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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since World War II there has been a growing openness in the Catholic Church to address the problems involved in religion with the expertise of the social sciences. A major contribution to this movement was the decision of the Catholic bishops of the United States in April, 1967 to undertake an extensive study of the life and ministry of the American priest. Seven subcommittees were established in Fall, 1967, and Eugene C. Kennedy, M.M., Ph.D. was named head of the subcommittee on psychology.

Approaching the priesthood through psychology is of value to both the Church and to psychology. The Church is concerned with increasing the supply of priests and at the same time improving the general quality of clergy-functioning by improving the way they are selected and trained.

With the development of psychology of religion, more researchers who have interests in both psychology and religion have investigated popular areas. The opportunity to study American priests in-depth was practically unique, because there is little in-depth psychological data on any professional persons. At the time Kennedy began the study of priests the American Bar Association rejected a study of its members because it was unwilling to subject them to such an intense scrutiny (Kennedy & Heckler, 1972).

Kennedy and Heckler published the results of their study in 1972.
Their basic question was, "What are the priests of the United States like as men" (p. 18)? The objective of the study was:

   to allow the priests of the United States to speak for themselves, and to help them articulate what they themselves cannot fully express about their life and their ministry, to understand, at as deep a level as possible, and in language as clear as possible, what kind of men American priests are. (p. 19)

They chose a subsample of a subsample of the National Opinion Research Center's sociological study of priests (Greeley, 1972). The stratified random sampling was chosen to insure that no systematic bias entered their selection of subjects. A total of 218 priests completed both an in-depth interview, that was a compromise between the clinical and research interview, and the other instruments, viz., (1) the Loyola Sentence Completion Blank for Clergymen, (2) the Self-Anchoring Rating Scale of Maturity of Faith, (3) the Identity Scale, and (4) the Personal Orientation Inventory.

The authors clinically evaluated each subject as belonging in one of four categories describing level of psychological development in terms of an abbreviated Ericksonian growth-continuum model. Of the 218 subjects, 19 priests were evaluated as belonging in the maldeveloped level. The authors applied two principles in selecting men for this category:

   first, a long-term history of difficulty, dating back to earliest life experience of the individual and associated in some way with the faulty resolution of the initial growth problems of life; secondly, serious psychological problems recognizable as major difficulties which interfered in a marked way in the individual's personal life and work. (Kennedy & Heckler, 1972, p. 55)

There is value in studying these maldeveloped priests because they have not reached the level of overall personal growth that would
be commensurate with their careful recruitment and lengthy training. The problem of generalizability and sampling arises in this context. Kennedy and Heckler (1972) emphasized that they did not try to make statements about proportions that would be estimates for all priests. However, they pointed out that the method of sampling used indicates that "successive samples drawn with the same care would yield the same results as those which have come from the interviews with this group of men" (p. 6). If this conclusion is accepted, it seems worthwhile to put together a picture of the maldeveloped priest that is fair, accurate, and as full bodied as possible. Such an understanding may give rise to some new ideas to be used in setting policy on the recruitment and training of candidates for the priesthood to try to reduce the number of the maldeveloped in the future.

The authors stressed the results of the interviews, and these interviews alone have been the data for the present study. The reason: If their level of growth, labelled "maldeveloped," has resulted from a distorted personal history, as the authors contended, then it seems logical to investigate that history. The interview material is the best data to use for this search—the other test material does not directly tap personal life history.

The mass of interview data provides the results of direct observation. The researchers' clinical psychological approach in the in-depth interview provided first-hand, extensive and intensive experience with the maldeveloped priests. This is a rather rare investigation, considering that most research deals with priests and seminarians in an indirect way through psychological testing. Kennedy and Heckler commented on the in-depth interview as offering an
advantage:

to both the interviewer and the subject interviewed. It enables the interviewer to proceed systematically through the important developmental experiences of the individual interviewed even as it allows the latter to explain and express himself in a full manner which is difficult in any other format. The clinical interview, then, far from being merely a probing device, is respectful of the individual because it focuses on him alone and allows him the fullest possible opportunity to express himself and his motivation. (1972, p. 19)

Such a structured interview may provide a tool for others to use in checking a candidate's early history.

After reading the reports from the interviewers, Kennedy and Heckler concluded that the emotional problems of the men in the mal-developed category were associated with poor early family backgrounds, that there was a major disruption of the accepted family pattern in each case. More specifically, they concluded: (1) that there was a deep flaw in the relationship between the husband and wife who were the subject's mother and father; (2) that the mother was a strong, over-protective, dominant, overbearing woman; (3) that the father was a weak and passive person or was totally lacking; (4) that, because of the previous two conditions, the subject was likely to have experienced difficulties in his own personal male identification; and (5) that the subject was likely to have had disturbances in later relationships with authority. The present study proposes to explore, in a quantitative way through content analysis, the support for these conclusions and for several additional hypotheses about preordination socio-psychological factors.

Specifically, if Kennedy and Heckler's conclusions are correct it is expected that the greater percentage of maldeveloped priests
reported the following experiences:

First, they perceived the relationship between their parents or parent-figures to be such that it would be judged as "flawed."

Secondly, they perceived their mothers' influence to be such that it would be judged as excessive or distorted.

Thirdly, they perceived their fathers' presence in the family to be such that it would be judged as inadequate.

Fourthly, they had difficulties with their own personal masculine identity.

Fifthly, they had difficulties in later relationships with authority figures.

In addition to the above hypotheses, several corollary hypotheses are to be explored: If it is correct that the maldeveloped priests experienced their parents' relationship as flawed, it seems reasonable to expect that their relationships with their siblings and peers would not be close.

Thus it is expected, that the greater percentage of this sample will be judged, first, not to have been close to their siblings, nor, secondly, to their peers before entering the seminary.

If Kennedy and Heckler were correct in concluding that the maldeveloped priests had mothers whose influence was excessive or distorted, it is possible these men would have considered school an important positive influence. As a result of identification with their influential mothers they would have found the largely female-dominated world of school a place where there would be adults available to whom they could transfer their feelings for their mothers, and where need-achievement could be satisfied.
Thus, it is anticipated, thirdly, that the greater percentage of these priests spoke of school in a way that would indicate it was an important positive experience for them.

If there is support for Kennedy and Heckler's conclusion that the fathers of maldeveloped priests were inadequate in their influence or totally absent, it seems logical that the priests would not have been close to them. It is impossible to relate to someone who is not there, and it is unlikely that these men would have been attracted to a male who was not a strong, positive presence.

Consequently it is expected, fourthly, that the greater percentage of these priests did not have close relationships with their fathers.

Assuming that these priests did have difficulties in their personal masculine identification—as Kennedy and Heckler concluded—it is possible that this was related to an intervening factor of poor sex instruction. A young male who assimilates negative attitudes about sexuality from negative parental instruction, or from the street, is likely to be in conflict over identifying with the behaviors and attitudes of masculinity.

Thus it is hypothesized, fifthly, that the majority of the maldeveloped priests received no information on sex from their parents or that they received negative instruction.

If the conclusion about difficulties with sexual identity is supported by content analysis, it seems logical that these difficulties might include two specific issues: a problem with masturbation and minimal dating experience. When a young male is in conflict over his masculine identity he is likely to be reluctant to engage in social relations with females. He may be rather shy and introverted in
heterosexual situations, and is likely to express his sexuality in an auto-erotic way.

Consequently it is anticipated that the greater percentage of these priests, sixthly, had difficulties with masturbation and seventhly, engaged in minimal dating behavior.

When a young man has not had a strong father with whom he can identify, he is likely to have difficulties in relating to authority figures because of his underlying hostility toward his father. If he is in an environment with many male authorities he is likely to have trouble relating to them. If the environment is all male and he has a history of not relating well with peers and has problems in masculine identity, he is also likely to have few close relationships. Consequently he would probably not find that environment very pleasant and would seek to remove himself from it unless he experiences some duty or other pressure to stay. The seminary is such an all male environment with male authority figures, and if the above hypotheses about inadequate fathers and poor peer relations are supported, it seems reasonable that the maldeveloped priests would have had difficulties with seminary authorities, would have not been close to their fellow seminarians, would have evaluated the seminary as a negative experience, and would only have persevered because they experienced some pressure to go through with becoming priests.

Therefore the following hypotheses are proposed: Eighth, the greater percentage of these priests had difficulties with seminary authorities; ninth, the majority were not close to their seminary peers; tenth, the majority found the seminary to have been a negative experience; and, eleventh, they only persevered because of some sense
of pressure to continue.
Religious Personnel

Just a brief overview of the surveys of literature available on ministers and seminarians indicates the great amount of interest in studying religious personnel. Psychology and psychiatry have been considerably involved in this area of religion. The reviews collect research from different disciplines and from different denominations. It is common to see reviews of research on Protestant ministers, Catholic priests, Jewish rabbis, religious sisters and brothers, and seminarians, all in the same survey.

Argyle (1959) summarized the speculative literature on mental disorders among religious leaders; Meissner (1961) collected 2,905 entries on Catholic and Protestant studies; Menges and Dittes (1965) organized 700 studies; Demereth (1968) brought together sociological and psychological studies on subjects from several religious denominations; D'Arcy (1968) included statistical, clinical, and theoretical studies by sociologists, anthropologists, medical doctors, educators, and psychologists on Catholics; Rooney (1972) provided the review for the Kennedy and Heckler study; and Nauss (1973) reviewed research over the past thirty years on personality traits among Catholic and Protestant clergy and seminarians.

Rooney (1972) combined the schemata for classifying research
used by Menges and Dittes (1965), Demereth (1968), and D'Arcy (1968). Rooney concentrated on empirical psychological research in which priests and seminarians were subjects, and developed the following outline for his survey (p. 188):

1) Early studies of priests and seminarians.
2) Mental and physical health of members of this profession.
3) Research using personality inventories with clinical groups.
4) Interests and values of priests and seminarians.
5) The role of motivation on persistence and effectiveness in religious life.
6) Effects of seminary training.
7) Role of the priest and the nature of his work environment.
8) Stages of career development in the priesthood.

His survey will be summarized to give a brief overview of the research on religious personnel. This overview can serve as a context for understanding the research on early socio-psychological factors. Much of the research in the present review is available in masters' theses and doctoral dissertations.

In the early research, starting with Sward (1931) and Moore (1936), the focus was on the problem of emotional adjustment of seminarians and priests. Some of their conclusions on the incidence of disturbance in religious personnel stimulated more research and tighter screening programs for applicants to religious life.

