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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The Catholic priesthood stands at the center of the mystery of Redemption. The priest is a man taken from among men in the things that appertain to God. He is as St. Pius X constantly repeated, "another Christ." Pope Pius XII (1958a) reminds the candidate for the priesthood in the words of Charles Borromeo (quoted by Pius XII, p. 265), that he "has been called not to a life of ease and leisure, but to hard work in the army of the Church (p. 265)." He must be prepared for the colossal demands made on a priest today. It is all the more true when the demands of the priesthood are joined to those of religious life.

Bier (1960) refers to the psychological demands of religious life as greater than those in the world:

Spiritual writers quite generally refer to religious life as a martyrdom and a holocaust. It is evident that such terms cannot be taken in the literal sense of physical martyrdom, but neither, on the other hand, are they mere figures of speech. There is a reality behind the use of such terms, and I would suggest that the reality is to a considerable extent a psychological one. The vows of religion involve the surrender of the three most basic natural rights: the right to possess, the right to marry, and the right to reasonable self-autonomy. In taking his vows, the religious freely renounces the exercise of these basic rights, but he does not change thereby his human nature which continues to clamor for these things. Can one question the reality of the psychological struggle—a lifetime struggle—between religious ideals and human wants, and can one doubt that the cumulative effect of such an enduring struggle deserves to be called a martyrdom?
It seems self-evident that an applicant who has distinctly less than the average amount of psychological stability and maturity is ill-advised to embrace a life whose psychological demands are considerably more than average (p. 12).

There is also no reason to expect that the psychological problems characteristic of our age will not be found in those seeking to enter the religious and priestly life. Since the priest religious will minister to persons seeking various services of him, including psychological counseling, he should be as free as possible of debilitating psychological conflicts that interfere with a healthy and productive priestly apostolate. The exigencies and stresses of the day demand more and more from the priest and, therefore, from the future candidate. The vocation to the priesthood is not a vocation of "human choice," but a divine calling. This vocation is unique among the vocations. No man can take this vocation to himself. He may respond only when God calls him. This divine element is central to the nature of the priestly vocation. The divine element is present in God intervening, choosing, and endowing a person with necessary qualifications: inclination of will and human qualities suited for the priesthood itself.

The divine vocation (calling) is the foundation of the priestly life. No one may embrace it without such a divine calling. The divine vocation consists of a two-fold element: divine and ecclesiastical. According to the canonists, Bouscaren and Ellis (1948), "A vocation to the priesthood is a call from God, which, however, is usually indicated not by an extraordinary internal inspiration, but by a right intention together with fitness for the life and work so chosen. This fitness is the result of various gifts in the natural and supernatural order, and is proved by
probity of life and sufficient learning to give ground for the expectation that the person will sacredly fulfill the functions and obligations of the priesthood (p. 697)."

There are, however, questions one might ask: What is the meaning of being called by God? How does one recognize a divine vocation in the individual? How is it manifested? These questions admit there must be a divine vocation but ask what it is and how it is manifested.

These questions become the center of theological concern over the course of the Church's history. The discussion was settled at least for the time being in an authoritative decision.

Since the Council of Trent decision, the development of minor and major seminaries spread throughout much of the Catholic world. This institutionalizing of the formation of the future priest emphasized the priestly vocation. Agreed that God must give the vocation, how was one to know he was called. According to Stockums (1942),

... there increasingly prevailed in the post-Tridentine period, especially in the nineteenth century, a view which placed the essence of the priestly vocation in the feelings, inclinations, and dispositions of the individual candidate. This was the so-called "attraction theory," that is, the theory which asserted that the essential and necessary element in priestly vocation is the strong emotional inclination to the ecclesiastical state, and this attraction was in turn traced back to the special inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The champions of this view taught that whenever this attraction, together with the other qualities demanded of a candidate by the Church, indisputably manifested itself, a true vocation was present, and the ecclesiastical authorities, especially the bishops were bound to respect it as something given and desired by God, and to complete it canonically by conferring holy orders. They finally went so far as to assert that the candidate who believed he could lay claim to the possession of such an attraction had the right to receive holy orders, that is, the right to demand that he be admitted to the priesthood. It also followed, they maintained, that the bishop of the candidate had the obligation to receive him into the ecclesiastical state (pp. 30-31).
A defender of this view was Louis Branchereau, a Sulpician, who published his *De La Vocation Sacerdotale* in 1896. Among those who took exception to the attraction theory was Joseph Lahitton, the seminary rector of the Diocese of Aire who responded to Branchereau's work with his own book entitled *La vocation sacerdotale*. Stockums (1942) summarizes Lahitton's position:

"... he maintained that priestly vocation consists essentially in the call and acceptance of the candidate by his bishop; that, at least ordinarily and fundamentally, it does not come immediately from God as a direct calling manifested in an interior attraction; that it is rather an external grace conferred by the authorities of the Church; that the interior inclination, far from being essential and decisive, need not even be present, at least not necessarily in all circumstances (p. 32)."

As to be expected Lahitton's ideas were both praised and rejected. His opponents were answered in and his admirers were treated to a second book *Deux conceptions divergentes de la vocation sacerdotale*. The controversy was inflamed and became so acrimonious that a decision on the matter was sought from Rome. A special commission of cardinals was appointed by Pope Pius X to study the matter. Their decision was approved by the Pope on July 2, 1912. The statement of the Commission approved by Pius X (1958) read:

1. No one ever has the right to ordination antecedently to the free choice of the bishop;

2. On the part of the candidate, the requisite which has to be examined, and which is called priestly vocation, by no means consists, at least necessarily and a general rule in a certain interior attraction of the subject, or in invitations of the Holy Spirit, to enter the ecclesiastical state;

3. On the contrary, in order that the candidate may be rightly called by the bishop, nothing more is required of him than a right
intention and fitness; this fitness consists in qualities of nature and grace, proved by such uprightness of life and sufficiency of knowledge as will give solid grounds for hope that he will be able to discharge properly the functions of the priesthood and fulfill its obligations in a holy manner (pp. 88-89).

The ecclesiastical vocation must always presuppose the divine call. It is the ecclesiastical superiors who must prove, acknowledge and legislate regarding the vocation. If a candidate shows these signs of a vocation he should be admitted so that he can answer the divine call.

Pius XI (1958) reminded all those engaged in the religious formation of candidates for the priesthood to exercise the greatest care in the selection of seminarians. They are to "do everything they can to foster and encourage a true God-given desire to enter the Priesthood," but "be no less zealous in discouraging from Holy Orders and sending away in good time those whom they know to be unsuitable and incapable of carrying out these duties of the priesthood fittingly (p. 232)." Then the Pontiff gives a practical norm for those who would be reluctant to perform this disagreeable task: "It is far better to send away an unsuitable student in the early days, because delay in these matters can lead to errors and can do harm (p. 232)." They must allow no human consideration to interfere with this decision or be moved by "any mistaken sense of mercy." This is so because it is harmful to the "church which is given a useless and unworthy minister" and also the "young man himself, because choosing the wrong course would be a misfortune to him and to others and might gravely imperil their eternal salvation (pp. 232-233)."

The Sacred Congregation of Religious (1957) in the Apostolic
Constitution, *Sedes Sapientiae*, warns that only those are to be accepted who "after careful examination and diligent inquiries, are found not to be debarred by any of the impediments established by law, are inspired by the right intention, and are able to bear the burdens of the Institute (p. 44)."

The screening for admission to the minor seminary must be less strict and demanding than the admission to novitiate, profession and Orders. The minor seminarian for a religious community must have the beginnings of a religious vocation necessarily only a generic one.

Frison (1961) commenting on this "careful examination" writes:

To promote selective recruiting many Institutes are developing testing and interview procedures designed to enable Church authorities and superiors, for their own good and that of the Church to advise applicants for admission more wisely. A very considerable number of seminaries are now requiring the students to take special tests of academic achievement, personality traits, vocational interests, emotional stability, intelligence, et cetera. Most of the seminaries prudently emphasize the experimental nature of their use and their relevance to the counseling rather than to the admission of students (p. 28).

The authentic and authoritative teaching of the true and sufficient, ordinary, positive and essential signs of vocations require (1) right intention, (2) physical, intellectual and moral fitness, and (3) admission by superiors.

Article 33 in the decree *Sedes Sapientiae* (1957) reads:

The peculiar signs and motives of a genuine vocation must be attentively weighed in those to be admitted to the novitiate, according to the age and condition of the candidates. Both the moral and the intellectual qualities of the candidates must be accurately and thoroughly examined. Moreover, their physical and psychological fitness must also be investigated, without omitting the obtaining of the medical history and the diagnostic judgement of a reliable doctor, even in relation to possible hereditary diseases, especially mental ones. The judgement of the doctor must be recorded in the report of each candidate (pp. 44-45).
This norm applies to the novitiate, but *mutatis mutandis* to the minor seminary. The interpretation of the psychological suitability is general, i.e., "possessed of sound mental health." Frison (1961) comments:

This norm (or psychological fitness) does away with any objection to this type of screening and with the slowness of excessive prudence in seeking to postpone the use of the services of psychology and psychotherapy. On the other hand, this norm curbs the overenthusiasm of those who demand the use of tests even though conducted many times by amateur psychologists, or by persons without adequate training. For this reason article 33 adds: "attending in this to the medical history and diagnostic judgment of a reliable doctor, even in relation to possible hereditary diseases, especially mental ones." Many latent defects, that would go unnoticed during the time of probation will be discovered in time by a good psychologist (p. 84).

It would seem that while the above norm does not specify method or extent of psychological examinations (except perhaps the mention of possible hereditary diseases, especially mental ones) it does prescribe that "psychological fitness must be investigated." Perhaps the fourth part of the *Monitum* of July 15, 1961 by the Congregation of the Holy Office (1961) does put a limitation when it legislates:

(4) the opinion of those who maintain that previous psychoanalytical training is altogether necessary for the reception of Holy Orders, or that candidates for the priesthood and religious profession must undergo examinations and tests of a strictly psychoanalytical character, must be rejected. This holds also if there is question of determining the aptitude required for the priesthood or religious profession (p. 571).

Lynch (1962) says that the first two sentences of this fourth norm appear to be doctrinal and do "not directly impose or forbid any particular *modus agendi*, but rather reject as speculatively false an opinion regarding the requisites for the proper selection and training of priests and religious (p. 236)." The opinion rejected would maintain in part,
that no priest is adequately equipped for the apostolic work of the ministry until he has been properly trained in psychoanalytical theory and method. Furthermore, as the same school of thought would have it, until he himself has submitted to examinations and tests of a strictly psychoanalytical kind, no candidate for the priesthood or religious life is capable of managing his own spiritual affairs in the manner and degree required by his vocation. Finally, the theory repudiated by the Holy Office would contend that no prudent test of vocation to the seminary or cloister is complete until each aspirant has been subjected to strict psychoanalysis the results of which will reveal his aptitude or lack thereof, for the life which he ambitions. The reason behind this insistence on psychoanalysis as an essential factor in priestly and religious training is primarily a sexual consideration for in the opinion of those who formulated the theory, without the psychoanalytical experience no priest or religious is qualified either to cope with his own problems of sexual adjustment or to counsel others effectively in theirs. And there lies the nexus between this portion of the fourth norm and the introductory sentence of the Monitum (p. 236).

It is obvious that seminary officials and religious superiors may continue using psychological tests to evaluate and screen candidates. These tests are not strictly psychoanalytical ("proprie dicta psychoanalytica examina et investigationes"). Lynch (1962) comments that "it is not recourse to the tests themselves which in this instance is forbidden by the Monitum, but rather endorsement of the speculative thesis that psychoanalysis is an essential requisite in every case for determining the suitability of aspirants to a life of perfect chastity (p. 238)."

