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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of the present study is twofold. First, it will attempt to extend the work begun by McKay (1982) who constructed a sentence completion test (SCT) for Protestant seminarians. In that study McKay sought to validate a SC test similar to those reported by previous investigators (Gorman & Kobler, 1963; Heinrich, 1967; McLaughlin, 1969; Sheehan, 1971; Sheridan, 1968) who have, over the past two decades developed, validated, and cross-validated the Loyola Seminarian Sentence Completion Test (LSSCT) and the Loyola Sentence Completion Blank for Clergy (LSCBC). Both tests have been demonstrated to be useful in detecting individuals who need counseling, and in assessing psychological adjustment. They both represent an effort to find effective assessment techniques for the psychological study of Catholic religious personnel.

McKay (1982) validated the total test score and four of the six subscale scores from his scale. McKay concluded that the failure to validate the two subscales, Psychosexual Maturity and Important Issues, indicated the need for revision of the test in those areas. With the exception of several items central to a priest's psychosexual maturity (e.g., "celibacy. . .") McKay used the identical Psychosexual Maturity scale that Kennedy, Heckler, Kobler and Walker (1977) found to be effective in differentiating adjusted from maladjusted priests. McKay
suggested that the Psychosexual Maturity category, developed and validated initially by Sheehan (1971), needed to include stems dealing with intimacy, closeness, giving and receiving affection, and addressing conflict in intimate relationships, if it was to be effective in detecting maladjustment in Protestant religious personnel. The present study will involve revising and validating the Psychosexual Maturity subscale, eliminating the Important Issues category, dropping some stems from the test, and moving other items to other subscales if rational justification for such a transfer can be established.

The sentence completion (S-C) method, an assessment tool that has been a focus of attention in the psychological literature, is also frequently used in clinical practice (Crenshaw, 1968; Goldberg, 1968; Murstein, 1965; Ivnik, 1977; Wade & Baker, 1977). Goldberg (1965), Murstein (1965), and Becker, DeFontaine, and Moran (cited in Sheehan, 1971) have criticized the proliferation of different S-C tests constructed for specific populations and purposes without the research necessary to demonstrate their reliability and validity. The present study will address these criticisms in that it proposes to further establish the reliability of and cross-validate on another sample those portions of McKay's test which have already been validated, and to initially validate the revised Psychosexual Maturity subscale.

The second purpose of the present study is closely related to the first. It involves an attempt to provide an additional assessment tool for the psychological study of men and women preparing for Protestant ministry. Anderson (1953), echoing Moore's (1936) conclusions,
suggested that the ministry attracts unstable people. Others (Daniel & Rogers, 1981; Nauss, 1973; Southard, 1958) conclude that those attracted to ministry are no less adjusted than people who enter other professions. Daniel and Rogers (1981) suggest examining the interaction between a minister's level of emotional adjustment and the personal and professional stress encountered in ministry.

Menges (1975) suggested that in assessing readiness for professional practice, one should consider personality characteristics as well as job performance and grasp of the subject matter in a particular field. Ford (1963), Halleck and Woods (1962), and Campbell (1980) point to the need for more effective psychological screening of people preparing for professions in psychiatry and psychotherapy. Collins (1982), Chessick (1978) and Houts (1977) emphasize the importance of emotional stability, psychological maturity, and personal insights into one's problems for a person preparing for ministry. Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke (1980) found that relational ability and emotional adjustment were held to be the most important factors in assessing an individual's readiness to minister.

A review of the literature revealed only one study (Dodson, 1957) that utilized the S-C method in the study of Protestant seminarians. The present study will continue to examine an instrument that may prove to be useful in the psychological study of Protestant seminarians.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be investigated in this study:
1. The sentence completion test will be reliable as indicated in two ways. First, it will be internally consistent, i.e., the scores for each test item will correlate more highly with the subscale to which it is assigned than to the other subscales. Also, subscale scores will correlate moderately with each other and more highly with the total test score.

2. Sentence completion scores indicating emotional conflict will be positively correlated with the number of MMPI clinical scale scores greater than 70.

3. Sentence completion scores indicating conflict will be negatively correlated with Hogan's Empathy Scale.

4. The revised Psychosexual Maturity subscale will be significantly correlated with the criterion measures of conflict and of emotional adjustment.
The Sentence Completion Method

The sentence completion (S-C) method is an approach to the study of personality through a semistructured projective technique. Rotter and Rafferty (1950) viewed the S-C method as being closely related to the word association test which came into prominence through Jung's (1904) research and publication. Many sentence stems consist of only one word and frequently a one-word answer suffices. Generally, however, the stem is longer and introduces more structure than other projective tests such as human figure drawings or the Rorschach Inkblot Test.

Early reviews of the literature (Bell, 1948; Rohde, 1946) reflected wide interest in the construction and use of sentence completion tests prior to 1948. Rohde (1957) reviewed the S-C literature through 1954. She credits Ebbinghaus with developing the method in 1879 as a part of his testing of mental ability in school children. She also cites works by Binet and Simon (1904), Piaget (1924), and Thorndike (1927) who also used the S-C method in studying intelligence and reasoning ability in children. She reviewed 16 other published studies which reported on the use of the S-C test. Four of these (Holzberg, 1947; Hutt, 1945; Murray & MacKinnon, 1946; Rotter & Willerman, 1947) used the approach with military personnel during World War II. Rohde reviewed over 40 studies published between 1946
and 1954 in the United States and Europe which had applied the S-C technique to a variety of topics including family relationships, sex differences, emotional reactivity, school life and achievement, personal adjustment, and prejudice and social attitudes.

Tendler (1930) was among the first to report the usefulness of the S-C method in assessing emotional adjustment. He claimed his test would elicit "... trends, fixed attitudes, attachments to persons, conflicting desires, and satisfactions and annoyances." (p. 122).

Rohde (1946; 1948; 1957) also reported on the extensive investigation she undertook with her own 65-stem S-C test. She concluded that it was effective in the study of various types of personality and psychoneurotic disorders, and schizophrenic reactions. She presented a detailed and systematic approach in the scoring and interpretation of her test. According to Goldberg (1965), her approach has been widely criticized on both methodological and theoretical grounds.

Two of the early S-C tests, the Incomplete Sentences Blank (ISB) reported by Rotter and Rafferty (1950) and Sack's S-C test (Sacks & Levy, 1950) were more highly regarded, with the former still widely used (Goldberg, 1968).

Rotter and Rafferty (1950) constructed the first S-C test that was submitted to the rigor generally accepted as necessary in producing psychological tests. Most of the earlier tests were not submitted to thorough investigation and were thus open to criticism.

Mention was made earlier of the degree of structure introduced by a sentence completion test. Although in many discussions of test-
ing techniques the S-C method is referred to as projective (Crenshaw, 1968; Murstein, 1965; Sacks, 1965; Zubin, Eron, & Schumer, 1965), most writers contend that there is a need for qualification. Murstein (1965) refers to the S-C test as a type of "preconscious" test that has just enough novelty to let the subject project many unconscious aspects of self without arousing the suspicion and guardedness that occurs when one is directly asked something personal about oneself. Kobler (1968) notes that the structure imposed by a sentence stem results in a greater dependence on the cooperation of the subject for useful clinical material. He suggests that the S-C technique be viewed as a type of structured interview wherein the usefulness of the material is in part a function of the transparency and spontaneity of the interviewee.

Goldberg (1965) stated that "... most theorists agree that the material elicited by the sentence completion method is typically less dynamic than that elicited by the Rorschach, the TAT, and projective drawings." (p. 783). He suggests, as did Shneidman (1949) earlier, that the personality has different levels which are tapped into depending on the degree of structure of the stimulus material. Murstein and Wolf (1970) concluded that tests with less structured stimuli evoke responses from deeper levels of the personality. They suggest an interaction between "levels of structure" of the personality and degree of structure of the stimulus material (p. 245). Discussion of the concept of 'stimulus pull' -- the propensity of a projective stimulus to evoke responses of a given kind, is usually
traced back to Meltzoff (1951) who conducted early investigations in
the S-C method. Research that has investigated the effect of stem
construction on the ability to evoke unconscious material will be dis-
cussed later in this paper.

Semeonoff (1976) in a discussion of projective techniques,
denies the S-C method full projective status. He describes it as a
"... channeled self-report inventory" and holds that due to the
degree of structure in the stimulus, the S-C test does not evoke un-
conscious or pathological material as is the case with less struc-
tured techniques (p. 12). According to Frank (1939), if a test is
truly projective, its rationale must rest on the projective hypothesis
which holds that the subject is unable to censor his responses to the
stimulus material in order to conceal significant personal charac-
teristics. In taking a S-C test the subject is afforded the oppor-
tunity to answer as he wishes as well as to consciously censor sen-
sitive material. It is this point that some writers have argued in
claiming that the S-C technique is not a projective in the strictest
sense.

As a personality measure, projective or otherwise, the sen-
tence completion method has gradually acquired a body of literature
which supports its validity and utility. In an early study, Murray,
MacKinnon, Miller, Fiske, and Hanfman (1948) added a sentence com-
pletion test to their evaluation battery for the assessment of men.
It was their conclusion that of all the tests used, the sentence
completion was the only projective technique they considered to be of
Goldberg (1965) summarized the research literature on the sentence completion method through 1962. He concluded that the S-C approach had demonstrated its utility in clinical psychological research. He cites research using S-C tests with normal populations in the study of social attitudes and prejudice, success potential for flight cadets and clinical psychology graduate students, relations between parents and children, and attitudes toward aging people. Other studies included in his review used clinical populations — delinquents, schizophrenics, neuropsychiatric outpatients, and hospitalized psychotics and neurotics. He held that its "... considerable and generally favorable research literature justifies wide clinical and research use of the sentence completion approach." (p. 42). Goldberg thought that compared to other projective techniques, the validity of the S-C method is impressive. It was his conclusion that, in general, the validity, reliability, and utility of the S-C tests compared well with that of projective drawings, the Rorschach, and the TAT.

Murstein (1965) devoted considerable attention to the sentence completion method in his Handbook of Projective Techniques. He concluded that the S-C method is "... a valid test in general and that it is perhaps that most valid of all projective techniques reported in the literature" (p. 777). He also suggests that it is not more widely used because of several reasons: It is not a broad-band instrument as are the Rorschach and the TAT; the multiple forms that are pro-
duced make it difficult to draw conclusions about it; it is not rec-
ognized by many people to be as valid as the literature indicates it
to be; and it is not as glamorous or mysterious as the Rorschach, the
Holtzman, or the TAT.

Sundberg (1961) reported that the frequency of usage of the S-C
method as a group personality test was second only to the MMPI, but
that it did not even make the top ten of all personality measures
used if all forms of administration are considered. Crenshaw (1968)
found that of all projective techniques, the S-C test ranked fourth
behind the Rorschach, the TAT, and human figure drawings, and ahead of
the Bender-Gestalt and word-association tests. He concluded that the
S-C method was appealing and useful as a projective research tool.

Goldberg (1968) surveyed 100 members of the Society for Pro-
jective Techniques and Personality Assessment and asked them to rank
10 tests in terms of how frequently they used them clinically. He
found this order of preference: Rorschach, Wechsler, TAT, MMPI,
projective drawings, sentence completion tests, the Bender-Gestalt,
Edwards Personality Preference Scale, the Strong Vocational Interest
Blank, and the Blacky Pictures. The S-C method ranked sixth of all
tests and fourth of the projective tests.

Even so, Becker, DeFontaine, and Moran (cited in Sheehan, 1971)
reviewed the literature on the S-C method through 1969 and found con-
trary to their expectations, that the use of the S-C method had not
shown a dramatic increase given the positive evaluation of previous
writers (Goldberg, 1965; Murstein, 1965). More recent reviews have
demonstrated, however, that although the S-C is not used as frequently
as several other personality measures, it continues to be widely and
frequently used. Ivnik (1977) reports a gradual shift away from the
use of projective techniques between 1959 and 1969. His results also
show, however, that the S-C method actually gained from not making
the top 10 most used in 1959 to being ninth overall and fifth among
projective techniques in 1969 (Lubin, Wallis, & Paine, 1971). Wade and
Baker (1977) surveyed 500 clinical psychologists and received 236
returns showing that overall the S-C method ranks ninth of all psycho-
logical tests which the clinicians advised clinical psychology students
to use, fifth of all personality measures, and fourth of the pro-
jectives recommended. Wade, Baker, Morton, and Baker (1978) conclude
that the S-C method has become one of the more frequently used tests
reported in the literature. To summarize, in the last 29 years the
S-C method has become one of the four most frequently used projective
techniques.

Suinn and Oskamp (1969) held that although the S-C method is
quickly and easily administered and is easily adapted to local demands,
it should be considered most useful as a rough screening device. They
found little research demonstrating the method's clinical utility.
According to them, further investigation is necessary before using the
instrument in individual prediction. Goldberg (1965) and Becker,
DeFontaine, and Moran (cited in Sheehan, 1971) criticize the prolifera-
tion of sentence completion tests without sufficient reason or valida-
dation research. This criticism, levied about 15 years ago, appears
to be valid even to date (with some notable exceptions which will be discussed later). The S-C method, because of its ease of adaptability to local needs, is perhaps more susceptible to the kind of unmerited proliferation referred to above than some of the other widely used psychological tests.

Construction and Scoring of Sentence Completion Tests

The research literature has revealed a range of approaches in the construction of sentence stems, the directions used in administration, and the method used in scoring and interpreting responses.

The most basic issue in test construction is item selection. Murstein (1965) wrote that one of the attractive features of the S-C method is the ability to custom-fit a test to the specific issues and struggles of a local population. He agrees that this has led to a multiplication of forms but sees that as natural and desirable insofar as there is not a needless replication. Rotter and Rafferty (1950) and Loevinger and Wessler (1970) attempted to find items that would apply to the general population while other writers have reported on tests that were constructed with very specific populations in mind (Bier, 1960; Lunneborg & Olch, 1970; Sheehan, 1971; Sheridan, 1968). Some tests, Rotter's ISB and Sacks' SCT, have been devised to provide a global measure of adjustment, while others, Sheehan's LSCBC (1971) and Sheridan's LSSCT (1968), seek to provide multiple indices of adjustment or conflict. Wilson and Arnoff (1973) report on a test designed to measure safety and self-esteem motives, a fairly narrowly-defined aspect of personality. Loevinger et al. (1970) and her
followers devised the WU-SC to test the underlying assumptions of an ego-developmental approach to personality. Thus, while some tests consist of items which would be generally useful, other tests required the inclusion of stems which were rationally derived as a function of a specific task or target population.

Another issue involved in designing sentence completion tests is the construction of the sentence stems. The discussion in this area usually centers around the length and degree of structure of the stem and whether the stem should be in the first or third person. Murstein (1963, 1965) and Murstein and Wolf (1970) have demonstrated the importance of the stimulus properties of projective techniques in determining the nature of the response. Murstein and Wolf (1970) speculated that the level of personality addressed is related to the degree of structure of the sentence stem. Stem structure is generally taken to be largely a function of length or number of words used. Rotter and Rafferty (1950) preferred to use shorter stems (mean of 2.2 words/stem) while Sacks and Levy (1950) used longer ones (mean of 5.43 words/stem). Weisgerber (1969) used long stems with the theory that in so doing, the subject's associations will be channeled in certain directions. Murstein and Wolf (1970) suggested that shorter stems evoke material from a deeper level of personality. Recently, however, Turnbow and Dana (1981) found that the more highly structured (longer) stems in the Sacks' SCT elicited responses with more feeling words and responses which were judged to be clinically more productive than did the less structured (shorter) ISB items.
Goldberg (1965), however, defined stem structure in terms of the determining power of stem content. Structure is high if the content of the stem tends to establish narrow response classes. Given this understanding of stem structure, clinically productive material probably results from an interaction between stem length and the evocative power of single words or concepts that might have particular power when used with a specific population. This has not been investigated.

