



1970

An Exploratory and Descriptive Study of Social Class, Academic Achievement, and Selected Attitudes of First Year Students in a Metropolitan Minor Seminary

William Joseph Mackey
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Mackey, William Joseph, "An Exploratory and Descriptive Study of Social Class, Academic Achievement, and Selected Attitudes of First Year Students in a Metropolitan Minor Seminary" (1970). *Dissertations*. Paper 1042.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1042

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/).
Copyright © William Joseph Mackey

AN EXPLORATORY AND DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF SOCIAL CLASS,
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND SELECTED ATTITUDES
OF FIRST YEAR STUDENTS IN A
METROPOLITAN MINOR SEMINARY

by

William Joseph Mackey

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Loyola University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of Doctor of Philosophy

February, 1970

To the Seminarian, the leader of the
Christian Community of the future,
this work is fondly dedicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author of this dissertation wishes to acknowledge his deep gratitude to Professor Paul Mundy, his academic advisor, for his encouragement, guidance, and many helpful suggestions during the compilation of this work.

No less a debt of gratitude is owed to Dr. Marcel Fredericks of Loyola University for his friendship and counsel during the critical years of work on this study. To Dr. Ross Scherer, Loyola University, another reader of this dissertation, is also extended gratitude for his advice and help.

To Msgr. Martin Howard, Msgr. John O'Donnell, and Father John Fahey, rectors of the seminaries chosen for this research, without whose cooperation this work would not have been possible, the author wishes to acknowledge a sincere debt.

Also, the assistance given in many instances by my professional colleagues and the students in the seminaries, is gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, the sacrifices in time and effort made by my family to insure the completion of this work are acknowledged, with special appreciation to my wife, Helen.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Problem Area.....	3
Review of the Related Literature.....	11
Theoretical Considerations.....	20
Questions Posed.....	27
Hypothetical Considerations.....	29
Justification of Problem Choice.....	30
II. METHODOLOGY.....	33
The Research Case.....	33
The Minor Seminary Setting.....	36
Gathering the Data.....	46
Key Independent Variable: Social Class.....	47
Variables: Ability and Aptitude.....	49
Variable: Dogmatism.....	53
Variable: Anomy.....	55
Variable: Stress and Anxiety.....	58
Variable: Academic Achievement.....	59
The Questionnaires.....	60
Statistical Procedures.....	62
III. SOME SELECTED DESCRIPTIVE FACTORS OF THE MINOR SEMINARIANS' BACKGROUNDS.....	66
Parental Backgrounds.....	68
The Grammar School and Parish.....	78
Selected Attitudes of Respondents.....	82
General Observations: Seminary and Seminarian.....	84
IV. SOCIAL CLASS, SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE, MENTAL ABILITY, AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN THE MINOR SEMINARY....	97
Social Class and Academic Achievement.....	98
Social Class, Mental Ability (IQ) and Scholastic Aptitude (SRA).....	100
Mental Ability (IQ) and Scholastic Aptitude (SRA).	110
Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Academic Achievement	111
Mental Ability (IQ) and Academic Achievement.....	116

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
Social Class, Mental Ability (IQ), Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Academic Achievement.....	117
Summary.....	120
V. SOCIAL CLASS, DOGMATISM, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND THE ADMISSION TESTS TO THE MINOR SEMINARY.....	124
Social Class and Dogmatism.....	127
Academic Achievement and Dogmatism.....	133
Dogmatism and Academic Achievement.....	134
Dogmatism and Mental Ability (IQ).....	141
Dogmatism and Scholastic Aptitude (SRA).....	142
Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Dogmatism.....	146
Summary.....	150
VI. SOCIAL CLASS, ANOMY, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, THE ADMISSION TESTS, AND THE DOGMATIC PERSONALITY IN THE MINOR SEMINARY.....	155
Social Class and Anomy.....	157
Academic Achievement and Anomy.....	163
Anomy and Academic Achievement.....	164
Anomy and Mental Ability.....	170
Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Anomy.....	172
The Dogmatic Personality and Anomy.....	176
Summary.....	180
VII. SOCIAL CLASS, STRESS/ANXIETY, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND RELATED FACTORS IN THE MINOR SEMINARY.....	184
Social Class and Stress/Anxiety Responses.....	184
Academic Achievement and Stress/Anxiety Responses	190
Stress/Anxiety Responses and Academic Achievement	194
Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Stress/Anxiety Responses.....	198
The Dogmatic Personality and Stress/Anxiety Responses.....	204
Anomy and Stress/Anxiety Responses.....	211
Student Conduct Grades, Academic Achievement, Stress-Anxiety, and the Dogmatic Personality....	212
Summary.....	219

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	223
Questions and Hypotheses Posed.....	223
The Findings.....	227
Acceptance and/or Rejection of Hypotheses.....	241
Relevance to Theory.....	244
Implications for the Future.....	247
APPENDICES	
A. DOGMATISM SCALE--FORM E (1960).....	252
B. ANOMY SCALE (PAB SAMPLE) 1965.....	255
C. PERSONALITY SCALE.....	256
D. GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE.....	259
E. PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PRIEST- HOOD--ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO--GRAMMAR SCHOOL REPORT.....	265
F. PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PRIEST- HOOD--ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO--PARISH REPORT.....	268
G. TABLE C CRITICAL VALUES OF t	271
H. SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER IV...	272
I. SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER V....	281
J. SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER VI...	292
K. SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER VII..	304
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	323

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. U.S. Diocesan Minor Seminaries: Enrollment Statistics--1965-66.....	34
2. Minor Seminary Enrollment Statistics: Chicago Diocese--1967-68.....	36
3. Social Class Distribution of Minor Seminary Faculty (Q-S) by Number and Per Cent.....	41
4. Teaching Experience Distribution of Minor Seminary Faculty (Q-S) by Number and Per Cent.....	43
5. Age Distribution of Minor Seminary Faculty (Q-S) by Number and Per Cent.....	44
6. Ethnic Background of Minor Seminary Faculty (Q-S) by Number and Per Cent.....	45
7. Social Class Distribution of Study Group by Number and Per Cent.....	50
8. Mental Ability Distribution of Study Group as Measured on Otis Test--1966.....	52
9. Scholastic Aptitude Distribution of Study Group as Measured by the Science Research Associates Tests--1966.....	54
10. Parental Ages of Study Group by Social Class Position--Q-N Seminary.....	69
11. Parental Ages of Study Group by Social Class Position--Q-S Seminary.....	70
12. Parental Ethnic Background of Study Group by Social Class Position--Q-N Seminary.....	72
13. Parental Ethnic Background of Study Group by Social Class Position--Q-S Seminary.....	74

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
14. Respondents' Place of Residence by Social Class.....	76
15. Parental Estimate of Respondents' Qualities as a Student by Social Class.....	79
16. Distribution of Respondents by Degree of Dogmatism.....	85
17. Distribution of Respondents by Degree of Anomy.....	87
18. Distribution of Respondents by Degree of Stress and Anxiety.....	89
19. Distribution of Respondents by Conduct Grades at Q-S Seminary.....	91
20. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-N Seminary.....	101
21. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-S Seminary.....	102
22. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-N Seminary.....	107
23. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-S Seminary.....	107
24. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Combined Seminary Scores.....	108
25. Mean Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-N Seminary.....	108
26. Mean Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-S Seminary.....	109
27. Mean Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Combined Seminary Scores.....	109

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
28. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) as Measured by Science Research Associates Battery of Tests--Q-N Seminary.....	112
29. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) as Measured by Science Research Associates Battery of Tests--Q-S Seminary.....	112
30. Mean Academic Achievement (AA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) as Measured by Science Research Associates Battery of Tests--Q-N Seminary.....	114
31. Mean Academic Achievement (AA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) as Measured by Science Research Associates Battery of Tests--Q-S Seminary.....	115
32. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-N Seminary.....	118
33. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-S Seminary.....	118
34. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-N Seminary.....	130
35. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-S Seminary.....	131
36. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Combined Seminary Scores....	132
37. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-N Seminary.....	135

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
38. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-S Seminary.....	136
39. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	139
40. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	140
41. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	144
42. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	144
43. Mean Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	145
44. Mean Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	145
45. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on SRA Scholastic Aptitude Composite Scores--Q-N Seminary.....	148
46. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on SRA Scholastic Aptitude Composite Scores--Q-S Seminary.....	149
47. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-N Seminary.....	160

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
48. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-S Seminary.....	161
49. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Combined Seminary Scores.....	162
50. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-N Seminary.....	166
51. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-S Seminary.....	167
52. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Anomy Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	168
53. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Anomy Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	169
54. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Anomy Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	171
55. Mean Mental Ability (IQ) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Anomy Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	171
56. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on SRA Scholastic Aptitude Composite Scores--Q-N Seminary.....	174
57. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on SRA Scholastic Aptitude Composite Scores--Q-S Seminary.....	175
58. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-N Seminary....	178

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
59. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-S Seminary....	179
60. Mean Stress and Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-N Seminary.....	187
61. Mean Stress and Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Q-S Seminary.....	188
62. Mean Stress and Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Social Class--Combined Seminary Scores.....	189
63. Mean Stress and Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-N Seminary.....	192
64. Mean Stress and Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Cumulative Academic Achievement--Q-S Seminary.....	193
65. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	196
66. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	197
67. Mean Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	201
68. Mean Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	201

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
69. Mean Stress and Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on SRA Scholastic Aptitude Composite Scores--Q-N Seminary.....	202
70. Mean Stress and Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on SRA Scholastic Aptitude Composite Scores--Q-S Seminary.....	203
71. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	207
72. Mean Dogmatism Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	208
73. Mean Stress/Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	209
74. Mean Stress/Anxiety Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	210
75. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-N Seminary.....	213
76. Mean Anomy Score Comparisons for Seminary Freshmen by Rank on Stress/Anxiety Scale--Q-S Seminary.....	214
77. Mean Academic Achievement Score Comparisons for Q-S Seminary Freshmen by Rank on Student Conduct Grades During Final Quarter of Academic Year 1967-68.....	217
78. Mean Stress/Anxiety Score Comparisons for Q-S Seminary Freshmen by Rank on Student Conduct Grades During Final Quarter of Academic Year 1967-68.....	218
79. Mean Student Conduct Grade Comparisons for Q-S Seminary Freshmen by Composite Rank on Dogmatism Scale....	219

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

At a time when a spirit of ecumenism and renewal is influencing the many Christian followings in western societies one might raise the point that a study of minor seminarians is an anachronism. Certainly in recent times there has been a shift in concern to problems of a higher level of generality. The provincial perspective of most denominations has given way to a "long hard look"¹ at reform.

And yet the seminary continues to be studied both in terms of its long range effectiveness and its specific educational function.² There appears to be a tacit recognition of the unity

¹Keith R. Bridston and Walter D. Wagoner, Unity in Mid-Career: An Ecumenical Critique (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963), pp. 1-7.

²Walter D. Wagoner, The Seminary: Protestant and Catholic (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966).

Magda B. Arnold, Petreolus Hispanicus, Charles A. Weisberger, and Paul F. D'Arcy, Screening Candidates for the Priesthood and Religious Life (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964).

Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., Religion as an Occupation (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961).

John Joseph O'Connell, S.J., "A Study of Selected Sociological Factors in Personal Adjustment of Members to a Religious Order in Terms of Integration and Alienation" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Loyola University, Chicago, 1967).

or wholeness of the life process in studies of those committed to a religious way of life. This is not surprising inasmuch as the several behavioral sciences have emphasized such unity. What is surprising is that there has not been a focal concern with the process of vocation formation for religious functionaries.

Up to very recent times seminaries have been largely immune to the criticism and scrutiny of research. Indeed it was no overstatement that the "religious organizations and their leaders, unlike those on the political and social stage, tend to be treated with cloyed deference. In terms of public criticism they are often given a 'clergy discount.'"³ This predisposition has changed. Awareness of the internal problems of seminary life has not escaped seminary administrators who are presently amenable to suggestion.⁴ It seems clearly up to the professional investigator

³ Bridston and Wagoner, p. 7.

⁴ Unpublished minutes of the Day Seminary Administrators (Catonsville, Md.: St. Charles College, Nov. 2, 1967). Appraisal of these minutes gives evidence of the many problems that affect seminary rectors and deans, e.g., the socialization of seminarians outside the seminary, the advisability of having graduation rings, the type and place of formal graduation, etc. What is inferred from these minutes is that the seminary administrators are willing to cope with social problems outside of the authoritarian setting of the past.

to bridge the hiatus between this awareness of problems and effective social research.

Thorough investigation of the problems of the seminary may well result in solutions being offered that are not otherwise discernible. Those responsible for effecting social change will then be in a better position to carry out their respective obligations. In this way there will be established a clear connection between the Christian vocation and the higher ordered values of Christian living. Little is known of the effectiveness of the socialization process that prepares young aspirants for their later roles in the ministry.

The Problem Area.--Wagoner has asserted that "...minor seminaries are a central and normative feature for preparation for the priesthood."⁵ He takes note that "...most priests now living in the United States began their education as minor seminarians."⁶ His observations in no way intend to perpetuate or expand minor

⁵Wagoner, p. 158

⁶Ibid.

seminaries. Quite to the contrary, Wagoner along with others⁷ strongly questions the utility of such preparatory schools.

The minor seminary is oriented to the secondary school curriculum. While it is mainly a school of religious and academic formation for the Catholic religion, it is also found in some Jewish seminary systems. "Protestantism has nothing at all comparable to it, unless it be the few preparatory high schools of the Missouri Synod Luthern Church."⁸

There are two types of minor seminaries in the United States. These consist of the boarding school and the day school arrangements. Wagoner implicitly tends to discount the latter (day schools)⁹ in that they are far less numerous. Admittedly, the day schools are far outnumbered in this respect. Numerical considerations alone, however, are not the sole criteria for measuring importance in vocation formation. For the most part the boarding school seminaries have small student bodies and equally

⁷James M. Lee and Louis J. Putz, Seminary Education in Times of Change (Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides Publishers, 1965).

Stafford Poole, Seminary in Crisis (New York: Herder and Herder, 1965), pp. 19-24.

⁸Wagoner, p. 158.

⁹Ibid.

small teaching faculties. Furthermore, the day school seminary is primarily operated by a diocese for the training of a secular clergy.¹⁰

Day school seminaries are generally located in or near the large metropolitan areas. They are a phenomenon of the large Catholic diocese. Boys with vocations¹¹ to such schools generally come from highly urbanized settings. Those who are later ordained--after the completion of twelve years of training through the major seminary--most likely continue their ministerial careers in the urban metropolis.

Diocesan bishops are likely to view the day school seminary most personally.¹² Diocesan funds supplement fiscal expenses of such schools. Local priests are often in alumni associations

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. 194-198. Wagoner points out two types of seminary, the secular and the religious. The latter is operated by and for a religious community.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 165. Wagoner calls our attention to the particular use of the word "vocation." He notes that it is a peculiarly Catholic word, specifically used in the context of a calling to the priesthood, brotherhood, or sisterhood.

¹² Unpublished minutes of the Day School Administrators. Even the names of the day school seminarians have the imprint of bishop or diocese, e.g., Bishops' Latin School (Pittsburgh), St. Paul Latin High School, Cathedral Preparatory Seminary (Brooklyn, N.Y.), Quigley Preparatory Seminary (Chicago--named after its founding Bishop), etc.

of these seminaries; these local parish priests normally look forward to becoming pastors to a particular parish within the diocese. In a sense, then, the day school seminary is better looked upon as an integral part of the whole diocese. Such considerations most often do not apply to the boarding school seminary which is usually under the direction of a religious order.

For the past few decades seminary administrators have been concerned with the screening of candidates. It is not surprising that much reliance was placed on psychological tests and measurements. The period since World War II in the United States has been marked by an interest in personnel recruitment and selection.¹³ A broad range of psychological studies treating the various personality components has emerged.¹⁴

In the late 1950's a large surplus of vocations appeared on the seminary scene; of recent date there has been an observable reduction in the number of applicants to minor seminaries. This

¹³William H. Whyte, The Organization Man (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1957), Chapter I. Whyte deplors most of the psychological testing programs. He even offers advice on "how to cheat on personality tests," pp. 449-456.

¹⁴Magda B. Arnold, et al. This volume is an excellent example of current psychological literature in this problem area.

phenomenon applies not only to the day and boarding school seminaries, but also to those seminaries outside of the continental limits of North America. An intense interest in the psychology of the individual seminarian has resulted. But selection of candidates on the basis of psychological tests alone is being seriously questioned.

The percentage of ordinations has not increased within the seminary systems based on beginning vocations.¹⁵ Recently the attrition or "drop-out" rate ranges between five and thirty-one per cent for each of the twelve years preparatory to ordination.¹⁶ Seminary administrators estimate that there is an average of twenty per cent in the attrition rate per year, and this is in spite of the changes that have been made in screening. Administrators are seriously tempted to rely on past experience and concentrate their efforts on public relations programs that will

¹⁵ Xavier de Chalendar, *Seminaires de Jeunes Aux U.S.A., "Vocation: le Diaconat et sa Renovation*, No. 234, Paris 2262-80, Centre National des Vocations (Avril, 1966), p. 395. The author describes the minor seminaries of Chicago, Detroit, New York, and St. Louis. He particularly compares the Chicago day school seminary with the others, pp. 381-388.

¹⁶ Enrollment and Statistics for Quigley, Niles, and Mundelein (unpublished report for the Chicago seminary system, Sept., 1966), p. 4.

bring in more candidates, satisfying themselves with survival "percentages." In this respect heavy emphasis is given to beginning with large classes of freshmen.

All of this would seem to point to the need for a better understanding of the seminary as a social entity. Social factors influencing the seminary have been studied only in brief contexts.

Fichter reports that there has been an upward shift in the number of vocations from the lower to the middle class. Upper class vocations, although more heavily represented than in the past, are becoming more and more delayed beyond the high school years.¹⁷ The class structure as it relates to the minor seminary and the young seminarian's chances for completing his preparation for the priesthood through ordination is still only partially understood. The data that do exist in this area refer to major seminarians, young priests, and others in religious life who are well along in their formal training or careers. "We know nothing of the larger numbers of their former classmates who dropped out during the training period."¹⁸

¹⁷Fichter, pp. 83-84.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 85.

On the basis of what is known, however, Fichter and others would argue for the establishment of vocational clubs, seminary departments in the regular parochial high school, and the like. The minor seminary would be phased out or else it would occupy a diminished role relative to religious careers in the priesthood. Yet there is some caution that should be urged here without the necessary conclusions of further research. In studying a vast array of career choices by college students, Davis has asserted that "the college years are not the sole determinant of vocational choice--nor is any span of four years--for vocational choice is the result of a continuous decision process over decades, but there is no evidence in our data that the college years do not contribute their fair share of influence. Although our guess is that the last two years of high school are the most strategic of all for vocational choice, college is not without its effect."¹⁹

Herberg has asserted that the percentage of Catholics is overly weighted in the lower class when compared to the national distribution of the class structure.²⁰ Fichter additionally notes

¹⁹James A. Davis, Undergraduate Career Decisions (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965), p. 33.

²⁰Will Herberg, Protestant, Catholic, Jew (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1960), p. 212.

that the study of the relation of class to Catholicism clearly shows upward social mobility.²¹ Furthermore, it has been pointed out that "not only has the middle class been increasing in size relative to the working class, but its social standards are permeating the working class more and more with each passing year, thanks to the growing influence of the mass media."²² This is precisely the basis for Cohen's theory of the development of specific (albeit delinquent) subcultures.²³ Values and the reactions of individuals to these values are overlapping the class structure. All of this would seem to indicate a need to investigate the seminary, the class structure, and related variables that pertain to the minor seminarian.

The minor seminary is not only a socializing agency; it particularly focuses on the educational process. Success is more often than not placed in the academic framework. Potential and actual achievement are critical variables. So, too, are those

²¹Fichter, pp. 59-87.

²²Gerhard Lenski, The Religious Factor (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1963), pp. 48-49.

²³Alberg K. Cohen, Deviance and Control (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Publishers, Inc., 1966), pp. 65-66.

Albert K. Cohen, Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955).

variables that create stressful situations that bear upon achievement. The problem area of this research study pertains to the identification and explanation of such variables as they interrelate with the social class backgrounds of day school seminarians and their achievement. This present study should cast new light on the whole process of vocation formation.

Review of the Related Literature.--There is a plethora of literature on the seminary, largely descriptive and impressionistic, written for a lay audience. There is nothing wrong with it; the only imperative is that more problems and questions are raised than are answered. One such article points out that "the minor seminary does not demand an absolute commitment. A minor seminary is a place where young men are trained to be Christian young men, some of whom will be priests and many of whom will enter the market place as Christian men in business and in professions."²⁴ What the author fails to note is that if the seminary administrators were able to distinguish the "drop-outs" from those who would complete their training they would do so. In this sense, then there is a type of apologia in the above quotation which is

²⁴ Joseph P. Higgins, "Minor Seminaries are Not Priest Factories," The Serran (Jan-Feb. 1966), p. 5.

in reality a de facto comment on the present condition of the minor seminary.

Another article, written by a sociologist, points to the widely held view of inferior seminary education. "Separate and, I am afraid, unequal, education has been the lot of many American seminarians for too long a time."²⁵ What is not taken into account is the large differences in types of seminaries--particularly the diocesan as opposed to the religious order seminaries. What is pointed out by McNamara may be entirely true; it is simply too general an indictment.

A series of descriptive studies is presented by the National Catholic Education Association.²⁶ The Association has a department that is specifically interested in seminary systems; each year studies are presented at the Association's annual meeting. The articles reviewed from this source are generally directed to the seminary and parochial school teacher. Those articles that appear methodically correct are of a psychological

²⁵Robert J. McNamara, "Seminary Education: Separate and Unequal," America, 116 (Apr. 8, 1967), 536.

²⁶National Catholic Education Association Bulletin, "Today's Changing Seminaries," N.C.E.A. (Washington, D.C.: N.C.E.A. Feb. 1967).

orientation and do not treat sociological variables in any systematic manner.

Still another article written for the lay audience--this time by a psychologist--raises a confusion in definition.

"Although 'vocation,' from the Latin vacatio means 'calling,' realistically we know that the heavens will not shower forth signs. We are human, and thus we are rational and responsible beings."²⁷

A reader might quite logically conclude that the author is referring to a "calling" to the religious life. In actuality this article, along with others like it, emphasizes the extended meaning of the word vocation. Del Vecchio uses it to mean a situation or position in life, far removed from any specific religious affiliation.

Another extended meaning of the word vocation would be evidenced through a perusal of the various educational journals directed from departments of education of universities and colleges, and from the many governmental boards of education. Here the word connotes a type of trade school education; this type of

²⁷Anthony Del Vecchio, "Moment of Choice," Ave Maria, 99 (March 28, 1964), 8.

education is seen in contradistinction to a full academic curriculum preparatory to further study. When the term is used in this way, the four year curriculum supposedly culminates with the diploma; a type of terminal education and status is thus conferred on the student.

When the word is used in connection with a seminary, the full implications of the socialization and education process leading to ordination are intended. "Vocation" in this context takes on added meaning. Awareness of the other possible usages is important, however, particularly when the extension in meaning covers a wide choice of career opportunities or stations in life. The current debate over the effectiveness of the minor seminary often concludes that a change in the direction of a Christian leadership school curriculum would be the answer to "everyman's" vocation regardless of life goals.

Sociological studies thus far on seminarians have tended to be largely "after the fact." By this it is meant that those well along in their religious careers are asked to provide data on recall; it is thus assumed by the investigator that the study group is representative of a larger population of seminarians, referring back to the initial stages of seminary education.

Scientific evidence is simply lacking in this area.

An ubiquitous report on the relation of social class to achievement is found in the literature from the educational field. There is an assumption made that academic achievement is positively correlated to social class background. Frankel notes that "as expected, the families of the A's (high achievers) were rated higher on the Hamburger Socio-Economic scale."²⁹ His study compared high school boys' achievement, holding ability as a constant factor.

Burton goes further in his observations on social class and achievement. He concludes:

The social classes differ materially in approving or stigmatizing certain beliefs, values and behaviors, and in their regard for education. Middle and upper classes particularly stigmatize, in the lower classes, what the upper classes call laziness, shiftlessness, irresponsibility, ignorance, immorality. Within the lower classes, however, some of these are anticipated ways of behavior, possessing background and rationale. The lower classes are likely to resent in the upper classes what lower class individuals call 'snootiness' or snobbery, good manners, proper language, lack of aggressiveness, or unwillingness to fight.

28

Fichter, p. 84.

29

Edward Frankel, "A Comparative Study of Achieving and Underachieving High School Boys of High Intellectual Ability," in V.H.Noll and R.P.Noll (eds.), Readings in Educational Psychology (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962), p. 175.

The middle and the upper-lower classes also believe in and impress on the children the value of 'getting ahead' or of 'bettering one's self' in life. Children in the middle class largely resist strongly the class values and habits imposed upon them, preferring the less controlled behaviors of the lower classes. Children of the lower classes quite generally accept the values and behaviors of their class. Significantly the latter group is often unaware that its language, manners, and standards are quite unacceptable within the other groups.³⁰

Burton seems aware of the difficulties of the posed relationships. An underlying assumption of the suspected close relationship between social class and academic achievement is quite evident, however.

The evidence is still far from conclusive, though.

Fredericks reports no relationship between social class backgrounds and academic achievement in his study of medical school freshmen.³¹ Waldo finds that, although there is a positive relationship between academic achievement and social class, the relationship is significantly influenced by both the school and the child's parents. Waldo's study concerned the adolescent boy;

30

W.H. Burton, "Education and Social Class in the United States," in Arthur Foff and Jean D. Grambs (eds.), Readings in Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), p. 223.

31

Marcel A. Fredericks, "The Professionalization of Medical Students: Social Class Attitude, and Academic Achievement," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Loyola University, Chicago, 1965), p. 265.

class background was viewed as intervening variable when compared to such factors (independent variables) as the parental relationship and school norms as they bear upon academic achievement (dependent variable).³²

Simms also finds a positive relation between social class and academic achievement. He additionally concludes that the clarity of perception of occupational goals was not as closely related to academic achievement as was previously considered.³³ His study focused on a large urban high school and did not consider specific preparatory schools. Occupational goals would seem to be of necessity less structured than in the school that prepares for college, the major seminary, or some other additional training beyond graduation.

Pannes investigated the relationship between dogmatism, self-acceptance, intelligence, academic achievement (grade placement), and sex of the student. She finds a significant relation-

³²Leslie C. Waldo, "Educational Aspirations of Adolescent Boys: A Sociological Study" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1963).

³³James C. Simms, "Values and Status Variables as Determinants of Academic Achievement" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1962).

ship between the intelligence and grade placement of her respondents when compared to the variables of self-acceptance and dogmatism. Although she did not include the social class backgrounds of her respondents (Junior-Senior high school students), she noted important changes in her variables--self-acceptance and dogmatism--occurring in the adolescent period.³⁴ These changes were viewed as being detrimental to the adequate functioning of the adolescent. A reader is tempted to further question the importance of the parental life styles for these observed changes.

In a pilot study of 102 senior students from a minor seminary, this researcher found that both the upper and lower class respondents did better academically than the middle class. It was further found that the low achievers were more likely to be engaged in non-seminary sponsored recreational activities. Further investigation with the Srole Anomy Scale³⁵ led to the

³⁴Ernestine D. Pannes, "The Relationship Between Self Acceptance and Dogmatism in Junior-Senior High School Students," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36 (May, 1963), 419-426.

³⁵Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: an Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, 21 (Dec., 1956), 709-716.

observation that there was a statistically significant difference (employing the standard error of the difference of means) between the middle class and lower class respondents with regard to the socio-psychological variable of anomy.

No single study was uncovered dealing with the proposed problem area of this dissertation. This literature review is intended to give an indication of the wide varieties of the observed phenomena that exist in related studies.

Many questions might be raised by a consideration of the preceding paragraphs. Sociological theory will be explored in order to frame questions in their proper perspective. Hypothetical formulations can only be properly placed when a conceptual model is employed to uncover gaps, contradictions, or inconsistencies in scientific theory.³⁶ Valid questions and related hypotheses are raised when there is a "working back and forth" between observed phenomena and sociological theory. Hypotheses cannot stand alone but must be related to theoretical positions.³⁷

³⁶Matilda W. Riley, Sociological Research: A Case Approach (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1963), p. 15.

³⁷Hans L. Zetterberg, On Theory and Verification in Sociology (New York: The Bedminster Press, 1965).

Theoretical Considerations.--Sociologists are well aware of the current debate over "grand" and "partial" theory in their science.³⁸ Parsons, while noting that "...Robert Merton first put forward (1947) publicly his plea for concentration on theories of the 'middle range',"³⁹ goes on to explore levels of codification of (general) theory. In opting for interdisciplinary grand theory, Parsons additionally concludes that "...general theory has, furthermore, produced a whole range of middle-range hypotheses."⁴⁰

Znaniecki earlier noted a tendency for the development of fragmentary studies in sociology.⁴¹ Stryker, in his eulogy for Arnold Rose, noted that Rose felt that "...what was needed in sociology was an outlet for studies that were longer than conventional

³⁸ Mihailo Popovich, "What the American Sociologists Think About Their Science and Its Problems," The American Sociologist, 1 (May, 1966), 133-135.

³⁹ Talcott Parsons, "General Theory in Sociology," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (eds.), Sociology Today (New York: Harper and Row, 1959), p. 3.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 36.

⁴¹ Florian W. Znaniecki, "Basic Problems of Contemporary Sociology," American Sociological Review, 19 (Oct., 1954), 519-524. In this Presidential Address to the American Sociological Society, Znaniecki urged sociologists to begin concentrating on collating their work into general theory.

journal articles but shorter than conventional books."⁴² Both Rose and Stryker are seemingly opting for the development of the monograph. Much can be said for this position. What is inferred is a general dissatisfaction with the type of fragmentation pointed out by Znaniecki.

This present dissertation will attempt to realize the counsel of these sociologists. The tie-in to general theory through the validation or rejection of hypotheses based on research conducted at the middle-range will be the research orientation. Several researchers have generated knowledge in this area which is still only partially understood in terms of specific backgrounds. The body of sociological knowledge thus far assembled should be more meaningful when connections are made to general principles. These general principles are to be found in almost any of the several theoretical systems (sociological). Reliance on the system developed by Znaniecki⁴³ is purely a matter of choice in this present study.

⁴² Sheldon Stryker, "In Memoriam: Arnold M. Rose," The American Sociologist, 3 (Feb., 1968), 61.

⁴³ Joseph B. Gittler (ed.), Review of Sociology: Analysis of a Decade (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957). Gittler notes that "...in 1952 Znaniecki's Cultural Sciences...outlines his major theoretical system which had been scattered throughout his multifarious writings since 1910." p. 18.

In a rather thorough review of the sociological theory of Znaniecki, Frankel goes on to note the heavy "Germanic" syntax involved in his many contributions.⁴⁴ Indeed this is the case, although Znaniecki is always precise and logically consistent within the same work.

Znaniecki warned against an over-emphasis on psychological data for sociological research. He insisted many times that the proper data of sociology would be the investigation of social actions. In attempting to overcome the criticism of Blumer⁴⁵ that there were inherent discrepancies of definition in his basic model (attitude ↔ definition of situation ↔ value), Znaniecki posited the concept of active tendency.⁴⁶ Active tendencies made possible the comparison of all kinds of human action--being incipient, innate, and fundamental to human conduct. In a real sense, these tendencies were psychological in origin.

⁴⁴Hyman H. Frankel, "The Sociological Theory of Florian Znaniecki" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois 1958).

⁴⁵Herbert Blumer, Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: I (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1939).

⁴⁶Florian W. Znaniecki, Cultural Sciences: Their Origin and Development (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1952), p. 217.

Although Znaniecki recognized several types of attitudes,⁴⁷ he would define the social attitude as a pre-set to act in a given situation. He further noted that the concept of attitude helped compare all kinds of definitions of the situations.⁴⁸ Values take on their meaning as ideological definitions of the situation only when formalized in basic institutions.⁴⁹

By employing Znaniecki's basic model indicated above, it is possible to move back and forth between the attitudes of individuals and given values of a system through the definition of the situation. This is important for the present study for it enables the assessment of values of the seminary--however tentative--through an evaluation of attitudes of individual seminarians. The definitions of the situation become evident in the inter-relationship of variables.

The seminary itself can be conceived as a social group. Such a social group would be considered a social system by Znaniecki.⁵⁰ Riley specifies that the nature of the case being

⁴⁷ Ibid., Chapter IX.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid., Chapters VIII, IX, and X.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 372.

researched may be combined.⁵¹ To this end it would be possible to study the concept of seminarian as a role performance and the seminary as a dynamic social group in combination. Her view of social system is that it contains mutually interdependent, identifiable parts, connecting the system as a whole.⁵²

As this research study unfolds it will become apparent that no claim can be made that the social system of the minor seminary is revealed. Indeed, the minor seminary has four distinct levels of students--freshmen through senior upper-classmen. A study of any particular level of students could only be partially complete. What is important is the recognition that there is a "wholeness" in seminary life for the minor seminarian.

Meier and Bell research the connection of goal achievement to the condition of anomia.⁵³ The usual denotation of anomia is that of normlessness, but it may also connote a type of personal

⁵¹Riley, pp. 3-31.

⁵²Ibid., p. 10-11

⁵³The reader is advised of the several possible spellings of the word: anomia; anomie; anomy; anomique. They are not differentiated in contemporary sociology. Srole does introduce the word "eunomia" but would mean it to cover a state of the individual. For Srole a continuum would exist between eunomia-anomia. See Srole, pp. 709-716.

deregulation or else a state of society where precept and practice are not in attune. Meier and Bell assert:

We have argued that anomia results when an individual is prevented from achieving his life goals, and that the character of the goals and the obstacles to their achievement are rooted in social and cultural conditions. We have illustrated this hypothesis by showing the very high negative correlation between anomia, as measured by the Srole scale, and structural access to the means for the achievement of life goals, as measured by a multi-dimensional index.

For this generalization to be accepted additional research is required. Our analysis is largely post factum: our findings are "explained" by a single formulation after the results were known.⁵⁴

These authors further view the possibility of socio-economic status being the dependent variable when compared with anomia.

"An individual who despairs might become socially isolated, move down the social scale, identify himself with the working or lower classes... ."55

Several references in the review of the related literature have been presented which show the uncertain relationship between social class backgrounds and academic achievement. Additionally, although Fredericks found no significant relationships between

⁵⁴Dorothy L. Meier and Wendell Bell, "Anomia and the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review, 24 (April, 1959), 201.

⁵⁵Ibid.

social class and stress and anxiety responses in his study of the pre-clinical years of medicine, he did observe significant differences between stress and anxiety and other variables--specifically the internalization of professional attitudes.⁵⁶ This latter variable had been suspected of being important for success and continuation in medical careers.

A final notation is with reference to the type of study that is being undertaken. An exploratory study seeks to uncover relationships within a system.⁵⁷ Specific hypothesis testing is much more definitive.⁵⁸ Descriptive studies are more likely to cover a wider range of detail and to identify the system "in the round." The various processes and behavior patterns that are latent or otherwise not known to the participants in the system are exposed in descriptive studies.⁵⁹ By carefully regarding the research objective--exploratory and descriptive--while testing specific hypotheses, this present research ought to be guided in the correct methodological considerations.

⁵⁶Fredericks, pp. 216, 241.

⁵⁷Riley, p. 14.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid., pp. 69-70.

Questions Posed.--Merton notes that there are levels of questions that can be asked in the solution of problems in sociology.

Indeed, he most carefully points out that questions, properly framed, lead to their own conclusions. Originating questions⁶⁰ are at a higher level of generality than specifying questions.⁶¹ The former are likely to be of a different kind, focusing on sociological facts, adequacy of concepts, observed empirical generalizations, social uniformities, and the like.⁶² Specifying questions must be empirically verifiable. When questions are put to the test of research, they must be of a sort such that "the originating question must still be recast to indicate the observations that will provide a provisional answer to it. Only then has the problem been definitely posed."⁶³

Following Merton's lead, a few of the originating questions pertinent for this research would be as follows: Are there patterns of behavior for individuals of particular backgrounds that

⁶⁰ Merton, et al., pp. xiii-xix.

⁶¹ Ibid., pp. xxvi-xxix.

⁶² Ibid., p. xix.

⁶³ Ibid., p. xxvi.

enable them to adjust better than others--not of their background--in particular school settings? If there are such patterns, are the patterns thus related to any particular frames of mind of the individual? Are there factors in any patterned relationships--indicated by the above two questions--that further obviate a close relation between a person's background and his frame of mind?

In particularizing the above questions so that they may have an empirical reference, the following questions are proposed for the purpose of this present research:

- (1) Are seminarians from upper class backgrounds more likely to achieve academically superior grades as compared to seminarians from middle or lower class backgrounds?

Variables: a) Social class
b) Academic grades

- (2) Is the degree of close-mindedness (dogmatism) of seminarians related to social class position and academic success in the minor seminary?

Variables: a) Social class
b) Academic grades
c) Dogmatism

- (3) Are seminarians of upper class backgrounds less likely to indicate a degree of normlessness and deregulation (anomy) than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds?

Variables: a) Social class
b) Anomy

- (4) Are seminarians of upper class backgrounds less likely to exhibit stress and anxiety than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds?

Variables: a) Social class
b) Level of stress and anxiety

- (5) Are the various selected psycho-sociological factors--dogmatism, personal anomy, and individual stress and anxiety--related to academic achievement as measured by grades in the minor seminary?

Variables: a) Academic grades
b) Dogmatism
c) Anomy
d) Stress and anxiety

Hypothetical Considerations.--Riley⁶⁴ has observed that "the conceptual model is a heuristic device serving to guide the formulation and solution of sociological problems." Znaniecki would go further and note that hypotheses, rather than being definitive, ought to be equally heuristic. By this he meant that hypotheses should lead the way to better insights into the problem. Such hypotheses would flower and await the conclusions of further research so that general theory would be formulated through the collation of specific research findings.

The problem area, the literature, and the empirical questions presented in this chapter give rise to the formulation of

⁶⁴Riley, p. 15.

the following four hypotheses chosen for this study:

- (1) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will exhibit a higher academic grade placement than seminarians of middle or lower class position.
- (2) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will show less dogmatism than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds.
- (3) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will show less disposition to normlessness and deregulation (anomy) than seminarians of middle or lower class position.
- (4) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will tend to express less stress and anxiety than seminarians from middle or lower class backgrounds.

