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CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION  

At the 1957 meeting of the American Catholic Psychological Association (ACPA), the need for an organized approach to the psychological assessment of religious vocations was expressed (Bier, 1960.) It was argued that if criteria for success in religious life were carefully defined, psychological screening programs set up in terms of these same criteria would appreciably diminish the attrition rate in religious communities.

A glance at the decade since that ACPA meeting, however, suggests that the hopes expressed and initial plans made then, have done little to influence the drop-out rate (McGrath, 1965; Cuyler, 1965; Schleck, 1965; Wagoner, 1966.)

What are some of the contributing factors which have emerged in this failure to halt this attrition rate? First of all, attempts at setting up screening programs for candidates to the religious life have encountered numerous pitfalls inherent in the stated intent to define criteria for success in religious life (Frison, 1962; McCloskey, 1967.) As time elapsed, it became more evident that the criteria of success or failure could by no means be equated or even correlated with the simple terms "drop-out" or "nondrop-out" (Dittes, 1962.) To be a clergyman or religious was not
necessarily the same as being an effective clergyman or religious (Evoy and Christoph, 1963; McAllister and VanderVeldt, 1961.) From another point of view, the drop-out might not necessarily be a failure. He might be seeking to serve a higher purpose in his decision to leave religious life. Indeed, this was the stated purpose of a large group of nuns who left their order en bloc to "...[be] committed to service for human development with a focus on religious and social needs". (Catholic Accent, July 27, 1967, p. 3; Chicago Tribune, August 1, 1967, p. 10.)

For an example of another kind of drop-out, at Cuernavaca, Mexico, a Benedictine Prior of a monastery with twenty of his monks left the monastic life so that they might be able to function as a psychoanalytically oriented community, without interference from Church authorities (National Catholic Register, June 28, 1967, p. 6.) It would appear then, that the criteria of success or failure are far more complex than originally conceived by early investigators.

Another problem in regard to the selection and assessment of candidates to the religious life has been the inadequacy of the psychological testing instruments (Wauck, 1956; Murtaugh, 1965.) It may be indeed as Wauck (1956) has suggested: the tests have been asked to do a job that is beyond their capability because they are trying to discriminate members of an already highly select and homogeneous group. These difficulties, however, do not free the determined investigator from renewed and hopefully more refined attempts at
coping with the problems. Seen in historical context then, this study is an attempt to correct some of the defects in investigations which have preceded it. Notably, the majority of these investigations have failed to make a distinction between voluntary and non-voluntary drop-out, with the result that testing results have been confounded. It is hoped that the present investigation may add some slight bit of knowledge to the endless search for suitable instruments which may serve as aids in the selection and assessment of candidates to the religious life. This is a task of some urgency, in that the priesthood and religious life have undergone a searching and penetrating criticism in recent years (Kavanaugh, 1966; Lee and Putz, 1965.) If it is true that the traditional manifestations of religious life have a contribution to make to the world, then ways and means of safeguarding that contribution should be uncovered. If it is not true, then perhaps newer forms of this manifestation should be developed. The refinement of testing programs may help play a part in that decision.

This present investigation was undertaken at a large midwestern suburban junior college minor seminary and utilizes the data accumulated on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (1959) over the period of years from 1962 to 1966. All told, the data embrace six classes. Those who have successfully gone through the minor seminary and have chosen to go on to the major seminary will be designated the nondrop-out group (N = 465.) They will also serve as the normative group, in that Edwards' normative data have not seemed appropriate
for special populations (Koons and Birch, 1964.) The seminary drop-out group has been separated into voluntary (N = 330) and non-voluntary (N = 65) categories. The voluntary drop-out group was composed of those who chose to leave of their own accord. The non-voluntary drop-out group consisted of those who for reasons of emotional instability, poor adjustment, or academic disciplinary reasons were asked to leave or were counseled out of the minor seminary program. A group of 270 non-seminarian Catholic college freshmen serve as control group for purposes of comparison.

It is hypothesized then, that the seminary normative group will give evidence of a distinctive profile of needs from that of the non-seminary group. It is further hypothesized that the seminary normative group will have significantly higher scores than the non-seminary group on at least two variables, Nurturance and Affiliation, needs which appear to be related to vocational effectiveness. A third hypothesis is that the non-seminary group will show evidence of greater social and heterosexual maturity as reflected in higher mean scores for the Intraception and Heterosexuality need variables. Finally, it is hypothesized that both seminary drop-out groups will be distinctive from that of the seminary normative profile of group means.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature will be organized in the following manner:

1. Literature concerned with testing religious.
2. Literature concerned with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.
3. Literature concerned with drop-out studies.

Literature concerned with testing religious.

Religious superiors and diocesan officials have long been aware of the need for some type of screening program which would ensure that only the mentally and emotionally well-balanced would enter religious life (Zellner, 1960.) As Bier (1959) has noted, only the methods, not the aim of screening, have changed. In this country, it was perhaps Moore (1936, a) who gave the strongest impetus toward evolving some workable psychological instrument that would help screen out the unfit. As a result of his study of the incidence of insanity among priests and religious, he suggested that a booklet containing pointed clinical questions should be given to the applying candidate, a member of his family, and to the parish priest or any other family outsider who knew the candidate and his family. Information on the applicant's family history, mental and physical health, character, anxiety and emotional traits, would
thus be available (Moore, 1936, b.) The criteria which Moore sought to use for judgment of fitness have changed practically not at all to the present day.

Despite the suggestions of Moore, it seems that little was done to implement them until 1942. In that year, McCarthy (1942) carried out a study on personality traits of seminarians, and Peters (1942) studied the intercorrelations of personality traits among novices. McCarthy's findings pointed to a general schizoid factor, and a "general fitness" factor for continuance in seminary life. These studies were followed by those of Burke (1947) on minor seminarians, and Bier (1948) in a comparative study of a major seminary group with four other groups, in which the seminary group was seen as the "most deviant group of an already deviant student population." Burke established that the minor seminary functions selectively in regard to intelligence and academic ability. Bier, analyzing the extremes of his major seminary population, found that the well-adjusted seminarian differed far more from the poorly adjusted seminarian, than he did from the well-adjusted members of the four other comparative groups. Subsequent to these findings, Bier decided to modify the MMPI, through an item analysis, to fit special populations. In a private communication to Wauck (1957) however, he reported that he still found, as "in his original work, a tendency for an elevation of about a standard deviation on most MMPI scales."
By 1957, studies had become more sophisticated. Wauck (1957) sought to find the relationship between a battery of tests and a faculty rating scale. A twenty-two variable multiple correlation study was carried out between a battery of tests, the Ohio State University Psychological Examination, the Kuder Vocational Interest Test, and MMPI, Group Rorschach, and the Faculty Rating Scale devised by McCarthy as criterion. A significant, positive, but moderate (.38) correlation was obtained between the test battery and the Faculty Rating Scale. There were no significant differences of mean scores between the extremes of the population (N = 206) on either the Kuder or Ohio State. On the MMPI, only the D scale and Mf scale showed significant differences. In both cases the higher mean score belonged to the best-adjusted group of seminarians. Although no predictive value could be attached to these findings, it was suggested that the best adjusted seminarian is one who tends to be serious-minded and conscientious, and who is possessed of social sensitivity. One other significant difference, at the .01 level, was obtained for the FC variable of the Group Rorschach, in favor of the well-adjusted group. This denotes the healthy, reasonable control over the affect-impulse life as an essential component of the well-adjusted person. Wauck concluded, that although the battery of tests could not be used as sole criterion of selection, it could serve in an adjuvant role to observer judgment, to clarify and increase certitude of that judgment. As will be seen, studies such as Wauck's and Bier's and those of other investigators were to provide the basis for later follow-up studies.
Murray (1957) e.g., provided basic data in 1957 when he utilized the MMPI, the Strong VIB and Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (G-ZTS) on 200 college students and 100 each of priests, major seminarians, and minor seminarians. The last three subgroups were divided equally between religious and diocesan personnel. Among the findings were that the clerical groups scored significantly higher in the (G-ZTS) Mf scale, the priests and major seminarians were "easily normal and more 'masculine' than even the college group" (Murray, 1959, p. 444.) Using the clerical scale of the Strong VIB, it was found that the seminarians and priests clearly scored higher than the college group. In regard to the MMPI, priests' scores were as favorably normal as the college group who themselves scored as a sound normal group. On many scales, the priests' scores and especially the major seminarians' were interpreted as being more favorable than the comparison group.

Murray's later follow-up study (Murray and Connolly, 1966) in this same population was to join another line of research emanating from Bier's original work on modification of the MMPI. Studies such as Mastej (1954), and Sandra (1957), with the modified MMPI showed that religious tended toward elevated scores, just as they did on the standard MMPI. The work of Fehr (1958) suggested that if groups were carefully matched, the tendency for religious to score in the direction of greater deviancy than lay groups, would be minimized. Fehr matched 45 seminarians with 45 lay students for age, citizenship, socioeconomic level, intelligence, word fluency, race, urban and rural back-
ground, bilingualism, unmarried status and religion. This tight control of variables resulted in both groups showing marked similarities on the Sentence Completion Test, Bier's modified MMPI, and Rorschach. The few significant differences found were in the direction of greater deviancy for the lay group.

Barry (1960) followed up the 798 candidates for the seminary who had been tested on Bier's modified MMPI over a ten-year period. He attempted to develop by item analysis of Bier's 342 items, a Seminary scale (Se) for the modified MMPI which might differentiate those likely to be successful in seminary life from those unlikely to be successful. Criterion groups were set up: 415 candidates who entered and persevered in the seminary, the "good" group; 159 candidates who were rejected for psychological reasons or who entered but later left for psychological reasons, the "poor" group. Eighty-one of the 342 items of Bier's inventory were eventually culled out by examination of the responses of the criterion groups who entered in the odd-numbered years from 1949 through 1957. Labelled the Seminary scale (Se), it was cross-validated on the criterion groups who applied in the even-numbered years from 1950 through 1958. The groups were differentiated at the .01 level of significance for each scoring. The split-half reliability of the scale was .80, corrected to .89 by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, comparing favorably with reliabilities reported for standard MMPI scales.