Some writers, Goldberg (1965), Sacks and Levy (1950), and Rotter and Rafferty (1950) have favored the use of the first person in the sentence stem while others (Siipola, 1968; Stricker & Dawson, 1966) favor using the third person. Murstein, Colon, Destexhe-de Leval and Van Hoof-Van Parys (1972) found that first-person stems were significantly more effective in eliciting projection than were the third-person items. This research lends support to Irvin (1967) and the efforts of Sheehan (1971), Sheridan (1968) and other developers of the Loyola sentence completion tests who used primarily first-person stems.

Murstein et al. (1972) also investigated the effect of the affective tone of the sentence stem. Sheehan (1971) agreed with Meltzoff (1965) who concluded that positively-toned stems tend to evoke completions which suggest adjustment, the negative stems produce responses suggesting conflict, and that neutral stems may evoke either conflict or adjustment responses. Stephens (1970) reports similar conclusions regarding the material elicited by positive and negative yet suggests that neutral stems tend to elicit more positive responses
Siipola (1968) suggested the inclusion of all three varieties of stem tone in order to gain an understanding of the total person. Murstein et al. (1972), however, concluded that neutral stems were superior to either the positive or negative stems in revealing useful information, although he also found that positive stems produce more "adjusted" responses than the other two types. He speculated that a positive-affect stem elicits a socially desirable "set" which does not elicit projection. This research, however, did not compare modes of presentation with diagnostic criteria. Therefore, in diagnostic assessment Siipola's (1968) suggestion may still be valid.

Another source of variation in the sentence-completion method involves administration instructions. Discussion of differences in opinion usually revolve around whether the subjects are requested to operate with speed or simply to express their real thoughts and feelings. Rotter's ISB (1950), the LSSCT (Heinrich, 1967; McLaughlin, 1969; Sheridan, 1968), and Weisgerber (1969) request test-takers to express their real thoughts or feelings. Sacks' SCT (1950) and Bier's (1960) test instruct the subject to work rapidly. Sheehan (1971) encourages the subject to both work rapidly and express real feelings while Loevinger's WU-SC (1970) does neither. Sheehan holds that a time-limit should not be strictly imposed even though in not doing so the subject may have an opportunity to intellectualize and censor. This does not bother her, however, as she suggests that a conflict response elicited under these conditions would indeed be an indication
of maladjustment. If her assumption is true, the test would result in a higher percentage of false positives and a lower percentage of false negatives. This may or may not be helpful depending on the purpose of the testing. Turnbow and Dana (1981) investigated the effect of instructional set on the clinical productivity of stem completions and found no significant differences. This finding is consistent with that of an earlier study (Cromwell & Lundy, 1954) which also found that varying instructions did not affect the clinical productivity of hypotheses generated from responses. The evidence, therefore, suggests that differences in instruction do not result in significantly different answers.

A final area where there is variation in the approach to the sentence completion method is that of scoring and interpreting responses. Generally, sentence completion tests have been devised in such a way as to minimize the amount of interpretation of any individual response. Four general approaches have been used in scoring stem responses: the impressionistic method; the exemplar method; the categorized manual; and the rationalized method. Holsopple and Miale (1954) adopted an impressionistic method wherein a response was evaluated by making a clinical interpretation of the stem completion. Sacks and Levy (1950) also followed a non-quantitative, clinical approach to scoring S-C tests. Most sentence completion tests, however, follow the exemplar method where examples are listed for each of a number of levels for each stem. The test user then attempts to match a subject's response to one of the levels and assigns a cor-
responding score. Sacks' SCT (1950) requires assigning each completion a score of two to zero, representing severe disturbance and no significant disturbance respectively. Rotter's ISB (1950) extended that method by assigning scores from zero (very positive) to six (very conflicted). Sheehan (1971), Sheridan (1968), and McKay (1982), also used the exemplar method in scoring responses on a scale of one (extremely positive) to seven (very severe conflict). Sheridan constructed a systematic approach in scoring stem responses that provided a high interjudge reliability coefficient ($r = .91$) which is typical of the research reporting the use of the exemplar method. Sheehan and McKay report reliability coefficients that compare with Sheridan's.

The categorized manual is one wherein responses are grouped into sets with common content and every such group has a title that expresses the common element. Loevinger et al. (1970) report an attempt to use this method, which they later modified in favor of the rationalized approach. Rohde (1957) attempted what appears to be a variation of the categorized manual and was criticized subsequently in the literature (Goldberg, 1965).

The rationalized method represents a combination of the exemplar method and the categorized manual. Loevinger attempts to deal with all empirical differences among categories by rationalizing them with the underlying theory of ego-development. Although highly sophisticated, Loevinger's method requires extensive training. Detailed instructions are provided in a self-training program (Loevinger & Wessler, 1970) which Loevinger suggests should be completed in one or two months.
Also recommended is a thorough knowledge of ego development. These requisites limit practical utility of the test to few clinicians.

Sentence Completion Tests Reported in the Literature

The ISB, developed by Rotter and Rafferty (1950), although one of the earlier S-C tests, remains the most widely recognized and well-known of the S-C tests available. Its manual includes reliability, validity and normative data as well as a scoring manual and a brief training section in the use of the manual. The ISB obtained split-half reliability of .83 for 71 female college students and .84 for 124 males. The ISB manual reports inter-rater reliability coefficients of .96 and .91 for 50 female and 50 male protocols respectively. The ISB was validated on 226 subjects demonstrating its utility in differentiating between adjusted and maladjusted (r_bis = .50 for females; r_bis = .62 for males). Goldberg (1965) cites the ISB as one of the more systematically developed of the S-C methods. He praised the quantification of its scoring system yet cited criticisms that claim it is undynamic and of little use for clinical purposes. Goldberg concluded however, that when used as a measure of general psychological adjustment with both clinical and normal groups, "... the reliability, validity, and usefulness of the instrument have received impressive support from a considerable research literature." (p. 812). Churchill and Crandall (1965) concluded that in general, the ISB was a reliable and valid test. The reported interjudge reliability coefficients of .94 to .98 and test-retest correlations of .38 to .70.

Murstein (1965) concluded that the ISB "... has proved to be
one of the most successful of the projective techniques insofar as validity studies are concerned." (p. 859). He held that the test was sensitive to projection on the part of the subject yet speculated that a possible weakness of the test is its dependence on subject-openness and non-defensiveness for clinically useful information. Baker and King (1970) in a more recent study used the ISB in studying the difference between repression and sensitization. They found that the ISB correlated well with a scale designed to differentiate between people who tend to repress anxiety and those who are sensitive to it. They cited studies that show the latter group manifesting more psychological symptoms and conflict than those who repress it. The "sensitizers" in their study were found to be less adjusted as indicated on the ISB.

Although the ISB is probably the most well-known of S-C tests, others have been used and reported in the literature. Sacks and Levy (1950) developed a S-C test that has been used clinically and in research (Fiske & Van Buskirk, 1965; Sacks, 1950; Turnbow & Dana, 1981) yet has not gained the popularity of the ISB, perhaps in part because the findings in the literature have not been as favorable with Sacks' SCT as they have with the ISB. Goldberg (1968) reported that 17 published and 16 locally-developed S-C tests were cited by the studies used in his survey. Weisgerber (1969) reported using a S-C test developed by Bier (1960) for use with candidates for religious orders. Weisgerber noted that the test had demonstrated its usefulness as a predictive criterion for perseverance in orders although its reliability was not known.
More recently Arnoff (Note 1), Arnoff and Meese (1971), and Wilson and Arnoff (1973) have reported the effectiveness of a sentence completion test designed to differentiate between safety- and esteem-oriented individuals as described by Maslow (1970). They concluded that the safety-oriented individuals scored higher on manifest anxiety and dependency and lower on dominance than the esteem-oriented subjects as measured by the MMPI. Using the same test, Michelini, Wilson, and Meese (1975) found that esteem-oriented males were more willing to help a female in a bystander situation than the safety-oriented men. Wilson and Petruska (1982) found that esteem-oriented subjects scored higher on the Dominance, Capacity-for-Status, Self-Acceptance, and Sense-of-Well-Being scales from the California Psychological Inventory.

Stotsky and Weinberg (1965) report using a S-C test which they concluded was valid in predicting the adjustment of a psychiatric population to a therapeutic work setting. Lunneborg and Olch (1970) reported on pilot attitude and performance as measured by an 80-stem sentence completion test. They found that positive adjustment as a pilot was correlated with the capacity to suppress anxiety and hostility under stress. They concluded that, although their S-C test provided useful personal information yet was questionable as to its usefulness in predicting pilot performance.

Another body of literature has reported extensively on the Washington University Sentence Completion Test (WU-SCT), a test designed to measure level of ego development. The WU-SCT was constructed by Loevinger and Wessler (1970) and Loevinger, Wessler, and
Redmore (1970) to assess at which of eight levels of ego-development a person may be functioning. The underlying theory assumes that each person has a core level of ego functioning and that a person may revert or regress to an earlier level, but that he cannot consistently affect a level beyond his own (Loevinger, 1966). The first two studies regarding the WU-SCT (cited above) involved extensive reliability and validity research and the construction of a highly sophisticated scoring manual. That initial research used over 1700 subjects (mostly women) in the various phases of the project.

Subsequent research has focused on cross-validating the WU-SCT and examining different aspects of ego-development using this instrument. Holt (1974) in a review of the approaches to measuring ego development concluded that the WU-SCT was useful in assessing level achieved by a subject. Redmore and Waldman (1975) conducted two studies which examined the reliability of the WU-SCT. They reported test-retest coefficients of .76 to .91 and .38 to .64 for the first and second study respectively. Split-half correlations ranged from .68 to .90 for the two studies and coefficients of .80 to .89 were obtained when internal consistency was examined.

Lorr and Manning (1978) and Loevinger (1979) report findings supporting the construct validity of the WU-SCT using subjects from a non-clinical population, while Vincent and Vincent (1978) and Waugh (1981) have demonstrated its validity for use with clinical samples. Hoppe and Loevinger (1977), using a sample of 107 private-school boys in grades 8, 9, and 11, demonstrated construct validity for the WU-SCT
and supported Loevinger's theory that there is maximum conformity between the self-protective and conscientious stages of ego-development.

Wilber, Rounsaville, Sugarman, Casey, and Kleber (1982) used the WU-SCT in assessing the level of ego development in opiate addicts. They found that the addicts on the average scored a full developmental stage lower than non-clinical adult subjects. They also found that addicts at lower levels of ego development manifested more psychological symptoms, functioned more poorly socially, and used drugs more heavily. Deitch and Jones (1983) used the WU-SCT in an investigation of the possible relationships between stages of ego development and the way in which people view themselves and their experience with the world. They found that subjects who functioned at higher levels of ego development (autonomous level) were more concerned with being able to meet their own needs and solve their problems independently. In addition, also supporting Loevinger's theory, they found that higher level ego development is characterized by more openness to one's own and to other people's emotions than is lower level development.

Other studies, Redmore (1976) and Rootes, Moras, and Gordon (1980) have criticized the WU-SCT on two counts. Redmore concluded that the WU-SCT is susceptible to faking. Subjects were able to decrease their scores (acceptable given the underlying theory) and also to increase their scores somewhat if the subject had minimal information about an aspired higher level, and significantly so if the subject was sophisticated and informed about psychological development. The latter two findings were not predicted according to Loevinger's
theory. These findings have implications for the present study given the strong possibility that the seminarians who participated are intelligent and informed to some extent about psychological development. Rootes et al. (1980) found that the WU-SCT was valid in the global assessment of maturity but not with regard to maturity in intimate interpersonal relationships. Thus, the validity of the WU-SCT is generally supported in the research, but its application might not be as broad as the theory behind it.

Another body of research has reported the construction and validation of two sentence completion tests that have been widely used with Catholic seminarians and clergy. The Loyola Seminarians Sentence Completion Test (LSSCT) was constructed by Gorman and Kobler (Note 2) selected 100 semi-structured stems on a postriori basis. Heinrich (1967) reported the results of a study that cross-validated the LSSCT, a six subscale test, on 50 first-year college seminarians. He used Sheridan's (1968) scoring norms and correlated the LSSCT results with the MMPI as a measure of maladjustment. He reported the following correlation coefficients for the relationship between the LSSCT and the criterion: Self=.80; Priesthood=.69; Family=.85; Women=.21; Others=.50; Important Issues=.62; total=.88.

Sheridan (1968) reported the results of research aimed at developing a scoring system for the LSSCT which followed the exemplar method used by Rotter and Rafferty (1950). His study also sought to demonstrate the utility of the LSSCT in predicting perseverance in seminary and in differentiating between maladjusted and adjusted subjects.
The mean age of his sample was slightly less than 18 years old. He reported an interjudge-reliability correlation of .91. He used a two-fold criterion of maladjustment: 3 MMPI scores greater than 70 (excluding MF) and psychologists' judgments of the subject's "need of psychological help." His results included the following biserial correlation coefficients: Self=.82; Priesthood=.60; Family=.59; Women=.49; Others=.73; Important Issues=.69; total=.88, demonstrating the validity of the LSSCT as a criterion of maladjustment.

McLaughlin (1969) reported the results of research which cross-validated the LSSCT on a group of 60, twelfth-grade minor seminarians from the Chicago area. The criterion of maladjustment used here was a combination of the need-for-counseling as determined by "priest-counselors" and by the number of MMPI scale scores over 70. He reported significant biserial correlation coefficients of .49 to .81 for subscale scores and .83 for the total test score.

Sheehan (1971) constructed the Loyola Sentence Completion Blank for Clergymen (LSCBC). The final version consisted of 72 items and like the LSSCT, the LSCBC stems fall into six different categories or subscales. She demonstrated interjudge reliability for both the subscale and total scores (r's = .84 to .96). The validity of the LSCBC was demonstrated by correlating its results with an MMPI measure of adjustment and psychologists' ratings of adjustment as reflected in personal interviews. Sheehan reported the following correlations of the LSCBC with the MMPI: Self=.41; Interpersonal Relations=.71; Psychosexual Maturity=.11; Priesthood=.54; Church/faith=.26; Job Satisfaction
Subsequent studies have supported Sheehan's (1971) conclusions regarding the LSCBC's validity. Sheehan (1974) and Sheehan and Kobler (1976) reported the results of a study of American bishops in which the LSCBC was shown to be effective in assessing the degree of psychological adjustment. Sheehan contended that the LSCBC assesses self-actualization and adjusting behaviors which she defines as the ability of the bishops to have learned to repress sexual conflict and negative feelings in interpersonal relationships. Murphy (1980), however, concluded that the LSCBC measures the degree of psychological adjustment rather than self-actualization. He suggests that there is a difference between self-actualization and adjustment, and that adjustment, as measured by the LSCBC, is not necessarily equivalent to psychological health in general. Self-actualization apparently is related to psychological adjustment in the areas of self, interpersonal relationships, and psychosexual maturity. Sheehan (1974) noted some of the limitations of the LSCBC in observing that the items on the Church/faith and the Priesthood subscales cluster together and that the same might be true of other subscales. She also suggested further work on the manual.