Although the above empirical questions are framed in such a way that they will be answered through standard methodological procedures, it is additionally the purpose of this study to investigate the changes in attitude or value orientations of students in a minor seminary. The hypotheses of this study place social class backgrounds of seminarians in the position of key independent variable. The psycho-sociological variables referred to are placed as the dependent variables, along with academic achievement. Certain intervening variables--to be taken up in Chapter II--will be treated systematically.

Justification of Problem Choice.--Merton has taken up the notion of proper questions in sociology in relation to problem finding. He also takes up the crucial issue of the relevance of such

questions and problems. He notes that "...the bare question does not constitute the problem. It is only one component. Another is the rationale of the question, the statement of the reasons why it is worth asking."⁶⁵ Questions worth asking--and problems worth solving--stand related to their practical or theoretical value.

This chapter has dealt with a review of the related literature as it pertains to the problem area. Several middle range conclusions of previous research hypotheses have also been presented. The position is taken that there is both a practical and theoretical worth to this present study. From the practical standpoint it may be argued that such an investigation has not been attempted before. The findings should better enable those responsible for seminary activities and curricula to deal with problems in an intelligent manner. It is known that all too often administrators of seminaries do not have the necessary information to act in a manner that best fits the interests of the seminary. Without necessary information, administrators are often forced to make policy in a vacuum. As has already been noted, they fall into the expediency of acting from past experience which is more

⁶⁵Merton, et al., p. xix.

often than not reinforced by a great deal of impressionistic literature.

From the theoretical standpoint it may further be argued that there are insufficient data, and conclusions often run counter to one another with regard to several fundamental positions. It was noted in the earlier parts of this chapter that the key variable of this present research--social class--is not consistently associated with certain other variables, particularly academic achievement. It is hoped that further light might be placed on such fundamental sociological concepts as social class by this study.

The succeeding chapter will attempt to organize a methodology best suited to the problem posed. The hypotheses stated do have empirical referents and it becomes the task of this study to employ those procedures that will yield the most valid and reliable evidence.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The source of data of the present research study is outlined in this chapter. In addition, the operational referents of the key concepts, the nature of the variables, the descriptive questionnaires, and the statistical procedures are presented.

The Research Case.--Available information indicates there were 45,681 seminarians in U.S. seminaries in 1966. This included both minor and major seminarians. Of this number there were 13,024 diocesan minor seminarians; 5937 seminarians were day school students. Only 231 day school seminarians were attending religious order seminaries. There were seventy-three diocesan minor seminaries, although an additional twenty-six seminaries not so designated had diocesan minor seminarians as "special" students.¹

Table 1 gives the breakdown of diocesan minor seminaries (1966)² in the U.S. in terms of the number of students and faculty. It should be noted that many of the seminaries with smaller

¹ National Catholic Education Association, "Catholic Seminaries in the United States, 1966," Seminary Newsletter, 7 (March, 1966), i-iii.

² Ibid., pp. 1-84. This is the source of information for Table 1.

TABLE 1

U.S. DIOCESAN MINOR SEMINARIES
ENROLLMENT STATISTICS--1965-66

Student Enrollment	Seminary Statistics		
	Number of Seminaries	Number of Students	Number of Faculty
Under 99	50	2720	566
100-199	34	4919	545
200-299	6	1463	114
300-399	4	1431	107
400-499	3	1368	122
Over 500	2	1667	75
Total	99 ^a	13,468 ^b	1529

^a Seventy-three minor seminaries are reported by the National Catholic Education Association. This figure of ninety-nine includes those seminaries (26) that take minor seminarians on a "special" basis.

^b The seventy-three minor seminaries enroll 13,024 students; the twenty-six major seminaries and Religious Order seminaries enrolled 444 diocesan minor seminarians on a special basis.

student enrollments share teaching faculties with major seminaries and other schools. Therefore some of these figures could be misleading, particularly with regard to the smaller seminaries. The larger seminaries tend to be staffed wholly by and for the same school.

The decision was made not to seek a random sample of either seminaries or seminarians, but rather to choose two cases from the universe. Availability and assured cooperation led to the choice of the two largest diocesan seminaries (with student populations over 500). These two seminaries are sister schools in that there is some degree of fiscal organization between them, but for the most part they may well be considered relatively autonomous. Both serve the Archdiocese of Chicago and are therefore under a single Bishop. On the other hand both have administrative directors--Rectors--that see to the individual direction of their respective seminaries.

The number of students enrolled by academic level for these two seminaries for the 1967-68 academic year is given in Table 2. The decision was made to limit the research to the freshman level which would include 320 respondents. The reasoning behind such a choice was that these students were newcomers to the seminary experience; any changes in attitude of

such seminarians could thus be systematically treated from a given starting point, that is, entrance into the seminary life.

TABLE 2

MINOR SEMINARY ENROLLMENT STATISTICS
CHICAGO DIOCESE: 1967-68

Seminary	Academic Level				
	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Total
Q-N	108	118	85	83	394 ^a
Q-S	212	173	196	185	766
Total	320	291	281	268	1160

^aEnrollment was less than 500 at this seminary for this academic year.

The Minor Seminary Setting.--Hereinafter these two seminaries will be designated Q-N (108 respondents) and Q-S (212 respondents). Both seminaries have a common historical background. In 1905 the first minor seminary training school was established for the Chicago diocese. In 1917 Q-N was built and took on the vocational and educational program that had been established as part of the system leading to the major seminary. It was the principal

"feeder school" to the major seminary of the diocese that had been established at Mundelein, Illinois.

The one seminary--Q-N--was sufficient until the late 1950's when it was observed that "in the short space of ten years (the) eighth grade (new registrants) has almost doubled... ." ³ This necessitated the expansion of seminary facilities and the construction of an additional minor seminary. Q-S went into operation in 1961. At that time high school boys intending to study for the priesthood who lived in the northern part of the diocese continued to commute to school at Q-N. Boys from the southern part of the diocese began their training by commuting to Q-S.

In addition to the expansion program of 1961, the whole format of education was changed. Prior to that year the minor seminary consisted of a five year training program. The 4-4-4 plan of education was initially instituted, which would call for four years of high school, four years of college, and four years in the study of theology at a major seminary. The curriculum was

³ Dedication Booklet, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary and Quigley Preparatory Seminary--South (September 13, 1962), p. 49. This booklet gives the only rather complete history of the seminary system in Chicago concerning the minor seminary.

revised also. Before 1961 the major emphasis was on the humanities and traditional learning. In 1961 the minor seminary curriculum was broadened to include the physical sciences and diversified subject matter. Briefly, the minor seminary was attuned to other metropolitan high schools--both private and public--in terms of curriculum.

The expansion brought about still another change. Whereas the teaching faculty had been almost entirely composed of diocesan clergy before 1961, there was a change made to include a substantial increase in lay faculty. In 1967-68 the Q-N seminary had twenty-three priests and five laymen on their teaching staff; the Q-S seminary opened with thirty priests and eighteen lay faculty.

Other changes in the minor seminary over the past several years--up to 1967-68--include those of a social nature. The students are given much more individual freedom and responsibility than in the past. They must now choose much of the personal conduct that fits their notion of a priestly vocation. They are no longer dismissed from the seminary for behavior that was once forbidden. A case in point is the social dating of seminarians with girls. This was once cause for immediate dismissal. Still further

the students are given a voice in self-government (the student council), and through a committee of the student council they practice a form of self-discipline--the monitor system. The monitor system lends some authority to upper-classmen in carrying out rules. The traditional seminary setting was much more autocratic.

Athletic programs have been enhanced so that varsity level competition is maintained with both public and private schools in the area. Intramural sports and club activities account for a greater portion of the time of the seminarians. While there has been no deliberate attempt to downplay the academe, the net result has been a shift in focus to the wholeness of education for the minor seminary.

What has been said thus far has been an attempt to reconcile two opposing views. One student has commented that "...the minor seminary is no different from any other school." This is an over-statement and like all over-statements it is not entirely without qualifications. The opposite view that the minor seminary has not changed is also rejected. Significant changes have been brought about. A cognitive awareness is held by the faculty that all students will not continue on to the priesthood. With this awareness has come such programs as "college counseling." This

type of counseling is more directed to those who are not going on in the seminary system than those who are, but under-classmen are excluded by policy decision.

The minor seminary today is still a school for priestly formation. But the seminary no longer occupies the position of the past for young students. The seminary faculty member emphasizes his role of professional teacher rather than his status of teacher as in the past. In short, the seminary program and setting for this study group pulls together a broad range of social and educational activities that are in keeping with the modern Zeitgeist-- the spirit of the times.

The social class backgrounds for the faculty of the Q-S are presented in Table 3. An assumption was made that faculty backgrounds for the Q-N seminary were similar and data were not collected there. It should be noted that a standard index of social positioning was employed to stratify the faculty backgrounds.⁴ Although there are forty-eight on the Q-S faculty, thirteen members failed to detail necessary background information.

⁴

August B. Hollingshead, Two Factor Index of Social Position (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1956).

TABLE 3

SOCIAL CLASS DISTRIBUTION OF MINOR
SEMINARY FACULTY (Q-S) BY NUMBER
AND PER CENT

Social Class Position	Faculty		
	Number	Per Cent	Expected Distribution ^a (Hollingshead)
Class I	2	5.7	2.7
Class II	2	5.7	9.8
Class III	9	25.7	18.9
Class IV	18	51.4	48.4
Class V	4	11.4	20.2
Total	35	99.9	100.0

^aBased on Hollingshead's three factor Index of Social Position. These three factors are: education, occupation, and place of residence. The third factor was dropped subsequently by Hollingshead. Hollingshead's distribution anticipates these figures in the social structure. See August B. Hollingshead and Frederick C. Redlich, Social Class and Mental Illness (New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 395

The number of years of teaching experience of the faculty at the Q-S seminary is depicted on Table 4. Although the rates of faculty turnover are low for any given year, the percentage of teachers having less than eight years' experience is quite high. Turnover is not limited to the lay faculty; about the same number leave their teaching assignments for parish duties and other clerical positions from the priest faculty as do the lay faculty for other teaching positions. Although the priest faculty have a different relationship to the Bishop of the diocese than do the lay faculty, their teaching assignments are to a large extent voluntary.

Table 5 gives the age distribution for the Q-S seminary faculty. The larger percentage of faculty members are between the ages of thirty-one and forty-five. The typical or modal age of a faculty member would be in this middle range. There are no known statistics of faculty ages for schools in the area, but it is the impression of this writer that other parochial and public high schools have much younger teaching faculties.

For the Q-S seminary faculty, the preponderant ethnic background (Table 6) is heavily weighted in terms of Irish descent. This no doubt reflects the tradition of an Irish clergy in the Church in America that has been reported upon by many researchers.

TABLE 4

TEACHING EXPERIENCE DISTRIBUTION OF MINOR
SEMINARY FACULTY (Q-S) BY NUMBER
AND PER CENT--1967-68

Number of Years Teaching	Faculty	
	Number	Per Cent
0-2	5	14.3
3-4	7	20.0
5-6	5	14.3
7-8	11	31.5
9-10	2	5.7
11-12	2	5.7
13-14	1	2.8
...
23-24	1	2.8
25-26	1	2.8
Total	35	99.9

TABLE 5

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF MINOR SEMINARY FACULTY (Q-S)
BY NUMBER AND PER CENT--1967-68

Faculty Age	Faculty	
	Number	Per Cent
22-25	3	8.6
26-30	5	14.3
31-35	7	20.0
36-40	9	25.7
41-45	7	20.0
46-50	1	2.8
51-56	3	8.6
Total	35	100.0

TABLE 6

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF MINOR SEMINARY FACULTY (Q-S)
BY NUMBER AND PER CENT

Nationality-Descent	Faculty	
	Number	Per Cent
Irish	13	37.2
Irish-German	7	20.0
German	2	5.8
Irish-German-Scotch	1	2.8
Italian	4	11.5
Polish	3	8.6
Polish-Czech	1	2.8
Lithuanian	1	2.8
Croatian	1	2.8
Swedish	1	2.8
Other ^a	1	2.8
Total	35	99.9

^a Faculty member lists seven ethnic or national backgrounds.

In addition, the faculties at both the Q-N and Q-S seminaries have generally completed training leading to the Master's degree in diversified fields. By and large, these faculty members have been continuing their own graduate education at many different universities. This is accomplished at evening and summer school locations. The faculties are encouraged by the seminary administration in this respect and several of the faculty--both lay members and priests--have taken the equivalent of sabbatical leaves to obtain degrees.

Gathering the Data.--The data for the present study were gathered at several different times. Prior to entry into the seminary the students were screened on the basis of aptitude and intelligence. These tests were administered by the seminary in October, 1966, for the academic year 1967-68. About this same time the applicants and their parents were interviewed in their homes by diocesan priests selected for this task. Also during the fall and winter of 1966-67, questionnaires were sent to the parish priests and grammar school principals; these were returned by mail prior to entry into the seminary. Personality factors gleaned from the interviews and questionnaires also were a consideration in screening candidates.

Questionnaires on the socio-psychological variables of dogmatism, anomy, and individual stress-anxiety were administered to the entire study population three times: September, 1967; January, 1968; May, 1968. The forms were given in a controlled setting which would tend to minimize peer influence during testing. At the Q-S seminary the entire study population was assembled in an auditorium for an hour of the school day. Instructions for each form were read and monitors were available for the students. At the Q-N seminary the forms were given on the same day at different periods by a teacher from the social studies department. The same procedures were followed. It should be noted that these forms were not timed, and ample time was allowed for all students for completion.

Academic achievement data were gathered four times; November, 1967 (first quarterly grades); January, 1968 (first semester grades); March, 1968 (second quarterly grades); June, 1968 (second semester grades). The grades in the freshman year are taken as the expression of academic achievement for this study.

Key Independent Variable: Social Class.--The concept of social class is used in this study to refer to the variegated life styles of the respondents and their families. The assumption is made

that psychological and social characteristics are differentially located in the respondents' backgrounds and that expression will be made in terms of attitudes and action. The term "upper-class" (Class I) will refer to minor seminarians classified as upper or upper-middle through the use of Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position; the term "middle-class" (Class II) will refer to those classified in the same manner as lower-middle; the term "lower-class" (Class III) will refer to the upper-lower and lower-lower classes of the Hollingshead Index.⁵

Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position stratifies respondents on the basis of two weighted factors of parental background. These factors are: 1) educational attainment, and 2) present occupation. Each of these factors is given a rating of a high of one to a low of seven. The rating obtained is multiplied (weighted) by seven for occupation and four for education. The sum of the individual's ratings multiplied by the weights determine his placement in one of five social classes. These classes range from an upper of I to a lower-lower of V. Hollingshead has offered elsewhere the typical descriptive features

⁵Ibid.

of the various classes found in society,⁶ Precedent for the acceptance of this stratification procedure is found in many studies.

The social class distribution of the study group is presented on Table 7. The decision was made to combine classes I and II, IV and V. This was prompted by the relatively low numbers of respondents in classes I and V. Without such combinations statistical analysis of the relationship between variables for this study would be overly tentative.

Variables: Ability and Aptitude.--The Gamma test (form Am)⁷ was administered to the respondents in October, 1966, by the seminary administration. Individual scores were taken from seminary records. The purpose of this test developed by Otis is to measure "...thinking power or degree of maturity of the mind."⁸ Reliability and validity coefficients have been presented and satisfy the use of this intelligence test for the present study.⁹

⁶Hollingshead and Redlich, pp. 66-135

⁷Arthur S. Otis, Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Tests (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1954).

⁸Ibid., p. 1.

⁹Ibid., pp. 5-6.

TABLE 7

SOCIAL CLASS DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY
GROUP BY NUMBER AND PER CENT^a

Social Class Position	Q-N		Q S		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
I } I	5 } 21	4.7 } 19.6	13 } 41	6.1 } 19.3	18 } 62	5.6 } 19.4
II } I	16 } 21	14.9 } 19.6	28 } 41	13.2 } 19.3	44 } 62	13.8 } 19.4
III II	35	32.8	37	17.4	72	22.6
IV } III	41 } 51	38.3 } 47.6	105 } 134	49.7 } 63.3	146 } 185	45.8 } 58.0
V } III	10 } 51	9.3 } 47.6	29 } 134	13.6 } 63.3	39 } 185	12.2 } 58.0
Total	107	100.0	212	100.0	319	100.0

^aThe numbers in Class I and Class V were too small to allow for accurate statistical analysis. Therefore Classes I and II, Classes IV and V were combined. Also, one respondent from Q-N could not be assigned a class position as he had come to the seminary from a Catholic Dependent school (Maryville) and could not provide the necessary background information.

Scoring is in terms of a quotient that reflects both age of respondent and comparable mental ability. Ability is operationalized in this study through the intelligence quotient score of this test. Higher quotients are reflective of higher ability while lower quotients reflect less ability.

Table 8 shows the distribution of the freshmen respondents in this study group for the Otis test administered in October, 1966. The two seminaries are seen to be quite comparable on this variable. The national norms would place one standard deviation (plus and minus) between the scores of 90-110. In this respect the study group is well above the statistical norm.

Scholastic aptitude is operationalized through the composite score obtained by a battery of standardized tests.¹⁰ These tests (arithmetic, language arts, and reading) were administered in October, 1966, to the respondents. The composite score is expressed in terms of a grade placement and a percentile ranking. Again higher scores indicate higher scholastic aptitude while lower scores are indicative of less aptitude. The percentile rank composite is utilized in this dissertation.

¹⁰ Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Illinois.

TABLE 8

**MENTAL ABILITY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY GROUP
AS MEASURED ON OTIS TEST--1966**

Range of I.Q. Scores	Q-N		Q-S		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
135-139	2	1.9	5	2.6	7	2.3
130-134	6	5.6	9	4.6	15	5.0
125-129	12	11.4	21	10.7	33	10.9
120-124	18	17.0	35	17.9	53	17.5
115-119	23	21.5	45	22.9	68	22.6
110-114	24	22.7	42	21.4	66	21.9
105-109	13	12.3	18	9.2	31	10.8
100-104	7	6.7	18	9.2	25	8.3
95-99	0	--	3	1.5	3	1.0
90-94 ¹	1	0.9	0	--	1	0.3
Total	106	100.0	196	100.0	302^a	100.0

^aAll of the respondents did not complete the Otis test before admission to the seminary.

The distribution of the freshmen respondents for the Science Research Associates battery of tests is given on Table 9. Again both the Q-N and the Q-S seminaries are seen to have similar distributions. Significant numbers of respondents score above the fiftieth percentile, the median for standardized tests of this variable. The higher scores of the study group for the tests of scholastic aptitude and mental ability reflect the tests employment by the seminary administration in initial screening of candidates.

Variable: Dogmatism.--The degree of openness and closedness of belief systems (dogmatism) is measured with the Dogmatism Scale (form E-1960) developed by Rokeach.¹¹ The test¹² obtains a score ranging from 40 to 280 which operates on a continuum of belief-disbelief. Situations are presented to the respondent which contain relevant and irrelevant factors with respect to appropriate action. To the extent that action depends on irrelevant factors, the personality system is said to be closed.¹³

¹¹ Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960), pp. 71-80.

¹² See Appendix A.

¹³ Rokeach, pp. 55-64.

TABLE 9

**SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDY
GROUP AS MEASURED BY THE SCIENCE
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES TESTS--
1966**

Percentile Range	Q-N		Q-S		Total	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
90-99	7	6.9	20	10.2	27	9.0
80-89	23	22.5	34	17.3	57	19.1
70-79	30	29.4	52	26.5	82	27.4
60-69	18	17.6	39	19.9	57	19.1
50-59	15	14.7	21	10.7	36	12.0
40-49	6	5.9	20	10.2	26	8.7
30-39	2	1.9	7	3.6	9	3.1
20-29	0	--	3	1.5	3	1.1
10-19	1	1.0	0	--	1	0.4
0-9	0	--	0	--	0	--
Total	102	99.9	196	99.9	298^a	99.9

^a All of the respondents did not complete the Science Research Associates battery of tests before admission to the seminary.

Reliability coefficients of .68 to .93 are given by Rokeach.¹⁴ Validity is taken from Rokeach's own standardization, face validity, and the employment of this test in other studies. The higher scores on the test represent a more dogmatic belief system of the personality, while lower scores represent a more open system.

Forty items make up the Dogmatism Scale (form E-1960).

The response on each item follows the Likert-type scaling technique whereby the respondent chooses from strongly agreeing through strongly disagreeing positions. The respondent receives a possible score of seven for each item strongly agreed to and a score of one is received for each that is strongly disagreed with. The sum of the item scores gives the test value (score) for the dogmatism variable for each individual. This operation gives the concrete indicant of a test score for the variable of the study.

Variable: Anomy.--Degree of personal normlessness is measured through the use of an Anomy Scale¹⁵ developed by McCloskey and Schaar.¹⁶ These authors attempt to show the connection between

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 96.

¹⁵ See Appendix B.

¹⁶ Herbert McCloskey and John Schaar, "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, 30 (Feb., 1965), 23.

anomy and various personal factors--cognitive, emotional, and substantive beliefs and opinions.¹⁷

Anomy is defined in this present dissertation to mean personal normlessness and deregulation. Anomy is taken to be a result of impaired socialization.¹⁸ "The core of the concept is the feeling of moral emptiness."¹⁹ The Anomy Scale serves to operationalize the anomy variable.

The scale contains nine items with which the respondent agrees or disagrees. Six to nine "agrees" are considered indicative of high anomy; three to five "agrees" are considered middle range; zero to two "agrees" are classified as low or non-anomic.²⁰ The test is easily administered and scored.

Face validity, correlation with related scales, and coefficients of reproducibility--.80-.83--are presented by McCloskey and Schaar. Reliability is satisfied through correlating split-halves (Spearman-Brown, .76), and an "...alternative computation utilizing a formula presented by L. J. Cronbach..." yielding

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 21.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 19.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 25.

a reliability coefficient of .77.²¹

Mizruchi notes an inverse relationship between social class and anomie, introducing the additional variable of social participation into his research.²² In this he follows Srole who had earlier hypothesized the same relationship between social class and anomie.²³ Roberts and Rokeach have taken the contrary position that the relationship of social class to anomie is quite "negligible."²⁴ From the preceding chapter it is noted that the present dissertation also hypothesizes an inverse relationship between these two variables (see p. 30). The common assumption of similar life goals seems more adequate in this present study, which possibly satisfies an objection of Mizruchi toward his own and others' previous research.²⁵

²¹ Ibid., pp. 23-25.

²² Ephraim H. Mizruchi, "Social Structure and Anomie in a Small City," American Sociological Review, 25 (Oct., 1960), 645-654.

²³ Srole, p. 715.

²⁴ A. H. Roberts and M. Rokeach, "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice," American Journal of Sociology, 62 (Jan., 1956), 355-358.

²⁵ Mizruchi, p. 653.

Variable: Stress and Anxiety.--Taylor's Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety²⁶ was used to measure the respondents' ability to cope with stress and anxiety.²⁷ This test has been reported as satisfying basic validity requirements²⁸ and having reliability coefficients of .81 to .96.²⁹

The test has fifty items that are answered "true" or "false" by the respondent. Answers judged to be "correct" are indicative of underlying stress and anxiety. Some items are more aptly answered "true" while others are more aptly answered "false" as an indicator of this variable. Higher scores are taken as a reflection of stress and anxiety while lower scores indicate the opposite.

Taylor compared neurotic and psychotic patients with normal subjects finding that the two former categories exhibited greater anxiety both in terms of her test and objective clinical observation.³⁰ While the test could not be used as a predictor of mental illness it did serve to objectify the variable of stress

²⁶ See Appendix C.

²⁷ Janet A. Taylor, "A Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety", Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 48 (1953), 285-290.

²⁸ Fredericks, pp. 62-64.

²⁹ Taylor, pp. 285-290.

³⁰ Ibid.

and anxiety.

Fredericks, in his study of medical students, found no relationship between social class and individual stress and anxiety.³¹ An hypothesis of this present study is in effect an extension and replication of this facet of the study by Fredericks.

Variable: Academic Achievement.--Quarterly and semester grades of the respondents in the study group serve to operationalize the academic achievement variable for the academic year 1967-68. The Q-N seminary employs a numerical grading system whereas the Q-S seminary operates on a letter grade-point system. The grade-point averages are computed in terms of the 4.0 system: A=4 points; B=3 points; C=2 points; D=1 point; F=0 points. Selected honors and advanced placement classes in some subjects allow for the accumulation of additional credit differentials in both the numerical and grade-point systems.

The seminaries treat grades of students as valid and reliable. They share this as a common ground with practically all other schools. It is a generally observed faculty impression that students are not as "grade conscious" in the earlier years as in

³¹Fredericks, p. 183.

the later years of schooling. Whether students' "grade consciousness" or faculty attitudes operate separately or work in tandem, the effect is that fewer students receive lower grades in the junior-senior levels in the seminary.

The Questionnaires.--The General Information Questionnaire³² was administered to the families in the study group in the fall of 1966. Approximately twenty-five to thirty priests of the diocese--some of whom were seminary faculty priests--completed the home interviews. Each priest-interviewer had about ten homes to visit and questionnaires to complete. A few had more. The priest-interviewers had been instructed on the establishing of rapport and the handling of the interview relationship. Specific items were to be completed, thus structuring the information that was given. By this method the questionnaires became quite comparable.

Most of the priest-interviewers took this responsibility quite seriously. Although they were selected for this task, there was general agreement on cooperation. The reliability of a

³² See Appendix D.

subjective instrument of this nature is sometimes questionable; nevertheless, it was felt that the descriptive picture of seminarians' lives would be enhanced by its inclusion as a source of data. The validity for the most part was taken at face value.

Two other questionnaires were mailed to the seminarians' grade-school principal³³ and parish pastor.³⁴ These were returned sometime before the candidates were screened as incoming freshmen for the academic year 1967-68. These questionnaires also offer descriptive background for the study group of this dissertation. Perusal of Index E and Index F indicates that the items are similar and that they are extremely subjective in nature.

Several prospective candidates were eliminated during screening on the basis of the three questionnaires. Information became available to the seminary administration which would not otherwise have been brought to their attention. Discipline problems, personality problems, and physical difficulties revealed by the questionnaires became considerations for non-acceptance. This is taken as additional verification of the validity of the

³³ See Appendix E.

³⁴ See Appendix F.

questionnaires for this study in that they were acceptable to the seminary administration.

Statistical Procedures.--The variables are compared in this study through the utilization of mean scores, standard deviations, standard errors, and the "t" statistic.³⁵ The data were processed by high speed electronic computers (the 1401 and 1620 IBM devices).

The level of significance was determined at the .05 level. This level of significance is most conventional in the social sciences.³⁶ When it is established the researcher may reject the null hypothesis and accept the study hypothesis, asserting that the observed differences in variables occur by chance in five or less cases in each hundred.

Some authors have argued that setting any level of significance is artificial and that data ought to be reported with the investigator's conclusions without any special notation of

³⁵ Philip J. McCarthy, Introduction to Statistical Reasoning (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1957).

³⁶ James K. Skipper, Jr., Anthony Guenther, and Gilbert Nass, "The Sacredness of .05: A Note Concerning the Uses of Statistical Levels of Significance in Social Science," The American Sociologist 2 (1967), 16.

significance.³⁷ These same authors argue that the data--properly presented--should speak for themselves. While there is some merit in this position, it is felt that by establishing the level of confidence beforehand, some objective standard is assured.

Still others have argued against too great a reliance on statistics in the uncovering of relationships in the social sciences. Martindale has observed:

Although one cannot accept Sorokin's personal formulations (his integral truths seem to eliminate mathematics in principal), his criticism of such trends in contemporary sociology as forms of quantophobia and numerology seem to be essentially correct. Apparently there are no limits on the nonscientific use of mathematics in sociology, unless it be the reluctance of the scientifically minded to tolerate pseudo mathematics as well as the metaphysics which would reject mathematics in principle. But we must take care not to cast out all mathematics.³⁸

It is not the intention of this dissertation to belabor the obvious. The uses to which statistics is put here clarify observations that would not otherwise be discernible.

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 16-18.

³⁸ Don Martindale, "Limits to the Uses of Mathematics in the Study of Sociology," Mathematics and the Social Sciences (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, June, 1963). This article is one of a group dealing with this subject; the articles were the result of a symposium conducted by the Academy.

Some confusion has resulted over the tables to be used in the interpretation of "t" values for their corresponding levels of significance. This point will become apparent as this research study proceeds. In brief, whenever directionality is hypothesized for the differences between variables (either greater-than or less-than), the one-tailed test should be used. If it is merely hypothesized that differences do exist between variables, the two-tailed test must be used. A table is incorporated in this dissertation³⁹ which allows for comparison of the one and two-tailed tests. Also, since the one-tailed test for "t" should be used in this research study, the table facilitates accurate reference.

As a final note to this chapter and in particular to this section on statistical procedures, it should be noted that the study group of 320 respondents dwindled somewhat in the course of the academic school year. Sixteen respondents were eliminated from the Q-S seminary study group because of not completing one or the other of the original entrance tests. Six more were

³⁹ See Appendix G. The source of this table is: Richard P. Runyon and Audrey Haber, Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1967), p. 253.

eliminated from Q-N for similar reasons. One each from Q-N and Q-S had prolonged absence from school and therefore missed the testing on the variables. Three more were eliminated because of dismissal from the seminary (Q-N) for discipline reasons. The final study group used in this dissertation for statistical analysis and comparison consisted of 293 respondents--Q-N had 98 and Q-S had 195 respondents.

CHAPTER III
SOME SELECTED DESCRIPTIVE FACTORS
OF THE MINOR SEMINARIANS'
BACKGROUNDS

This chapter details several selected features found in the social and psychological backgrounds of the freshman minor seminarian. The objective here is to clarify the possible relationships between variables reported upon in succeeding chapters. The type of qualitative description employed at this point sacrifices reliability for an effort at comprehensiveness.¹ In the same way, "qualitative description often serves the important purpose of dealing with the social system in the round, since these studies are not limited by the rigorous requirements of measurement and analysis."²

With this note of caution it is further advised that the tables and other data of this chapter should be taken to represent the broad backgrounds for which they are intended. It was

¹ Riley, p. 23

² Ibid., p. 22.

considered advisable to review a wide variety of the data gathered from the questionnaires and school records (see appendices).

Much of the data gathered in the early stages of this research were submitted by priest-interviewers, pastors, grammar school principals, and seminary staff. As a consequence, no direct control could be maintained as the data were not essentially part of the study.

The attempt is made to show parental backgrounds and some parent attitudes toward their sons. Also, some selected attitudes toward the minor seminary and seminarian by pastors and grammar school principals are detailed. Pastors and principals reported on the respondents in consultation with priest assistants and school teachers.

The seminarian himself is described with respect to certain key features of his personality background that bear upon this study. In particular, the distributions of scores for the variables of dogmatism, anomy, and stress/anxiety are presented. These distributions detail the overall dispersion for the seminary study group as a whole. Also, the personal adjustment by minor seminarians to seminary life is tapped by way of the student conduct grade. How such grades are dispersed within the study population is of interest and has a bearing on the questions of this study,

and is a focal concern of this research.

Briefly, the descriptive backgrounds of the seminarian, his family, and the seminary are interconnected. It is in this fashion that an approach is made to qualitative description.

Parental Backgrounds.--It was found (Tables 10 and 11) that the modal average age for fathers was in the 46-50 age group for Q-N and in the 41-45 age group for Q-S. The modal average age for mothers was found to be in the 36-40 age group for both seminaries. On the whole there appeared a tendency for the upper class parents (Class I) to be younger. The Q-S seminary is comparatively overweighted for the lower class (Class III); it appears that Q-S has a somewhat higher representation of older parents.

The Irish ethnic origins of the parents predominate from both the Q-N and Q-S seminaries (Tables 12 and 13). In an overall comparison with the ethnic backgrounds of the seminary faculty (see Table 6, p. 45) the respondents' parental origins are observed to be similar. There is a concentration of those of Polish origins in the lower social class for the Q-S seminary. There is no black seminarian in the study population from the Q-N seminary; there are sixteen black students in the study group at the Q-S seminary.

TABLE 10

PARENTAL AGES OF STUDY GROUP BY
 SOCIAL CLASS POSITION--
 Q-N SEMINARY^a

Social Class	Fathers' Age						Mothers' Age						Total
	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	
I (Upper)	-	3	9	4	-	-	2	6	6	2	-	-	32
II (Middle)	1	8	6	10	2	-	1	14	6	4	3	-	55
III (Lower)	1	9	11	14	3	5	4	16	9	7	6	-	85
Total	2	20	26	28	5	5	7	36	21	13	9	-	172

69

^aFailure to indicate age resulted in slightly incomplete taxonomy.

TABLE 11

PARENTAL AGES OF STUDY GROUP BY
 SOCIAL CLASS POSITION--
 Q-S SEMINARY^a

Social Class	Fathers' Age							Mothers' Age							Total
	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	31-35	36-40	41-45	46-50	51-55	56-60	61-65	
I (Upper)	1	12	16	4	-	1	1	6	20	3	1	3	-	-	68
II (Middle)	1	10	12	3	6	-	-	4	11	10	4	3	-	-	64
III (Lower)	2	24	23	25	20	9	1	8	33	34	24	6	5	-	214
Total	4	46	51	32	26	10	2	18	64	47	29	12	5	-	346

The wide diversity of ethnic origins is easily noted. What is not seen from the tables is the general tendency for the mother and father of any particular family to be of different ethnic extraction. This is all the more interesting in that in spite of the study group showing multiple ethnic backgrounds, it is the general impression that the seminarians react as if they themselves and others in the study group were of single ethnicity. They seem fairly conscious of this facet of their backgrounds.

Table 14 reports on the place of residence of the families of the seminarians. For all of the social classes greater numbers from Q-S live in the city of Chicago when compared to Q-N. While there is a difference by social class, suburban residence is most noticeable for the Q-N seminary; the upper classes in particular evidence this from Q-N. The upper classes do not evidence suburban residence from Q-S to such a marked degree. Well over two-thirds of the seminarians in the entire study group live in the city, mainly lower class city residence.

Only one set of parents viewed their son as "below average" in qualities as a student (Table 15). Although there were differences by social class, all of the rest of the parents of the seminarians tended to view their sons as "average" or "above."

TABLE 12

PARENTAL ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF STUDY
GROUP BY SOCIAL CLASS POSITION--
Q-N SEMINARY

Nationality- Descent	Class I		Class II		Class III		Total	
	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
Irish	8	8	11	11	15	14	34	33
German	1	1	1	5	6	6	8	12
Polish	3	2	2	4	6	8	11	14
English	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
Italian	1	-	3	2	4	4	8	6
Lithuanian	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Slavonian (sic)	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Austrian	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	1
Bohemian	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Hungarian	-	-	1	-	2	1	3	1
Mexican	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Norwegian	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Swedish	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Irish-English	1	-	1	-	1	-	3	1
Irish-French	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	1
Irish-German	-	2	4	2	-	2	4	6
Irish-Norwegian	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-

Continued

TABLE 12-Continued

Nationality- Descent	Class I		Class II		Class III		Total	
	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
Irish-Scotch	-	-	2	1	-	1	2	2
Irish-Swedish	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-
Irish-Swiss	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
German-Dutch	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
German-English	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	2
German-Polish	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
German-Swiss	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Swedish-Norwegian	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Swedish-Scotch	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Spanish-English	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Polish-French	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
American ^a	2	2	1	1	2	2	5	5
Other ^b	-	-	1	-	1	-	2	-
Unidentified ^c	4	4	4	4	8	6	16	14
Total	21	21	35	35	51	51	107	107

^aListed as a categorical preference by parents.

^bIndicates three or more ethnic backgrounds.

^cEthnicity of parents failed to be disclosed.

TABLE 13

PARENTAL ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF STUDY
 GROUP BY SOCIAL CLASS POSITION--
 Q-S SEMINARY

Nationality- Descent	Class I		Class II		Class III		Total	
	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
Irish	17	14	11	17	31	40	59	71
German	4	3	4	4	11	10	19	17
Polish	4	3	5	4	32	29	41	36
English	1	1	2	2	4	-	7	3
Italian	1	1	2	2	5	7	8	10
Lithuanian	-	-	2	2	4	5	6	7
Negro	1	1	1	1	14	14	16	16
Slovak	1	1	1	-	3	3	5	4
Austrian	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Bohemian	-	-	1	1	2	2	3	3
Czech	1	-	-	-	1	2	2	2
Dutch	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1
French	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Jugoslavian	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
Mexican	-	-	1	1	1	1	2	2
Norwegian	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Scotch	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Swedish	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-

Continued

TABLE 13-Continued

Nationality- Descent	Class I		Class II		Class III		Total	
	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother	Father	Mother
Irish-English	1	2	1	-	2	1	4	3
Irish-Finnish	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Irish-French	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Irish-German	3	5	1	2	5	3	9	10
Irish-Holland	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Irish-Scotch	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Irish-Swedish	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1
German-Bohemian	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	1
German-English	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
German-French	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
German Lithuanian	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
German-Polish	1	2	-	-	2	-	3	2
German-Scotch	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Polish Czech	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	1
Italian-Swiss	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
English-Norwegian	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Danish-Dutch	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
American ^a	3	3	2	1	5	6	10	10
Other ^b	-	1	1	-	3	3	4	4
Total	41	41	37	37	134	134	212	212

^aListed as a categorical preference by parents.

^bIndicates three or more ethnic backgrounds.

TABLE 14

RESPONDENTS' PLACE OF RESIDENCE
BY SOCIAL CLASS

Social Class	Chicago				Suburbs				Total			
	Q-N	Per Cent	Q-S	Per Cent	Q-N	Per Cent	Q-S	Per Cent	Q-N	Per Cent	Q-S	Per Cent
I (Upper)	7	12.3	31	17.7	9	25.7	10	27.0	16	17.4	41	19.3
II (Middle)	14	24.6	26	14.8	16	45.7	11	29.8	30	32.6	37	17.5
III (Lower)	36	63.2	118	67.5	10	28.6	16	43.3	46	50.0	134	63.2
Total	57	100.1	175	100.0	35	100.0	37	100.1	92	100.0	212	100.0

There was a noticeable tendency for the upper class of both seminaries to evaluate their sons as "above average." The lower class tended to evaluate in terms of being "average." The findings for the middle class in this respect vary according to the seminary--Q-N middle class tending to follow the lower class pattern and Q-S middle class tending to follow the upper class pattern.