When norms for the scale were set up, none of the "good" group scored above the arbitrarily set critical scale of 36, 2 sigmas above the mean.
Twenty-eight of the "poor" group scored above this point. Along with the other indications, it was concluded that a highly reliable and valid instrument had been constructed to help differentiate between candidates who would be successful in seminary life, and those who would not.

Murray and Connolly (1966) in their follow-up study of Murray's (1957) original data, among other interests, sought to compare the discriminability of the modified MMPI for Murray's groups based on simple perseverance-nonperseverance criterion with Barry's (1960) study in which the seminary candidates were pre-selected and divided on the basis of personality variables into successful and unsuccessful seminarians. Also, they applied Barry's Re[sic] scale to the persevering-nonpersevering students of their own follow-up study, in order to evaluate its applicability.

One hundred and fifty-one of Murray's original 200 seminarians were ordained or had continued in the seminary at the time of the follow-up study. Forty-nine had dropped out, although reasons why were not available in their records. When the modified MMPI scores of these two groups were compared, none of the scores of either group surpassed the MMPI norms (T score of 70.) The Sc and Ma scales were significantly lower in favor of the non-perseverers. By contrast, Barry's (1960) successful-unsuccessful groups, who were used as the item analysis group, were significantly differentiated on 7 of the 9 scales. All 9 scale scores were higher and indicative of more deviancy for the unsuccessful group than for the successful seminarians. Murray and
Connolly concluded that the decisiveness of Barry's results in direction and number of significant differences on the modified MMPI were due to his division of individuals on the basis of personality variables rather than on the more vague persevere-nonpersevere criteria.

Applying Barry's Se scale to their data, Murray and Connolly found that both their persevering and non-persevering groups scored significantly higher than both of Barry's successful and unsuccessful groups. In fact both Murray and Connolly groups had less suitable scores than Barry's unsuccessful group. Again, it was felt that the vagueness of criteria plus a homogenizing tendency of a shared environment were responsible for the failure to differentiate the Murray and Connolly groups. Barry's groups were tested before entrance into the seminary. The overlap in scores for the persevering-nonpersevering groups of Murray and Connolly requires caution in applying the Se scale to similar groups.

Murtaugh (1965) did a follow-up study on Wauck's (1957) original data. One hundred and forty-six of Wauck's sample of 206 seminarians were ordained from 5 to 10 years when Murtaugh's study was carried out. Ninety of those ordained retested on the MMPI and Kuder. When correlational studies and tests for significance of mean differences were carried out, the MMPI was found to be unreliable as a predictor of performance. Although group changes were not significant, individual changes were numerous and significant for almost every scale, as attested by very low coefficients of correlation. The Kuder did
prove to be reliable. However, neither the MMPI nor the Kuder could successfully discriminate the 90 responding ordained seminarians from the 55 non-ordained seminarians. These tests further failed to discriminate the 90 responding from the 56 non-responding priests. Murtaugh concluded that the MMPI could not be used as a reliable prediction of future performance, and the Kuder could serve only an ancillary role in that it predicted conditional not causal factors related to vocational success.

Sweeney (1964) in analyzing MMPI and Kuder protocols accumulated over ten years of testing, chose admission to perpetual vows in a religious order, as criterion of success, for ordination was virtually assured at this point. Of 461 candidates, 333 dropped out and 126 persevered to perpetual profession. MMPI results showed that both groups, successful and unsuccessful, were well within the normal range of scores, and that group means were so similar as to suggest a single homogeneous population. Attempts to establish an effective cut-off score level to differentiate the groups were unsuccessful.

A study of Kuder scores for a random sampling of 40 successful and 77 unsuccessful candidates disclosed an even greater homogeneity for the entire group. The profile patterns of both groups were very similar. The only significant difference (.05 level) lay in the higher mean score for the successful group on the Computational interest scale. Sweeney concluded that the Kuder and MMPI are helpful only in a counseling situation and cannot be safely used for predictive purposes in selecting religious personnel.
The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) has been used infrequently in the testing of religious. Withrow (1960) investigated the relationship between personality variables and 2 theological orientations within Protestantism, namely, the liberal and conservative. He hypothesized that individuals who were of the conservative orientation would manifest a greater need than the liberals on the Abasement scale, and a lesser need on the Autonomy scale as measured by the EPPS. The subjects were 98 first-year male students from 4 theological seminaries. Fifty were identified as conservative, and 48 as liberals on the Gustafson Scale of Religious Beliefs. Overall, there were five significant differences between the groups, on the Edwards variables. The conservatives scored higher on Abasement, Order and Deference; the liberals scored higher on Heterosexuality and Intraception. A correlation seeking to determine the relationship of the Abasement and Autonomy variables to the conservative orientation was significant at the .01 level. Withrow concluded that these two theological orientations are basically different in mood and concept, and that there was a definite relationship between the statistical findings and the theological emphasis of each orientation.

Literature concerned with the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

Barron (1959) commenting on the literature dealing with studies on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (EPPS) felt that, at the time, the Edwards was not ready for use in counseling or personnel selection. Borislow's (1958) study had seemed to indicate that the test was easily fakable, and
that neither the consistency score nor the index of profile stability would discriminate the true from the false profile. Along with this deficit, Barron lamented the dearth of evidence for the validity of the EPPS. Radcliffe (1965) was also critical of the meagerness of validity data contained in the Edwards Manual (1959) even though it had been revised twice.

An increasing number of studies have been carried out with the Edwards over the years, however, and there is evidence that the test has at least some contribution to make to the field of personality testing. Thus, for example, seeming to negate for the most part Barron's (1959) strictures against the use of the EPPS for counseling and selection, is a study done by Suziedelis and Steimel (1963). These investigators gave the EPPS and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) to 198 college freshmen and sophomore males. They determined need hierarchies by ranking highest to lowest T scores. Next, they composed "high" and "low" groups based on, respectively, subjects having the corresponding needs ranked first and second, and fourteenth and fifteenth in their hierarchy. The "high" and "low" groups were then matched for A's and B's on 7 major occupational categories of the Strong VIB. After testing for significance by the binomial test, with these categories and each of the 15 EPPS needs, it was found that the obtained results gave support to their hypothesis, namely, that specific predominant needs are related to inventoried interests to a significant degree. More than this, these investigators felt that because the Strong VIB was empirically derived from persons successful
in their occupations, and therefore satisfied in their jobs, need hierarchies could be related to job satisfaction within given occupational areas. They do not mean to argue that a given need can be satisfied in one occupation only, but rather, all things being equal, a specific need may be more readily satisfied in a given occupational area. For this reason, they concluded that the EPPS may have a more direct application in counseling and personnel selection.

This study seems to give substance to earlier work by Walsh (1959) who had hypothesized that specific duties would be chosen which correspond to specific needs. He gave 24 job descriptions with 8 descriptive duties attached to each. Subjects were to mark these as appealing or unappealing. Relating the questionnaire to each subject's protocol, Walsh concluded that one's job serves as the primary outlet for one's needs. Where there is a strong need, the person will choose a job to match; a given job will be shaped to fit the need; finally, different elements of a given job will be responded to in relation to the need.

Dilworth (1958) investigated the hypothesis that, with regard to needs, the EPPS should elicit information comparable to that of the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT.) Five qualified clinical psychologists evaluated the protocols of 20 college males, for 10 story protocols, with regard to the 15 needs purportedly tapped by the EPPS. Scoring independently, they found no significant positive correlation between the relative strengths of the personality needs as evoked intra-individually by the Edwards and relative
strengths of the same needs, as reflected intra-individually by the TAT. Perhaps this failure to elicit comparable information may be due, as Melikian (1958) has suggested to the fact that the EPPS and the TAT measure needs at different levels.

Caputo and others (1965) carried out studies concerned with both the validity and the reliability of the EPPS. In November of 1962, the EPPS was administered to a group of 79 female freshman nursing students. Two groups were differentiated on the basis of EPPS scores, and then tested on three other behavioral and projective measures. It was predicted that this EPPS grouping would be reflected in the other measuring instruments as well, and that there would be high correlations between EPPS needs and corresponding scores on these instruments. In terms of group differentiation, the EPPS failed to show adequate validity. Only need Autonomy seemed to be a valid measure. Validity of the remainder of the scales was questioned in terms of their ability to discriminate groups.

It was the same group of student nurses who took part in the test-retest reliability study carried out by Caputo and his associates (1966.) Of the 79 original nursing students who took the test in November of 1962, 52 were still in training in March of 1964, and were retested on the Edwards. The test-retest correlations tended to be lower than those carried out over shorter time intervals (Horst and Wright, 1959, e.g.) but were significantly positive on all the individual EPPS need variables. In addition, stability of individ-
ual profile was indicated by the fact that 51 profile correlations were found to be significantly greater than zero at the .05 level; 48 of these attained significance at the .01 level. There was some evidence of random responding on the part of the 52nd subject's profile. It was concluded that the EPPS showed acceptable reliability over the long term, both for measurement for single scales over all subjects and for a single subject over all scales. Horst and Wright (1959) and Mann (1958) also found acceptable test-retest reliabilities, the former over a one-week interval (range .64 to .84), the latter over a three-week interval (range .55 to .85.)