The research dealing with the mental and physical health of priests was intended to find evidence in the incidence of mental illness for the degree of stress in priests' lives and on the type of person who enters such a profession. VanderVeldt and McAllister (1962) found that priests frequently have dominant mothers and that this factor is related to the development of alcoholism, a disease which is more prevalent in hospitalized priests than in hospitalized laymen.
Rooney (1972) presents other areas of research stimulated by early findings: the attempt to discover whether the priesthood attracts greater numbers of poorly adjusted candidates than expected, and whether there are measurable personality characteristics, interests, values, and motives that are unique to priests.

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) has been most widely used in descriptive studies of the personalities of seminarians and priests. T. N. McCarthy (1960) and Dunn (1965) agreed after surveying the pertinent literature that there is a consistency in MMPI profiles for religious: high Pt and Sc scores. Males score high on Mf. Dunn (1965) concluded that religious personnel show indications of using defenses which are typical of people with neurotic tendencies. Gorman (1961), Dittes (1967) and others criticized these findings and found profiles of samples comparable to norms. Rooney (1972) presented a survey of the research and his own speculation on the limitations of the MMPI and concluded that any conclusions about priests and seminarians based on MMPI profiles should be very tentative. He encouraged the use of other instruments—like the Cattell 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, etc.—because of their "potential value in supplementing—and perhaps clarifying—the results reported with the MMPI, particularly since they are designed to detect individual differences among a normal population" (Rooney, 1972, p. 194).

Little published research exists, however, using other instruments to evaluate priests and seminarians. The handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire gives data on 1,707 priests and 145 Catholic seminarians. The most notable differences are on factor I and on factor F, indicating that priests generally have a protected
emotional sensitivity in childhood, and lower self-reliance, and have a more serious and sober disposition (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsouka, 1970). Sutter (1961) used the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and found major seminarians to be "more submissive, introverted, sensitive, feminine and deliberate in the pace of their activities . . . more emotionally stable, serious minded, tolerant, reflective and cooperative" (Rooney, 1972, p. 195) than the norm group of college students. The Omnibus Personality Inventory was also used to test major seminarians (Lonsway, 1967) and the results indicated that, compared to college students who were the norm group, the seminarians:

showed a greater need for independence, a more trusting attitude in interpersonal relations, . . . a greater degree of satisfaction in their personal lives, . . . tolerance of uncertainty, interest in social activities, readiness to communicate with people, concern for the feelings and welfare of the people they meet and an emphasis on reflection and logic. (Rooney, 1972, p. 195)

There are many studies that compare those who persevere in the seminary with those who drop out, but the results are often contradictory. Most of the research has been done with the MMPI since it is so commonly used in screening batteries and the data are kept in seminary files.

In summarizing the results of research with inventories, Rooney (1972) pointed out that the priesthood seems to attract a greater than expected number of men with a "low degree of masculine identification and a variety of emotional problems" (p. 198). He also noted that those who leave the seminary show poorer adjustment on tests than those who stay, and those who stay seem to develop more problems as they continue in training.

Studies on priests' interests have usually employed the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB), and occasionally the Kuder Personal
Preference Record. Lepak (1968) used the SVIB and found that priests scored: (1) high on the Social Service Group and the Aesthetic-Cultural Group; (2) relatively "feminine" on Masculinity-Femininity Scale; and (3) higher than average on the Occupational Level Scale.

Rooney (1972) concluded that most attempts to differentiate, on the basis of interests, those who persevere in the seminary from those who do not have been unsuccessful. He also concluded from the literature that the longer men are in the seminary the more homogeneous their tested interests become, and although priests may share considerable interest in common, they maintain a wide variety of interests, and perform considerably diverse types of work.

Although values would seem to be an important element to study in priests, there has been little research and what has been done depended on the Allport-Vernon Study of Values. Most later studies supported T. J. McCarthy's (1942) finding that seminarians score significantly higher on religious and social values than control groups.

Motivation in religious personnel would also seem to be an important factor to study, yet not that much research has been conducted. Weisgerber (1969) found that about 92% of those evaluated by a psychologist as manifesting poor motivation dropped out of the seminary. Most researchers used a global evaluation of motivation. Potvin and Suziedelis (1969) found that an open expression of doubts was a good predictor of withdrawal from the seminary. A striking study using the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT)--Quinn (1962)--found that there is a high correlation between scores on the TAT and ratings of "promise for religious life" by peers and by superiors. An instrument that
might merit adaptation for use with Catholic seminarians is the Theological School Inventory (Dittes, 1964) which is meant to tap various patterns of motivation.

The recent changes in seminaries and reevaluation of their effects have stimulated much interest and research. T. N. McCarthy (1970) reviewed studies up to 1966 on the effects of training and found that although there is greater deviation in personality variables the longer a man is in training, this trend reverses to a more normal pattern after ordination. Carroll (1970) supported this conclusion with longitudinal studies. Hackenewerth (1966) did a longitudinal study of religious brothers and found that the elevations in MMPI scores was a function of the training period, rather than a function of religious life itself. He concluded, however, that the regimes of some religious groups tend to maintain this elevation in the active life after training.

Vaughn (1970) added to McCarthy's (1970) conclusions in his study comparing seminarians in a closed, self-contained seminary with seminarians in an open seminary on a regular campus. He concluded that the groups in the more isolated, confined environment showed the greatest changes in the direction of abnormality, whereas those who experienced a normal campus life showed almost no significant changes.

In regard to career development, the present controversy over the role of the priest, and other issues, may result in a changed pattern of career development. For now, however, researchers can only explore the career development of today's priests.

The research indicates that a vocation to priesthood usually starts early. Potvin and Suziedelis (1969) found that 86% of the
seminarians sampled first thought of a vocation in grade school. They also reported that seminarians generally come from middle income families. Rooney (1972) noted that the exodus to the suburbs has had an impact, and that most seminarians now come from the suburbs and small cities. Fichter (1961) found that a seminarian is more likely than a non-seminarian to have at least one close relative in religious life, and that the majority of priests entered the seminary after high school (Fichter, 1968).

Potvin and Suziedelis (1969) interpreted their results with an emphasis on the all important role of the mother in encouraging her son to enter the seminary and stay interested. Both parents are seen as strict, yet affectionate and supporting, and the seminarian's special closeness with his mother is related to a tendency to define priesthood as something sacred and to a willingness to accept celibacy and to persevere. The father is generally seen as more affectionate and accepting compared with how non-seminarians view their fathers. Barry and Bordin's (1967) study, which contradicted this last conclusion, will be commented on later.

A lot of debate has occurred over the effect of a minor seminary on the maturity of the boy, yet Keefe (1968) found no evidence to support the contention that a minor seminary retards psychological development. Lavoie (1968) interviewed seminarians and concluded that the restricted environment of the seminary leads a boy to prematurely accept an identity from others, whereas a freer environment would encourage him to face the identity crisis and resolve it with an identity he achieved. Kinnane (1970) found that the main reason young men reported for leaving the seminary was the struggle for independence.
and self-direction.

There is growing interest in researching the specialized training that many ministers and seminarians undergo. Jansen and Garvey (1972, 1973) examined clergy involved in a clinical training program at a state hospital. They used both the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI), the MMPI, and ratings of clinical competence by supervisors. They found that clergy scored lower on the POI scales measuring degree of adherence to the values of self-actualizing people, existentiality, and acceptance of personal feelings of anger and aggression. Jansen, Robb, and Bonk (1972) compared clergy counselor trainees with counselors rated most and least competent by peers and found that the clergy were more similar to the low-rated counselors. They concluded that clergy may be less promising candidates for training as counselors.

The flow of priests from the active ministry since Vatican Council II has stimulated comparative studies of priests who stay versus those who leave. Echlin (1968) found the still active group to have a higher mean IQ, to have more likely worked as a summer camp counselor during college, to be better adjusted on Neurotic tendency, Self-confidence, and Introversion-extroversion scales on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory. He found the non-active group to be better adjusted on the Self-sufficiency scale. Gilbride (1973) made a similar comparison but used Holland's theory and Holland's Vocation Preference Inventory.

The controversy over celibacy in the last few years has also stimulated some research. Loftus (1973) compared priests who are legally committed to celibacy with those personally committed.
Heuscher (1972) drew conclusions on celibacy from 31 male and 19 female Catholic clergy he saw over ten years, and noted that the religious celibate today more easily explores the feasibility of a married priesthood, unmarried sexual experiences, and communal living with free expression of sex, and is not convinced that the celibate life contributed to the effective performance of religious responsibilities. A new area of research related to celibacy is the problem experienced by those priests who marry. Araoz (1972) gives some comments on what to expect and how to deal with former priests in marital therapy.

Some of the traditional problems are still being investigated. Harkening back to some of the early studies, Sorenson (1973) found that alcoholic Episcopal and Catholic priests have a need for personal power, whereas nonalcoholic priests do not.

Rooney (1972) provided a good general coverage of research on priests and seminarians, but it has certain drawbacks in that it is primarily limited to studies on Catholics and it does not adequately review the studies on early socio-psychological factors of ministers. Menges and Dittes (1965) devoted a special section of their survey to background factors. The present review is intended to fill in the gaps on these factors of ministers in general.

The earliest study on background, by Moxcey (1922), found a relationship between success in the ministry for Protestant theology students and their general ability to handle human problems and relationships in the seminary. Alaimo (1940) did a case study analysis through extensive interviews, but he was studying the factors influencing ministers' vocational choice and provided no quantitative
information on the incidence of those factors. Dean (1947) surveyed background characteristics of students in Methodist seminaries from about 1900-1945, and found that those ranked "effective" by their associates participated to a greater degree in college activities than those who were ranked "ineffective." However, he was studying a group rated "effective" in pastoral ministry. Whitesel (1952) compared parental relationships of theology students in reference to dominance-submission and found the mothers of both groups were accepting, but the dominants experienced more acceptance and, paradoxically, reported more rejection situations. The submissives' fathers were characterized as rejecting, although they described their mothers as accepting.

Allen (1955) studied 316 men in the Methodist ministry to check on the backgrounds of successful ministers. He found the more successful to be from larger towns and schools, to be better educated, of higher-status parents, and from smaller families. They were most likely the only children and to have parents who were only children and to report other evidence of being closest to their parents. They majored in social sciences or philosophy, but not religion. The problem with his study is the criterion of success was the salary level of the individual minister. Jackson (1955) studied Methodist ministers in terms of pastoral effectiveness as rated by peers. He found the 86 out of 159 rated effective to be less likely to have stepsiblings and less likely born in rural areas. Their parents attended church frequently and they had more family worship. They reported that they took more leadership in church and college, especially in college.