The evaluation by the parents of their sons' qualities as students did not necessarily coincide with seminary faculty evaluations. In other words, the faculty agreements with parents were far from unanimous. Some lower class parents labeled their sons as "average" while faculty impressions indicated "above average" students. The opposite held true in several instances for upper class parents.

Parents of lower class origins seemed to believe that their sons were best regarded as "average" students. Even where some of the upper class parents indicated their sons as being "average," there was the tendency to qualify the response verbally; the questionnaires completed by the priest-interviewers for the lower class parents indicated no such verbal qualification in their acceptance of the "average student" category.

A general impression made from a review of the questionnaires (see appendix D) was that the mothers rather than the fathers were more active in the interview situation. Class differentials in this respect did not seem to exist. The place of residence--city or suburban--also did not seem to make a difference in the fathers being less dominant in the interview situation.

The Grammar School and Parish.--Data were submitted from the grammar school and parish for each respondent. As indicated previously, character reports were furnished by the grammar school principal and the respondent's pastor. These were made in consultation with teachers and priest-assistants. The seminary administration received these reports (see appendices E and F) sometime in the fall-winter of 1966-67; the reports were to become part of the basis for acceptance or rejection of candidates.

A perusal of these reports indicates little variation in response by the principals and pastors. There was a general tendency to report favorable qualities of the respondents. Although no information was available as to those who were "screened out" as candidates for the seminary on the basis of these reports, the few instances where unfavorable qualities for

TABLE 15

PARENTAL ESTIMATE OF RESPONDENTS' QUALITIES
AS A STUDENT BY SOCIAL CLASS

Social Class	"Above Average"		"Average"		"Below Average"		Total	
	Q-N	Q-S	Q-N	Q-S	Q-N	Q-S	Q-N	Q-S
I (Upper)	11	22	5	17	-	-	16	39
II (Middle)	9	22	21	12	-	-	30	34
III (Lower)	17	46	28	75	-	1	45	122
Total	37	90	54	104	-	1	91	195

respondents were reported upon did not eliminate them from their vocation choice.

Perhaps these reports and the items involved tell more about the seminary, the pastors, and the school principals than they do about the young seminarians. The favorable qualities seem more to be descriptive of an ideal type of seminarian; this much was suggested by several of those completing the reports. Several more indicated an unwillingness to complete the item responses, expressing the feeling that such items were "meaningless."

The seminary administration feels that a fertile ground for vocation recruitment is in the grammar school. To this extent the administration has attempted to involve the parochial school teachers--for this purpose, usually religious orders of teaching sisters--in seminary extra curricular affairs. The seminary faculty has expressed the tacit attitude that the teaching sisters from the grammar schools were in the past a part of the seminary's greatest support, but that in recent times this support has waned. The feeling of the faculty at present seems to be that the sisters in the primary schools do not represent a unity either for or against the seminary. It had been observed, for instance, that in at least one instance boys from a particular grammar school were being dissuaded from entering the minor seminary. Perhaps

with this in mind several "institutes" were held with the expressed purpose of bringing the sisters to a closer understanding of seminary curricula and life.

The parish pastors are continually involved with the minor seminary. Pastors must sign academic report cards of seminarians living in their parish boundaries. The clergy faculty of the two seminaries reside in scattered parish rectories throughout the diocese. A good deal of social activities are also carried on through an interconnection with religious functions that are a part of the activities of the whole diocesan clergy.

It would be a mistake not to recognize the special status that is given to minor seminarians within the parishes. Oftentimes these seminarians are given small jobs around the parish. The pastor usually assigns one of his priest-assistants the special task of "looking after" the minor seminarians. Some parishes pay the entire tuition cost to the seminary, which usually is the responsibility of the parents. Unfortunately, this is more often the case from the more affluent parishes where need would not necessarily be great. It should not be assumed from this that families that exhibit financial need do not receive scholarships. The diocese does give selected tuition free grants to needy families.

Selected Attitudes of Respondents.--An integral part of the present study is the measurement of the degree of open-mindedness and close-mindedness. Table 16 reports on the degree of dogmatism for the study group. The data for this table together with Tables 17 and 18 represent the mean score on three tests for each of three variables--dogmatism, anomy, and stress/anxiety. These tests were administered to the respondents during the school year, 1967-68. Each datum represented is a composite score.

There is a large clustering of scores in the 140-189 range for degree of dogmatism. This pattern coincides fairly well with the type of distributions found by Rokeach on his sample groups for the Dogmatism E- Scale where standard deviations of from 22.1 to 27.9 are reported.³ Relatively small percentages of the study group are found at either extreme of this continuous measurement of the open and the closed mind--e.g., eight per cent of the total group above the score of 190, and fourteen per cent under the score of 140. Both the Q-N and Q-S freshmen were fairly similar (Table 16).

The degree of anomy for the study group is detailed in Table 17. The cumulative percentages ranging downward from high

³Rokeach, p. 90.

to low anomy show Q-N to be slightly higher than Q-S--there is 6.0 per cent from Q-N with a score above seven whereas there is only 2.5 per cent from Q-S in this upper and more anomique range.⁴ Also, Q-N has slightly fewer respondents in the low anomy range compared to Q-S. Scores of below three have been indicated to be relatively free of an indication of anomy.⁵

The distribution of the study group for the degree of stress/anxiety is reported in Table 18. The Q-N seminary has more respondents than would be expected in the scores above twenty; also the Q-N seminary has fewer respondents in the very low ranges of stress and anxiety. On a sight comparison of Table 18, it is estimated that the distribution of scores is somewhat comparable to that found for anomy--see Table 17. Here it is seen that the two seminaries differ. Q-N has more respondents in the upper ranges for anomy and stress/anxiety as compared to Q-S. Although there are differences, they appear to be slight.

The ranges and spreads of scores for stress and anxiety are generally comparable with those found for medical school freshmen

⁴McCloskey and Schaar, pp. 24-25.

⁵Ibid.

by Fredericks.⁶ The median scores for stress/anxiety of the study group lie within the mean scores reported in this same study--e.g. between the scores of twelve and sixteen.⁷

General Observations: Seminary and Seminarian.--Conformity to and deviation from seminary regulations and codes of conduct concern all those involved in the socialization process at the minor seminary. Table 19 reports on the "conduct" grades of respondents from Q-S for the final quarter of the academic year 1967-68. Conduct grades from both seminaries are computed negatively. That is, students begin the academic quarter of eight weeks with 100 in "conduct." For each violation of seminary rule or regulation two demerits are given, subtracted from the 100.

The grade is considered important by the seminary faculty and the administration. If a student receives more than twenty-five demerits in any quarter of the school year he is subject to immediate dismissal. In practice, the administration allows the student to finish out the semester and make a transfer to another school. Warning letters are sent to the parents and the parish

⁶Fredericks, p. 187.

⁷Ibid., pp. 185-186.

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
DEGREE OF DOGMATISM^a

Degree of Dogmatism	Q-N			Q-S			TOTAL		
	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent
230-240(high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
220-229	-	-	-	2	0.9	0.9	2	0.6	0.6
210-219	1	0.9	0.9	2	0.9	1.8	3	0.9	1.5
200-209	1	0.9	1.8	4	1.9	3.7	5	1.5	3.0
190-199	3	2.8	4.6	16	7.6	11.3	19	6.0	9.0
180-189	16	15.4	20.0	24	11.4	22.7	40	12.7	21.7
170-179	13	12.6	32.6	36	17.2	39.9	49	15.7	37.4
160-169	20	19.3	51.9	37	17.6	57.5	57	18.2	55.6
150-159	19	18.4	70.3	35	16.7	74.2	54	17.3	72.9
140-149	13	12.6	82.9	26	12.3	86.5	39	12.4	85.3
130-139	11	10.6	93.5	13	6.2	92.7	24	7.7	93.0

Continued

TABLE 16-Continued

Degree of Dogmatism	Q-N			Q-S			TOTAL		
	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent
120-129	3	2.8	96.3	8	3.9	96.6	11	3.5	96.5
110-119	1	0.9	97.2	4	1.9	98.5	5	1.5	98.0
100-109	3	2.8	100.0	3	1.4	99.9	6	1.9	99.9
90-99 (low)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
...	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	104	100.0	100.0	210	99.9	99.9	314	99.9	99.9

^aThis table represents the mean summary of scores of three tests administered to the study group during the 1967-68 academic year.

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
DEGREE OF ANOMY^a

Degree of Anomy	Q-N			Q-S			TOTAL		
	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent
9.0 (high)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8.0	3	3.0	3.0	-	-	-	3	1.0	1.0
7.6	1	1.0	4.0	1	0.5	0.5	2	0.7	1.7
7.3	1	1.0	5.0	3	1.5	2.0	4	1.4	3.1
7.0	1	1.0	6.0	1	0.5	2.5	2	0.7	3.8
6.6	4	4.1	10.1	2	1.0	3.5	6	2.0	5.8
6.3	4	4.1	14.2	10	5.1	8.6	14	4.8	10.6
6.0	5	5.1	19.3	11	5.6	14.2	16	5.5	16.1
5.6	1	1.0	20.3	9	4.6	18.8	10	3.4	19.5
5.3	9	9.2	29.5	12	6.1	24.9	21	7.2	26.7
5.0	3	3.0	32.5	12	6.1	31.0	15	5.1	31.8
4.6	8	8.2	40.7	10	5.1	36.1	18	6.1	37.9
4.3	8	8.2	48.9	16	8.3	44.4	24	8.2	46.1
4.0	4	4.1	53.0	10	5.1	49.5	14	4.8	50.9

Continued

TABLE 17-Continued

Degree of Anomy	Q-N			Q-S			TOTAL		
	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent
3.6	8	8.2	61.2	13	6.7	56.2	21	7.2	58.1
3.3	6	6.1	67.3	16	8.3	64.5	22	7.5	65.6
3.0	8	8.2	75.5	18	9.4	73.9	26	8.9	74.5
2.6	5	5.1	80.6	14	7.2	81.1	19	6.5	81.0
2.3	3	3.0	83.6	10	5.1	86.2	13	4.4	85.4
2.0	10	10.3	93.9	4	2.0	88.2	14	4.8	90.2
1.6	1	1.0	94.9	9	4.6	92.8	10	3.4	93.6
1.3	2	2.0	96.9	8	4.1	96.9	10	3.4	97.0
1.0	3	3.0	99.9	-	-	-	3	1.0	98.0
0.6	-	-	-	4	2.0	98.9	4	1.4	99.4
0.3	-	-	-	1	0.5	99.4	1	0.3	99.7
0.0 (low)	-	-	-	1	0.5	99.9	1	0.3	100.0
Total	98	99.9	99.9	195	99.9	99.9	293	100.0	100.0

^aThis table represents the mean summary of scores of three tests administered to the study group during the 1967-68 academic year.

TABLE 18

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
DEGREE OF STRESS AND ANXIETY^a

Degree of Stress and Anxiety	Q-N			Q-S			Total		
	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Per Cent
39 (high)	-	-	-	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.3	0.3
...	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
36	1	1.0	1.0	-	-	-	1	0.3	0.6
...	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	-	-	-	1	0.5	1.0	1	0.3	0.9
31	-	-	-	1	0.5	1.5	1	0.3	1.2
30	3	3.0	4.0	-	-	-	3	1.0	2.2
29	1	1.0	5.0	2	1.0	2.5	3	1.0	3.2
28	3	3.0	8.0	2	1.0	3.5	5	1.7	4.9
27	1	1.0	9.0	2	1.0	4.5	3	1.0	5.9
26	-	-	-	1	0.5	5.0	1	0.3	6.2
25	1	1.0	10.0	3	1.5	6.5	4	1.3	7.5
24	4	4.0	14.0	7	3.5	10.0	11	3.7	11.2
23	1	1.0	15.0	3	1.5	11.5	4	1.3	12.5
22	6	6.0	21.0	5	2.5	14.0	11	3.7	16.2
21	4	4.0	25.0	5	2.5	16.5	9	3.0	19.2
20	7	7.0	32.0	3	1.5	18.0	10	3.3	22.5
19	5	5.0	37.0	9	4.5	22.5	14	4.7	27.2
18	4	4.0	41.0	8	4.0	26.5	12	4.0	31.2
17	3	3.0	44.0	8	4.0	30.5	11	3.7	34.9
16	4	4.0	48.0	9	4.5	35.0	13	4.3	39.2

Continued

TABLE 18-Continued

Degree of Stress and Anxiety	Q-N			Q-S			Total		
	Number	Per Cent	Cum Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Cum Per Cent
15	4	4.0	52.0	14	6.9	41.9	18	6.0	45.2
14	9	9.0	61.0	10	5.0	46.9	19	6.3	51.5
13	5	5.0	66.0	15	7.4	54.3	20	6.7	58.2
12	8	8.0	74.0	18	8.9	63.2	26	8.6	66.8
11	8	8.0	82.0	12	6.0	69.2	20	6.7	73.5
10	4	4.0	86.0	13	6.4	75.6	17	5.7	79.2
9	2	2.0	88.0	5	2.5	78.1	7	2.3	81.5
8	4	4.0	92.0	15	7.4	85.5	19	6.3	87.8
7	1	1.0	93.0	5	2.5	88.0	6	2.0	89.8
6	4	4.0	97.0	8	4.0	92.0	12	4.0	93.8
5	1	1.0	98.0	5	2.5	94.5	6	2.0	95.8
4	2	2.0	100.0	5	2.5	97.0	7	2.3	98.1
3	-	-	-	5	2.5	99.5	5	1.7	99.8
2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 (low)	-	-	-	1	0.5	100.0	1	0.3	100.1
Total	100	100.0	100.0	201	100.0	100.0	301	100.1	100.1

^aThis table represents the mean summary of scores of three tests administered to the study group during the 1967-68 academic year.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY
CONDUCT GRADES AT Q-S SEMINARY^a

Conduct Grades	Q-S		
	Number	Per Cent	Cum. Per Cent
100	31	14.8	14.8
98	26	12.4	27.2
96	23	10.9	38.1
94	22	10.5	48.6
92	17	8.1	56.7
90	11	5.2	61.9
88	6	2.8	64.7
86	11	5.2	96.9
84	12	5.6	75.5
82	7	3.3	78.8
80	6	2.8	81.6
78	3	1.4	83.0
76	4	1.9	84.9
74	3	1.4	86.3
72	10	4.7	91.0
70	3	1.4	92.4
68	1	0.5	92.9
66	4	1.9	94.8
64	-	-	-
62	8	3.7	98.5
...
54	2	0.9	99.4
50	1	0.5	99.9
Total	211	99.9	99.9

^aJune, 1968 conduct grade for final quarter. The seminary operates on a demerit system. Two points are subtracted from a possible of 100 for each infraction of rules and regulations; more serious violations result in subtractions in multiples of two. This is a quarterly grade reflecting eight weeks of schooling.

pastor if and when a seminarian receives fifteen demerits in any quarter. An accumulation of sixty demerits during the school year (four quarters) puts the seminarian in the same position of being dismissed as twenty-five demerits in a single quarter.

More than half the respondents from Q-S (56.7 per cent) received less than five demerits; nineteen (8.9 per cent) received fifteen or more demerits and were subject to the censure of the seminary administration. Only one respondent (0.5 per cent) was subject to dismissal. This table reports the final quarter conduct grade. It is generally observed by the faculty that students not intending to return to the seminary as sophomores incur "excessive" demerits. With this in mind it can generally be concluded that the large majority of this study group are quite conforming to the rules and regulations within the seminary setting.

Failure in academic subjects was rare for the study group during the 1967-68 school year. This is indicated by the fact that there were only eighteen subject failures for all freshmen respondents at Q-S, for all subjects and all freshmen at the conclusion of the second semester. In view of a few of the respondents failing several subjects, this means that the vast majority of the study group passed to the sophomore level. Academic standards are not low at the seminary. Nor is there pressure on the

faculty to "distribute the grades normally." It is a common complaint among seminary students that they would receive higher grades at other high schools for the same effort. There is perhaps some truth to their complaint in view of the admission screening process and the resulting competitiveness.

The minor seminary occupies a distinct position in that it conveys a particular social role to the young seminarians in the view of the family and seminary faculty. The seminarians' social relations are modified by the fact that they are at the beginning of a religious career. Minor seminarians are aware of the deferential behavior of relatives and peers with regard to this role. Often they feel overprotected by family and relatives; also, they realize that they are excluded from certain social relations by their peers from other high schools. Recently the seminary attempted to adjust to this by making the school week from Monday through Friday inclusive; for several decades the seminary had school on Saturday with Thursday as the free day.

Several faculty members have noted a close relationship between academic success and continuation in the seminary. The general feeling of the faculty in this regard is that seminarians "will not make it" if their general academic average is not a "B" or better.

There has been a parents' club at the Q-S seminary since 1966. The mothers' and fathers' clubs at the seminary are different from their counterparts found in most high schools in the area. They differ in two primary respects: first, they take no part in fund raising for the seminary, and second, they are organized more with respect to the formal relations of associations of this type; even the informality set for certain occasions seems to be highly structured.

The second point may be the logical corollary of the first. Status relationships seem more important than the role relationships played by members of these parents' clubs. Relatively insignificant contacts are made with regard to the faculty-parent-student relationships. This is attested by the few faculty members present at club meetings. The social interplay at club meetings is largely between the seminary administration and club officers. This is not generally the case at other high schools where large faculty representation is more common and where individual club members make more contact through the various committees to which they belong.

The foregoing is not intended as criticism. It is probably the natural outgrowth of a traditional seminary relationship with parents that stressed clerical status. In this regard, the

parents' role is viewed as a supportive one whereby they back-up the policy and decisions of the seminary. There is little, if any, dissensus. O'Dea sums the point being made here:

It is in present-day attitudes, in contemporary values, in current definitions of the situation, that the past history of American Catholicism persists in the present.

The partial segregation of Catholicism from basic elements of the general American culture, the over-identification with other elements, the defensiveness, the definition of life in terms of getting ahead in the new world, the odd divisions of labor between clergy and laity,...⁸

Although O'Dea was speaking of Catholicism and the American Catholic intellectual in general terms here, his comments seem crystallized in the relationships between parents and clergy at the minor seminary, particularly when these relationships are given the structure of parents' associations.

Most of the diocesan priests are alumni of the Q-N seminary. There is a recently formed alumni association to which priests and lay alumni alike belong. The association is not "close" to the school, however. Some of the diocesan priests do not seem to look with favor on the present arrangement of the minor seminary. It would be difficult to assess the accuracy of this judgment; if it is true, the reason may originate within a

⁸ Thomas F. O'Dea, American Catholic Dilemma (New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1958. Published as Mentor Omega Book, New York: New American Library, Inc., 1962), p. 81.

general discontent concerning recent broad changes in the church.

The physical facilities at Q-N and Q-S are strikingly different. Q-N is centrally located in a large metropolitan area, close to everything that is "city" By contrast, Q-S is located at the fringe of the city, in almost suburban surroundings. Q-N is gothic in structure and architecture while Q-S is modern. It is much more difficult to meet present standards of education at the Q-N seminary.

Finally, it would be a mistake not to report on the impressions of a "class consciousness" among the seminarians. This is most difficult to assess. The general impression is that the minor seminarians react superficially with regard to social class. They are most apt to view each other in terms of clothing and spending money. On the surface they are more likely to react to ethnic origins than to social class. Additionally, there is a large degree of mixing in their social relations; seminarians do associate by parishes, particularly in the early years at the seminary, but by their junior and senior years they often visit at each others' homes, criss-crossing the half of the diocese which each seminary serves.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL CLASS, SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE, MENTAL ABILITY AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN THE MINOR SEMINARY

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings relative to social class and academic achievement in the minor seminary. The first hypothesis of this dissertation posits a direct relationship between social class and academic achievement: the higher the social class position of the freshmen seminarians the higher would be their academic achievement, and the lower the social class the lower would be the academic achievement.

As indicated in Chapter II, the study groups of freshmen seminarians were from sister seminaries of the Archdiocese of Chicago. For statistical comparisons the Q-N seminary totaled 98 freshman respondents while the Q-S seminary had 195 freshman respondents. In testing the first hypothesis, the data pertaining to social class and academic achievement were compared separately for the seminaries. It was not possible to combine data on academic achievement because the Q-N seminary employs a percentage grading system and the Q-S seminary uses a 4.0 grade point system. Academic achievement in the seminary is measured successively through four quarters of the 1967-68 academic year; a fifth measure

is the cumulative average which combines the two semester grades--the second and fourth quarters. The first and third quarter grades are considered advisory and are not included in the cumulative average.

Social Class and Academic Achievement--The first hypothesis, that social class position for freshmen seminarians directly influences their academic achievement in the seminary, is not attested by the findings. Tables 20 and 21 bear this out. The findings are ambiguous.

The reader is advised at this point that every table treating levels of significance and appearing in the text of this dissertation has its complementary table to be found in the appendices. The latter tables detail the descriptive statistics--means, standard deviations, and standard errors. For simplicity, they are divided by chapter and carry the same table number, suffixed with the letter A.

At the Q-N seminary (Table 20) mean score comparisons never go beyond the statistically significant level of less than .05. Student's t-Test is employed to assess levels of significance.

An examination of Table 21 reveals three significant differences between the mean comparisons on academic achievement for Class I (upper) and Class III (lower). In these few instances Class I achieves higher academically than Class III. These are insufficient by themselves to reject the null hypothesis and accept the study hypothesis.

In Chapter II it was noted that the respondents of this study group evidenced higher scholastic aptitude and mental ability than the national norms for these two variables.¹ Furthermore, some potential seminarians were eliminated on the basis of lower-than-acceptable scores from tests of these two variables given as entrance examinations.²

As a consequence of these considerations, the null hypothesis asserting "no relationship" between class backgrounds and academic achievement was further tested. Specifically--before an acceptance of the null hypothesis and a rejection of the study hypothesis could be made--the relation among social class,

¹ See Tables 8 and 9 showing distributions of these variables.

² See page 53.

scholastic aptitude, and mental ability had to be determined. The further problem addressed here is the tangential or oblique relation of social class to academic achievement, by way of the seminary admission tests for scholastic aptitude and mental ability.

Social Class, Mental Ability (IQ), and Scholastic Aptitude

(SRA).--The dependent variables of mental ability and scholastic aptitude are investigated separately here. Indeed, the seminary administration views the two qualities as distinct. Whether the qualities are separate is a matter that has interested social scientists for a long time. The question comes down to one of differentiating between those characteristics that are more-or-less innate from those that are culturally influenced. As Merrill has noted, "this distinction is not easy to maintain in theory, let alone in practice."³ Merrill would opt for a type of cultural determinism, for as he says "culture and personality are not two separate and independent entities, but are in reality two aspects of the same thing."⁴ A note of caution is interjected by

³ Francis E. Merrill, Society and Culture (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), p. 103.

⁴ Ibid., p. 101

TABLE 20

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 50	1st	0.239	>.05
	2nd	0.069	>.05
	3rd	-0.179	>.05
	4th	0.580	>.05
	Cum AA	0.364	>.05
I vs. III df= 64	1st	0.545	>.05
	2nd	0.678	>.05
	3rd	0.687	>.05
	4th	1.541	>.05 ^a
	Cum AA	1.165	>.05
II vs. III df= 76	1st	0.375	>.05
	2nd	0.765	>.05
	3rd	1.013	>.05
	4th	1.159	>.05
	Cum AA	0.997	>.05

N= 98

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

TABLE 21

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 72	1st	0.813	>.05
	2nd	0.713	>.05
	3rd	1.200	>.05
	4th	1.095	>.05
	Cum AA	0.920	>.05
I vs. III df= 159	1st	1.002	>.05
	2nd	1.432	>.05 ^a
	3rd	1.924	<.05 ^b
	4th	1.879	<.05 ^b
	Cum AA	1.690	<.05 ^b
II vs. III df= 153	1st	0.119	>.05
	2nd	0.652	>.05
	3rd	0.673	>.05
	4th	0.695	>.05
	Cum AA	0.700	>.05

N= 195

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

Bierstedt regarding the same point when he notes that "we do our sociology no service when we make personality entirely a function of culture."⁵ Although the interdependence of these two variables is taken up later in this dissertation, the question itself is set aside.

As indicated previously, the variables of mental ability and scholastic aptitude are operationalized by way of the Otis test for mental ability and the Science Research Associates' battery of tests for scholastic aptitude. The data presented on Tables 22 through 27 indicate that social class is related to mental ability and scholastic aptitude for the freshmen seminarian study group. The evidence does not give a wholly consistent picture, however.

When the social classes of the two seminaries are compared with the mean scores of the two dependent variables of mental ability and scholastic aptitude, there are statistically significant differences (Tables 24 and 27) between the upper class (Class I) and the lower class (Class III). In the total study group Class I freshmen seminarians are more likely than Class III

⁵Robert Bierstedt, The Social Order (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963), p. 216.

freshmen seminarians to be found with higher mental ability and scholastic aptitude scores. This relationship does not hold when comparing such mean scores for specific seminaries--either Q-N or Q-S--by social class.

The Q-N seminary data evidence significant differences in mental ability between the upper class (Class I) and the middle class (Class II) and also between the upper class (Class I) and the lower class (Class III), as seen in Table 22. Although no significant differences for the Q-N seminary are obtained for scholastic aptitude (Table 25) there is an approaching significance here for the upper (Class I) and lower (Class III), class comparisons.

The data from the sister seminary--Q-S show a significant difference between the upper class (Class I) and the lower class (Class III) for scholastic aptitude; there is also an approaching significance here between the middle class (Class II) and the lower class (Class III) as evidenced on Table 26. There are no significant differences for mental ability by social class at Q-S, although there is an approaching significance (Table 23) between the upper class (Class I) and the lower class (Class III).

The social classes from the two seminaries of this study group are represented in Table 7. Hollingshead's anticipated

distribution of the social classes is also presented in Table 3. There is a striking difference in the proportions of freshmen assigned to the middle class (Class II) and the lower class (Class III) for the two seminaries. The Q-N seminary has a much larger middle class (Class II--32.8 per cent) and a much smaller lower class (Class III--47.6 per cent) than the Q-S seminary, Hollingshead's anticipated distribution, or the combined seminary class structure.

While it might be extrapolating beyond the data to interpret the observed differences in mental ability and scholastic aptitude in terms of the class structure of the two seminaries at this point, the data do suggest that there are factors associated with seminary processes that are class related. The tests of mental ability and scholastic aptitude given to the freshmen study group as pre-entrance examinations were of a standardized form where social class backgrounds are thought to be of little consequence. Therefore the data further suggest that there are factors associated with the freshman seminarians that are class-linked; these factors specifically show up in the qualifying and selection process for minor seminary candidates since these tests are used in preliminary "screening."

Before rejecting or accepting the null hypothesis of "no relation" between social class and academic achievement it is necessary to observe the relationship between the two dependent variables of mental ability and scholastic aptitude. Since the hypothesized relation between social class and academic achievement is not accepted at this point, and yet an ambiguous relation exists for social class, mental ability, and scholastic aptitude, there is still the consideration of a close link between the entrance examinations. It seems obvious that the seminary administration assumes the tests are independent of each other. The seminary uses both for entrance screening.

TABLE 22

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	t-Values	α
I vs. II, df= 50	2.176	<.05 ^a
I vs. III, df= 64	1.693	<.05 ^a
II vs. III, df= 76	-0.827	>.05

N= 98

^aSignificant difference.

TABLE 23

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	t-Values	α
I vs. II, df= 72	-0.026	>.05
I vs. III, df= 159	1.347	>.05 ^a
II vs. III, df= 153	1.245	>.05

N= 195

^aApproaching significance (.10 > p > .05).

TABLE 24

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	t-Values	α
I vs. II, df= 124	1.516	>.05 ^a
I vs. III, df= 225	2.091	<.05 ^b
II vs. III, df= 231	0.341	>.05

N= 293

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 25

MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	t-Values	α
I vs. II, df= 50	1.201	>.05
I vs. III, df= 64	1.505	>.05 ^a
II vs. III, df= 76	0.517	>.05

N= 98

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

TABLE 26

MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	t-Values	α
I vs. II, df= 72	0.333	>.05
I vs. III, df= 159	1.959	<.05 ^a
II vs. III, df= 153	1.433	>.05 ^b

N= 195

^aSignificant difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

TABLE 27

MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) SCORE COMPARISONS
FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	t-Values	α
I vs. II, df= 124	1.003	>.05
I vs. III, df= 225	2.507	<.01 ^a
II vs. III, df= 231	1.466	>.05 ^b

N= 293

^aVery significant difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

Mental Ability (IQ) and Scholastic Aptitude (SRA).--It is evident from the data presented in Tables 28 and 29 that a close relationship between mental ability and scholastic aptitude exists for the freshmen seminarian study group. The freshmen seminarians were divided into upper, middle, and lower third groups based on their scores on scholastic aptitude (SRA) for each seminary. The mean mental ability (IQ) scores of these groups were then compared. Statistically significant t-values were evidenced throughout. Seminarians with higher mental ability scores (IQ) were more likely to have higher scholastic aptitude scores (SRA) and conversely, seminarians with lower mental ability scores were more often to be found with lower scholastic aptitude scores.

Since there is such a close relation between the Otis test for mental ability and the Science Research Associates' battery of tests for scholastic aptitude, it would appear that either test could substitute for the other. In other words, the seminary could use one test for its screening purposes. The point needs further testing, for the seminary is interested in predicting success--academic achievement--by employing the entrance examinations. There is still the relation of each test to academic achievement.

The close link found between these tests does not further a rejection of the null hypothesis. If anything, it suggests the probability that such tests are not independent of past experience. Otis assumes independence⁶ while Science Research Associates predicate their tests on prior experience.

Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Academic Achievement.--The freshmen seminarians, differentiated into upper, middle, and lower thirds for scholastic aptitude (SRA), show significantly different mean scores for academic achievement in all four time periods and in the cumulative academic averages. These observations hold true for both the Q-N and the Q-S seminaries (see Tables 30 and 31).

It is not surprising that academic achievement and scholastic aptitude, as measured by SRA testing are positively related. Science Research Associates specifically intend that actual success in the classroom (academic achievement) be predicted by the potential that their tests seek to measure.

Although all mean score comparisons evidence significance, Table 30 makes clear that the confidence level is more diminutive

⁶Arthur S. Otis, p. 1. Otis qualifies this point by naively assuming equality of educational opportunity within a given community.

TABLE 28

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE
 RESEARCH ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS--
 Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude SRA Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 63	4.393	<.001 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 65	7.353	<.001 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	2.429	<.01 ^a

N= 98

^aVery significant difference.

TABLE 29

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE
 RESEARCH ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS--
 Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude-- SRA Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 129	7.985	<.001 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	12.933	<.001 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 128	5.889	<.001 ^a

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

for the Q-N seminary between the upper and middle third groups on scholastic aptitude (SRA) for academic achievement in the seminary. The confidence levels for all other mean score comparisons are less than .001, which evidences very high statistical significance.

An interesting finding relates to the Q-S seminary. Not only is there a very significant degree of difference among the upper, middle, and lower third groups by scholastic aptitude (SRA) in regard to academic achievement (Table 31), but also these same groups are very significantly different with respect to mental ability (see Table 29). Either tests of mental ability or scholastic aptitude could be used as screening devices for prospective freshmen seminary candidates. This follows if a primary objective in screening candidates is to eliminate those below a minimal level of ability--or, positively, to assure a selection of high ability students.

TABLE 30

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (AA) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR
 SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA)
 AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
 BATTERY OF TESTS--Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 63	1st	2.362	<.05 ^a
	2nd	2.215	<.05 ^a
	3rd	2.070	<.05 ^a
	4th	2.606	<.01 ^b
	Cum AA	2.460	<.05 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 65	1st	7.331	<.001 ^b
	2nd	7.214	<.001 ^b
	3rd	5.555	<.001 ^b
	4th	6.462	<.001 ^b
	Cum AA	6.995	<.001 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	1st	4.128	<.001 ^b
	2nd	4.859	<.001 ^b
	3rd	3.697	<.001 ^b
	4th	3.695	<.001 ^b
	Cum AA	4.377	<.001 ^b

N= 98

^aSignificant difference.

^bVery significant difference.

TABLE 31

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (AA) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR
 SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA)
 AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES
 BATTERY OF TESTS--Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α^a
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 129	1st	6.645	<.001
	2nd	6.893	<.001
	3rd	6.103	<.001
	4th	6.989	<.001
	Cum AA	6.622	<.001
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	1st	10.077	<.001
	2nd	11.248	<.001
	3rd	9.848	<.001
	4th	11.517	<.001
	Cum AA	11.727	<.001
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 128	1st	3.993	<.001
	2nd	5.044	<.001
	3rd	3.938	<.001
	4th	5.746	<.001
	Cum AA	5.538	<.001

N= 195

^aAll alpha levels evidence very significant differences.

Mental Ability (IQ) and Academic Achievement.--The relationship between academic achievement in the seminary and scholastic aptitude (SRA) has been shown in the previous section. The data relating academic achievement and mental ability (IQ) are presented in Tables 32 and 33.

In testing the relation of academic achievement to mental ability, both seminaries were divided into upper, middle, and lower thirds for the cumulative academic achievement in the freshman year. The data could not be combined--as previously indicated--because of differing grading systems. The mean scores on mental ability (IQ) were then compared within each seminary.

The same high degree of statistical significance (Table 33) obtains for the Q-S seminary between these groups as did previously for scholastic aptitude, mental ability, and academic achievement. This is considered further evidence that tests of mental ability and scholastic aptitude are superfluous. Either one would suffice for the purposes they are put to in screening candidates.

For the Q-N seminary there is no significant difference for mental ability for one of the three comparisons: the middle third and the lower third academic achievement groups (see Table 32). The lower-two-thirds of those respondents ranked for

academic achievement have similar mental ability scores (IQ) as measured by the Otis test. Although there is a similarity for this finding and the finding that social Class II and Class III respondents (see Table 22) have comparable--and lower--mental ability, this fact is insufficient to reject the null hypothesis. As was evidenced previously for the Q-N seminary (see Table 20), Class I respondents were not significantly differentiated from the other social classes for academic achievement.

Social Class, Mental Ability (IQ), Scholastic Aptitude (SRA), and Academic Achievement.--A wholly adequate test of the relationship between social class and academic achievement could not be made because the total sample could not be considered as a unit, due to different grading systems at the two seminaries.

The asymmetry of the class structure at the Q-N seminary possibly accounts for the differences noted when the seminary is considered separately as opposed to a consideration of combined seminary scores for mental ability and scholastic aptitude (see Tables 22, 24, 25 and 27). The over representation of the middle class (Class II) and the under representation of the lower class (Class III) at this seminary are striking. Without knowing the social class backgrounds of those candidates to the Q-N seminary

TABLE 32

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--
Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 63	2.753	$<.01^a$
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 63	4.178	$<.001^a$
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	1.306	$>.05^b$

N= 98

^aVery significant difference.^bApproaching significance ($.10 > P > .05$).

TABLE 33

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--
Q-S SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 127	6.091	$<.001^a$
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 130	9.600	$<.001^a$
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	3.615	$<.001^a$

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

who were screened out during the admission process, it would be impossible to indicate whether or not the subtleties of social class were being employed as admission criteria--however unwittingly.

Standardized tests used in operationalizing the variables of mental ability and scholastic aptitude are "not supposed to be" class related. Therefore, it seems probable that there are factors of a psycho-sociological origin for the freshmen seminar-ians that are class-related and filter out some applicants in the selection process to the seminary. The following three chapters of this dissertation take up this very important problem.

A further conclusion seems evident. The middle and lower social classes (Classes II and III) were seen to be more homogeneous with respect to mental ability and scholastic aptitude at the Q-N seminary (see Tables 22 and 25). Yet when considering the upper, middle, and lower third groups by scholastic aptitude (SRA), the upper third and middle third were much more alike with respect to academic achievement (see Table 30). Either there are a large number of respondents at Q-N who are "over achieving" or the grading practices at the two seminaries differ substantially. That is, the Q-N faculty may be "over-grading" a large number of minor seminar-ians from this study group.

Summary.---The hypothesized relationship between social class and academic achievement does not hold for the minor seminarians of this study. Academic achievement in the freshman year is not significantly related to social class position. While the data evidence both interesting and significant relationships with variables that are seemingly related to social class--specifically, mental ability and scholastic aptitude--the evidence is not of such a conclusive nature as to reject the null hypothesis and to accept the study hypothesis.

The findings presented do, however, indicate several important implications. Further study by seminary administrators and faculties are needed to shed light on further relations of this problem area. Several of the findings of this Chapter are enumerated in order to give direction to further research.

Upper class seminarians (Class I) are more likely than lower class seminarians (Class III) to have higher mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores for combined seminary enrollments. Also, the particular seminary seems to make a difference in the middle class (Class II), being more like the upper (Class I) or the lower (Class III) classes; this is in regard to mental ability or scholastic aptitude. Inasmuch as the tests of

these variables seem to rely heavily upon past experience, the academic preparation and curricula of the grammar schools might be focused upon. Indeed, this problem has been aptly sensed in recent programs designed to upgrade poorer neighborhood parochial school students through tutorial services given by senior seminary students. The Q-S seminary has particularly been interested in upgrading potential lower class seminary candidates through this type of effort. The data presented here would support such programs.

The class structures of the two seminaries are not similar. The Q-N seminary is over-represented for the middle class and under-represented for the lower class for this study. It would behoove seminary administrations to consider this carefully. The possibility of the subtleties of class creeping in as admission criteria has been suggested. Another possibility of the asymmetrical class structure might be the seminaries' physical boundaries. Each seminary of this study serves approximately half of the Archdiocese of Chicago. The physical division is simply one of mid-point. The possibility of gerrymandering the boundaries for greater class symmetry seems open.

While the evidence presented is insufficient to accept the hypothesized relation between class and academic achievement, it

should be noted that at one seminary (Q-S) the upper class respondents become significantly differentiated from the lower class during the second semester of 1967-68. Also, the direction of mean academic achievement scores is important. Only during the third quarter grading period at the Q-N seminary is there a reversal of mean academic achievement scores from the hypothesized direction. In this one instance, the upper class achieves less academically than the middle class. All other mean score comparisons for academic achievement do evidence directionality. That is, the three social classes show a type of correlation for academic achievement. Even though this relationship is considered fortuitous for this study, further investigations by seminary administrations and faculty seem called for.