What kind of testing is open to superiors and administrators who wish to screen candidates? If psychological fitness is demanded of the candidate why is there any question of psychological testing. The first reason often given is that such testing is tampering with the supernatural and divine. Since the vocation is divine, it should be tested with those age-old means of the Church; spiritual direction, guidance of the Holy Spirit, grace, the sacraments, et cetera. The answer to this objection
is not hard to discover as long as one distinguishes the internal and external aspects, the natural and supernatural aspects of a vocation. Somehow, the long established impediments of physical and intellectual disabilities have been accepted as legitimate areas of examination for acceptance of candidates. It must be admitted that while the instruments for psychological fitness are not without their limitations the well-trained clinical psychologist who diligently and scientifically uses his testing instruments should be aware of their assets and defects and can assist religious superiors in the matter of screening candidates.

There is another reason for hesitancy in the psychological screening. It uses no less authority than Pius XII (1958b) who insisted so strongly on the right to psychic privacy:

Just as it is illicit to appropriate another's goods or to make an attempt on his bodily integrity without his consent, so it is not permissible to enter into his inner domain against his will, no matter what techniques or methods are used. . . . If the consent is unjustly extorted, any action of the psychologist will be illicit, if the consent is vitiated by lack of freedom (due to ignorance, error, or deceit) every attempt to penetrate into the depths of his soul will be immoral, . . . (pp. 276-277).

Therefore Bier (1963), in view of the nature of personality testing, postulates that several conditions must be met before such testing can be vindicated as irreproachable. (1) knowledgeable consent on the part of the subject; (2) warranty, or sufficiency of reason for this psychic probing; and (3) restraint on the part of the psychologist, i.e., reasonable care not to explore further than individual circumstances require. (Quoted by Lynch, 1963, p. 214) Lynch, after citing Bier's postulate, agrees that Bier's interpretation is correct, but feels that there would
be certain differences of opinion on the matter of proper fulfillment in concrete cases, e.g., the amount of antecedent information necessary for subject's consent to be an informed and voluntary decision.

A psychological test attempts to assess the person using some objective and standardized measure of a sample of behavior or performance. The performance or behavior that is sampled should be determined by the trait or characteristic which the test is designed to measure. To the extent that an item or group of items measures an interest, aptitude or personality trait harmonious with a vocation to the priesthood, it possesses validity. The extent to which there is stability or consistency in such a test, the test has reliability. The psychological test must be uniformly administered, scored and interpreted. This uniformity is necessary to standardize a test.

In the present study two kinds of psychological tests have been used: The Kuder Preference Record-Vocational, which is an interest test, and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, which is a personality test. Both of these tests might be the kind of tests that would be viewed as a type of invasion into the private life of another. However, Bier (1963) thinks that much of the self-revelation in the self-report inventories, e.g., Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, pertains to the public self-concept, or at least to the amplification of it, which most people are willing to provide given a proportionate and justifying reason (p. 166). He distinguishes this "public self-concept" from the "private self-concept," which we are much less willing and sometimes frankly unwilling to reveal (p. 166).
However, he admits that some items on these self-report inventories belong to the private self-concept. Such items are those that seek for information from an individual, e.g., inner feelings of resentment, hostility or love, unexpressed thoughts and desires that are one's own and not witnessed by others.

Leary and Coffey (1955) distinguish these levels of personality assessed with different means. The public personality is the way a person appears to others. The private (conscious) personality is the way an individual appears to himself. The symbolic personality is reflected in projective tests. Harney (1967) views the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, which is used in the present study, as tapping the private, conscious level of personality.

The psychologist Cronbach (1960) says "Any test is an invasion of privacy for the subject who does not wish to reveal himself to the psychologist (p. 459)." The statement of Pope Pius XII, according to Bier (1963) suggests "that a consent obtained by concealing the nature of the test . . . would be an invalid consent (because obtained by deception) and would render immoral the information secured (p. 173)." However, test construction and/or test administration must take into account the problem of faking. One of the methods for dealing with faking on personality tests is to conceal the purpose of the test. One might do this by stating a plausible purpose of the test but not the real interest of the tester. Cronbach (the Chairman of the committee responsible for developing the Technical Recommendations for Psychological Tests) says that this procedure
"skirts the edge of unethical practice (p. 453)." However, if the tester told the testee the exact nature and purpose of the test, i.e., what facets of the personality the test is attempting to discover, it may possibly invalidate the personality test since the subject's spontaneity would be restricted. Bier (1963) does not think it is necessary to do this. He feels that what is "essential and sufficient is an honest presentation of the testing situation and of the relationship to obtain between the respondent and the psychologist (p. 173)."

Cronbach recommends a statement to introduce a testing situation:

It might help to solve your problems more rapidly if we collect as much information (about yourself) as we can. Some of our tests use straightforward questions whose purpose you will readily understand. Some of our other tests dig more deeply into the personality. Sometimes they bring to light emotional conflicts that the person is not even conscious of. Few of us admit even to ourselves the whole truth about our feelings and ideas. I think I can help you better with the aid of these tests (pp. 461-462).

Bier says: "When an individual consents to the testing after such an explanation (as Cronbach's) he has obviously given a valid consent and one may predict that the testing will be conducted in an atmosphere of mutual trust (p. 173)." Here Bier is speaking of tests that do not enter into the "inner psyche of the subject." Bier agrees when a person agrees to testing after an explanation such as that suggested by Cronbach above, he has given his consent and more than that such instructions encourage mutual trust. Again we must remember Bier is speaking only of tests that do not go to the private psyche of the testee. If that is done, the psychologist would have to have a proportionately greater and more justifying reason.
The opposition to this screening is only partly satisfied with such a response. An individual candidate being tested for his own benefit, at his own request, for his own personal information and guidance might be presumed to reveal himself most extensively, since the testing is for him and will not be used against him. However, what about the entire seminary or groups of seminarians being tested; would such a generic instruction be much above this level to the uninitiated as to what they were agreeing? About such testing Lynch (1963) says:

... more explicit information as to the purpose of the test may well be an ethical requisite, for it may not be presumed that people generally are willing to reveal their inner selves to any considerable extent for the benefit of third parties. Accordingly, unless it be reasonably certain beforehand that a subject is already aware of the generic kind of information about self that he is likely to divulge— and undoubtedly a considerable number of those who at present submit to psychological testing have no illusions in this regard—adequate precautions should be taken to repair this defect in knowledge with an explanation which is intelligible to the subject. Otherwise his consent to personality testing will be proportionately defective (p. 215).

It would thus be deceitful and an illicit invasion into the psychic privacy were one to give the impression that the subjects were taking an intelligence or aptitude test whereas their personalities were being studied. Also, Lynch holds it would be forbidden to extort consent by "any compulsory testing of students, even in conjunction with guidance and counseling programs (p. 216)." These must be entirely optional.

In view of these remarks, may a candidate for the priesthood or religious life be required to undergo psychological screening? Bier (1963) answers affirmatively because the applicant's suitability must be presumed and cannot be assumed. A Superior who is obliged to admit only suitable
applicants is justified in requiring the demonstration of personality suitability which would come from psychological test results (p. 175). This testing is for the benefit of the applicant as well as the seminary or religious order since it would not be harmful to the applicant to keep him from a way of life for which he is not suited. However, Bier does not permit the same for the testing of persons already admitted to religious life. Here he maintains that the "information secured from personality tests is the equivalent of a manifestation of conscience (p. 175)," so that a superior may not require such a person to undergo this testing but may urge him. He does not think that students should be required to undergo such personality tests even for purposes of guidance and counseling. Thus he is opposed to the compulsory taking of personality tests in school, by all the students.

In summary, mental illness is one of the major health problems in our nation. Those applying for entrance into our seminaries come from the general population. Therefore, one might expect to find mental disorder in this group of applicants as well as among the general population. The future seminarian is just as likely eventually to need psychiatric care as are other boys who follow different vocations. In fact, the seminarian may run a greater risk since life in a seminary has its own unique stress often greater than that encountered outside the seminary. If the candidate for the priesthood is emotionally unstable, neurotic or pre-psychotic, he will find such stress too demanding and frustrating. This may reinforce and intensify his unstable, neurotic or psychotic
behavior. Psychological screening can help such a candidate by preventing his exposure to such stresses. This screening program also aims at helping the seminary authorities decide whether a candidate has the necessary qualifications for life in the seminary and priesthood. Psychological testing and interviewing of candidates attempt to exclude those for whom the stresses of the seminary may be too great. This avoids exposure to a stressful environment that may entrench them in their present illness or eventually catapult them into a more serious mental illness.

The Church demands psychological fitness in her candidates. Psychological testing is only one of the methods used to screen such candidates. Nevertheless, the Church respects the psychic privacy of the individual candidate. Thus any personality testing done with seminarians should be prefaced with such remarks that will honestly convey to the candidates the purpose of the testing. In every case the candidate has the option of taking the test or refusing to do so. It is presumed that the candidate is willing to reveal whatever is necessary so that superiors can prudently decide if he is to be admitted. If there is contrary evidence with an individual candidate superiors may use some other legitimate method to get necessary knowledge. In this regard it must always be remembered that the seminary is a constant screening process.

The Sacred Congregation of Seminaries (1961) views the seminary as the necessary place of selection as well as formation:

To evaluate a vocation properly, it is indispensable to know the student's whole personality. Taking qualities and abilities singly, considering weak points and defects in isolation, it is possible to be seriously mistaken. These elements must be considered under the aspect
of a person's whole character. . . . Therefore, the whole personality and the many individual traits must be thoroughly examined, with particular attention being paid to psychological and emotional stability. The superior in dealing with the realm of the spirit where the meeting of God with man is the intimate personal responsibility of each individual; he must tread warily, making constant use of humble prayer, approaching God with reverence, waiting and listening and sensitive to the manifestations of His will. Supernatural means must take the first place, but the aid which the sciences of the educationalist and the psychologist afford should not be forgotten. When one's own experience does not suffice, a specialist should be called in. . . . We can never be too careful in such delicate matters; this is especially true because, as competent psychologists tell us, the mental maturity of modern youth frequently lags behind his physical growth—a trap for the unwary, who would content themselves by judging from appearances (pp. 166-168).

It is felt that if candidates are approached with a fair, direct and open request for personality testing and are assured that the secrecy of their testing will be safeguarded and used only as necessary for judging their fitness and assisting the individual candidates in their future counseling and guidance that there will be genuine cooperation. Thus superiors can make prudent decisions to assist in assuring that only the psychologically fit will approach orders. The candidate who enters the seminary and becomes aware of the necessary qualities to continue toward the priesthood may well see the psychological testing as a personal help to evaluate his fitness. The value of psychological testing may be granted as an asset but the manner in which it is done and the use of the results is important to gain cooperation from otherwise doubtful, reluctant and even hostile subjects.

D'Arcy (1962) spoke of the need for research of the interests of seminarians and religious: "Without longitudinal studies there will be no
way of adequately accounting for the differential effects of training, 
maturity and selection. Predictive studies are needed and for them is 
necessary the development of adequate criteria of success in the priesthood 
and religious life. There is a need for the study of larger samples and of 
a wider variety of subgroups (p. 193)."

Friedl (1952), Kennedy (1958), and Kenney (1959) studied the in-
terest patterns of successful and unsuccessful seminarians of a foreign 
missionary society. Successful was defined in terms of perseverence and 
non-perseverence in the seminary. This study is a replication of these 
studies. It proposes to study whether there is any significant difference 
between high school seminarians who persevered toward the priesthood, i.e., 
continue in the seminary, and those who do not continue, as measured by 
interests and personality traits. Specifically, this study hypothesizes 
that there is no significant difference (at the .05 level of confidence) 
between interest scores and personality traits of high school seminarians 
who are remaining in the seminary after a period of nine years and those 
who left the seminary during this period.
CHAPTER II

Review of Relevant Literature

Psychological Studies of Seminarians

Psychological tests are widely used today in schools, industry, professions, and trades. The purpose of the testing varies from general intelligence and aptitude tests to self-report and projective personality testing. Specific tests have been devised to study the personality traits of various vocational groups and screen candidates for such groups: Engineers and doctors (Ghosh, 1956), mechanical engineers (Harrison, Tomblen, & Jackson, 1955), farmers (Straus, 1956), company presidents (Clarke, 1956), eminent research workers, teachers and administrators (Cattell & Drevdahl, 1955), artists (Machover, 1955), pilots (Anastasi & Foley, 1952), nurses (Weisgerber, 1951), psychologists (Kelly & Fiske, 1951), and seminarians (Bier, 1948; Burke, 1947; McCarthy, 1942; Murray, 1957; Sutter, 1961, Gorman, 1961; McDonagh, 1961).