Other studies concerned with validity of the EPPS such as those of Fisher and Morton (1957) and Endler (1961) had obtained similar results to Caputo's (1965.) For these investigators also, the EPPS had failed to show sensitivity to known differences between groups. Yet, Izard (1960) seems to have successfully differentiated engineering students from liberal arts students, and engineering students from successful engineers. Groups of overachievers and underachievers also show measurably different profiles (Gebhardt and Hoyt, 1958; Merrill and Murphy, 1959; Krug, 1959) in that overachievers have higher Achievement and Order needs and lower Affiliation needs than the underachievers. Demos and Spolyar (1961) in a later study, did not discriminate these two groups. These last two investigators, using the Cooperative School and College Ability Test and grade point average in appropriate combinations, found no significant differences in EPPS need Achievement scores.
between either achievers and underachievers, or between overachievers and nonachievers. Atkinson and Litwin (1960) and Izard (1962) did not find the Achievement scale to be correlated to other standard measures of need for achievement. Yet, Longenecker (1962), found EPPS need Achievement to correlate with ACE scores at the .001 level for 292 college sophomores chosen for ACE scores between 90 and 120. It may well be as Christie and Lindauer (1963) have pointed out, that the EPPS need Achievement scale has suffered from its own popularity, for as soon as one investigator reports a significant finding with it, another investigator, in replicating the study, reports a contradictory finding.

At this point, it is not out of place to consider some of the variables which have a more direct bearing in the population under consideration. A preview of the data shows a consistently and significantly high score for need Abasement for all seminary groups of this study, over the Edwards college male normative group. Rosenkrantz and O'Halloran (1965) considered the relationship of this need to adjustment in the light of Blatt's (1964) finding that, in the context of mental health, the low rank given Abasement by this group "represents the conceptualization that a desire for resignation and self punishment is least descriptive of optimal personality integration." Rosenkrantz and O'Halloran, working on a Catholic college campus, composed 3 groups: 97 students selected from the files of the counseling center; 57 students enrolled in the college honors program; and a random group of 111 students who
had been induced to take part in a study of personality and ethnicity. All 3 groups scored significantly higher than the Edwards college male normative group, but were not significantly differentiated from one another. Discovery that a comparable Catholic college population in the same geographical area did not score significantly higher than national norms, these investigators chose other groups (Irish and Italian) and controlling for class difference, CEEB scores, and numbers of generation in the United States, they found that culture significantly discriminated the groups on Abasement scores. They felt that the Abasement scale was validated, with culture controlled as an added variable.

Minge and Bowman (1967) choosing a different perspective, sought to find if there were personality differences between 3 groups of students: those who avoid counseling, yet are in need of it; those who freely seek counseling in difficulty; and vocational-educational students who seem to have difficulties which center around a fairly specific problem area. These investigators, using T scores, found 3 significant differences on the 15 subscales, those of Dominance, Order and Abasement. The vocational-educational group had a greater need for Order; both vocational-educational and personal counseling clients scored significantly higher on the Abasement scale, and significantly lower on the Dominance scale than the non-counseling group. This was interpreted to mean that there are personality differences in college students who do seek counseling, and those who do not. Those who seek counsel are less dominant
than their peers, and have more doubts about their self-worth (abasement.) Those who do not seek counseling, avoid a role of dependency, in seeking to maintain the need for dominance.

Appley and Moeller (1963) measured conforming behavior in an Asch situation by means of EPPS variables and 2 other personality measures. Only the Abasement scale showed a small but significant correlation with the conforming behavior of the 41 female subjects.

Izard (1962) in correlating freshman and senior scores found that Abasement changed significantly over a 4 year period. He interpreted this lessening, along with increase in other need variables such as Autonomy and Heterosexuality to be, in part, personality development in the direction of greater social and emotional maturity.

Intraception has been considered an important variable for the population studied in this investigation. Bernhardt (1960) sought to find the relationship between the EPPS variable Intracception and an academic grade for a psychiatry course. Intracception has reference to, among other things, the need to put one's self in another's place, to analyze motives and feelings, to observe others, etc. All of these are goals in the teaching of psychiatry, which seeks to develop understanding, sensitivity, and psychodynamic insight.

Freshman and sophomore grades in psychiatry courses at a large midwestern medical school were obtained. Mean score differences suggested that the medical students were much more "intracceptive" than the college normative group,
although age differential (medical group 22.5 years mean age) may have contributed to this. Correlations between test score on the Intrceptive subscale and psychiatric course revealed no correspondence between them. Freshman grades correlated -0.28, and at less than .02 level of confidence. Sophomore grades correlated 0.02, not significant at the .05 level. Bernhardt concluded that this disparity between freshman and sophomore results (-0.28 and 0.02) was due to the grading faculty's relative consideration of what was acceptable or unacceptable classroom performance for freshman and sophomore students in terms of "intrception." The failure in predictive validity of the Intrceptive subscale was attributed to the incomplete and unsystematic nature of the EPPS sampling of paired comparisons.

Carrier (1963) investigated the relationships between certain personality characteristics of students with tendencies to accept "fake" personality analyses of themselves. Eighty-seven male and 41 female Introductory Psychology students were given the EPPS and told that they would be given the results at a later point in the course. Several hypotheses were related to EPPS need variables, e.g., high introception subjects would be more gullible than low intraception subjects. Statistically reliable positive relationships were found between the gullibility measure, a "fake" personality analysis, and the Achievement, Deference and Intrception variables for the males. For the females, relationships between gullibility and the Intrception and Abasement variables were statistically significant. It was not suggested that gulli-
bility was a unitary trait, but that rather it was probably situation-evoked.

This brief review of the EPPS literature will, in closing, examine studies which have suggested the need for norms in regard to the use of the Edwards. Allen and Dallek (1957) carried out a normative study among undergraduate students at a southern university. Eighty-two males and 42 females comprised the sample whose scores were then compared with the Edwards normative college group. For the males, there were two significant differences between groups, the Edwards group scoring higher on need Abasement and lower on need Intraception. For the females, significant differences were found on 4 scales, the Edwards group scoring higher on need Affiliation and Abasement and lower on need Achievement and Heterosexuality. Although these six differences between groups are beyond chance expectations, Allen and Dallek felt that the absolute size of the statistically significant mean raw scores lessened the force of the obtained differences. Converting raw scores to T scores showed that all 32 variables were between 45 to 57, quite within Edwards "average" range. As a result, these investigators felt justified in concluding that their sample did not differ in terms of their manifest needs as expressed in the EPPS items. In their opinion, this data offered further normative data in support of Edwards original norms. This conclusion, however, does not imply that there is no difference in personality makeup of the two groups.
Koons and Birch (1964) seem to imply a difference of opinion with Allen and Dallek (1958) by citing this study in the context of need for local norms in the use of the Edwards. Koons and Birch (1964) administered the EPPS to 100 male and 200 female college students in a midwestern university. Raw score means for 15 variables for the sexes separately were tested for significance of difference with the Edwards sample. The males differed significantly for 8 of the 15 variables. The Koons-Birch group scored lower on Achievement, Deference, Autonomy, Intraception, Dominance, Heterosexuality and Aggression. They scored higher in Abasement. With the Koons-Birch female group, there were likewise 8 significant differences, as they scored lower on Achievement, Deference, Affiliation, Intraception, Dominance, Endurance, and Aggression. They scored higher on Abasement. Koons and Birch felt that their own sample closely matched Edwards' sample in every respect save geographical heterogeneity, and time of life. The Koons-Birch sample were "war babies," while the Edwards sample were pre-World War II children. Shifts in culture could perhaps account for the differences in groups. Koons and Birch felt that discretion was in order when applying EPPS norms for selection and counseling purposes. They suggested that cautious experimenters should develop local norms.

Bernin (1966) likewise found a number of differences between the Edwards normative college male group and a sample of 458 Japanese college males. The Japanese men scored lower in Achievement, Deference and Dominance; higher in Abasement, Endurance and Change.
Boose and Boose (1967) in studying 119 culturally disadvantaged college males and 187 college female freshmen found significant differences to exist between their sample of males and females, between their sample of males and the standardization college males, and between the sample females and the standardization group females.

The cumulative evidence of such findings is suggestive of the need for developing local norms for the population under consideration in this study.

Literature concerned with drop-out studies.

The word "drop-out" was coined somewhere in the course of trying to discriminate the successful from the unsuccessful candidates to, and in, religious life. One immediately sees that it is not a univocal concept, for to lump all those who leave religious life in one category necessarily overlooks a number of variables when it comes to relating cause and effect (Murray and Connolly, 1966.) Even the categories of successful and unsuccessful are likewise unsatisfactory; one wonders whether those who persist in religious life, but fall prey to emotional illness are successful. Could this not be another form of "dropping-out" as well?

Studies specifically concerned with the drop-out do not abound in the literature, particularly in the professional journals (Greene, 1967.) In terms of the tremendous cash outlay which goes to support minor seminaries, this may be a costly oversight. Patterson (1942) for example, estimated that the financial loss over a period of ten years to one seminary training
religious priests, was $476,000.00. His study showed that 88.3 percent of the students dropped out between the first year of high school and ordination. Verstynen (1948) made a similar study in 27 seminaries during the period from 1935 to 1939. His finding was that six out of every ten students who entered, eventually left.

Friedl (1952) chose interest tests over tests of ability or aptitude in the hopes of predicting vocational success. He tested 534 seminarians from 11 foreign mission seminaries, using the Strong Interest Blank for Men (Revised.) Subjects' scores were divided into Group A and B according to whether they persisted in the seminary for one year after testing or whether they did not persist during that period. Both groups were further subdivided into high and low groups on the basis of scores on the Interest Maturity scale. Results suggested that a predictive value for the Strong test may be found only for seminarians with mature interests. A Missionary Priest scale significantly discriminated the persisters from the non-persisters. A Diocesan Priest scale did not. Four scales of the Strong on which moderate relationships with success were found could not be used with accuracy as predictive criteria.