It does appear that factors related to social class are being introduced into the seminary situation during the selection and admission process. The psycho-sociological variables investigated in the following chapters are thought to be significant. Then, too, the importance of social class cannot be dismissed, especially when joined with such factors as race, national descent, etc.

It is probably relevant that no known research has hypothesized an inverse relationship of social class to academic

achievement. This is in spite of a number of references in the literature that have indicated that children of middle class backgrounds--and perhaps the upper class--frequently take on lower class values in opposition to parental authority.⁷ So much stress has been placed on the "middle class success syndrome" in the scientific and popular literature that it seems generally assumed that class makes a difference even in the school room. The need for the future is to indicate the conditions under which such hypothesized relationships are confirmed or not. Only in this way will the multiple factors be understood.

⁷Burton, p. 223.

CHAPTER V

SOCIAL CLASS, DOGMATISM, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND THE ADMISSION TESTS TO THE MINOR SEMINARY

Hypothesis two of this present research study asserts that there is an inverse relationship between social class position and the degree of dogmatism for freshmen seminarians. This chapter will report on the findings testing this assertion. Also, some other factors referred to in the previous chapter that might be related to social class and academic achievement will be presented in this and the succeeding chapters. Since social class is not related to academic achievement for the freshman seminarian study group, although social class is related to mental ability and scholastic aptitude, it is necessary to investigate those kinds and degrees of selected attitudes that bear upon "success" in the minor seminary. As was noted previously, "success" and continuation in the seminary system are intimately associated with academic achievement.

DiRenzo investigates the dogmatic personality¹ in relation to the professional politician and non-politician. One of his conclusions is that, "with the exception of religious practice, our data show no relationships between dogmatism and social background factors."² A rather severe criticism of DiRenzo's study is that he employed a table of significance levels for the two-tailed test. Given that his hypothesis stated directionality he should have followed the table for the one-tailed test.³ This would have brought about accepted levels of significance (less than .001) in at least four instances of his reported data.⁴ Consequently, his findings of no relationship between dogmatism and social class cannot be accepted.

¹Gordon J. DiRenzo, "Professional Politicians and Personality Structures," American Journal of Sociology, 73 (September, 1967), 217-225. DiRenzo claims that "dogmatic personality" was never used by Rokeach and that this concept is his own innovation. It seems that this meaning is certainly implicit in much of the literature by Rokeach, however.

²Ibid., p. 222.

³Runyon and Haber, p. 151. See also the level of significance for the one-tailed test as compared to the level of significance for the two-tailed test, appendix G, (Table C) Critical Values of t.

⁴DiRenzo, Tables 2 and 3, pp. 221-222.

Chapter II of this present study reports on the meaning of dogmatism as defined by Rokeach. The concept was operationalized through the Dogmatism Scale, form E-1960. Furthermore, as previously indicated, the scale was administered to the freshman study group on three different occasions--in September, 1967, and in January and May of 1968. One important notation with regard to the meaning of the dogmatism concept is introduced by DiRenzo. He states that "it is (thus) not so much what as how one believes that distinguishes the dogmatic personality structure."⁵ The notion of a continuum of belief-disbelief in DeRenzo's sense is further reinforced.

The admission and qualification tests to the minor seminary have been indicated to be the Otis test of mental ability and the Science Research Associates' battery of tests for scholastic aptitude. While other subjective information is also considered in the admission process, these two objective tests are important indices used in screening candidates. The specific importance of the dogmatic personality for the admission process is consequently investigated. The findings in this regard are presented later in this chapter.

⁵ Ibid., p. 218.

Social Class and Dogmatism.--It was previously indicated in Chapter III that the mean summary of scores for dogmatism for individual seminarians evidenced the type of distribution found by Rokeach (see Table 16). Hence it may be assumed that this study group is comparable to the Rokeach sample. This test is considered acceptable for the present research commitments.

The data presented in Tables 34, 35, and 36 indicate that a significant difference obtains between social class and dogmatism. Seminarians of upper class backgrounds are more likely to be or become found with lower scores on the dogmatism scale. Conversely, seminarians with lower class backgrounds are more likely to exhibit higher scores for the dogmatic personality.

In spite of particular statistically insignificant differences for each seminary of the study group, the weight of the evidence leads to a rejection of the null hypothesis and an acceptance of the study hypothesis. The direction of the differences in mean dogmatism scores for the social classes remains always in the predicted inverse relationship. At no time is this relationship different. Furthermore, a perusal of the mean scores for the different social classes indicates that there is a tendency for the upper class to become less dogmatic and an opposite tendency for the lower class to remain about the same or become

more dogmatic from the first to the third tests.

Significant t-scores with alpha values of less than .05 are present or develop when the social classes are compared in successive tests. There are only minor indications of t-scores becoming less significant or insignificant from one test to the succeeding test.

While the study hypothesis of an inverse relationship between social class and dogmatism is accepted, several important findings deserve further consideration. First, middle class (Class II) seminarians are more like lower class (Class III) seminarians for this variable at the Q-N seminary (see Table 34-A). Second, at the Q-S seminary the middle class (Class II) is more like the upper class (Class I) for dogmatism mean scores (see Table 35-A). Third, the upper class (Class I) and the lower class (Class III) become significantly differentiated from the middle class (Class II) for the combined seminary mean scores for dogmatism (see Table 36-A). For combined scores, the middle class remains about the same for all three tests of dogmatism.

In Chapter IV it was noted that the particular seminary setting--whether Q-N or Q-S--made a difference in the middle class being more like the upper class or lower class for mental ability

and scholastic aptitude. This same tendency for the seminary situation to intervene when social class is compared to dogmatism is noted. In one sense, the middle class might be said to occupy a pivotal position, swinging either way in its attitude depending on the definition of the situation to the respondents.

Given what has already been demonstrated with regard to the relationship between social class and the variables of mental ability and scholastic aptitude, and the relationship between these two latter variables to academic achievement, an educated guess would be that dogmatism is negatively related to academic achievement in the seminary. By considering this dimension the analysis of this study is carried one step farther.

TABLE 34

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 50	1st	-1.022	>.05
	2nd	-2.193	<.05 ^a
	3rd	-3.081	<.01 ^b
I vs. III df= 64	1st	-1.696	<.05 ^a
	2nd	-3.074	<.01 ^b
	3rd	-3.660	<.001 ^b
II vs. III df= 76	1st	-0.769	>.05
	2nd	-0.885	>.05
	3rd	-0.154	>.05

N= 98

^aSignificant difference.

^bVery significant difference.

TABLE 35

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 72	1st	-0.168	>.05
	2nd	-0.351	>.05
	3rd	-0.132	>.05
I vs. III df= 159	1st	-1.452	>.05 ^a
	2nd	-1.449	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-2.319	<.05 ^b
II vs. III df= 153	1st	-1.193	>.05
	2nd	-0.922	>.05
	3rd	-2.085	<.05 ^b

N= 195

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 36

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--COMBINED
SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 124	1st	-0.732	>.05
	2nd	-1.372	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.829	<.05 ^b
I vs. III df= 225	1st	-2.119	<.05 ^b
	2nd	-2.557	<.01 ^c
	3rd	-3.939	<.001 ^c
II vs. III df= 231	1st	-1.348	>.05 ^a
	2nd	-1.530	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.779	<.05 ^b

N= 293

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

^cVery significant difference.

Academic Achievement and Dogmatism.--As indicated in Chapter IV each freshman class was divided into an upper, a middle, and a lower third grouping by cumulative academic achievement scores gathered at the end of the school year. The mean dogmatism scores for these groups for the three successive tests of the variable were compared for statistical difference. The results are presented in Tables 37 and 38.

For the final of three surveys of dogmatism the upper group of academic achievers is significantly differentiated from the lower academic achievers' group in both the Q-N and Q-S seminars. For the final test of dogmatism those seminarians distinguished by high academic achievement are likely to be less dogmatic than those seminarians who fall in the lower third group for cumulative academic achievement. All other mean score comparisons are insignificant.

The impression is given from a sight comparison of the mean scores--Tables 37-A and 38-A--and the observations from Tables 37 and 38 indicating a general negative direction for t-values--that there is still an inverse relationship between dogmatism and academic achievement that needs to be investigated. Consequently, a slight variation in method is employed to interpret further this

area of concern. Specifically, the independent and dependent variables are reversed here, Attention is focused on the quality of academic achievement for the dogmatic and non-dogmatic personality rather than the degree of dogmatism for the academic achiever and non-achiever.

Dogmatism and Academic Achievement.--The rationale behind an additional consideration in method is that those high achievement-low dogmatism seminarians or low achievement-high dogmatism seminarians might not be the same individuals when the independent variable is considered to be the dogmatic personality.

In order to test the assumed relationship posed here, the three scores for dogmatism for each seminarian were totaled. A mean score was derived, and a cumulative rank was established for each seminary. The cumulative rank was then divided into an upper, a middle, and a lower third grouping for the Q-N and the Q-S seminaries. The mean academic achievement scores for each academic quarter plus the cumulative academic achievement were then compared. Tables 39 and 40 present the findings.

Tables 39 and 40 show significant differences in the majority of testing periods for both the Q-N and Q-S seminaries where the upper and middle third groups of dogmatic personalities

TABLE 37

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 63	1st	-1.249	>.05
	2nd	-0.676	>.05
	3rd	-1.410	>.05 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 63	1st	-0.451	>.05
	2nd	-0.601	>.05
	3rd	-1.698	<.05 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	1st	0.826	>.05
	2nd	0.033	<.05
	3rd	-0.452	<.05

N= 98

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 38

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-S SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 127	1st	0.018	>.05
	2nd	0.027	>.05
	3rd	-0.762	>.05
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 130	1st	-1.013	>.05
	2nd	-1.176	>.05
	3rd	-1.726	<.05 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	1st	-0.914	>.05
	2nd	-1.165	>.05
	3rd	-1.049	>.05

N= 195

^aSignificant difference.

are compared. The same inverse relationship of dogmatism to academic achievement holds true. It seems evident, though, that the same seminarians are not being compared as when academic achievement was the independent variable.

Furthermore, the lower third group of dogmatic personalities--while not significantly different from the middle third group--have lower academic achievement mean scores at both seminaries (see Tables 39-A and 40-A) for all time periods. Also, all t-values presented in Tables 39 and 40 comparing the mean academic achievement scores for the middle and lower third groups of dogmatic personalities are positive. The indication here is that the more dogmatic personalities have significantly lower academic achievement, yet those seminarians scoring in the lower third for dogmatism--having more open minds--do not score higher in academic achievement than the middle group on the dogmatism continuum. It would seem that scoring in the middle levels on the belief-disbelief continuum scale are associated with higher academic achievement for a freshman seminarian.

Of further interest here is the relationship of dogmatism to mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA). The relationships between academic achievement, mental ability (IQ), and scholastic aptitude (SRA) have already been discussed in the

previous chapter. Given those relationships, the expectation is made that higher scores on the entrance examinations to the seminary should distinguish the less dogmatic personalities.

Finally, those seminarians with more open-minded personalities (less dogmatism) probably do not have higher mental ability (IQ) or scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores than those seminarians ranked in the middle range of scores for the dogmatism variable.

TABLE 39

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 64	1st	-1.518	>.05 ^a
	2nd	-1.638	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.868	<.05 ^b
	4th	-1.776	<.05 ^b
	Cum AA	-1.749	<.05 ^b
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	1st	-0.507	>.05
	2nd	-0.580	>.05
	3rd	-0.521	>.05
	4th	-0.769	>.05
	Cum AA	-0.700	>.05
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	1st	1.101	>.05
	2nd	1.058	>.05
	3rd	1.304	>.05 ^a
	4th	0.930	>.05
	Cum AA	0.997	>.05

N= 98

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 40

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	1st	-1.848	<.05 ^a
	2nd	-1.773	<.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.638	>.05 ^b
	4th	-2.327	<.05 ^a
	Cum AA	-2.081	<.05 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	1st	-0.835	>.05
	2nd	-1.074	>.05
	3rd	-0.939	>.05
	4th	-1.500	>.05 ^b
	Cum AA	-1.309	>.05 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 126	1st	1.005	>.05
	2nd	0.700	>.05
	3rd	0.741	>.05
	4th	0.844	>.05
	Cum AA	0.777	>.05

N= 195

^aSignificant difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

Dogmatism and Mental Ability (IQ).--The same three groups that resulted from a three-fold division of the cumulative dogmatism scores were compared for each seminary with respect to mean mental ability (IQ) scores. The data are presented in Tables 41 and 42.

Significant differences beyond the .01 and .05 levels are observed for the mental ability variable at the Q-N seminary (see Table 41) when the upper third dogmatic group is compared with the middle third group, and when the upper third group is compared with the lower third dogmatic personalities. No significant differences are obtained at the Q-S seminary although approaching significant t-values were evidenced for the same comparisons as indicated for the Q-N seminary (see Table 42).

The same observation as indicated in the previous section of this chapter with regard to dogmatism and academic achievement holds true for dogmatism and mental ability (IQ). Higher (upper third) dogmatism scores are associated with lower mental ability (IQ) for seminary freshmen, while the more open minded (lower third group) do not evidence significant or appreciable differences in mental ability from those seminarians scoring in the middle third on the dogmatism continuum. Indeed, at the Q-N seminary the middle third group for dogmatism have the higher mean mental ability scores of 118 (see Table 41-A), and both the middle

and lower third groups for dogmatism at the Q-S seminary (see Table 42-A) have mental ability mean scores of 117.

Dogmatism and Scholastic Aptitude (SRA).--As in the two previous sections, seminarians who were ranked into upper, middle, and lower third groups for cumulative scores on the dogmatism scale were compared for each seminary. The differences in scholastic aptitude (SRA) mean scores were evaluated through the t-test using the one-tailed test table of significance. The findings follow and are represented on Tables 43 and 44.

Significant differences of less than .01 were obtained at both seminaries when comparisons were made between the upper and middle third groups that were ranked on the dogmatism scale (see Tables 43 and 44). Additionally, the upper third was very significantly different from the lower third group at the Q-S seminary (see Table 44). Although the upper third groups scored the least for scholastic aptitude (SRA), the lower third dogmatic groups--the more open minded seminarians--scored appreciably less at the Q-N seminary and about the same at the Q-S seminary when visual comparisons were made with the middle third groups of dogmatic personalities (see Tables 43-A and 44-A). Again, this seems to indicate that higher dogmatism scores are correlated with lower

scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores, but lower dogmatism scores are not characterized by scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores that are higher or significantly different from the SRA scores that are found for seminarians in the middle range of the continuum of open-mindedness and close-mindedness.

Up to this point in this chapter the admission tests to the minor seminary have been analyzed with respect to respondents' degree of dogmatism, academic achievement, and social class. Since the admission tests were given before the tests for dogmatism to this seminary study group, and also since the composite dogmatism scores for freshmen include the distinct possibility of social change in the seminary process, the writer will present some of the findings for the study group where dogmatism is viewed as the dependent variable. Specifically, ranked scores for scholastic aptitude (SRA) are investigated with respect to the three separate tests for dogmatism.

TABLE 41

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 64	-2.455	<.01 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	-2.204	<.05 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	0.205	>.05

N= 98

^aVery significant difference.^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 42

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	-1.481	>.05 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	-1.525	>.05 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 126	-0.142	>.05

N= 195

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P >.05).

TABLE 43

MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 64	-2.786	<.01 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	-1.235	>.05
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	1.505	>.05 ^b

N= 98

^aVery significant difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P >.05), positive direction.

TABLE 44

MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	-2.826	<.01 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	-2.986	<.01 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 126	-0.236	>.05

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Dogmatism.--Both the Q-N and Q-S seminary place heavy emphasis on the Science Research Associates' battery of tests as a qualification and selection tool in screening prospective candidates to the minor seminary. For each seminary the respondents' scores on scholastic aptitude (SRA) were ranked into an upper, a middle, and a lower third group. The mean dogmatism scores for these groups were then compared for the successive tests given in September, 1967, January, 1968, and again in May, 1968. The findings are presented in Tables 45 and 46.

At the Q-N seminary the upper third group in scholastic aptitude (SRA) became significantly differentiated from the lower third group in the second and third tests for dogmatism. The upper third group represented lower dogmatic personality scores while the lower third group evidenced higher dogmatic personality scores. For the second test of dogmatism at the Q-N seminary, the upper third group was significantly different from the middle third group for dogmatism in the same inverse fashion. A visual impression from the mean dogmatism scores found at the Q-N seminary (see Table 45-A) is that while the middle and lower third groups remain about the same for the three successive tests for dogmatism, the upper third (high scholastic aptitude) become less dogmatic.

At the Q-S seminary very significant differences beyond the

.01 level were obtained for all the tests of dogmatism between the upper third group and the lower third group in scholastic aptitude (SRA). This same high degree of statistically significant difference obtained when the middle third group was compared with the lower third group. By way of contrast, the upper third group was not significantly different from the middle third group at this seminary, and dogmatism mean scores do not decline in successive testing for those seminarians distinguished by high scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores (see Tables 46 and 46-A). The inverse relationship holds for Q-S but not in the same way as for the Q-N seminary.

The interpretation of the data here is that higher scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores are likely to be associated with lower scores on the dogmatism scale for freshmen seminarians. Additionally, lower scores for scholastic aptitude (SRA) are more likely to be significantly related to a higher degree of dogmatism--the more closed mind. This is most evident at the Q-S seminary but is also indicated at the Q-N seminary from a comparison of mean scores in Table 45-A.

At the time of admission to the minor seminary young seminarians are likely to be differentiated from peers on the basis of selection and qualification tests. Most notable of these tests is

TABLE 45

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY RANK ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	0.754	>.05
vs.	2nd	-2.068	<.05 ^a
Middle Third	3rd	-1.416	>.05 ^b
df= 63			
Upper Third	1st	-0.669	>.05
vs.	2nd	-1.677	<.05 ^a
Lower Third	3rd	-2.150	<.05 ^a
df= 65			
Middle Third	1st	-1.535	>.05 ^b
vs.	2nd	0.390	>.05
Lower Third	3rd	-0.736	>.05
df= 62			

N= 98

^aSignificant difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

TABLE 46

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY RANK ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
 Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	0.080	>.05
vs.	2nd	0.804	>.05
Middle Third	3rd	0.211	>.05
df= 129			
Upper Third	1st	-2.625	<.01 ^a
vs.	2nd	-2.508	<.01 ^a
Lower Third	3rd	-3.216	<.01 ^a
df= 127			
Middle Third	1st	-2.731	<.01 ^a
vs.	2nd	-3.106	<.01 ^a
Lower Third	3rd	-3.398	<.001 ^a
df= 128			

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

the Science Research Associates' battery. This test for scholastic aptitude (SRA) is or becomes inversely related with degree of dogmatism, which in turn has been shown to be significantly related to social class backgrounds.

Summary.--The evidence presented in this chapter supports the acceptance of the second hypothesis of this research study and the rejection of the null hypothesis. Seminarians of upper class backgrounds are more likely to exhibit lower degrees of dogmatism than seminarians of middle or lower class position. Although the differences for each seminary situation have been presented, the weight of the evidence supports acceptance of the study hypothesis. Class backgrounds serve to differentiate minor seminarians by degree of open-mindedness and close-mindedness. Not only is the upper class differentiated from the middle and lower classes, but also the middle class is differentiated in the same inverse way from the lower class for the dogmatic personality.

Several additional findings have been presented in this chapter and serve the purpose of drawing attention to the complex network of social class and related variables. These further offer implications for the future study of the minor seminary. It is again recognized that research limited to freshmen seminarians does

not thoroughly assess the seminary system. There are three other classes of seminary students--sophomore, junior, and senior. This study is a modest beginning.

Those seminarians who distinguish themselves through high academic achievement during the freshman year at the minor seminary are likely to score lower for dogmatism at the end of the first year when compared to those seminarians who achieve less academically. On the other hand, it appears that scoring in the middle ranges of scores for degree of open-mindedness or close-mindedness is associated with higher academic achievement in the first year of the minor seminary.

It was found that mental ability (IQ) scores were significantly and inversely related to the degree of dogmatism at one seminary of this study group--the Q-N seminary. An impression of the same type of relationship was formed from the direction of mean scores and negative t-values seen through a perusal of the data relating to the Q-S seminary. Again, it was noted that although high dogmatism scores were associated with low mental ability (IQ) scores, the opposite indication did not proceed in an orderly manner. The middle ranges for the dogmatism variable scored higher than (at Q-N) or as high (at Q-S) as the lower range scores for mental ability (IQ). The indication is that the middle ranges of

those scoring on the dogmatism continuum are more closely associated with high mental ability (IQ).

With regard to the other entrance test to the minor seminary--the Science Research Associates' battery of tests--the indications are that higher dogmatism scores are correlated with lower scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores, but also that lower dogmatism scores are not characterized by scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores that are higher or significantly different from the SRA scores that are found for seminarians in the middle ranges of scores on the continuum of open-mindedness and close-mindedness. Yet when scholastic aptitude (SRA) was considered the independent variable, those seminarians characterized by high SRA scores had, or developed over successive testing for dogmatism, more open-mindedness--lower scores for dogmatism. The particular seminary setting--whether Q-N or Q-S--seemed to make a difference here in whether seminarians with upper scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores became less dogmatic--as at the Q-N seminary--or seminarians with lower scholastic aptitude scores (SRA) became more dogmatic--as at the Q-S seminary.

The data presented here show a different finding from that of DiRenzo in his study of dogmatism as related to professional

and nonprofessional politicians.⁶ For this seminary study dogmatism is inversely related to social class backgrounds.

Pannes has indicated that the "junior and senior high school years are very important in the formulation of (the) open-mindedness"⁷ of students. The junior-senior high school years for Pannes ranged from the seventh through the twelfth grades.⁸ Her finding cannot be confirmed or denied by this research study, since this study takes into consideration only the freshmen (ninth grade) of a seminary. It seems probable that factors other than school setting are important in the development of open-mindedness. Social class, cultural origin, race, etc., are a few of these suspected other factors.

Seminary administrators need be aware of attitudes that are related to social class backgrounds and academic achievement. While social class is not related to academic achievement in this study, it is related to dogmatism. Also, the dogmatic personality is related to lower academic achievement, scholastic aptitude (SRA), and mental ability (IQ). It would seem that seminary

⁶ Ibid., p. 222.

⁷ Pannes, p. 426.

⁸ Ibid., p. 421.

administrators and faculties would do well by further considering the multiple facets of success and continuation in the system, not merely academic achievement.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL CLASS, ANOMY, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, THE ADMISSION TESTS, AND THE DOGMATIC PERSONALITY IN THE MINOR SEMINARY

The finding that social class position is inversely related to the dogmatic personality has been presented. The relationship of dogmatism to academic achievement and related variables has also been explored.

It is the purpose of this chapter to treat the relationship of anomy to the social class backgrounds of seminarians during the freshman year of study at the minor seminary. Hypothesis three of this present research asserts that there is an inverse relationship between social class position and anomy. Upper class seminarians are hypothesized to have lower degrees of anomy than middle or lower class seminarians.

The variable of anomy was operationalized through a variation of the Srole anomy scale.¹ Certain authors emphasize that this variable represents a continuum of normlessness and deregulation depicting, on the one hand, the state of the individual and,

¹McCloskey and Schaar, p. 23.

on the other, the state of society.² The future of research on the anomy concept awaits further clarification of this variable. For the purposes of this research study, however, anomy is taken to be a socio-psychological attitude, as previously discussed.

Hayakawa has stated that science has often not distinguished observation from inference.³ This warning is particularly relevant here in that attitudes of seminarians might easily be confused with conditions of the seminary. Caution also is indicated that references not be made to conditions prior to the seminary experience. Even though the first test for anomy was given early in the seminary experience, in September, 1967, by this time some attitudes toward the seminary were probably already being formed by the freshmen respondents. The follow-up tests for anomy given in January and May, 1968, should account for some of the social change in the minor seminary. In order to make rational inferences about the seminary system, it is necessary to analyze the interrelations of social class and anomy with the variables of academic achievement, scholastic aptitude (SRA),

²Ibid., pp. 14-22.

³S. I. Hayakawa, Language: Key to Human Understanding (New York: McGraw-Hill Inc., 1968). Sound seminars, taped instructional material.

mental ability (IQ), and the dogmatic personality.

Social Class and Anomy.--Very significant differences were obtained when the upper class (Class I) was compared with the lower class (Class III) for combined seminary scores for anomy (see Table 49). Significant differences are also observed for the mean comparisons of these classes by seminary--Tables 47 and 48--although the timing of the particular test seems to make a difference in acceptable levels of significance occurring. The direction of the relationship is inverse.

The lower class (Class III) becomes significantly differentiated from the middle class (Class II) for the Q-S seminary and for the combined social classes of both seminaries for the anomy variable as observed in Tables 48 and 49. Again, the same inverse direction of anomy mean scores to social class position remains. At the Q-N seminary there is no observed significant difference between the middle class (Class II) and the lower class (Class III) for normlessness and deregulation of minor seminar-ians in their freshman year.

Observations from Tables 47-A, 48-A, and 49-A seem to indicate that the anomy mean scores for the social classes increase as the status structure is descended. The t-values for

all but two tests for anomy--see Table 48--are negative. This would seem to indicate that there is a general tendency for lower class seminarians (Class III) to score higher and upper class seminarians (Class I) to score lower. Also, a perusal of Tables 47-A, 48-A, and 49-A indicates that the standard deviations and standard errors remain about the same and are relatively slight as they refer to the mean scores. Individual seminarians' anomy scores deviating from the mean for their social class should be considered relatively small. In other words, the clustering about the mean scores by individual scores indicate very high (leptokurtic) curves for each of the social classes.

In the analysis of data presented in this research study, standard deviations and standard errors are highly important in that they detail the type of statistical distribution being considered. The probability of individual scores overlapping from one class or group to another is measured through Student's t-Test. This is particularly applicable for small group research, a type presented in this study. But the standard deviations and standard errors are particularly helpful in presenting data that relate to statistical means' comparisons.

In spite of the foregoing observations, the hypothesis that anomy is inversely related to social class position is not accepted. The findings supporting the null hypothesis asserting no difference by class background for the anomy variable are presented in Tables 47, 48, and 49. The data in these tables indicate that there is never a statistically significant difference between the upper class (Class I) and the middle class (Class II) seminarians for any of the successive tests for anomy given in September, 1967, January, 1968, and May, 1968.

While the hypothesis that seminarians' social class position is inversely related to their scores on the anomy scale cannot be accepted, several additional findings related to academic achievement need to be presented. The data thus far presented in this chapter indicate that a variation in the study hypothesis would lead to its acceptance. Such would be the case, for instance, if the middle class (Class II) was ignored or the stratified study group manipulated. This would not be methodologically correct. Consequently, correct methodology leads to the further exploration of intervening variables.

TABLE 47

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 50	1st	-1.120	>.05
	2nd	-0.894	>.05
	3rd	-1.361	>.05 ^a
I vs. III df= 64	1st	-2.458	<.01 ^b
	2nd	-1.500	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.828	<.05 ^c
II vs. III df= 76	1st	-1.552	>.05 ^a
	2nd	-0.641	>.05
	3rd	-0.363	>.05

N= 98

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bVery significant difference.

^cSignificant difference.

TABLE 48

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 72	1st	-0.623	>.05
	2nd	0.000	>.05
	3rd	0.831	>.05
I vs. III df= 159	1st	-1.766	<.05 ^a
	2nd	-1.824	<.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.493	>.05 ^b
II vs. III df= 153	1st	-0.958	>.05
	2nd	-1.761	<.05 ^a
	3rd	-2.438	<.01 ^c

N= 195

^aSignificant difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^cVery significant difference.

TABLE 49

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
SOCIAL CLASS--COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 124	1st	-1.335	>.05 ^a
	2nd	-0.665	>.05
	3rd	-0.440	>.05
I vs. III df= 225	1st	-2.708	<.01 ^b
	2nd	-2.371	<.01 ^b
	3rd	-2.252	<.05 ^c
II vs. III df= 231	1st	-1.292	>.05 ^a
	2nd	-1.612	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.761	<.05 ^c

N= 293

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bVery significant difference.

^cSignificant difference.

Academic Achievement and Anomy.--The cumulative academic achievement representing grade distributions for each seminary based on semester grades has already been presented in Chapter IV and Chapter V. The upper, middle, and lower third groups of academic achievers were compared for the three tests of anomy. Tables 50 and 51 detail the findings comparing the mean scores for anomy.

There is a significant difference as noted from Table 50 for the third test of anomy at the Q-N seminary between the upper third and the lower third groups of academic achievers. The difference is inverse--as was anticipated--indicating that those seminarians differentiated by higher academic achievement are likely to score lower on the anomy scale.

At the Q-S seminary there is a very significant difference between the upper third and lower third groups of academic achievers--in the same inverse relation--but only for the first test for anomy given in September, 1967. Significant differences disappear for succeeding tests.

Observations from the descriptive statistics presented in Tables 50-A and 51-A seem to indicate that further refinement of method is necessary to uncover the relation between academic achievement and anomy. The mean anomy scores for all tests tend

to decrease as greater academic achievement increases. Also from Tables 50 and 51 the t-values are all negative, further indicating a type of inverse relationship between anomy and academic achievement.

Anomy and Academic Achievement.--As has been indicated, the test for anomy was administered three times to the entire study group. The total scores for each seminarian were summed and the two seminaries were divided into upper, middle, and lower third groups based on the summed scores for the anomy scales. Anomy was considered to be the independent variable as the mean scores for academic achievement were compared for each seminary for all academic quarter periods and including the cumulative academic achievement for the school year 1967-68.

Tables 52 and 53 present the data and findings here. The same type of negative t-scores are found as in the previous section when means are compared for all academic time periods. Also, the academic mean scores vary inversely with the degree of anomy. Significant t-values beyond the .05 level are observed when comparisons are made between the upper third and lower third anomic groups for academic achievement. Only at the Q-N seminary for the first quarter and first semester grades are the comparisons of

means found to be statistically insignificant. Thus the findings indicate that higher scores for anomy are associated with lower academic achievement and vice-versa.

Chapter V detailed the observation that although high scores for dogmatism were associated with lower academic achievement, more open-mindedness for seminarians was not necessarily associated with higher academic grades than for those seminarians scoring in the middle ranges on the dogmatism scale. Although no significant differences were obtained when comparisons were made for the middle and lower third anomy groups for academic achievement, it seems likely from the descriptive statistics presented in Tables 52-A and 53-A (and also from Tables 50-A and 51-A from the previous section) that lower anomy scores are more closely associated with higher academic grades in the minor seminary. In other words, those seminarians scoring in the middle ranges for the anomy variable appear to achieve less academically than those scoring low for anomy. Since this appears to be the case, further analysis of the admission tests--scholastic aptitude (SRA) and mental ability (IQ)--is necessary to give credence to this inference.

TABLE 50

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	-0.362	$>.05$
vs.	2nd	-1.283	$>.05$
Middle Third	3rd	-1.186	$>.05$
df= 63			
Upper Third	1st	-1.360	$>.05^a$
vs.	2nd	-1.536	$>.05^a$
Lower Third	3rd	-1.842	$<.05^b$
df= 63			
Middle Third	1st	-1.111	$>.05$
vs.	2nd	-0.252	$>.05$
Lower Third	3rd	-0.942	$>.05$
df= 64			

N= 98

^aApproaching significance ($.10 > P > .05$).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 51

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-S SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 127	1st	-1.136	>.05
	2nd	-0.759	>.05
	3rd	-1.045	>.05
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 130	1st	-2.596	<.01 ^a
	2nd	-0.983	>.05
	3rd	-1.646	>.05 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	1st	-1.138	>.05
	2nd	-0.267	>.05
	3rd	-0.517	>.05

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

TABLE 52

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Anomy Rank Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 64	1st	-1.037	>.05
	2nd	-0.957	>.05
	3rd	-0.701	>.05
	4th	-0.649	>.05
	Cum AA	-0.808	>.05
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	1st	-1.141	>.05
	2nd	-1.480	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.830	<.05 ^b
	4th	-2.061	<.05 ^b
	Cum AA	-1.832	<.05 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	1st	-0.194	>.05
	2nd	-0.655	>.05
	3rd	-1.308	>.05 ^a
	4th	-1.585	>.05 ^a
	Cum AA	-1.182	>.05

N= 98

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 53

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Anomy Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 124	1st	-0.999	>.05
	2nd	-1.191	>.05
	3rd	-1.276	>.05
	4th	-1.386	>.05 ^a
	Cum AA	-1.319	>.05 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 128	1st	-2.293	<.05 ^b
	2nd	-2.537	<.01 ^c
	3rd	-1.963	<.05 ^b
	4th	-2.699	<.01 ^c
	Cum AA	-2.633	<.01 ^c
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 130	1st	-1.202	>.05
	2nd	-1.196	>.05
	3rd	-0.574	>.05
	4th	-1.119	>.05
	Cum AA	-1.142	>.05

N= 195

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P >.05).

^bSignificant difference.

^cVery significant difference.

Anomy and Mental Ability.--The upper third, middle third, and lower third groups ranked on the composite scores for the tests for anomy were again compared. The dependent variable was considered to be the scores derived from the Otis test for mental ability (IQ). The data follow on Tables 54 and 55.

Seminarians scoring in the upper third for anomy are likely to have lower mental ability scores (IQ) than those seminarians scoring in the lower third on the anomy variable. Significant t-scores with alpha values of less than .05 are indicated.

Also, the descriptive statistics found in Tables 54-A and 55-A indicate that lower anomy scores are closely associated with higher mental ability (IQ). For the seminarians ranked on cumulative scores for the three tests for anomy, mental ability (IQ) seems to increase somewhat proportionately to lower scores for personal normlessness and deregulation. It must be remembered, however, that the entrance examination for mental ability (IQ) was administered to the freshman study group before the tests for anomy.

The same type of relationship seems to hold here for comparisons of anomy and mental ability as were inferred for anomy and academic achievement. Unlike lower scores for the dogmatic personality variable, lower scores for anomy are more closely

TABLE 54

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Anomy Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 64	-1.666	$>.05^a$
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	-2.094	$<.05^b$
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	-0.475	$>.05$

N= 98

^aApproaching significance ($.10 > P > .05$).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 55

MEAN MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Anomy Rank Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 124	-0.654	$>.05$
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 128	-1.720	$<.05^a$
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 130	-1.117	$>.05$

N= 195

^aSignificant difference.

associated with higher mental ability (IQ) scores and greater academic achievement than for the middle groups.

Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Anomy.--The upper, middle, and lower third groups by scholastic aptitude (SRA) were compared for the mean scores of the three tests given for anomy. Means, standard deviations, and standard errors are presented in Tables 56-A and 57-A found in the appendix. The t-values comparing the mean anomy scores for the groups are given in Tables 56 and 57.

Table 57 shows alpha values beyond the .01 level of significance not only when the upper third group in scholastic aptitude (SRA) is compared with the middle third, but also this same very high level of statistical significance obtains between the middle third and lower third groups. The direction is negative, indicating an inverse relationship between scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores and degree of anomy. While this holds true for the Q-S seminary, the Q-N seminary evidences no significant differences between the middle third and lower third in scholastic aptitude (SRA) as noted in Table 56. Also from this Table 56, only for the third test for anomy is the upper third significantly differentiated from the lower third group. It would appear that

change occurs during the seminary experience for the Q-N seminarians. The seminary setting and the definition of that situation by the two groups of this study seem to make a difference. This is seen as particularly true in that the anomaly scores are for successive testing periods during the freshman year at the minor seminary.

Data not presented, whereby anomaly is viewed as the independent variable and scholastic aptitude (SRA) the dependent, indicate the same findings presented here. The inference is made that better qualifying scores on the scholastic aptitude (SRA) battery of tests are closely associated with later conditions where low anomaly scores are evidenced for minor seminarians of this study.

TABLE 56

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK
ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	0.190	>.05
vs.	2nd	-0.253	>.05
Middle Third	3rd	0.531	>.05
df= 63			
Upper Third	1st	-0.981	>.05
vs.	2nd	-1.481	>.05 ^a
Lower Third	3rd	-1.736	<.05 ^b
df= 65			
Middle Third	1st	-1.088	>.05
vs.	2nd	-1.186	>.05
Lower Third	3rd	-1.228	>.05
df= 62			

N= 98

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 57

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK
ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	0.134	$>.05$
vs.	2nd	-1.433	$>.05^a$
Middle Third	3rd	-1.130	$>.05$
df= 129			
Upper Third	1st	-3.407	$<.001^b$
vs.	2nd	-3.337	$<.001^b$
Lower Third	3rd	-4.072	$<.001^b$
df= 127			
Middle Third	1st	-3.458	$<.001^b$
vs.	2nd	-2.016	$<.05^c$
Lower Third	3rd	-2.828	$<.01^b$
df= 128			

N= 195

^aApproaching significance ($.10 > P > .05$).

^bVery significant difference.

^cSignificant difference.

The Dogmatic Personality and Anomy.--Similarities and differences have been observed in this and the preceding chapter when dogmatism and anomy were compared with the variables of social class, academic achievement, scholastic aptitude (SRA), and mental ability (IQ). It was assumed that the Rokeach test for dogmatism and McCloskey and Schaar's test for anomy were qualitatively distinct. Indeed, the evidence presented in this research study thus far does not seriously question this assumption. In order to further explore the inter-relationship of variables to class backgrounds and academic achievement in the minor seminary it is necessary to observe if and how anomy and dogmatism "hang together."

The three tests for dogmatism were summed for each seminarian. The resulting composite scores were ranked for each seminary into an upper, a middle, and a lower third group. Dogmatism was considered the independent variable as the three tests for anomy were compared for means, standard deviations, standard errors, and t-values. Tables 58 and 59 present the findings.

The evidence supports the observation of a very direct relationship between the dogmatic personality and anomy. Seminarians with high dogmatism scores are very likely to have high anomy scores, and the opposite, seminarians with low dogmatism scores are very likely to have low anomy scores.

All t-scores (see Tables 58 and 59) are statistically significant and positive. Most t-values evidence very high significance at or beyond the .001 level. Furthermore, a sight comparison of mean scores and standard errors between groups (Tables 58-A and 59-A) reinforces the observation of a direct and linear relationship between dogmatism and anomy.