The investigation of interests has been considered as relevant to personality studies. The individual in expressing his interests is in reality saying something about himself. Again, interest patterns have been established for doctors, lawyers and business men (Shaffer & Kuder, 1953), Lutheran ministers (Bertness, 1955), Catholic diocesan priests (Lhota, 1948), foreign missionaries (D'Arcy, 1954), minor seminarians
(Gorman, 1961; McDonagh, 1961), major seminarians (Sutter, 1961).

Several studies of the personality and interest patterns of seminarians have been made. Investigations ask if candidates for the priesthood have a specific type of personality and pattern of interests before entering the seminary or are they due to seminary environment, or is it a combination of an intensification of a pre-seminary personality type and pattern of interests along with the seminary training.

Moore (1936a, 1936b) reported the incidence and kind of mental problems found in priests and religious. His conclusion was that the priesthood and religious life may have an attraction for pre-psychotic personalities. He attempted to implement the corollary to his finding: screening candidates for the priesthood and religious life.

Sward (1931) studied 80 seminarians who rated themselves using Heidbreder's Standard Scales for Measuring Introversion and Inferiority Attitudes. In comparison with college students, faculty members and businessmen, the seminarians were more introverted and had more feelings of inferiority. The more advanced seminarians did not have as marked inferiority feelings. These inferiority feelings and introversion may dispose one to enter religious life.

McCarthy (1942) investigated 85 major seminarians and 144 minor seminarians with the Bell Adjustment Inventory, the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, and the Allport-Vernon Study of Values. Here the seminarian, compared to his age counterpart in other walks of life, manifests a little higher neurotic tendency, a greater degree of self-consciousness, and a
more unsatisfactory total adjustment when measured with the Bell Adjustment Inventory. He claims there are two factors indicated in the seminarian's personality: a schizoid factor and a "g" (general fitness) factor. This latter indicates a fitness to continue in the seminary. It is based on a faculty rating scale of ten traits. However, when he compared the results of his battery of 13 tests with faculty ratings, he found no significant correlations. The Bernreuter scales indicated average introversion and sociability but greater submission. The seminarian's aesthetic, social, political, economic and theoretical interests were found to be average on the Allport-Vernon Study of Values, but significantly higher were his religious interests.

Burke (1947) studied the personality traits of successful minor seminarians. He found that in using the same personality tests as McCarthy (1942) there was no significant difference between these seminarians and average high school boys' scores. If anything, there was a somewhat better adjustment noted in the seminarians. Besides the personality studies, Burke administered the Cleeton Vocational Interest Inventory and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank Minister Scale. On the latter he found a pattern of interests with such variety of individual scores to make it a poor screening device. He did find the typical seminarian indicated a personality which is more submissive, dependent, introspective and self-conscious than is that of the average person his age. The tests reveal greater emotional disturbance for the seminarian than applicants of other professions. For predicting persevering and non-persevering seminarians, he was unable
to find a score or combination of scores to do this. Good academic achievement was the best characteristic of persevering seminarians.

Bier (1948) used the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) with five groups of Catholic students. One of the groups consisted of 171 major seminarians. The other groups included 208 medical, 121 dental, 55 law and 369 college students. He found that all subjects in these five groups obtained in the nine MMPI scales a mean T score above 50, 89 per cent of the time. However, even more significant is that there were twice as many T scores above 70 (classified as abnormal) as would be expected. He found the seminary group was "the most deviant portion of an already deviant population (p. 81)." Their scores were significantly higher than other four groups on the Mn, Ma, Sc, Hs, D and Pa scales and higher than the population-at-large on all scales. He felt this indicated a poorer adjustment on the part of the seminarians. When he compared the well-adjusted of all the groups, he found greater homogeneity than between the well-adjusted and poorly adjusted of the same group. So the well-adjusted seminarians resemble more the well-adjusted members of the other four groups than they do the poorly adjusted seminarians. Bier's item analysis eliminated items not applicable to sheltered life of seminarians, which elevated the seminarians' scores. He then substituted other MMPI items more applicable to the seminarian. This revision is referred to as Bier's Modified Form of the MMPI for Religious. Barry (1962) developed an Re (Religious) scale for Bier's Modified Form to differentiate persevering and non-persevering seminarians. Markert (1963) does not substantiate this
significant difference between the well-adjusted and poorly adjusted of the group nor does he find this homogeneity within the well-adjusted of different groups. He was also unable to corroborate Bier's finding that the well-adjusted group had smaller deviations from the total population than the well-adjusted group. He disagrees that adjustment is the same for the seminarians group as other groups. Low scores in members of the group do not indicate equal adjustment. Markert finds Bier's reasoning to be circular when he concludes about the power of the MMPI to discriminate. Others have criticized the Modified form of Bier for various reasons. It seems that the most regrettable aspect of his form is that it does not allow for the comparison with the original form and the wealth of literature generated by it.

Skrincosky (1953) studied 100 minor seminarians using both the standard form of the MMPI and Bier's Modified Form of the MMPI for religious. Although the general pattern for mean scores and profiles were the same there was a tendency for the profile to be higher for Bier's Modified version than the standard form. This elevation on the modified version was studied with an item analysis and revealed items inserted by Bier were responsible for it.

Murray (1957), using Bier's Modified Form of the MMPI, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS) and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), studied 100 Catholic College students, 100 minor seminarians, 100 major seminarians and 100 priests (diocesan and religious seminarians and priests were represented equally). There was a similar configural
pattern for the groups but deviations within the groups. Compared with college students the minor seminarians were significantly higher on the D, Mf, Pt, and Sc scales. The major seminarians scored higher than minor seminarians and college students on the Hs, D, Hy, Mf, Pa, Pt, and Sc but lower on the Pd and Na scales. The priests scored higher on the Hs and D scales but lower on the Na scale. He argues that the major seminarians' higher scores reflect the constrictive atmosphere of the seminary. Once the seminarian is ordained the scores drop. Since the minor seminarians are lower in several scales, this may be a function of the screening and selection process of the seminary. Sweeney (1964) differs with Murray's explanation that it reflects a constricted atmosphere. He points out that compared to major seminarians the score on the Sc scale is higher for the minor seminarian and not significantly lower for the priest group. A tendency toward introversion, a drive for achievement by way of perfectionistic tendencies and some psychological insecurity were noted. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey yielded no similar configural pattern and confirmed the tendencies of introversion in seminarians. On the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey the college students scored significantly lower than the seminarian and priest groups in Friendliness and Good Personal Relations. The major seminarians and priests indicated more masculine tendencies than the college students. Murray explains this on the basis of the kind of items that make up the masculinity-femininity scale. These items reflect a common culture and set of interests shared by male and female collegians. Priests were found to be introverted as
regards thinking and public situations but extroverted as regards social situations. Priests and seminarians indicated good personal relations and friendliness. Priests distinguished themselves from the other groups by their greater emotional maturity. In this study there was a similarity of profile patterns on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. The seminarians and priests were effectively differentiated from the college students by the Minister Scale and even more so by Lhota's Clerical Interest Scale. Murray (1958) found this latter to be the best single screening instrument for otherwise suitable candidates for religious life.

Lhota (1948) developed his Clerical Scale from the Strong Vocational Interest Blank for diocesan priests. His subjects were 262 diocesan priests, 208 diocesan theological students, 190 minor seminarians (100 first-year seminarians and 90 fourth-year) and 133 Catholic High School students (72 high school freshmen and 61 high school seniors). Lhota found the pattern of interests in priests, theological students and minor seminarians to have sufficient commonality and significant difference from men in general to warrant a special clerical interest stencil. This group resembled closely the interests of ministers, social science teachers, and musician groups. They shared few interests of carpenters, mathematicians, purchasing agents, psychologists, forest rangers and engineers.

Palomo (1966) suggests that the Lhota study would be more valuable if the interests at the time of entering the seminary of the priests used in the sample were known. This would permit a comparison of contemporary seminarians with seminarians who are now priests. Such a comparison might
give a view of the development of interests from seminarian to priest and also changes of interests of two more generations of seminarians. Maffia (1954) used items from the SVIB, Lhota's Clerical Interest Scale, and several other rating scales and developed the Seminary Priest Scale. He found this new scale better than Lhota's scale for priests and seminarians and persevering seminarians and non-persevering seminarians.

D'Arcy (1954) also used the Strong Vocational Interest Blank in studying the constancy of interest patterns of foreign missioners. He accomplished this by developing a new Strong scale, the Missionary Priest Scale derived from 311 foreign missionary priests (Society of Maryknoll). As Lhota found with diocesan priests, D'Arcy found the Minister scale ineffective in detecting missionary priests. He found the interests of missionary priests were similar to social workers, diocesan priests, workers needing verbal-linguistic tools, and biological scientists. They shared few interests with certified public accountants, owners, manufacturers, and business people. According to D'Arcy (1963) the pattern of interests characteristic of a specific vocation was not something static, but that this pattern changed with age in a somewhat systematic way. Interests tended to grow in the direction of the characteristic pattern of the older successful members of the occupation.

Friedl (1952) using the SVIB and Lhota's and D'Arcy's scales in a battery of tests to distinguish successful and non-successful seminarians for the foreign missions found that D'Arcy's Missionary Priest Scale revealed a significant difference between the two groups. The Diocesan
Priest Scale of Ihota did not do this. However, he did not find either scale accurate enough to use for individual prediction. Friedl defines successful seminariums as those staying seven to fourteen months. He used one standard deviation as a cut-off point. He predicted 72 per cent of successful and 47 per cent unsuccessful seminarians within his definition of successful. Kennedy (1958) used ordination as criterion of success. He gave the Strong Vocation Interest Blank and Kuder Preference Record to seminarians of a foreign mission society who were seniors in college. He found only one significant difference and that was on the business contact on the SVIB where the successful seminarians (priests) scored lower than the unsuccessful seminarians.

Kenny (1959) defined the successful foreign mission seminarian as one who completed at least eight months in a novitiate of a foreign mission society and was currently persevering. The unsuccessful seminarian was one who had dropped out. As college seminarians the two groups, consisting of 125 matched pairs, had taken the SVIB and KPR. The successful seminarian's pattern indicated in order: technical, social service, and biologically scientific interests. The unsuccessful seminarian rated social service, technical and biologically scientific interests. The two groups had similar interest reject patterns and differed in a similar way from the liberal arts students. There was a great deal of overlapping between the successful and non-successful groups. The successful seminarians present a more homogeneous picture of interests. He concludes that the two groups differ not in the kinds of interests but in the intensity of such interests. He
found foreign mission seminarians differed from diocesan seminarians, clergymen and other liberal arts college students.

Lepak (1968) used the revised SVIB to study the interests of priests (diocesan and religious). He developed a Priest Criterion Group using responses of 287 priests. He found similar interests in priests despite differences in age, education, experience, or affiliation (i.e., diocesan or religious order priests). He concludes that his 65-item scale is able to be used with all priests.

