DOCTORAL DISSERTATION SERIES
Publication No.: 8435

AUTHOR: John Charles Whitcomb, Ph. D., 1954
University of Michigan

TITLE: THE DETERMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND THE NATURE AND PERSISTENCE OF PROBLEMS IN THE PROTESTANT MINISTRY

University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE DETERMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND THE NATURE AND PERSISTENCE OF PROBLEMS IN THE PROTESTANT MINISTRY

by
John C. Whitcomb

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1954

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Harlan C. Koch, Chairman
Assistant Professor H. Glenn Ludlow
Professor Howard McClusky
Assistant Professor Wilbert J. McKeachie
Associate Professor William C. Morse

A DETERMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND THE NATURE AND PERSISTENCE OF PROBLEMS IN THE PROTESTANT MINISTRY

John C. Whitcomb

This study was stimulated by an increasing concern on the part of churchmen for the adjustment of ministers to the ministry. It was projected for the purpose of establishing the degree of relationship that might exist between personality characteristics and problems in the Protestant ministry.

The investigation tested five hypotheses:

1. There is a significant relationship between personality characteristics and problems in the Protestant ministry.
2. There is a significant relationship between personality characteristics and certain personal factors; namely, pastoral experience, age, marital status, educational status, number of children, number of brothers and sisters, father's occupation (professional versus non-professional), experience in industry and/or the trades, age at which the decision to enter the ministry was made, and veteran status.
3. There are significant differences between the personality characteristics of seminarians and the norms for the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.
4. There are no significant differences between the personality characteristics of seminarians and five-year graduates.
5. There are significant differences between seminarians and five-year graduates in terms of the problems which tend to disturb them.

The principle recent studies of personality and adjustment of Catholic and Protestant ministers were reviewed, and a preliminary questionnaire of ninety-nine problems of ministers was constructed. This questionnaire was submitted to 148 seminarians in Indiana and Illinois who were attending Garrett Biblical Institute.

On the basis of returns by eighty-three respondents, thirty-five problems were selected for the final problem evaluation instrument.

The paired-comparisons method was used to construct a Survey of the Opinions of Ministers concerning Problems in the Protestant Ministry, consisting of seventy-two comparisons. This instrument, together with a personal data inventory and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, was given to 156 seminarians and ninety-six five-year graduates from McCormick Theological Seminary, Garrett Biblical Institute, Federation of Theological Schools in the University of Chicago, and Union Theological Seminary. Of the total, 108 seminarians and sixty-five graduates responded.

The writer employed the Pearson product-moment correlation and the Fisher t test for the differences between means in making a detailed analysis of the data. A 1 percent and a 5 percent level of significance were used to determine whether the data supported the hypotheses.

The major findings included the following: Significant positive or negative relationships existed between seventeen problems of ministers and one or more personality factors. Intercorrelations between the ten factors measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were gratifyingly low. Significant positive relationships were found between the following personal factors and one or more personality characteristics: marital status, seminary status, number of brothers and sisters, industrial experience, and age. The seminarians exceeded the norms at the 1 percent level of significance for Restraint, Ascendancy, Sociability, Emotional Stability, Objectivity, Friendliness, Thoughtfulness, and Personal Relations. Differences between seminarians and five-year graduates were statistically significant for only the Thoughtfulness factor in the personality instrument. Significant differences were found between seminarians and five-year graduates on only five problems of ministers. Of the seminarians, 30.6 percent were

married and reported they had an average of 1.6 children per couple. Eighty percent reported they had one or more brothers and/or sisters. The fathers of 79.5 percent were engaged in non-professional occupations. Almost half reported having no full-time industrial and/or trades experience. The mean age for the decision to enter the ministry as a career was 23.6 years, with no evidence of a bi-modal distribution in the teens and early twenties.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer takes great pleasure in acknowledging his indebtedness to the following persons for their contributions to this investigation:

To Dr. Harlan C. Koch, the writer's major professor, chairman, and friend, whose encouragement and assistance contributed greatly to the successful completion of the project.

To the members of the doctoral committee: Dr. Howard McClusky, Dr. William Morse, Dr. H. Glenn Ludlow, and Dr. Wilbert McKeachie for their efforts and helpful suggestions.

To Dr. Paul S. Dwyer for his statistical advice.

To Mr. John Fedyk, instructor in I.B.M. operations, for his assistance on I.B.M. operations.

To Dr. Harold M. Skidmore, Superintendent of the Michigan Congregational Conference, for his suggestions and assistance in formulating the problem.