In an extensive survey of 100 priests discharged from a private mental hospital, McAllister and VanderVeldt (1961) made some striking
comparisons with 100 lay male patients discharged from the same hospital and 100 seminarians approaching ordination. They found that 48% of the hospitalized patients had been "A" students and 16% more had been "B" students. Of the priests, 91% were from homes where the mother was the dominant figure. A significantly higher proportion of the clergy patients had parents with psychiatric symptoms, and they more frequently had alcoholic fathers. They suggested that the psychic impact of a priest's parents is greater because the early meaningful relationships with them are not as easily displaced or modified as in the non-clergy group. Of the 100 priests 46 were diagnosed personality disorders and 77% admitted to having experienced serious emotional problems in the seminary. The conclusion is that they suffered from long-term maladjustment and that it in most cases preceded the clerical state.

They also found 10 priests who manifested symptoms of disturbed sexuality, and 9 of the 10 had problems before ordination, which also suggested that neither celibacy nor the priestly function created the conflict. The priest group came from lower economic and lower social backgrounds, and the authors suggested that such factors may have caused a more difficult adjustment in a vocation which placed them in the higher stratum of society. Their study, however, dealt only with hospitalized subjects, whereas the subjects in the present study are all in the active ministry and most have never been in psychiatric hospitals.

Christensen (1963) found intrafamilial disharmony to be a persistent finding in 51 out of 100 ministers with personality disorders. All of his subjects were in therapy, whereas few of the present subjects were in therapy. Echlin (1968) found a slight and non-
significant difference in early ratings on the stability of the homes of priests who left the ministry and those who remained. Those who remained had more stable homes as children. However, these differences could be due to chance.

Barry and Bordin (1967) examined biographies and autobiographies of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergymen and found 19 with enough material to make inferences about their parents. They found 14 clergymen experienced their father as distant, but toward whom they could permit themselves to feel love and respect. The father died early or was frequently absent or was inadequate, and had to be replaced by an idealized father. The mother shaped the boy's attitude toward his absent father and kept alive a respect for, and perhaps a yearning for, the father. Of the 7 with complete data on intrafamilial relationships, 6 had positive feelings about their distant father. The mother was likely to define herself as feminine and submissive to men, to see men as benevolently powerful, capable of being certain and punishing as well and loving and forgiving. She performed the functions of the father but in his name, and, even though the boy took his father as model, through identification with his mother the minister became oriented toward his future role of acting in God's name.

The mother was religiously oriented and influenced the boy deeply by appeals to religious and moral values. The authors speculated, however, that his father's absence probably stimulated a certain amount of resentment and rebellion which left an ineradicable residue of rebellion, and that the mixture of masculine and feminine in his identification could result in doubts and anxieties over masculine identity leading to vocational indecision.
These authors, however, were not studying a maldeveloped group, and proposed to make analytic inferences in developing a theory about vocation choice.

In conclusion, the majority of studies on religious personnel dealt with the subjects in an indirect way. Some of the more popular approaches were the following: the MMPI, the 16PF, the POI, etc.; the SVIB and the Kuder; the Allport-Vernon Study of Values; the TAT; questionnaires; and demographic analyses. These approaches were used to study: the incidence of psychological disturbance; the stresses in priests' lives; the types of candidates who enter the ministry; the effects of training; possible unique variables of personality, interests, values and motivation in ministers; factors discriminating seminarians or priests who persevere versus those who leave; factors related to specialized training in counseling, etc.; and special issues such as celibacy.

More direct and flexible approaches, such as interviewing and content analyses, were used predominantly to study career development and background factors. The researchers who used such approaches, however, did not focus on the type of priests in the present study; rather on the normal population, or on hospitalized priests, or on priests in therapy, or on priests treated for alcoholism. Also, previous research was not intended to relate background factors to developmental level, but to success or effectiveness in the ministry, or to salary level, or to involvement in some form of treatment.

**Content Analysis**

Several general reviews of content analysis are available--for
example, Berelson (1952, 1954) and Stone et al. (1966). Holsti (1969) provides a review of content analysis research, summarizing Barcus' (1959) survey, which included 1,719 titles, and updating it to 1969. Hansen et al. (1968) provide a separate bibliography, including 50 books and articles on different types and applications of content analysis. They also list 19 pages of over 450 studies that involved content analysis as a technique, studies in various media and dealing with various problems. Content analysis research first appeared within journalism, primarily, and was taken up by political science. In addition it has been undertaken in other disciplines: anthropology, education, history, literature, philology, psychiatry, psychology, and sociology.

Although there are content analytic studies that appeared as early as the 1740's (Doering, 1954), the use of content analysis as a research technique really began at the start of the twentieth century (Holsti, 1969, p. 20). Holsti (1969) perceived a series of seven interrelated and continuing trends in applying this technique:

(1) Increased frequency of such research. From 1900 to 1920 there were approximately 2.5 studies each year using content analysis. The rate rose the next 30 years until there were almost 100 studies a year in the 1950's, and the quantity continued to increase.

(2) Growing concern for theoretical and methodological issues. In the first 20 years more than 98% of the studies dealt with the subject matter of the text. This figure was down to 75% by the 1950's, and one study in six dealt with the issues of theory and method (Holsti, 1969, p. 21). A major concern in the 1950's was the use of standardized content analysis categories (Pool, 1959). Consideration
of these issues has increased with the recent developments in computer content analysis.

(3) Application to a broader range of problems. Barcus (1959) concluded that over 60% of the research on empirical content was focused on five mutually exclusive areas, each constituting at least 10% of the total: journalistic studies, propaganda analyses, studies of social values, media inventories, and psychological-psychoanalytic research.

(4) Movement from purely descriptive studies toward increased use in testing hypotheses. Pool's Trends in Content Analysis (1959) is one indicator that researchers in the late 1950's were debating a broader range of theoretical issues and research on the causes and effects of content.

(5) More varied forms of data to which content analysis is applied. Researchers limited themselves to journalistic studies and media inventories until the 1930's, when they started to apply content analysis to sociological, historical, and political problems. Propaganda analysis was initiated by Lasswell (1927) and his associates (Lasswell & Blumenstock, 1939; et al.), and gained impetus after World War II began. Newspapers as a source of data for content analysis studies dropped to less than 30% by the 1950's, and with the popularity of new media (movies, radio, television) audio and visual analyses increased. In recent years more varied nonlexical data have been researched: pottery fragments, children's drawings, art, gestures and facial expressions, cartoons, vocal tone, music, and postage stamps.

(6) Development of various techniques of computer analysis. Computer content analysis began with Sebeok's study (1958) of 4,000 Cheremis folktales. Most computer studies fall into one of two
categories: programs that make frequency counts of words, or programs that look up a word in a dictionary system and code it with information that represents the researcher's frame of reference and assumptions. The former is most widely used. Substantial contributions to this type of program have emerged from analysis of psychotherapeutic interviews and related materials. A very elaborate program of this type, WORDS, was developed for research in psychotherapeutic interviews (Harway & Iker, 1964; Iker & Harway, 1965). The content analysis programs in probably the widest use are those that are part of the "General Inquirer" system (Stone, 1964; Stone et al., 1966). This system includes a family of dictionaries, data preparation systems, and data analysis programs.

Other types of programs deal with syntactical, rather than semantic, discriminations: with how something is said. The computer approach to content analysis will probably continue to grow in popularity.

(7) Combination of other social research techniques with content analysis. Instead of just using data that is "natural" or "available," researchers are eliciting verbal data by various techniques and applying content analysis to it. The data may be of two types. First is the type of data that is a by-product of other techniques of social research, such as responses to open-ended questions in a survey (Scheuch & Stone, 1964), or verbal material produced during groups (Bales, 1950; Mills, 1964). Content analysis can render the data more objective and systematic. A second type of data is verbal material alone which is content analyzed. The psychiatric interview and projective material are examples of such data (Colby & Menchik, 1964).
In reviewing individual studies, Holsti (1969, p. 2) organized them around three possible purposes of research designs: (1) to describe characteristics of communication; (2) to make inferences as to the antecedents of communication; and (3) to make inferences as to the effects of communication. Both he and Stone (1966) reviewed articles arising from the psychiatric and psychological disciplines and Holsti categorized them under the second purpose mentioned above.

Many psychologists use content analysis on an intuitive level in making assessments based on their impressions and clinical experience. McClelland (1953) was first to develop a systematic content analysis procedure for measuring need-achievement imagery. Comparable measures were developed by Atkinson and others (1958) to measure need-power and need-affiliation. One formal procedure to analyze content that has proved itself clinically useful is Arnold's story sequence analysis (1962) based on the Thematic Apperception Test.

Personal documents have also been emphasized in the study of personality. Allport's The Use of Personal Documents in Psychological Science (1942) drew attention to and strongly argued for the contribution nomothetic and idiographic studies of personal documents can make. He defined them as "any self-revealing record that intentionally or unintentionally yields information regarding the structure, dynamics, and functioning of the author's mental life" (1942, p. xii). They may take many forms and may be produced specifically for research, as was done through the interviews that are to be used in the present study.

The idiographic approach was shown to be sound through two empirical studies in the 1940's. Baldwin (1942) applied his system of
"Personal Structure Analysis" to letters of a woman and revealed major configurations in her personality. White (1947) studied Wright's autobiography *Black Boy* and revealed information on goals and values that would have escaped impressionistic approaches. Baldwin's study was replicated using computer techniques by Paige (1966). Several category systems have been developed to analyze characters, themes, and plots of novels to make inferences about the psychological traits of the authors. Studies have been carried out on D. H. Lawrence (McCurdy, 1939), the Bronte sisters (McCurdy, 1947), Charles Kingsley (Deutsch, 1947), Dostoyevsky (Kanzer, 1948), Knut Hamsun (Lowenthal, 1949), and Shakespeare (McCurdy, 1953).

Using very different types of documents, Schubert (1965) analyzed continuities and changes in Justice Robert Jackson's legal philosophy, and Holsti (1967) tested an hypothesis about the way John Foster Dulles interpreted information about Russia in a way consistent with his beliefs about the Soviet system. Schneidman (1963) examined the logical styles of Kennedy and Nixon, and made inferences about their personalities.

There is potential for content analysis to be very useful in psychiatry and clinical psychology if one accepts the view that "psychiatric disorders, regardless of their etiology, are ultimately manifested as disorders of social communication" (Jaffe, 1966, p. 689). Audio and video recordings of psychotherapy have provided a whole new source of personal documents for study. Much of the research to date has been aimed at creating and validating measures useful in diagnosis, and at evaluating psychotherapy. Auld and Murray (1955) reviewed the literature on content analysis in studies of psychotherapy. Marsden
(1965) updated that survey, and Jaffe (1966) provided a review of studies that used computer analysis.