Gorman (1961) using the MMPI, Kuder Preference Record, the Mooney Problem Check List and faculty ratings on a five-point basis scale, studied 188 diocesan minor seminarians in their senior year of high school. This group indicated highest scores on the social service, literary and computational scales. It was speculated that the elevated computational scale was due to the interest in mathematics encouraged by new teaching methods and mathematics clubs. In the MMPI the only score that did not indicate the group better adjusted than the male college norms was the Sc. Gorman offers a possible explanation by referring to the "more retiring" nature of the seminarian. Comparing the profiles of fourth-year and fifth-year seminarians, there was a similarity of profiles, but fifth-year seminarians scored higher on every scale with a significant difference at .05 level of confidence on the Hs, D, Hy, Pa and Pt scales. He postulates that age differences, greater realization of their vocation and a more serious direction of their lives might partially account for this difference.
McDonagh (1961) did a comparison study to Gorman's. He used the same tests with 135 fifth-year seminarians (first year of college). The interest patterns were the same ordering for high social service, literary and computational interests, but lower scores in computational interest scale. Gorman (1961) and McDonagh (1961) indicate that both groups were low on the persuasive scale. Both of these studies divided the seminarians into "high" and "normal" groups on the basis of the MMPI scores. There was not a significant relationship between good faculty ratings and the normal group nor the bad faculty ratings and the high group. While Gorman saw the MMPI as a possible counseling tool but not a predictor of seminary adjustment, McDonagh felt the instrument was blunt. These twin studies may have found their studies more valuable if they had studied the relationships of results of the tests in the battery together, rather than each test in particular.

Herr (1962) studied a group of 50 seminarians using the MMPI, an intelligence test and faculty ratings. The criterion used in this study was leaving or dropping out of the seminary. Ten of the 50 dropped out. Herr found that faculty ratings agreed with the MMPI scores on the Pd, Hs and Pa scales, did not agree on the Pt scale and partially agreed on the D and Hy scales. He found that the highest faculty ratings were related to those with the highest scores on the Mf scale. Those who dropped out had significantly higher scores on the Pt, Pd and Sc scales. Herr concludes that there is a real personality difference between the persevering and non-persevering seminarians. He felt the MMPI does indicate emotional
problems of the seminarians of which the faculty is unaware as important for perseverance in the seminary. Herr views his persevering seminarians as well-adjusted and his non-persevering ones as poorly adjusted. Although, Herr admits the very limited number of the non-persevering seminarians of his study, it is still questionable that the evidence of this study would be able to conclude that the well-adjusted persevere and poorly adjusted drop out.

Vaughan (1963) using a battery of four personality tests studied a group of 218 seminarians. Again in this study perseverance was the criterion. In a five-year period 163 persevered and 55 did not. Using the MMPI, he could not find any scale on this instrument to distinguish the two groups. However, he did make a frequency patterning of peaks around Hy-Pd and Pd-Ma in the non-persevering group. On another test, the Sacks' Sentence Completion Test, he found a significant difference at the .01 level on the mean score of persevering and non-persevering seminarians. This investigator questions Vaughan's study since he uses only one scorer and consequently no reliability study is reported in it.

Sweeney (1964) studied 355 profiles of non-persevering seminarians and 126 persevering seminarians. All the seminarians were seminarians in the year of study prior to novitiate. The profiles were from a battery of tests composed of the Ohio State University Psychological Test, the MMPI and the Kuder Preference Record. He found that 14 per cent of the non-persevering group had three t scores above 70 but also that 10 per cent of the persevering group also did. He did not confirm the hypothesis of
non-persevering being correlated to t scores of 70 or over on two or three scales. Sweeney explains this lack of disparity on the basis that the more conscientious seminarians faked good, thus elevating their scores. He did not find the faculty ratings of the seminarians helpful. These ratings were correct 84 per cent of the times with those who persevered and 70 per cent of the time with the non-persevered candidates. Nor did he find the Kuder Preference Record able to distinguish the successful and unsuccessful seminarians.

Weisgerber (1962) administered the Bier form of the MMPI to 211 seminarians. He analyzed the profiles of 141 persevering and 70 non-persevering seminarians and found no significant difference on any scale. He felt that the profiles did identify poor risks and those who needed clinical help. He suggests that the psychological screening may screen for the first four or five years.

Murtaugh (1965), comparing MMPI and Kuder profiles of 90 priests, who were tested and retested after a ten-year interval with 56 priests, tested and retested, and 55 seminarians who dropped out before ordination, confirmed Weisgerber's suggestion that the MMPI varies with age. It did not reliably predict the quality of performance over the ten-year period and did not differentiate persevering and non-persevering vocations. Murtaugh does find significant variability in the test-retest of the 90 priests on the Hy, Pt and Ma scales. He explains the significant increase on the Hy scale as a function of the frustrations and worries and not excessive introversion and compulsive tendencies. These frustrations and
worries express themselves in somatic complaints (gastric or intestinal) and symptoms (cardiac). The slight decrease on the Pt scale may indicate less concern over minutiae, scrupulosity and obsessive-compulsive feelings. The slight increase on the Ma scale points to greater overt behavior, less social constriction, and behavioral inhibition. He reasons that the decreased Pt scale and the increased Ma scale reflects environmental differences between the more confining and demanding seminary life and the freer and less introspective priestly life. Comparing the ordained seminarian (priest) and non-ordained seminarian on the MMPI, he found only the Pa scale significant at the .01 level of confidence. He was reluctant to see this elevated Pa scale in the ordained seminarian as measuring paranoia (refers to paranoid tendencies) but rather conscientiousness, anxiety to please superiors and to persevere in the testing atmosphere of the seminary. The elevated Pa scale of the ordained seminarian is still within the normal range. Murtaugh found the Kuder scales reliable as a predictive instrument along with other testing methods. The t values for the test-retest group on the social service, persuasive and mechanical were significant at the .01 level of confidence. The increased social service and persuasive scales and the decreased mechanical scale among the ordained group are compatible with the life style of the diocesan priest. There were no significant differences of t values between the ordained or drop-out groups on any of the Kuder scores. The results of his study merely confirm the well recognized fact that the more serious, more conscientious, more self-respecting seminarian will more likely appreciate the rigors and demands of seminary life, more likely acclimate himself and more likely persevere...
later did adapt to the environmental demands of the diocesan priesthood in that their social service and persuasive abilities increased. While their so-called paranoid tendencies as seminarians remained fairly constant, these tendencies did not inhibit their priestly social behavior (pp. 63-64).

Kobler (1964) studied the MMPI profiles of 1,152 religious and 5,000 college students and Kuder Preference Record of 740 religious and Mooney Problem Check List of 390 religious. Kobler designated 102 subjects as "highs" with a mean of 58 or more and with a peak of 70 or more. Faculty ratings for emotional adjustment were used. These faculty ratings did not distinguish the highs. The "highs" indicated more but not different problems on the Mooney and showed less feminine interests on the Kuder. This latter finding was opposed to a more general finding where religious women in the study indicated interests similar to the general male population and religious men's interests were similar to the general female population. Kobler suggests that further evaluation should be done for an applicant who has a mean score of 58 or one or more scores above 70 or high scores especially on the Pt and Sc scales. The same is true for those who have an exaggerated Kuder profile in the direction indicated in the study or with no pronounced interests or a Mooney profile with 20 or more problems checked, 10 of which are serious. He questions the use of the MMPI as a screening instrument for candidates to the priesthood. It was devised to screen psychopathology. Again we are faced with the unanswered question: Is there a significant correlation between those who leave the seminary and maladjustment in the seminary?

Wauck (1957) studied 207 major seminarians with the Ohio State
Psychological Examination, the Kuder Preference Record, the MMPI, and a group Rorschach. He compared faculty ratings of adjustment with the scores of the tests. There was no significant correlation between faculty ratings and any individual test. However, there was a multiple correlation of .38 between the test battery and faculty ratings. He found the D and Hs scales of the MMPI and total adjustment score of the group Rorschach able to discriminate between the groups of ratings. He suggests that the more successful seminarian is "one who tends to be serious-minded and conscientious and who is possessed of social sensitivity and tact (p. 52)." He comments that the "findings tend to bear out the hypothesis that seminary life, when taken seriously, does increase temporary or situational anxiety. Thus the findings seem to suggest a triad in terms of profile or pattern of D, Hs and Pt with the peak on Hs for the typical, successful seminarian (p. 52)."

Wauck does not think that the MMPI is a good predictive instrument for such a highly selected population as major seminarians but is able to show basic levels of adjustment. In Wauck's study the KPR is not helpful in predicting success. He found two scales--social service and literary--significantly correlated to faculty ratings.

Despite Wauck's specific findings, he depicts the typical, well-adjusted seminarian of his study in a very favorable light.

The typical, well adjusted seminarian in this study may be described as being of superior intelligence, strongly interested in people and ideas, tending toward more normal anxiety but with insight and good emotional control. He tends to have fewer pathological conflicts and basic immaturities in his personality than
does his poorly adjusted classmate. He always tends to be relatively freer of morbid preoccupations, strong depressive feelings and crippling anxiety. In a word, he is able to organize, mobilize and direct his intellectual, volitional and affective powers towards the goal of social achievement, a personal happiness with a minimum of strain and dissatisfaction. This interpretation is made despite the presence of relatively elevated D and Pt scores on the MMPI for the "best adjusted" portion of the population, since the writer does not believe that the usual interpretation oriented along pathological lines is warranted. De facto, in the light of careful clinical observation, this group with higher D and Pt scores is not more maladjusted than the group with lower scores. This is further borne out by the fact that the better adjusted group, while obtaining higher D and Pt scores on the MMPI, is actually singularly low in these signs on the Group Rorschach (pp. 64-65).

Rice (1958) studied 73 seminarians of a religious order using the MMPI and found significant differences between his group and the Minnesota male normal group at the .01 level of confidence on scales Hy, Pd, Mf, Pa, Sc, and Ma and significant differences at the .05 level of confidence on scales D and Pt. He suggests the necessity of religious orders and seminaries constructing their own norms if they wish to use the MMPI as a screening device. Rice questions the heterogeneous group of seminarians who formed the subjects for Bier (1948) as representative of seminary groups. Comparing his seminarian group with that of Bier, he found that by not using the K correction the t scores of his subjects were significantly higher. The K correction on his sample elevated the Hy, Pd, Mf, Pt and Sc scales to t scores of 60 or above. Not using the K correction, he found the only elevated scores were on the Hy and Mf scales. With the K correction, the Pt and Sc scales yielded t scores over 63. This may indicate a disturbed and schizoid group.

Using the K correction there were elevated scores for the
seminarians above the highest ones for any group tested by Hathaway in his normalizing study. Rice reasoned that this correction distorted the scores of the seminarian group. Comparing the raw scores of Bier and Hathaway without the K correction to his sample of seminarians he found a significant difference in seven scales. Sweeney (1964) suggests that age differential between Bier's sample (average age: 24.6 years) and Rice's sample (average age: 31.9) of 7.3 years could have contributed to the difference in scores. Rice's subjects were older and had a defense-free attitude and so scored higher compared to Bier's test-conscious group.

Sutter (1961) surveyed 1693 diocesan major seminarians throughout the United States using the KPR and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. He found significant differences on all scales except artistic in his comparison of seminarians with men in general. Seminarians were higher than men in general on social service, literary and musical and lower on outdoor, mechanical, computational, scientific, persuasive and clerical. He also found six of the seven environmental variables were significant in the interest scores.

McAllister and Vanderfeldt (1961) studied a group of 100 priests and 100 seminarians four months from ordination. The priests had been patients in a private psychiatric hospital. They also compared the priest patient group with 100 male patients of the same institution. Both patient groups were studied after discharge. There were differences between these two patient groups in several areas: diagnosis, major symptomatology, age of onset, socio-economic background, school achievement and parental influence.
There were more sociopaths among the priest group than other groups indicated by the former's elevated Pt scale. The authors explain this disparity as reflecting results of the seminary training and clerical life, short and shallow interpersonal relationships, a spirit of detachment, need to prove oneself, and the kind of endorsement given to those who distance themselves from others.