To the following professors of pastoral theology, without whose assistance this project would not have been possible: Dr. Walker M. Alderton, Chicago Theological Seminary; Dr. Richard W. Miller, Garrett Biblical Institute; President Wallace M. Robbins, Meadville Theological School; Dr. G. W. Webber, Union Theological Seminary; Dr. William N. Weaver, The University of Chicago; Dr. Alfred S. Nickless, McCormick Theological Seminary; Dr. W. B. Blakemore, The Disciples Divinity House; and Dr. Llewelyn Owen, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology.

To the Catholic University of America for their splendid cooperation in making available research information.

To the many seminarians and ministers for their contribution of the required data.

And lastly, to Lenore Whitcomb, the writer's wife, for her patience, encouragement, and help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS		iii
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I.	THE CHARACTER OF THE PROBLEM	1
	Origin of the problem	2
	Objectives of the study	3
	Definitions of terms	4
	Delimitations of the study	5
	Description of the study	6
	Construction of a problem evaluation instrument	6
	Collection of data	8
	Analysis of data	9
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	11
	Studies in Catholicism	11
	Studies in Protestantism	17
	Summary	23
III.	HOW PROBLEMS WERE SECURED	25
	Construction of preliminary questionnaire	25
	Administration of preliminary questionnaire	27
	Analysis of data	27
	Summary	37
IV.	INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE FINAL INQUIRY.	39
	Construction of personal data inventory.	39
	Selection of a personality inventory	40
	Construction of a problem evaluation instrument	43
	The method of paired comparisons	43
	Summary	48
V.	COLLECTION AND TABULATION OF THE DATA.	49
	Selection of the subjects	49
	Administration of the final questionnaire	51

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
	Instructions to respondents	52
	Anonymity of responses	53
	Scoring the responses	54
	Recording the data	55
	Summary	55
VI.	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	56
	Interpretation of responses to the final inquiry	56
	Determination of the significance of certain coefficients of correlation. .	57
	Determination of the significance of differences between seminarians and five-year graduates on personality and problem evaluation responses . . .	61
	Determination of the significance of differences between the seminarians from the participating schools on the Guilford-Zimmerman Survey and on the problem evaluation responses	62
	Summary	63
VII.	FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT STUDY	64
	Analysis of responses to the final inquiry	64
	The personal data responses	64
	The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	71
	Correlation of final inquiry variables .	83
	Correlation of Guilford-Zimmerman scores with the problem evaluation responses	83
	Correlation of the Guilford-Zimmerman scores with personal data responses. .	100
	Significance of differences between seminarians and five-year graduates on certain variables	102
	Analysis of differences between theological schools on certain variables	110
	Differences between seminaries on the Guilford-Zimmerman scores	111
	Differences between seminaries on the problem evaluation instrument	111
	Summary	117

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
VIII.	FINAL CONSIDERATIONS	119
	Summary of the investigation	119
	Reflections concerning the investigation	127
APPENDIX		132
BIBLIOGRAPHY		154

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Degree of Concern and Frequency of Occurrence of Ninety-nine Problems as Judged by Eighty-three Ministers-in-Training	29
II.	Random Order for the Presentation of Pairs in the Paired-Comparisons Instrument	47
III.	Distribution by Seminaries of the Seminarians Selected to Answer the Final Questionnaire, and of Seminarians Completing It	50
IV.	Distribution by Seminaries of the Five-year Graduates Selected to Answer the Final Questionnaire, and of the Graduates Completing It	52
V.	Length of Pastoral Experience of 108 Respondents	66
VI.	Ages of Respondents	66
VII.	Marital Status of Respondents	67
VIII.	Number of Children of Respondents	67
IX.	Academic Degrees Held by Respondents	67
X.	Seminary Status of Respondents	69
XI.	Number of Brothers and/or Sisters of Respondents	69
XII.	Occupations of Respondents' Fathers	70
XIII.	Extent of Full-time Industrial and/or Trades Experience of Respondents	70
XIV.	Age when the Decision was Made to Enter the Ministry as a Career	72
XV.	Veteran Status of Respondents	72

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
XVI.	Significance of the Differences Between Means of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey Factors and Norms Established for those Factors	74
XVII.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the General Activity Scale of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	76
XVIII.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Restraint Scale . .	76
XIX.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Ascendance Scale . .	77
XX.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Sociability Scale .	77
XXI.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Emotional Stability Scale	79
XXII.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Objectivity Scale .	79
XXIII.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Friendliness Scale .	80
XXIV.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Thoughtfulness Scale	80
XXV.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Personal Relations Scale	82
XXVI.	Distribution of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians on the Masculinity Scale .	82
XXVII.	Product-Moment Coefficients of Correlation Between Guilford-Zimmerman Scores and Scores Assigned to Thirty-five Problems by 108 Seminarians . . .	85