With the evidence presented in Chapter V and this one, the assumption would still seemingly hold true that the tests for anomy and dogmatism operationalize qualitatively different variables. Dogmatism is inversely related to the social class backgrounds of seminarians; anomy is not. Both dogmatism and anomy are related to academic achievement, scholastic aptitude (SRA), and mental ability (IQ), but with some major variations. The question then as to why tests for the two variables are so closely and directly related must await further inquiry.

Particular interest in stressful situations and conditions will be explored in the following chapter. It is hoped in this way to further explain the tie-in the variables thus far explored.

TABLE 58

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
 Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	2.171	$<.05^a$
vs.	2nd	4.110	$<.001^b$
Middle Third	3rd	4.423	$<.001^b$
df= 64			
Upper Third	1st	6.198	$<.001^b$
vs.	2nd	6.264	$<.001^b$
Lower Third	3rd	7.093	$<.001^b$
df= 62			
Middle Third	1st	2.976	$<.01^b$
vs.	2nd	1.710	$<.05^a$
Lower Third	3rd	2.891	$<.01^b$
df= 64			

N= 98

^aSignificant difference.

^bVery significant difference.

TABLE 59

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
 Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	1st	4.702	<.001 ^a
	2nd	1.883	<.05 ^b
	3rd	3.781	<.001 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	1st	8.660	<.001 ^a
	2nd	6.301	<.001 ^a
	3rd	6.904	<.001 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 126	1st	3.621	<.001 ^a
	2nd	4.282	<.001 ^a
	3rd	2.760	<.01 ^a

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

^bSignificant difference.

Summary.--The hypothesis that seminarians of upper class backgrounds will show less disposition to normlessness and deregulation (anomy) than seminarians of middle or lower class position cannot be accepted. There is no instance of significant difference between the upper class seminarians (Class I) and middle class seminarians (Class II) with respect to anomy.

Higher scores for anomy tend to be inversely related to academic achievement in the minor seminary. Personal normlessness and deregulation tends also to be inversely correlated with mental ability (IQ) scores of minor seminarians of this study.

The entrance examination to the minor seminary for scholastic aptitude (SRA) shows an inverse relation to anomy. While this is true for all tests for anomy at the Q-S seminary, it becomes true during the freshman year at the Q-N seminary--for the third and final test for anomy given to the study group.

Scores on the dogmatism scale are directly and significantly related to scores on the anomy scale for all tests of these variables in the freshman year of study at the minor seminary. Even though this is the case, it would appear that the tests for these two variables still operationalize conceptually different variables. This is inferred because of the differential relation

that both dogmatism and anomy have for social class backgrounds, academic achievement, and the admission tests to the minor seminary.

While social class backgrounds of seminarians do not make a difference when comparing the upper class seminarians (Class I) with the middle class seminarians (Class II) for anomy, social class position does make a difference in the degree of anomy obtaining between the upper class (Class I) and the lower class (Class III). This is also true for comparisons of the middle class (Class II) and the lower class (Class III) in the seminary, although the particular seminary setting seems to make a difference--that is, whether the comparisons are for the Q-N or the Q-S seminary. Again, an inverse relation obtains.

In Chapter II it was noted that Mizruchi had found an inverse relation between social class and anomy.⁴ Srole had made the same finding.⁵ Roberts and Rokeach have found the relationship between social class and anomy to be quite negligible.⁶

⁴Mizruchi, p. 653.

⁵Srole, p. 715.

⁶Roberts and Rokeach, p. 358.

The findings of this present research study support the conclusion of no significant inverse relationship.

Znaniecki has earlier cautioned researchers against formulating what he termed "conclusive" hypotheses. He preferred to see the development of heuristic hypotheses.⁷ By this he meant that there should be a "flowering" of further research problems and questions as a result of a tentatively accepted hypothesis. This seems particularly relevant here. The inconsistencies in the literature where social class is explored for clues to anomy may not in the final analysis be as important as they appear at the moment. The general questions for the future should probably focus on the particular conditions under which anomy and social class are hypothesized to be related. Mizruchi has perhaps caught the central problem in that his finding of significant inverse

⁷Znaniecki's reference here was in answer to several serious criticisms of his and Thomas' work in formulating a model where action could be predicted when attitudes of individuals were considered in reference to the values of a society through the definition of the situation. He emphasized the term "heuristic" as an ongoing process of "becoming." In Herbert Blumer, Critiques of Research..., p. 91. See also the same type of reference where Howard Becker urges the casting of hypotheses at that level of abstraction where the researcher is guided "...safely between the extremely idiographic and nomothetic poles." In Charles P. Loomis and Zona K. Loomis, Modern Social Theories (2nd ed. rev.; N.Y.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1965), p. 34.

relationship takes into account the social participation of his respondents.⁸ The condition of social participation is seen as important in the original relationship. This present research study refers to minor seminarians and the seminary situation. The conditions clearly relate to similar goal orientations. Nominally at least, minor seminarians have given tacit acceptance of a future commitment to the priesthood.

⁸Mizruchi, p. 653.

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL CLASS, STRESS/ANXIETY, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND RELATED FACTORS FOUND IN THE MINOR SEMINARY

This chapter's findings bear on the hypothesized inverse relationship between social class position and stress/anxiety responses for minor seminarians during their first year of study. The analysis is carried further in an exposition of the interrelations of stress/anxiety, academic achievement, scholastic aptitude (SRA), dogmatism, anomy, and student conduct grades.

Social Class and Stress/Anxiety Responses.--The independent variable of social class position was employed as in previous chapters using Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position to obtain a ranking for three social classes. The dependent variable of individual stress and anxiety responses was operationalized--as previously indicated in Chapter II--through Taylor's Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety.¹ As in the case for the tests for dogmatism and anomy, the test for stress/anxiety was administered three times during the academic year 1967-68: September, 1967; January, 1968; and May, 1968.

¹Taylor, pp. 285-290.

Tables 60, 61, and 62 indicate the findings. The study hypothesis asserting that seminarians of upper class backgrounds have significantly less stress/anxiety than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds must be rejected; the null hypothesis must be accepted. From the tables indicated above it is evident that no significant differences in mean score comparisons for the social classes obtain. Tables 60-A, 61-A and 62-A indicate that the stress/anxiety mean scores, standard deviations, and standard errors show no patterns of differences are noted. This is true both among the three social classes and within any social class; no evidence of directionality--moving or becoming toward more or less stress/anxiety--is evidenced. There are also no observable differences for the Q-N seminary, the Q-S seminary, or for the combined social classes of both seminaries.

The data of this study confirm the finding of Fredericks that no relationship obtains for groups of medical students between social class position and stress/anxiety responses.² Both Fredericks' study and this present research have focused on somewhat elite groups of students for empirical evidence testing their assertions. Sewell and Haller found an inverse relationship

²Fredericks, p. 183.

between class position and the symptoms of "nervousness and anxiety" when they compared a much larger and perhaps more representative sample--of the general population--of elementary school children.³ Significantly, that latter study compared the upper class and the lower class only, preferring to ignore the presence of a middle class. More will be said of this point as this study progresses.

³William H. Sewell and A. O. Haller, "Factors in the Relationship Between Social Status and the Personality Adjustment of the Child," American Sociological Review, 24 (August, 1959), 511-520.

TABLE 60

MEAN STRESS AND ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR
SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 50	1st	0.916	>.05
	2nd	-0.127	>.05
	3rd	1.382	>.05 ^a
I vs. III df= 64	1st	-0.129	>.05
	2nd	-0.406	>.05
	3rd	0.663	>.05
II vs. III df= 76	1st	-1.419	>.05 ^a
	2nd	-0.332	>.05
	3rd	-1.009	>.05

N = 98

^aApproaching significance ($.10 > P > .05$).

TABLE 61

MEAN STRESS AND ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR
 SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
 Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 72	1st	0.544	>.05
	2nd	0.643	>.05
	3rd	-0.054	>.05
I vs. III df= 159	1st	1.061	>.05
	2nd	0.064	>.05
	3rd	-0.135	>.05
II vs. III df= 153	1st	0.289	>.05
	2nd	-0.690	>.05
	3rd	-0.055	>.05

N= 195

TABLE 62

MEAN STRESS AND ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR
 SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
 COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
I vs. II df= 124	1st	0.786	>.05
	2nd	0.350	>.05
	3rd	0.570	>.05
I vs. III df= 225	1st	0.912	>.05
	2nd	-0.150	>.05
	3rd	0.430	>.05
II vs. III df= 231	1st	-0.007	>.05
	2nd	-0.568	>.05
	3rd	-0.286	>.05

N= 293

Academic Achievement and Stress/Anxiety Responses.--Even though stress and anxiety responses are not significantly related to social class position for this study, there remains the probability that academic achievement is inversely related to stress/anxiety.

The data presented in Tables 63 and 64 indicate the findings when the cumulative academic achievement of freshmen seminarians during the 1967-68 academic year is considered as the independent variable. As indicated in previous chapters, the respondents' cumulative academic averages were used to stratify upper, middle, and lower third groups for each seminary. The mean scores for stress and anxiety were then compared for each of the three tests.

Table 63 contains no significant t-values for the Q-N seminary comparisons. However, Table 64 shows that significant differences occur when the upper third academic achievers are compared with either the middle or lower third groups of academic achievers for the second and third tests of stress/anxiety at the Q-S seminary. The negative t-values evidenced throughout (except in two instances--one at Q-N and one at Q-S) further indicate the direction of mean scores. And a perusal of Tables 63-A and 64-A generally portray an inverse relationship when the mean scores

for the three groups of academic achievers are compared for successive tests of stress/anxiety.

The evidence seems to suggest that--at least for the Q-S seminary--the upper third group of academic achievers becomes less stressful and anxious during the course of the freshman year at the seminary. Further evidence of this relationship of these two variables is provided in the following section.

TABLE 63

MEAN STRESS AND ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--
Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	<i>d</i>
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 63	1st	-0.414	>.05
	2nd	-0.551	>.05
	3rd	-0.252	>.05
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 63	1st	-0.746	>.05
	2nd	-0.287	>.05
	3rd	-0.793	>.05
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	1st	-0.276	>.05
	2nd	0.286	>.05
	3rd	-0.526	>.05

TABLE 64

MEAN STRESS AND ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--
Q-S SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	0.243	>.05
vs.	2nd	-0.254	>.05
Middle Third	3rd	-0.539	>.05
df= 127			
Upper Third	1st	-0.984	>.05
vs.	2nd	-2.381	<.01 ^a
Lower Third	3rd	-2.215	<.05 ^b
df= 130			
Middle Third	1st	-1.258	>.05
vs.	2nd	-2.131	<.05 ^b
Lower Third	3rd	-1.652	<.05 ^b
df= 127			

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

^bSignificant difference.

Stress/Anxiety Responses and Academic Achievement.--As indicated, three tests for stress and anxiety responses were given to freshmen seminarians during the academic year 1967-68 at the two sister seminaries of the study group. The scores for these three tests were summed for each seminarian, rank ordered, and an upper, middle, and lower third group were identified for each seminary. The mean academic achievement scores were then compared for all four quarters of the academic year and for the cumulative academic grade averages of the freshman year of study. The findings are presented on Tables 65 and 66.

Again, no significant differences are observed for the Q-N seminary (see Table 65) when the independent variable is taken to be stress/anxiety. But for the Q-S seminary (see Table 66) very significant differences are found when those seminarians found with high scores (upper third) for stress and anxiety are compared with either the middle or lower third groups. Such is the case for all academic time periods at Q-S.

The interpretation here is that higher stress/anxiety scores seem to be inversely associated with academic achievement, and the particular seminary setting makes a difference. Also, less stress and anxiety does not seem to differentiate significantly or substantially those seminarians who score in the middle

ranges for stress/anxiety at Q-S.

Inasmuch as a respectable argument could be made that there is a type of ex post facto analysis being made when either the cumulative academic achievement scores or the cumulative stress/anxiety scores are used as independent variables (these scores do represent final cumulative scores during the freshman year), the emphasis in the following section is placed on that variable most closely associated with academic achievement that is not "after the fact." Specifically, scholastic aptitude (SRA) is compared with stress and anxiety.

TABLE 65

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY
SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	0.239	>.05
vs.	2nd	0.120	>.05
Middle Third	3rd	-0.153	>.05
	4th	-0.071	>.05
df= 62	Cum AA	0.005	>.05
Upper Third	1st	-0.605	>.05
vs.	2nd	-0.734	>.05
Lower Third	3rd	-0.887	>.05
	4th	-0.926	>.05
df= 67	Cum AA	-0.849	>.05
Middle Third	1st	-0.844	>.05
vs.	2nd	-0.893	>.05
Lower Third	3rd	-0.715	>.05
	4th	-0.848	>.05
df= 61	Cum AA	-0.874	>.05

TABLE 66

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY
SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Score	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 134	1st	-2.590	<.01 ^a
	2nd	-2.619	<.01 ^a
	3rd	-2.602	<.01 ^a
	4th	-2.847	<.01 ^a
	Cum AA	-2.771	<.01 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 125	1st	-1.917	<.05 ^b
	2nd	-1.976	<.05 ^b
	3rd	-1.709	<.05 ^b
	4th	-2.205	<.05 ^b
	Cum AA	-2.164	<.05 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 125	1st	0.410	>.05
	2nd	0.427	>.05
	3rd	0.787	>.05
	4th	0.520	>.05
	Cum AA	0.520	>.05

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.^bSignificant difference.

Scholastic Aptitude (SRA) and Stress/Anxiety Responses.--This section first confirms the findings of the previous section by comparing those seminarians from each seminary who were ranked on the stress/anxiety composite score. Tables 67 and 68 detail the relationships. Again, no significant differences are obtained for the Q-N seminary when stress and anxiety is compared with scholastic aptitude (SRA) as measured by the Science Research Associates' battery of tests. For the Q-S seminary (see Table 68) the same type evidence indicated previously obtains. Significant differences do occur. The upper third group of those seminarians with more stress and anxiety are significantly differentiated from the middle and lower third groups for scholastic aptitude (SRA). The finding is again in the hypothesized inverse relation.

Tables 69 and 70 report on the findings when scholastic aptitude (SRA) is considered the independent variable. Following the same procedure as in previous chapters, those seminarians from each seminary who were ranked into upper, middle, and lower third groups based on the Science Research Associates composite scores were compared for mean scores on the three tests for stress and anxiety. Merton's notion of the serendipitous (unexpected) finding is observed from Table 69. When comparing the upper third group with the middle third for the third test of stress/anxiety the

mean difference would be significant except for the t-value's positive direction. When using the one-tailed test for t it is not proper to indicate significance for those mean scores that fall in the opposite tail or side of the curve. In other words, to be significant the t-value would have to be negative, indicating an inverse relationship.

Even so, the comparisons of SRA mean scores for the third stress and anxiety test at the Q-N seminary seem to indicate that higher scholastic aptitude (SRA) scores are likely to be accompanied by higher levels of stress/anxiety scores. The data do not even suggest this position from previous comparisons at Q-N.

At the Q-S seminary (Table 70) the same inverse relation as was found between academic achievement and stress/anxiety holds when comparisons are made for scholastic aptitude (SRA) and stress/anxiety responses. Those seminarians scoring in the upper third for scholastic aptitude (SRA) are likely to exhibit and/or develop less stress and anxiety as measured on Taylor's test. Also it appears that lower scholastic aptitude (SRA) is likely to be associated with higher levels of stress/anxiety responses at the Q-S seminary.

It should be additionally noted from Tables 69-A and 70-A (see appendix) that stress and anxiety mean scores appear more uniformly higher for the Q-N seminary than they do for the Q-S seminary. The same observation could be made for social class and stress/anxiety responses (see 60-A and 61-A in appendix), and for cumulative academic achievement and stress/anxiety responses (see Tables 63-A and 64-A in appendix). Data not available as yet oblige a deferential and respectable silence until such inter-seminary social class and statistical group comparisons can be made.

TABLE 67

MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR
SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON
STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 62	-0.101	>.05
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 67	-0.110	>.05
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 61	-0.010	>.05

N= 98

TABLE 68

MEAN SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) SCORE COMPARISONS FOR
SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON
STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 134	-1.872	<.05 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 125	-1.686	<.05 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 125	0.130	>.05

N= 195

^aSignificant difference.

TABLE 69

MEAN STRESS AND ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY RANK ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE
COMPOSITE SCORES--Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 63	1st	1.484	$>.05^a$
	2nd	1.453	$>.05^a$
	3rd	1.817	$>.05^b$
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 65	1st	0.622	$>.05$
	2nd	1.026	$>.05$
	3rd	1.042	$>.05$
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	1st	-0.763	$>.05$
	2nd	-0.494	$>.05$
	3rd	-0.702	$>.05$

N= 98

^aApproaching significance ($.10 > P > .05$).

^bNot significant because of positive t-value. Had the t-value been negative, significance would be indicated.

TABLE 70

MEAN STRESS AND ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY RANK ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE
COMPOSITE SCORES--Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 129	1st	1.274	>.05
	2nd	-0.157	>.05
	3rd	-0.496	>.05
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	1st	-0.589	>.05
	2nd	-1.618	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-2.488	<.01 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 128	1st	-1.861	<.05 ^c
	2nd	-1.379	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.915	<.05 ^b

N= 195

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bVery significant difference.

^cSignificant difference.

The Dogmatic Personality and Stress/Anxiety Responses.--Several important differences have thus far been noted with respect to the freshmen groups in the two minor seminaries of this research study. Since it has been previously shown that social class position is inversely related to a dogmatic personality, it seems advisable to explore the relationship of dogmatism to stress/anxiety responses in the minor seminary.

Tables 71 and 72 detail the findings when the composite rank on the stress/anxiety scale is considered the independent variable. A direct and significant relationship between these two variables is observed for the Q-S seminary as evidenced on Table 72. For the Q-N seminary (Table 71) there is some equivocation and frustration of this direct relationship. Those seminarians at Q-N seminary in the lower third for stress and anxiety responses are not likely to be differentiated from those scoring in the middle ranges for dogmatism. The opposite finding that more stress/anxiety is correlated with higher degrees for dogmatism--the closed mind--seems indicated at the Q-N seminary also.

When the composite scores are ranked for dogmatism and the mean stress/anxiety scores compared for the upper, middle, and lower third groups, several differences are observed. Tables 73 and 74 detail the data for the two seminaries. Table 74 indicates

that the direct relationship between dogmatism and stress/anxiety does not hold. For the Q-S seminarians, those ranked in the upper third--having more closed minds--are not likely to have more stress and anxiety. This is in comparison to the middle third dogmatic group. The important finding here is that only the more open minded seminarians (lower third group) at Q-S are likely to be found with scores on the Taylor test indicating fewer stress and anxiety responses.

At the Q-N seminary (Table 73) only one significant difference is observed when mean score comparisons are made for the second test for stress and anxiety. In this instance the upper third in dogmatism have significantly more stress/anxiety than the lower third group of seminarians ranked on the dogmatism continuum. The more open mind does not seem to be as associated with less stress/anxiety responses at the Q-N seminary as it does at the Q-S seminary.

A more general observation from the descriptive tables presented in the appendix to this section is that there is a tendency for the lower two-thirds of respondents to be more alike at the Q-N seminary while there seems to be a different tendency (for the upper two-thirds to be more alike) at the Q-S seminary. This appears to be the case when comparisons are made visually for the

same variable from the standpoint of the two seminaries of this study group. The tentative conclusion might be added that there are different values in the seminary situation; seminarians' attitudes seem differentially formed with respect to these values, depending on whether one "belongs to" the Q-N seminary or the Q-S seminary of this study.

TABLE 71

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--
 Q-N SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 62	1st	1.981	<.05 ^a
	2nd	2.133	<.05 ^a
	3rd	1.557	>.05 ^b
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 67	1st	1.773	<.05 ^a
	2nd	2.104	<.05 ^a
	3rd	1.794	<.05 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 61	1st	-0.182	>.05
	2nd	0.098	>.05
	3rd	0.229	>.05

N= 98

^aApproaching difference.

^bApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

TABLE 72

MEAN DOGMATISM SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--
 Q-S SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Dogmatism	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	2.737	$<.01^a$
vs.	2nd	3.824	$<.001^a$
Middle Third df= 134	3rd	2.591	$<.01^a$
Upper Third	1st	4.884	$<.001^a$
vs.	2nd	5.417	$<.001^a$
Lower Third df= 125	3rd	4.510	$<.001^a$
Middle Third	1st	2.452	$<.01^a$
vs.	2nd	1.990	$<.05^b$
Lower Third df= 125	3rd	2.239	$<.05^b$

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 73

MEAN STRESS/ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 64	1st	1.473	$>.05^a$
	2nd	1.034	$>.05$
	3rd	1.345	$>.05^a$
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 62	1st	1.655	$>.05^a$
	2nd	2.120	$<.05^b$
	3rd	1.460	$>.05^a$
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 64	1st	0.289	$>.05$
	2nd	1.127	$>.05$
	3rd	0.243	$>.05$

N= 98

^aApproaching significance ($.10 > P > .05$).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 74

MEAN STRESS/ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	1st	0.231	>.05
	2nd	1.062	>.05
	3rd	1.181	>.05
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	1st	3.658	<.001 ^a
	2nd	4.667	<.001 ^a
	3rd	5.075	<.001 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 126	1st	3.329	<.001 ^a
	2nd	3.218	<.001 ^a
	3rd	3.650	<.001 ^a

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

Anomy and Stress/Anxiety Responses.--Chapter VI indicated that a very significant and direct relationship obtained between dogmatism and anomy. It was also suggested that the tests of these two variables--anomy and dogmatism--operationalized qualitatively different variables in spite of close correlation for this seminary study. The tie-in to stress and anxiety responses was inferred and is tested here. Those ranked into upper, middle and lower third groups for the composite rank scores on the stress/anxiety scale are compared for the three successive tests for anomy. Tables 75 and 76 present the evidence from the data obtained.

At the Q-N seminary (Table 75) significant differences are found in all but two instances--between the middle and lower third groups for the first and second tests for anomy. Even here there is an impression of significance (see Table 75-A). A direct relationship between anomy and stress/anxiety appears to develop at Q-N.

At the Q-S seminary (Tables 76 and 76-A) the same observation holds true for respondents of this seminary setting as for the Q-N seminary with one important exception: the lower two groups (middle and lower third) of those seminarians ranked on the stress/anxiety scale are significantly different for the first and

second tests for anomy but not for the third. Differences for these two groups that did exist at the Q-S seminary with respect to anomy disappeared by the conclusion of the academic year.

The conclusion seems warranted that there are different values operative in the two seminaries of this study. How these values manifest themselves in terms of seminarians' attitudes and personality characteristics has been alluded to in this study. A more positive connection between seminarians' attitudes, values of the seminary, and continuation in vocation toward the priesthood must await future research.

Student Conduct Grades, Academic Achievement, Stress/Anxiety, and the Dogmatic Personality.--An additional probe into the subjective area of student conduct was undertaken. Chapter III (see Table 19) detailed the student conduct grades for the final quarter of the academic year 1967-68 at the Q-S seminary. Each seminarian started out the quarter period with a clear demerit card. For infractions of rules, misconduct, etc., he might receive demerits--each of which causes the loss of two points from an otherwise perfect (100 per cent) conduct report for the quarter. The entire faculty of the seminary is involved in that demerits may occur in or outside the classroom situation; the faculty discretion here is

TABLE 75

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 62	1st	2.746	<.01 ^a
	2nd	2.300	<.05 ^b
	3rd	1.843	<.05 ^b
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 67	1st	3.186	<.001 ^a
	2nd	3.545	<.001 ^a
	3rd	3.939	<.001 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 61	1st	0.425	>.05
	2nd	1.387	>.05 ^c
	3rd	1.708	<.05 ^b

N= 98

^aVery significant difference.

^bSignificant difference.

^cApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

TABLE 76

MEAN ANOMY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	t-Values	α
Upper Third	1st	3.011	<.001 ^a
vs.	2nd	3.748	<.001 ^a
Middle Third df= 134	3rd	4.194	<.001 ^a
Upper Third	1st	5.395	<.001 ^a
vs.	2nd	5.772	<.001 ^a
Lower Third df= 125	3rd	6.042	<.001 ^a
Middle Third	1st	2.133	<.05 ^b
vs.	2nd	2.260	<.05 ^b
Lower Third df= 125	3rd	1.588	>.05 ^c

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

^bSignificant difference.

^cApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

obvious enough to note the subjective quality of the conduct grades. Even so, the conduct grades are viewed as important by the seminary and are an important influence in the evaluation of seminarians.

The conduct grades were divided into upper, middle, and lower third groups, and the seminarians' scores for academic achievement by these groups were compared. The final quarter grade was viewed as more important for conduct because it was achieved after the initial socializing experience had worn off and the students were more likely to act "naturally." The rationale behind the probe was that subjective factors could be identified as they impinge upon academic achievement and continuation in the seminary. The assumption was made that high conduct grades would be directly correlated with high academic achievement.

Table 77 gives the findings here. The quarter academic grades and the cumulative academic achievement averages all evidence significant differences when mean score comparisons are made. Lower conduct grades are directly and significantly associated with lower academic achievement, and vice versa.

The same three groups of seminarians at the Q-S seminary that were ranked for the fourth quarter conduct grades were compared for mean scores on the Taylor test of manifest stress/anxiety.

Table 78 indicates that there is a significant difference in stress/anxiety responses for the third test between the upper and middle groups, and the upper and the lower third groups. The two lower third groups of those ranked for conduct grades were likely to evidence more stress and anxiety than the upper third group. This upper third group has developed less stress and anxiety over time.

For a final comparison the relation between dogmatism and student conduct grades was made. Again the unexpected finding is observed from Tables 79 and 79-A. Those seminarians scoring in the middle range for the dogmatism variable are evidenced to have significantly higher conduct grades. This middle range group of seminarians ranked on the dogmatism continuum are significantly differentiated from either group of seminarians ranked in the more open minded category or the more close minded category. There is also no evidenced significance between the lower conduct grades received by the upper or lower third groups. The inverted U-shaped curve for these data is most interesting. Data were not available for similar comparisons for the Q-N seminary. It is not suggested by the data available that similar findings of this section of Chapter VII would obtain for Q-N.

TABLE 77

MEAN ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT SCORE COMPARISONS FOR Q-S SEMINARY
 FRESHMEN BY RANK ON STUDENT CONDUCT GRADES
 DURING FINAL QUARTER OF ACADEMIC
 YEAR 1967-68

Conduct Rank-- Final Quarter	Academic Time Periods	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	1st	2.522	<.01 ^a
	2nd	2.868	<.01 ^a
	3rd	3.571	<.001 ^a
	4th	3.791	<.001 ^a
	Cum AA	3.385	<.001 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 133	1st	4.981	<.001 ^a
	2nd	5.379	<.001 ^a
	3rd	6.381	<.001 ^a
	4th	6.570	<.001 ^a
	Cum AA	6.131	<.001 ^a
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df=120	1st	2.089	<.05 ^b
	2nd	2.198	<.05 ^b
	3rd	2.207	<.05 ^b
	4th	2.434	<.01 ^a
	Cum AA	2.403	<.01 ^a

N= 195

^aVery significant difference.

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 78

MEAN STRESS/ANXIETY SCORE COMPARISONS FOR Q-S SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY RANK ON STUDENT CONDUCT GRADES DURING
FINAL QUARTER OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68

Conduct Rank-- Final Quarter	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	1st	-0.252	>.05
	2nd	-1.566	>.05 ^a
	3rd	-1.911	<.05 ^b
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 133	1st	0.294	>.05
	2nd	-0.931	>.05
	3rd	-2.116	<.05 ^b
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 120	1st	0.561	>.05
	2nd	0.503	>.05
	3rd	0.349	>.05

N= 195

^aApproaching significance (.10 > P > .05).

^bSignificant difference.

TABLE 79

MEAN STUDENT CONDUCT GRADE COMPARISONS FOR Q-S SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	t-Values	α
Upper Third vs. Middle Third df= 131	-2.253	<.05 ^a
Upper Third vs. Lower Third df= 127	-0.794	>.05
Middle Third vs. Lower Third df= 126	1.660	<.05 ^b

N= 195

^aSignificant difference.

^bSignificant difference, positive direction.

Summary.--The findings of this chapter lead to a rejection of the study hypothesis asserting an inverse relation between social class position and stress/anxiety responses. There is no evidence that seminarians from upper class backgrounds have or develop significantly less stress and anxiety than seminarians of middle or lower class position. The relation of stress/anxiety responses to social class appears throughout to be one of chance association in

this study.

Several additional findings where stress/anxiety responses are associated with other variables are reported in this chapter. Academic achievement is not related to stress/anxiety responses at one seminary of the study group--Q-N. However, respondents' academic grades are related to scores on Taylor's test for manifest stress and anxiety at the Q-S seminary. At this second named seminary, upper academic achievement is likely to be significantly associated with lower stress and anxiety responses. The data suggest that the upper academic achievers become less stressful and anxious during the freshman year at the Q-S seminary.

Comparisons for the entrance examination to the minor seminary--the Science Research Associates' battery of tests--with the mean scores for stress and anxiety responses indicate no significant relationships at the Q-N seminary. At the Q-S seminary higher scores for scholastic aptitude (SRA) are inversely and significantly related to lower scores for stress and anxiety. It was found that those seminarians who ranked low (lower third) for scholastic aptitude (SRA) were significantly differentiated from the others in having more stress and anxiety.

Stress/anxiety responses are directly and significantly related to scores for dogmatism and anomy. Although the particular

seminary setting seems to make a difference in certain respects, respondents with upper scores for stress/anxiety were more likely to be found with more closed minds (higher dogmatism) and more personal normlessness and deregulation (high anomie).

At the Q-S seminary student conduct grades are directly and significantly associated with academic achievement. Also at this seminary, those respondents who ranked high for conduct grades appeared to develop significantly less stress and anxiety during the freshman year when compared to the other seminarians of this study. Furthermore, it was found that those seminarians scoring in the middle ranges of the dogmatism continuum--between the open and the closed mind--have significantly higher conduct grades at Q-S.

Earlier in this chapter it was noted that two authors had found an inverse relation between social class position and symptoms of nervousness and anxiety.⁴ Their method included the conceptual framework of a two-class (non middle class) social structure. Their study population was simply split in two halves for comparisons. Variations of this method are not unique in

⁴Sewell and Haller, pp. 511-520.

social research. Schatzman and Strauss have also directed their attention to the differences between the upper and the lower classes by their inference that "these extremes were purposely chosen for maximum socio-economic contrast... ." ⁵ In this latter case a middle class was identified in the study population, but was set aside in the comparisons and analysis. Such methodological considerations appear confusing. A reader is apt to infer more than he should. By imputation the two studies mentioned above do not disregard the actual or implied presence of a potentially large segment of the population--the middle class. This disregarding of the middle class is found only in their method.

In this chapter as in the three previous, it was noted that the middle class and middle statistical groups demanded close attention. Perhaps only by framing empirical questions with this in mind will further research generate knowledge that is sociologically respectable.

⁵ Leonard Schatzman and Anselm Strauss, "Social Class and Modes of Communication," in Scott G. McNall (ed.), The Sociological Perspective (Boston, Mass.: Little, Brown, and Co., 1968), p. 109.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It is the purpose of this final chapter to summarize the findings of this research study. The law of parsimony¹ counsels succinctness and inclusiveness. The heuristic premise² obliges pointing out areas and avenues of concern for future research. The following sections of this chapter are presented from the standpoint of these two considerations.

Questions and Hypotheses Posed.--Several originating questions served to focus attention on the backgrounds of seminarians, their frames of mind, their patterned relationships, and the manner in which adjustment was made to the academic situation. Specific derivations of these questions were framed in the form of empirically answerable questions. The first year of study at two minor seminaries was a limitation imposed on this dissertation. The educational curriculum of the minor seminary is at the secondary school level--the high school.

¹Bierstedt, p. 21

²Znaniecki, in Herbert Blumer, Critiques of Research..., I, 92, 95, 96.

The empirical questions most problematic for this research were:

- (1) Are seminarians from upper class backgrounds more likely to achieve academically superior grades as compared to seminarians from middle or lower class positions?
- (2) Is the degree of close-mindedness (dogmatism) of seminarians related to social class position and academic success in the minor seminary?
- (3) Are seminarians of upper class backgrounds less likely to indicate a degree of normlessness and deregulation (anomy) than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds?
- (4) Are seminarians of upper class backgrounds less likely to exhibit stress and anxiety than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds?
- (5) Are the various selected attitudes and personality characteristics--dogmatism, personal anomy, and individual stress and anxiety--related to academic achievement as measured by grades in the minor seminary?

The variables operationalized from the above empirical

questions were:

- (1) Social class backgrounds of minor seminarians.
- (2) Academic achievement in the minor seminary.
- (3) The attitude of the open and the closed mind (dogmatism) of the minor seminarian.
- (4) The attitude of personal normlessness and deregulation (anomy) of the minor seminarian.
- (5) The state of individual stress and anxiety of the minor seminarian.

In an effort to counteract the intervening, extraneous, or confounding factor³ introduced in research, two additional variables were further operationalized.

(6) The mental ability (IQ) of the minor seminarian.

(7) The scholastic aptitude (SRA) or potential of the minor seminarian.

An additional probe was made for one of the two seminary groups for one further intervening variable. The conduct grades were taken to operationalize the somewhat subjective faculty evaluation of the students' personal adjustment to the seminary demands for conduct.

The empirical questions, current literature, and relevant theoretical considerations gave rise to four educated guesses--hypotheses--to be tested. These were that:

- (1) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will exhibit a higher academic grade placement than seminarians of middle or lower class positions.
- (2) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will show less dogmatism than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds.
- (3) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will show less disposition toward normlessness and deregulation (anomy) than seminarians of middle or lower class positions.

³Riley, pp. 403, 417, 620, 630, 633, and 635.

- (4) Seminarians of upper class backgrounds will tend to express less stress and anxiety than seminarians from middle or lower class backgrounds.

The research cases for this study were twofold: a) the individual seminarian from the standpoint of a set of attitudes, and b) the first-year subgroup of the two minor (high school level) seminaries. Two "sister" minor seminaries of the Archdiocese of Chicago with a freshmen enrollment for 1967-68 of 320 students served as the study group sample. Because of student attrition and a few instances of incomplete data, the statistical research analysis was completed on 293 respondents from the two minor seminaries designated Q-N and Q-S.

The operationalization of variables and procedures employed in gathering and analyzing the data are fully detailed in Chapter II. The critical point for re-emphasis is that this research study evaluated the study group over one year only. Data for the two intervening variables--mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA)--were completed prior to the seminarians' admission to the seminary system. Data for academic achievement, dogmatism, anomie, and individual stress/anxiety responses were gathered several times during the 1967-68 academic year. The key independent variable--social class position--was operationalized through the employment of Hollingshead's Two Factor Index of Social Position. The research

study took on a longitudinal emphasis. Data for an additional probe--the intervening variable of student conduct grades--were taken from the final academic quarter at one seminary (Q-S) only.

The Findings.--The minor seminaries of this study are located in a metropolitan setting. The seminarians commute to the seminary. The Catholic community to which the study group has reference is a majority grouping.

The faculties at each seminary have approximately the same ethnic structure as do the students. The Irish ethnic group predominates, although several of the faculty identify Polish, Italian, and other or mixed ethnic or national origins. Further, the faculties are composed of clerical and lay teachers; the proportion of priest faculty to lay faculty is approximately two-to-one at Q-S, while the number of lay teachers at Q-N would indicate this ratio to be slightly higher. Educational standards follow closely the guidelines set by the North Central Association of Schools. Accreditation with this association was secured for the first time in 1963.

The class structure origins of the faculty follow fairly closely an expected distribution with approximately two-thirds in the relatively lower classes. The same type of expected distribution (Hollingshead) was found for the class backgrounds of the

seminarians at the Q-S seminary. On the other hand, an asymmetrical class distribution was found for the Q-N seminarian respondents, indicating a much larger than anticipated middle class and lower than anticipated lower class. Thus there was a striking difference in the two seminaries of the study group here in terms of the class structure.

Mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA) for the respondents at both seminaries are higher than the national norms. The modal average for mental ability (IQ) of the study group is in the 110-119 range; the modal average for scholastic aptitude (SRA) is in the 70-79 percentile range. This is not surprising inasmuch as these two variables are used in qualifying and screening candidates to the minor seminary.

Since this research is an exploratory and descriptive study some parental background information about the minor seminarian was described in Chapter III. The parental age of the study group differed slightly by seminary and by social class. There appeared to be a tendency for the Q-N seminary to have younger parents, particularly in the upper classes. Also it seems that for this study, higher parental age is associated with lower social status.

Irish ethnicity predominates at both seminaries seemingly without regard to class backgrounds. At the Q-S seminary the

Polish and Negro parental backgrounds heavily weight the lower classes; the same is not true for the Q-N seminary. There is also great diversity of ethnic or national origins from both seminaries. An impressionistic observation was made that minor seminarians seemed more likely to react to the ethnic origins of others than they were to social class position.

The familial place of residence differs by seminary in terms of city or suburban location. Greater numbers from all social classes live in the city from the Q-S seminary; at the Q-N seminary (which is centrally located) the upper and middle classes are relatively overweighted for suburban place of residence. It is obvious, then, that a large number of seminarians commute long distances to the Q-N seminary.

Class backgrounds seemed to make a difference in the parental judgment of the respondents' qualities as students. Lower class parents from the Q-N and Q-S seminaries tended to evaluate their sons as "average" while upper class parents tended to evaluate them as "very good." The middle class parents seemed to vary by seminary for this attitude. The middle class parents were more like the lower class parents at the Q-N seminary; the middle class parents were more like the upper class parents at the Q-S seminary for this same attitude.

Questionnaires regarding the seminarians' grammar school and parish background were returned prior to entry into the seminary (see appendices E and F). They were completed by the grammar school principal and the pastor, respectively. These questionnaires were also used in the selection and screening process to the minor seminary. A careful appraisal of these questionnaires leads to a conclusion that they are of doubtful reliability and perhaps even validity. Only minor variations in responses for the principal and pastor were noted, with an overall tendency for choosing "acceptable" categories of response.

The variables of dogmatism, anomy, and stress/anxiety responses for the two seminaries seem comparable. Some visually observed differences by seminary comparisons would have to be discounted at this time inasmuch as tests of significant differences between seminaries were not conducted. It should be additionally noted that the range of scores for these three variables--dogmatism, anomy, and stress/anxiety--would fit well the type of distribution anticipated. In other words, there were large enough numbers of respondents in the "high" and "low" categories for comparative purposes. There seemed to be no unusual clustering about the mean scores.