Some of the indices devised in the above studies are as follows: (1) the type-token ratio (TTR) (Johnson, 1944) is based on the hypothesis that speech variability increases in successful therapy. Mann (1944) and Fairbanks (1944) tested this index on schizophrenics, and Roshal (1953) applied it in a longitudinal study of therapy. The hypothesis has generally been supported, and Gottschalk (1961) described further applications of TTR. (2) The adjective-verb ratio was found to differentiate normal subjects from schizophrenics (Border, 1940). (3) The discomfort-relief quotient (DRQ) computes a ratio of discomfort words to discomfort plus comfort words to measure the amount of drive a patient is experiencing (Dollard & Mowrer, 1947). (4) The positive-negative-ambivalent quotient (Railey, 1948) is similar to the DRQ except that only the subject's self-evaluations are scored. (5) A measure of defensiveness was developed by Haigh (1949, p. 181), (6) scales for analysis of hostility were developed by Gottschalk, Gleser, and Springer (1963), and (7) a scale to measure anxiety was developed by Gleser, Gottschalk, and Springer (1961). (8) Mahl (1959) found that speech disturbance correlated with anxiety and conflict in therapy interviews. (9) Laffal (1965) developed a general approach for studying normal and pathological speech through analysis of word association.

Research analyzing therapy has continued to grow. Dohrenwend (1970) studied directive interviewing and Howel and Vincent (1970) factor analyzed interview data. Interviewee behavior has been studied (Matarazzo, Wiens, Jackson, & Manaugh, 1970) as has the counselor's
Most of the above studies dealt with analyses of individuals rather than classes of communicators, partly because personal documents on large groups of people are seldom available. The nomothetic approach to personal documents has been used in some studies to make "generalizations about patterns in the way groups of people approach a situation or set of circumstances" (Stone et al., 1966, p. 47). Allport, Bruner, and Jandorf (1953) analyzed 90 life histories to investigate the effects on personality of the Nazi revolution. Allport and Gillespie (1955) studied youth from various parts of the world by content analyzing questionnaires and essays. Cochran (1953) analyzed over 100,000 letters from presidents of railroads to study business values.

The combination of personal documents with depth interviews has been used in several nomothetic content analysis studies. In *Opinions and Personality*, Smith, Bruner, and White (1956) analyzed attitudes toward Russia. Lane (1962) researched the attitudes, values, and opinions of men used in relating to different levels of government. Some studies include interviews of a large number of people, like Sears, Maccoby, and Levin's study (1957) in which 379 mothers were interviewed about child rearing.

Some of the content analysis studies on religious personnel utilized this combination of personal documents and depth interviews. Carlin and Mendlovitz (1951) content analyzed structured interview material from 34 rabbis, and discriminated three types of roles. Blizzard (1958) conducted a very broad study analyzing the statements of 1,111 college and seminary trained clergymen from 22 Protestant denominations, and discriminated two dimensions of their integrating
roles: (1) the ideological or theological, and (2) the functional or service oriented. Kling (1959) analyzed the statements he obtained from ministers on their original motivation for entering the ministry and their present evaluation of that motivation. Alberts (1961) took recorded interviews of the 20 highest and 20 lowest scorers on an original Juvenile Delinquency Attitude Scale and found through content analysis that the data elaborated the coercive and punitive or supportive and rehabilitative attitudes toward delinquency. Klausner (1964) prepared questions for a discussion between ministers and psychiatrists on their roles as related to their professional identification groups. He analyzed the differences in roles and in their approach. Mills (1965) interviewed 60 Presbyterian ministers and content analyzed their reasons for leaving a parish. In a study already mentioned, Lavoie (1968) interviewed a group of seminarians who stayed and a group of those who left, and from his analysis concluded that restricted environments in the seminary produce identity foreclosure, i.e., the assumption of an identity given to them by others.

Other content analysis studies involving religious personnel have utilized a variety of data. Worden (1962) took a rather novel approach in content analyzing 60 films according to the portrayal of Protestant ministers in American movies. He concluded that the ministry is presented as a poor vocational choice because of its irrelevance, the minister's personal awkwardness, and the conflict between the minister's maleness and ministry. Glock and Ringer (1956) used church documents and questionnaires to analyze the attitudes of ministers and parishioners from 234 Episcopal congregations on social
Sermons are a readily available source of personal documents produced by the clergyman. Kanter (1955) content analyzed sermons of 40 Protestant ministers according to two modes of orientation: authoritarianism and humanism. Porter (1956) analyzed the ideas of God reflected in the sermons of 25 Protestant ministers selected as "most influential" in 1924. Barnes (1962) took the sermons of 92 ministers and analyzed them in terms of aspects of guilt as related to their preaching.

Another way to elicit data, besides interviewing, is to have subjects write essays. Hall (1960) obtained essays on the scientific method from Protestant seminarians in the Chicago area and found an even split between attitudes of acceptance and rejection of the scientific method. The only variable significantly related to acceptance was that those seminarians were from larger colleges and had a social science background. Baldwin (1964) analyzed essays from 100 Unitarian ministers on their vocational values. He used 138 categories derived from Maslow's theory of personality.

There does not seem to be much recent use of content analysis in studying religious personnel, and what studies there are are generally of Protestant ministers as subjects. The Kennedy and Heckler study, with its 271 in-depth interviews with priests, provides a large data pool of personal documents that can be researched by using content analysis techniques.

From these two surveys it can be concluded that no studies on religious personnel seem to exist which focus on the early socio-psychological factors of Catholic priests who are clinically evaluated.
as maldeveloped. There are many studies which explored or described the psychological adjustment of religious personnel but not the factors in the early history of the subjects. There are numerous studies which dealt with early factors but did not attempt to study them in relation to level of adjustment. They proposed to explore what factors were related to variables like leaving the ministry, financial success, ministerial roles, etc.

Content analysis was used as a technique in studies on individuals in terms of studying the individual's philosophy, beliefs, diagnosis as schizophrenic, progress in therapy, or specific traits such as hostility or anxiety. It was used in studies on groups to explore the consequences of a specific event, such as the effect of the Nazi revolution; to make a general survey of beliefs, attitudes, values or modes of orientation; to discriminate minister's roles, such as the roles of rabbis or Protestant ministers; or to discern a minister's motivation for entering or leaving the ministry. It has not been used to explore the early socio-psychological factors of Catholic priests who are still in the ministry but have not reached an effective level of development.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Personnel

The interviews were conducted by twelve clinical psychologists, all members of the APA, 35.5 years of age on the average, with an average of 5.5 years of experience beyond the Ph.D. Only graduates of the Clinical Division of the Psychology Department of Loyola University were chosen, for two reasons: (1) to insure that they had knowledge of and empathy toward Catholic values, and (2) their personal maturity, stature, and sense of professional responsibility were known to the Director of Clinical Training at Loyola who was a senior consultant on the study. These interviewers were trained during a pilot study.

Subjects

A subsample of a subsample of the NORC study was chosen for the Loyola study. A stratified random sampling was used, not to be completely representative, but to insure that no systematic bias entered into the selection of subjects. A total of 271 priests were interviewed. Only 218 priests completed the interview and the other instruments. The authors of the Loyola study took the interviewers' reports and test data on these men and, as clinical experts, evaluated each subject as fitting into one category of the continuum of growth based on an abbreviated version of Erickson's model. Nineteen priests
were evaluated as maldeveloped, and the authors agreed in their independent ratings with a Pearson product-moment correlation of .76 (p < .01) (Kennedy & Heckler, 1972, p. 51).

**Interview**

The interview used in the Kennedy and Heckler study was a structured interview. The manual (Appendix A) was used as a set of guidelines, rather than a list of rigid questions. The content of the interview was determined after a search of the literature on various topics and consultations with various specialists and clergy and hierarchy. The following is a list of the major areas covered:

1. Family life and relationships.
2. Other developmental experiences.
3. Psychosexual development.
5. Development of vocation.
6. Interpersonal relations.
7. Faith.
9. Celibacy.
10. The Future.

The structure, however, was used by different psychologists interviewing different priests in different ways, and at times several areas were not covered completely or at all. Consequently research into certain socio-psychological factors was not possible, although none was a priori excluded from consideration in content analysis.

The interviewers tape-recorded the interviews, with permission
from the subjects. These tapes were later transcribed by several typists who followed the same format. The present author read the transcript as he listened to the tapes, to verify the accuracy of the transcriptions; then he used the transcripts for the analysis.

Procedure

The basic method of analysis was content analysis. To repeat Berelson's (1952) definition, content analysis is a "research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communications" (p. 18). Two points are of importance in this definition: (1) a representative rather than an instrumental approach to the language was used. This assumes that the study of the manifest content is meaningful. This assumption required that the content be accepted as a common meeting-ground for the communicator, audience, and analyst. (2) The second point is that the analysis is quantitative rather than qualitative. The qualitative approach was used in the clinical judgments made by the authors of the Loyola study. This assumption required that the analyst deal with relatively denotative communication materials and not with relatively connotative materials.

The basic design for this study is described in Holsti (1969, p. 33). The approach is to take the message produced by source A and compare the content variable data, $A_x$, with evidence from independent sources, the behavior variable $A_z$. Only then can one draw valid inferences about the sources from the messages they send. In the present study this meant taking the interviews from the priests with the knowledge that their overall behavior had been clinically judged
"maldeveloped," and examine the content data to make inferences about the priests, to make as full-bodied as possible a description of them.

There was no real sampling of the communication material since only 19 subjects were considered.

The categories of early socio-psychological factors were derived from familiarization with the tapes and transcripts of the interviews, from reading other studies, and from discussion with the Senior Consultant on the Kennedy and Heckler study.

As for the units of analysis, rules were developed to determine what was a context unit and what was a recording unit. A context unit is "the largest body of content that may be examined in characterizing a recording unit" (Berelson, 1952, p. 135), and the recording unit chosen was the assertion, the "smallest section of text in which the appearance of a reference is counted" (Stone et al., 1966, p. 41). Stone et al. (1966) divided such assertions into two varieties: (1) one "employs an active verb and a noun to describe events," (p. 35) as well as complete transitive statements, e.g., "he didn't care very much about her in any human way (Subject #1, p. 2); and (2) "static assertions described by a word and its modifier" (p. 35), e.g., "the domineering personality in the family" (Subject #3, p. 3). Whenever a subject spoke on the theme of one of the categories the statements were evaluated first as to whether or not there was adequate information to evaluate them, then as to whether or not they should be counted in that category. For example, if there were statements in which the priest spoke about his mother or other significant mother-figure those assertions were first judged as to whether or not there was adequate information to make a judgment about his mother, then they were judged
as to whether or not they fit the rules to be counted under the category of mother's influence being distorted. The rules for discriminating context units and recording units are presented in Appendix B.