Vocational Interest Testing

The aim of vocational interest testing is assessing the individual's preferences of inclinations with the aim of his choosing an occupation that will match his interests and give him personal satisfaction throughout his working life. Thus, according to Berdie (1949), Kuder in making a case for the validity of his test "places most emphasis upon the fact that people in different occupations, when tested, obtain profiles characteristic of people in those occupations (p. 660)." Vocational interest testing has, therefore, the essential feature of ascertaining the interests and preferences of a large number of successful workers in varying occupations and using them for comparing interests of those seeking occupational placement. According to Bordin (1953) the Kuder Preference does not measure constellations of preferences of various occupations but dimensions of vocational interests. While this necessitates fewer scoring keys and therefore makes it easier scoring, it is more difficult to interpret as it lacks the information of successful persons' interests in a given occupation. According to Clark (1968),
... the individual does have the opportunity to see himself described according to meaningful measures in comparison with other persons of his own age or status, so that he may see whether he exceeds them in terms of interests in various areas. If he then also has the opportunity to compare his scores with the average scores of persons employed in a wide variety of occupations, he may make an assessment of his likelihood of success or his likelihood of happiness in a given field (p. 346).

This is the normative interpretation of the inventory where an individual (e.g., seminarian is being compared with some reference group as other seminarians, priests or other young men). In comparing the interests of seminarians with those of successful priests, it must be established that such likeness of interests is predictive. For example, will he have satisfaction or happiness in the priesthood? Will he persevere in the priesthood? Will he competently and generously minister or render service to those who are to be recipients of his priestly activities? On the other hand would a low interest relationship with those of successful priests predict a future dissatisfied, unhappy, non-serving or non-persevering priest? This is the very center of concern for necessary validity studies. Katz (1965) is not satisfied with the adequacy of the norms given in the manual for the Kuder Preference Record-Vocational. He writes: "In fact, empirical evidence often fails to substantiate that a score above the 75th percentile promises satisfaction or success in a given occupation or school subject (p. 1063)." Some studies indicate that the 75th percentile is far below the mean of persons in a given occupation. Low interest scores, on the other hand, have not always been verified in dissatisfied and unsuccessful workers of a given occupation. Since the raw scores on this record are not independent, an individual with many intense
interests may receive a lower interest percentile score in a given area than other persons who have little interest in any area but have more interest in this specific area.

A second kind of interpretation of the vocational preference on this record has been referred to as ipsative. This interpretation is based on the highest vs. lowest scores of an individual without regard to a comparison group. The ipsative interpretation seems warranted because of the forced choice demanded of the respondent. However, the translated percentile scores do not totally reflect the true area of greater or less interest preference. A student might, for example, choose an equal amount of two interest areas which have the same possible total raw scores and yet obtain very different percentile scores. This interpretation may assist the student to validate his choice of an occupation with things he ordinarily prefers.

Thus Katz (1965) comments that "the normative conversion spoils ipsative interpretation (p. 1065)." Therefore, one might say that norms vitiate the objectively true personal interests and the personal forced choice interests interfere with normative interpretation.

The interest instrument comparison is based on two assumptions. The first assumption is that interests are stable in the sense that they do not radically vary with age. Speaking of this stability in regard to the Strong Vocational Interest Blank, Clark (1968) writes:

A variety of studies of this sort have been completed but have not yet been published. They lead to the generalization that students of college age as well as those in the 11th and 12th grades of high school have interests that are not sufficiently mature and that they have
stabilized enough to be generally useful for prediction of later scores. At the 9th and 10th grade levels some young persons have achieved a maturation of interests sufficient to enable prediction of their scores at later times but others have not. Unfortunately there is no certain way to identify those persons for whom interest measurements are appropriate and those who are not adequately mature although many signs of immaturity may be used. These studies have demonstrated that the interests of persons in general move from an emphasis on natural sciences toward social sciences and the social sciences during the period from early high school to late college years (p. 347).

A second assumption of stability of interests is that members of an occupation or vocation do not change occupational interests. The relevant question here is: do priests today differ in their interests from priests a generation or two ago. One might, for example, ask what effect the contemporary religious situation of Vatican II has on the nature of priesthood or ministry. Also how do these events alter the interests of those who are priests and seminarians. Campbell (1966) gives some evidence that employees in the Federal Reserve System in Minnesota tested on the SVIB in early 1930's have almost identical interests of individuals 35 years later who are entering into the same occupational work of banking, even though banking theory and practice has undergone serious changes in this period of time. This may be unique and the interests were measured on the SVIB. It would seem that each vocation, e.g., the priesthood, should be studied over a period of time to see:

1) if individuals in the priesthood have the same interests now that they had before entering the seminary and as seminarians and priests;

2) if seminarians and priests today show the same interests of seminarians and priests twenty-five years ago.
Interest instruments purport to assist a person find satisfaction in a given vocation or occupation. They might, therefore, be questioned in terms of stability of interests, that if the interests remain stable and the vocation or occupation changes, is there not danger that a person may become dissatisfied to the degree that the given vocation alters its nature or function. It might even be questioned whether satisfaction is a necessary result of choosing a vocation consistent with one's interests. It may be too simplistic to relate occupational satisfaction with occupational interest as occupational satisfaction may be a multi-dimensioned function.

Clark (1968) writes:

It may also be . . . that satisfaction itself is not readily predictable and that whatever factors produce high degrees of satisfaction or low degrees of satisfaction as reported by individuals are not factors relating to the pleasure that a person gets from the activities that are specific to the occupation. Recent studies of the different factors producing satisfaction and dissatisfaction in work settings may yield light on this matter (p. 348).

A seminarian or priest may be dissatisfied or unhappy not because he lacks the proper interests but because of other related events, i.e., those related to his living out his life in a specific situation.

Kuder Preference Record

The norms of the Kuder consist of two groups of adults and high school students. One adult group is made up of 1000 men--telephone subscribers--of 138 cities and towns from all over the United States. Using the Census Bureau Classification, Kuder divides the men according to occupation. The number of men in each occupation is given and their appropriate interest scores. Another normative group consists of 1296 adult men
classified by United States Census Bureau. In the former group of 1000, 10 clergymen are included and in the latter group of 1296 adult men, there are 12 clergymen. Another adult normative group consists of 100 women.

The Manual (1956) says that the "norms for scales 1 through 9 have been transmuted from the norms for Form B (N = 1429) by means of equations developed from a group of subjects who took both forms. The norms on the Outdoor scale are based on 100 women (p. 23.)" The high school norms are based on 3418 high school boys and 4466 high school girls representing the entire country.

In this way one can compare a given profile against the normative sample of men, women or high school students or with individuals of a variety of specific occupations. He can thus learn his similarity or disparity with these groups.

Carter (1953) refers to the reliability of the Kuder as satisfactory and to the validity as one of the best in this area. He regards the KPR as a "carefully constructed and well planned instrument (p. 738)." Although Fowler (1953) evaluates the manual evidence as supporting the validity of the scores, he views the criteria upon which it is based as armchair reasoning and consequent-antecedent logic. He suggests: "What is needed are some genuine follow-up studies in which scores obtained by people before they enter occupations are compared with various measures of their vocational success. In the opinion of this reviewer, the validity of the Kuder Preference Record scores is still very much open to question (p. 741)."

Chambers (1949) questions what "validity" means in a test such as
the Kuder. He finds it "a vast assumption to take workers in a particular occupation as necessarily having strong occupational preferences for that sphere of employment. Very often it happens that individuals become experts in some career upon which they embarked through economic pressure or in some haphazard way and, though experts, their genuine preferences may be for something very different (p. 640)."

The Kuder Preference Record, according to Bordin (1953), "identifies broad areas of vocational interest and proceeds to translate them into specific occupations (through mean profiles for occupational groups and regression equations) (p. 737)." Carter (1953) finds the claims made for the test modest, reasonable, practical and valuable. He judges the Kuder as the most useful available instrument "for introducing students to organized study of occupations and career selection, and for guiding them into educational and vocational activities they will find satisfying and enjoyable (p. 738)." He finds it not only especially suited for high school students but also average adults not preparing to occupy one of the professions, and even helpful for superior seventh-grade students. Fowler (1953) thinks the Kuder is in many ways as good or better than the Strong Vocational Interest Blank. However, Katz (1965) does not evaluate KPR-Vocational as such. He argues that the "problems involved in the derivation and interpretation of scores must rank it well below such other vocational interest inventories as the Strong Vocational Interest Blank and the Kuder Preference Record--Occupational in usefulness (p. 1067)." Pierce-Jones (1959) reports that the KPR-V has approached but not attained "the standard of technical
thoroughness set by the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (p. 891)."

There is some criticism of validation data used by Kuder for his interest record. Bordin (1953) questions data that is largely that of consumers of the test on the basis that the controls of administration are unknown. He queries how unbiased is such data. He finds it "hard to imagine anyone ordinarily being motivated to send to a test author data which demonstrates that it does not do what the author hopes and believes it does (p. 737)." Another criticism Bordin makes is that the mean profiles of the occupational groups are based on a small number of cases. Finally he does not find in the research any follow-up studies beyond a year period and questions the justification of several studies of the KPR establishing its validity. The Kuder "still cannot be considered as a fully developed instrument until validation studies and evidence on stability are available (p. 738)." Super (1949) found no studies correlating the Kuder scores with either achievement or continuation in a vocation. Fowler (1953) evaluated the evidence cited in the Manual to be "scanty and inconclusive" for differentiating "successful from nonsuccessful people within an occupation (p. 742)." He mentions his own discouraging research results in this matter. Froelich (1959) cites as his greatest dissatisfaction with the Kuder the implication that the interest norms "have established relevance to occupations (p. 891)."

The reliability estimates for the 10 interest scores for 1000 men, 100 each of women, high school boys and girls range between .84 and .93. Fowler (1953) questions "whether scores obtained from a single administration
of the blank should be accepted completely at their face value. The reported reliabilities are none too high for individual differentiation, and counselling must be done on an individual basis. . . . the author should provide more information about the groups used and the situations in which the reliability estimates were obtained. Otherwise the unsophisticated reader may think of these estimates as the reliability of the blank (p. 740).

Occupational and Vocational Choice

Interest testing used the normative profiles of a given occupation to predict a person's satisfaction in this occupation. If one assumes that the interests of members in an occupation have been established to the relevant occupational interests, when can one use the norms in assisting a person to enter this occupation? The question is when are the young person's interests mature enough to make an occupational choice.

Ginzberg (1952) defines occupational choice as a process, largely irreversible and containing the essential element of compromise. There are three periods of occupational decision: 1) fantasy choices (before 11 years); 2) tentative choices (ages 11-17 years); and 3) realistic choices (between 17 and young adulthood at which time one makes a final choice).

In the tentative period, there are four stages: 1) interests stage--choices are based almost exclusively on interests; 2) capacities stage; 3) values stage; and 4) transition stage. It is not until the realistic period that one acquaints himself with his alternatives in a final way (exploration stage), determines his choices (crystallization stage) and delimits his choice (specification stage). Ginzberg makes no claim for the final validity
of this scheme or any part of his developmental theory. He cites only his own experience which includes work with males from lower and upper income classes. Apropos of our own concern, he notes two types of major variations within his structure:

The first in the patterns of choice. There are people who might be characterized by their singleness of purpose. They are found typically among those with a pronounced aptitude or talent which comes to the surface early. Others start with a rather broad and ill-defined area of interest, which is narrowed during adolescence.

The second major variation concerns the timing of crystallization of choice. Although this usually occurs between 19 and 21, it may take place considerably earlier or much later (p. 493).

According to Ginzberg's theory there are besides normal variability in the above pattern and timing of crystallization, certain deviations. The first has to do with making choices solely in terms of interests not considering his capacities or values. A second deviation is being unable to make a choice due to pathological passivity or extreme pleasure orientation not allowing for the necessary compromise.