The final quarter conduct grades at the Q-S seminary indicate that a very small minority--0.5 per cent--of seminarians would be subject to dismissal for disciplinary reasons. Another 8.9 per cent received conduct grades expressing official displeasure. Almost half of the respondents at the Q-S seminary--48.6 per cent--received three or less demerits during the final quarter, and by the seminary's own standards for conduct would be rated as excellent students--an A grade.

For the second semester grades at the Q-S seminary only eighteen failing grades were recorded in all academic subject areas. This represented about 1.9 per cent of the possibilities for failure. Since the eighteen subject failures also included multiple failures by individual students, it appears that relatively few seminarians actually "flunk" out.

Again from the impressionistic and descriptive standpoint, it is probable that the minor seminarians of this study group are aware of an attitude of deference directed toward them by priests, parents, and relatives. Quite often they speak of being "over-protected." On the surface, few seem to rebel against this attitude. Many seem to adopt an attitude of indifference, while a sizable minority seem to develop an attitude of condescension

to this deferential behavior. It is interesting to note that minor seminarians do not seem to get this deference from siblings or former peers who are not seminarians.

There is a great deal of social interaction among the seminarians at each of the seminaries of the study group. As mentioned previously, the young seminarian seems more likely to evaluate others in terms of ethnicity, the type of clothing worn, and the amount of spending money available. Perhaps they share this attitude with other high school students. In any case the interaction among seminarians crosses over social class boundaries and appears to gain momentum during the years of study at the minor seminary. Little research has been accomplished in this area however.

Sisters who taught the study group members prior to entry into the seminary do not seem to represent an unanimous front either "for" or "against" the seminary. This seems attested by the seminary's efforts to "re-educate" them through various public relations programs and all-day seminars designed to show the present curriculum and objectives of seminary training. These efforts would not be incompatible with secondary school objectives in general. Such programs are unique in the history of the minor seminary, however, and are all the more interesting in view of the probability that in the past the minor seminary had unquestioned

support from the teaching sisters in the parochial grammar school.

Only a modest commitment to a religious vocation is expected from the minor seminarian. On the other hand, without this verbalized "contract" from freshmen, rejection to the seminary would result. There is a change occurring in the minor seminary today. The indications are clear that it is becoming more versatile. Whether or not it will evolve into a type of Christian leadership school remains for the future.

Chapter IV detailed the statistical levels of significance between social class backgrounds and academic achievement. Also, the variables of mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA) were analyzed. No relationship was found between social class and academic achievement for this research study. Three significantly different t-values were evidenced at Q-S between the upper and lower social classes but the weight of evidence was insufficient to indicate a finding of a direct or inverse relationship.

Social class backgrounds at the Q-N seminary were associated with mental ability (IQ). The upper class was clearly higher in mental ability (IQ) than either the middle or lower classes. Differences for this variable were insignificant at the Q-S seminary, although the combined social classes of the two seminaries of the study group indicated that the upper class was significantly

higher for mental ability (IQ) than the lower class.

At the Q-S seminary the upper class seminarians showed significantly higher scholastic aptitude (SRA) than the lower class. Insignificant differences between social class and scholastic aptitudes (SRA) obtained at the Q-N seminary. Again the combined social classes for the two seminaries of the study group resulted in the upper class being clearly differentiated from the lower class in having higher scores for scholastic aptitude (SRA).

Mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA) were both very significantly and positively related to each other. Also, scholastic aptitude (SRA) was very significantly and positively related to academic achievement. But while mental ability (IQ) was very significantly and positively related to academic achievement at the Q-S seminary, the lower two-thirds of academic achievers at the Q-N seminary were not significantly differentiated for mental ability (IQ). The inference seems clear that the definition of the seminary situation intervenes for the respondents of the two different seminaries of the study group.

The middle social class and "middle third" groups of seminarians seem to take on a "pivotal" reference. By this it is meant that these middle classes and middle statistical groups are more closely associated with those ranked above or below them for

a particular variable, depending on the situation--in particular, the seminary situation.

Some evidence of change in academic achievement occurred during the freshman year of study. By and large, the changes were insignificant or inconclusive. And yet, in spite of the absence of general patterns of social class being associated with academic achievement, the positive direction of mean scores and the few significant and near significant differences in academic achievement for the social classes indicate that more subtle research ought to be undertaken. While this research concludes that for the freshmen study group class backgrounds are not clearly related to academic achievement, academic achievement is related to factors that are in turn class-related. It is repeated for emphasis that this study concerns itself with only the freshmen and the first year of study at the minor seminary. With the total seminary experience in perspective this is indeed a relatively short time in the educational and socialization process of the minor seminary.

Chapter V reported on the findings with regard to social class, dogmatism, academic achievement, and the admission tests to the minor seminary. In general, it was found that dogmatism was significantly and inversely related to social class position.

The middle class was more like the lower class at the Q-N seminary but more like the upper class at the Q-S seminary for this variable. The evidence indicated that the upper class seems to develop more open-mindedness.

Seminarians with more open-mindedness are likely to have higher academic achievement than those scoring high for dogmatism--more close-mindedness. On the other hand, seminarians scoring in the middle ranges of the belief-disbelief continuum do very well on academic achievement. The same holds true for mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA), although the particular seminary setting makes a difference. At the Q-S seminary those distinguished by more open-mindedness score just slightly higher (though not significantly so) for mental ability (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA) than those seminarians ranked in the middle range for dogmatism. In any case while the dogmatic personality is associated with less academic achievement, mental ability (IQ), and scholastic aptitude (SRA), the more open minded personality is not significantly differentiated from those scoring in the middle ranges for dogmatism on these three variables.

One admission and screening test to the minor seminary--the Science Research Associates' battery of tests--significantly differentiates the more dogmatic personality from the less dogmatic.

The relationship is inverse and the particular seminary makes a difference. During the freshman year of study the upper third in scholastic aptitude (SRA) at the Q-N seminary became less dogmatic while the lower third at the Q-S seminary became more dogmatic. This is the reason for the accentuated significant differences here. Further--for scholastic aptitude (SRA)--the lower two-thirds are more alike at the Q-N seminary and the upper two-thirds are more alike at the Q-S seminary. A possible conclusion is that somehow the social system of the particular seminary is differentially evaluating the open and the closed personality and that the minor seminarians become aware of this "policy." Those seminarians in the middle group seem to fit their attitudes on dogmatism to the local environment.

In Chapter VI an analysis of data was made among social class, anomy, academic achievement, the admission tests, and dogmatism. The general finding is one of no relationship for normlessness and deregulation between the upper and the middle social classes. Although this is the case for this research study, significant differences were observed when the extremes of the social class structure--the upper vs. the lower--were compared for mean score differences on the anomy variable. If the middle classes at each seminary of the study group were ignored then a significant

inverse relation would obtain for social class and anomy. However, such methodological considerations are not acceptable in this research study. Again, the particular seminary setting makes a difference even for gross comparisons.

High Anomy was likely to be significantly associated with low academic achievement and mental ability (IQ). Lower scores on the scholastic aptitude (SRA) admission test are significantly associated with high anomy at the Q-S seminary during the whole first year of study; the same inverse pattern becomes the case during the freshman year of study at the Q-N seminary. The seminary setting again makes a difference in the degree and manner in which anomy is a factor in academic achievement, mental ability (IQ), and scholastic aptitude (SRA).

Unlike the dogmatism variable, lower scores for anomy do seem to be correlated with higher academic achievement, mental ability (IQ), and scholastic aptitude (SRA). In other words the observation of a continuous inverse relation pertains. This is one indication that the tests for dogmatism and anomy operationalize qualitatively different variables in spite of the observation that dogmatism and anomy mean scores were significantly and directly related to each other.

The social class backgrounds of the seminarians were analyzed with reference to stress/anxiety responses, academic achievement, and related factors in Chapter VII. Social class position was not found to be an influence for greater or less stress and anxiety responses. Chance relationships were obtained for data from each seminary and when both seminaries were compared. There was no evidence of class becoming a factor for more or less stress and anxiety during the freshman year of study.

Academic achievement is inversely associated with stress/anxiety responses at one seminary (Q-S) but not at the other (Q-N). Less stress and anxiety at the Q-S seminary is not related to better academic achievement when comparisons are made with those scoring in the middle ranges for this variable. In this sense, then, it is like the dogmatism variable.

Scholastic aptitude (SRA) is inversely related to stress/anxiety responses at the Q-S seminary. The upper scholastic aptitude (SRA) group at Q-S develop less stress and anxiety during the freshman year. An opposite finding for the Q-N seminary seems indicated. The higher or upper scholastic aptitude (SRA) group shows higher (although not significantly so) stress and anxiety responses.

Lower stress and anxiety at the Q-S seminary is significantly related to less dogmatism. Such is not the case at the Q-N seminary. Higher stress and anxiety at both seminaries of the study group is associated with the closed mind--more dogmatism--although more significantly so at the Q-S seminary.

High anomy scores and high stress/anxiety responses are significantly related for the study group. The relationship of low anomy scores and low stress/anxiety responses differs by seminary. At the Q-N seminary a direct relation between stress/anxiety and anomy develops during the freshman year from the first to the third test for anomy; at the Q-S seminary, a direct and significant relationship between low anomy and low stress/anxiety responses disappears during the freshman year of study--from the first to the third test of the anomy variable.

Conduct grades (taken only at Q-S) for the final quarter of the 1967-68 academic year were directly and significantly related to academic achievement. Higher conduct grades became significantly associated with lower stress and anxiety responses. Also, the middle third group on the dogmatism scale had significantly higher conduct grades. It seems that both the open and the closed minds at the extremes of this continuum are associated significantly with lower conduct grades.

Acceptance and/or Rejection of Hypotheses.--This research study began with four hypotheses (see pages 224-225). One was accepted on the basis of the evidence presented. Minor seminarians of upper class backgrounds do exhibit less dogmatism than seminarians of middle or lower class backgrounds. Furthermore, during the freshman year, social class position became inversely associated with the degree of openness or closedness of the belief system; more open mindedness became associated with the upper class seminarian and greater dogmatism became associated with the lower class.

The three other hypotheses of this study were not confirmed on the basis of the evidence. Social class backgrounds were not related to academic achievement for the freshman study group. Upper class seminarians were not likely to have less normlessness and deregulation than the middle class--although the upper and the middle class seminarians are significantly differentiated (inversely) from the lower class. Finally, social class position is not significantly related to the degree of stress and anxiety responses of minor seminarians of this study.

Even though three hypotheses of this present study were not confirmed it is necessary to realize the implications of this for the problem area of this study and for methodological considerations in general. The conclusion of no relationship between the

key variable of social class and the dependent variables of academic achievement, anomy, and stress/anxiety responses for this study is of itself very consequential. Further study might well build on these observations. It was also noted that the framing of questions and hypotheses for any research study give rise to investigative methods that in turn structure the findings. Such was the case, for instance, when--in Chapter VI--it was noted that this present research study's concern for the reality of the middle social class obviated a finding of significant inverse relation for social class position and anomy.

Along this same line, Deutsch and Krauss further add that even when observables can be coordinated to constructs, however, it is rarely the case that any given observation or experiment, by itself, will be crucial in determining whether a particular hypothesis that is deduced from a theory will be rejected or accepted. If the results of an experiment are negative for a given hypothesis, one may "save" the hypothesis by rejecting as inappropriate the particular operational definition of the construct involved in the hypothesis.⁴

These authors further clarify this position by noting that the rejection of the operationalization of variables (constructs)

⁴Morton Deutsch and Robert M. Krauss, Theories in Social Psychology (N. Y.: Basic Books, Inc., 1965), pp. 9-10.

depends largely upon the investment and rationale involved in the original linkage to observables.⁵

All of this would give an additional impetus for continuing research along these same lines and in this area. Fruitful extensions to theory ought to build not only upon the verified but also the unverified hypotheses of past research. The variable or construct of academic achievement has a most facile operational extension in terms of student grades. Perhaps it is too easy. It appears that a recent educational issue seriously questions the appropriateness of the academic achievement/student grade linkage. This is attested by the development of curricula where grades are either minimized or all but done away with for students. Indeed, this present research study, by showing a close connection between conduct grades and academic achievement grades, would extend the operation of academic achievement into a very subjective and yet highly significant area. As noted previously, the concern of this research study was with the freshmen seminarian. No data have been presented that refer to the sophomore, junior, or senior seminarians at the minor seminary.

⁵Ibid., p. 10

Relevance to Theory.--Several approaches to sociological theory at the "middle ranges" have already been set forth in the summaries of preceding chapters. The four study hypotheses were concerned with issues reported in the literature where ambiguities or discrepancies were noted. The findings tended to support an inverse relation between social class position and dogmatism, and no relationship between social class and the variables of academic achievement and stress/anxiety responses. The connection between social class and anomie was not acceptable to confirm the posed relation for this study.

A more general finding related to the middle class and middle statistical groups of this study. It appears that respondents in this class and in these statistical categories (middle groups) were much more able to change in the direction of the upper or lower classes or statistical groups for particular attitudes, beliefs, or states depending on the situation. It is inferred that the respondents reacted to various sets of "givens"--values in their definition of the situation. For this study the situation was the minor seminary but was further influenced by the conditions characteristic of the setting, whether Q-N or Q-S. Without specifying the conditions of the situation, it is not likely that accurate prediction can be had as to which direction the middle

class and middle statistical groups will take.

Much the same point is considered by Mizruchi. Even though finding an inverse relation between social class and anomie, he further stated:

Among the extensive findings, was that although there was a generally greater tendency for lower class respondents to obtain high scores on Srole's anomie scale, when multivariate analysis was utilized it was those in the relatively higher classes who were significantly more frustrated when they felt that their opportunities were circumscribed than were those in the lower classes. The same relationship held for employment status. Thus it was not the lower classes who felt the greatest impact of limited opportunity to attain success goals, it was the middle classes.⁶

Burton has implicitly made this assumption as was earlier noted in that he assumed the middle class students would prefer the "...less controlled behaviors of the lower classes."⁷ In order to know why--if it does--the middle class might have such attitudes, it is first necessary to know the conditions under which the posed relationships are said to exist. This consideration is reinforced by this present research study.

A further methodological and theoretical implication seems

⁶Ephraim H. Mizruchi, "Alienation, Anomie and the American Dream," in Ephraim H. Mizruchi (ed.), The Substance of Sociology (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Pub. Co., 1967), p. 552. Italics (underlining) added.

⁷Burton, p. 223.

indicated by this present study. Whenever continuous variables are hypothesized to be directly or inversely related to each other, the notion of simple articulation is quite often implied or explicit. In other words, one whole continuous variable is posited to be directly or inversely related to another whole continuous variable. Such an articulation need not be the case. It is conceivable at this juncture, for instance, to indicate that those seminarians who take a middle position on the belief-disbelief continuum have higher conduct grades and are in "better" standing with the seminary faculty and administration than those seminarians who have either more open or more closed minds. The point being made is that it is necessary to pay attention to the complexities of relationships when framing empirical questions and hypotheses.

Znaniecki's systematic theory connected the attitude of individuals to the values of society through the definition of the situation. That multiple social action outcomes were evident was critical in this early formulation. He further delineated the concept of attitude, noting that as "...the concept of active tendency helps us compare all kinds of actions--so then the concept of attitude helps us compare all kinds of definitions of the

situation."⁸ The lesson to be learned here is that certain regularities of the seminary are evident from what is known about the minor seminarians' attitudes. If Znaniecki's theory holds, the kinds of definitions of the situation learned from the attitudes of seminarians should illuminate values within the seminary. Although this appears to be the case, further study is awaited to make the empirically verifiable connections.

Implications for the Future.--Many questions remain unanswered and await further exploration. There are two levels of questions that mutually overlap: questions dealing with general sociological theory and questions addressed to problem-solving. For the purpose of this study's implications they will not be separated. Some of the most important empirical questions for future research are:

- (1) Does academic achievement "become" associated with social class during the remaining years of study in the minor seminary and on through the major seminary educational process?
- (2) Do seminarians from upper class backgrounds continue to have more openness of mind (less dogmatism) through the seminary years of study? Do lower class seminarians continue to be more dogmatic in their attitudes?
- (3) Does the close relationship for lower normlessness and deregulation (anomy) continue to describe the upper and middle classes?

⁸Znaniecki, *Cultural Sciences: Their Origin...*, 252.

- (4) Do stress and anxiety responses "become" related to social class during the latter years of study at the seminary?
- (5) Is the one seminary (Q-N) significantly different from the other (Q-S) for social class and the related variables presented in this study?
- (6) Does the middle range for dogmatism continue to be significantly associated with higher academic achievement in the seminary?
- (7) Do the standardized tests for intelligence (IQ) and scholastic aptitude (SRA) continue to be so closely associated with social class and academic achievement?
- (8) Is there a significant difference by place of residence --suburban or city--for academic achievement and related variables?
- (9) Does ethnicity make a difference for academic achievement and related variables of this study?
- (10) Do seminarians scoring high on the subjective conduct grades "become" associated with any particular social class?

Finally, it was suggested that the findings presented here could be tested with regard to other theoretical empirical systems.⁹ By this it is meant that other parochial, denominational, or private schools might well have the approximate social settings that would allow for operational extension. What has been learned here might well be applicable to other schools and systems. Such might

⁹W. W. Lambert, "Stimulus Response Contiguity and Reinforcement Theory," in Gardner Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954), Vol. 1, Chap. 2.

be the case for a large number of high schools and small colleges that educate along limited vocational lines--e.g., college preparatory schools, engineering schools, nursing schools, teachers colleges, and the like.

Concluding Remarks.--Religious institutions continue to change in time as do other social institutions. A prime concern with particular religious institutions has been and remains with the functionaries that carry out expressive and integrative tasks within religious organizations. In order to better understand the clerical role in full operation it is first necessary to know the whole process of professionalization. Glock further amplifies this point when he notes that

...the processes by which the raw recruit comes to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and values of the profession through his seminary training, and the prior question of the underlying values which have governed the development of seminary curricula, have not been examined comprehensively. Donovan's study perhaps, comes closest to filling this gap, at least for the Roman Catholic seminary and its seminarians. However, even this study touches only lightly on the core question of what ideas, values, beliefs, and conceptions of clerical role the candidate brings with him and how these are reshaped and elaborated by seminary training. Research on the educational process in all the professions has been neglected. It is to be hoped, however, that work parallel to the current study on medical education by Merton and his associates might be done for

seminary education.¹⁰

Donovan's study was concerned with the Catholic priest and was completed in 1951.¹¹ Merton and his associates studied selected cohorts of medical students from the time of entrance to graduation from medical school.¹²

It is generally recognized that three stages are represented in the "...professionalization process: recruitment, training, and the assumption and practice of the professional role."¹³ More attention has focused on the middle-stage--training. Still more emphasis has been placed on the psychological and personality development components of the seminarian. Gradually, the recognition has come about that a thorough understanding is only feasible when the seminarian is studied within a defined social

¹⁰Charles Y. Glock, "The Sociology of Religion," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (ed.), Sociology Today (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1959), pp. 165-166.

¹¹J. D. Donovan, "The Catholic Priest" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951).

¹²Robert K. Merton, George Reader, and Patricia Kendall, The Student-Physician (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957).

¹³Glock, p. 165.

or organizational setting. The organization requires study as well.

Just as the role of the cleric cannot be understood without reference to a community or congregation, so then the role of the seminarian cannot be fully comprehended or appreciated without knowing the seminary--the values, organization, and patterned relationships that are deeply entrenched in the system. The role and the setting have intrinsic ties. So also have the stages in the developmental process of the professional role.

Some of today's minor seminarians will be the ordained priests of tomorrow. They will not only take on the roles of religious functionaries in a limited setting; they will go on to be the leaders within a larger Christian community. Their formative years of training will undoubtedly have a major effect on their later behavior. Also, those former seminarians who go on to various professional and social roles may assume positions of leadership in the larger Christian community. The socializing experience of earlier seminary training will presumably have its impact. It is hoped that this limited research study will shed some light not only on the present but also on the future of the institutionalized church.

APPENDIX A

DOGMATISM SCALE- FORM E
(Rokeach, Milton. 1960)

INSTRUCTIONS:

(The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement in the left margin according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please check every one (x).

For simplicity the six marking places for each statement are labeled strongly positive to strongly negative; positive means agreeing while negative means disagreeing; between these two extremes you may expect to "lean" in one direction or the other. Thus you may: AGREE STRONGLY (+++); AGREE ON THE WHOLE (++) ; AGREE A LITTLE (+); OR you may: DISAGREE A LITTLE (-); DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE (--); or DISAGREE STRONGLY (---).)

AGREE DISAGREE

+++++ + - - - - -
() () () () () ()

1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.
2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are the most intelligent.
3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.
5. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.
6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.
7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.
8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.
9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.

AGREE DISAGREE

- +++++ + - - - - -
 () () () () () () 10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.
- () () () () () () 11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.
- () () () () () () 12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.
- () () () () () () 13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.
- () () () () () () 14. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.
- () () () () () () 15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.
- () () () () () () 16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.
- () () () () () () 17. If given the chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.
- () () () () () () 18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.
- () () () () () () 19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.
- () () () () () () 20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- () () () () () () 21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.
- () () () () () () 22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
- () () () () () () 23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
- () () () () () () 24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
- () () () () () () 25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
- () () () () () () 26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
- () () () () () () 27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.

AGREE

DISAGREE

+++ ++ +
() () () () () ()

- () () () () () () 28. In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.
- () () () () () () 29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.
- () () () () () () 30. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.
- () () () () () () 31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.
- () () () () () () 32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.
- () () () () () () 33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.
- () () () () () () 34. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.
- () () () () () () 35. It is often desirable to reserve judgement about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.
- () () () () () () 36. In the long run the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.
- () () () () () () 37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.
- () () () () () () 38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."
- () () () () () () 39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.
- () () () () () () 40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

APPENDIX B

ANOMY SCALE (PAB Sample)
(McCloskey, Herbert, and John H. Schaar. 1965)

DIRECTIONS:

(Place a check in the appropriate place in the left margin. You will tend to agree with the statement or disagree with it. In any case there will be others who will agree with you in your judgement. Please check an agreement or disagreement for each statement.)

AGREE DISAGREE

- | | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| _____ | _____ | 1. With everything so uncertain these days, it almost seems as though anything could happen. |
| _____ | _____ | 2. What is lacking in the world today is the old kind of friendship that lasted for a lifetime. |
| _____ | _____ | 3. With everything in such a state of disorder, it's hard for a person to know where he stands from one day to the next. |
| _____ | _____ | 4. Everything changes so quickly these days that I often have trouble deciding which are the right rules to follow. |
| _____ | _____ | 5. I often feel that many things our parents stood for are just going to ruin before our very eyes. |
| _____ | _____ | 6. The trouble with the world today is that most people really don't believe in anything. |
| _____ | _____ | 7. I often feel awkward and out of place. |
| _____ | _____ | 8. People were better off in the old days when everyone knew just how he was expected to act. |
| _____ | _____ | 9. It seems to me that other people find it easier to decide what is right than I do. |

APPENDIX C

PERSONALITY SCALE (Taylor, Janet A., 1953)

DIRECTIONS:

(Circle the "T" (true) or the "F" (false) for each item as it applies to yourself. All items should be answered. Individual persons may differ in their judgement of the truth or false-ness of any statement.)

TRUE FALSE

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| T | F | 1. I do not tire quickly. |
| T | F | 2. I am troubled by attacks of nausea. |
| T | F | 3. I believe I am more nervous than most others. |
| T | F | 4. I have very few headaches. |
| T | F | 5. I work under a great deal of tension. |
| T | F | 6. I cannot keep my mind on one thing. |
| T | F | 7. I worry over money and business. |
| T | F | 8. I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something. |
| T | F | 9. I blush no more than others. |
| T | F | 10. I have diarrhea once a month or more. |
| T | F | 11. I worry quite a bit over possible misfortunes. |
| T | F | 12. I practically never blush. |
| T | F | 13. I am often afraid that I am going to blush. |
| T | F | 14. I have nightmares every few nights. |
| T | F | 15. My hands and feet are usually warm enough. |
| T | F | 16. I sweat very easily even on cool days. |
| T | F | 17. Sometimes when embarrassed, I break out in a sweat which annoys me greatly. |
| T | F | 18. I hardly ever notice my heart pounding and I am seldom short of breath. |

- T F 19. I feel hungry almost all the time.
- T F 20. I am very seldom troubled by constipation.
- T F 21. I have a great deal of stomach trouble.
- T F 22. I have periods in which I lost sleep over worry.
- T F 23. My sleep is restless and disturbed.
- T F 24. I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.
- T F 25. I am easily embarrassed.
- T F 26. I am more sensitive than most other people.
- T F 27. I frequently find myself worrying about something.
- T F 28. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
- T F 29. I am usually calm and not easily upset.
- T F 30. I cry easily.
- T F 31. I feel anxiety about something or someone almost all the time.
- T F 32. I am happy most of the time.
- T F 33. It makes me nervous to have to wait.
- T F 34. I have periods of such great restlessness that I cannot sit long in a chair.
- T F 35. Sometimes I become so excited that I find it hard to get to sleep.
- T F 36. I have sometimes felt that difficulties were piling up so high that I could not overcome them.
- T F 37. I admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter.
- T F 38. I have very few fears compared to my friends.
- T F 39. I have been afraid of things or people that I know could not hurt me.
- T F 40. I certainly feel useless at times.

- T F 41. I find it hard to keep my mind on a task or job.
- T F 42. I am usually self-conscious.
- T F 43. I am inclined to take things hard.
- T F 44. I am a high-strung person.
- T F 45. Life is a strain for me much of the time.
- T F 46. At times I think I am no good at all.
- T F 47. I am certainly lacking in self-confidence.
- T F 48. I sometimes feel that I am about to go to pieces.
- T F 49. I shrink from facing a crisis or difficulty.
- T F 50. I am entirely self-confident.

APPENDIX D

GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR APPLICANTS TO
QUIGLEY

Name: _____
Last First Middle

Home Address: _____
Number Street Apartment Number

Phone Number: _____
Area Code Number

Age of Applicant: _____

Today's Date: _____

FAMILY HISTORY:

1. Owned: House _____ Apartment _____
Rented: House _____ Apartment _____ Room _____

2. Age of Parents, if living:
Father _____ Mother _____

3. If Parents are not living, give year of Death:
Father _____ Step or Foster Father _____
Mother _____ Step or Foster Mother _____

4. If Parents are separated or divorced, give date:
Separated _____ Divorced _____

5. If either Parent is remarried, give date of marriage:
Father _____ Mother _____

6. Occupation or former occupation of Parents:
Father: Present _____
Former, if any _____
Mother: Present _____
Former, if any _____

7. Education of Parents (Circle highest year completed)
Father: Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
High School 1 2 3 4
College 1 2 3 4
Graduate studies _____ Specialty _____

8. Mother: Elementary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
High School 1 2 3 4
College 1 2 3 4
Graduate studies _____ Specialty _____

9. Religion of Father: _____
Practicing _____ Non-practicing _____

10. Religion of Mother: _____
Practicing _____ Non-practicing _____

11. Family members in Religious Life:
Number _____
Relationship to Applicant _____
Diocese or Religious Community _____

2. Children in Family (Rank Order)

INTERVIEWER'S NOTES

Name	Age	Work/School	Health

3. Which sibling is applicant closest to:

4. Other people living in home:

HEALTH HISTORY:

5. Health of Parents (if ill, describe nature of illness):

Father _____

Mother _____

6. a) Is there any chronic illness in his family?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, describe briefly _____

b) Alcoholism: Yes _____ No _____

c) Mental illness: Yes _____ No _____

7. Was there any complication or difficulty at birth of applicant?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, describe briefly _____

Has applicant ever had any serious accidents?

Yes _____ No _____
 If yes, specify: Age _____ Nature of illness _____

1. _____

2. _____

Has he ever been hospitalized?

Yes _____ No _____
 If yes, specify: Age _____ Nature of hospitalization _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Does he have any physical handicaps?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, describe _____

Indicate his height _____ Current weight _____

The most he has weighed _____

When _____

Place a check mark after those that apply to applicant:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> bedwetting | <input type="checkbox"/> asthma |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sleepwalking | <input type="checkbox"/> hay fever |
| <input type="checkbox"/> night terrors | <input type="checkbox"/> allergies |
| <input type="checkbox"/> diet or eating problem | <input type="checkbox"/> severe constipation or diarrhea |
| <input type="checkbox"/> weight problem | <input type="checkbox"/> twitching |
| <input type="checkbox"/> insomnia | <input type="checkbox"/> diabetes |
| <input type="checkbox"/> stuttering | <input type="checkbox"/> habit problem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> coughing | <input type="checkbox"/> sick headaches |
| <input type="checkbox"/> homesickness | <input type="checkbox"/> breathing problem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> dizzy spells | <input type="checkbox"/> heart trouble |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fainting spells | <input type="checkbox"/> lung trouble |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fits or spasms | <input type="checkbox"/> stomach trouble |
| <input type="checkbox"/> blackouts | <input type="checkbox"/> kidney trouble |
| <input type="checkbox"/> head injury | <input type="checkbox"/> ulcers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> backaches | <input type="checkbox"/> flat feet |
| <input type="checkbox"/> hearing problem | <input type="checkbox"/> nervous trouble |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sight problem | <input type="checkbox"/> morbid fears or scruples |
| <input type="checkbox"/> rupture | <input type="checkbox"/> trouble with mood swings |
| <input type="checkbox"/> psychological or psychiatric treatment | |

SCHOOL HISTORY:

INTERVIEWER'S NOTES

What kind of student is he?

Very good _____

Average _____

Below average _____

School problems, if any _____

Hobbies or special interests _____

SOCIAL HISTORY:

Does he have close personal friends?

Yes _____ No _____

How does he relate to the opposite sex?

Do you approve of his friends?

Yes _____ No _____

a) Please describe his personality, Father's view:

b) Please describe his personality, Mother's view:

From your experience, what do you consider to be his greatest weakness?

a) Father's view _____

b) Mother's view _____

31. What do you consider his strongest qualities?

a) Father's view _____

b) Mother's view _____

2. Which parent does he resemble more (personality-wise)?

PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

GRAMMAR SCHOOL REPORT

TO BE FILLED IN BY PRINCIPAL IN COLLABORATION WITH TEACHER

Name _____ Parish _____ CITY _____

Home Address _____ Parish Address _____

School _____

PHYSICAL General state of health _____

Has he had any serious illness? _____

Has he any physical defects, such as poor eyesight, deafness, lameness, heart ailment, etc.? _____

Any serious injury from accidents, etc.? _____

ACADEMICAL General Average _____ English Average _____ Math Average _____

Standing in class _____ Number in class _____

Intelligence or Aptitude Test			
Name & Form	Date	I. Q.	%-ile

Achievement Tests			
Name & Form	Date	Area	%-ile

Parents' cooperation with school _____

Parents' attitude toward son's entrance into the seminary _____

PERSONALITY TRAITS Please check the descriptions which best characterize the applicant.

- MATURITY OF VOCATION**
 - More interested in the world
 - Vacillating, hot and cold
 - Just recently interested
 - Steady interest for year or more
 - Seriously interested, confident, working at it

- GENEROSITY**
 - Ready to serve even in face of personal sacrifices
 - Generally concerned, volunteers at times
 - Slow to respond to needs of others, but does with prodding
 - Complains about demands on him; eyes return or reward when he helps out
 - Selfish, resents demands, excuses himself from having to help

3. SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT

- At work or play ready to meet others; mixes very well
- Friendly, not given to quarrel or argument
- Gets along with others, but seldom initiates relationships
- Shy, hesitant about individual and group contacts
- Clannish, restrictive in associations; indifferent to others
- Argumentative, unable to sustain friendly relationships
- Anti-social, lone wolf

4. MANLINESS

- Unaffected, wholesome
- Manly in manner and speech
- Affected in manner and speech
- Old womanish, gossipy
- Effeminate

5. LEADERSHIP

- Unusually competent, initiates and follows through; accepted as leader
- Often shows initiative, makes suggestions; ready to lead
- Sometimes leads in minor activities; will take on tasks, if encouraged
- Seldom leads, prefers others to plan; generally follows; no suggestions
- Avoids all responsibility; probably unable to lead

6. PERSONAL HABITS AND APPEARANCE

- Well-groomed; fine taste, meets occasions
- Reasonably well-groomed, good impression
- Without taste, but clean and usually neat
- Careless, unconcerned
- Slovenly, resentful of legitimate criticism

7. WILLINGNESS TO PROFIT BY CORRECTION

- Markedly willing, anxious to improve
- Generally responds well; docile
- Listens, but needs re-telling first before responding
- Passive, fails to amend
- Shows disbelief, temper or resentment when corrected
- Disrespectful, shows hostile feelings

8. COOPERATION, WILLINGNESS TO WORK

- Eager, usually does more than required
- Steady, occasionally goes out of his way
- Generally willing, but not beyond the required tasks
- Slow to respond, often does not follow up, lazy
- Needs much prodding, minimal effort at best; self-indulgent

9. OPENNESS OF CHARACTER

- Very straightforward, frank, communicative; utter honesty
- Usually frank and communicative
- Angles his response to fit the questioner; basically sincere
- Tends to be evasive, limits area and degree of communication
- Closed, incommunicative; solid wall

10. RELIABILITY, SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

- Outstanding fidelity; thoroughly dependable
- Willing to assume obligations; does a good job
- Ordinarily performs tasks satisfactorily; usually reliable
- Often needs supervision; reliability uncertain, whimsical
- Unreliable, neglects promises and obligations

11. COMMON SENSE AND JUDGMENT

- Manifests good sense and tact
- Has the good sense expected of his age
- Varies; fails to grasp situations
- Shows poor judgment, unaware of failure
- One-sided view, distrustful of others

12. STABILITY AND MATURITY

- Clearly purposive, constant, and well-adjusted
- Well-balanced, takes things in stride; steady
- Gets unsettled or nervous in situations; adjusts with difficulty
- Preoccupied with self; childish, desirous of attention
- Hyperemotional, excitable, flighty, loses perspective

13. PIETY AND SPIRIT OF RELIGION

- Unassumingly pious, reverent, and zealous; wholehearted commitment; very frequent communicant
- Concerned with growth, open to suggestion and development; weekly communicant
- Passive piety, undistinguishable from his peers, but with some interest
- Casual, responds only when prodded; minimal response
- Flippant and sophisticated in matters spiritual

14. STUDY HABITS

- Seeks extra work; does assigned work completely and with excellence
- Faithful to assigned work; achievement usual for his age
- Needs occasional prodding; varies in performance
- Needs constant prodding; produces only with sanctions
- Seldom works even under pressure and sanction

15. GENERAL APTITUDE, I. E., PROMISE, FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

- Outstanding material; high rating in every required area
- Suitable material, shows evidence of desire to develop; good promise
- Suitable material, but has not given clear signs of capacity for development; uncertain promise
- Seems unsuited at this time, but present desire may perhaps flower with age; questionable promise
- Unsuitable from all human viewpoints; no promise

OTHER
REMARKS

All things considered, what is your opinion about the boy's application for the seminary? _____

PRINCIPAL'S SIGNATURE

TEACHER'S SIGNATURE

N.B. Please return form by OCT. 27, 1966.

**PROSPECTIVE CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE PRIESTHOOD
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
PARISH REPORT**

TO BE FILLED IN BY PASTOR AND ASSISTANT PASTORS

Name _____ Parish _____ CITY _____
 Home Address _____ Parish Address _____
 School _____

PHYSICAL General State of Health. _____
 Has he had any serious illness? _____
 Has he any physical defects, such as poor eyesight, deafness, lameness, heart ailment, etc? _____

PERSONALITY TRAITS Please check the descriptions which best characterize the applicant.