Maffia (1954) developed a Seminarian Interest Scale by measuring the interests of ordained priests, as representative of successful seminarians, and by measuring the interests of former seminarians as representative of the non-successful seminarian. Subjects, all of whom were chosen by random sampling, included 100 ordained Catholic priests, 108 former seminarians and 117
seminarians. The Scale was developed from 160 items from the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) which successfully differentiated 50 of the above priests and 50 of the former seminarians. It was cross-validated on the remainder of these two groups. Maffia felt, on the basis of his investigation, that the Scale had the power of differentiating between promising and non-promising candidates for the priesthood as represented by priests and former seminarians. Nonetheless, he counseled caution in the use of the Scale, in that various other factors such as personality traits, intelligence, social adjustment, and supernatural motivation also contribute to success in the seminary.

Darling (1958) attempted to find personality factors related to the persistence or non-persistence in the Evangelical ministry. The subjects were those who entered training in Evangelical colleges in 1952 and who persisted to graduation in 1956, or who indicated in the Fall of 1956 continuing plans to enter the ministry. His findings showed that a greater proportion of the persisting candidates (differentiated at the .01 level) experienced a "call" to the ministry. The persisters achieved significantly higher scores on the Thoughtfulness scale (.05 level) on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (G-ZTS.) The persisters also made higher scores on 7 other of the G-ZTS scales: General Activity, Restraint, Ascendance, Sociability, Emotional Stability, Objectivity, and Friendliness.
Kennedy (1958) did a longitudinal follow-up study of Freidl's (1952) group when criteria for success, ordination, had been established. Extending over a six year period, the study utilized scores for 48 ordained priests and 33 drop-outs who were tested on the SVIB, the Kuder, the MMPI, the Thurstone Temperament Schedule, the California Test of Mental Maturity, and faculty ratings. There were no significant differences found between the groups on any of the objective tests. On the faculty ratings, seven areas of significant differences were found. Kenney (1959) sought to find whether successful foreign mission seminarians could be differentiated and predicted by their patterns of occupational interests, and whether the successful were more homogeneous in their interests than the unsuccessful. He carefully matched 125 of each group on age, education, years in seminary, and verbal factor on an intelligence test. In analyzing the results of SVIB and Kuder, he found the differences to be in the indicated direction. The successful group were more homogeneous and were differentiated from the unsuccessful group. The successful group were characterized by high scores on Social Service and Technical interests. However, differences between the groups in regard to patterns of interest lay more in intensity than in kinds of interest. For that reason, differentiation could not be used to predict success or lack of it in the individual case.

Morse (1962) investigated the use of the SVIB and the MMPI among men who persisted to their goal as Presbyterian ministers. The sample consisted of 701
white Presbyterian ministers born between the years 1930-1934, and who had made a written declaration of interest in the ministry. These were tested on the SVIB and MMPI during the period between 1950-1954. Some 503 men persisted; 198 did not. Among Morse's conclusions were that the SVIB and MMPI do not discriminate persisters from non-persisters among men who indicate interest in the ministry. However, the persisters differ from general male groups of comparable backgrounds on both the SVIB and MMPI. He also concluded that predictive efficiency is a function of the situation in which it is employed: guidance, admission, or scholarship prediction.

Weisgerber (1966) in attempting to discriminate potential drop-outs from a religious order, by means of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, found this test to be of no use. Surprisingly, even low scores on the Religious value scale of the test were not discriminatory when contrasted with scores of the non-religious control group, for Weisgerber's data show that 33 percent of this group scored higher than a score of 45. By contrast, of 8 novices who scored below 45, only 3 dropped out.

Maehr and Stake (1962) found the Study of Values a little more useful for their study than did Weisgerber for his. They made a study of value patterns of the men who voluntarily quit the training program of a Missouri Synod Lutheran Seminary. When value profiles of 100 randomly selected persisters and 71 voluntary non-persisters were subjected to a discriminant analysis, the value profile of the persisting group was found to be significantly different
from the non-persisting group. The major contribution to the difference resided in the Aesthetic value, although the Economic value made a large but statistically nonsignificant contribution as well. Again the Religious value failed to discriminate the groups. These investigators concluded that although the Scale of Values should not be the primary instrument in a ministerial selection program, it did demonstrate that persons who will succeed in becoming ministers are measurably different from others in terms of their avowed personal values, and that these differences are identifiable before seminary training. They made no statement, however, concerning the predictive potential of the Scale of Values in regard to selection of candidates to the Lutheran ministry.

Greene (1967) in a more clinical type of study of 4 drop-out and 2 persisters found that careful psychological testing plus a psychiatric interview would definitely weed out the unsuccessful candidates. His main impression of the 4 drop-outs was that there was a significant inability to repress or sublimate the sexual drive and that this inability was instrumental in the decision to leave. He felt that corroborating evidence was contained in the statements of three of the four that their desire to marry was an important factor in that decision. Necessarily, no definitive conclusions can come from so small a sample of students, but it suggests that another variable may be related to the factor of perseverance in the religious life: that of celibacy.
Turning now to some studies which concern the use of the EPPS and drop-out groups, one finds again that the Edwards has not been frequently used in this type of study. Knott (1964) attempted to discover factors motivating women to enter the Master of Religious Education program, and then to relate these factors to perseverance or non-perseverance as well as in subsequent professional practice. Thirty-one women at Boston University School of Theology who enrolled from September, 1959, through September, 1962, were the subjects. In the two standardized tests used, the Theological School Inventory (TSI) and the EPPS, no strong pattern of correlation was found to exist between their variables. Knott felt that a motivational pattern was found with these tests viewed separately. He noted that, on the EPPS, mean scores were significantly higher than for the Edwards college women normative group on Deference, Intraception and Endurance. The Edwards college women scored significantly higher on Achievement, Exhibition, Autonomy, Succorance, Heterosexuality and Aggression. The lower score on Heterosexuality for Knott's group was regarded as a factor related to perseverance in vocation. Factors related to the same, as reflected in the TSI, were higher scores than the non-perseverers on Acceptance by Others, Witness, and Order.

Nisi (1962) determined to investigate the seemingly generally accepted notion that ministerial students, as a group, would have high dependency needs. He chose a random sample of 50 out of 300 Bachelor of Divinity theology students. He was able to statistically isolate 2 groups: those certain of a
parish or special ministry and an uncertain group. With the Autonomy and De-
ference scales of the EPPS considered as reflecting measures of dependency,
he found that these students did not differ significantly from the college
male normative population. However, intergroup comparisons did show a cor-
relation between dependency and uncertainty of vocational plans.

Rakowski (1965) carried out a study with the EPPS on a part of the same
junior college minor seminary population with which this study is concerned.
His study was restricted to the first three classes only, and he did not dif-
ferentiate his drop-out group when comparing the seminarian scores with the
Edwards college male normative group. He did, however, distinguish a drop-out
group for purposes of comparison with the nondrop-out group, but he made no
distinction between voluntary and involuntary drop-outs.

In contrasting his seminarian population with the Edwards college male
normative group, he found seminarians to score significantly higher on Nur-
turance, Affiliation, Succorance, Abasement, Aggression and Achievement. They
scored significantly lower on Autonomy, Intraception, Dominance and Hetero-
sexuality.

In comparing seminarians with ex-seminarians, he found the ex-seminar-
ians to score significantly higher for needs Heterosexuality and Change. The
seminarians scored significantly higher on Intraception, Affiliation and
Nurturance. A third comparison was made between the nondrop-out and a group
of seminarians identified in earlier studies by Gorman (1961) and McDonagh
(1961) as a "high" group on MMPI scores (mean score 57.3 and above.) This high group, on the EPPS, scored significantly higher in Succorance and significantly lower on Endurance than the remainder of the undifferentiated seminarians. When the three classes, A, B, and C were compared with one another, minor evidence of "class personality" emerged.

The final study to be reported in this section was carried out by McCloskey (1967) and concerned the freshman and sophomore class at this same junior college minor seminary. McCloskey sought to find the contributions made by faculty ratings in an assessment program, when used in conjunction with standardized tests such as the EPPS. With regard to this instrument, seminarians who persisted and were better vocationally adjusted when rated by the faculty, were expected to score higher on the Intraception scale and lower on the Exhibition, Aggression and Heterosexual scales. None of these hypotheses was verified, however. Even with a forced choice of ten best and ten worst vocationally adjusted, as judged by the faculty, no significant differences were discovered on these same four variables. Neither individual nor averaged perseverance ratings of the faculty members for the freshman class correlated significantly with any of the same four variables. With the sophomore faculty members, only the averaged perseverance ratings were significantly correlated with just one variable, that of Exhibition (-.31.)

According to McCloskey, this almost total failure to discriminate by means of the EPPS variables was due to the inadequacy of the rating procedure
itself. The lack of standardization for the rating scale, as well as lack of training of raters could not be expected to correlate significantly with the more specific scales of the standardized instrument, the EPPS.
In 1951, Allen L. Edwards had become interested more by accident than design in the problem of social desirability as a test taking response set (Edwards, 1957.) At the time, he had been intending to investigate the interrelationship between various measures of attitudes and personality traits. He found himself dissatisfied with the then existing inventories which purported to measure "abnormal" traits. There were few which claimed to measure the "normal" personality variables which Edwards felt to be relevant for his research at the time. As a result he determined to develop the needed inventory.