The validity of the LSCBC has been demonstrated in two additional major studies of Catholic clergy. Kennedy, Heckler, Kobler, and Walker (1977) found that of all criterion variables used, the Psychosexual Maturity subscale of the LSCBC contributed the most meaningfully to the classification of the priests studied into the four develop-
mental groups they found. They also found that all LSCBC scales reached significant levels in differentiating the developmental groups. Schroeder and Kobler (1979) used the LSCBC in studying Catholic bishops in the United States and further validated its ability to differentiate between well-adjusted and conflicted subjects.

McKay (1982) constructed a 68-stem S-C test for Protestant seminarians which included many of the stems used in the Loyola tests reported above. Following the lead of the Loyola researchers, he assigned the stems to one of six subscales. Using a sample of 25 Protestant divinity students, he obtained interjudge reliability coefficients of .82 to .99. Using 80 evangelical seminarians, McKay correlated the S-C test scores with indices of conflict and of adjustment. The number of MMPI clinical scales less than or equal to 60, Hogan's Empathy Scale (Hogan, 1969), and Hoge's Measure of Intrinsic Religious Motivation (Hoge, 1972) were used as measures of adjustment while the mean MMPI score, the number of clinical scale-scores greater than 70, and the MMPI F-K were used as indices of conflict. None of the S-C scores correlated with Hoge's scale, while the Self, Family, Relationships, Ministry, and Total scores correlated with many of the indices. One of the subscales, Important Issues, correlated significantly with only two indices of conflict and the Psychosexual Maturity scale failed to correlate significantly with any criterion index used. The latter finding was unexpected, given the success of virtually the identical subscale with Catholic populations (Kennedy et al., 1977; Schroeder & Kobler, 1979; Sheehan, 1971). McKay speculated that the Protestant
seminarian may face issues with regard to Psychosexual Maturity that are related to intimacy, giving and receiving affection, and maintaining close relations with partners, all issues which are not experienced in the same way with a Catholic seminarian population. He suggested eliminating the Important Issues category and revising the Psychosexual Maturity scale so as to include stems which may elicit material regarding the areas noted above. McKay also noted the importance of cross-validating the validated subscales on another sample of Protestant seminarians.

Psychological Study of Protestant Religious Personnel

Research that has been conducted with Protestant seminarians and clergy spans the past three decades. Menges and Dittes (1965) present an extensive annotated bibliography of research with Protestant and Catholic religious personnel. Some of the early literature, Anderson (1953) and Christensen (1959, 1961, 1963a, 1963b) focused on ministers who were moderately to severely disturbed while others (Southard, 1958; Schroeder, 1958) concluded that those who enter the ministry are no less emotionally adjusted on the average than people who enter non-religious professions.

Dunn (1965) reviewed 38 studies of seminarians and ministers and found that Pt and Sc scores were consistently high. He concluded that people who enter ministry tend to be worrisome, perfectionistic, introversive, socially inept, and socially isolated. Nauss (1973) reached different conclusions, however, when he reviewed studies of ministers' personalities. Nauss failed to find conclusive evidence
that seminarians and ministers are neither healthier nor more conflicted than people entering other professions.

Other writers note the importance of considering the pressures of ministry as well as the emotional predisposition of the minister. Bradshaw (1977) researched hospitalized ministers who were moderately to severely disturbed. He pointed to the ministerial role which on one hand may satisfy immature needs and condone eccentric behaviors, and on the other hand involve expectations for conformance to high behavioral standards. Daniel and Rogers (1981) conclude that although some research shows that many men enter seminary and the ministry experiencing emotional conflict, the stress of ministry results in emotional conflict in otherwise stable individuals. Schuller, Brekke, and Strommen (1975) and Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke (1980) report the results of an intensive investigation into readiness for ministry. They gathered data from over 6000 lay people, clergy, seminarians, seminary professors, and denomination officials from over 40 denominations and identified 11 themes which were considered important in evaluating an individual's readiness to minister. They found that ministers are expected to be open, flexible, affirming, and able to skillfully empathize with people who are experiencing personal stress. Clergy are expected to be psychologically healthy people whose security is based on positive self-image. These investigators also discovered that the people surveyed found it highly undesirable for a minister to be self-serving, irresponsible, immature, undisciplined, and legalistic. Sexual misconduct, self-indulgence, and avoiding intimacy were found
to be highly disqualifying personal and behavioral characteristics. Other themes such as personal faith commitment, theological training, and denominational awareness were identified but were not held to be as important as the factors which define the kind of person the minister is to be.

Sheridan (1968) and Sheehan (1971) assumed that for the Catholic seminarian and priest areas such as self concept, relationships, relations with family, psychosexual maturity, attitudes toward ministry and work were critical in assessing the subjects' general adjustment. Kennedy, Heckler, Kobler and Walker (1977) found that all of Sheehan's categories attained statistical significance in differentiating priests who were diagnosed as being either developed, developing, underdeveloped, or maldeveloped. They also reported that Sheehan's Psychosexual Maturity subscale was the best discriminator among the groups. McKay (1982) followed their lead in assigning sentence stems in his test to similar categories that would also be important to Protestant seminarians. In constructing his test McKay used 15 of Sheehan's 16 Psychosexual Maturity sentence stems, yet this scale failed to correlate significantly with any of the criterion measures used. He concluded that although it may be that Protestants could be differentiated in terms of psychosexual maturity, stems addressing issues such as dealing with intimacy and giving and receiving affection would need to be included.

Houts (1977), Chessick (1978), and Campbell (1981) emphasize the importance of the minister's personal and emotional development as part
of his or her readiness for ministry. Erikson (1963) holds that in young adulthood, the individual is faced with the tasks of developing intimate relations with someone of the opposite sex, having a family, and finding meaningful work. Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978) propose that the "life structure" which the young adult needs to develop involves establishing intimate relations and finding fulfilling work. Most Protestant seminarians are between ages 23 and 35, the age range being addressed by both Erikson and Levinson et al.

Lowenthal and Weiss (1976) propose that men and women find energy to live autonomous, self-generating, and satisfying lives only through mutually supportive and intimate relationships. Angyl (1965) claims that establishing and maintaining close, affectionate relationships is fundamental to human development. Maslow (1970) suggests that highly developed individuals usually have significant close relationships. Rassieur (1976) however, concludes that clergymen are particularly reluctant to address and resolve sexual conflicts which they experience and instead tend to utilize repression, denial, regression, externalization, and rationalization. The present writer assumes that sexual relations are best understood in the context of an intimate relationship and that they are one aspect of psychosexual maturity.

A less obvious aspect of intimate relations is the way in which an individual deals with conflict in his relationships. Yelsma (1981) found that couples who were happily married were those who were able to productively manage conflict. Doane (1978) concluded that the ability to be flexible in relationships was in part a function of their ability
to resolve conflict. Harvey, Wells, and Alvarez (1978), Jacobson and Margolin (1979), and Kelley (1973) report results suggesting that difficulty resolving conflict in relationships is correlated with maladjustment.

Others have suggested that the ability to resolve conflict is essential for ministers who work in parish settings. Anderson (1973) states that most churches develop norms which reject conflict resolution and instead reinforce behavior that suppresses conflict. Lewis (1981) points to the need for churches to learn how to deal with conflict. He also notes that the clergy needs to play a more prominent role in facilitating conflict resolution.

A goal of the present study is to revise the S-C test reported by McKay (1982) so as to address the issues discussed above. It is assumed that in assessing the level of adjustment or conflict experienced by Protestant seminarians, the test must include stems which elicit information about intimacy, closeness, affection, and dealing with conflict in relationships.

Hogan's Empathy Scale (Hogan, 1969; 1975) was used as an indirect measure of emotional adjustment in the present study. The use of an empathy scale as an index of adjustment is based on the understanding that capacity for empathy is an aspect of positive object relations and is a condition for and result of a high level of emotional adjustment (Klopfer, Ainsworth, Klopfer, & Hunt, 1954). Rogers (1951) emphasized the role of empathy in psychotherapy and counseling. Truax and Carkuff (1967), Carkuff (1969), and Egan (1982) have applied
a skills approach to the concept of empathy, contending that the capacity for and communication of empathy forms the basis for successful therapy. Schuller, et al. (1980) found that the capacity to relate empathically with people who experience distress is regarded as a necessary characteristic of the effective minister.

Hogan (1969) validated the scale which consists of 64 items (See appendix) taken from the California Psychological Inventory and the MMPI. He used a group of 211 adults and cross-validated it on a sample of 70 medical school applicants. Hogan reported validity coefficients of .62 and .39 for the former and latter studies respectively. Using a sample of 50 college undergraduates, Hogan obtained a test-retest correlation coefficient of .84. Gladstein (1977), Grief and Hogan (1973), and Hogan (1975) cross-validated the Hogan as a measure of the capacity for empathy. McKay (1982) found that Hogan Empathy scores correlated significantly with four of his S-C scores. The following r values were obtained: Self = -.20, Relationships = -.20, Family = -.25, Total = -.23.

Use of the MMPI with Religious Personnel

The MMPI-Group Form (Hathaway & McKinley, 1970) is used in the present study and provides indices both of adjustment and of conflict. The MMPI has been reported frequently in studies of Protestant seminarians (Goring, 1980; Jansen, Bonk, & Garvey, 1973; Jansen & Garvey, 1973; Kania, 1967; Simono, 1978; Templer, 1974). Bier (1949) used a form of the MMPI from which he had removed items which he thought to be objectionable or to have little discriminatory power with seminary
populations. Other writers (Butcher & Tellegen, 1980; Dahlstrom, 1980; Hathaway, 1980; Walker, 1980) have objected to such a practice, claiming that it reduces the test's reliability while doing nothing beneficial for the test-taker.

Although some writers (Butcher, 1979; Widom, 1980) advocate the use of the MMPI in personnel selection and in predicting social outcome, others criticize such use of the test. Wauck (1957) did not find any test, including the MMPI, that could be used for individual prediction. Sweeney (1964) suggests that it is probably not a good screening instrument although it may be helpful in counseling. Kobler (1964) concludes that the MMPI is better used as a measure of maladjustment than as a predictor of perseverance in religious life. In the present study the S-C scores will be correlated with MMPI indices. It is expected that since the MMPI is most useful with a clinical population and the subjects participating in the present study are assumed to be normal, the correlations between the SCT scores and the MMPI may be moderately low.

Summary of Literature Review

In summary, a consistent finding reported in the literature is that the S-C method has demonstrated its utility for research and clinical purposes. Of the many S-C tests that have been reported, Rotter's ISB has been more widely used and has been found to be both reliable and valid. Many other S-C tests have been reported, some not having been validated and others having been validated but not as widely used because of their narrow focus. Several S-C tests are an
exception to that, however. Arnoff and Meese (1971) have reported a SCT used to measure safety- and esteem-oriented individuals, Loevinger and Wessler (1970) developed the WU-SCT to measure ego-development, and Gorman and Kobler (1963) and Sheehan (1971) constructed tests to assess emotional adjustment in Catholic seminarians and priests. The above studies have been followed by a body of research supporting the reliability and validity of these S-C tests.

A focus of research has been sentence stem construction. Some researchers hold that short stems evoke projected material, but others contend that longer stems elicit more feeling words and generate more clinically useful material. Another important consideration which the literature has not dealt with explicitly is the degree to which stem content establishes narrow response classes for given populations. Some studies conclude that the use of the first person in the sentence stem results in generating more useful information and more projected material. Results are equivocal as to whether positive, negative, or neutral stems are the most productive in generating useful clinical information. Other research has concluded that varying the administration instructions has no effect on the content of the sentence completions.

Four different approaches have been used in scoring sentence completions: the impressionistic, the rationalized, the categorized, and the exemplar methods. Of these, the exemplar method has received the widest support in the literature, although the WU-SCT which requires the rationalized method has demonstrated both validity
and reliability.

Research with Protestant seminarians and ministers reveals that although some ministers are emotionally unstable, in general they are fairly well adjusted and not more or less disturbed than individuals entering other professions. Some writers emphasize the effect of a potentially stressful occupation on a clergyman's level of adjustment. Most writers hold that in order for a minister to be effective, he/she must be emotionally stable and have the capacity to relate empathically with people. Some have emphasized the importance of a minister's ability to deal with intimacy and others underscore the importance of his/her ability to facilitate conflict resolution in both personal and congregational matters.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects for the present study were drawn from three sources in the Greater Chicago metropolitan area. (See Appendix F for further description of samples used.) The first group consisted of 14 volunteers from a Lutheran seminary in Chicago. Twelve were Caucasian Americans, one was from Zimbabwe, Africa, and the other from India. The mean age of this group was 32 with a standard deviation of 5.9; three were women and 11 were men. Seven of these subjects were married, four were in their third and fourth year in seminary, and 10 were in a Doctor of Ministry program open to students who had already completed the four-year course of study. Four (29%) claimed to be evangelical, four (29%) claimed to be Neo-evangelical, three (21%) identified themselves as liberal, and three were undecided. (Evangelicals emphasize gospel teachings, the authority of scripture, a conservative approach to the interpretation of scripture, and a personal religious experience with God. Liberal theology emphasizes freedom from tradition and personal authority in matters of belief. Neo-evangelicalism and neo-orthodoxy reaffirm, in varying degrees, the values of a more evangelical or orthodox religious position.)

The second sample was drawn from a group of seminarians who were studying urban ministry in a program which draws students from 10
different Protestant seminaries from the United States and Canada. Twenty-one of these seminarians volunteered to participate in the study. The mean age of this group was 29 with a standard deviation of 7.9. Fifteen of these subjects were men, six were women, and 14 were married. Ten denominations were represented and the seminarians came from the Midwest (75%), the East (20%), and one foreign country. Twelve (57%) claimed to be evangelical, 3 (14%) neo-evangelical or neo-orthodox, 1 (5%) liberal, 3 (14%) "other", and 2 undecided.

The third sample of 79 seminarians was drawn from an evangelical seminary in the Chicago area. The mean age of this group was 27.4 years, with a standard deviation of 5.68. Sixty-nine subjects (87%) were men, 10 (13%) were women, and 44 (56%) were married. Of those who were married, 19 (43%) had children. Forty-seven (59.8%) were in their first year of seminary, 20 (25%) were in their second, six (7.5%) were in their third, four (5%) were in their fourth, and two (2.5%) were unclassified students. The sample represented 26 denominations from the United States (Midwest--56%; West/North--13.9%; East--19%; South--1%) and five foreign countries. Sixty-nine (87%) were Caucasian American, three (4%) were minority Americans, and seven (9%) were from foreign countries. Seventy-five (95%) classified themselves as evangelical, three (3.8%) as neo-evangelical or neo-orthodox, and one (1%) liberal or "other". The seminary claims an evangelical orientation, holding to the authority of scripture, emphasizing gospel teachings, and taking a conservative approach to the interpretation of scripture.
The 79 subjects represent about 9% of the student body from which the sample was drawn. Fifty-eight of these (73%) were volunteers from an introductory course in pastoral counseling, a course which most students take at some point in their three or four-year course of study. Approximately 75% of this class participated in the present study. The remaining (27%) of the sample was drawn from three other classes to which the author was granted access in order to obtain volunteers.

Another group of 25 subjects was administered the sentence completion test for the purpose of examining interjudge-reliability and developing scoring examples for the revised portions of the test. The mean age of this group was 28.8 years with a standard deviation of 7.2. Six of the subjects were women and all identified themselves as evangelicals. Two were from Taiwan and 23 were Caucasian Americans.