- 1. MATURITY OF VOCATION
 - More interested in the world
 - Vacillating, hot and cold
 - Just recently interested
 - Steady interest for year or more
 - Seriously interested, confident, working at it
- 2. GENEROSITY
 - Ready to serve even in face of personal sacrifices
 - Generally concerned, volunteers at times
 - Slow to respond to needs of others, but does with prodding
 - Complains about demands on him; eyes return or reward when he helps out
 - Selfish, resents demands, excuses himself from having to help
- 3. SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT
 - At work or play ready to meet others; mixes very well
 - Friendly, not given to quarrel or argument
 - Gets along with others, but seldom initiates relationships
 - Shy, hesitant about individual and group contacts
 - Clannish, restrictive in associations; indifferent to others
 - Argumentative, unable to sustain friendly relationships
 - Anti-social, lone wolf
- 4. MANLINESS
 - Unaffected, wholesome
 - Manly in manner and speech
 - Affected in manner and speech
 - Old womanish, gossipy
 - Effeminate

- 5. LEADERSHIP
 - Unusually competent, initiates and follows through; accepted as leader
 - Often shows initiative, makes suggestions; ready to lead
 - Sometimes leads in minor activities; will take on tasks, if encouraged
 - Seldom leads, prefers others to plan; generally follows; no suggestions
 - Avoids all responsibility; probably unable to lead
- 6. PERSONAL HABITS AND APPEARANCE
 - Well-groomed; fine taste, meets occasions
 - Reasonably well-groomed, good impression
 - Without taste, but clean and usually neat
 - Careless, unconcerned
 - Slovenly, resentful of legitimate criticism
- 7. WILLINGNESS TO PROFIT BY CORRECTION
 - Markedly willing, anxious to improve
 - Generally responds well; docile
 - Listens, but needs re-telling first before responding
 - Passive, fails to amend
 - Shows disbelief, temper or resentment when corrected
 - Disrespectful, shows hostile feelings
- 8. COOPERATION, WILLINGNESS TO WORK
 - Eager, usually does more than required
 - Steady, occasionally goes out of his way
 - Generally willing, but not beyond the required tasks
 - Slow to respond, often does not follow up, lazy
 - Needs much prodding, minimal effort at best; self-indulgent

9. OPENNESS OF CHARACTER

- Very straightforward, frank, communicative; utter honesty
- Usually frank and communicative
- Angles his response to fit the questioner; basically sincere
- Tends to be evasive, limits area and degree of communication
- Closed, incommunicative; solid wall

10. RELIABILITY, SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY

- Outstanding fidelity; thoroughly dependable
- Willing to assume obligations; does a good job
- Ordinarily performs tasks satisfactorily; usually reliable
- Often needs supervision; reliability uncertain, whimsical
- Unreliable, neglects promises and obligations

11. COMMON SENSE AND JUDGMENT

- Manifests good sense and tact
- Has the good sense expected of his age
- Varies; fails to grasp situations
- Shows poor judgment, unaware of failure
- One-sided view, distrustful of others

12. STABILITY AND MATURITY

- Clearly purposive, constant, and well-adjusted
- Well-balanced, takes things in stride; steady
- Gets unsettled or nervous in situations; adjusts with difficulty
- Preoccupied with self; childish, desirous of attention
- Hyperemotional, excitable, flighty, loses perspective

13. PIETY AND SPIRIT OF RELIGION

- Unassumingly pious, reverent, and zealous; wholehearted commitment; very frequent communicant
- Concerned with growth, open to suggestion and development; weekly communicant
- Passive piety, undistinguishable from his peers, but with some interest
- Casual, responds only when prodded; minimal response
- Flippant and sophisticated in matters spiritual

14. STUDY HABITS

- Seeks extra work; does assigned work completely and with excellence
- Faithful to assigned work; achievement usual for his age
- Needs occasional prodding; varies in performance
- Needs constant prodding; produces only with sanctions
- Seldom works even under pressure and sanction

15. GENERAL APTITUDE, I.E., PROMISE, FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

- Outstanding material; high rating in every required area
- Suitable material, shows evidence of desire to develop; good promise
- Suitable material, but had not given clear signs of capacity for development; uncertain promise
- Seems unsuited at this time, but present desire may perhaps flower with age; questionable promise
- Unsuitable from all human viewpoints; no promise

BACKGROUND

Are both parents living? _____ If not, which one is? _____

Are both parents Catholics? _____

If not, which one is? _____

Is the boy legitimate? _____ Is the marriage a normal and wholesome one? _____

Is the Catholicity of the home vigorous? _____

Are the parents converts? _____ Which one? _____

Are there any marriage difficulties? _____

Is there any scandal connected with his name? _____

Nationality of father _____ of mother _____

Number of children _____ boys _____ girls _____

THE
BACKGROUND
(continued)

Is there any history of tuberculosis, epilepsy, or insanity in the immediate family? _____

Financial condition _____

Can parents pay tuition? _____

Attitude of parents towards boy's entrance into the seminary _____

In all, what is your opinion of this boy's application to the seminary? _____

If you have more than one applicant from your parish, please list them in order of their promise (suitability):

Any additional remarks you wish.

PASTOR'S SIGNATURE

N.B. Please return form by OCT. 27, 1966.

APPENDIX G

Table C
Critical Values of t

For any given df, the table shows the values of t corresponding to various levels of probability. Obtained t is significant at a given level if it is equal to or greater than the value shown in the table.

df	Level of significance for one-tailed test					
	.10	.05	.025	.01	.005	.0005
	Level of significance for two-tailed test					
	.20	.10	.05	.02	.01	.001
1	3.078	6.314	12.706	31.821	63.657	636.619
2	1.886	2.920	4.303	6.965	9.925	31.598
3	1.638	2.353	3.182	4.541	5.841	12.941
4	1.533	2.132	2.776	3.747	4.604	8.610
5	1.476	2.015	2.571	3.365	4.032	6.859
6	1.440	1.943	2.447	3.143	3.707	5.959
7	1.415	1.895	2.365	2.998	3.499	5.405
8	1.397	1.860	2.306	2.896	3.355	5.041
9	1.383	1.833	2.262	2.821	3.250	4.781
10	1.372	1.812	2.228	2.764	3.169	4.587
11	1.363	1.796	2.201	2.718	3.106	4.437
12	1.356	1.782	2.179	2.681	3.055	4.318
13	1.350	1.771	2.160	2.650	3.012	4.221
14	1.345	1.761	2.145	2.624	2.977	4.140
15	1.341	1.753	2.131	2.602	2.947	4.073
16	1.337	1.746	2.120	2.583	2.921	4.015
17	1.333	1.740	2.110	2.567	2.898	3.965
18	1.330	1.734	2.101	2.552	2.878	3.922
19	1.328	1.729	2.093	2.539	2.861	3.883
20	1.325	1.725	2.086	2.528	2.845	3.850
21	1.323	1.721	2.080	2.518	2.831	3.819
22	1.321	1.717	2.074	2.508	2.819	3.792
23	1.319	1.714	2.069	2.500	2.807	3.767
24	1.318	1.711	2.064	2.492	2.797	3.745
25	1.316	1.708	2.060	2.485	2.787	3.725
26	1.315	1.706	2.056	2.479	2.779	3.707
27	1.314	1.703	2.052	2.473	2.771	3.690
28	1.313	1.701	2.048	2.467	2.763	3.674
29	1.311	1.699	2.045	2.462	2.756	3.659
30	1.310	1.697	2.042	2.457	2.750	3.646
40	1.303	1.684	2.021	2.423	2.704	3.551
60	1.296	1.671	2.000	2.390	2.660	3.460
120	1.289	1.658	1.980	2.358	2.617	3.373
∞	1.282	1.645	1.960	2.326	2.576	3.291

APPENDIX H

SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER IV

TABLE 20-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR
SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 20	1st	87.020	4.901	1.096
	2nd	86.010	5.792	1.295
	3rd	85.000	5.688	1.272
	4th	86.010	6.131	1.371
	Cum AA	86.035	5.908	1.321
II N= 32	1st	86.688	4.961	0.829
	2nd	85.906	4.831	0.854
	3rd	85.300	5.817	1.028
	4th	84.994	5.953	1.052
	Cum AA	85.450	5.267	0.931
III N= 46	1st	86.239	5.425	0.800
	2nd	84.917	5.986	0.883
	3rd	83.828	6.505	0.959
	4th	83.252	6.767	0.998
	Cum AA	84.085	6.260	0.923

N= 98

TABLE 21-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR
SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--
Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 40	1st	2.389	0.770	0.122
	2nd	2.425	0.805	0.127
	3rd	2.550	0.715	0.113
	4th	2.558	0.812	0.128
	Cum AA	2.491	0.791	0.125
II N= 34	1st	2.249	0.675	0.116
	2nd	2.300	0.660	0.113
	3rd	2.360	0.612	0.105
	4th	2.365	0.659	0.113
	Cum AA	2.333	0.642	0.110
III N= 121	1st	2.229	0.901	0.082
	2nd	2.188	0.931	0.085
	3rd	2.250	0.890	0.081
	4th	2.245	0.937	0.085
	Cum AA	2.214	0.924	0.084

N= 195

TABLE 22-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN AS MEASURED BY OTIS IQ TEST, BY
SOCIAL CLASS--Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I (N= 20)	119.750	7.924	1.772
II (N= 32)	114.469	8.606	1.521
III (N= 46)	116.065	8.039	1.185

N= 98

TABLE 23-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN AS MEASURED BY OTIS IQ TEST, BY
SOCIAL CLASS--Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I (N= 40)	117.775	7.182	1.135
II (N= 34)	117.824	8.672	1.487
III (N= 121)	115.645	9.037	0.822

N= 195

TABLE 24-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN AS MEASURED BY OTIS IQ TEST, BY
SOCIAL CLASS--COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	IQ MEANS	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I (N= 60)	118.433	7.495	0.968
II (N= 66)	116.197	8.801	1.083
III (N= 167)	115.760	8.775	0.679

N= 293

TABLE 25-A

SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE RESEARCH
ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS,
BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	SRA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I (N= 20)	74.050	13.651	3.052
II (N= 32)	69.344	13.374	2.364
III (N= 46)	67.457	17.065	2.506

N= 98

TABLE 26-A

SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
 FRESHMEN AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE RESEARCH
 ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS BY SOCIAL
 CLASS--Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	SRA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I (N= 40)	72.400	15.169	2.398
II (N= 34)	71.176	16.005	2.745
III (N= 121)	66.603	16.426	1.493

N= 195

TABLE 27-A

SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
 FRESHMEN AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE RESEARCH
 ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS BY SOCIAL
 CLASS--COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	SRA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I (N= 60)	72.950	14.701	1.898
II (N= 66)	70.288	14.816	1.824
III (N= 167)	66.838	16.609	1.285

N= 293

TABLE 28-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS--
Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude-- SRA Composite Scores	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third (N= 34)	122.882	7.463	1.280
Middle Third (N= 31)	114.806	7.091	1.274
Lower Third (N= 33)	110.909	5.485	0.955

N= 98

TABLE 29-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE
RESEARCH ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS--
Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude-- SRA Composite Score	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third (N= 65)	124.246	6.530	0.810
Middle Third (N= 66)	115.667	5.647	0.695
Lower Third (N= 64)	109.375	6.426	0.803

N= 195

TABLE 30-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (AA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
 FRESHMEN BY SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) AS MEASURED
 BY SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS--
 Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 34	1st	89.706	3.562	0.611
	2nd	88.935	4.207	0.721
	3rd	87.924	5.148	0.883
	4th	88.365	4.903	0.841
	Cum AA	88.650	4.506	0.773
Middle Third N= 31	1st	87.258	4.635	0.833
	2nd	86.542	4.366	0.784
	3rd	85.342	4.714	0.847
	4th	84.994	5.363	0.963
	Cum AA	85.784	4.741	0.851
Lower Third N= 33	1st	82.618	4.215	0.734
	2nd	80.873	4.792	0.834
	3rd	80.324	5.869	1.022
	4th	79.709	5.866	1.021
	Cum AA	80.291	5.118	0.891
N= 98				

TABLE 31-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT (AA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) AS MEASURED BY SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES BATTERY OF TESTS-- Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude-SRA Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 65	1st	2.952	0.792	0.098
	2nd	2.993	0.777	0.096
	3rd	2.791	0.749	0.093
	4th	3.041	0.768	0.095
	Cum AA	3.018	0.754	0.094
Middle Third N= 66	1st	2.128	0.606	0.075
	2nd	2.149	0.604	0.074
	3rd	2.222	0.642	0.079
	4th	2.285	0.663	0.082
	Cum AA	2.213	0.621	0.076
Lower Third N= 64	1st	1.709	0.581	0.070
	2nd	1.618	0.586	0.073
	3rd	1.793	0.589	0.074
	4th	1.655	0.573	0.072
	Cum AA	1.634	0.560	0.070
N= 195				

TABLE 32-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third (N= 32)	120.875	8.138	1.439
Middle Third (N= 33)	115.303	7.926	1.380
Lower Third (N= 33)	112.848	7.089	1.234

N= 98

TABLE 33-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-S SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third (N= 66)	123.015	7.202	0.886
Middle Third (N= 63)	115.413	6.847	0.863
Lower Third (N= 66)	110.909	7.177	0.883

N= 195

APPENDIX I

SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER V

TABLE 34-A

DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 20	1st	156.000	21.815	4.875
	2nd	142.750	22.985	4.728
	3rd	141.700	20.589	4.604
II N= 32	1st	162.156	19.999	3.535
	2nd	157.469	23.953	4.234
	3rd	163.375	26.209	4.633
III N= 46	1st	165.870	21.209	3.127
	2nd	162.457	24.327	3.587
	3rd	164.261	23.507	3.466

N= 98

TABLE 35-A

**DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-S SEMINARY**

Social Classes	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 40	1st	158.475	27.199	4.301
	2nd	159.825	21.246	3.359
	3rd	157.050	28.127	4.301
II N= 34	1st	159.500	23.952	4.108
	2nd	161.195	24.195	4.149
	3rd	157.882	24.622	4.223
III N= 121	1st	165.099	24.032	2.185
	2nd	166.040	24.040	2.185
	3rd	168.116	25.261	2.296

N= 195

TABLE 36-A

DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 60	1st	157.650	25.558	3.299
	2nd	154.133	23.272	3.148
	3rd	151.933	26.853	3.467
II N= 66	1st	160.788	22.164	2.728
	2nd	159.652	24.171	2.975
	3rd	160.545	25.552	3.145
III N=167	1st	165.311	23.291	1.802
	2nd	165.054	24.173	1.871
	3rd	167.054	24.850	1.923

N= 293

TABLE 37-A

DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement Freshman Year	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	1st	159.563	22.503	3.978
	2nd	154.125	24.898	4.401
	3rd	152.688	25.810	4.563
Middle Third N= 33	1st	166.242	19.898	3.464
	2nd	158.212	23.050	4.013
	3rd	161.212	22.081	3.844
Lower Third N= 33	1st	162.030	20.862	3.632
	2nd	158.000	26.910	4.217
	3rd	164.000	27.014	4.703

N= 98

TABLE 38-A

DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-S SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 66	1st	161.273	21.688	2.670
	2nd	162.379	21.965	2.704
	3rd	160.273	25.891	3.187
Middle Third N= 63	1st	161.349	25.645	3.231
	2nd	162.270	22.862	2.880
	3rd	163.508	24.530	3.081
Lower Third N= 66	1st	165.606	26.815	3.301
	2nd	167.303	25.648	3.157
	3rd	168.379	27.627	3.401

N= 195

TABLE 39-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	1st	85.644	5.702	1.008
	2nd	84.400	6.082	1.075
	3rd	83.316	6.233	1.102
	4th	83.013	6.224	1.100
	Cum AA	83.706	6.061	1.071
Middle Third N= 34	1st	87.606	4.610	0.791
	2nd	86.653	4.885	0.838
	3rd	86.088	5.635	0.966
	4th	85.776	6.218	1.066
	Cum AA	86.215	5.414	0.928
Lower Third N= 32	1st	86.319	4.741	0.838
	2nd	85.263	5.621	0.994
	3rd	84.144	6.288	1.111
	4th	84.275	6.697	1.184
	Cum AA	84.784	6.067	1.072

N= 98

TABLE 40-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 67	1st	2.134	0.839	0.103
	2nd	2.113	0.857	0.105
	3rd	2.207	0.826	0.101
	4th	2.136	0.892	0.109
	Cum AA	2.122	0.866	0.106
Middle Third N= 66	1st	2.406	0.845	0.104
	2nd	2.383	0.887	0.109
	3rd	2.447	0.851	0.105
	4th	2.494	0.869	0.107
	Cum AA	2.436	0.861	0.106
Lower Third N= 62	1st	2.257	0.818	0.104
	2nd	2.275	0.842	0.107
	3rd	2.340	0.765	0.097
	4th	2.366	0.832	0.106
	Cum AA	2.319	0.826	0.105

N= 195

TABLE 41-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	IQ MEANS	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	113.156	7.298	1.290
Middle Third N= 34	118.029	8.490	1.456
Lower Third N= 32	117.594	8.514	1.505

N= 98

TABLE 42-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	IQ MEANS	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 67	114.790	8.498	1.038
Middle Third N= 66	117.136	8.237	1.014
Lower Third N= 62	117.355	9.132	1.160

N= 195

TABLE 43-A

SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
 FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
 Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank Composite Scores	SRA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	64.188	17.469	3.088
Middle Third N= 34	74.412	11.433	1.961
Lower Third N= 32	69.344	15.329	2.710

N= 98

TABLE 44-A

SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
 FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
 Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	SRA MEANS	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 67	63.119	17.607	2.151
Middle Third N= 66	71.152	14.777	1.819
Lower Third N= 62	71.774	14.808	1.881

N= 195

TABLE 45-A

DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK
ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests For Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 34	1st	162.853	23.208	3.980
	2nd	149.350	26.089	4.512
	3rd	152.029	25.520	4.377
Middle Third N= 31	1st	158.548	22.000	3.951
	2nd	161.968	22.900	4.113
	3rd	160.903	24.070	4.323
Lower Third N= 33	1st	166.273	17.499	3.046
	2nd	159.636	24.123	4.199
	3rd	165.485	24.921	4.338

N= 98

TABLE 46-A

DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK
ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 65	1st	159.015	22.671	2.812
	2nd	161.754	20.582	2.553
	3rd	159.508	23.595	2.927
Middle Third N= 66	1st	158.697	22.212	2.734
	2nd	158.621	23.551	2.899
	3rd	158.621	24.033	2.958
Lower Third N= 64	1st	170.766	27.576	3.447
	2nd	171.859	24.665	3.083
	3rd	174.297	28.064	3.508

N= 195

APPENDIX J

SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER VI

TABLE 47-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 20	1st	3.750	1.337	0.299
	2nd	3.400	2.154	0.482
	3rd	3.250	1.894	0.424
II N= 32	1st	4.281	1.789	0.316
	2nd	3.938	2.015	0.356
	3rd	4.063	2.150	0.380
III N= 46	1st	4.978	2.016	0.297
	2nd	4.239	2.013	0.297
	3rd	4.217	1.966	0.290

N= 98

TABLE 48-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 40	1st	3.625	1.798	0.284
	2nd	3.500	2.098	0.332
	3rd	3.475	2.049	0.324
II N= 34	1st	3.882	1.676	0.287
	2nd	3.500	1.929	0.331
	3rd	3.088	1.869	0.320
III N= 121	1st	4.223	1.861	0.169
	2nd	4.124	1.779	0.162
	3rd	4.025	1.994	0.181

N= 195

TABLE 49-A

**ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
SOCIAL CLASS--COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES**

Social Classes	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 60	1st	3.667	1.660	0.214
	2nd	3.467	2.117	0.273
	3rd	3.400	2.002	0.258
II N= 66	1st	4.076	1.743	0.215
	2nd	3.712	1.983	0.244
	3rd	3.561	2.068	0.255
III N= 167	1st	4.431	1.934	0.150
	2nd	4.156	1.847	0.143
	3rd	4.078	1.988	0.154

N= 293

TABLE 50-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY CUMULATIVE
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement Freshman Year	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	1st	4.219	2.088	0.369
	2nd	3.469	2.264	0.400
	3rd	3.438	2.150	0.380
Middle Third N= 33	1st	4.394	1.740	0.303
	2nd	4.152	1.956	0.340
	3rd	4.000	1.576	0.274
Lower Third N= 32	1st	4.879	1.754	0.305
	2nd	4.273	1.879	0.327
	3rd	4.455	2.231	0.388

N= 98

TABLE 51-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY CUMULATIVE
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-S SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement Freshman Year	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 66	1st	3.667	1.511	0.186
	2nd	3.697	1.749	0.215
	3rd	3.439	1.868	0.230
Middle Third N= 63	1st	4.032	2.078	0.262
	2nd	3.937	1.816	0.229
	3rd	3.810	2.130	0.268
Lower Third N= 66	1st	4.424	1.801	0.222
	2nd	4.030	2.096	0.258
	3rd	4.000	2.015	0.248

N= 195

TABLE 52-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Anomy Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	1st	85.606	5.153	0.911
	2nd	84.294	5.949	1.052
	3rd	83.222	6.511	1.151
	4th	82.906	6.772	1.197
	Cum AA	83.600	6.234	1.102
Middle Third N= 34	1st	86.882	4.688	0.804
	2nd	85.606	4.998	0.857
	3rd	84.271	5.444	0.934
	4th	83.929	5.830	1.000
	Cum AA	84.768	5.320	0.912
Lower Third N= 32	1st	87.125	5.327	0.942
	2nd	86.481	5.680	1.004
	3rd	86.169	6.162	1.089
	4th	86.344	6.357	1.124
	Cum AA	86.428	5.915	1.046

N= 98

TABLE 53-A

**ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY**

Anomy Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 61	1st	2.102	0.688	0.088
	2nd	2.067	0.705	0.090
	3rd	2.175	0.677	0.087
	4th	2.121	0.743	0.095
	Cum AA	2.093	0.707	0.091
Middle Third N= 65	1st	2.244	0.876	0.109
	2nd	2.244	0.927	0.115
	3rd	2.357	0.890	0.110
	4th	2.334	0.948	0.118
	Cum AA	2.289	0.926	0.115
Lower Third N= 69	1st	2.430	0.901	0.108
	2nd	2.435	0.908	0.109
	3rd	2.444	0.851	0.102
	4th	2.512	0.879	0.106
	Cum AA	2.469	0.885	0.107
N= 195				

TABLE 54-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Anomy Rank-- Composite Scores	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32)	113.719	7.698	1.361
Middle Third N= 34)	117.059	8.303	1.424
Lower Third N= 32)	118.063	8.613	1.523

N= 98

TABLE 55-A

MENTAL ABILITY (IQ) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON ANOMY SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Anomy Rank Composite Scores	IQ Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 61)	115.180	9.005	1.153
Middle Third N= 65)	116.200	8.371	1.038
Lower Third N= 69)	117.841	8.493	1.022

N= 195

TABLE 56-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK ON SRA
SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 34	1st	4.382	1.799	0.309
	2nd	3.676	2.025	0.347
	3rd	3.588	1.896	0.325
Middle Third N= 31	1st	4.290	2.035	0.366
	2nd	3.806	2.054	0.369
	3rd	3.426	1.851	0.332
Lower Third N= 33	1st	4.818	1.783	0.310
	2nd	4.424	2.045	0.356
	3rd	4.485	2.258	0.393

N= 98

TABLE 57-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK ON SRA
SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 65	1st	3.708	1.684	0.210
	2nd	3.369	1.794	0.222
	3rd	3.169	1.785	0.221
Middle Third N= 66	1st	3.667	1.787	0.220
	2nd	3.818	1.766	0.217
	3rd	3.545	1.986	0.244
Lower Third N= 64	1st	4.766	1.809	0.226
	2nd	4.484	1.968	0.246
	3rd	4.547	2.023	0.253

N= 195

TABLE 58-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	1st	5.563	1.413	0.250
	2nd	5.469	1.639	0.290
	3rd	5.594	1.765	0.312
Middle Third N= 34	1st	4.618	2.000	0.343
	2nd	3.618	1.941	0.333
	3rd	3.735	1.596	0.274
Lower Third N= 32	1st	3.313	1.446	0.256
	2nd	2.844	1.660	0.294
	3rd	2.594	1.558	0.275

N= 98

TABLE 59-A

ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 67	1st	5.239	1.622	0.198
	2nd	4.687	1.738	0.212
	3rd	4.851	1.814	0.222
Middle Third N= 66	1st	3.894	1.653	0.203
	2nd	4.106	1.793	0.221
	3rd	3.606	1.953	0.240
Lower Third N= 62	1st	2.903	1.399	0.178
	2nd	2.790	1.647	0.209
	3rd	2.710	1.669	0.212

N= 195

APPENDIX K

SUPPLEMENTARY DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS--CHAPTER VII

TABLE 60-A

STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-N SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 20	1st	17.950	9.641	2.156
	2nd	14.800	7.167	1.602
	3rd	18.050	7.235	1.618
II N= 20	1st	15.969	5.637	0.997
	2nd	15.063	7.124	1.259
	3rd	15.031	7.683	1.358
III N= 20	1st	18.239	7.593	1.120
	2nd	15.652	7.932	1.170
	3rd	16.671	7.115	1.049

N= 98

TABLE 61-A

STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY SOCIAL CLASS--Q-S SEMINARY

Social Classes	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 40	1st	15.325	6.286	0.994
	2nd	14.875	7.417	1.173
	3rd	13.875	6.849	1.083
II N= 34	1st	14.412	7.938	1.361
	2nd	13.765	7.166	1.229
	3rd	13.971	8.158	1.399
III N=121	1st	14.008	6.913	0.628
	2nd	14.785	7.682	0.698
	3rd	14.050	7.144	0.649

N= 195

TABLE 62-A

STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY SOCIAL CLASS--COMBINED SEMINARY SCORES

Social Classes	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
I N= 60	1st	16.200	7.672	0.990
	2nd	14.850	7.334	0.947
	3rd	15.267	7.252	0.936
II N= 66	1st	15.167	6.962	0.857
	2nd	14.394	7.175	0.883
	3rd	14.485	7.949	0.978
III N= 167	1st	15.174	7.354	0.569
	2nd	15.024	7.761	0.601
	3rd	14.796	7.238	0.560

N= 293

TABLE 63-A

STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-N SEMINARY

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Stress/ Anxiety	Stress/ Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	1st	16.719	6.806	1.203
	2nd	14.750	7.297	1.290
	3rd	15.813	6.917	1.223
Middle Third N= 33	1st	17.515	8.334	1.451
	2nd	15.818	8.058	1.403
	3rd	16.273	7.541	1.313
Lower Third N= 33	1st	18.061	7.442	1.296
	2nd	15.273	7.162	1.247
	3rd	17.273	7.668	1.335

N= 98

TABLE 64-A

**STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY CUMULATIVE ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT--Q-S SEMINARY**

Cumulative Academic Achievement-- Freshman Year	Tests for Stress/ Anxiety	Stress/ Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 66	1st	14.030	7.211	0.888
	2nd	13.439	6.845	0.843
	3rd	12.833	6.777	0.834
Middle Third N= 63	1st	13.730	6.650	0.838
	2nd	13.746	6.778	0.854
	3rd	13.492	6.992	0.881
Lower Third N= 66	1st	15.258	7.022	0.864
	2nd	16.652	8.456	1.041
	3rd	15.652	7.708	0.949

N= 195

TABLE 65-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 35	1st	86.366	5.254	0.888
	2nd	85.149	6.043	1.022
	3rd	84.009	6.282	1.062
	4th	83.834	6.741	1.139
	Cum AA	84.491	6.292	1.064
Middle Third N= 29	1st	86.062	4.659	0.865
	2nd	84.979	4.893	0.909
	3rd	84.248	5.905	1.096
	4th	83.952	6.164	1.145
	Cum AA	84.483	5.380	0.999
Lower Third N= 34	1st	87.141	5.236	0.898
	2nd	86.200	5.663	0.971
	3rd	85.359	6.171	1.058
	4th	85.318	6.367	1.092
	Cum AA	85.759	5.926	1.016
N= 98				

TABLE 66-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 68	1st	2.057	0.743	0.090
	2nd	2.035	0.787	0.095
	3rd	2.135	0.700	0.086
	4th	2.086	0.775	0.094
	Cum AA	2.057	0.764	0.093
Middle Third N= 68	1st	2.407	0.819	0.099
	2nd	2.406	0.852	0.103
	3rd	2.492	0.874	0.106
	4th	2.500	0.903	0.110
	Cum AA	2.449	0.870	0.106
Lower Third N= 59	1st	2.343	0.924	0.120
	2nd	2.338	0.927	0.121
	3rd	2.371	0.839	0.109
	4th	2.416	0.898	0.117
	Cum AA	2.379	0.900	0.117

N= 195

TABLE 67-A

SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank Composite Scores	SRA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third, N= 35	69.143	18.120	3.063
Middle Third, N= 29	69.552	12.735	2.365
Lower Third, N= 34	69.588	14.605	2.505

N= 98

TABLE 68-A

SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE (SRA) STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	SRA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third, N= 68	65.221	17.525	2.125
Middle Third, N= 68	70.559	15.424	1.870
Lower Third, N= 59	70.203	15.179	1.976

N= 195

TABLE 69-A

STRESS/ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
RANK ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
Q-N SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 34	1st	18.676	6.867	1.178
	2nd	16.765	6.864	1.177
	3rd	18.147	7.507	1.288
Middle Third N= 31	1st	16.000	7.444	1.337
	2nd	14.000	8.227	1.478
	3rd	14.903	6.571	1.180
Lower Third N= 33	1st	17.515	8.145	1.419
	2nd	14.970	7.238	1.260
	3rd	16.182	7.697	1.340

N= 98

TABLE 70-A

STRESS/ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
RANK ON SRA SCHOLASTIC APTITUDE COMPOSITE SCORES--
Q-S SEMINARY

Scholastic Aptitude--SRA Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 65	1st	14.662	6.833	0.847
	2nd	13.862	6.631	0.822
	3rd	12.769	6.365	0.790
Middle Third N= 66	1st	13.061	7.420	0.913
	2nd	14.061	7.685	0.946
	3rd	13.364	7.227	0.890
Lower Third N= 64	1st	15.359	6.506	0.813
	2nd	15.984	8.086	1.011
	3rd	15.906	7.784	0.973

N= 195

TABLE 71-A

**DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--
Q-N SEMINARY**

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 35	1st	168.886	21.076	3.563
	2nd	164.828	23.009	3.978
	3rd	166.114	24.947	4.217
Middle Third N= 29	1st	158.655	19.180	3.562
	2nd	152.690	22.214	4.125
	3rd	156.414	23.771	4.414
Lower Third N= 34	1st	159.618	21.709	3.723
	2nd	152.059	27.244	4.672
	3rd	154.941	26.041	4.466

N= 98

TABLE 72-A

**DOGMATISM STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY
COMPOSITE RANK ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--
Q-S SEMINARY**

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Dogmatism	Dogmatism Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 68	1st	173.000	24.690	2.994
	2nd	175.632	22.719	2.755
	3rd	174.250	26.465	3.209
Middle Third N= 68	1st	161.912	22.130	2.684
	2nd	161.338	20.490	2.485
	3rd	163.088	23.294	2.825
Lower Third N= 59	1st	151.949	23.256	3.028
	2nd	153.695	22.426	2.920
	3rd	153.441	24.845	3.235

N= 195

TABLE 73-A

STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/ Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 32	1st	19.500	8.703	1.539
	2nd	17.250	7.575	1.339
	3rd	18.250	8.082	1.429
Middle Third N= 34	1st	16.676	6.543	1.122
	2nd	15.324	7.331	1.257
	3rd	15.794	6.374	1.093
Lower Third N= 32	1st	16.188	6.953	1.229
	2nd	13.281	7.164	1.266
	3rd	15.375	7.411	1.310

N= 98

TABLE 74-A

STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/ Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 67	1st	15.776	7.096	0.867
	2nd	16.866	7.256	0.866
	3rd	16.373	7.144	0.873
Middle Third N= 66	1st	15.485	7.314	0.900
	2nd	15.439	8.102	0.997
	3rd	14.864	7.477	0.920
Lower Third N= 62	1st	11.597	5.627	0.715
	2nd	11.339	5.968	0.758
	3rd	10.516	5.719	0.726

N= 195

TABLE 75-A

**ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK
ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-N SEMINARY**

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 35	1st	5.343	1.723	0.291
	2nd	4.914	2.116	0.358
	3rd	4.857	1.884	0.319
Middle Third N= 29	1st	4.138	1.717	0.319
	2nd	3.793	1.627	0.302
	3rd	3.931	2.067	0.384
Lower Third N= 34	1st	3.941	1.878	0.322
	2nd	3.147	1.957	0.336
	3rd	3.088	1.788	0.307

N= 98

TABLE 76-A

**ANOMY STATISTICS FOR SEMINARY FRESHMEN BY RANK
ON STRESS/ANXIETY SCALE--Q-S SEMINARY**

Stress/Anxiety Rank-- Composite Scores	Tests for Anomy	Anomy Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 68	1st	4.838	1.641	0.199
	2nd	4.853	1.942	0.236
	3rd	4.824	1.925	0.233
Middle Third N= 68	1st	3.926	1.858	0.225
	2nd	3.676	1.684	0.172
	3rd	3.412	1.972	0.239
Lower Third N= 59	1st	3.254	1.632	0.212
	2nd	3.017	1.557	0.203
	3rd	2.898	1.591	0.207

N= 195

TABLE 77-A

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STATISTICS FOR Q-S SEMINARY FRESHMEN
BY RANK ON STUDENT CONDUCT GRADES DURING FINAL QUARTER OF
ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68

Conduct Rank-- Final Quarter	Academic Time Periods	AA Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 73	1st	2.585	0.736	0.086
	2nd	2.614	0.724	0.085
	3rd	2.727	0.676	0.079
	4th	2.769	0.700	0.082
	Cum AA	2.692	0.694	0.081
Middle Third N= 60	1st	2.235	0.852	0.110
	2nd	2.218	0.856	0.111
	3rd	2.256	0.834	0.108
	4th	2.259	0.840	0.108
	Cum AA	2.240	0.834	0.108
Lower Third N= 62	1st	1.919	0.805	0.102
	2nd	1.872	0.867	0.110
	3rd	1.936	0.753	0.096
	4th	1.882	0.857	0.109
	Cum AA	1.870	0.852	0.108

N= 195

TABLE 78-A

STRESS AND ANXIETY STATISTICS FOR Q-S SEMINARY FRESHMEN
 BY RANK ON STUDENT CONDUCT GRADES DURING FINAL QUARTER
 OF ACADEMIC YEAR 1967-68

Conduct Rank-- Final Quarter	Tests for Stress/Anxiety	Stress/Anxiety Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third N= 73	1st	14.370	7.521	0.880
	2nd	13.630	7.072	0.828
	3rd	12.452	6.582	0.770
Middle Third N= 60	1st	14.683	6.456	0.833
	2nd	15.583	7.142	0.922
	3rd	14.683	6.732	0.869
Lower Third N= 62	1st	14.000	6.856	0.871
	2nd	14.871	8.304	1.055
	3rd	15.161	8.180	1.039

N= 195

TABLE 79-A

STUDENT CONDUCT GRADES STATISTICS FOR Q-S SEMINARY
FRESHMEN BY COMPOSITE RANK ON DOGMATISM SCALE

Dogmatism Rank-- Composite Scores	Conduct Grades Means	Standard Deviations	Standard Errors
Upper Third, N= 67	86.478	13.140	1.605
Middle Third, N= 66	91.061	9.892	1.218
Lower Third, N= 62	88.129	9.928	1.261

N= 195

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Books

- Arnold, M., Hispanicus, P., Weisgerber, C., and D'Arcy, P. Screening Candidates for the Priesthood and Religious Life. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1964.
- Bierstedt, Robert. The Social Order. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
- Blumer, Herbert. Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: I. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1939.
- Bridston, Keith R., and Wagoner, Walter D. Unity in Mid-Career: an Ecumenical Critique. New York: Macmillan Company, 1963.
- Burton, W. H. Readings in Education. "Education and Social Class in the United States," ed. Arthur Foff and Jean D. Grambs. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.
- Cohen, Albert K. Delinquent Boys: the Culture of the Gang. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1955.
- _____. Deviance and Control. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Publishers, Inc., 1966.
- Davis, James A. Undergraduate Career Decisions. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.
- Deutsch, Morton and Krauss, Robert M. Theories in Social Psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965.
- Fichter, Jos. Religion as an Occupation. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.
- Frankel, Edward. Readings in Educational Psychology. "A Comparative Study of Achieving and Understanding High School Boys of High Intellectual Ability," ed. V. H. Noll and R. P. Noll. New York: Macmillan Company, 1962.

- Gittler, Joseph B. Review of Sociology: Analysis of a Decade. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1957.
- Herberg, Will. Protestant, Catholic, Jew. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1955.
- Hollingshead, August B. Two Factor Index of Social Position. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1956.
- Hollingshead, August B. and Redlich, F. C. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Lambert, W. W. "Stimulus Response Contiguity and Reinforcement Theory," in Gardner Lindzey (ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology, Cambridge: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
- Lee, J. M. and Putz, L. J. Seminary Education in Times of Change. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1965.
- Lenski, Gerhard. The Religious Factor: A Sociologist's Inquiry. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1961.
- McCarthy, Philip J. Introduction to Statistical Reasoning. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1957.
- Merrill, Francis E. Society and Culture. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Merton, Robert K., Reader, George, and Kendall, Patricia. The Student Physician. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- O'Dea, Thomas F. American Catholic Dilemma. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1958.
- Parsons, Talcott. Sociology Today. "General Theory in Sociology," ed. Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Riley, Matilda W. Sociological Research: a Case Approach. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1963.
- Rokeach, Milton. The Open and the Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

Runyan, Richard P. and Haber, Audrey. Fundamentals of Behavioral Statistics. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1967.

Wagoner, Walter. The Seminary: Protestant and Catholic. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

Whyte, William H. The Organization Man. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1957.

Zetterberg, Hans L. On Theory and Verification in Sociology. New York: Bedminster Press, 1965.

Znaniecki, Florian. Cultural Sciences, Their Origin and Development. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1952.

Articles and Periodicals

De Chalendar. "Seminaires de Jeunes Aux U.S.A.," Vocation: le Diaconat et sa Renovation, (No. 234, Paris 2262-80, Centre National des Vocations, Avril, 1966).

Del Vecchio, Anthony. "Moments of Choice," Ave Maria, 99:8-11, (March 28, 1964).

Di Renzo, Gordon J. "Professional Politicians and Personality Structures," American Journal of Sociology, 73, (September, 1967), 217-25.

Glock, Charles Y. "The Sociology of Religion," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (ed.), Sociology Today, New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Higgins, Joseph P. "Minor Seminaries are not Priest Factories," The Serran, (January-February, 1966), 3-6.

Martindale, Don. "Limits to the Uses of Mathematics in the Study of Sociology," Mathematics and the Social Sciences: Symposium, ed. James C. Charlesworth, American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, (June, 1963).

- McCloskey, H. and Schaar, J. H. "Psychological Dimensions of Anomy," American Sociological Review, 30: 14-39, (February, 1965).
- McNamara, Robert J. "Seminary Education: Separate or Unequal," America, Vol. CXVI, No. 14, 536, (April, 8, 1967).
- Meier, Dorothy L. and Bell, Wendell. "Anomia and the Achievement of Life Goals," American Sociological Review, 24:189-201, (April, 1959).
- Mizruchi, Ephraim H. "Social Structure and Anomia in a Small City," American Sociological Review, Vol. 25, No. 5, (October, 1960).
- Mizruchi, Ephraim H. "Alienation, Anomie and the American Dream," in Ephraim H. Mizruchi (ed.), The Substance of Sociology, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Meredith Publishing Co., 1967.
- National Catholic Education Association Bulletin. "Behavioral Sciences and Seminary Life," 62:127-33, (August, 1965).
- National Catholic Education Association Bulletin. "Today's Changing Seminaries," (February, 1967).
- Pannes, Ernestine D. "The Relationship Between Self Acceptance and Dogmatism in Junior-Senior High School Students," Journal of Educational Sociology, 36: 419-26, (May, 1963).
- Popovich, Milhailo. "What the American Sociologists Think About Their Science and Its Problems," The American Sociologist, Vol.1 XIX, No. 5, (October, 1966).
- Roberts, A. H. and Rokeach, M. "Anomie, Authoritarianism, and Prejudice," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXII, No. 4, (Jan., 1956).
- Sewell, Wm. H. and Haller, A. O. "Factors in the Relationship Between Social Status and the Personality Adjustment of the Child," American Sociological Review, 24:511-52, (August, 1959).