In Edward's view (1964) socialization is that process by which a child learns to know, but not necessarily follow, the norms of desirable and undesirable behavior which a society sets up for its members. This process is considered relatively complete by adolescence, if not earlier. Values are thus associated with every belief, every feeling, every act of behavior. However, this does not rule out neutral acts which are considered neither desirable nor undesirable. A continuum is thus envisaged which ranges from the
highly socially desirable through the zone of neutrality to the highly socially undesirable. This is known as the social desirability continuum. If then, statements which attempt to assess a given motive or some other variable, are given to a group of judges to be rated on a 9 point scale which embraces the social desirability (sd) continuum, it would be found that some statements would be judged, on the average, as highly desirable. Others would be judged undesirable, and some judged to be between the extremes. The average rating would be known as the sd scale value of the statement.

That there is a relationship that exists between the sd scale value of an item (as referred to oneself) and the probability of endorsement was made clear in a study done by Edwards (1953.) He had a group of 152 student judges rate 140 personality statements for their sd value by the method of successive intervals. Later, these same statements, in inventory form, were given to 140 different students. Product moment correlation between the two variables, i.e., probability of endorsement and sd value was .87 for the 140 statements. Wright (1957) likewise gave these 140 statements to 127 male and female college student judges. Correlation of the sd scale value with the mean rating of student self description for these 140 statements was .88. Løvaas (1958) furnished support for the argument that sd scale values of judgments of different groups tend to be highly correlated. He found that scale values of judgments of Norwegian students correlated .78 with those of American students.
Edwards concluded, that by pairing statements which represented differing personality traits, and at the same time matching them for equal, or nearly equal value, he would force the respondent to reply to the content of the statement rather than the sd value. The resulting inventory was in Edwards' words, "designed primarily as an instrument for research and counseling purposes to provide quick and convenient measures of a number of relatively independent normal personality variables." (1959, p. 5) It sought to measure 15 personality variables taken from a list of manifest needs derived from the work of Henry A. Murray and others (1958.)

The variables were listed as follows:

1. Achievement (ach)
2. Deference (def)
3. Order (ord)
4. Exhibition (exh)
5. Autonomy (aut)
6. Affiliation (aff)
7. Intraception (int)
8. Succorance (suc)
9. Dominance (dom)
10. Abasement (aba)
11. Nurturance (nur)
12. Change (chg)
13. Endurance (end)
14. Heterosexuality (het)
15. Aggression (agg)

Items from each of the 15 scales are paired twice with items of the other 14. The total of 225 is derived from these 210 pairings plus 15 paired items which are repeated in order to obtain a consistency estimate from each subject.
Even in the 1959 revised Manual, Edwards avoids any statement beyond a simple description of the variables. Typical descriptions are as follows:

**suc** Succorance: To have others provide help when in trouble, to seek encouragement from others, to have others be friendly, to have others be sympathetic, etc.

**end** Endurance: To keep at a job until it is finished, to complete any job undertaken, to work hard at a task, to keep at a puzzle or problem until it is solved, etc.

**het** Heterosexuality: To go out with members of the opposite sex, to engage in social activities with the opposite sex, to be in love with someone of the opposite sex, to kiss one of the opposite sex, etc.

Though these descriptions are based on statements in the EPPS, they do not follow the wording of the statements exactly.

Edwards' assumption that a forced-choice format of pairings of statements regarded as relatively equal in sd scale values, would indeed minimize sd as a variable, has been challenged by other investigators. Corah and others (1958) selected the item pairs used by Edwards, to compare the variables Achievement, Order, Succorance, Abasement, Heterosexuality and Aggression as a check on whether items paired were equated for the same sd value as these items would be rated singly for sd value. Their 30-item paired, short form, of the Edwards was given to 50 male and 31 female Introductory Psychology students. These were asked to choose the statement in each pair which they would consider to be the more socially desirable, i.e., if it would "make another person look better to other people if it were said of him." It was hypothesized that if sd does not materially influence choices, and a
group of subjects are then forced to choose the member of a pair which they believe to be more socially desirable, they will choose each member with equal frequency \( (p = .50.) \)

Using the binomial expansion as a basis for testing this, the hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level for 20 item pairs; for 17 item pairs at the .01 level. For these subjects, choice of Achievement over Succorance, Achievement over Heterosexuality, Order over Aggression, Abasement over Heterosexuality was always judged to be more socially desirable. No overall trend was statistically discernible with regard to systematic position preference for either A or B members of the statements. Corah and his associates admitted that results could have been due to a biased sample of item statements, non-representative student sample, or that the items on the EPPS are not equated for sd. They suggested that paired items have a tendency to acquire contextual meaning, thus altering the judgment of sd values when judged out of that context. They felt revision in pairing and additional judgments of item pairs are necessary before concluding that sd is eliminated as a variable in the EPPS.

Kelleher (1958), however, concluded that sd played only an insignificant role in item responses for the Edwards variables. He gave the Edwards PPS plus the Social Desirability Scale, also originated by Edwards to 101 each of male and female Introductory Psychology students. He then computed point biserial correlations separately for each sex between the Social Desirability Scale and the choice of A or B for each of the 210 different item pairs. Only
48 item pairs were isolated in which the judged sd rating of the items were great. However, this group of 48 did not show proportionally high plus correlations, which would be necessary if sd were a factor in item choice. Kelleher concluded that sd is a negligible factor in the EPPS.

Radcliffe (1965) suggested that idiosyncratic conceptions of desirability may be a factor in the Edwards. Scott (1963) had called attention to this possibility as a result of his own investigations on the conceptions of the desirable. Working with a random sample of 218 students at the University of Colorado in 1958, he used 12 scales of personal values to assess whether these students admired 60 different attributes in other people. In the same questionnaire, there were some relatively objective self report items which assessed behavior relevant to each of the values. Finally, there were 12, 9 point rating scales on which each student indicated how he stood in relation to others he knew, on the traits relevant to the values. Scott found correlation between the personal values, self-ratings and reported behaviors to be significantly different from zero, suggesting some tendency toward congruence among the three psychological process of behavior, self concepts, and conceptions of the desirable. He concluded that within a definable social group, such as a college, people differ in their notion of the desirable and that evaluations tend to reflect a person's own traits.

Such a conclusion, along with other findings, suggested to Scott (1963) that, after all, Edwards had not truly controlled for sd by the forced-choice
format he had employed. In other words, Edwards interpreted high correlations between sd scale value items rated by one group and the same items checked by another group in terms of self description, as reflecting the effect of sd on self description. According to Scott, the converse could just as easily be true: self description affects rather than reflects judgment of trait desirability.

Acting on this consideration that sd is not a characteristic of an item but a result of subject-item interaction, he carried out a study designed to show, that if sd is a characteristic of a test item, judges should agree on this stimulus property to a greater extent than they agree on how closely the item describes themselves. First, Scott assessed variabilities of sd of student judgments on 30 statements from the EPPS, following the same instructions given by Edwards in his original work (cf. Edwards, 1957, p. 4.) Comparing the actual variabilities with the expected binomial variances, Scott found that in 26 out of 30 comparisons, sd judgments were more variable than could be expected if the judgments only reflected random error around a true stimulus location.

Next Scott administered the same 30 items under conditions of self-rating and was statistically able to conclude that sd judgments were not less variable than self-ratings on the same items.

Finally, in correlating sd ratings with self-ratings on the same 30 items he found correlations ranging from .28 to .77 with a mean of .53. He
concluded then, that sd was not a characteristic of the test item but de-
pend on the relationship between subject and item. The question, then, of
whether or not social desirability is controlled in the Edwards is not clearly
answered one way or the other. The cautious tester must bear this in mind in
interpreting the results.

A related factor which has concerned investigators has to do with the
meaning of the scores obtained from the various scales. Cattell (1944) had
called attention to measures whose scores reflected only the relative strengths
within a given individual. These he designated as ipsative measures. Other
measures, whose scores reflected the strength of traits for a given individual
relative to other individuals, he designated as normative. Since the Edwards
derives normative statements from ipsative measures, investigators have ques-
tioned their degree of equivalence. Stoltz (1958) had called for caution in
the use of correlational ipsative scores. Guilford (1954) felt that individual
differences in ipsative measurements had little meaning, as there was no single
scale for all individuals.

Block (1957) found a high degree of equivalence between these measures.
Kogan and Fordyce (1962) in comparing the relationships between 3 ipsative Q
sort forms, and a normative check list concluded that the obtained correla-
tions argued for practical equivalence of the two types of measures.

Heilbrun (1963) evaluated two types of ipsative scales and also con-
sidered the relative validities of ipsative and normative scales in a study of
197 undergraduates. He used both a normative and ipsative measure of two personality traits, need Nurturance and need Achievement. The one measure was from the need scales of Gough and Heilbrun; the other was from a forced choice measure of an adjective check list with the request for the subject to choose the more characteristic item in each pair, omitting none. This procedure, plus the scoring method adopted, resulted in scores corresponding to the identity of average raw scores on the ipsative EPPS across the 15 variables measured.

A third scale, an ipsative Q sort deck of identical test items and scale scores as the two other measures, was given to the same 197 subjects under similar conditions as for the other two tests. Thus the form of item presentation was the only important scale difference for the three tests. Criterion of achievement was level of academic performance as measured by cumulative grade point average, intellectual ability being held constant. Criteria of Nurturance were related to suitable unselfish charitable, medical and educational activities over a particular time interval. Heilbrun felt that his obtained interest correlations which were positive, of moderate magnitude and highly significant, supported the notion that ipsative and normative personality measures were functionally interchangeable in making comparisons between individuals. However, he admitted that it may be important to stipulate the nature of the ipsative scale used (e.g., forced-choice, or Q sort.) According to Heilbrun, more decisive evidence of this functional interchangeability of
ipsative and normative measures was that the forced-choice ipsative scale did correlate significantly with college ability, intellectual ability being held constant. Therefore the self-appraisal strength of achievement motivation relative to need Nuturance within the individual was related to the actual achievement of that individual relative to other individuals.