As assertions were evaluated they were recorded on ruled paper. In the top margin was the code number for each subject. In the left margin was a symbol corresponding to each category of socio-psychological factor that was explicitly stated in the interview material or clearly implied in it. The system of quantification was simply a tabulation of the presence or absence of adequate information plus a tabulation of the presence or absence of assertions on the theme of that category. A row was also provided to tabulate the number of categories on which each subject did not provide adequate information to evaluate his assertions, if he made any.

A reliability study was done to check the objectivity and replicability of the rules devised for the analysis by having a colleague, a clinical psychologist, make independent analyses, using the rules, of a random sample of six subjects' interview material relating to each category. Since the data were categorical, nominal data, a phi correlation coefficient was computed between the independent analyses of the author and the psychologist.

After the interviews were analyzed and frequency counts made in each category, percentages were computed on how many subjects, who provided information on a particular category, actually indicated that they experienced the early socio-psychological factor of that category. Since there are no normative data as to the occurrence of most of the factors studied, no further statistical manipulation was possible.
Because of their personal wishes two subjects were not recorded. The interviewers noted that both subjects were very anxious. One was judged to be mildly paranoid, whereas the other had connections with people related to the study, so did not want a permanent record of his interview. Each was also concerned about his homosexual orientation. Since there were no tapes or transcripts, these subjects' interviews could not be content analyzed. This reduced the number of subjects to seventeen.

As can be noted in Table 1 two frequency counts were made for each factor: one count to note the occurrence of factors in the subjects' interviews and one count to note the total number of subjects who made assertions about each factor. The lack of data in some interviews was the result of one or more conditions. In some cases the interviewer simply did not ask the subject about that area of his life. In other cases the interviewer asked the questions but the subject did not answer, usually by skirting the issue or by answering in such a limited, general manner that a judgment about fact or perception was not possible.

The mean number of factors about which the subjects did not provide adequate information was 3.82. This number is elevated by two subjects who did not provide adequate information on a large
Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Socio-psychological Factors in Maldeveloped Priests' Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th>Total Number of Subjects</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother-father</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother influence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father presence</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine identity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early authority</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling relations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer relations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School experience</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father relation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex instruction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masturbation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating behavior</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary authority</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary peers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminary negative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation pressure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>One subject gave inadequate data on 10 factors, another on 11 factors.
number of factors, ten and eleven factors respectively. The mean number of subjects who did not provide adequate information on a factor was 4.31. This number was elevated by the large number of subjects who did not provide information on the following three factors: nine on difficulty in relationships with authority figures before entering the seminary; nine on difficulty in dealing with seminary authority figures; and seven on evaluating the seminary as a negative experience.

A reliability study was done to check on the objectivity of the category rules, with the result that the author and a clinical psychologist agreed in their overall independent judgments with a phi correlation coefficient of .83 \( (p < .001) \).

The information referring to the presence of the hypothesized socio-psychological factors in the lives of these subjects can be put into focus by looking at the percentages of subjects who reported such factors. Since there was not adequate information to judge some categories for some subjects, the percentages are a ratio of those who reported such factors in relation to those who talked about those content areas. In regard to the Kennedy and Heckler (1972) conclusions, the lowest percentage, 71%, spoke of a flaw in the relationship between the parent figures in their early life. The highest percentage, 100%, reported having had difficulty with authority figures--although only eight subjects provided adequate information to make a judgment. The other percentages are above 80%.

Regarding the results related to the present author's hypotheses, the lowest percentage was the 67% who reported minimal or no dating experience. The highest percentage, 100%, was of those who said they
received negative or no instruction on sex at home. All the other percentages are 75% and above.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The results provide support, as anticipated, for all five of Kennedy and Heckler's (1972) conclusions, in that the greater percentage of subjects—over 70% on each conclusion—reported the relevant experiences.

Considering that Kennedy and Heckler pointed to the flaw in parental relationship as a primary distorting influence, it is surprising to note that only ten of fourteen subjects were judged as having experienced such a flaw. It is the lowest percentage supporting their conclusions. Although the incidence is relatively low, it is high enough to confirm their conclusion and a previous finding. Christensen (1963) found intrafamilial disharmony prevalent in ministers in therapy with personality disorders. Although most of the present sample have never been in therapy, the influence of their parents' marital relationship would be a factor worth exploring in therapy.

Of the 14 subjects who provided adequate information on their parents' marital relationship the 4 who did not directly report parental conflict did experience some distortion in either the mother's or father's presence, or both, and all 4 reported difficulties with their own masculine identities. They also were not close to their siblings or peers. These findings indicate that although a flaw in parental relationship is a primary distorting influence, it is not essential.
The parents as individuals can be present to the child in such a way that both his own identity and interpersonal relationships are given a poor foundation, in that he has inadequate models and initial distorted experience.

The importance of the mother to her child is once again confirmed in this study. The mother's dominance in some distorting way in 13 of 16 subjects' lives supports Kennedy and Heckler's conclusion. This result confirms McAllister and VanderVeldt's (1961) finding that 91% of hospitalized priests came from homes where the mother was the dominant figure. It also relates to two other studies. Barry and Bordin (1967) found that the mother had a strong influence in the lives of all the clergymen they studied. Potvin and Suziedelis (1969) concluded that the seminarian of the 1960's, in general, had a special closeness with his mother—that she played an all important role—but that she was viewed as strict yet affectionate and supporting. Perhaps the average clergyman experiences his mother as very influential, but there is a difference in the individual's human development as a man-become-minister depending on the type of dominance or influence his mother exerts. If the dominance is coupled with the balance of strictness and affection the maturation of the man is forwarded; if not, maturation seems to be delayed or frustrated.

The father's presence seems to be a more prevalent factor, in that 93% of the subjects, the second highest percentage supporting a Kennedy and Heckler conclusion, felt their father's presence was inadequate. This result confirms Barry and Bordin's (1967) finding that 14 of 19 clergymen in their general sample reported that their fathers were frequently absent or inadequate. This result, like that on the
mother's influence, is open to qualification, however. Father-inadequacy may be common to priests in general. Barry and Bordin speculated that it is a crucial factor in the development of a vocation to the ministry in which a man is spokesman for an absent divine father figure. The level of development of the man-become-minister may be more dependent on his relationship with his father than on the fact that the father was absent or inadequate. This consideration will be expanded in discussing the present author's fourth hypothesis regarding father relation.

The fact that 87% of these priests reported difficulties with their own personal masculine identities supports Kennedy and Heckler's study and relates to several others. Sutter (1961) found major seminarians in general to be more feminine than their lay peers according to the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Barry and Bordin (1967) speculated that the mixture of feminine and masculine in the identification of clergymen is likely to result in anxieties over masculine identity. Lepak (1968) found that priests scored as relatively "feminine" on the Masculinity-Feminity Scale of the SVIB. Rooney (1972) concluded from the research using inventories that the priesthood attracts a greater than expected number of men with a low degree of masculine identification. Consequently, it is probable that this factor is not unique to the maldeveloped priest. Because of such variables as higher education, interests in the arts, and in social services priests in general, and other populations with such factors, score as more feminine on standardized tests. However, there may be differences in degree of difficulty with masculine identity and in types of behavior that do or do not result from these difficulties,
which could differentiate the maldeveloped from other more developed ministers. Content analysis of interviews with a more developed group of priests could provide data that might differentiate the two groups on this factor.

Kennedy and Heckler's final conclusion about the maldeveloped priest's difficulty in relating to authority figures is supported by the fact that 100% of these priests were judged to have experienced such difficulty. Although no causal relationship can be affirmed it is logical that, with the mothers' influence and the inadequate or absent fathers that were such common conditions in the early lives of these subjects, they would have problems with authority. This finding relates to Sutter's (1961) finding that major seminarians score as more submissive on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. It also supports Barry and Bordin's (1967) speculation that ministers are likely to have an ineradicable residue of rebellion stimulated by their fathers' absence. Those researchers, and Sutter's finding, referred to seminarians and ministers in general. Consequently, this factor, too, may be common to priests, and only differentiate the maldeveloped from the normally developed on the basis of degree or type of difficulty with authority.

It is obvious from the data on the present author's eighth hypothesis that problems with authority figures do not disappear when a boy enters the seminary. More discussion on that issue will be provided below.

Although the results of the present study support Kennedy and Heckler's conclusions, there are considerations from other research that make it questionable as to whether all these factors are unique to or common primarily to maldeveloped priests. It seems not uncommon for ministers in general to experience their mother as very influential
or dominant, to experience their fathers' presence as inadequate, to have difficulties with their own masculine identities, and to have difficulties in relating to authority figures. The data indicate that a flawed parental marital relationship is more characteristic of the maldeveloped, and that the type and degree of identity-difficulty and authority-difficulty differentiate the maldeveloped from the average developed priest. Also, the type of relationship with the dominant mother and with the inadequate father seem to be possible differentiating variables. Some of the other data in this study provide information on these issues.

The results of this study provide support for the present author's hypotheses, in that the majority of maldeveloped priests--67% or more--reported the relevant experiences for the eleven socio-psychological categories.

The subjects experienced some flaw in their parents' relationship, and the data support that these priests also manifested inadequate relationships themselves. They perceived that they were not emotionally close to their siblings, 92%, or to their peers, 93%. With such a learning history of being emotionally rather isolated, the data indicating that the majority, 83%, were not close to their peers in the all-male environment of the seminary seem logical. Such findings are characteristic of the maldeveloped. Lonsway (1967) tested major seminarians with the Omnibus Personality Inventory and found them to be more trusting in relations with others, more interested in social activities, more ready to communicate, and more concerned about the feelings of people. This description of the average seminarian is the opposite of what one would say about the average maldeveloped priest.
Moxcey's (1922) conclusion about the more successful Protestant minister having a general ability to handle human relationships in the seminary also seems to reflect the opposite, on both points, of the present sample.

Considering that such a high percentage of these priests were not close to their peers, it seems logical that some other component of early schooling made it a positive experience. There may be other variables, such as identification with the dominant mother and consequent transference of feelings to female teachers, which are relevant to the maldeveloped priest's experience. Only additional analyses, including analysis of normally developed priests' interviews, will make such a distinction possible.

Closely tied to the identification question is the issue of the priest's relationship with his father. Considering the absence or inadequate presence of the fathers of these priests it is not surprising that they did not have close relationships with each other--75% felt they were not close to their fathers. Such data provide the qualification that can differentiate the distant father of the maldeveloped priest from the distant father of the average developed priest. The maldeveloped group spoke quite differently about their fathers than the subjects in Potvin and Suziedelis's (1969) work, who felt their fathers were affectionate and accepting. The present sample also appears different from Barry and Bordin's (1967) subjects who felt love and respect and positive feelings toward their fathers.