- Schatzman, Leonard and Strauss, Anselm. "Social Class and Modes of Communication," in Scott G. McNall (ed.), The Sociological Perspective, Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1968.
- Skipper, James K., Jr., Guenther, Anthony, and Nass, Gilbert. "The Sacredness of .05: A Note Concerning the Uses of Statistical Levels of Significance in Social Science," The American Sociologist, Vol. II, No. 1, (1967).
- Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploration Study," American Sociological Review, 21:709-16, (Dec., 1956).
- Stryker, Sheldon. "In Memoriam: Arnold M. Rose," The American Sociologist, Vol. III, No. 1, (February, 1968), 61.
- Taylor, Janet A. "A Personality Scale of Manifest Anxiety," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, Vol. XLVIII, (1953).
- Znaniecki, Florian W. "Basic Problems of Contemporary Sociology," American Sociological Review, Vol. XIX, No. 5 (Oct., 1954), 519-24.

Unpublished Material

- Donovan, J. D. "The Catholic Priest." Unpublished Ph.d. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951.
- Frankel, Hyman H. "The Sociological Theory of Florian Znaniecki," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1958.
- Fredericks, Marcel A. "The Professionalization of Medical Students: Social Class Attitudes and Academic Achievement." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Loyola University, Chicago, 1965.
- O'Connell, John Joseph, S.J. "A Study of Selected Sociological Factors in Personal Adjustment of Members to a Religious Order in Terms of Integration and Alienation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Loyola University, Chicago, 1967

Simms, James C. "Values and Status Variables as Determinants of Academic Achievement." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1962.

Waldo, Leslie C. "The Educational Aspirations of Adolescent Boys: A Sociological Study." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1963.

Other Sources

Hayakawa, S. I. Language: Key to Human Understanding. (Sociology Seminar). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1968.

Otis, Arthur S. Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1954.

Science Research Associates Inc. (materials). Chicago, Illinois.

Secondary Sources

Books

- Allport, Gordon W. The Individual and His Religion. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950.
- Bafin, Pierre. Crisis of Faith. (trans. Eva Fleischner). New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.
- Baltzell, E. Digby. The Protestant Establishment. N. Y.: Random House, 1966.
- Bendix, R. and Lipset, M. (ed.) Class, Power, and Status. N. Y.: Free Press, 1966.
- Benton, William. A Challenge to Catholic Educators. Milwaukee: National Catholic Education Association, 1957.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. The Development of Motives and Values in the Child. New York: Basic Books, 1964.
- Bier, William C. A Comparative Study of a Seminary Group and Four Other Groups on the M.M.P.I. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948.
- Blaine, Graham B., Jr. Emotional Problems of the Student. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1966.
- _____. Youth and the Hazards of Affluence: the High School and College Years. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Blanchard, Paul. American Freedom and Catholic Power. Boston: Beacon Press, 1949.
- _____. God and Man in Washington. Boston: Beacon Press, 1960.
- Booth, Goddard. Ministry and Mental Health. "The Psychological Examination of Candidates for the Ministry." (ed.) Hans Hoffman. New York: Association Press, 1960.
- Burke, Henry. Personality Traits of Successful Minor Seminarians. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947.

- Burke, Thomas J. (ed.). Sinews of Love. New York: New American Library, 1959.
- Cattell, Raymond B. Description and Measurement of Personality. New York: World Book Company, 1946.
- Clark, H. F. and Sloan, H. S. Classrooms on Main Street: an Account of Specialty Schools in the U.S. that Train for Work and Leisure. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press, 1966.
- Cloward, Richard A. and Ohlin, Lloyd E. Delinquency and Opportunity. New York: Free Press, 1960.
- Cogley, John. Religion in America. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1958.
- Cohen, Arthur A. Humanistic Education and Western Civilization: Essays for Robert M. Hutchins. New York: Rinehart and Winston, n.d.
- Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Cronin, J. F. Catholic Social Principles. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1950.
- Curran, Charles. Counseling in Catholic Life and Education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1952.
- Daniel, W. A. The Education of Negro Ministers. New York: G.H. Doran Company, 1925.
- D'Arcy, Paul F. Constancy of Interest Factor Patterns Within the Specific Vocation of the Foreign Missioner. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1954.
- Demerath, N. J., III. Social Class and American Protestantism. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.
- Donovan, John D. The Academic Man and the Catholic College. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.

- Elder, Glenn H., Jr. Adolescent Achievement and Mobility Aspirations. Chapel Hill: Institute for Research in Social Science, 1962.
- Ellis, John T. American Catholicism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.
- _____. American Catholics and the Intellectual Life. Chicago: The Heritage Foundation, 1956.
- Farrell, Melvin. First Steps to the Priesthood: An Explanation of the Christian Life for Minor Seminarians. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1960.
- Fichter, Joseph H. Parochial School: a Sociological Study. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1958.
- _____. Social Relations in the Urban Parish. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- _____. Southern Parish. Vol. I: Dynamics of a City Church. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.
- Fordham University. Church in the Changing Community: An Area of Sociological Research. New York: Fordham University Press, 1958.
- Form, W. and Miller, D. Industry, Labor, and Community. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Fullam, Raymond B. The Popes on Youth. New York: D. McKay Co., Inc., 1956.
- Gelpi, Donald. Functional Asceticism. New York: Sheed and Ward, Inc., 1966.
- Gilson, Anton E. Disputed Questions in Education. New York: Doubleday, 1954.
- Gleason, G. Successful Social Action. New York: Vantage Press, 1961.

- Glock, C. and Stark, R. Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.
- Goodland, John. The Changing American School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life: the Role of Race, Religion, and National Origin. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Goslin, David. The School in Contemporary Society. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965.
- Gottlieb, D., Reeves, J., and TenHouten, W. The Emergence of Youth Societies. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Greeley, Andrew. And Young Men Shall See Visions. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.
- _____. Religion and Career: a Study of College Graduates. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
- _____. Religion, Culture, and Society. "Influences of the 'Religious Factor' on Career Plans and Occupational Values of College Graduates," ed. Louis Schneider. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- _____. Strangers in the House. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- _____. The Church and the Suburbs. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959.
- _____. The Hesitant Pilgrim: American Catholicism after the Council. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.
- Greeley, A. and Rossi, P. The Education of Catholic Americans. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.
- Guitton, Jean. Catholic-Protestant Dialogue. (trans. from the French by Fergus Murphy). Baltimore, Md.: Helicon Publishing Co., 1959.
- Halstead, Ronald. (ed.) The Priest and Vocations. (trans. from the French). Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1962.

- Hammond, Phillip. The Campus Clergyman. New York: Basic Books, 1966.
- Hertz, K. H. Everyman a Priest. New York: Muhlenberg Press, 1961.
- Johnstone, Ronald L. The Effectiveness of Lutheran Elementary and Secondary Schools as Agencies of Christian Education. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Seminary Research Center, 1966.
- Kane, John L. Catholic-Protestant Conflicts in America. Chicago: Regnery, 1955.
- Kelly, George A. The Catholic Family Handbook. New York: Random House, 1959.
- Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted: Alienated Youth in American Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1965.
- Kness, Robert. The Parish from Theology to Practice. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1958.
- Knudson, Harold F. To Know or Not To Be: An Arraignment of the Religiously Oriented Attitude. New York: Wm. Frederick Press, 1966.
- Kurtz, Paul. Handbook for Spiritual Growth Groups. Redwood City, California: Human Growth Institute, 1963.
- Lee, Robert and Marty, Martin E. Religion and Social Conflict. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Lhota, Brian G. Vocational Interests of Catholic Priests. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948.
- Longo, Gabriel. Spoiled Priest: the Autobiography of an Ex-Priest. New Hyde Park, New York: University Books, 1966.
- Maritain, Jacques. Reflections on America. New York: Scribner and Sons, 1958.
- Masse, Benjamin L. The Catholic Mind through Fifty Years: 1903-1953. New York: America Press, 1952.

- Mays, John B. The Young Pretenders: A Study of Teenage Culture in Contemporary Society.
- McAvoy, Thomas T. Roman Catholicism and the American Way of Life. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1960.
- McCarthy, T. J. Personality Traits of Seminarians. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942.
- McDonald, Donald. Catholics in Conversation. N. Y.: Lippincott, 1950.
- McGloin, Joseph T. Fifteen Years. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1955.
- McGorman, J. B. (ed.) Christian Wisdom and Christian Formation. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.
- McLoughlin, E. American Culture and Catholic Schools. New York: Lyle Stuart Co., 1960.
- Merton, Robert K., Broom, Leonard, and Cottrell, Leonard S. Jr., (ed.) Sociology Today. New York: Harper and Row, 1959.
- Michonneau, George. Revolution in a City Parish. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1952.
- Mizuchi, Ephraim H. The Substance of Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts; Meredith Publishing Company, 1967.
- Mullen, Joseph J. Psychological Factors in Pastoral Treatment of Scruples. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1927.
- Myers, Rawley. This is the Seminary. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1963.
- Navagh, James. The Apostolic Parish. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1950.
- Newman, Jeremiah. What is Catholic Action? Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1953.

- Niebuhr, H. R., Williams, D., and Gustafson, J. The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry: Reflections on the Aims of Theological Education. New York: Harper, 1956.
- Novak, Michael. The New Generation. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.
- Nugent, Francis E. The Priest in Our Day. Westminster, Md. Newman Press, 1954.
- O'Doherty, E. F. Religion and Personality Problems. New York: Alba House, n.d.
- Ogburn, William F. Social Change with Respect to Cultural and Original Nature. New York: Dell Publishers, 1966.
- Ong, Walter J. Frontiers in American Catholicism. New York: Macmillan Company, 1957.
- Pierce, James V. The Educational Motivation of Superior Students Who Do and Do Not Achieve in High School. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1959.
- Poague, G. and Treacy, J. P. Parents' Role in Vocations. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1959.
- Poole, Stafford. Seminary in Crisis. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.
- Putz, L. J. The Modern Apostle. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Publishers, 1957.
- Regional Church Planning. The West Side Church and Community Study. Buffalo, N. Y.: Regional Church Planning, 1966.
- Reiss, Albert J., Jr. Schools in a Changing Society. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Remmers, H. H. (ed.) Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1963.

- Robertson, D.B. (ed.) Voluntary Associations: a Study of Groups in Free Societies. Richmond, Va.: J. Knox Press, 1966.
- Rosen, Bernard C. Adolescence and Religion: the Jewish Teenager in American Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1966.
- Scharper, Philip. (ed.) American Catholics: a Protestant-Jewish View. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959.
- Schneider, Louis. (ed.) Religion, Culture, and Society. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- Schnepp, Gerald. Leakage from a Catholic Parish. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1942.
- Schuyler, Joseph. Northern Parish. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1960.
- Shaw, Marvin and Wright, J.M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishers, 1966.
- Sheed, F. J. God and Politics. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960.
- Simoneaux, Henry. Spiritual Guidance and the Varieties of Character. New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1956.
- Slater, Philip. Microcosm: Structural, Psychological, and Religious Evolution in Groups. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Snavely, Guy E. Religious Education. New York: Harper, 1955.
- Spencer, A. E. C. W., Mellon, E., and Roberts, W. N. T. Youth and Religion. London: Young Catholic Workers, 1958.
- Tavard, G. H. Church, the Layman, and the Modern World. New York: Macmillan Company, 1959.
- Tawney, R. H. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., Inc., 1926. (Mentor Publishing Co., eleventh printing, 1961).

Thomas, John L. Religion and the American People. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1963.

_____. The American Catholic Family. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Turner, Ralph H. The Social Context of Ambition: a Study of High School Seniors in L.A. San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishers, 1964.

Van Dusen, H.P. God in Education. New York: Scribner, 1954.

Vernon, Glenn M. Sociology of Religion. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

Ward, Leo R. New Life in Catholic Schools. New York: Herder and Company, 1958.

_____. Religious Education. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1960.

Warner, W. Lloyd. American Life: Dream and Reality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Warren, Roland. (ed.). Perspectives on the American Community: a Book of Readings. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Company, 1966.

Wynn, John C. How Christian Parents Face Family Problems. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955.

Yinger, J. Milton, Religion, Society, and the Individual. New York: Macmillan Company, 1957.

Znaniecki, F. Social Relations and Social Roles. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1965.

_____. The Method of Sociology. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1934.

_____. The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Articles and Periodicals

- Ahern, E. "Wasted Time in the Seminaries," Ave Maria, (August 31, 1963).
- America. "New Pattern for Catholic Education," (May , 1960).
- _____. "Seminary Reform," (November 16, 1963).
- _____. "Updating Seminaries," (August 8, 1964).
- _____. "Urban Church and Urban Problems," (October 24, 1959).
- Anderson, C. Arnold. "A Skeptical Note on the Relation of Vertical Mobility to Education," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXVI, (May, 1961).
- Ave Maria. "Minor Seminaries: A New Proposal," (December 4, 1965).
- Bier, William C. "Practical Requirements of a Program for Psychological Screening of Candidates," Review for Religious, 13:13-27, (January, 1954).
- _____. " Ψ Tests in the Screening of Candidates in the Minor Seminary," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, LI (August, 1954), 128-35.
- _____. "Psychological Testing of Candidates and the Theology of Vocations," Review for Religious, 12:291-303, (November, 1953).
- Blow, Richard. "The Sociology of Religion in Latin America," American Catholic Sociological Review, 15:161-75, (June, 1954).
- Booth, Goddard. "The Psychological Examination of Candidates for the Ministry," Ministry and Mental Health, ed. Hans Hoffman. New York: Association Press, 1960.
- Boucree, T. C. "Negro Priests in the American Apostolate," Shield, XXXII, (March, 1953), 2-4.
- Brecht, C. A. "Public Relations for the Minor Seminary," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 58:84-93, (August, 1961).

Brown, J. R. "Catholic Social Action in the American Environment," Social Order, 10:43-45, (January, 1960).

Buckley, W. F. "The Catholic in the Modern World," Commonweal, 73:307-10, (October, 1960).

Berghardt, W. "The Intellectual Formation of the Future Priest," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 61:58-68, (August, 1964).

Burrell, D. "Theology and the Seminary," Perspectives, 10:83-84, (May-June, 1965).

Callahan, D. "Freedom of Priests," Commonweal, 79:95-98, (October 18, 1963). (Discussion: 79:285-88 and 79:373-75), (Nov.-Dec., 1963).

Catholic Layman. "Seminaries Under Fire," 87:26, (July, 1964).

Catholic School Journal. "Psychological Testing in Seminaries," 64:24, (December, 1964).

Catholic World. "Seminary Aggiornamento," 200:136, (December, 1964).

Clark, Dennis. "Catholic and Urban Affairs," Social Order, 10:53-57, (February, 1960).

_____. "Modern Christians and the Wealth of Cities," Social Order, 11:12-22, (July, 1961).

Commonweal. "Priests of the Slums," 64: 510, (August 24, 1956).

_____. "Seminary Training," 79:497-98, (January 31, 1964).

_____. "To Preach and Teach," 74:4, (March 31, 1961).

Conley, K. "Ecumenism and the Catholic Seminary," Christian Century, 82:523-25, (April 28, 1965).

Coyle, P. R. "The I.Q. of Seminararians," Priest, 17:520-22, (June, 1961).

- Cushing, R. "The Christian and the Community," Commonweal, 72:27, (April 8, 1960).
- Davis, T. N. "Who Will Teach Religion in America?," America, 96:27, (October 13, 1956).
- D'Arcy, P. "Differential Seminary Discipline," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 61:85-89, (August, 1964).
- Deasy, P. "Portrait of a Parish Priest," Commonweal, 69:392, (January 9, 1959).
- Delea, Leo et al. "The Changes in Religious Life in Spain During the Last Twenty Years," Lumen Vitae, 6:104-18, (January-June, 1951).
- Delmage, Willibald. "There is a Student Social Apostolate," Direction, (March, 1957).
- Dillingham, H. G. "Protestant Religious and Social Status," American Journal of Sociology, LXX, (January, 1965), 416-22.
- Donnellan, T. A. "New Breed, Old Breed, and the Creed," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 62:103-08, (August, 1965).
- Donovan, John D. "American Catholic Sociologists and the Sociology of Religion," American Catholic Sociological Review, 15:104-14, (June, 1954).
- Elder, Glen H., Jr. "Achievement Orientation and Career Patterns of Rural Youth," Sociology of Education, 37:30-58, (Fall, 1963).
- Eberhard, K. "Can Seminaries Improve Right Now?," Ave Maria, 98: 5-7, (December 7, 1963). (Replies in Jan.-Feb., 1964).
- _____. "What Seminaries Don't Teach," Ave Maria, 98:13-14, (July, 1963). (Replies in Aug. , 1963).

- Falardeau, Jean. "Reviews of 'Southern Parish' and 'Sociology of the Parish'," American Journal of Sociology, 60:308-10, (November, 1954).
- Farrell, M. "Let's Keep Our Minor Seminaries," American Educational Review, 154:302-11, (May, 1965).
- Ferkiss, V. C. "Social Action in the Affluent Society," Catholic Mind, Vol. 57, (August, 1959).
- _____. "Suburbia: a Religious Problem?," Social Order 10:84-88. (February, 1960).
- Fichter, Joseph H. "Catholics in the United States," America, 82:523-24, (February 4, 1950).
- _____. "Parochial School Teacher," Catholic World, 185:51-55, (April, 1957).
- _____. "Profile of Catholic Religious," American Journal of Sociology, 58:145-49, (September, 1952).
- _____. "Religious Values and the Social Personality," American Catholic Sociological Review, XVII, (June, 1956), 109-16.
- _____. "That 'Celibacy' Survey," America, 116:92-95, (January 21, 1967).
- _____. "Urban Mobility and Religious Observance," American Catholic Sociological Review, 11:130-39, (October, 1950).
- Fick, J. L. "Nature and Purpose of Communications Program in the Seminary," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 59:52-57, (August, 1962).
- Fink, Salvator, OFM, "Personality Traits with Regard to Vocations," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, LIII, (August, 1956), 352-53.
- Fitzpatrick, J. P. "Catholics and the Common Good," Commonweal, (July, 1955).

- Flanagan, A. J. "Priest and Social Action," Catholic Mind, 51:719-25, (December, 1953).
- Furfey, P. H. "Code of the Catholic Clergy," Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science, 297:64-69, (January, 1955).
- _____. "Is Ours a Mission Country?," American Ecclesiastical Review, 120:8-18, (January, 1949).
- Furlong, M. "Parish Pattern," Commonwealth, 66:11-13, (September 20, 1957).
- Furrow. "The Training of Priests Symposium," 16:259-82, (May, 1965).
- Gallagher, R. "The Education of the Clergy," Catholic Charities Review, 47:1-2, (December, 1963). (Reply by M. McCarthy, 48:18, Mar., 1964).
- Gannon, R. I. "In a Catholic Ghetto," America, 104:13-14, (October 1, 1960).
- Gibson, J. E. "How Do You Rate Yourself?," Catholic Digest, (August, 1959).
- Giese, V. J. "Toward a Teen-Age Catholic Movement," Apostolate, 7:2-8, (September, 1960).
- Giguere, R. "The Reorientation of Seminary Courses," National Association of Liturgical Work, 24:7-23, (1963).
- Gleason, J. "Does the Seminary Take Boys Too Young?," Liguorian, 53:42-44, (June, 1965).
- Glick, Paul and Young, Kimball. "Justification for Religious Attitudes and Habits," Journal of Social Psychology, XVII, (February, 1943), 45-68.
- Godin, A. "Psychology and Religion in Training for Urban Social Work," Social Service, 20:10-17, (January, 1960).

Greeley, Andrew M. "Changing City," Catholic World, 188:481-87, (March, 1959).

_____. "City Life and the Churches," America, 103:573-74, (August 27, 1960).

_____. "Letter to a Seminarian," Ave Maria, 97:5-9, (November 4, 1963).

Grigg, C. M. and Middleton, R. "Community of Orientations of Ninth Grade Students," Social Forces, 38:303-08, (May, 1960)

Groggin, R. D. OP, "Norms for Screening Applicants to Minor Seminaries and Novitiates," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, L, (August, 1953), 139-41.

Hafner, R. A. "Personality and Interests of the Seminarian," (C. Suttler's study), Nuntius Aulæ, 44:83-92, (1962).

Hagmaier, G. "Today's Religious Candidate: Psychological and Emotional Considerations," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 59:110-18, (August, 1962).

Hannan, J. "Preparatory School for Tomorrow's Priests," Saint Anthony Messenger, 71:26-29, (March, 1964).

Herr, V. J. "Loyola National Institute of Mental Health Seminary Projects: A Progress Report," American Catholic Sociological Review, 21:331-36, (November, 1960).

_____. "Mental Health Training in Seminaries," Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists Bulletin, 13:17-20, (January, 1966).

Herriot, Robert E. "Some Social Determinants of Educational Aspirations," Harvard Educational Review, XXXIII, (Spring, 1963).

Hickey, J. "Vatican II and Its Proposals for Seminaries," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 62:116-27, (August, 1965).

Hoffman, J. "Meet the Young Christian Workers," Liguorian, 48:22-27.

- Homiletic and Pastoral Review. "American Catholic Seminary Renewal," 65:340-46, (January, 1965).
- Horne, E. P. and Stender, W. H. "Student Attitudes Toward Religious Practices," Journal of Social Psychology, XXII, (1945), 215-17.
- Howe, R. L. "What is Christian Education?," International Journal of Religious Education, 35:8-9, (July, 1959).
- Hulme, W. E. "Breakthrough: Dubuque's Experiment in Ecumenism: Cooperative Graduate Programs and Open Classes for Undergraduates," The Christian Century, 82:1187-90, (September 29, 1965).
- Inman, George H. "Apostles to Apostles," Action Now, (January, 1956).
- Jarbusch, W. F. "New Seminaries in Europe," Commonweal, (October 7, 1966), 17-21.
- Jeanne, Sister. "To What Extent are Opinions Conditioned by Social or Majority Pressure?," Catholic Art Quarterly, 120: 56-67, (Spring, 1957).
- Keefe, R. "College Entrance Policies," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 61:121-26, (August, 1964).
- Kennedy, E. "Aggiornamento, Anxiety, and the Seminary," Critic, 23:33-35, (June-July, 1965).
- Kennedy, Ruby Jo Reeves. "Single or Triple Melting Pot," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXIX, No. 4, (January, 1944).
- Kinnane, J. "The Minor Seminarian: A Growing Boy," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 65:400-06, (February, 1965).
- LaFarge, John. "Catholic Intellectual and Social Movements," Catholic Mind, 53:551-59, (September, 1955).
- Lagey, Joseph C. "Social Factors Related to Attitude Change in Students," Sociology and Social Research, XXXIX, (July, 1955), 401-03.

- Leighton, S. "Ferment in the Seminaries," U.S. Catholic, (June, 1966), 32:6-14.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. "Social Correlates of Religious Interest," American Sociological Review, XVIII, (October, 1963). 533-44.
- Life. "Priest to the Oppressed," 50:93-94, (September 14, 1960).
- Liguorian. "About Lay Teachers in Catholic Schools," XLVII, (August, 1960), 31-33.
- Lindley, W. Kenneth and Soroka, John J. "Teens Tell Why Vocations Decline," Saint Anthony Messenger, Vol. LXXV, (May, 1963), 12, 19-22.
- Liu, William T. "The Community Reference System, Religiosity, and Race Attitudes," Social Forces, XXXIX, (May, 1961), 324-28.
- Locket, L. "Paths to Holiness: the Diocesan Priesthood," Doctrine and Life, 9:64-76, (September, 1959).
- Mahoney, R. "Is the High School Seminary Obsolete?," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 66:69-74, (May, 1966).
- Manley, B. M. "Junior Catholic Interracial Council of Syracuse," Interracial, 32:14- , (January, 1959).
- Masse, Benjamin L. "Catholic Mind," America, (101:192-93, (April 11, 1959).
- Mayer, A. J. and Sharp, R. "Religious Preference and Worldly Success," American Sociological Review, XXVII, (April, 1962), 218-27.
- McCarty, S. "Survey of Guidance Services in Selected Minor Seminaries," (abstract), Catholic Counselor, 5:103- , (Spring, 1961).
- McDonald, D. "Have Catholics Done Their Share?," America, 104-589, (February 4, 1961).
- McGiffert, A. C. "Greek Theologians to be in Protest," The Christian Century, 79:662-63, (May 23, 1962).

- McMullin, E. "Science and the Catholic Tradition," America, 102: 346-50, (December 12, 1959).
- Merton, Thomas. "Active and Contemplative Orders," Commonweal, 47:192-96, (December, 1947).
- Meseguer, P. "Are Priests Bourgeois?," America, 182:150-152, (November 7, 1959).
- Moore, J. C. "Quantity and Quality," Commonweal, 72:513-15, September 23, 1960).
- Mulvaney, Bernard. "Catholic Population Revealed in Catholic Baptisms," American Ecclesiastical Review, 183:183-93, (September, 1955).
- National Catholic Education Association Bulletin. "Behavioral Sciences and Seminary Life," 62:127-33, (August, 1965).
- _____. "Seminarians' Responsibility: Scope and Means," 59:128-31, (August, 1962).
- Niebuhr, R. "Religion and Education," Religious Education, 49:67-128, (March, 1954).
- O'Dea, Thomas. "The Sociology of Religion," American Catholic Sociological Review, 15:73-103, (June, 1954).
- O'Doherty, E. F. "Emotional Development of the Ecclesiastical Student," Doctrine and Life, 12:411-21, (August, 1962).
- O'Donoghue, J. "Reforming the Seminaries," Commonweal, 81:194-96, (November 6, 1964). (Replies in Dec.-Jan., 1964-65).
- Oger, H. M. "Young People in Face of the Church," Lumen Vitae, 17:683-94, (December, 1962).
- _____. "Young People in Face of Religion," Lumen Vitae, 17:435-54, (September, 1962).
- O'Neill, Michael. "Four Myths About Parochial Schools," America, 116:82-87, (January 21, 1967).

O'Neill, Francis J. "Are Seminarians Immature?," Liguorian, (January, 1967), 13-14.

Ottensmeyer, H. "Blueprint for Seminaries," America, 113:780-81, (December 18, 1965).

Photiadis, John D. "Overt Conformity to Church Teaching as a Function of Religious Belief and Group Participation," American Journal of Sociology, LXX, 423-28, (January, 1965).

Photiadis, J. D. and Johnson, A. "Orthodoxy, Church Participation, and Authoritarianism," American Journal of Sociology, LXIX, 244-48, (November, 1963).

Poole, S. "American Seminary Education," America, 113:288-89, (September, 1965).

_____. "The Ideal Seminary: Some Afterthought," Priest, 20:869-73, (October, 1964).

_____. "Tomorrow's Seminaries," America, 110:86-88, (January, 1964).

Pope, Liston. "Religion and the Class Structure," Annals of Political and Social Science, CLVI, 84-91, (March, 1948).

Powers, R. "Psychological Testing: Archdiocese of New York Admission to the Seminary," Jurist, 24:450-55, (October, 1964).

Priest. "Black Priest: Reflections of a Negro Convert," 16:92-99, (January, 1960).

Putney, Snell, and Middleton, R. "Dimensions and Correlates of Religious Ideologies," Social Forces, XXXIX, 285-90, (May, 1961).

Raftery, W. "Selecting Suitable Seminarians," Priest, 20:673-77, (August, 1964).

Raible, D. "Developing the Virtue of Genuine Love in the Minor Seminarians," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 60:102-109, (August, 1963).

- Reedy, J. L. "Explosive Buried in Catholic Schools," Ave Maria, 92:16-17, (September 10, 1960).
- Riga, P. "The Aggiornamento of Seminarists," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 61:89-96, (August, 1964).
- Rodloff, T. "A Seminarist Learns," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 62:32-36, (October, 1961).
- Rokeach, Milton. "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, 61:194-204, (1961).
- Rokeach, M. and Eglash, A. "A Scale for Measuring Intellectual Conviction," Journal of Social Psychology, 44:135-41, (1956).
- Rosenblum, Abraham L. "Ethnic Prejudice as Related to Social Class and Religiosity," Society and Social Research, XLIII, 272-75, (March, 1959).
- Rossi, R. "God and the People: Seminarists Concern," Shield, 44:27-28, (April-May, 1965).
- Schuyler, Joseph B. "Elements of Organization and Disorganization in Northern Parish," American Catholic Sociological Review, 18:98-112, (June, 1957).
- _____. "The Parish Studied as a Social System," American Catholic Sociological Review, 17:320-37, (December, 1956).
- _____. "Religious Behavior in Northern Parish: A Study in Motivating Values," American Catholic Sociological Review, 19:34-44, (June, 1958).
- Shehen, L. "The Seminary Today and Today's Seminarists: Obedience and Freedom," Priest, 20:742-50, (September, 1964).
- Sheil, B. J. "Vocation of the Student," Commonweal, 65:17- , (October 5, 1956).
- Siekman, T. C. "The Spiritual Direction of Teen-Age Boys," Homiletic and Pastoral Review, (June, 1946), 651- .

Simmons, W. "The Seminary in a Time of Renewal," Ave Maria, 103:13-15, (March 19, 1966).

Simons, J. "Seminary as Institution," Catholic Educational Review, 64:97-105, (Fall, 1966).

Simpson, Richard L. "Parental Influence, Anticipatory Socialization, and Social Mobility," American Sociological Review, 27:517-22, (August, 1962).

Sophia, Sister. "Teenagers Can Become Lay Apostles," Catholic School Journal, 60:21-23, (March, 1960).

Speltz, G. "The Winona Plan: Seminary and College: Seminary or Liberal Arts College Campus," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 60:1-7, (February, 1964).

Stark, R. and Glock, C. "The New Denominationalism," Review of Religious Research, 7:8-17, (Fall, 1965).

Strunk, Orlo. "Note on Self-Reports and Religiosity," Psychological Reports, 4:29- , (March, 1958).

Tablet. "Coeducation for Minor Seminarians," 220:1056, (September, 1966).

_____. "New Rules for Seminaries," 219:165, (February, 1965).

Tartre, R. "Crisis in the Seminary," Emmanuel, 70:98-108, (March, 1964).

Telford, C. W. "A Study of Religious Attitudes," Journal of Social Psychology, 31:217-30, (May, 1950).

Time. "Ministers of Tomorrow," 81:69, (February 22, 1963).

_____. "Reform in the Seminaries: Carrying Out the New Spirit of Freedom in the Catholic Church," 87:60, (April 15, 1966).

_____. "U.S. Membership Boom: Statistics on Number of Catholics Increasing Faster than Number of Seminarians, Priests, Parishes," 76:53- , (September 12, 1961).

- _____. "Vocation Gap," 77:53- , (April 7, 1961).
- Thomas, J. L. "Catholic Family in a Complex Society," Social Order, 5:309- , (September, 1955).
- _____. "Catholic Layman in the Crisis of the Modern Family, Sex, Parental Responsibilities," Catholic Messenger, 77:5-6, (April 23, 1959).
- Toland, T. "Methods of Teaching Theology in the Seminary," Catholic Theological Society of America Proceedings, 20:11-21, (1965).
- Tyson, Robert. "Current Mental Hygiene Practice: An Inventory of Basic Teachings," Journal of Clinical Psychology, Vol. VII, No. 1, (1951).
- Van Dyke, P. and Pierce-Jones, J. "The Psychology of Religion of Middle and Late Adolescence: A Review of Empirical Research, 1950-1960," Religious Education, 58:529-37, (November, 1963).
- Vanesse, J. "Television au Seminaire?," Maintenant, 3:207-08, June, 1964).
- Vernon, P. E. and Allport, G. "A Test for Personal Values," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 26:231-48, (Oct.-Dec., 1931).
- Veroff, Joseph et al. "Achievement Motivation and Religious Background," American Sociological Review, 27:205-17, (April, 1962).
- Veronica, Sister Helen. "A Religious Maturity Scale," Catholic Educator, 29:487-89, (March, 1959).
- Vie Spirituelle Supplement. "Formation des Responsables des Petits Seminaires Religieux," 15:5-200, (March, 1962).
- Von Kuehnelt, E. "American Protestants," America, 102:488-92, (January 16, 1960).
- Wagoner, W. D. "Ecumenicity and Seminary Archaism," The Christian Century, (April 25, 1962).

- Wakin, E. "Training at Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic Seminaries," Sign, 44:11-16. (October, 1964). (Replies in Nov. and Dec., 1964).
- Whealan, J. F. "Judging the Character of a Seminarian," Bulletin of the National Catholic Education Association, 59:103-09, (August, 1962).
- Windmueller, R. P. "Ideals and the Vocation of Brothers," Religious Review, Vol. XX, (January, 1961).
- Work, M. "What's Ahead for the Sixties?," Sign, 39:24-26, January, 1960).
- Wright, John C. "Personal Adjustment and Its Relationship to Religious Attitudes and Certainty," Religious Educator, 54:521-23, (November, 1959).
- Wright, J. J. "Perseverance in the Seminary: Problems and Remedies," American Educational Review, 147:73-87, (August, 1962).
- Zeller, P. "Seminaries and Puzzled Professors," Priest, 21:399-400, (May, 1965).

Unpublished Material

- Berghorn, Forrest J. "The Function of Parents as Role Models in the Character Development of Their Children: A Study Using the Concepts of 'Inner- and Other' Direction." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1964.
- Breen, Edward. "The Appraisal of Minor Seminarians." Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Cahoon, Sister M. Janelle. "Tensions and Dilemmas Facing Organized Christianity in the Contemporary United States as Recognized in Official Church Statements." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1963.

- Campbell, Douglas F. "Religion and Values Among Nova-Scotian College Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1964.
- Chatel, Marie, A. L. "The Effect of Being in a Longitudinal Study of Career Development on Certain Aspects of Early Vocational Behavior." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1964.
- Coombs, Robert H. "A Socio-Psychological Analysis of the Relationship between High School and College Scholastic Achievements." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University, 1964.
- Dedication Booklet, Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary and Quigley Preparatory Seminary South, September 13, 1962.
- Enrollment and Statistics for Quigley, Niles, and Mundelein. Unpublished Report for the Chicago Seminary System, September, 1966,4.
- Ezekiel, Raphael S. "Differentiation, Demand, and Agency in Projections of the Personal Future: A Predictive Study of the Performance of Peace Corps Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.
- Gorman, John R. "Adjustment and Interests of Fourth Year Minor Seminarians Studying for the Diocesan Priesthood." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Loyola University, Chicago, 1961.
- Heckert, Paul C. "The Forms of Social Expression: A Study of Response Consistency." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1964.
- Hershenson, David B. "Erikson's Sense of Identity, Occupational Fit, and Enculturation in Adolescence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1964.
- Hilbert, Richard E. "The Relation of Deferred Gratification to School Grades." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963.

- Houts, Peter S. "The Relation Between Psychological Distance to a Goal and Intensity of Performance." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.
- Hynam, Charles A.S. "Some Sociological Aspects of Superstition in Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1964.
- Islar, Stanley M. "The Expressed Moral Beliefs of Adolescent Boys of Different Socio-Economic Status and Race." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1963.
- Jenne, William C. "Parental Life Goals for Children." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1964.
- Johnson, Cyrus M. "Family Patterns and Occupational Success Orientation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1963.
- Johnson, Kenneth E. "Personal Religious Growth Through Small Group Participation: A Psychological Study of Personality Changes and Shifts in Religious Attitudes Which Result from Participation in a Spiritual Growth Group." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pacific School of Religion, 1963.
- Kenny, Charles. "Differential Vocational Interest Patterns of Successful and Unsuccessful Foreign Mission Seminarians." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, 1959.
- Leonard, Richard C. "Community Values in Educational and Occupational Selection: A Study of Youth in Emmitsburg, Maryland," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1963.
- McCarrick, Theodore E. "The Vocation Parish: An Analysis of a Group of High Vocation Supplying Parishes in the Archdiocese of New York to Determine the Common Characteristics of the Vocation Parish." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1963.
- McDonough, Andrew. "A Study of Adjustment and Interests of First-Year College Seminarians for the Diocesan Priesthood." Unpublished M.A. thesis, Loyola University, Chicago, 1961.

- McNamara, Robert J. "The Interplay of Intellectual and Religious Values." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1963.
- Moore, Douglas R. "Anxiety and the Development of Values in Early Adolescence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1964.
- Murray, John B. "Training for the Priesthood and Personality Interest Test Manifestations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1957.
- O'Neil, Robert P. "The Development of Political Thinking During Adolescence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1964.
- Ostrow, Jeanne. "A Comparative Study of Certain Aspects of Intellectual Functioning in Achieving and Low-Achieving High School Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.
- Palisi, Bartolomeo. "Ethnicity, Family Structure, and Participation in Voluntary Associations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1963.
- Pittard, Barbara B. "The Meaning and Measurement of Commitment to the Church." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Emory University, 1963.
- Powell, John R. "Development and Change in Certain Senses of the Self During Adolescence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Missouri, 1964.
- Schmuck, Richard A. "Social-Emotional Characteristics of Classroom Peer Groups." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.
- Shook, Charles. "Rebellion Against Authority in Religious Maturation." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1963.

- Smith, Inez L. "The Invariance of Educational Attitudes and Their Relation to Social Attitudes: An Inverse Factor Analytic Study." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1963.
- Smith, Thomas E. "Social Class and Adolescents' Attitudes Toward Adopting or Rejecting Their Fathers' Frames of Reference." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1964.
- Sutter, Cyril R. "A Comparative Study of the Interest and Personality Patterns of Major Seminarians." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1961.
- Swickard, Don L. "A Factor Analytic Study of the Patterns of Religious Belief, Degree of Prejudice, and Perceived Parent-Child Rearing Practices." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Denver, 1963.
- Trent, James W. "The Development of Intellectual Disposition Within Catholic Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1964.
- Unpublished Minutes of the Day Seminary Administrators.
Catonsville, Maryland: Saint Charles College, November 2, 1967.
- Wauck, LeRoy. "An Investigation into the Use of Psychological Tests as an Aid in the Selection of Candidates for the Diocesan Priesthood." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago, 1957.
- Zwillinger, Eugene L. "A Study of Conformity in Adolescents: the Effects of Social Class Membership and Self-Esteem." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1964.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by William Joseph Mackey has been read and approved by three members of the Department of Sociology.

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated, and that the dissertation is now given final approval with reference to content, form, and mechanical accuracy.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

January 19, 1970
Date

Paul W. Gundy
Signature of Advisor