**Measures**

Hogan's Empathy Scale (Hogan, 1969) was used as a measure of emotional adjustment. McKay (1982) found that capacity for empathy as measured by Hogan's Scale, was significantly correlated with emotional adjustment. (See literature review for more complete discussion of Hogan's Scale.)

The MMPI-Group Form (Hathaway & McKinley, 1970) was used to generate indices of conflict and adjustment. Indices of adjustment include the number of clinical scales (excluding Mf) less than or equal to a scale score of 60, Barron's Ego Strength Scale (ES), and K. The indices of conflict include the number of clinical scales...
greater than a scale score of 70 (excluding Mf), the mean of all clinical scales, and F-K.

The sentence completion test (SCT) was a revision of one reported earlier (Mckay, 1982). The revised form (see Appendix B) consisted of 70 sentence stems, each of which was assigned to one of the five following subscales: Self--16; Relationships--12; Family--14; Psychosexual Maturity--14; Ministry--14. The final form utilized 64 stems assigned as follows: Self--15; Relationships--11; Family--12; Psychosexual Maturity--13; Ministry--13. Six stems were eliminated due to low correlations with the subscale to which they were assigned. The SCT is accompanied by a manual which contains general scoring instructions, underlying rationale, description of the subscales, and scoring examples for each sentence stem. Separate forms are provided for men and women with only four stems reflecting the difference between the two. These stems differ in gender use but not in the content addressed by the item.

Procedure

The revised SCT was administered to 25 subjects from the evangelical seminary setting for the purpose of studying inter-judge reliability, for generating scoring examples for the revised portions of the test, and for examining correlations between items and their subscales. Two judges, the present writer and a Masters-level therapist with a background in counseling psychology, independently scored the 25 protocols using the scoring manual developed earlier (Mckay, 1982). The Master's-level judge was trained for three hours in the
rationale and use of the scoring manual. Both judges scored eight or nine protocols at a time and rated each item for all protocols before proceeding to the answers to the succeeding sentence stems. Six stems were found to correlate poorly with the subscale to which they were assigned and to all other subscales. In addition, because these stems tended to elicit stereotypic responses from most subjects, it was concluded that they would offer little in differentiating conflicted from adjusted subjects. Two stems were removed from the Family subscale and one each from the other four subscales.

Data were collected from subjects in the three different seminary settings over the course of two months. Subjects took the personality measures in two-hour sessions where they were requested to fill out an information sheet (see Appendix E), the Hogan Scale, the S-C test, and the MMPI, in that order. Subjects were provided with informed consent forms which they signed, releasing the information which they were providing. The battery of tests was administered to the Lutheran (LSTC) subjects on two different occasions, nine during the first session and five subjects one week later. The Seminary Consortium (SCUPE) subjects participated in the study in one two-hour block of time, while the third seminary group was tested in four different testing sessions. Subjects were encouraged at the beginning of each session to move quickly through the testing and most finished within two hours. Several took only $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours and three took almost three hours to complete the work.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Interjudge Reliability

Interjudge reliability was examined for the Total score and for the five subscale scores. The following Pearson $r$ values were obtained in this analysis: Self = .95, Relationships = .98, Family = .97, Psychosexual Maturity = .97, Ministry = .94, Total = .98. All reliability coefficients are significant at the .001 level of significance.

Internal Consistency

The test's internal consistency was examined using two different samples, the first sample of 25 which was used for interjudge reliability and all 114 protocols from the validation phase of the study. Using Pearson $r$, internal consistency was assessed in two ways. First, each of the 70 sentence stem scores was correlated with each of the subscales and the total score. Of the 70 stems, 65 correlated more highly with their own subscale than with any other. Of those five which correlated more highly with another category, four were highly correlated with their own subscale ($r$ = .39 to .48) and were left in the assigned subscale. Six of the 70 stems were not computed in the second item-subscale analysis using the sample of 114, and were not used in the validation study, although they were retained as part of the test. One of these stems failed to correlate well with any subscale.
and five, although they correlated most highly with their own subscale, obtained such low correlations ($r'$s=-.009 to .17) that they were not used with the final sample of 114.

In the final version of the test, 62 of the 64 test stems correlated highest with their own subscales. The two which did not had $r$ values less than .30. Forty-six of the 64 stems correlated well with their own subscales ($r'$s=.30 to .71) and 18 had $r$ values less than .30. These poorly correlating stems were distributed throughout the test, although two subscales had a disproportionate number (Self--7; Ministry--5). These correlations are presented in Appendix C.

Inter-subscale Relationships

The second test of internal consistency entailed correlating the subscales with each other and with the total scores. These results are presented in Table 1. Correlations were also computed for the evangelical seminary sample alone and for the SCUPE/LSTC samples combined (see Appendix D). These results are very similar to those presented in Table 1. In all three instances the subscales are only moderately correlated ($r'$s=.26 to 46) with each other and more highly correlated with the total scores ($r'$s=.67 to .74) When all protocols were examined together, all intercorrelations were statistically significant at the .01 level. With SCUPE/LSTC and Evangelical seminarians examined separately, the former yielded 3 correlations that were not significant, while the latter revealed only one intercorrelation which failed to reach significance. In all analyses, the subscales correlated highly with the total score.
TABLE 1

Intercorrelations of SCT Subscales and Total Score

All Subjects

(n=114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Psychosexual Maturity</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

**p < .001
Validity

All sentence completion scores were correlated with both measure of conflict and measures of adjustment. Barron's Ego Strength Scale (Es) was computed for only 98 subjects whose protocols were machine scored. The remaining 16 protocols were hand-scored without computing the Es score.

Correlations between SCT scores and the measures of adjustment and of conflict for all subjects are presented in Tables 2 and 3 respectively. All correlations were in the hypothesized direction and all but four were statistically significant for measures both of conflict and of adjustment. The Family subscale failed to correlate significantly with two indices of adjustment, Barron's Ego Strength Scale and the number of MMPI scales ≤ 60, and one index of conflict, the mean MMPI score. The Relationships subscale failed to correlate with the number of MMPI clinical scales greater than 70.

Validity coefficients were computed for the Evangelical and SCUPE/LSTC samples separately and are presented in Tables 4 and 5 respectively. All correlations for the smaller SCUPE/LSTC sample were in the hypothesized direction, although not all were statistically significant. All but four of the correlations presented in Table 4 for the Trinity sample were statistically significant.

In only two instances was a correlation between a criterion index and a SCT subscale greater than that between the total score and that criterion measure (Table 2--Es; Table 4--Es).
TABLE 2

SCT Correlations with Measures of Adjustment

All Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hogan Empathy Scale (n=114)</th>
<th>MMPI a Clinical Scales ≤ 60 (n=114)</th>
<th>Barron's Ego Strength (n=98)</th>
<th>MMPI K Scale (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.46***</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a number of scales excluding Mf

*P < .05
**P < .01
***P < .001
TABLE 3

SCT Correlations with MMPI Indices of Conflict

All Samples
(n=114)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clinical Scales &gt; 70</th>
<th>All Scales &gt; 70</th>
<th>Mean MMPI</th>
<th>F-K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a number of scales excluding Mf

*p < .05  
**p < .01  
***p < .001
TABLE 4

SCT Correlations with Indices of Adjustment and Conflict  
Evangelical Seminary Sample  
(n=79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hogan Empathy Scale</th>
<th>MMPI&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Scales ≤ 60</th>
<th>Barron's Ego Strength&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>MMPI&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Clinical Scales &gt; 70</th>
<th>Mean MMPI</th>
<th>MMPI F-K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>- .28**</td>
<td>- .23*</td>
<td>- .45***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>- .39***</td>
<td>- .21*</td>
<td>- .36***</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>- .24*</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td>- .39***</td>
<td>- .18</td>
<td>- .30**</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td>- .26**</td>
<td>- .23*</td>
<td>- .30**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>- .46***</td>
<td>- .25*</td>
<td>- .39***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.49***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> number of scales excluding Mf  
<sup>b</sup>n=64  
*<i>p < .05</i>  
**<i>p < .01</i>  
***<i>p < .001</i>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hogan Empathy Scale</th>
<th>MMPI&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Scales ≤ 60</th>
<th>Barron's Ego Strength</th>
<th>MMPI&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Clinical Scales &gt; 70</th>
<th>Mean MMPI</th>
<th>MMPI F-K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>-.48**</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychosexual Maturity</strong></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.49**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry</strong></td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.33*</td>
<td>-.53***</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.63***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> MMPI clinical scales excluding Mf

<sup>b</sup> n=64

*<p> < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001
Test Scores

The means and standard deviations for the SCT scores from the three populations are presented in Tables 6 and 7. When all groups are compared (Table 6) there are significant differences on only two SCT scores where the LSTC group on the average reflected more adjustment than the evangelical seminary group: Self, $F(2,111)=4.34$, $p<.01$; and Total, $F(2,111)=3.90$, $p<.05$.

When the LSTC and SCUPE groups were combined and compared with the evangelical seminarians (Table 7) the SCUPE/LSTC subjects were significantly more adjusted as reflected by the Self subscale, $F(1,112)=7.05$, $p<.01$; the Psychosexual Maturity category, $F(1,112)=5.30$, $p<.05$; and the Total score, $F(1,112)=5.63$, $p<.01$.

Criterion measure scores and ANOVA for the three samples are presented in Table 8, where only one significant difference was found. The LSTC group was found to have significantly greater capacity for empathy than the evangelical group $F(2,111)=7.08$, $p<.001$, as measured by Hogan's Empathy Scale. No significant difference was found between groups on any other criterion index.

Sentence completion scores for all subjects and the ANOVA results for men and women are presented in Table 9. Women were found to be significantly more adjusted than the men on the Relationships subscale $F(1,112)=5.69$, $p<.05$, and in the Ministry category $F(1,112)=6.08$, $p<.05$. In all analyses of variance reported in Tables 6 through 9, wherever a significant difference is found, homogeneity of variance was also demonstrated.
TABLE 6

SCT scores and ANOVA Across Seminarian Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Lutheran Seminary (n=14)</th>
<th>SCUPE&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (n=21)</th>
<th>Evangelical Seminary (n=79)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df=2/111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.34**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.90*&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Seminary Consortium for Urban Pastoral Education

<sup>b</sup>Lutheran Seminary sample mean significantly less than Evangelical mean

*<sup>p</sup> < .05

**<sup>p</sup> < .01
TABLE 7

SCT Scores and ANOVA Across Groups
(LSTC & SCUPE Combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Subjects (n=114)</th>
<th>SCUPE/LSTC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (n=35)</th>
<th>Evangelical Seminary (n=79)</th>
<th>F&lt;sub&gt;df=1/112&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>7.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Lutheran seminarians and Urban Pastoral students combined

*<sup>P</sup> .05
**<sup>P</sup> .01
TABLE 8
Criterion Measure Scores and ANOVA Across Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Indices</th>
<th>All Subjects (n=114)</th>
<th>Lutheran Seminary (n=14)</th>
<th>SCUPE (n=21)</th>
<th>Evangelical Seminary (n=79)</th>
<th>F df=2/111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>40.76</td>
<td>37.81</td>
<td>7.08c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean MMPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>56.13</td>
<td>54.72</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>56.31</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Scales &gt; 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Scales ≤ 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>-13.38</td>
<td>-12.93</td>
<td>-11.90</td>
<td>-13.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>57.57</td>
<td>58.81</td>
<td>60.13</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Es</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>55.64c</td>
<td>59.54b</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>54.73b</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001  a_n=98  b_n=62  csignificant difference between LSTC and evangelical seminary subjects  dUrban Ministry students
TABLE 9

SCT Scores and ANOVA for Men and Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>All Subjects (n=114)</th>
<th>Men (n=95)</th>
<th>Women (n=19)</th>
<th>F df=17/112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Four hypotheses were investigated in this study which proposed to cross-validate four subscales and to initially validate a modified subscale of a sentence completion test for Protestant seminarians. The SCT scores were expected to reflect emotional conflict or health.

Hypothesis One was supported as the test was shown to be a reliable measure both in terms of its internal consistency and by the high rate of interjudge agreement found in scoring the test. The data indicate that, with only two exceptions, the sentence stems are assigned to the appropriate subscales. Twenty-eight stems which correlated highly with the subscales to which they were assigned, also correlated well with other subscales. This suggests some content overlap which is probably unavoidable and not undesirable, since all subscales and stems are expected to be sensitive to conflict and adjustment. The fact that Self and Ministry contained a disproportionate number of items which correlated poorly with those subscales, may have lowered $r$ values in the validation phase. If this was the case, the correlation coefficients for those subscales would be higher, further supporting their validity. All subscales correlated moderately with each other, suggesting that they all are assessing similar though not identical constructs. All subscales correlated highly with the total score yet
none so highly that it would be a replacement for the total test. That similar results were obtained when the LSTC/SCUPE and evangelical seminary samples were analyzed separately, provides further support for the test's internal consistency and its generalizability.

Inter-rater reliability coefficients for all SCT scores were very high, lending support for the use of the exemplar method in scoring S-C tests. The results reported in this study are similar to those reported earlier by Sheridan (1968) and Sheehan (1971) who developed scoring manuals which were the prototype of the one used in the present study and by McKay (1982).

Hypothesis Two, that conflict scores on the SCT would correlate positively with the number of MMPI clinical scales greater than 70, was supported by the data. All SCT scores obtained significant correlations with this index of conflict, although one subscale, Relationships, obtained a lower correlation than the other five scores. In addition, the subscales correlated well with other conflict indices from the MMPI, further supporting that the SCT scores are valid indicators of conflict. The data also validate the SCT conflict scores across seminary groups sampled, suggesting that the test may have broader application than just a conservative evangelical population.

Hypothesis Three, that SCT conflict scores would be negatively correlated with capacity for empathy as measured by the Hogan, was supported by the study. All SCT scores correlated significantly with the Hogan Empathy Scale and three other indices of adjustment taken from the MMPI. In general, these findings are consistent across the samples
and validate the use of SCT scores as indicators of adjustment as well as of conflict.

The Fourth Hypothesis, that the revised Psychosexual Maturity subscale would correlate significantly with criterion measures of conflict and adjustment, was also supported by the results of this study. When all subjects were included, the Psychosexual Maturity subscale correlated with all indices, with five of the six used when only the evangelical seminary subjects were analyzed, and with three out of the six when the smaller SCUPE/LSCT group of 35 people was examined. These results confirm McKay's (1982) theory that to accurately assess level of emotional adjustment by examining a Protestant seminarian's psychosexual maturity, one must investigate his/her attitudes, thoughts, and feelings about intimate relationships, as well as about more explicitly sexual issues.

The present study confirms McKay's hypothesis that Protestant and Catholic seminarians face different issues with regard to psychosexual adjustment. The Protestant seminarian is likely to be married (almost 70% of the present sample was married) or has the option of marriage, and may have much more frequent contact with women on a daily basis. Many of the Protestants have developed the relational skills necessary to maintain relations with members of the opposite sex and may feel comfortable in such a relationship. Important areas of resolution for the Protestant seminarian are explicitly sexual issues and other aspects involved in intimate relationships.
McKay (1982) discussed the possibility that the high MMPI F-K scores (M=-12.2, SD=6.67) may have contributed to the failure to validate the previous Psychosexual Maturity subscale. This appears not to be the case since in the present study even higher F-K scores were obtained (M=-13.38, SD=6.33) and the level of psychosexual maturity was still correlated with conflict and adjustment indices. McKay also reported that of all criteria used, the F-K score correlated most highly with the SCT scores. The results of the present study are consistent with those findings, with the exception of the Psychosexual Maturity scale which, although it correlated significantly with F-K, correlated more highly with five other indices. Graham (1977) cautions against using F-K as an index of a tendency to fake in a positive direction given the high K scores that are usually obtained by higher socio-economic individuals. His criticism may be valid, yet in the present study, there is the strong suggestion of underlying conflict when a high F-K is found. In addition, F-K was found to correlate significantly with all other criterion indices used in this study. It may be that with the present populations, a tendency to present oneself in a socially acceptable way is an indication of emotional tension underlying the favorable self-presentation.