Considering that the majority of the maldeveloped were not close to their fathers, and many expressed that they feared or could not talk freely with their fathers, it is logical that the data support the
hypothesis about sex education: not one of them received positive instruction on sexuality from his parents, especially his father. Instruction on sexuality that came from peers, magazines, the street, etc., combined with the difficulty in identifying with a father-figure that would logically result from a lack of intimacy with the father, possibly contributed to the problems in personal masculine identification—problems which the data supported. Although the data support the hypothesis regarding lack of positive instruction on sexuality, Shope (1975) concluded that this lack is common, therefore its contribution to difficulties in masculine identification should not be overestimated.

Some data on the degree and type of behavior that may have resulted from problems with masculine identity—data which may differentiate the maldeveloped priest from other priests who experienced problems with masculinity—resulted from two other hypotheses. The finding that 67% of these maldeveloped priests engaged in minimal dating activity supports the hypothesis on dating and gives some weight to the logical basis that if a young man is uncertain about his own sexual identity it is likely that he will have difficulties relating to female peers. Barclay and Cusumano (1967) concluded that males from father-absent homes experience sex-role confusion and are less aggressive and more dependent. As young men these priests engaged in very few relationships with women. Lonsway's (1967) findings on the social tendencies of major seminarians would indicate that the more normally developed are more socially outgoing. The social reticence of the maldeveloped would make it very difficult for them to orient their sexuality toward another. McCandless (1970) contends that the usual
coeducational and dating aspects of our society usually push sexually ambivalent adolescents to attain appropriate sex role consolidation. If an ambivalent young man avoided this push by withdrawing or by entering a seminary where dating and other heterosexual behavior was strictly sanctioned he is less likely to have resolved his difficulties of sex role identification. When sexual expression is not oriented toward another it tends to be self-oriented and can result in autoerotic behavior. The data support the hypothesis that the majority—79%—of these priests experienced difficulty with masturbation. Such a finding seems to indicate that their sexual expression was self-oriented. Masturbation, however, is very prevalent among adolescents—as high as 90% or more (Weikert, 1970)—and is likely to be present in the background of the majority of normally developed priests. Further distinctions on the degree of conflict it causes, the age at which it created the most difficulty, and the types of fantasies associated with it may differentiate the history of the maldeveloped from the history of others. Whether differentiation can be made on the basis of degree and type of sexual identity problems can only be ascertained by further analyses of interviews with the maldeveloped and with more normally developed.

As was mentioned above, the maldeveloped priests continued their early style of isolation from peers into the seminary. The majority—88%—also continued to have difficulties relating to authority figures in the seminary. This may have been a continued expression of their anger at their inadequate fathers. The problem with authority may have been exacerbated because the authorities were all priests. Barry and Bordin (1967) speculated that the mother of a minister may present
an idealized image of the father, which image may be fulfilled by God. Such an image may also be sought in the priest with whom the prospective priest may partially identify and imitate. In the seminary the candidate sees priests more closely and may find that they do not really fit his idealized image. The priest authorities may then become the objects not only of the seminarian's anger at his father but also of the seminarian's anger at having been disillusioned. An additional source of anger may be his frustration at being given limits by a male—which the inadequate father may have never given—and at being separated from his mother—about whose dominance he may feel quite ambivalent.

The difficulties these men experienced in relating with both early and later authority figures may have resulted from the ways they learned to handle anger. The interviews do not provide adequate data on their training to handle anger, but it is speculated that they learned, from modeling or from specific instructions, that anger was not to be expressed at all or that it was to be expressed in maladaptive ways such as passive-aggression or explosive episodes. If these men had learned to appropriately express their anger at their fathers' inadequacies they probably would not have had so much difficulty with seminary authorities.

In the light of the findings that the majority of these priests were not close to their seminarian peers and had problems with seminary authorities, it is not surprising that the data support the hypothesis that the majority—80%—considered the seminary to be a negative experience. The possible inconsistency of this finding with the fact that 75% found early schooling to be a positive experience may be resolved by some speculation about the parents' influence as intervening
variables. Considering that these subjects felt their fathers were inadequate, and that they were therefore more likely to identify with their mothers, it seems logical that they would enjoy a system largely dominated by females, the elementary school system, but evaluate negatively a system that was almost completely male dominated, the seminary. Success and enjoyment in the seminary very much depended on harmonious relationships with males.

It was hypothesized that these priests persevered in the seminary, despite their evaluation of it as a negative experience, because they experienced some pressure to continue. The majority—76%—reported they felt some obligation to continue. It was surprising that five of them spoke of explicitly making pacts or agreements with God that they would stay in the seminary, even though they did not like it and did not like the idea of becoming a priest, unless the seminary authorities told them to leave. Many of these subjects felt under obligation to follow "God's will," which in their perspective was that they persevere and be ordained.

This finding may relate to Potvin and Suziedelis's (1969) conclusion that the special closeness of seminarians to their mothers is related to the tendency to define priesthood as something sacred, and to a willingness to accept celibacy, and to persevere. Although their research dealt with seminarians in general, there seems to be a difference between the tone or quality of the way those seminarians defined priesthood, accepted celibacy, and persevered and the tone or quality of the way these priests handled the same three issues. Those seminarians in general felt their parents were strict yet affectionate and supportive. These qualities seemed to color their approach to the
priesthood. Perhaps the maldeveloped priests felt a more coercive pressure because their parents, fathers especially, were not so supportive and affectionate. In perhaps trying to please a father-figure, God, by doing what they thought he wanted, they did so in an emotionally cold, rather begrudging way.

Such a forced response may be attributed to an unresolved Oedipal conflict. These priests experienced inadequate fathers and consequently did not consolidate adequate identifications with them. Through transference they could have dealt with God as they would with their fathers. The priests obeyed God out of fear or some experienced coercive power, but were not capable of identifying with Him or transferring the warmth and support they would have experienced in more normal father-son relationships. Also, in trying to please God they could have been striving for acceptance from this father-figure, and have been unconsciously striving for greater closeness with their mothers.

The data indicating that these priests experienced pressure to continue should be taken into account in dealing with borderline seminarians. It is not extraordinary today to ask a candidate why he is in the seminary, but he is seldom asked whether he wants to stay, or what it would take for him to decide on his own to leave. With the common practice today of giving a seminarian the benefit of a doubt and allowing him more time in the hope that he might decide on his own to leave—rather than expel him or ask him to leave—it is likely that candidates with a mentality like that of many of these subjects will stay until they are ordained. This is what happened in regard to many of these subjects. It would be prudent to avoid
such a result in the future because it would not be to the individual's or the Church's benefit.

In summary, the author's hypotheses were supported by the data. Some findings that seem to be characteristic of the maldeveloped priest are his early lack of emotional closeness to his siblings, his peers in early schooling, and his peers in the seminary. The lack of close relationship with his father also seems to be an important and perhaps fundamental factor that is particular to the maldeveloped. Certain qualities in the sensed pressure to continue seem unique to the maldeveloped, although the understanding of vocation that was popular fifteen to twenty years ago might have resulted in interview material from most of the Kennedy and Heckler sample that would be judged as pressure to continue.

Whatever factors are unique to or more characteristic of these men, it is obvious that they entered the seminary with problems. Since they attended closed seminaries at that time, it is likely that their problems were exacerbated by the training, and their more adjusted peers developed behaviors and had experiences that made them, too, look less well-adjusted (Vaughn, 1970). Whereas the more adjusted peers returned to more normal behaviors after leaving training, this group, and others like them, continued to experience problems that interfered with their lives. If seminarians attended more open seminaries on campus the average pathology of the training situation would be reduced and the maldeveloped would not so easily be overlooked. Some corrective action could then be attempted, or they could be counseled out of the ministry.

A comment on the use of this interview seems in order. It is
obvious that even a structured interview and training to use it in a pilot study are not adequate to get full information on some areas or from some subjects. The two subjects who gave inadequate data on ten and eleven areas, respectively, were either difficult to interview or the interviewers were not functioning well on those occasions. Also, the fact that nine subjects gave inadequate data on their relationships with early or seminary authority figures seems to indicate some problem in interviewing on this area. Perhaps the subjects were reluctant to talk about these areas, or perhaps something in the interviewers affected the way they probed those areas of a priest's, an authority figure's, life.

These difficulties resulted in deficient data, which might be eliminated by further training of interviewers to follow the format more carefully, or by using a detailed, forced choice, questionnaire in conjunction with an interview.

In conclusion, these seventeen men suffer from "affective disorders rather than logical disorders" (Kennedy & Heckler, 1972, p. 55). It is difficult to classify them under one psychiatric label. Their difficulties cover the gamut from temporary reactions and personality disorders to neuroses and psychoses, with such attendant problems as alcoholism and homosexuality. Those that were rated by the interviewers in regard to severity of abnormality were as follows: two mildly abnormal, seven moderately abnormal, and six severely abnormal. A twelve step scale of adjustment was also filled out by the interviewers, with A1 as best adjusted and D3 as most poorly adjusted. This sample ranged from C3 to D3 and the mean score was D1—the tenth of the twelve steps.
The degree of maladjustment influences their whole lives. Some experience emotional disruption and turmoil with a lot of stress and anxiety. Others are basically unaware of internal difficulties and/or blame any problems they experience on others. In relating to their colleagues and superiors they may express inappropriate anger and antagonism or may just be distant and sullen or unhappy. A few may manifest genuinely bizarre behavior but most merely lead disordered and unproductive lives. Surely their colleagues find it difficult to live with them and work with them. In their work with people some may be distant, over-controlled and unemotional. Others may avoid contact as much as possible. Some may be seen by the people as a little eccentric and others may elicit stronger reactions by their sexual, drinking, or hostile behavior.

In the continuing effort to effectively screen and train candidates so that maldeveloped men are not ordained the present study does not offer adequate data to refuse admittance to candidates with backgrounds like these subjects. It is not clear which specific factors or how many in combination determine if a boy will be maldeveloped. The structured interview used in this study could certainly be used to help uncover some early socio-psychological factors that are characteristic of the maldeveloped, and the factors, depending on which and how many are uncovered, could be considered by the seminary directors as indicators to look more closely at students who report them. Surely a student who reports all of them would be a poor risk without considerable corrective action during training.