Radcliffe (1965) however was of the opinion that Heilbrun's correlations were not quite high enough to justify his conclusions. Until more decisive evidence is collected, the careful tester must use caution in interpreting the results of the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule.

The subjects for this present study were composed of two major groups, the seminary group and the non-seminary group. The seminary group was composed of six classes (classes A to F) who had been tested on the EPPS in the second semester of the school year, over a time period between 1962 and 1966. The first two classes were tested together when one class was in the 5th or college-freshman equivalent year. Both these classes came as one group to the junior college minor seminary in 1962, to form the first freshman and sophomore class of that institution. The remainder, or last 4 classes, were all tested at this junior college minor seminary, and in the second semester of their freshman year.

For purposes of analyzing the seminary group data, the test results were broken down into 3 categories: (1) the nondrop-out group (NDO) who consisted of all those who entered and successfully passed on to the major seminary
located in the same diocese; (2) the voluntary drop-out group (DOV) consisting of all those seminarians who chose to leave of their own accord at some point, after testing, of their minor seminary stay; (3) the voluntary drop-out group (DOI) who were asked to leave or were counseled out of the minor seminary for reasons of emotional difficulty, poor adjustment, or for academic disciplinary reasons. All of these seminarians were tested by qualified psychologists and under standard testing conditions as outlined for the EPPS (cf. Manual, 1959.)

The non-seminary group was composed of 297 second-semester Catholic college students enrolled at a large midwestern university in the 1965-1966 school year. They were part of another study (Arens, 1967) being conducted at the time. Of the 297 EPPS protocols, 27 were rejected as belonging to former or current seminarians, and thus contaminating the data. Thus, 270 students served as the non-seminary group. They were tested by a psychologist registered in the State of Illinois. They were tested under standard conditions, over a period of three months, either in a classroom situation, or in a small group setting. In effect then, this group was comparable to the seminary group at the time of testing in age, education and background.

The results were tabulated and processed at the Loyola University of Chicago Data Processing Center. Means, standard deviations, variances, and T tests for significance of difference between the means for large groups, were calculated. In addition a frequency distribution for each of the variables of the nondrop-out group was compiled. Results will be considered in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF RESULTS

The description of results will be fruitful if two concepts are kept in mind: a group can be viewed from the perspective of its absolute hierarchy of needs, that is, its ranking of needs; a group can be viewed from the perspective of its relative intensity of needs, that is, in comparison with others. An inspection of Table 1 shows that the nondrop-out group (NDO), absolutely considered, is characterized by strong needs to be helpful and to relate to others, to be friendly and generous. They want to succeed, and to be known and respected as leaders. Along with this, they show a healthy need to empathize with, and to appreciate the thoughts, motives, and feelings of others. Allied to this, may be an overreadiness to yield to others, a tendency to self doubt and self blaming, perhaps best described as a sensitivity to wrong doing. Again, absolutely speaking, needs for independence, for activities regarding the opposite sex, for keeping order in their affairs, and for being conventual are of lesser importance. Relative to other groups, however, these lesser intensities are distinguishing characteristics.
A comparison of the nondrop-out group with the voluntary drop-out group in terms of significant differences and with ranking of choice according to the mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nurturance</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Nurturance</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Change</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achievement</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Dominance</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intraception</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>5. Achievement</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Exhibition</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>8. Intraception</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Succorance</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>10. Aggression</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a relative comparison, there are 8 significant differences between the NDO group and the voluntary drop-out group (DOV.) Table 1 shows that DOV have significantly higher Change, Exhibition, Heterosexuality and Autonomy scores; significantly lower Abasement, Endurance, Deference and Order scores. The DOV share 4 of the first 5 needs in their hierarchy with the NDO group: Nurturance, Affiliation, Dominance and Achievement. They are relatively kindred spirits on these variables, the need for Change distinguishing
significantly the DOV group in this first five hierarchy, and the Intraception need taking higher ranking for the NDO group. For both groups, Deference and Order share the last two places, but significantly differentiate one group from another, the NDO having the higher means. Comparatively speaking then, the DOV group are much more extraverted, with their needs for new experience, to be the center of attention, to freely come and go while avoiding responsibility, and at the same time to be freer in their expression of, and desire for their sex life. By contrast, the more steady, enduring NDO group are more inhibited in their sex life, and perhaps tormented more by feelings of self doubt and inferiority. They also appear more compulsively orderly, and more worried about their superiors' opinions about them, perhaps awaiting their lead before beginning tasks.

Inspection of Table 2 shows that there is only one significant difference between the NDO and the involuntary drop-out group (DOI), and this in a far stronger Heterosexuality need for the DOI group. For them it takes sixth place; for the NDO group, it takes thirteenth place. As with the DOV group, so too does the NDO group share 4 of the first 5 needs: Nurturance, Affiliation, Dominance, and Achievement, with the need for Change taking a higher place for the DOI, and the Intraception need having the higher place for the NDO. Both groups estimate alike in regard to needs for Deference, Order and Autonomy in that they are ranked among the last five, though ranked slightly different from one another.
TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF THE NONDROP-OUT GROUP WITH THE INVOLUNTARY DROP-OUT GROUP IN TERMS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AND WITH RANKING OF CHOICE ACCORDING TO THE MEAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nurturance</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Nurturance</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dominance</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3. Achievement</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Achievement</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Change</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intraception</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>5. Dominance</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Abasement</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Heterosexuality</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Succorance</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Intraception</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the DOV and the DOI groups (Table 3), only one significant difference is found between them, that of a greater need for order on the part of the DOI. Otherwise they are remarkably similar in sharing the same first five needs and the last four. They seem to differ most in ranking of Autonomy (higher for DOV, lower for DOI) and Abasement (higher for DOI, lower for DOV.)

Such comparisons bring to light interesting phenomena: the NDO group is quite clearly differentiated from the DOV group, but not so from the DOI group;
TABLE 3

A COMPARISON OF THE VOLUNTARY DROP-OUT GROUP WITH THE INVOLUNTARY DROP-OUT GROUP IN TERMS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AND WITH RANKING OF CHOICE ACCORDING TO THE MEAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nurturance</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Nurturance</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Achievement</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dominance</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Change</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Achievement</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Dominance</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Aggression</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Intraception</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

at the same time, the DOI group is hardly distinguishable from the DOV group.

Discussion

It was hypothesized that the seminary NDO group would be distinctive from both seminary drop-out groups (DOV, DOI) in terms of mean score group profiles. Only one hypothesis was borne out, and it is not immediately clear why the DOI group is not distinctive from either the NDO or the DOV group. As a general
observation, it should be noted that all 3 groups rank Nurturance and Affiliation as one, two, respectively, in their hierarchy of needs. In this, all three groups are significantly differentiated from the other two non-seminary groups, the Edwards college male normative group (ECM), and the local college male sample (LCM) except for Affiliation between the DOI and the ECM. Both DOI and DOV share the same first 5 needs, Nurturance, Affiliation, Dominance, Achievement and Change, with minor differences in ranking; NDO shares 4 of these needs with them. It should be noted that of these first 5 needs, Change is characteristic of both DOI and DOV; it significantly differentiates DOV from NDO, while DOI ranks it fourth and NDO ranks it seventh. The last 5 places are likewise similar with regard to needs for Endurance, Deference, Order and Autonomy for all 3 groups, again with minor differences in ranking. At this point, it should be noted that the variable Succorance is characteristic of the DOV and DOI groups in the lower ranks, while Heterosexuality is the distinctive characteristic for the NDO group. It significantly differentiates both the DOI group and the DOV group from the NDO group. DOI ranks it sixth, DOV ranks it seventh, whereas NDO ranks it thirteenth. Such similarity of rankings, plus differentiation from each other and from other groups suggests the following interpretation: Seminarians belong to a population whose predominant needs are for nurturance and affiliation. Each of the three, NDO, DOV and DOI, is essentially a normal group, for all of their group mean scores fitted into the Edwards T scores for the college male normative group,
fall within the average range of 41 - 59 (cf. Allen and Dallek, 1957.) The one exception is the T score for Heterosexuality for the NDO group. Reasons for this score will be discussed at a later point.

Schaffer (1953) has proposed that the satisfaction of an individual's strongest 2 or 3 needs will determine to a significant extent the overall satisfaction on any job. If Schaffer's view could be more broadly conceived, it might be stated thusly: the satisfaction of an individual's strongest 2 or 3 needs will determine to a significant extent the overall satisfaction in life orientation or vocation. If such were true, individuals such as those who make up the seminary population are therefore attracted to the religious life which provides opportunities for the exercise of strong nurturant and affiliative needs. At the same time there is a necessity to inhibit another fundamental need, that of heterosexuality. This may be one of the strongest determining factors for the voluntary drop-out (DOV) in that he has significantly greater need (.001 level) for its expression. The other significantly greater needs for change, exhibition and autonomy are difficult to satisfy in institutional living (such as that of a minor seminary) and thus the DOV, seemingly stronger-minded (the NDO has a significantly greater need for Deference at the .001 level, and Abasement at the .02 level) elects to leave the seminary. The NDO is apparently more satisfied in the more routine-like institutional setting (significantly different from DOV on need Order at the .001 level, and need Endurance at the .01 level) and so he tends to persist longer
in his vocation to the religious life. The pivotal factor on whether to go on
to final vows or ordination could well rest on a specifically religious motiva-
tion.

The foregoing discussion suggests that seminary authorities need not
worry about the voluntary drop-out; he will take care of himself adequately.
The involuntary drop-out (DOI) remains somewhat of an enigma, for he is dis-
tinguished significantly from the voluntary drop-out (DOV) by only one vari-
able, that of Order, and from the nondrop-out (NDO) in that of need Hetero-
sexuality. How then to single him out in a seminary population?