The highest correlation obtained in the present study was between the SCT Total score and F-K. When the SCUPE/LSTC and evangelical seminary samples were analyzed separately, F-K continued to be highly correlated with SCT scores although not as consistently as when all samples are considered together. When the samples were considered
separately, the correlation between F-K and four of the six SCT scores with the LSTC/SCUPE subjects were unexpectedly high. This may suggest that in those groups a tendency to fake good may indicate conflict, particularly in the areas of Perception of Self, Relationships, and attitudes and feelings toward family as reflected in the SCT scores.

Post hoc analysis of the data indicate that SCT scores correlate significantly with other indices of adjustment and conflict. Five of six sentence completion scores were correlated significantly with the number of MMPI clinical scales less than 60, an index used for this purpose in previous research (Jansen, Bonk, & Garvey, 1973; Jansen & Garvey, 1973). Only the Family subscale failed to correlate significantly with this index as well as with Barron's Ego Strength Scale (Es). Kleinmuntz (1960), Himelstein (1964), Frank (1967), Graham (1977) and Harmon (1980) report studies which indicate that the Es is useful as an index of overall emotional adjustment. The SCT Total score and the Self, Relationships, Psychosexual Maturity and Ministry subscales correlated significantly with Es.

All SCT scores correlated significantly with the MMPI K scale, a scale which according to Graham (1977) can be interpreted to indicate emotional adjustment and a healthy balance between self-evaluation and self-criticism. Kania (1967) concluded that high K in seminarians was a measure of healthy defensiveness and not a denial of problems. Subjects in this sample obtained K scores well within Graham's (1977) acceptable T-score range of 55-70 (M=59.51, SD=8.90).
With all subjects used in the analysis, the Family subscale obtained fewer significant correlations with criterion indices (5 of 8) than the other SCT scores. This may suggest the need for further revision of this subscale or may reflect a difference between people who are presently the parents of one or more children and those who are unmarried or without children. The subscale contains items pertaining to family-of-origin as well as the subject's feelings and attitudes about involvement as a parent in his/her own family. Further analysis may be necessary to determine whether this factor has an effect on the score obtained by a seminarian taking the test.

The Self subscale generally correlated more highly than the other categories with the criterion measures, although all SCT scores generally correlated well with the indices used. Many of the r values are relatively low though statistically significant. This is to be expected with MMPI indices since that measure was not designed for use with a normal population and may not be sensitive to variations within a normal range. Also, the sentence completion subscales were constructed to assess level of adjustment in some narrowly defined areas of an individual's life, whereas the MMPI focuses on specific clinical syndromes. The indices which might be seen as measures of overall adjustment are the Es and K scales which correlated moderately with SCT scores. It may be that further revisions of the subscales would improve the validity coefficients. Further investigation could involve correlating the SCT scores with measures that assess level of adjustment in areas similar to those addressed by the present test.
The data suggest that in general the three groups of seminarians used in the present study are quite similar. The LSTC group obtained SCT scores that reflect significantly more adjustment than the evangelical group on the overall test score and in the Self category. The LSTC group also reflected significantly more capacity for empathy than the evangelical seminarian sample. In all other areas, however, there were no significant differences. The LSTC sample was significantly older than the evangelical seminarian group, t(91)=2.775, p < .01.

When the SCUPE and LSTC groups were combined, they reflected significantly more adjustment on three SCT scores than the evangelical seminary sample. These data suggest that the former group feels better about themselves, is more adjusted psychosexually, and is better adjusted overall. When all samples are considered, both separately and together, the highest level of adjustment is in the area of family and the lowest in the Self category.

The criterion measures indicate that as a group, the seminarians who participated in the present study maintain a healthy balance between self-criticism and positive self-evaluation. In general, they demonstrate a fair degree of ego strength and psychological adjustment. The data suggest that they are enterprising, resourceful, capable of dealing with problems, and that they mix well socially and take a dominant role in relationships. Hogan Empathy scores suggest that all groups tend to be likeable, outgoing, and sensitive interpersonally.

The elevated F-K scores suggest a tendency to present oneself in a socially acceptable way to an extent that may contribute to a ten-
dency to deny one's problems. Approximately 30% of the subjects had F-K scores of -15 and greater, while 14% had scores of -19 to -24. Scores from -15 to -24 likely suggest a tendency to deny or suppress emotional problems. Eighteen (16%) of the seminarians had at least one MMPI clinical scale (excluding Mf) greater than 70, yet seven (6%) had two or more scales over 70. Only 24 seminarians (21%) obtained low-empathy scores and 31 (27%) demonstrated extremely high capacity for empathy. The remaining 59 seminarians (52%) obtained scores which reflect average or above average capacity for empathy.

The SCT data also suggest that the female seminarians are better adjusted than the males in the area of relationships and attitudes toward ministry, but in the other areas assessed by the test, are no more adjusted than the men. Both men and women reflect the greatest conflict in their perception of self. The category in which the men reflected the greatest adjustment was in the area of family while women reflected more adjustment in relationships than in the other areas.

The results of the present study suggest several directions for research. First, there exists the need to further investigate the SCT reported here in terms of its reliability and validity. Possibilities include investigating the test-retest reliability of the measure, validating its use with a wider range of seminary populations. The results in this study suggest the possibility of differences in level of adjustment across theological orientations and denominational lines. Another possibility is to validate the SCT using a different instrument such as the California Psychological Inventory. The SCT subscales
might be investigated by correlating their results with those of other instruments designed specifically to address issues such as self-esteem, level of marital and family adjustment, and aspects of relationships such as intimacy, self-disclosure, and conflict resolution.

Another area of investigation might involve the psychological study of various seminarian groups. As was mentioned above, one might investigate differences along denominational and/or theological lines. Since there is a growing number of women entering Protestant ministry, there exists a need to investigate the personality and needs of female seminarians. This might be particularly interesting given the results reported above -- that in Relationships and Ministry, as measured by the SCT, the women were significantly more adjusted than the male seminarians. It may be that women who make the decision to enter ministry experience less ambivalence going into ministry than men, some of whom may still be undecided about ministry. It may also be that female seminarians as a group are more confident in relationships given the relational demands on women who are entering a vocation that is largely male-dominated. The present study suggests the need for more research.

Further research is also indicated in the area of how Protestant seminarians resolve their emotional problems. The results of this study suggest that it may be difficult for the Protestant seminarian to acknowledge emotional problems. Further investigation is necessary to examine possible cultural expectations and norms which may in part account for the elevated F-K scores and which may also make it difficult for this population to resolve emotional and relational conflicts.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the present study was to cross-validate a S-C test reported earlier by McKay (1982). This test is designed to assess level of adjustment or conflict experienced by Protestant seminarians. McKay validated the total test score and four of the six subscale scores from his scale which was patterned after those reported earlier by Sheehan (1971) and Sheridan (1968) who devised sentence completion tests for use with Catholic religious personnel. The present study proposed to cross-validate those portions of the test which were previously validated and to validate a revised Psychosexual Maturity subscale.

A review of the literature revealed that the S-C method has demonstrated its clinical and research utility. Several sentence completion tests, Rotter's ISB, Arnoff and Meese's Safety and Esteem Test, Loewinger's VW-SCT, and the Loyola tests for seminarians and clergy have been shown to be reliable and valid instruments.

Research has focused on variations in stem construction and four different approaches that have been used in scoring sentence completions. The exemplar method, used in the ISB, the Loyola tests, and in the present study, has received the greatest support in the literature.

Research with Protestant religious personnel has emphasized both the stressful nature of ministerial work and the emotional stability
of the seminarian and minister. It is generally accepted that in order to be effective in ministry, a man or woman must be emotionally stable, must be able to relate empathically with people, and should be able to function well in intimate relationships.

The SCT validated in this study consists of 64 stems, each of which was assigned to one of five subscales -- Self, Relationships, Family, Psychosexual Maturity, and Ministry. The Psychosexual Maturity scale was revised to include stems that address issues involved in intimate relationships. The scoring manual was revised to accommodate the revised test items.

Four hypotheses were tested in the present study. All hypotheses were supported by the data. The test was shown to be reliable as demonstrated by high inter-judge reliability in scoring and by the internal consistency of each subscale and of the entire test. The subscales correlated well with each other and with the total score. All subscale scores and the total test score correlated significantly with indices of conflict and adjustment, thereby validating the use of the test in assessing a seminarian's level of emotional adjustment. The revised Psychosexual Maturity scale correlated significantly with all criterion indices used.

The seminarian samples used in this study were found to be quite similar as reflected in the criterion scores and the SCT scores. The LSTC group was found to be significantly more adjusted in their view of the self than the evangelical seminarian group. In addition, when the two smaller samples, LSTC and SCUPE, are combined, they
reflect significantly more adjustment than the evangelical seminary group in terms of their feelings about themselves, their psychosexual maturity, and overall adjustment. The Lutheran seminary group was found to have a greater capacity for empathy than the evangelical seminary sample. Women were found to reflect greater adjustment in relationships and attitudes toward ministry.

Further research was suggested to extend the reliability and validity of the S-C test. Investigation might also be made into differences which may exist between denominational groups and across theological orientations. Female seminarians merit further psychological investigation. A final area of study which is proposed would focus on the way in which the Protestant seminarian and minister deals with his/her emotional problems, the possibility existing that problems are denied or suppressed, and not resolved productively. The SCT has demonstrated its validity and may prove to be useful in future investigations with Protestant seminarians.
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APPENDIX A
SENTENCE COMPLETION TEST MANUAL

Prepared by
David J. McKay
Loyola University of Chicago

This manual is patterned after those created by
Edward Sheridan and Mary Sheehan.
Some sections are taken from those manuals.
**DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSE CATEGORIES**

The following is a brief description of positive and negative response categories which was provided for the judges and which can be used in understanding the general content of each subscale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. SELF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;self-esteem&quot;; self acceptance; perception of oneself as competent, capable, worthwhile</td>
<td>&quot;self-devaluation&quot;; critical attitude toward self; depreciation of self; sees self as inadequate, unattractive or ineffectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance and liking of other people; concern for and ability to share with others; interpersonal relationships are enjoyable and rewarding; conflict is accepted and resolved</td>
<td>fear or avoidance of people; difficulty in relationships; relationships not fulfilling or rewarding; avoiding mishandling conflict; difficulty being close with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. FAMILY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive attitudes and feelings about family; healthy closeness with family of origin and present nuclear family if that be the case; warm feelings about family and children</td>
<td>negative experiences, thoughts, and feelings about family predominate; disappointment with family of origin and difficulty in present family; difficulty with family roles and parenting responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. PSYCHOSEXUAL MATURITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive regard for opposite sex; finds opposite sex attractive and enjoys being with them; feels comfortable with sexuality and expression of love physically and emotionally; capacity for intimacy, giving and receiving affection, and resolving conflict in intimate relations</td>
<td>negative feelings toward or avoidance of opposite sex; difficulty relating with opposite sex; intimacy is a problem; sexual tension is present and produces significant emotional conflict; physical contact is difficult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. MINISTRY

views it as positive and attractive way of life; satisfying to self; sure of ministry as a vocation; awareness of a "fit" with subject's abilities and gifts; sure of ministry as a vocation; relates well with authority

is doubtful if ministry is the right direction; questions validity of the ministry; questions personal competence regarding ministry; afraid of ministry; dislikes the work; difficulty relating to authority figures
 ITEMS BY SCORING CATEGORIES

The SCT generates five subscale scores and a total score. Each score is obtained by adding the stem scores for each subscale and dividing by the total number of stems completed for that scale. The total score is simply the sum of all scores divided by the total completed. Omissions are not computed in the total.

For the validation study the five subscales consisted of the following stems:

**Self (15)**

1, 7, 10, 17, 20, 23, 34, 38, 40, 41, 46, 47, 64, 66, 67

**Relationships (11)**

5, 12, 24, 29, 33, 43, 51, 54, 68, 69, 70

**Family (12)**

2, 11, 19, 22, 28, 31, 35, 39, 52, 57, 60, 65

**Psychosexual Maturity (13)**

3, 6, 14, 16, 26, 30, 37, 44, 45, 48, 50, 58, 62

**Ministry (13)**

4, 9, 13, 15, 21, 25, 32, 36, 49, 53, 55, 61, 63

**Note:** Items 8, 18, 27, 42, 56, 59 are included on the test form but because they correlated so poorly with their own subscales and with the total score, they were not computed in validating the test.

Men's and women's forms vary on stems 3, 44, 52, and 56 which differ only in gender reference.
In the following section, each stem will be presented with examples for the various scores. When possible, these examples should determine the score given a completion. Since it is not possible to give enough examples to cover all the completions that one may find, general rules for scoring will be presented here.

Each sentence completion is scored on a seven point scale containing three degrees of adjustment (1, 2, and 3); a neutral point (4); and three degrees of maladjustment (5, 6, 7). The easiest approach to using the scoring system is to start at the neutral point and work toward the extremes. Thus, if the completion is judged to be positive, one considers whether it is mildly positive (3), quite positive (2), or extremely positive (1). If the completion suggests conflict, one considers whether this conflict is mild (5), somewhat severe (6), or very severe (7). A neutral score (4) is given if one cannot place a completion in any other category. An omission is scored zero (0).

Positive Responses

A positive response is one that expresses a healthy attitude of mind. Completions indicating optimism and happiness as well as hope, humor and a positive feeling toward people are scored here.

Completions receiving a score of three (3) are those which express a positive attitude toward school, sports, extracurricular activities or a warm feeling or concern toward another person.

A score of two (2) indicates a generalized positive feeling toward people, good interpersonal relationships, a warm family life, enthusiasm, hope or good humor. A score of two (2) indicates a broader, positive response to life in contrast to a score of three (3) which indicates a positive response to a single aspect of life.

Completions are scored one (1) when they express an excellent attitude toward people and life. Indications of strong positive feelings toward people in general and genuine optimism are included in this category.

Conflict Responses

These completions indicate a maladjusted frame of mind. They include depression, hostile reactions, statements of unhappy experiences, expectations of failure, interpersonal difficulties, sexual problems and statements of past maladjustments. If the response seems neutral or unrealistic, a lower score may be given.
The first degree of maladjustment which is given a score of five (5) indicates specific conflicts that do not appear severe or incapacitating. Such are worries over specific school problems, financial matters, physical complaints, concern over politics or specific religious practices and identification with minority groups.

Completions given a score of six (6) indicate that the problems are more deep-seated and chronic than those given a score of five (5) and that they affect the personality as a whole. These typically are expressions of feeling inadequate, expecting to do poorly in all or most of one's school work, psychosomatic complaints, difficulties in relating heterosexually as well as indications of general social inadequacy, inability to decide on a vocation, concern over living up to parental expectations or a pervading pessimistic outlook on life.

A score of seven (7) is given a completion that indicates very severe maladjustment. Such completions may express extreme family problems, suicidal wishes, bizarre thoughts, sexual conflicts, strong hostile attitudes toward people in general or feelings of confusion.

