantly in their personality profiles from students of the normative college group; second, that seminarians who remained in the seminary differed from the seminary students who had left the seminary from the time of testing up to the time of the study; third, that seminarians from a so-called "high group" (those who scored above a designated cut-off point on the MMPI) differed from the rest of the seminarian population; fourth, that individual classes within a population differed, lending to the possibility of the existence of a "class personality".

When the seminarians were compared with the normative college group, it was found that seminarians scored significantly greater than their college counterparts in affiliation, achievement, succorance, abasement, nurturance and aggression, and lower in order, autonomy, introspection, dominance, and especially
heterosexuality. It is believed that some of composite seminarian scores are weighted by the preferences of the groups within the population. Thus a high seminarian score in succorance might be partially explained by its value found among the high group; thus also the seminarians' low score on intraception and the lower-than-might-be expected score on nurturance could be explained by their comparatively lower significance among the dropout group within their total population. Nevertheless, certain conclusions can be made. It is seen that among seminarians and college students alike, certain variables rank high, such as dominance, achievement, and change; others rank universally low; succorance, endurance, deference, and order. Enough significant differences emerge, however, from the profile to discriminate the one group from the other. The college student seems to be more independent, with a greater need to say what he thinks and do what he wants. He has a greater need for dominance and thus to supervise and lead. His need for order is greater than the seminarian's. Quite surprisingly he is more intraceptive, more concerned with the problems and feelings of others. Finally, as to be expected, he is much more eager to seek out relationships with the other sex. The seminarian, on the other hand, has a somewhat greater desire to achieve; surprisingly perhaps, he is quicker to criticize, become angry and aggressive.
He has a deeper sense of abasement, accepting blame and feeling guilty in wrong-doing. He is quicker to seek help and encouragement from others when in need; but also he has a greater desire to be loyal and do things for friends. Perhaps most characteristically, he is quicker to help all people, somewhat inclined to be kind and sympathetic to others. Briefly, a high heterosexuality score characteristically indicates the college student; a high affiliation-nurturance score designates the seminarian. These and the other significant differences seem to indicate that seminarians differ in their value patterns from their collegiate counterparts.

The differences between the persevering seminarian and the drop-out seminarian also became apparent in the study. The dropouts' need for change and heterosexuality stood out; while the preference of nurturance, affiliation, and intraception (all in some way pertinent to their vocation) clearly marked out the seminarian who persevered. It was felt that high scores in these areas might serve to predict the future dropouts among the seminarian population.

The high group distinguished itself from the remainder of the seminarian population by a significantly lower score in endurance, and higher scores in abasement and succorance. The results seem to confirm the high MMPI scores, which indicated
an extreme sensitivity among members of the high group. The meaning of the sensitivity is not yet clear, whether it is a positive or negative quality, or both; nevertheless, the EPPS serves to distinguish the one group from the other precisely through these variables.

Finally, a comparison was made between the three classes within the seminarian population, attempting to determine if a "class personality" could be substantiated. It was found that the first-ranked variable in each instance turned out to be significantly greater for the particular group. Further investigation would be necessary to see if it were true that Group A were especially nurturant, Group B dominant, and Group C restless, seeking change.

The results of this test open the way for further research. The following areas are suggested:

1. A comparative study of seminarians' scores on the EPPS with a representative group of successful priests. This would serve to show the direction in which seminarian scores would be expected to turn.

2. Further research on the meaning of the seminarians' low heterosexual score. It seems necessary to determine the reason for such a score -- natural inclination, high school training (which discouraged heterosexual activities), self-discipline in training oneself for a life of
celibacy, or a combination of these or other factors.

3. Further research on the meaning of the seminarians' high aggression score. It would prove interesting to show whether the score bears any relationship to the seminarians' low heterosexual or high deference score.

4. Further research on the meaning of the seminarians' low intrapersonal score. It seems necessary to discover whether such a low score at this stage of a seminarian's life is commendable. A negative view would indicate that revisions should be made in the training of seminarians which would enable them to be more sensitive to the feelings and motivation of people.

In conclusion, it can be said that the seminarian population possesses its own preference profile. The same can be said for the dropout group and the high group. While each class seems to possess some individuality, more research would have to be done to establish a definite individual profile for the respective classes. It is hoped that these findings can help in making of the EPPS a fruitful instrument in the screening and counselling of seminarians.
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