An interesting aspect of Ginzberg's theory that is related to this study is the irreversibility of the choice process, which is based upon "reality pressures which introduce major obstacles to alterations in plans. A student in the second year of medical school will not easily decide to change his career plans. In addition, there are serious emotional barriers to a shift in plans because such a shift can so easily take on the quality of failure and present a threat to self-esteem (p. 493)."

The final contention of Ginzberg is the necessity of compromise in every occupational choice so that one might consider in the best way his
interests, capacities, values and goals within the given environmental opportunities and limitations. He evaluates all these in terms of attaining the greatest amount of satisfaction in his work and life. Ginzberg's own comment is: "The theory suggests the type of help to offer individuals at different stages in their development, as well as to emphasize the limitations attached to prematurely offering them help which they could utilize only at a later stage. The theory carries with it a strong overevaluation of objective tests (pp. 493-494)."

Super (1953) views Ginzberg's theory as "likely to be harmful because of its limitations . . . (p. 186)." He proceeds to enumerate these limitations:

First, it does not build adequately on previous work: for example the extensive literature on the nature, development, and predictive value of inventoried interests is rather lightly dismissed.

Second, "choice" is defined as preference rather than as entry or some other implementation of choice, and hence means different things at different age levels. . . .

A third defect in Ginzberg's theory emerges from these different meanings of the word "choice" at different ages: it is the falseness of the distinction between "choice" and "adjustment" which he and his research team make. . . . there is no sharp distinction between choice and adjustment. Instead they blend in adolescence, with now the need to make a choice and now the need to make an adjustment predominating in the occupational or life situation.

Finally, a fourth limitation in the work of Ginzberg lies in the fact that . . . did not study or describe the compromise process (pp. 186-187).

Super presents his own comprehensive theory of vocational development. Individuals differ in abilities, interests and personalities and qualify for a number of occupations, calling on certain characteristic patterns. This allows for a variety of occupations for each individual and a variety of
individuals within a given occupation. The necessary preferences and competences of one's self-concept are partially a function of time and experience.

The self-concept is generally more stable from late adolescence to late maturity. Thus both choice and adjustment are continuous processes. There are five life stages 1) growth, 2) exploration, 3) establishment, 4) maintenance and 5) declines.

The exploratory stage includes the fantasy, tentative and realistic phases and the establishment stage includes trial and stable phases. The nature of the pattern of a person's occupational level is determined by his parents' socio-economic level, his intelligence, personality and opportunities of experience. The vocational development can be helped by being assisted in the process of maturation of abilities, interests, reality testing and self-concept development. It demands the self-concept, which is an interaction of one's inherited qualities, his opportunities of role playing and the reactions of others. Role playing is the process used in vocational compromise. His work and life situations depend on his opportunities for expressing his abilities, interests, personality traits and values.

Ernst (1947) defines the life choice (option vitale) as a conscious direction of a person's life course, which is done approximately at about age 16. The previous choices of early childhood and adolescence may make the life choice more difficult. The author argues that this life choice is emotional in nature. Thus vocational testing must evaluate this emotional element. The person in view of his own personality development makes his
life choice. His rational motivation is secondary to this emotional aspect, in choosing one's vocation.

Ausubel (1954) holds that the adolescent must understand his real interests and values before he can make occupational choices that are congruent with his interests, abilities or values.

Katz (1965) refers to lack of relevant kinds of experience, activity and information as being important to understanding why the young person does not prefer certain interests. He writes: "Evidence that inventoried interests have not stabilized in the early secondary school years is probably a consequence not so much of genetic immaturity as of insufficient exploration (p. 1066)." Such a young person simply has not had the kind of experiences to either like or dislike something.

Super (1960) reports that his group of typical ninth-grade boys were developed vocationally to consider problems of prevocational and vocational choices. However, they lacked generally the readiness to make vocational choices. They can explore but not decide on a vocation. This is the age group that most often in the past entered a high school minor seminary. Super sees this period of development as one for expanding experiences in various environmental opportunities so that young men can subsequently make a choice.

Thompson (1960) also sees vocational development in this way:

The goal of vocational guidance at the junior high school level is the broadening of occupational horizons rather than the premature narrowing of choices. It should maximize the individual's potentialities rather than screen him in relation to a few requirements. It should provide a broad career orientation which will facilitate the making of the specific curricular choices required by our educational system but
it should not require specific occupational decisions per se. Vocational maturity in ninth graders is a function of the recognition of the possibility of vocational goals and the desirability of planning for them but it does not require having consistent or stable vocational preferences per se (p. 36).

Pfliegler (1957) cites the results of a questionnaire of two German Catholic newspapers for children. They asked their young readers "What do you want most of all?" Of the thousands of replies, 4.97 per cent of the boys answered that they wanted to become priests (p. 19). Pfliegler makes reference to this study to indicate that children are even attracted to the priesthood. However, he adds that "the conscious choice faces the young man at the end of his adolescence (p. 19)."

Bier (1964) refers to his own experience to collaborate what vocation directors have said that "most Catholic adolescents, at least those who attend Catholic schools, consider the possibility of a religious vocation at some time or other in the course of their schooling (p. 229)."

Frison (1962) claims that it is a known fact that interests are defined only after puberty. They take shape around the age of eighteen, before that age there is much instability and fluctuation. Keeping this in mind, one will not find it so strange that many vocations are "lost" during that period of time. Before that age, the use of tests of interests and personality have only a relative value. . . . The best time to judge a seminarian's vocation is the age sixteen - seventeen (p. 70).

D'Arcy (1962) summarizes the available work about interests of seminarians and priests measured on the Kuder: First, seminarians score high on social service, literary and musical interests. Secondly, they score low on mechanical, scientific and clerical interests. Third, their artistic interests are average. Fourth, successful and unsuccessful
seminarians resemble each other in their interests and differ from the interests of the general population. Fifth, the unsuccessful have more alternative interests. Sixth, interests characteristic of the priesthood can be obtained in the high school seminarian. Seventh, interests change with age, and the direction is towards helping and relating to people. Finally, certain environmental factors are related to interests.

Potvin and Suziedelis (1969) using a questionnaire found psychological adjustment differences between seminarians and non-seminarians at the high school level. These differences were on the "aesthete" patterns and heterosexual disinterest. (Concerning these, the authors find both of these findings understandable:

The "aesthete" pattern reflects avocational interests which are part and parcel of the religious "occupation," especially in contrast to science and technical occupations. The second—heterosexual disinterest—may be interpreted once again as reflecting the "idealistic" stance of the minor seminarian. For some seminarians, however, it may also reflect a difficulty in sexual identification. "The male body sometimes attracts me" is one of the items significantly differentiating between the two groups and implies a greater incidence of object ambivalence in the sexual development among the seminarians (p. 47).

In comparing the seminarians at the theologate level with those of high school and college these same authors note that "while there is a very steady and substantial drop in the scores of 'heterosexual disinterest,' there is an equally pronounced solidification of the 'aesthete' pattern. Developmentally, this makes good sense. At an earlier age, more masculine avocational interests are espoused, but direct heterosexual interests suppressed; at maturity, the situation is reversed (pp. 51, 53)." There is a greater crystallization of the feminine avocational interests (the aesthete)
among the religious than the diocesan seminarians.

Brooks (1965) cites the research of Bier (1948), Ihota (1948), D'Arcy (1954), Wauck (1958) and Sutter (1961) in their "agreement that priests and seminarians are more 'feminine' in their interests than the laity. This means that the tastes of the former tend to be more literary, artistic, musical and service-oriented than those of the average layman (p. 227-228)."

For high school seminarians who leave the seminary Potvin and Suziedelis (1969) report that "the sole definitely replicable differences (i.e., a difference significant with both half-samples) is the score of heterosexual disinterest (lack of interest in marriage, girls, uneasiness with them, no experience with dating or 'being in love'). This difference is not only significant, but of a sizeable magnitude . . . (p. 113)."

Brooks (1965) refers to the homogeneous population in the seminary. The seminarians are working toward identical goals and are exposed to an identical program of indoctrination. In view of this it may be that the common preferred interests are a function of the seminary that encourages and reinforces specific values and interests reflective of the expectancies of the seminarians' superiors and peers. However, Maddaus and O'Harra (1967) did discriminate on the basis of priest criterion interests high school boys preferring the priesthood from high school boys preferring science, business, medicine, law, non-professional occupations, military careers and engineering. This study done on 9-12th graders not in seminary situation may indicate that interests shared with priests transcends
Personality Traits

The screening of candidates for the priesthood is to assist in maximizing mentally healthy, mature and effective priestly personnel. The future priest shares a common culture with the layman. He may be affected by this culture positively or negatively. He has not only the strengths but the weaknesses of his fellowman. If he remains in his environs he may survive, get better or worse. If he chooses to move out of it, he may choose a situation that is similar to his previous one or different—more or less stressful to him. His survival, maturation and effectiveness depend on his ability to interact with this new environment. Priestly existence that is effective demands a psychologically healthy person, to be able to deal with the greater stresses of the ministry. A priest who cannot live a human, happy and holy life under these stresses may become an emotional casualty.

Bier (1964) cites the National Association for Mental Health's characteristics of good mentally healthy individuals as helpful for speaking of someone as psychologically suitable:

First . . . people with good mental health feel comfortable about themselves. . . . not overwhelmed by their own emotions. They take life's disappointments in stride. They neither underestimate nor overestimate their abilities and they are ready to accept their own shortcomings. They have self-respect, and they get satisfaction from simple everyday pleasures. The second chief characteristic . . . they feel right about other people . . . able to give love and to consider the interests of others. They expect to like and trust others, and take it for granted that others will like and trust them. They respect the differences they find in other people, and they have a sense of responsibility to their neighbors and their fellow-man. The third chief
characteristic . . . they are able to meet the demands of life. This means that they do something about their problems as they arise and they accept their responsibilities. They plan ahead, but do not fear the future. They welcome new experiences and new ideas and they set realistic goals for themselves. They put their best efforts into what they do, and get satisfaction out of doing it. . . These are the behavioral characteristics which, by and large, you expect to find in the applicant psychologically suitable for religious life (p. 234).

The person who seeks to enter the priesthood has both conscious and unconscious motives for doing so. Some are healthy and productive of a healthy priestly experience but others are not.

Patvin and Suziedelis (1969) wrote:

"Seminarian" is not a type; there may well be many types. There is no one psychodynamic of personality that fits the priestly vocation, but there may be patterns which can be discerned. There are many reasons for choosing the priesthood, and many reasons for rejecting it; many ways of succeeding and of failing, many modes of adjusting and mal-adjusting to the demands of the human role of the priest. We are conscious of the fact that a general descriptive approach tends to "average out" such realities (p. 129).

Speaking of the priest Pfliegler (1958) writes:

A very serious source of failure in later life is the suppression or even the neglect of personality. Only strong, rounded, healthy, and energetic men will be able to master the huge task that awaits them, humanly speaking. They alone make an impression; they alone will remain firm rocks of support in times of distress. . . . It is a tremendous mistake when candidates of a strong, self-willed character are regarded with suspicion or even rejected. . . . Therefore, it is the task of the seminary to try each one with regard to his vocation and not exclude the troublesome candidates (pp. 38-39).

Every candidate for the priesthood has both personality assets and flaws. Vocational screening purports to minimize if not eliminate those who could not remain intact in the priesthood. It attempts to help others know their strengths and weaknesses and use the former to overcome or deal with the latter. A part of the screening program, therefore, attempts to study
the personality of men who are mentally healthy, mature and effective and those who are not. It is hoped thus that while one perfect specimen personality profile is not attainable, there may be certain measurements of personality that may detect the personality qualities desirable for the priesthood. Once these qualities can be measured by some testing measures, items that refer to the behavior of a given trait can be constructed.

Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey

The 300 items of this survey chosen were identified by internal consistency analysis. The Manual (1949) reports split-half reliabilities ranging from .75 to .87. The intercorrelations have been found to be "gratifyingly low," ranging from .01 to .69. Van Steenberg (1949) agrees the intercorrelations are low and there are 10 separate traits being measured. Harney (1967) reports that the results obtained on GZTS profiles of seminarians tend to support Guilford's claim of reliability and low intercorrelations. The claim of intercorrelations, however, are "uncomfortably high," e.g., S and A have an \( r = .61 \) and E and O have an \( r \) of .69. Both S and A scores reflect social behavior and E and O refer to emotional behavior.

All of the test norms traits except the T (Thoughtfulness) trait were based on scores of 523 college men and 389 college women. The normal of the items on the T trait were obtained from 252 high school seniors and their parents. The ages of the male sample of the norm group range from 18 to 30 years with a mean about 23 years. The high school seniors and the parents (ages ranging from 37 to 62 years) did not differ significantly in their mean scores on the final 10-trait survey. It is assumed by the
authors of the test that "it is unlikely that intermediate age groups would differ from these two extremes with respect to T (Manual, p. 6)."

One is not to equate high scores with success and low with failure. The authors comment: "In most cases the optimal scores do not extend to the top of the scale, but are at a moderate position between the mean and the top (p. 8)." This optimal score would seem to vary with the type of demands made by the environment to which one has to adjust.

It is hoped that the screening instrument used on seminarians measures relatively stable characteristics of the personality. If this were not true one might well be measuring the seminary environment on the interaction of seminary situation on the seminarian. While it is true that the seminary environment will affect in some way all the seminarians, it may be assumed that the relatively stable characteristics of the personality will relate differently in the seminary situational stresses. The Church is interested in persevering and successful candidates but even more so, is she interested in persevering and successful priests. Therefore, one might present a favorable profile on a screening instrument, but does this reflect transient moods or situational stresses or does it portray the true personality. If the latter, how well does the GZTS or the KPR measure the desirable characteristics of a persevering and successful seminarian and priest. Jackson (1961) administered the GZTS to 96 female employees of two commercial offices of a telephone company in 1953 and again 18 months later. He found indications that the GZTS "scores demonstrate considerable stability over time, and high test-retest
reliability (p. 433)." This would indicate that the test does measure relatively persistent characteristics of the person.

The GZTS has been used to study trait likenesses and differences between subjects of different occupations and subjects of a specific vocation compared to norm group of men in general.

Beauer (1955) studied the GZTS scores of student nurses and compared them with a matched group (age and race) of female education majors. While both groups were average to superior on four traits (E, O, F and P), the student nurses scored higher than the education majors on three traits (E, F and S) and lower on one trait (M). The author concludes the GZTS does a "reasonably good" job differentiating these two groups.

Leeds (1956) found that a group of teachers compared to the norm group scored significantly higher (.01 level) for five traits (R, E, O, F and P) and lower for two traits (G and A) with no significant difference on the S, T and M traits.

Cook, Linden and McKay (1961) factor analytically investigated the relationship of scores on the EPPS and GZTS. The subjects were 196 sophomore college teacher trainees. They identified six factors, given new labels, and found a discrepancy between teachers ideal and real personality characteristics. Then Cook, LeBold and Linden (1963) compared the results of the above teacher trainees with 252 students enrolled in a freshman engineering orientation course in 1960. The results indicated five of the six factors as common to both groups but a sixth factor (Authoritarianism) as peculiar to the teacher trainees and no corresponding unique factor
for the engineering students. The authors conclude that "the five factors identified tend to be a function of the group tested." In this latter study, two conditions limit its applicability: sex differences and academic classification (sophomore teacher trainees and freshman engineering students).

The effect of socio-economic status has been studied and its effect on GZTS. Singer, Steffire and Thompson (1958) classified 672 male high school seniors according to the father's occupation. Using the GZTS they found:

Boys from professional homes were more friendly and more thoughtful than the rest of the group, boys from semi-professional homes less active, boys from clerical homes less active and more friendly, boys from service homes more active and less restrained, boys from agriculture and unskilled homes less active, less restrained and less thoughtful. Most of these differences were at .05 level of confidence.

... matching boys from non-manual homes with those from manual homes showed that the former were more stable emotionally, more objective, more friendly and more thoughtful all at .01 level of confidence. Speculation suggests that these differences may be rooted in the emphasis placed on security of the child and development of social skills in non-manual homes which are so important in middle-class child rearing practices.

It is concluded that scores on some temperament traits vary with socio-economic status, and a consideration of this fact will aid in the interpretation of test data and the understanding of children (p. 283).

The GZTS has been studied to see the effect age has on the test. Bendig (1960) found that scores on G, A, S and M significantly and linearly decreased with increasing age, R linearly increased with age and P increased irregularly. These findings need not indicate change in personality with age but could reflect differences present in these persons from their
childhood. However, one might be cautious of age differences in groups and comparing of a specific group with the norm group.

A study on subjects according to religious adherence by Baggaley (1963) found no significant differences at the .05 level between Jewish and Gentile male students as measured by the GZTS.

As to the effects of personality traits on success and failure, Shaw and Grubb (1958) found significantly higher scores on the GZTS hostility scores among bright male underachievers than among a correspondingly bright group of male achievers. They conclude that scholastic underachievement is not a phenomenon caused specifically by the school situation.

Hughes (1963) found significant differences on the $E$, $O$ and $P$ factors between successful and unsuccessful groups of students completing a master's degree in education.

One of the major reasons for wariness on inventories such as the GZTS for screening is the transparency of the test and its amenability to faking. Herzberg (1954) reports that his study substantiates that various groups have different motives for taking the test. The evidence for faking is greater or less depending on the motives for which it is taken.

Jacobs and Schlaff (1955) developed three validation scoring keys to measure faking. They devised a gross-falsification ($GF$) score to detect those who willfully try to make good scores. A second score is the subtle-falsification ($SF$) for those who unwittingly attempt to make good scores. Finally, there is the careless deviancy score to detect those who respond erratically and produce an unusually large number of extremely rare
responses. The GF scale correlates significantly (at the .01 level) with the L and K scales of the MMPI. The SF scale has smaller but still significant correlations with these same MMPI scales.

Edwards (1953) speaks of the judged social desirability of a trait and the probability of its endorsement. He comments on this social desirability as follows:

The data clearly indicate that the probability of endorsement of them increases with the judged desirability of the item. This does not necessarily mean that the subjects are misrepresenting themselves on the inventory. It may be that traits which are judged as desirable are those which are fairly widespread or common among members of a culture or group. That is, if a pattern of behavior is prevalent among members of a group, it will be judged as desirable; if it is uncommon, it will be judged undesirable. We might thus expect items indicating desirable traits to be endorsed more frequently than items indicating undesirable traits (p. 92).

Rosen (1956) views another aspect of fakeability: personal desirability. He defines it as: "appraisal of the desirability of given behaviors and traits in oneself, regardless of whether one in fact evidences the behaviors or traits (p. 151)." He sees this personal desirability to be synonymous with one's own opinion of desirability of a trait in himself.

Sutter (1961) using the GZTS with major seminarians "hoped that, because of the type of subjects employed, this weakness was to a great extent inconsequential (p. 36)." However, one may be too optimistic in this regard. He needs to remember two things: the environment of the seminary and the possibility of being dismissed may influence faking on the part of seminarians. The seminary is an institution for attaining ideals and thus generates high standards of expected behavior. The seminarian may respond to the ideals of his life rather than the realities. Also the seminarian
is in a sense always on probation, trying to prove to himself and others that he is, if not worthy, at least not completely unworthy of the priesthood. Thus he may find himself attempting to make a good impression (GF) or at least giving himself the benefit of the doubt (SF). If Sutter's assumption may be made for major seminarians, the adolescent minor seminarian faced with the same two conditions of environment and dismissal may find faking a possible approach in this test.

Several personality instruments have been used on seminarians and priests. One of the most frequently used psychological tests used for this purpose is the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). A less frequently used instrument with seminarians and priests and the one used in this study is the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS). The populations relative to this study that have used the GZTS are seminarians of a religious order examined by Wagner (1957) and Kremp (1961); priests, minor and major seminarians by Murray (1957) and major seminarians by Sutter (1961).

**Follow-up Studies**

Follow-up studies on personality traits have not been extensive in seminary populations. Those that have been reported use the MMPI. The GZTS has been used to study the profiles of various kinds of seminarian and priest populations. However, the only follow-up study using this survey on seminarians has been the one reported by Kremp (1961). He found the GZTS did not distinguish persevering and non-persevering seminarians. The other studies compared GZTS profile scores of various groups of college
students, seminarians and priests (Murray, 1957) or major seminarians with them.

Several studies using other instruments have been reported that use their previous data in follow-up studies. Hispanicus (1962) compared 40 persevering and 10 non-persevering seminarians. Three scores on the MMPI (Pd, Pt and Sc) favored a better adjustment for the persevering over the non-persevering seminarians. Weisgerber (1962) used the modified MMPI form and found that Pd, Pt and Mf scales distinguished his persevering and non-persevering group. Barry (1960) in a 10-year follow-up study developed a religious scale (Re) which he devised by item analysis of the different responses given by one-half of the seminarians accepted as opposed to one-half of the seminarians not accepted. He then cross-validated his new Re scale on the other half of the accepted and on the other half of the rejected seminarians. He found that all the clerical scales except Ma and Hy differentiated the persevering and non-persevering seminarians at a significant level. Murray and Connolly (1966) report a follow-up study of modified form of MMPI scores obtained seven years previously to distinguish the persevering and non-persevering seminarians. They found that the Sc and Ma were the only scales that distinguished the two groups at the .01 level of significance. Using Barry's Re scale on their persevering and non-persevering seminarians and found them significantly higher on this scale than the accepted and rejected seminarians of Barry's study. In the Murray and Connolly study, the sigmas approached the size of the means and two to three times those obtained by Barry. These authors judge the Re
scale as unsuitable for those already in the seminary. The seminary has a homogenizing effect on the seminarians with its regularity and regulations. This may explain why such follow-up studies of seminarians who stay or leave have frequently failed to show any significant differences.

After analyzing his data on various tests of a college level group of seminarians, Weisgerber (1969) comments on the short- vs. long-term prediction:

In the first place, what success the psychologist has—and it is modest—is found in the first year, with sometimes a little addition in the second, third, and fourth years. For a period of about six years after that, the record does not flatter him. However, there is some evidence, albeit not more than suggestive, in favor of prediction for a longer term (11 to 13 years in this study). One can certainly not be as sanguine about long-term prediction as some of the literature on screening of seminarians has implied. On the other hand, one cannot simply pass it off as completely impossible (p. 108).

Weisgerber (1969) found the MMPI mean scores did not discriminate the successful from unsuccessful seminarians. However, he warns that this does not imply this instrument is useless. He writes: "... there is a fundamental objection to the reliance on mean scores in the personality test which purports to measure a number of traits which are more or less distinct. ... And it is precisely one of the advantages of a 'multiphasic' test it takes account of this selective abnormality by measuring a group of traits (p. 61)."

A trait is an abstraction of behavior. A seminarian cannot be thought of as possessing or not possessing a given trait. He performs in a certain way in different specified situations. Therefore, one has more or less of a given trait. So the seminarian stands somewhere along a continuum of behavior of a given trait.
CHAPTER III

Method

Subjects

The subjects of this study are 157 high school minor seminarians studying in a religious community without vows who do a variety of domestic and foreign apostolic works.

Test Material

The tests administered were the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (GZTS) and the Kuder Preference Record: Vocational Form C.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was designed to put into one inventory several previous inventories that were devised by Guilford and his colleagues. This new inventory measuring 10 traits has 300 items, i.e., 30 items for each trait. The possible answers to the survey items are "yes," "no," or "?," depending on respondent's agreement, disagreement or uncertainty in relation to the item.