Neutral Responses

These responses, which receive a score of four (4), do not fall clearly into either the positive or negative categories. Frequently, they are simple evasions or meaningless descriptions. Cliches, song titles and stereotyped responses are all included here. A neutral score is also given to ambiguous responses that might go into either category depending on the interpretation one gives it. A theoretical position, a definition, or a score of (3) which is qualified may be scored a (4).

Important Considerations

1. Omissions. Omissions are given a score of (0) but are not computed in any of the scores. They should be subtracted from the number of stems completed before computing the average subscale and total scores. Also, omissions are totaled and interpreted as an indication of evasiveness, avoidance, or lack of commitment to the task.

2. Qualifications. Frequently one may find a completion similar to one in the manual, but some qualification has been added. Such qualifications may alter the scoring. For example, My family... is very close, but I don't feel at ease with them appears to be a positive response at first but the qualification actually indicates it should receive a conflict score. Qualifications can also lead to a more positive score as in the example, My family... argues a lot but we are beginning to understand each other now.
3. Extreme Scores. It has not been possible to provide examples of extreme positive scores (1) and extreme conflict scores (7) for each stem. However, the scorer should feel free to use these scores if the completion follows the rules outlined for using these extreme categories.

4. Unusually Long Completions. In cases where a completion is unusually long, the general rule is to add one point to the score unless it already has a score of seven (7). It has been found that anxious subjects tend to write longer answers, seemingly finding it necessary to explain themselves. This has been verified under conditions where intelligence, which might seem to be the crucial factor here, was controlled (Rotter & Rafferty, 1950). An important exception is the case of a qualification. When completions are long because of a qualification, the score must be determined by whether the qualification is in the positive or negative direction.

5. Affectively-toned Stems. Some stems tend to elicit completions that reflect conflict and others that reflect adjustment. Some examples are: I worry about ...; What I fear most about being a minister ...; I have felt ashamed about ...; I take pride in ...; I most like .... Both can elicit completions in the opposite direction, however. For example, a subject may indicate that what he fears most about being a minister is that he sets healthy limits on his time. This response would be scored in the positive direction—a (3). It may be appropriate, too, for healthy people to worry about (finances occasionally) and be ashamed about certain behaviors (letting people down).

6. Spiritualized Responses. Some subjects tend to respond to the stems by including some reference to a spiritual struggle or a spiritualized approach to solving a problem. Although some stems may lend themselves to such an approach, most do not. Such answers should be dealt with by first eliminating the spiritualized portion and then scoring the remaining part of the completion. An example is I worry about not being good enough for God, which would be scored (5) for the response not being good enough. Some spiritualized responses are simply evasions or theoretical responses and would be scored (4).

7. When scoring multiple protocols, it is strongly recommended that all protocols be scored on the same item before going on to the next one.

8. Score should be recorded on the protocol.

9. When a completion includes both extremely positive and extremely negative of the same value, it is scored in a negative direction (5) rather than (4) which would not adequately convey the tension that exists in such a response.
1. When the odds are against me

(1) I'm at my best; I enjoy trying to overcome them and succeeding
(2) (indication that he can overcome the odds) I work even harder; I work to overcome them; (indication of motivation to work better or harder)
(3) (indication one will continue without expressed confidence of succeeding) I try anyway; I try my best; I hang in there; I do what I can; I usually come through; it is a challenge
(4) that's life; I turn to God; sometimes I win, sometimes I lose; I re-evaluate and decide whether or not to continue
(5) I feel some frustration; I sometimes get discouraged; I get discouraged but it's bearable; I get frustrated; I get out if I can
(6) I usually get depressed; I quit; I get angry; I tense up; I get defensive; I often feel powerless
(7) I run; I panic

2. Most families I know

(1) really care about each other; are very happy; are warm and loving; have been very kind to me
(2) are happy; are pretty close; function well; are close; like each other; like me
(3) get along all right; do the best they can; help their kids; aren't as happy as mine; are happy enough
(4) are complex; live together; go to church; aren't as close as mine
(5) are happier than mine; are unhappy without Christ; have financial problems; have unresolved tension between members
(6) are in trouble; are in pain; are pretty messed up; have a lot of unresolved tension; are from broken homes
(7) are hateful; are a mess; are wrecked

3. When I think of women (for men's forms)

(1) I think they are great; I'm excited; I feel happy
(2) I feel good; I think of good friends
(3) I remember women who have been friends; I smile; I wish I were married
(4) I think of one in particular; I think of my wife; I think of personality; I think of physical characteristics
(5) I feel they should be more respectful; I'm indifferent; I may get lonely; I don't always think of sex
(6) I think of sex; I lust; I feel depressed
(7) I get angry; I can't tolerate the thought

3. When I think of men (for women)

(1) I get excited
(2) I think of the goodness of my husband; I think of people I respect and admire; I feel good
(3) I think of leaders; I think of them as people just like me
(4) I wish the right one would come along; I think of my husband; some I like, some I don't
(5) I get annoyed; I feel a bit sad
(6) they seem power-hungry
(7)

4. My future in ministry

(1) is full of potential; is exciting
(2) is good; is bright; is open and positive; is promising
(3) is pretty good; is hopeful; will center on people and their needs; (is in a particular field indicating a choice has been made)
(4) I want to be led by God; is something I'm still exploring; is not specific as to the particular field
(5) is uncertain; is undecided; I'm unsure
(6) is shaky; is to be difficult
(7) is dismal; is hopeless; is depressing

5. Close relationships

(1) are one of the beautiful things in life; are the highlight of my life; give me great pleasure
(2) are important and meaningful to me; are very important to me; make me alive
(3) are important to me; are good; I'm learning to develop; are meaningful to me;

(4) are essential; are important; are crucial; are bound up in Christ

(5) are mandatory but scarce; are few; are sometimes difficult

(6) are difficult; are hard to form and keep; tend to scare me

(7) scare me; are impossible; have been very painful for me

6. When someone is affectionate with me

(1) I really enjoy it; I feel loved; I enjoy and reciprocate (positive feelings and returning affection)

(2) I feel good; I am flattered; I like it; I enjoy it; I feel affirmed and encouraged; I respond with more affection

(3) I respond likewise; I'm getting better at returning it; I feel comfortable; I like them; I appreciate it; I return it

(4) they’ve reached a crucial part of me

(5) I feel uncomfortable; I'm sometimes wary; I am skeptical; I might get nervous; I feel bad if I can't reciprocate

(6) I usually back off; I get pretty nervous; I feel bad

(7) I get scared; I get very upset; I become sexually aroused

7. I take pride in

(1) being able to do many things well

(2) myself; my accomplishments; relational abilities

(3) (positive activities); my spouse's abilities; my IQ; my calmness; things I do well; a well-prepared assignment; my home, my kid's abilities; knowing myself well

(4) my Lord and His love for me; being alive

(5) being a rebel

(6) not too much

(7) nothing at all

8. Healthy sexual adjustment

(1) is great; is wonderful; is fun

(2) feels good

(3) is good; keeps one spiritually healthy; is not a problem in my marriage; is most important; is developing; (associated with positives)
(4) is possible; is necessary; should take place in marriage; takes work; is important; (a definition)
(5) is sometimes a problem
(6) has been elusive for me; is tough; is uncommon
(7) is impossible

9. Some people in authority
(1) are terrific people
(2) are good; are friendly; do a very good job
(3) are wise; are more educated than I; are okay
(4) have difficult decisions to make; keep to themselves; are authoritative
(5) think they're better; don't know how to serve; use people; misuse their authority; irk me
(6) abuse the authority; are jerks; intimidate me; misuse people; are incompetent; shouldn't be
(7) abuse people; threaten me; become corrupted

10. I wish I could decide
(1)
(2) I don't wish -- I do decide
(3) on my spiritual gifts
(4) very quickly to save life; government policies; what to write here
(5) (questions regarding specific area in the future); what kind of work to do; which mission board to go with; more quickly
(6) what to do with my future; what to do with my life
(7) about God

11. A husband should (when there's a sense of the husband being parental/condescending/patronizing, then the score is lowered 1 point)
(1) love his wife and have her interests at heart (both love/care and a respect for the wife's individuality)
(2) be loving, patient & real; give of self for wife's greater good; support his wife's individuality
(3) protect and nourish his wife; love his wife; be aware of his own needs as a person; be faithful; be a partner (notion of being equal)
(4) have a wife; have kids; be a leader
(5) be the boss; be a servant to his wife
(6) do most anything he thinks is right

12. People I like least
(1)
(2) are very aggressive; use others selfishly; are physically aggressive
(3) (indication other person is difficult to like) are boisterous and obnoxious; are insensitive to others
(4) are set in their ways; are those who don't respond to God
(5) are those that are always on my mind; are those who are more educated; (indication writer feels inadequate); are quiet
(6) are Blacks; are poor people (air of superiority/condescension)
(7)

13. When I'm the one in charge
(1) I do a good job of leading and facilitating others with their gifts
(2) I do well; I feel very responsible; I feel confident; I like to share the leadership; I try to foster unity; I get things done right
(3) I do okay; I'm open to input; I'm organized; I like to help others feel good
(4) I try to lead; I want things organized; I feel important
(5) I get nervous; I become a different person; I expect cooperation
(6) I get quite nervous; I wish I wasn't; I get demanding
(7) I blow it; I expect people to follow my orders

14. Sexual relations
(1) are a joy in marriage; are beautiful; are God-created and terrific in marriage; are great; are very fulfilling
(2) are God's gift in my marriage; are enjoyable
(3) are good; are something I look forward to; are extremely important
(4) belong in marriage; is part of marriage; should be based on depth; are important
(5) can be difficult; has been a problem in the past; have their drawbacks; have been a weakness; are a major focus of this test

(6) are difficult; are ways to use people; is a problem now

(7) is a difficult area for I hate yet I love; are a mess for me; terrify me

15. I decided to go into the ministry
(1) because I enjoy it and it is a good way to use my gifts
(2) because it's where my interests and inclinations lie; it's the best way to use my gifts; because I really wanted to
(3) to help teenagers; because I saw a need; because it's what I wanted to do; because of a dedication to the city
(4) through the influence of many people; a long time ago; because I sensed a divine call; because it's God's will
(5) to improve myself; with some misgivings; to be accepted by my dad
(6) after much hesitation and reluctance
(7) I really don't know why; against my better judgment

16. For me, expressing affection
(1) is easy and something I love to do
(2) is easy; comes naturally; is the most important thing I can do
(3) is very important; isn't difficult; is good
(4) is important; is difficult but enjoyable
(5) is difficult to do with my folks; is hard in public; is sometimes blocked
(6) is hard because it's artificial; is hard
(7) is scary; has resulted in pain

17. I feel self-conscious about
(1)
(2) nothing
(3) being made fun of; myself when people stare; very little
(4) I'm really not sure; bad breath in the morning
(5) my public speaking ability; (single negative characteristics in a particular area) my weight; my looks; how I come across
(6) my lack of confidence in myself; (many areas of 'myself' in general) my body; my self-image
(7) my sins; my sexuality; sexual thoughts

18. When people affirm me
(1) I feel very warm inside; I feel loved; I love it
(2) I like it; I feel good; I feel close to them; I do affirm them back; it feels good and encouraging
(3) I feel motivated to work; I'm encouraged; I feel okay; I want to reciprocate
(4) I take it in stride
(5) it's sometimes hard to take; I get embarrassed; I wonder if it's true
(6) it doesn't feel good; I get suspicious; I don't believe them; it doesn't happen often
(7) no one ever does

19. When I think of my childhood
(1) I have very happy or fond memories; I have many happy memories
(2) I have fond memories; I feel very fortunate; I have happy memories; I feel good; I have warm feelings
(3) it is pleasant; I am thankful; I smile
(4) I have mixed emotions; I learn; I think of my folks
(5) I wish my folks would have spent more time with me; I think of some difficult areas for me; I am perplexed
(6) I feel sad and regretful; I think of all the difficulties I had with my folks
(7) it's too painful to remember; I think of an angry, distant dad

20. I have felt ashamed about
(1)
(2)
(3) very little
(4) something I did in high school; about past failures; about having let people down in the past; of my town
(5) of my grades; of an uncle; my family; my sisters; my IQ; my looks; past behavior but ones that are more serious; bed-wetting in the past; my hesitancy to date
(6) myself; my explosive temper; how dependent I can become; masturbation; sexual desires; past sexual misconduct; frequent sexual thoughts

(7) present sexual misconduct; being sexual

21. If I had not come to seminary

(1) (a sense that there were multiple positive options)
(2) I would be working with computers (any specific occupation that is respected); I would be in graduate/law school; I'd already be in Christian work
(3) I'd probably be in business; I'd maybe start a family
(4) I'd be somewhere doing something; I'd work; I'd probably have left the ministry
(5) I'm not sure what I'd do now; I'd be unhappy
(6) I'd be upset; I'd be lost
(7)

22. Having children

(1) is delightful; is great; is a blessing from God
(2) will be great; will be fun; I look forward to greatly;
(3) is something I hope to do; is okay; would be beneficial in my life; is good; has taught me much
(4) has not been decided in our family; will come; is a serious job
(5) has its drawbacks; means giving up things; in this present world is not wise; is mostly work
(6) scares me; worries me
(7) is a waste of time; makes me happy

23. When I compare myself with others, I

(1) usually look better; come out on top; feel great
(2) feel superior; sometimes come out looking better; am good at relationships
(3) feel okay; feel adequate; often place myself above them
(4) look to improve; not sure; sometimes feel okay, sometimes not
(5) fall short in some area; put myself down; am less confident
(6) feel inferior; don't do well at all; am overly dependent and insecure; I feel sad
(7) always lose; always feel inferior; look real bad
24. Being alone
(1) is a terrific time to relax; is wonderful and refreshing
(2) can be great at times; is good; is great if not in excess
(3) is usually good; is nice; used to bother me but now it's great
(4) is okay for the purpose of solitude; is tolerable; is sometimes okay, sometimes not
(5) is uncomfortable; is not enjoyable
(6) hurts; is tense; is lonely; is hard
(7) is unsafe for me for temptations come; is horrible

25. When I think of my spiritual gifts, I feel
(1) really good about myself; great
(2) blessed; happy; well-prepared; good; confident
(3) thankful; good most of the time; eager to use them; privileged
(4) God has given them; God will use them; they're developing; not sure of what they are
(5) sometimes inadequate; a little jealous of other people's gifts; unsure; anxious; unsure of myself
(6) bewildered; inadequate; inept
(7) like a total loser

26. For me intimacy is
(1) wonderful and enhances my life
(2) precious; highly prized; affirming; pleasurable; special
(3) crucial; very important; desirable; to love someone
(4) for my wife; important; appealing but elusive; relationships; necessary; a total thing; sharing
(5) a bit threatening; something on a spiritual plane; not a big deal; is still a goal in my marriage
(6) difficult; unknown
(7) impossible; scary

27. Minister should
(1)
(2) love their people; be warm and sincere; care for their people
(3) be aware of their congregations' needs; be careful to spend time with their families; be close with people
(4) preach expository; should love with more than self; be good counselors; should recognize their limitations
(5) help their staff more; (stop doing something negative) stop trying to be pleasers
(6) (criticism of many negatives or ministers in general)
(7) 

28. My parents
(1) love me very much; are super people; are wonderful people and great examples; are very special to me
(2) were good to me; are great— I wish they would visit more; are loving
(3) are a good model to me; were very trusting
(4) are simple folks; are dead; are old; aren't Christians
(5) have some faults; never seemed to be intimate with each other; disapprove of my life plans; didn't encourage expression of feelings
(6) are extremely unhappy, aging, non-Christians; had a bad marriage; never were supportive; were not close
(7) are hateful; are sad, angry people