Although many studies have attempted, without much success, to differentiate which seminarians will persevere, there are instruments
that can be used to assess the development and adjustment of candidates. The present study points to the importance of early socio-psychological factors and shows that certain ones are related to later level of development. More systematic attention to ascertaining the socio-psychological backgrounds of candidates, and appropriate selection and/or therapeutic intervention, could help insure that those who do persevere to ordination will not be maldeveloped.
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APPENDIX A
LIFE AND MINISTRY OF ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Loyola University

1969-1970

I. Beginning the Interview

A. Greetings and introductions

B. Assurance of anonymity

1. Coding system

2. Use of recording device

C. Turn on recording device

D. Standard introductory stimulus: "As you may already know, the study for which you have volunteered is aimed at obtaining a comprehensive view of the life and ministry of American Catholic priests. Could you tell me your reactions to this study?" (Allow and encourage approximately five minutes of free responding.)

E. Communicate that interview will cover a range of topics, including both developmental history and current life situation.

II. Developmental History

A. Family life and relationships

1. Parents: Father/Mother

   - what kind of person, disposition, occupation, health, religion
   - alive or when deceased
   - relationship to wife (husband), other children
   - relationship to him: warm-distant; permissive-authoritarian
   - traits he admired most in parents--weaknesses
   - parent he is most like
   - which parent made most of the decisions about him
   - quality of discipline; father/mother: harsh-kind; consistent-erratic
what was he punished for
what was he rewarded for

2. Siblings:
- who, how many, where was he in line of siblings
- who was he closest to
- with whom did he have most difficulty—why

3. Family values:
- what were the dominant values and concerns for his family
- education, religious practices, other people, money
- was his family closely knit or not
- what were some of the important crises in the life of his family

4. Other important people:
- did anyone else live with his family
- who visited his family
- who did his family visit
- his favorite people besides family

5. Changes in family:
- as the years went on how has his family changed:
  attitudes, ambitions, goals, etc.
- how does he feel about his family now

B. Illness and accident history
- what kind of illness or accidents did he have
- what kind of illness or accidents did family members have
- was he frequently sick
- how did family (father, mother) react to his illness
- was he separated from family for any length of time due to illness
- any history of him having minor and recurrent illness
- any history of repeated accidents—what parts of body injured
- what were his attitudes towards accidents, i.e.: punishment due to hostility, neglect of others, own shortcomings, etc.
- present state of his health

C. School career
- what kinds of schools did he attend—how long
- academic success or failure
- what areas, courses were preferred/disliked by him
- parental attitudes toward school and his performance
- school careers of parents and siblings
- what kinds of relationships did he establish with teachers
- what kinds of sports, clubs, other extra-curricular activities did he enjoy
- is he satisfied with his education

D. Relationship with peers
- was there ample opportunity for him to have social interactions with other children
- was he popular--why
- was he respected--why
- what kinds of relationship did he establish: bully, hanger-on, detached observer, intellectual leader, etc.
- any close friends--boys--girls:
  definition of a close friend; what did he value in a friendship; what kinds of people became his friends:
  intellectuals, religiously orientated, social misfits, handicapped and underprivileged, rebels, thrill seekers, party goers, etc.; quality of friendship: was he only a "giver" or did he receive too
- did the pattern of his social relationships and social values change as he grew up: how--why

E. Psychosexual development
- what were the sources of sexual information--how adequate were they
- parental attitudes toward sex
- early experience with sex
- how did he feel about sexual development at puberty
- what types of sexual exploration occurred
- was there any over-concern about masturbation/sexual adequacy
- what kind of relationships with girls--dating, etc.
- any specific problems with sexuality during seminary--solutions
- were there any changes in his attitudes, problems, behavior patterns as he grew up
- what was his conception of the masculine role
- what was his conception of the feminine role

F. Self-concept at present time
- how does he feel about himself--like, dislike
- how does he feel others see and evaluate him
- what does he think his strong points and weaknesses are
- what gives him security
- does he see himself as: creative, flexible, daring or rather ordinary, rigid, safety oriented
- does he see himself as warm and affectionate or rather distant
- does he feel any power or influence--where--how
- what are his plans--what would he like to do in ten or twenty years--how does he see the future
III. Core Areas of Priesthood

A. Development of vocation

- at what age did he start thinking of the priesthood
- at what age did he definitely decide to become a priest
- what were the most influential factors that determined his initial interest and ultimate choice of the priesthood: i.e., people, values
- what was his family's attitude toward his decision
- what was the most attractive part of becoming a priest
- what was the most difficult part of becoming a priest
- how would he evaluate the favorable and unfavorable aspects of his high school, college and theology careers re: personal formation, intellectual development, relations to peers and authorities
- vocational crises: when, nature of: i.e., faith, celibacy, authority, etc.
- how did he resolve it

B. Priestly assignments

- describe the type of assignments he has received as a priest and his reactions to each
- what has proven to be of most satisfaction to him in the priesthood
- what has been the most difficult part of the priesthood for him
- does he feel adequate to his job--supported, challenged by it
- does he feel needed by others and respected by them as a priest
- how does he see his role of priest
- what is preventing him from doing what he wants to do in his priesthood
- what is the present status of his vocation: why does he remain a priest--what would make him consider leaving the priesthood--what other occupation can he see himself in
- how does he view the changes in the priesthood: i.e., greater freedom of thought, different ministries, etc.

C. Interpersonal relations

- describe his ordinary relations with parishioners and friends: warm-distant; personal-task oriented
- what kind of personal relations does he have with family
- what kind of personal relations does he have with clerical friends
- what kind of personal relations does he have with lay friends--men--women
- who is his closest friend (friends)
- why is this person valuable to him
- describe other personal relationships he has had in his life
- who does he worry about, really care for, sacrifice self for
- how does he feel others care about him--who
- who does he feel really knows and understands him
- has the pattern of personal friendship changed since his ordination: how--why
- how would he describe his relationship to superiors and those over whom he exercises authority

D. Faith and Church

- what are the basic values he believes in, sacrifices for, lives for
- how would he describe his faith life: i.e., strong, weak, confused, etc.
- what means does he use to strengthen and support his faith life: i.e., prayer, reading, discussions, liturgy, serving people
- how effective does he feel these means are
- how does he feel about the present turmoil of the Church
- what does it mean for him personally
- what is the most difficult part of this turmoil for him
- what is the most exciting, challenging part
- what are his hopes for the Church
- what are his fears for the Church

E. Priesthood

- describe his life as a priest now: happy, challenging, frustrating, depressing--why
- what is the most satisfying aspect of his priesthood
- what is the most painful aspect of his priesthood
- does he feel supported, encouraged, rewarded by his priesthood
- does he feel he is operating at a level commensurate with his full potential--if not, what changes would he like to see in his life
- how does he feel about priests leaving the active ministry
- has he ever thought of leaving--if so, what would prompt him to leave--how would his life be different if he left the priesthood

F. Celibacy

- what kind of relationships does he have now with women: family, married women, single women, nuns
- what is his definition of celibacy
- has his definition changed since ordination--how
- does he feel celibacy is an aid or burden to his priesthood--why
- how does he handle the loneliness of not being married
IV. Future

- does he feel celibacy should be optional--why
- if celibacy were optional, would he marry
- if celibacy were optional and he married, would he continue in the priestly ministry

IV. Ending the Interview

As the interview comes to an end the Interviewer should:

A. Handle any anxiety that may have been aroused during the interview.

B. Communicate clearly to the Interviewee that there is no follow-up from this interview, i.e., no opportunity with the present team for counseling, etc.

C. Thank the person for the time and interest he has shown in the interview, for example, "I enjoyed discussing these topics with you. I hope you found it interesting also."

V. Hand Over and Explain Test Packet
GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS ON CONTENT ANALYSIS RULES

1) Caution should be exercised in not looking for the severity of pathology that is usually perceived in clinical situations. These subjects are not clinic patients, but ministers who are living and functioning in the community.

2) If the subject seems too general or did not speak about an area, or if the interviewer did not ask him about that area, the column "Not adequate information" (NA) should be checked.

3) It is not necessary that the subject have mentioned all the possibilities under a rule, he may have mentioned only one, or have mentioned them frequently, he may have mentioned one only once.

4) If the subject speaks in a way that explicitly meets the condition of the rule, or clearly implies perceptions or facts that meet the rule, that column should be checked.

5) Examples of assertions that meet the rule are provided with each rule, but these assertions do not cover all the possibilities of assertions that meet the rule.
RULE 1:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his parents, especially about their relationship to each other. Interview content area II.A.1. Developmental History: Family life and relationships--Parents: Father/Mother.

If one parent is absent from the home this rule can also be applied to the relationship between the parent present and another significant adult in the home, e.g. father and grandmother, or mother and interviewee's eldest brother, etc. The statements to be judged may be about past facts or perceptions.

Kennedy and Heckler (1971, p. 58) concluded that characteristically there is a deep flaw in the relationship between the mother and father of subjects in this group. They listed the possible distortions of the family picture:

- separation of parents who have proved incompatible,
- divorce of the parents for the same reason; desertion by either mother or father; psychological distance from the parents even though they remain married to one another; death of one or the other parent at a crucial stage in the individual's development.

A decision can be reached by judging statements that express one of the above situations or one of the following maladaptive marital systems: (1) a conflictual marriage, in which fighting has become ritualized; (2) an over-under adequate marriage, in which one spouse may function at a superior level and the other at an under adequate level; and (3) a united-front marriage, in which the couple is unable to deal with conflict, denies it, and is more concerned about the appearance of agreement than any real acceptance of occasional disagreements.

If the above situations or maladaptive systems are expressed in the interview the parents' relationship is to be judged as containing a "flaw." A flaw is also judged present if the interviewee perceived that they did not function as a unit, e.g. little or no affection expressed, or perceived that they had difficulty in the sexual relationship.

Examples: "he hit her one time and threw her all the way across the room"
"he didn't care very much about her in any human way"
"perceived him 'to be the underdog in parental relationship'"
"never got along sexually too well"
"mother and father were divorced when I was nine months old"
RULE 2:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his mother or other significant mother-figure. Interview content area II.A.1. Developmental History: Family life and relationships--Parents: Father/Mother.

The subjects' mother's influence is judged to have been distorted if there are statements expressing that she: was the strong, dominant figure in his life and/or the home; was over-protective; expressed minimal, excessive, or inappropriate affection toward him, or he toward her; was emotionally unavailable to him because she was absent, physically or mentally unstable or disabled, or inappropriate in behavior; or in alliance with the subject through her or his initiative against his father. The mother's influence is also judged excessive if the father was absent and there was no constant father-figure present.

Examples: "the domineering personality in the family"
"extremely opinionated...dominating type woman"
"mother is the Blessed Virgin and father is a scoundrel"
"attitude of indifference"
"when younger children my mother was fairly sick off and on"
"hardly a visitor in the house wasn't my mother's relative"
RULE 3:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his father or other significant father-figure. Interview content area III.A.1. Developmental History: Family life and relationships--Parents: Father/Mother.