Because of the important need to identify such young men, even slight
clues must be utilized. With due caution then, it is suggested that hier-
archical ranking of needs may be one of the indicating factors. In terms of
ranking need Change and need Heterosexuality, the DOI profile looks more like
the DOV than the NDO profile. The need for Dominance differentiates NDO from
DOI at the .06 level. Approaching significance at the .11 is need Intracpection
in favor of the NDO, and Autonomy at .12, likewise in favor of the NDO. If
these impressions can be relied on, the picture of the DOI will appear as fol-
lows: he will be more restless than the NDO in his desire for change, more
than likely more passive than the NDO, who is relatively more autonomous and
apt to exercise leadership. The DOI will perhaps be somewhat more obtuse in
his failure to adequately understand another person's viewpoint, or feelings.
Finally because of strong heterosexual needs, he may be grappling with prob-
lems of a sexual nature, because of his inability either to sublimate his sexual desires as the NDO, or to give them more open expression as the DOV seems to do.

If this is not a totally inaccurate picture, then seminary authorities should be more alert to this passive type of young man who does not choose consciously either to stay or to go, possibly lacking the ego-strength to do either, at least at this stage in his life. It would seem that if there is a doubt about such a young man, it should be resolved in favor of the seminary; better to be unhappy or inadequate as a layman than as a priest or religious, as the consequences for others are greater.

Turning now to the separate seminary groups (NDO, DOV, DOI) as contrasted with the non-seminary (LCM) group, an inspection of the data makes it quite clear that they are distinct from one another. (Cf. Table 4.) Six significant differences are common to all 3 seminary groups and to the non-seminary group (LCM.) These are higher scores on Nurturance, Affiliation and Succorrence for the seminary group; higher scores on Heterosexuality, Autonomy and Intracception for the non-seminary group. Even more, the DOI and NDO share a seventh significant differentiation from the non-seminary (LCM), that of higher Deference scores. It is true, that of these common differences, not all are at the same level of differentiation. Of 18, 12 are at the .001 level, 4 at the .01 level and 2 at the .02 level. Yet, the consistency of these differences is convincing evidence that seminarians differ sharply from non-seminarians.
TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES AND T SCORES FOR THE SEMINARY GROUPS (NDO, DOV, DOI) AND THE NON-SEMINARY GROUP (LCM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>LCM</th>
<th>NDO</th>
<th>DOV</th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Significant Difference Between Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement</td>
<td>15.70 (50)</td>
<td>15.48 (49)</td>
<td>15.40 (49)</td>
<td>15.31 (49)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deference</td>
<td>10.25 (48)</td>
<td>11.71 (51)</td>
<td>10.76 (49)</td>
<td>11.59 (51)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Order</td>
<td>8.61 (46)</td>
<td>9.68 (48)</td>
<td>8.64 (46)</td>
<td>9.82 (49)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exhibition</td>
<td>15.47 (53)</td>
<td>14.29 (50)</td>
<td>14.92 (52)</td>
<td>14.71 (51)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Autonomy</td>
<td>15.83 (53)</td>
<td>12.56 (46)</td>
<td>14.12 (49)</td>
<td>13.43 (48)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affiliation</td>
<td>14.41 (49)</td>
<td>16.63 (54)</td>
<td>16.19 (53)</td>
<td>16.06 (52)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intercpecton</td>
<td>15.70 (49)</td>
<td>14.72 (47)</td>
<td>14.37 (47)</td>
<td>13.75 (46)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Succorance</td>
<td>11.45 (52)</td>
<td>13.36 (56)</td>
<td>13.07 (55)</td>
<td>13.32 (56)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dominance</td>
<td>15.52 (46)</td>
<td>16.03 (47)</td>
<td>15.57 (46)</td>
<td>14.79 (56)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Abasement</td>
<td>13.66 (53)</td>
<td>14.71 (55)</td>
<td>13.85 (54)</td>
<td>14.57 (55)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nurturance</td>
<td>14.63 (51)</td>
<td>17.25 (57)</td>
<td>16.65 (55)</td>
<td>16.52 (55)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Change</td>
<td>15.19 (49)</td>
<td>14.65 (48)</td>
<td>15.61 (50)</td>
<td>15.00 (49)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Endurance</td>
<td>11.81 (49)</td>
<td>12.78 (51)</td>
<td>11.69 (48)</td>
<td>11.99 (49)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Heterosexuality</td>
<td>16.72 (48)</td>
<td>11.97 (40)</td>
<td>14.58 (44)</td>
<td>14.75 (45)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Aggression</td>
<td>15.10 (55)</td>
<td>13.42 (51)</td>
<td>13.88 (53)</td>
<td>14.12 (53)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N =</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 3 groups of the seminary population stand out in their needs to be helpful and friendly to others; apparently, too, they look to others for help and want them to be understanding and sympathetic to their needs. In further distinction, two of the seminary groups, NDO and DOI, are more deferring to others, tending to avoid the unconventional (cf. Table 4.) The NDO groups appear to be more compulsively orderly and tending toward inferiority and guilt feelings (cf. Table 4), beyond even that of the DOI and DOV groups. The non-seminary group (LCM) contrasted to the NDO (cf. Table 4) are more open in their expression of aggression, more apt to tell people off. At the same time, they appear to want to know the other person's views, being more analytical of motives. They don't mind being the center of attention, either, in contrast perhaps to the quieter persisting NDO seminarian, who has strong needs for endurance. The LCM are more aggressive than the DOV group, but not the DOI group. Considered in their own right, LCM like to be independent and unconventional, and seem characteristically more understanding than the seminary groups. Finally, their sexual and social life are of prime concern to them.

In summary, the LCM seem more open, fun-loving, independent, socially conscious, and heterosexually oriented. By contrast, the seminarian of whatever stripe, NDO, DOV or DOI, seems to be oriented toward forming friendships which allow him to help and be generous to others, while at the same time he expects the same in return, especially in time of need. The NDO seminarian, further defined, is less aggressive, more deferent and dependent, likes things
to be orderly, will not give up easily, and perhaps tends toward a greater moral sensitivity. This same picture, minus the need for endurance, orderliness, and self-blaming tendency will characterize the DOI in comparison with LCM, save that they have equal needs for aggression. The DOV has the same needs as his fellow seminarians, but is less deferent when it comes to accepting other's suggestions; he is not as aggressive as his non-seminarian counterpart, however.

At this point it may be noted that 4 of the hypotheses were borne out by the results:

(1) The seminary normative drop-out group gives evidence of a distinctive profile of needs from that of the non-seminary group.

(2) The seminary group did have significantly higher scores on the variables Nurturance and Affiliation, needs which seem to be related to vocational effectiveness.

(3) The non-seminary population show evidence for greater social and heterosexual maturity as reflected in the significantly higher mean scores on these variables.

(4) The last hypothesis was only partially borne. The normative or NDO group shows a distinctive profile from that of the DOV group; not so in contrast to the DOI group. Also, the DOV and the DOI do not show need profiles distinct from one another.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean Scores with Corresponding Edwards Normative T Scores in Parentheses</th>
<th>Between Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>NDO (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>15.48 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deferece</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>11.71 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Order</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>9.68 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exhibition</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>14.29 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Autonomy</td>
<td>14.34</td>
<td>12.56 (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affiliation</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>16.63 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Intraception</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>14.72 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Succorance</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>13.36 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dominance</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>16.03 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Abasement</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>14.71 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nurturance</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>17.25 (57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Change</td>
<td>15.51</td>
<td>14.65 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Endurance</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>12.78 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Heterosexuality</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>11.97 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Aggression</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>13.42 (51)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 760 465 330 65
Of interest, though not part of this study, were the comparisons between the Edwards college male normative group and the seminary population (cf. Table 5.) Again there is a clear distinction from one another, as separate groups. The seminary groups NDO, DOV AND DOI all score significantly higher on Nurturance, Abasement and Succorance, and significantly lower on Heterosexuality, Dominance and Intraception than the Edwards normative group.

What common denominators are there when all seminarian groups (NDO, DOV, DOI) are contrasted with both college male groups (LCM, ECM)? Seminary groups have significantly higher Nurturance and Succorance scores; college male groups have significantly higher Heterosexuality and Intraception scores (cf. Table 6.)

TABLE 6

A LISTING OF COMMON SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THREE SEMINARY GROUPS (NDO, DOV, DOI) AND TWO NON-SEMINARY GROUPS (LCM, ECM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Seminary Groups</th>
<th>Non-seminary Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDO - DOV - DOI</td>
<td>LCM - ECM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intraception</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally if the NDO group is contrasted with both college male groups (LCM, ECM) there is a quite clear distinction between them on 8 variables. (Cf. Table 7.) The NDO group score significantly higher in needs Nurturance, Affil-
A COMPARISON OF THE SEMINARY NORMATIVE GROUP (NDO) WITH TWO NON-SEMINARY GROUPS (LCM, ECM) AND A LISTING OF THEIR COMMON SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Seminary Normative Group</th>
<th>Non-seminary Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NDO</td>
<td>LCM - ECM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heterosexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abasement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intraception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abasement, Succorance and Deference; significantly lower in Heterosexuality, Autonomy and Intraception.

One cannot help seeing in these contrasts the personality who is at home in a routine-like institutional setting, and the personality who is impatient with such a setting. The one is quieter and more withdrawn, happier (at least at this stage) to be led, than to do the leading. The other is more extraverted, and seemingly more socially and sexually aware.