29. If someone gets in my way
(1) I confront them and work out a solution
(2) I reason with them; I try to work it out with them; I deal gently yet firmly; I try to resolve it with them; I ask them to move
(3) I go around them; I find another way; I confront them; I try to empathize with their perspective; I try to go around
(4) I make allowance for it; so be it; I pray about it; I turn it over to God; I ignore it
(5) I get frustrated; I have been known to push; it irritates me; I'll usually back off; I move aside
(6) I get angry and upset; I give in; I let them do so
(7) I fall apart; he'll wish he hadn't
30. My sexuality
   (1) is normal and healthy and enjoyable
   (2) is a great gift from God; is healthy; is healthy & secure
   (3) is normal; I accept and respect; I look forward to in marriage;
      is a gift; is much better than before; is okay
   (4) isn't a problem; is probably average; is important; has come
      into greater focus in the last six months
   (5) is somewhat incomplete; is my business; was hard to get used
      to; is my business; I keep to myself; is sometimes a problem
   (6) isn't easily tamed; is sometimes confused and threatening;
      is often hard to control; is hard to accept
   (7) is my biggest problem

31. My mother
   (1) is wonderful and a support to me; is a terrific all-around
      woman
   (2) is a lovely woman; is very sensitive; is gentle; is loving;
      is very affectionate
   (3) is mindful of my family; is very talented; is an open woman;
      is my friend
   (4) is a praying woman; is strong-minded; is like me; is a good
      cook; is a Godly woman; reads a lot
   (5) has her faults; irritates me; has a poor self-image; is dead;
      was not physically demonstrative
   (6) makes me mad; is domineering; never supported me; was very
      unhappy; has problems
   (7) is strange; is a witch

32. My secret ambition in life
   (1)
   (2) is to be a good preacher (if positive & regarding sound
      values
   (3) is to do pioneer mission work; is to be successful; is to be
      a musician; is to be great for God
   (4) is to play pro-ball; is to be a holy saint of God; is to be
      wealthy; is to be in the Olympics
   (5) is to die a Christian; was to be a race-car driver; is to be
      great; is to be better than others
(6) (anything obviously negative, insensitive or disreputable)  
(7) (anything that would involve harm to self or others)  

33. People I tend to go around with  
(1) are bright and personable; are very secure and stable; are terrific people  
(2) are good people; like people; are healthy people; are fun to be with  
(3) are those who talk about spiritual matters; are friendly; are fine Christians  
(4) like sports; are okay; are different from me; are church people; are like me  
(5) are few right now; are not very helpful to me; have some problems  
(6) are troubled; don't understand me; are depressing  
(7) drag me down; are messes  

34. The turning point in my life  
(1) was when I accepted myself--both the positive and negative  
(2) was when I integrated my life around Christ  
(3) (any positive incident) was when I decided to go to seminary; was my conversion; the day I trusted God; was when I got married  
(4) was in college; was in sixth grade  
(5) was when my father died; was when I worked through some painful stuff; was an emotional crisis  
(6) was going to a church and being rejected by some people; was when my son died; was my divorce; was an emotional crisis  
(7)  

35. A wife should (a sense of condescension on the part of the male should be scored 1 point lower)  
(1) love her husband and self; (a sense of positive toward self and others)  
(2) love and support creatively; be aware of her own needs as a person  
(3) love her husband more than self (if it's a female's response) have an equal partnership
(4) love her husband more than self (if it's a male's response); have kids; accept husband's leadership; love husband unconditionally

(5) be more conscious of the way she looks; be equal but should submit to her husband's authority

(6) should be submissive; obey her husband

(7)

36. When I'm in a position of power

(1) I feel confident and I do well; I enjoy it and do a good job

(2) I like it; I'm confident; I do well; I feel content

(3) I try to use wisdom and discretion; I try to delegate; I'm considerate

(4) I feel important; I hope I'm considerate; I don't abuse it; I hope I handle it okay

(5) I sometimes feel inadequate; I feel the burden of responsibility; I sense my weakness; I'm afraid I might abuse it; I become a different person

(6) I take it with fear and trembling; I get domineering

(7) I get scared; I blow it; I don't know what to do with it

37. Physical contact with others

(1) is really fulfilling; is something I really enjoy and value; is very pleasurable

(2) is a good way to show care and affection

(3) is a good thing; is fine; is reassuring; is very important

(4) is okay depending on the motive; is okay within limits; is part of life; is important

(5) can be uncomfortable; is good but I have inhibitions; is a little scary at first; can be uncomfortable; is unimportant; is okay in sports

(6) is difficult; is embarrassing; is tense and difficult; irritates me; is a violation of personal space

(7) can lead to sex; is dangerous; should not take place between men; is threatening

38. What I have to do now

(1) is enjoyable and stimulating

(2) is be my best in what I do; be open & honest with feelings
(3) get closer to the Lord; keep going wholeheartedly; relax; grow spiritually; is satisfying but too much
(4) study; finish this test; go to work; make some important decisions
(5) work my "tail off" to get by; work through some personal issues
(6) truly repent for my sins; stop lusting; is overwhelming; overcome impurity

39. My father
(1) was a good and affectionate man; is a loving, sensitive and intelligent man; is a great father
(2) is a caring man; is a good model for me; is a quiet man who cares for his kids
(3) is a very solid man; was a good man
(4) worked very hard; is powerful; isn't a Christian
(5) didn't show affection very well; is a lonely man; is difficult to talk to; died long ago; has some problems
(6) is quite depressed; never encouraged me; makes me feel sad; is in jail; is a stranger to me
(7) hated me; is weak and hostile; rejected me

40. My body
(1) is beautiful; pleases me a lot; is great
(2) is a very good one; is something I'm pleased with
(3) is in good shape; is healthy; is the way I contact others
(4) is all right; needs exercise to be healthy; is adequate
(5) could be in better shape; is something I'm self-conscious about; is too fat; takes a lot of stress
(6) is something I don't like; is something I'm ashamed of
(7) is physically abhorrent; is a mess

41. I get mad about
(1)
(2) people mistreating handicapped people; child abuse
(3) people not keeping commitments; being hurt by people; insensitivity; injustice; prejudice
(4) very little; taxes; inflation
(5) instances when people don't trust me; little things sometimes; (in general, a sense that negative things frequently occur so that I get mad); things that don't go smoothly
(6) not being able to overcome sin; other people doing well; when things don't go my way

42. Compared to my dad, my mother
(1) was a terrific person
(2) has a lot more self-confidence; was free-wheeling and fun; is more sensitive to people
(3) is more expressive; is slower to blurt things out; turned out equally as well; is more decisive
(4) is reserved; was aggressive; was larger; was older
(5) was strict, was a bit less expressive of love; is a non-listener; doesn't accept himself
(6) was insensitive; was unkind; is a loser; was cold; was inferior; is profane; is over-bearing
(7) has no love for anyone

43. Getting to know a person
(1) is exciting; is a beautiful part of a relationship
(2) is an enjoyable activity; is fun; is good; is rewarding
(3) is difficult but well worth the effort; is usually easy; is easy if you're interested; is interesting
(4) can be easy or difficult; requires time; is essential
(5) has its problems; is sometimes hard; is hard at first
(6) is hard and laborious; is difficult; is scary for me
(7) is painful; is a real pain in the butt

44. Closeness with women (men)
(1) is something I cherish
(2) is enjoyable; is something I like
(3) is desirable; is nice if the right one; is fine; is good; is something all men (women) should have
(4) I enjoy but it's hard; is important
(5) may raise thoughts of sex; is something I need to be careful with; is less important to me now; is less threatening to me now; is uncomfortable

(6) is sexually arousing; is important but it's hard to break down barriers of rejection; is hard

(7) can be dangerous

45. Sexual tension

(1) is no problem for me

(2) is something I've always been able to work through

(3) can be overcome by having sex with my wife; is a means of growth

(4) is part of being young; seems good; is very possible; needs release

(5) arouses conflict; is hard to single people; is often difficult; sometimes gets me down; can be frustrating

(6) is a daily constant tension; is depressing for me; frustrates me a lot; is usually difficult

(7) is unbearable; is destroying me

46. Most of my friends don't know I'm nervous about

(1)

(2)

(3) very little

(4) my internship; grades; my first preaching assignment; speech

(5) doing well; my future; who I am; my family

(6) my sexual fantasies; my lusting; sexuality

(7) my sexual sins; masturbation

47. I wish I

(1) could continue to have the good relationships I now have

(2) had more time to spend with others

(3) could play the guitar well; could do something to help people

(4) was more like Christ; was through school; the Bears had won more

(5) were more outgoing; was better at relationships; felt more confident; was rich
could overcome sins; didn't always mess up friendships; was not so depressed; (multiple wishes that would fit in "5" score)

(7)

48. I feel that romantic love

(1) is fantastic; is a beautiful part of my marriage; is very enjoyable
(2) is a beautiful thing among married couples; is very good; is fun
(3) when I'm alone with my wife; is an added spice; is important in a marriage; is extremely important; is good
(4) is fleeting without commitment; is not well understood; is important
(5) is hard at times; is fleeting; is played up too much; can blind people to the truth
(6) can be dangerous; is pretty frustrating; blinds people to reason
(7) is dangerous and painful

49. Any trouble I have with my work

(1) I can solve; I have been able to solve
(2) (any attempt to overcome it with some expectation of success) I must try to overcome it; I can cope with; is negligible
(3) (awareness of one's own part in the difficulty) is due to my own laziness
(4) is part of seminary; goes with the territory; is due to lack of time; I talk about with God
(5) is disturbing; frustrates me; (is due to a felt inadequacy)
(6) makes me sick (is due to deep-seated or real inadequacy)
(7) destroys me

50. Sex

(1) is a great part of marriage; (positive aspect of a committed relationship)
(2) is the pinnacle of friendship with my wife; is great; is fun; (positive but some concern that it only be in marriage)
(3) is a blessing from God; is a good gift; (positive but in future); is normal
(4) is part of being married; can be enjoyable or can be a source of tension
(5) is private and is flaunted too much; has sometimes been a problem; I have to adjust to
(6) is a problem for me; is scary
(7) is a tyrant--its impulses are so strong that it destroys; is wrong; is perverted

51. When I have trouble with someone
   (1) I deal with it until it is solved
   (2) I try to settle it (sense that there is an attempt to resolve); I bring up the problem and talk about it
   (3) (an attempt to confront it without an attempt to resolve it) I try to confront; I apologize; I confront the issue; it doesn't last long; I try to fell them about it
   (4) I pray about it; I talk to them but ignore it if it doesn't get better
   (5) I avoid them; I keep quiet; I work to control my anger; I hold it in
   (6) I usually have a fight; (revenge-seeking); I usually blame him/her; I get depressed; I dread confrontation
   (7)

52. My greatest difficulty as a husband is (will be)
   (1)
   (2)
   (3)
   (4) being a spiritual leader; I'm not sure
   (5) (personal characteristic that might detract) is being lazy; being messy; not having enough time for family; communication; patience; understanding my wife at times
   (6) not being too dependent; limiting our sex; expressing love; is being open without fear; (personal characteristic that will detract and are pervasive)
   (7) will be sexual performance

52. My greatest difficulty as a wife is (will be)
   (1)
   (2)
(3) not liking housework
(4) submission; being patient; the routine! responding; my in-laws
(5) is talking about my feelings (hurt, anger, etc.); initiating sex; supporting my husband even though I know he's wrong
(6) the whole sexual area

53. When I relate to a minister
(1) I openly share my feelings; I enjoy it
(2) I like it; I look to them for support and guidance; I feel good; I like to encourage him; I feel comfortable
(3) I treat him with respect; I try to learn from him; I feel OK
(4) I expect him to be spiritual; I try to get to know him; I think of my minister; I talk to him as any other person; I put myself in his place
(5) I try not to argue theology; I am careful; I think they are "B-S'ing"
(6) I am usually really frustrated; I am always disappointed; he seems unapproachable
(7)

54. For me, confronting people is
(1) a caring thing to do
(2) easy; a good thing to do
(3) sometimes fun; beneficial; necessary for reconciliation to take place
(4) okay if circumstances require; important; goes with the territory; sometimes easy--sometimes hard
(5) hard but important; difficult but necessary; hard but I do it; uncomfortable; sometimes hard
(6) hard; difficult; something I don't like
(7) extremely difficult

55. Seminary studies
(1) have been extremely rewarding; have been the best time in my life; are great
(2) are very profitable; are hard but well-worth it; are excellent but demanding
(3) are very informative; are usually profitable; are interesting at times
(4) are boring but useful; are okay; I take them or leave them
(5) are usually too time-consuming; are hard and wide; are irrelevant; are boring
(6) are very difficult
(7) are driving me crazy; are overwhelming; are ridiculous

56. When I think of myself as a father (mother)
(1) I feel excited; I can't wait for it to happen
(2) I think it will be fun; I feel good; I know my kids will love me; I will be a good one; I am warmed
(3) I'm comfortable; I want to be a good one; I feel good but its hard work; I think I'll be a good one
(4) I think of the responsibility; I find it hard to believe it's actually happened
(5) I have some regrets; I wish it was more fun; it's hard to do that; I have some concerns
(6) I have many regrets; I don't feel good about it; it's kind of threatening; I get anxious
(7) I realize I'm a terrible one; I'm scared; I don't want to be one

57. If my parents had only
(1)
(2)
(3)
(4) raised me in the church; taught me music
(5) not made me skip a grade; let me be more independent; (some negative aspects or shortcoming) taken time with me
(6) talked to me; stayed together; told me about sex; had only one child
(7) not abused me; never married

58. When I feel sexual impulses
(1)
(2) I get excited; I enjoy them; I feel good; I often initiate lovemaking with my wife
(3) I desire to release them with my wife; I suppress them if they're inappropriate; it is normal; I feel like a man (woman); I work them off through hard work because I'm single

(4) I need to control my mind; I control them; I don't mind; I attempt to redirect them; (exercise self-control)

(5) I feel some guilt; (externalizing of control to God, wife, etc.); I try to control them; I masturbate

(6) I lose control sometimes; I have a hard time; I masturbate and feel guilty

(7) I hate myself yet I can't stop sinning; I lose control

59. I wonder if one of my motives
(1)
(2) is love; is to help needy people
(3) is to help people; is to be appreciated; is to answer questions
(4) is true; is right; is to have a lot of money; is a need for approval
(5) is selfish; is to win my parents' approval; is to prove something; cynicism
(6) is guilt; is to escape
(7) is evil

60. My family
(1) has been a joy, has a loving relationship; is loving and warm
(2) has always supported me; is very close to me; is a very good one
(3) is close even though we sometimes argue; is very important to me; is friendly; is getting closer; a good one; a good group of people
(4) is an anomaly; is spread out; is getting older; has 5 people
(5) is pretty isolated; has gone through hard times lately; has difficulty with feelings
(6) was an emotional icebox; is strange; is troubled; fights
(7) hates me; is a mess

61. When I sense the person-in-charge is coming
(1) I'm delighted
(2) I stay relaxed; I might do something differently but not much
(3) I keep on working; I am on best behavior; I have no misgivings; I don't mind; I work harder
(4) I straighten up; I pay attention; I am aware of it
(5) I get nervous; I put up a good front; (any pretense of good work)
(6) I get nervous and inefficient; I try to conceal my wrongdoing; I get scared
(7) I freeze; I fall apart