The subject's father's presence in the family is judged to have been inadequate if there are statements expressing that he was absent a lot or completely; was a drinker; was perceived by the subject an object of shame or in a negative light; was weak or passive; did not show affection or interest; was constricted emotionally and/or only provided materially; abdicated his home responsibilities to others; or was held in a low opinion by others or by himself.

Examples: "nipping too much"
          "she just married beneath her"
          "wasn't any warmth"
          "was not home in the evenings"
          "somewhat reserved, especially with his own family...wasn't type...who did a lot of talking"
          "dad always told him (older brother) to beat me"
Psychosexual identity is a very complex concept. Consequently this category is applied to diverse statements in which the interviewee talked about masculinity-feminity; his self-concept; comparisons and relationships with males and females, especially his mother and father; sexual orientation and attitudes about sexuality; involvement in stereotypically male activities. These statements may be found in several interview content areas: II.A.1. Developmental History: Family life and relationships--Parents: Father/Mother; II.C. School Career; II.D. Relationship with peers; II.E. Psychosexual development; and II.F. Self-concept at the present time.

The subject is judged to have had difficulty with his own masculine identity if there are statements expressing that he considered himself inadequate as to size, strength, etc., whether physical or emotional; that he unfavorably compared himself to other males; that he considered himself more like females and considered this a problem; that he had considerable doubt about being heterosexual; that he was uncomfortable around females; that he was unable to relate comfortably with males; that he considered sex as negative; that he was considerably concerned about an inability to engage in male activities, like sports, etc.; that he attributed what he perceived as negative or weak qualities in himself to his father; or that he lacked interest in females during adolescence.

Examples: "was an invalid"
"was real runt"
"Kenny (best friend) was always a little bigger and a little older and a little better off"
"a thing I inherited from my mother...fell in love and...right over the top"
"frightened of sex and belittling it"
"I've always been and I still am fairly shy with women and I can't take their company too long"
"I had a terrible time getting along with the boys in the class"
"I have lots of homosexual tendencies"
"my faults I associate with him (father)"
RULE 5:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his relationship to any superior or authority figure. There is no one specific interview content area that probes this dynamic, however information needed to make a judgment may be found in the following areas: II.A.1. Developmental History: Family life and relationships--Parents: Father/Mother; II.C. School career; II.F. Self-concept at present time; and III.C. Core areas of Priesthood: Interpersonal relations.

It is judged that the subject has had difficulty in his relationship with authority if there are statements expressing that he is hostile toward, "hung-up" with, etc. individuals who were and/or are above him in some sense of authority; that he resents, fears, or relates poorly to authority figures; that he is generally obedient in all things with little dispute; that he would never question or confront an authority figure; that he typically opposes an authority figure; that his parent(s) were so directive he became overdependent on an authority figure; or that authority figures made him feel inadequate or inferior.

Examples: "I resent people who are put over me"
"it's very hard for me to relate to male authority figures"
"I followed the directions, whatever directions were given to me"
"I have a real hang-up on authority"
RULE 6:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his relationship to his siblings. Interview content area II.A.2. Developmental History: Family life and relationships--Siblings.

The subject is judged not to have been close to his siblings if there are statements expressing that he was not in the home when younger or older sibs were there because of difference in age, attendance at boarding schools, etc.; that he did not feel close to them; that he and his sibs all had separate friends and went their separate ways; that he was only close by circumstances rather than emotional attachment; or that he was distanced from them by some special position, such as being the oldest, the brightest, special, etc. Subjects who had no siblings are not to be included in this category.

Examples:
"always envied him (brother)"
"brother away nine months of the year...difficult...could not communicate with them as I'd want to"
"most friends outside of family"
RULE 7:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his relationships with peers before entering the seminary. Interview content area II.D. Developmental History: Relationship with peers.

The subject is judged not to have been close to peers before entering the seminary if there are statements expressing that he only had one person he was close to; that he was afraid of or had disdain for peers; that he was shy or a loner; that he had "friends" but never really interacted with them or had any intimacy, or was only ever close to one or two; or that there was only minimal acceptance of others.

Examples: "I've always had a sneaking preference for solitude and for lone pursuits"
"I had few friends until I got into my senior year"
"I was socially awkward as a child"
"they accepted me for some reason"
"other kids impinged upon my life very little"
"I was the only teenager with older G.I.'s"
RULE 8:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his school experiences prior to entering the seminary. Interview content area II.C. Developmental History: School career.

School is judged to be an important positive influence on the subject if there are statements expressing that: he did well in terms of grades or class standing; he enjoyed school; he found it easy or a pleasure; or he very much liked his teachers.

Examples: "graduated second with second honors"
"I enjoyed almost every moment of college while I was there"
"third or fourth in grade school"
"I loved my teachers"
RULE 9:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his father or a father-figure in relationship to himself. Interview content area II.A.I Developmental History: Family life and relationships--Parents: Father/Mother.

The subject is judged not to have had a close relationship with his father if there are statements expressing that the subject explicitly was not close to him; was ashamed of him; had little contact with him because he was absent, always working, too busy, etc.; could not talk to him; did not receive affection or attention from him; was afraid of him; or disliked him.

Examples: "used as a pawn especially on my father's part"
"never had any real association with my father"
"turned me off completely. He was a bore"
RULE 10:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about how he learned about sex. Interview content area: II.E. Developmental History: Psychosexual development.

It is judged that the subject did not receive information on sex from his parents or that he received negative instruction if there are statements expressing that he explicitly did not receive any instruction from his parents; that he perceived his parents as not believing children should know; or that he received strong aversive reactions from parents or other adult figures when nudity or childhood sexual activity was involved.

Examples: "discovered (mother) naked--she'd always do something drastic"
"when six, feeling ashamed about sex"
"didn't become aware of this through...parents...through group"
"if I fell in love with somebody the same will happen to me as happened to my mother (hitting and divorce)"
"they slept together and...I just sort of had this impression of lust...I became sexually aroused by Darrell all summer (teens he slept in room with when twelve years old)"
RULE 11:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about masturbation or self-abuse. Interview content area II.E. Developmental History: Psychosexual development.

The subject is judged to have had difficulty with masturbation before or during seminary years if there are statements expressing that he worried about it; was scared by it; struggled to stop; was disturbed by it; considered it a problem; felt considerable guilt; was anxious over even talking about it during the interview; used words like it was a "sin" or "temptation," etc. for him; or found it so unsettling that he was unable to consider or understand it.

Examples: "into habit of self-abuse--temptations against purity"
"very difficult to live with at the time"
"I enjoyed it but...very dishonest...I never could talk with anybody about it"
"felt terrible about it"
"kind of corrosive"
RULE 12:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about dating or association with girls. Interview content area II.E. Developmental History: Psychosexual development.

The subject is judged to have had minimal dating relationships if there are statements expressing that he explicitly never dated; was too shy to date; had no particular relationship with a girl; only went to group get-togethers; or dated several times but only for special occasions and/or they were negative experiences.

Examples: "first school dance that I went to the girl had to ask me"
"a couple of times but it was very painful"
"I had no friends"
"I didn't go to the dances"
RULE 13:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his relationships to authority figures in the seminary. Interview content area III.A. Core Areas of Priesthood: Development of vocation.

The subject is judged to have had difficulty in dealing with seminary authority figures if there are statements expressing that he had "run-in's," "conflicts," etc. with superiors or professors; explicitly had a "hang-up" or problem with authority figures; considered himself mistreated by superiors; used derogatory names in the interview for superiors indicating they were authoritarian; indicated the authority figures suppressed or in some way belittled him; avoided authority figures; was always quite obedient with few questions or protest; or withdrew when faced with authority figures.

Examples: "insane Capt. Quigg type paranoid superior...show-down with him"
"misconstrued and misrepresented...unjustly accused"
"two run-in's"
RULE 14:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about his relationships with peers in the seminary. Interview content area II.A. Core Areas of Priesthood: Development of vocation.

The subject is judged not to have been close to his seminary peers if there are statements expressing that he explicitly did not have what he perceived to be friendships with more than one person; that he was "close," "friendly," etc. to many but did not mention close relationships to any particular individuals; or that he did not associate with his peers.

Examples: "I was never that close to any of my classmates"
"I don't remember speaking too intimately with any of them"
"first close relationship since entering the monastery (with someone outside it, thirteen years after ordination)"
RULE 15:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee evaluated his seminary training. Interview content area III.A. Core areas of Priesthood: Development of vocation.

The subject is judged to have found the seminary a negative experience if there are statements expressing that he explicitly did not like, hated, etc. the seminary; that he was glad to leave it; that he perceived he was maltreated or not respected as an individual; that he perceived the training as poor; that his life was unhappy; or that disdainfully regarded the training.

Examples: "kept dragging myself through life but it was a task. Life was not enjoyable"
           "It was just hell, the whole thing"
           "I don't know how I put up with all that crap"
RULE 16:

Applied to statements in which the interviewee talked about the development of his vocation. Interview content area III.A. Core Areas of Priesthood: Development of vocation.

The subject is judged to have experienced some pressure to go through with becoming a priest if there are statements expressing that he explicitly experienced pressure; that he conceived of his continuing as being God's will; that he evaluated the situation such that there were no other alternatives available for him; that he felt some internal pressure to stick by a decision he had made, etc. These ideas are frequently in conjunction with some expression of not planning to be a priest and/or not choosing something the interviewee particularly liked and/or was fit for.

Examples: "I felt it my duty to be a priest--Divine injunction"
"I have an obligation to be a priest"
"this proviso, that I would stay in the seminary until they threw me out"
"felt as though this is where Jesus Christ wanted me so that's where I stayed"
"because there wasn't anything else to do"
Table A
Socio-psychological Factors in Maldeveloped Priests' Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Code</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SX</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. The factor abbreviations are as follows: MF (parent-figures' relationship), M (mother's influence), F (father's presence), ID (masculine identity), AT (early authority figures), SB (relationship with siblings), P (relationship with peers), SC (school experience), FR (relationship with father), SX (sex instruction), MS (masturbation), DT (minimal dating), SA (seminary authority), SP (relationship with seminary peers), SN (negative seminary experience), PR (pressure to continue), and TNA (total number of categories with inadequate data). The symbols in the columns have the following meanings: Y (yes, the subject experienced that factor) and N (no, the subject did not experience that factor). A blank in the columns means that the subject did not provide adequate data to make a judgment as to whether or not he experienced that factor. A "-" means the subject had no siblings.
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