The 10 traits and a description of each is given here.

General Activity (G). A high score stands for a strong and persistent drive reflecting energy, activity, efficiency and productivity. It characterizes a person who makes decisions quickly and implements them immediately. Contrary-wise, a low score indicates slowness and deliberateness in making and carrying out decisions. It reflects fatigue, inefficiency and
unproductivity.

Restraint (R). A high scorer tends to be serious mindedness, deliberateness, persistence in effort and self-control. A low scorer is happy-go-lucky, carefree, impulsive, and excitement loving.

Ascendancy (A). A high score indicates dominance and leadership ability. It reflects a person who desires to speak and convince people, be conspicuous, even at times bluffing to attain this role. A low score refers to a follower, submissive and hesitant in standing up and speaking out.

Sociability (S). The high scorer here is described as a person who has many friends and acquaintances, easily enters into conversation and seeks to be conspicuous through social activities and contacts. A low scorer tends to be shy, has few friends and acquaintances. He is likely to refrain from conversation, social contacts and activities.

Emotional Stability (E). An even-tempered, optimistic, composed and cheerful person is likely to obtain a high score. A moody, pessimistic, gloomy, excitable, brooding, day-dreaming, guilty, lonely or worried person is apt to score low.

Objectivity (O). A high score reflects a thickskinned individual. A low score characterizes a hypersensitive egotistic, self-centered, suspicious and trouble-prone person.

Friendliness (F). A person who can tolerate hostility, accept domination and respect others describes the high scorer. A belligerent, hostile, dominating, contemptuous person is reflected by a low score.

Thoughtfulness (T). A person who observes and reflects on his and
and others' behavior describes the high scorer. However, the individual whose interest in others is lacking or limited to superficial overt behavior is likely to obtain a low score.

**Personal Relations (P).** A high score indicates tolerances of others and faith in social institutions. A low score reflects a hypercritical, fault finding, suspicious, self-pitying person.

**Masculinity (M).** A person interested in masculine types of activities and vocations, not easily disgusted or frightened, hard boiled, inhibiting emotional expression and on showing little interest in clothes or styles is likely to score high. A low scorer is likely to be one interested in feminine activities and vocations, easily disgusted, sympathetic, fearful, expressive of romantic emotionality. Also such a person manifests interests in clothes and styles and dislikes vermin.

The Kuder Preference Record has 10 interest scales and a verification score. The interest scores are numbered 0 through 9 in the following order: outdoor, mechanical, computational, scientific, persuasive, artistic, literary, musical, social services and clerical.

The verification score aims at detecting those who failed to follow directions or answered carelessly or without understanding. This verification score does not preclude faking on the individual's part if he is so motivated. However, this is less likely to happen if administered under proper conditions. It is also more difficult to do this on the first administration as the subject is unaware of the scales. However, faking must always be a possibility on the retest. The seminarian aware that he
is constantly being screened may fake to meet expectancies. This conscious 
or unconscious desire may motivate other behavior and test taking offers 
no sure exception.

Procedure

The test materials were distributed to the seminarians sequentially 
and the respective instructions read for each test. The subjects were al-
lowed to ask questions about the instructions and then proceeded to take 
both tests. The test was administered in a large study hall. The admin-
istrator of the test was a psychologist who was very familiar with the 
test materials. These tests were administered in the fall of 1961.
CHAPTER IV

Results

The tests were scored at the time of administration in 1961. This study is interested in studying persevering and non-persevering seminarians. The data obtained in 1961 was analyzed in 1970. The persevering seminarians are those who have continued studying for the priesthood through the school year 1969-1970. Those who did not continue studying for the priesthood make up the non-persevering group without any distinction as to what part of the nine-year period they discontinued as seminarians.

The scores of the Kuder Preference Record are as given in Table 1. The persevering seminarians significantly differed at the .001 level of confidence from the non-persevering seminarians on social service interests. They were also significantly different from the non-persevering seminarians in musical interests (.002 level of confidence), computational interests (0.01 level of confidence) and literary interests (0.02 level of confidence).

The persevering and the non-persevering seminarians also differ in the rank choice of their interests as noted in Table 2. The persevering seminarians obtained high percentile scores in all the scales except for the outdoor and mechanical score where the non-persevering seminarians scored slightly higher.

The results of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey are given
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Non-Persevering (N=1141)</th>
<th>Persevering (N=16)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor</td>
<td>44.31</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>43.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>36.62</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>26.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>36.71</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>41.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>25.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary</td>
<td>15.04</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>20.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service</td>
<td>34.62</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>46.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>41.43</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>44.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.02  
** p < 0.01  
*** p < 0.002  
**** p < 0.001
Table 2

Kuder Preference Record Scores for Persevering and Non-Persevering Seminarians in Rank Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Persevering (N=141)</th>
<th>Persevering (N=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Outdoor</td>
<td>53rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Artist</td>
<td>48th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Clerical</td>
<td>40th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Scientific</td>
<td>39th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Literary</td>
<td>33rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Social Service</td>
<td>30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mechanical</td>
<td>26th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Musical</td>
<td>24th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Computational</td>
<td>19th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Persuasive</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Table 3. The only significant difference (.05 level of confidence) are the two traits, emotional stability and restraint.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traits</th>
<th>Non-Persevering (N=141)</th>
<th>Persevering (N=16)</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>15.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>17.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>15.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>19.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>15.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>17.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>16.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>17.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

The major hypothesis of this study was that there would be no significant differences (.05 level of confidence) in the scores obtained by a group of persevering and non-persevering high school seminarians on the Kuder Preference Record and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. This hypothesis was not confirmed. There were significant differences in the Kuder Preference Record for scores on social service interests at the .001 level; musical interests at the .002 level of confidence; computational interests at the 0.01 level of confidence and literary interests at the 0.01 level of confidence.

Wauck (1957, Sutter (1961), Gorman (1961) D'Arcy (1954) and McDonagh (1961) report social service interests to be the highest of interests scores in their seminarian groups. While Kenney (1959) found that both successful and unsuccessful report social service interests as their greatest interest, this study found the two groups differed significantly (.001 level of confidence) in social service interest preference. Also, while it was the second highest choice of the persevering seminarians it was sixth choice for the non-persevering seminarians.

D'Arcy (1962) also found that social service tends to differentiate the successful and unsuccessful seminarians. This study of the persevering
(successful) seminarians indicates that social service interests was very high in their choice. However, it does not have the high percentile as it does for older seminarians. It is interesting that when one separates the profiles of those who continue in the seminary from those who do not, there is a significant difference in this interest. It may be the non-persevering group that lowers the group's social service interests score of the younger group. Our group of non-persevering seminarians do not have more multiple interest patterns than successful seminarians. D'Arcy (1962) found this to be true of his study. He reasoned that "a seminarian who has many high interests comes to the seminary with less concentrated conviction than the successful seminarian. The unsuccessful seminarian will eventually leave because he may feel that he can satisfy other of his high interests in another profession or occupation (p. 180)."

This study shows that a high school minor seminarian who perseveres has relatively high scores in an "artistic, social service, musical, literary" sequence of interests. The unsuccessful seminarian is portrayed as one having lower scores (below 50th percentile) with an "outdoor, artist, clerical, and scientific" sequence of interests. It must be noted that this does not mean that the successful receive lower scores than the unsuccessful seminarians in these areas. In Table 2, the percentile of the successful seminarians have higher percentile scores than the unsuccessful seminarians except for outdoor and mechanical interests. Even in these two areas there is only a difference of 2 points in the mean score favoring the non-persevering seminarians. It would seem that the persevering seminarians of this
group have more multiple interests, perhaps indicating that the seminarians remain because they see more outlets in the priesthood for their many interests as priests rather than as laymen in the world. This is the current seminarian who is about to be ordained. Their many interests in areas not previously expressed by major seminarians is often a source of difference between the younger and older clergy. It would be interesting to discover if other high school seminarians of the same period as these seminarians expressed a similar interest pattern.

There were fewer significant result differences for the two groups on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey: emotional stability and restraint were the only traits that were significantly different at the .05 level of confidence between the two groups. The persevering seminarians scored higher on these traits than did the non-persevering seminarians. The emotional stability trait may indicate that these seminarians are optimistic and cheerful in their seminary environment. This situation may explain their emotional stability. It would seem logical that if the seminarian is not happy in the seminary, he may lack this optimistic cheerfulness and could be expected to disengage himself from the seminary. The persevering seminarians show a greater restraint and seriousness than the non-persevering seminarians. The persevering seminarians score in the optimal position of restraint and agreeableness. Since the seminarians' training is a long one that has many restrictions, it demands postponing immediate gratifications for long-ranged goals. Seminarians who would tend to be impulsive would not be willing to endure the seminary way of life and thus
leave. In this study the persevering seminarians have both the emotional stability, restraint, and seriousness that would auger well for perseverance in continuing toward the priesthood.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

One hundred and fifty-seven high school seminarians were administered the Kuder Preference Record Vocational Form C and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey in the fall of 1961. The protocols of the persevering and non-persevering seminarians were separated and analyzed in 1970.

Analysis of the data revealed that Kuder Preference Record scores were significantly different in the following interests: social service ($p = .001$), musical ($p = .002$), computational ($p = .01$), and literary ($p = .02$). All of these interests were significantly higher for the persevering seminarians.

Only two traits on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were significant at the .05 level of confidence and both higher for the persevering seminarians: emotional stability and restraint.

Further longitudinal studies are needed to see if these significant differences in interests and personality traits are maintained in the priesthood and throughout the span of the life of the priest.
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DIRECTIONS FOR PROFILING

1. Copy the V-Score from the back page of your answer pad in the box at the right.

   If your V-Score is 37 or less, there is some reason for doubting the value of your answers, and your other scores may not be very accurate.

   If your V-Score is 45 or more, you may not have understood the directions, since 44 is the highest possible score. If your score is not between 38 and 44, inclusive, you should see your adviser. He will probably recommend that you read the directions again, and then that you fill out the blank a second time, being careful to follow the directions exactly and to give sincere replies.

   If your V-Score is between 38 and 44, inclusive, go ahead with the following directions.

2. Copy the scores 0 through 9 in the spaces at the top of the profile chart. Under “OUTDOOR” find the number which is the same as the score at the top. Use the numbers under M if you are a man and the numbers under F if you are a woman. Draw a line through this number from one side to the other of the entire column under OUTDOOR. Do the same thing for the scores at the top of each of the other columns. If a score is larger than any number in the column, draw a line across the top of the column; if it is smaller, draw a line across the bottom.

3. With your pencil blacken the entire space between the lines you have drawn and the bottom of the chart. The result is your profile for the Kuder Preference Record—Vocational.

An interpretation of the scores will be found on the other side.
### Profile Chart for the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey

For high-school, college, and adult ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C SCORE</th>
<th>G (General Activity)</th>
<th>R (Restraint)</th>
<th>A (Ascendancy)</th>
<th>S (Social Boldness)</th>
<th>E (Social Interest)</th>
<th>O (Objectivity)</th>
<th>F (Friendliness)</th>
<th>T (Agreeableness)</th>
<th>P (Thoughtfulness)</th>
<th>M (Reflectiveness)</th>
<th>M (Masculinity)</th>
<th>F (Femininity)</th>
<th>CENTILE RANK</th>
<th>NEAREST T SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- **Inactivity**
- **Slowness**
- **Impulsiveness**
- **Rhythmicity**
- **Submissiveness**
- **Shyness**
- **Sociability**
- **Emotional Instability**
- **Depression**
- **Subjectivity**
- **Hypersensitivity**
- **Hostility**
- **Belligerence**
- **Unreflectiveness**
- **Criticalness**
- **Intolerance**
- **Femininity**
- **Masculinity**
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