62. When I see a man and woman together
(1) I think it's great; it reminds me of my best relationships
(2) I am happy; I figure they enjoy each other; I am pleased
(3) I hope they'll stay that way; I assume they're friends; it seems right
(4) I assume they are married or dating; I wonder if they are a couple
(5) I wish I had someone too; I get envious; I leave them alone
(6) I get depressed; I'm always jealous; I feel left out
(7) I get angry; I lust; I hate them

63. The greatest difficulty I'll face as a minister
(1)
(2) is showing love to all; maintaining a vital spiritual life
(3) is not obsessing with the work; taking more time with family; is being firm in a healthy way
(4) is the long hours; is the role; is avoiding the "mold"
(5) is preaching; is counseling; hope to cope with people; is getting my work done; is self-criticism; is confrontation
(6) is discouragement; is depression; is burnout; is relating to people; is me; is learning to love; is dealing with people
(7) is sexual temptation

64. I hesitate
(1)
(2) only when threatened; to give advice outside my area of experience; to violate my values
(3) when more than one option is available; in new relationships; to be someone I'm not
(4) when unsure; to tell people bad news; with this question
(5) to make important decisions; to confront people; to trust sometimes
(6) to tell the truth; to trust people
(7)

65. Compared to my mother, my dad
(1) was a terrific person
(2) has a lot more self-confidence; was free-wheeling and fun; is more sensitive to people
(3) is more expressive; is slower to blurt things out; turned out equally as well; is more decisive
(4) is reserved; was aggressive; was larger; was older
(5) was strict; was a bit less expressive of love; is a non-listener; doesn't accept himself
(6) was insensitive; was unkind; is a loser; was cold; was inferior; is profane; is over-bearing
(7) has no love for anyone

66. I think of myself as
(1) capable of doing most anything I choose; competent and well-liked
(2) a good guy; competent and intelligent; loving; well-adjusted; a capable person
(3) learning to be Christ-like; still growing; one who is motivated to grow; as intelligent
(4) as having more potential than I'm using; a person
(5) thoughtless; unsure; kind of mixed-up; having a few problems
(6) as having problems; a lonely person; unpopular
(7) sick and disturbed; a fool being stupid

67. I suffer most from
(1)
(2) not much at all
(3) not being able to help all the people I'd like to
(4) lack of time to finish my work
(5) laziness; inferiority; boredom; inactivity; my weight; lack of self-confidence; lack of specific goals
(6) not liking myself; seeing myself; depression; past pain; lack of communication and intimacy in my marriage; loneliness

(7) sexual temptations; sexual indulgence; mental anguish; misperceptions in reality

68. When I need something from someone

(1) I ask politely; I feel fine in asking for it; I often will ask for help

(2) I usually ask; I ask; I ask if it's appropriate

(3) I hesitate to ask; I don't like to ask

(4) I usually am afraid to ask; I usually go without; I expect to be turned down

69. Conflict with my close friends

(1) results in learning as well as closeness once its resolved

(2) is resolved by talking about it; is something we can solve; often moves us closer when resolved

(3) can usually be dealt with by talking; I try to resolve as soon as possible

(4) is not unmanageable; is rare; doesn't usually happen

(5) bothers me; is uncomfortable; never occurs for me; catches me off guard; I tend to avoid

(6) causes pain; is very distressing; I try to forget about it; is disturbing; hurts me; tears me up; I don't like and avoid it

(7) is scary; is agonizing; ruins the relationship

70. When someone confronts me

(1) I take it well and many times feel closer to that person

(2) I deal with the problem; I take the constructive criticism seriously; I think it's good; I'm thankful

(3) I'll listen; I try to learn from the experience; I like to know why; (some indication that the person takes responsibility)

(4) I'm quickly reformed; I'm both thankful and hurt; I hope I can take it
(5) I tend to get tense; I feel embarrassed; I get anxious
(6) I do get tense; I get defensive; I tend to get angry; I get hurt; I feel rejected
(7) I get scared; I get angry; I agonize
APPENDIX B
Please complete the following statements as quickly as possible. Try to express your real feelings and thoughts.

1. When the odds are against me ______________________________
2. Most families I know ______________________________________
3. When I think of men _______________________________________
4. My future in ministry ______________________________________
5. Close relationships ________________________________________
6. When someone is affectionate with me _______________________
7. I take pride in ____________________________________________
8. Healthy sexual adjustment _________________________________
9. Some people in authority _________________________________
10. I wish I could decide _____________________________________
11. A husband should _________________________________________
12. People I like least _________________________________________
13. When I'm the one in charge _________________________________
14. Sexual relations __________________________________________
15. I decided to go into the ministry __________________________
16. For me, expressing affection ______________________________
17. I feel self-conscious about ________________________________
18. When people affirm me ____________________________________
19. When I think of my childhood ______________________________
20. I have felt ashamed about ________________________________
21. If I had not come to seminary
22. Having children
23. When I compare myself to others
24. Being alone
25. When I think of my spiritual gift(s) I feel
26. For me intimacy is
27. Ministers should
28. My parents
29. If someone gets in my way
30. My sexuality
31. My mother
32. My secret ambition in life
33. People I tend to go around with
34. The turning point in my life
35. A wife should
36. When I'm in a position of power
37. Physical contact with others
38. What I have to do now is
39. My father
40. My body
41. I get mad about
42. Compared to my dad, my mother
43. Getting to know a person
44. Closeness with men
45. Sexual tension
46. Most of my friends don't know I'm nervous about ________________________
47. I wish I _______________________________________________________________________
48. I feel that romantic love _______________________________________________________________________
49. Any trouble I have with my work _______________________________________________________________________
50. Sex _______________________________________________________________________________________
51. When I have trouble with someone _______________________________________________________________________
52. My greatest difficulty as a wife is (will be) _______________________________________________________________________
53. When I relate to a minister _______________________________________________________________________
54. For me, confronting people is _______________________________________________________________________
55. Seminary studies _________________________________________________________________________________
56. When I think of myself as a mother _______________________________________________________________________
57. If my parents had only _______________________________________________________________________
58. When I feel sexual impulses _______________________________________________________________________
59. I wonder if one of my motives _______________________________________________________________________
60. My family _______________________________________________________________________________________
61. When I sense the person-in-charge is coming _______________________________________________________________________
62. When I see a man and woman together _______________________________________________________________________
63. The greatest difficulty I'll face in ministry _______________________________________________________________________
64. I hesitate _______________________________________________________________________________________
65. Compared to my mother, my dad _______________________________________________________________________
66. I think of myself as _________________________________________________________________________________
67. I suffer most from _________________________________________________________________________________
68. When I need something from someone _______________________________________________________________________
69. Conflict with my close friends _______________________________________________________________________
70. When someone confronts me _______________________________________________________________________

Please complete the following statements as quickly as possible. Try to express your real thoughts and feelings.

1. When the odds are against me__________________________________________
2. Most families I know__________________________________________________
3. When I think of women_________________________________________________
4. To me, the future looks________________________________________________
5. Counseling women_____________________________________________________
6. I worry about_________________________________________________________
7. I take pride in________________________________________________________
8. Healthy sexual adjustment_____________________________________________
9. Some people in authority_______________________________________________
10. People I like least____________________________________________________
11. I wish I could decide________________________________________________
12. A husband should____________________________________________________
13. I feel powerful when________________________________________________
14. Sexual relations______________________________________________________
15. I decided to go into the ministry_______________________________________
16. What I fear most about being a minister________________________________
17. I feel self-conscious about____________________________________________
18. Strangers____________________________________________________________
19. When I think of my childhood________________________________________
20. I have felt ashamed about____________________________________________
21. If I had not come to seminary________________________________________
22. Having children______________________________________________________
23. When I compare myself with others, I___________________________________
24. Being alone_________________________________________________________
When I think of my spiritual gift(s) I feel

The woman I most like

Ministers should

My parents

If someone gets in my way

Trusting other people

My mother

My secret ambition in life

People I tend to go around with

The turning point in my life

A wife should

Being married

Physical contact with others

What I have to do now is

My father

My body

I get mad about

I most like

Getting to know a person

When I meet an attractive woman

Sexual tension

Most of my friends don't know I'm nervous about

I wish I

I feel that romantic love

Any trouble I have with studies

Sex

When I have trouble with someone
52. People whom I consider my superiors

53. When I relate to a minister

54. Nothing is harder to stop than

55. Seminary studies

56. My experience of love

57. If my parents had only

58. When I feel sexual impulses

59. I wonder if one of my motives

60. My family

61. When I sense the person-in-charge is coming

62. When I see a man and a woman together

63. The greatest difficulty I'll face as a minister

64. I hesitate

65. Compared to my mother, my dad

66. I think of myself as

67. I suffer most from

68. Compared to the spiritual gifts needed in ministry, I feel that mine
APPENDIX C
### CORRELATIONS BETWEEN STEM SCORES AND SUBSCALE TO WHICH THEY WERE ASSIGNED

(\(n=114\))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Assigned Subscale</th>
<th>Correlation (^a) With Assigned Subscale</th>
<th>Correlation With Other Subscale If Higher Than Own</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family (Fam)</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity (Psyc Mat)</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ministry (Min)</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationships (Rel)</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.22** ** --Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Psyc Mat(^b)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Rel(^b)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16 ** --Psyc Mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Min(^b)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13 ** --Fam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>Assigned Subscale</td>
<td>Correlation(^a) With Assigned Subscale</td>
<td>Correlation With Other Subscale If Higher Than Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18 —Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.19 —Psyc Mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fam(^b)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03 —Rel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.54***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Fam(^b)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>Assigned Subscale</td>
<td>Correlation(^a) With Assigned Subscale</td>
<td>Correlation With Other Subscale If Higher Than Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Self(^b)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01 --Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Psyc Mat</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.27** --Psyc Mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.34*** -- Fam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>.67***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient

\(^b\) These 6 stems were not used in the validation of the test but were left on the test form and included in this analysis.

\(* p < .05$

\(** p < .01$

\(*** p < .001$
APPENDIX D
Intercorrelations of SCT Subscales and Total Score

Evangelical Seminary Sample

*(n=79)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Psychosexual Maturity</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.63***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01

**p < .001
Intercorrelations of SCT subscales and Total Score

SCUPE AND LSTC

(n=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Psychosexual Maturity</th>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>.79***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosexual Maturity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
**P < .01
***P < .001
INFORMATION SHEET

Sex: M__ F__

Age: _____

Marital Status: Married ____ How Long? ________
Single _____
Divorced ____ If so, what? ______
Other _____

Children: Yes____ No____

Year in Seminary: ______________________

Your Denominational Affiliation: ________________________
For how long? ______________________

Orientation: Fundamentalist ____
Evangelical _____
Neo-evangelical____
Neo-orthodox _____
Liberal _____ If so, what? ______
Other _____

Undergraduate Major: ______________________

Type of College/University: Denominational School ____
Private secular ___
State school ____
Other__________________

Graduate Degrees: Yes____ No____

Area of Study? ______________________

Your ethnic background: ______________________

Father: Living_____ Occupation____________________
Deceased ____ Education____________________

Mother: Living_____ Occupation____________________
Deceased ____ Education____________________

Area of ministry you are planning for__________________

Your spiritual gift(s)__________________________

What area of the country are you from? East____ West_____ North____ South____
Midwest____ Other____ If so, where?

Do you come from another country?____ Where?__________________________
HOGAN EMPATHY SCALE

Directions: This survey consists of numbered statements which I would like you to read and then decide whether the statement is usually true as applied to you or false as applied to you. Please do not leave any spaces blank.

1. A person needs to "show off" a little now and then.
2. I liked "Alice in Wonderland" by Lewis Carroll.
3. Clever, sarcastic people make me feel very uncomfortable.
4. I usually take an active part in the entertainment at parties.
5. I feel sure that there is only one true religion.
6. I am afraid of deep water.
7. I must admit that I often try to get my own way regardless of what others may want.
8. I have at one time or another in my life tried my hand at writing poetry.
9. Most of the arguments or quarrels I get into are over matters of principle.
10. I would like the job of a foreign correspondent for a newspaper.
11. People today have forgotten how to feel properly ashamed of themselves.
12. I prefer a shower to a bathtub.
13. I always try to consider the other fellow's feelings before I do something.
14. I usually don't like to talk much unless I am with people I know very well.
15. I can't remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
16. I like to keep people guessing what I'm going to do next.
17. Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it.
18. I like to talk before groups of people.
19. When a man is with a woman he is usually thinking about things related to her sex.
20. Only a fool would try to change our American way of life.
T  F  21. My parents were always very strict and stern with me.
T  F  22. Sometimes I rather enjoy going against the rules and doing things I'm not supposed to.
T  F  23. I think I would like to belong to a singing club.
T  F  24. I think I am usually a leader in my group.
T  F  25. I like to have a place for everything and everything in its place.
T  F  26. I don't like to work on a problem unless there is the possibility of coming out with a clear-cut and unambiguous answer.
T  F  27. It bothers me when something unexpected interrupts my daily routine.
T  F  28. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
T  F  29. I don't really care whether people like me or dislike me.
T  F  30. The trouble with many people is that they don't take things seriously enough.
T  F  31. It is hard for me just to sit still and relax.
T  F  32. Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
T  F  33. I feel that it is certainly best to keep my mouth shut when I am in trouble.
T  F  34. I am a good mixer.
T  F  35. I am an important person.
T  F  36. I like poetry.
T  F  37. My feelings are not easily hurt.
T  F  38. I have met problems so full of possibilities that I have been unable to make up my mind about them.
T  F  39. Often I can't understand why I have been so cross and grouchy.
T  F  40. What others think of me does not bother me.
T  F  41. I would like to be a journalist.
T  F  42. I like to talk about sex.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, &quot;on top of the world.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I like to be with a crowd who play jokes on one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>My mother or father often made me obey even when I thought that it was unreasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I easily become impatient with people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sometimes I enjoy hurting persons I love.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I tend to be interested in several different hobbies rather than to stick to one of them for a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I am not easily angered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>People have often misunderstood my intentions when I was trying to put them right and be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I am usually calm and not easily upset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I would enjoy beating a crook at his own game.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I am often so annoyed when someone tries to get ahead of me in a line of people that I speak to him about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I used to like hopscotch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I have never been made especially nervous over trouble that any members of my family have gotten into.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I frequently undertake more than I can accomplish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I enjoy the company of strong-willed people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Disobedience to the government is never justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>It is the duty of a citizen to support his country, right or wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I have seen things so sad that I almost felt like crying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I have a pretty clear idea of what I would try to import to my students if I were a teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>As a rule I have little difficulty in &quot;putting myself into another's shoes.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I am usually rather short-tempered with people who come around and bother me with foolish questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
# DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLES USED IN VALIDATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LSTC (n=14)</th>
<th>SCUPE (n=21)</th>
<th>Evangelical Seminary (n=79)</th>
<th>Total (n=114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>11 (79%)</td>
<td>15 (71%)</td>
<td>69 (87%)</td>
<td>95 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td>10 (13%)</td>
<td>19 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Married</strong></td>
<td>7 (50%)</td>
<td>14 (67%)</td>
<td>44 (56%)</td>
<td>65 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have Children</strong></td>
<td>6 (43%)</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>19 (24%)</td>
<td>32 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in Seminary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>47 (60%)</td>
<td>48 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7 (33%)</td>
<td>20 (25%)</td>
<td>27 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third</strong></td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>6 (29%)</td>
<td>6 (8%)</td>
<td>14 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth</strong></td>
<td>2 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (5%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>10 (71%)</td>
<td>5 (24%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>17 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denominations Represented</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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