Before bringing this section to a close some comments are in order. Although comparisons are necessary for purposes of description, nevertheless one
should bear in mind the traditional saying, "All comparisons are odious." If this is not borne in mind, one may be tempted to interpret the findings as being highly unfavorable or even "bad" for the seminarian groups. It is at this point that one must have regard for the evidence. In this case, the evidence is quantitative, i.e., in terms of more or less, and for that reason no value judgment may be placed on it. To begin with, all of the need variables for all seminary groups are within the average range of scores as reported by Edwards (T scores range: 41 - 59) for his college male normative groups (Manual, 1959, p. 14.) The one exception is for need Heterosexuality, which the NDO scored low on with a T score of 40. Given the transparency of these items (cf. Korman and Coltharp, 1962) and a selection situation (cf. Barron, 1959), one might well have predicted a low score for the NDO seminary group. Otherwise, this score, so close to being within the average range of 41 - 59, could well be considered average. As a matter of fact, with the exception of the Heterosexual scores, all of the other scores are within the T score range of 45 - 57.

The seminarians are therefore different from their peers, not worse, and vice-versa. Seminarians are less intraceptive than college males in general; yet they are more nurturant as well, and to be truly nurturant one can hardly be lacking in sufficient intraception. What the evidence suggests, is that the NDO seminarians, at this stage of their development, are not quite as mature (quantitative) or guilt-free as their peers, and perhaps they are more depend-
ent on others. It may be too, that they are more conscious of their own needs than the needs of others, and hence somewhat deficient in intraception. All of this information is important for seminary authorities to know, so as to provide the experiences and the institutional setting which counteract less desirable tendencies and encourage growth in a more mature direction. The movement toward more open, rather than the closed-in type of seminary training program is in the right direction.

In regard to nurturance and affiliation, the communality of needs of all three groups of seminarians is very suggestive. Following Schaffer (1953), one can probably predict that with strong needs such as these, all 3 groups will be involved in work which brings them into close contact with other people and in a social service role. It seems that religious life and the priesthood no longer provide the major outlet for these needs to be exercised. For this reason, if one notes the distinguishing characteristic which is common to both drop-out groups, need Heterosexuality, he will probably hit on the factor which will eventually differentiate the seminarians from the non-seminarians. True to the needs which separate and yet characterize them, the DOV and DOI will remain in social service, perhaps as teachers, perhaps in the Peace Corps, or in the social sciences, or in areas or occupations in which these needs can be exercised. In addition, their life orientation, or vocation to marriage, will be fulfilled as well. The persisting seminarian needs a stronger religious motivation, in order to sublimate this need (cf. Greene, 1967.) This
special gift of God, and perhaps of nature as well, will eventually differen-
tiate him from the non-persisting seminarian. As a final remark, the evi-
dence is also suggestive that the "so-called" vocational crisis may not be as bad as pictured. The idealism which characterizes youth can hardly have dis-
appeared; it is only expressed differently as in altruistic ventures such as VISTA, Peace Corps, and the like. This is in keeping with reality, in that specific ways of exercising needs for nurturance and affiliation are no longer restricted to the religious life or priesthood.

The question of whether the traditional forms of religious life have a contribution to make to our society has not been answered here, nor can it be answered in a study of this type. At the same time, the findings suggest that there is no need for panic. The meaning of the words "religious vocation" needs to be broadened to include more types of activities than that of the more specific vocation to the religious life or priesthood.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The need for an organized approach to selecting and assessing candidates for the religious life has long been recognized. Ill-defined criteria of success in religious life as well as inadequate psychological instruments have failed to stem the attrition rate as hoped for, by early workers in the field (Bier, 1960.)

The present study attempted to refine one of the variables: voluntary or involuntary dropping out. If characteristic profiles of the nondrop-out, the voluntary drop-out and the involuntary drop-out can be determined on a standardized psychological instrument, then the profiles will aid in the selecting, assessing and counseling of members who wish to embrace the religious life.

To that purpose then, data on the Edwards Personal Preference Test (EPPS) collected over the period from 1962 to 1966 were analyzed. All told, the data embraced six classes which have entered a large midwestern junior college minor seminary. As part of this study, local norms were to be set up for this particular instrument. However, these local norms were not necessary, as the
Edwards college male normative data were seen to be adequate for the intended seminary normative (nondrop-out) group. A group of 270 non-seminarian Catholic college freshmen served as a control group and for purposes of comparison.

It was hypothesized that:

(1) The seminary nondrop-out group (NDO) would have a distinctive profile from that of the non-seminary group.

(2) The nondrop-out group would have significantly higher scores than the non-seminary group in at least two variables, Nurturance and Affiliation, needs apparently related to vocational effectiveness.

(3) The non-seminary group would show evidence of greater social and sexual maturity as reflected in higher mean scores for Intraception and Heterosexuality need variables.

(4) Both seminary drop-out groups would have profiles distinctive from that of the nondrop-out group profile.

The first 3 of these hypotheses were verified; the fourth was only partially verified in that the nondrop-out group was clearly distinctive from the voluntary drop-out group, but not from the involuntary drop-out group.

In a consideration of the NDO's absolute hierarchy of needs, he is characteristically friendly and generous, eager to succeed and to be known and respected as a leader. Though he tends to be empathetic, as well, there seems to be a need to yield to others too quickly, with tendencies toward self-doubting and self-blaming.
The NDO is clearly differentiated from the DOV (voluntary drop-out.) There are 8 significant mean raw score differences. The NDO scores higher on Abasement, Endurance, Deference, and Order; lower on Change, Exhibition, Heterosexuality, and Autonomy. Comparatively speaking then, the DOV are much more extraverted in their need for new experiences, freedom to move about without responsibility, to be the center of attention, and to give freer expression to their sexual needs. The NDO is quieter, more given to endurance, inhibited in his sex life, and more tormented by doubt and feelings of inferiority.

In terms of ranking need Change and need Heterosexuality, the DOI (involuntary drop-out) was found to look more like the DOV than the NDO profile. Other slight differences suggested that the DOI tended to be more restless and at the same time passive and unwilling to exercise leadership; there was a suggestion of difficulty in handling sexual drive. The DOI appeared not to consciously choose either to stay or to go.

In contrasting all seminary groups (NDO, DOV, DOI) with the non-seminary group, six significant differences were found. The seminary groups scored higher on Nurturance, Affiliation, and Succorance, while the non-seminary group scored higher on Heterosexuality, Autonomy, and Intraception. Summarized, the non-seminarian seemed to be more open, fun-loving, independent, social conscious and heterosexually oriented than his seminarian counterpart of whatever status, NDO, DOV, or DOI.
When the seminary groups were contrasted with the Edwards normative group as well, much of the same picture emerged. In addition, when all 3 seminary groups were contrasted to both non-seminary groups, significantly high Nurturance and Succorance needs marked the seminary groups, while significantly high Heterosexuality and Intraception needs marked the non-seminary groups. The consistency of these differences found over a number of groupings in this study, points to the differences which seem to characteristically set off the seminary and the non-seminary group.

Interpretation of these findings was seen as primarily quantitative, i.e., the seminary groups are different from their peers, not worse. Keeping in mind the average distribution for these variables (T score average range 41 - 59 for EPPS norms) the NDO seminarians, at this stage of their development, seem to be not quite as mature, or guilt-free as their college peers, and perhaps they are more dependent on others. That seminarians are less intraceptive may be due to the fact that they are more aware of their own needs, than the needs of others. It is important that seminary authorities be aware of these findings. It means that the movement toward a more open-type program of training for seminarians is in the right direction.

Because the Edwards norms are applicable to junior college minor seminary students as well (cf. Allen and Dallek, 1957) this instrument can be used for the counseling and guidance of seminarians. In particular, the high Change, Heterosexuality, Exhibition and Autonomy scores plus hierarchy of ranking will
give clues to the potential voluntary drop-out. The involuntary drop-out will
be more difficult to identify, but he will appear more passive, restless,
sexually conflicted than the NDO; he will seem to drift, while the NDO will
choose to persist (higher Endurance and Autonomy needs.)

Strong needs for nurturance and affiliation will characteristically
mark the seminary candidate. However, the religious life and priesthood are
perhaps no longer the major outlet for the satisfaction of these needs. For
this reason, alert counseling will see, following Schaffer (1953), that in
regard to job satisfaction many of these seminary candidates might just as
easily be counseled into social service roles, not necessarily into the re-
ligious life or priesthood. There seems to be an added dimension which is not
just psychological, but theological as well: the ability and willingness to
sublimate the more fundamental heterosexual need as well. If Schaffer's
concept is broadened to include life orientation, or vocation, sublimation of
sexual desires and needs, celibacy, will be the deciding factor in
determining who will go on to final vows or remain in the seminary until or-
dination. It is of interest that both voluntary and involuntary drop-out
groups are significantly differentiated from the nondrop-out seminary group,
on this variable of Heterosexuality.

Further research on the seminary groups is suggested in the following
areas:

(1) Follow up studies on the eventual job status of the drop-outs in
regard to social service orientation. Can it be empirically established that
there is a relationship between job status and the type of individual who is drawn toward the seminary?

(2) Related to the former point, what is the eventual life orientation or vocational status of the drop-out? Do the majority marry? Is there a distinction between DOV and DOI in regard to this variable? Do those who eventually leave the priesthood do so primarily because they wish to marry? The point behind such a study would be to isolate the critical variable most responsible for success or non-success, from the variables which appear to only attract toward religious life or the priesthood.

(3) The EPPS could be administered to the seminary candidates in their third or fourth year of theology, perhaps contrasted with graduate students of comparable age and background (even from the same two populations investigated in this present study.) One could see the direction in which scores moved and determine whether the open-type training program was lessening the gap between these peer groups in certain important need variables such as Intraception.

(4) Along with this intermediate stage study, a final stage study of a sample of priests ordained 5 or more years, and therefore tested by experience, could be carried out. The relative consistency of profile and/or direction of change in scores could perhaps provide final validating data for the EPPS, as a useful instrument for the counseling and guidance of seminarians.
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