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table		Page
XXVIII.	Intercorrelations of Scores on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey Based on the Responses of 108 Seminarians	98
XXIX.	Product-Moment Coefficients of Correlation Between Guilford-Zimmerman Scores and Personal Data Inventory Responses by 108 Seminarians	101
XXX.	Significance of Differences Between Means of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians and 62 Ministers on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	103
XXXI.	Significance of Differences Between Means of Scores Obtained by 108 Seminarians and 62 Ministers on the Problem Evaluation Instrument	105
XXXII.	A Comparison of the Responses by Seminaries on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey	112
XXXIII.	A Comparison of the Responses by Seminaries on the Problem Evaluation Instrument	113

CHAPTER I

THE CHARACTER OF THE PROBLEM

The adjustment of ministers to the ministry has in recent years become a problem of increasing concern to churchmen and seminary administrators alike. The causes of this concern are two-fold; first, the need is increasingly evident among Protestant churches for ministers who are able to function effectively in the roles of preacher, pastor, priest, administrator, and counselor in a complex and troubled society; and second, the high cost of educating a seminarian for the ministry, only a small portion of which is paid by the student, makes the reduction of drop-outs due to maladjustment mandatory.

The need for self-understanding on the part of the minister as a pre-requisite for personal adjustment and an effective ministry is stressed by Wise when he says,

> To become aware of oneself, one's motives, frustrations, unhealthy reactions to life, is essential to the emotional maturity of the religious worker. And emotional maturity is a necessity for an effective religious ministry, whether that ministry is exercised in the pulpit, the classroom, or the counseling office.[1]

Hudson discusses the impact of the minister's emotions on the counseling relationship when he writes,

---

[1]Carroll A. Wise, "The Value of Clinical Training for Religious Education," Religious Education, XXXVIII (May-June, 1943), 162.

> Most modern ministers are called upon to do a certain amount of counseling... if the pastor has an emotional "kink," it is amazing how frequently he will project it into an interview. In other words, if the minister has an "illness of the unconscious" he may study all the books on psychotherapy and yet be a poor, even harmful, counselor.[1]

Similar conclusions have been expressed by Putsch[2] in terms of hostility, and by Stolz[3] from the point of view of occupational neuroses.

The present study is an attempt to determine the relationship between personality characteristics of ministers and the nature and persistence of problems in the Protestant ministry. In the opinion of the writer, such an investigation should provide ministers and seminary administrators with valuable information concerning the student minister's mental health as it relates to his work in the ministry.

Origin of the problem.-- The problem had its origin in the offices of the State Superintendent, Michigan Congregational Conference, during a conference on the problems of ministers as they relate to drop-outs and turnover in pastoral appointments. At that time the

---

[1]R. Lofton Hudson, "The Emotions of the Minister," Pastoral Psychology, II (May, 1951), 36.

[2]Robert W. Putsch, "The Elements of Hostility in Parish Work," Pastoral Psychology, II (February, 1951), 44.

[3]Karl R. Stolz, The Church and Psychotherapy. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943. P. 230.

question was raised, "What makes a minister want to move from pastorate to pastorate, even though there is no evident increase in salary or other gain?" The writer discussed the possibility of getting some evidence bearing on the problem, and a cooperative relationship was established in an effort to pin-point possible approaches to such a study.

Since tensions in pastoral relations seem to be a major factor in the problem, the author presented the possibility of determining the relationship between personality characteristics of ministers and those problems which seem to produce tension in the work of the ministry. It was felt that, if some light could be shed on this area of inquiry, steps might be taken which would lead to greater self-understanding for the minister, as well as to a fresh appraisal of the pastoral situation by ministers and seminary authorities. The purpose of this study, then, is to determine whether the problems which tend to disturb the minister are related to his personality, or whether they are a function of the pastoral situation.

Objectives of the study.-- The following objectives have prompted the writer to carry out this investigation:

1. To gain a greater knowledge of the problems which tend to disturb ministers in their pastoral work.

2. To secure knowledge about the personalities of ministers and their relationship to the problems which tend to disturb them.

3. To determine whether personality characteristics and disturbing problems in the ministry tend to persist through years of experience.

Definition of terms.-- In order that certain basic terms might be used without confusion to the reader, they are defined as follows:

1. Personality characteristics are considered to include those aspects of the personalities of ministers which are measurable by means of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

2. Personality is defined as the dynamic organization within the individual of those psychological systems that determine his unique adjustments to his environment.

3. Problem evaluation is a decision as to which of two problems most disturb the minister in his ministry.

4. Problems of ministers refer to any stimulus, directly related to the ministry, which cause feelings of tension or frustration in the minister.

5. Five-year graduates refer to the graduates of 1947 from the participating schools.

Hypotheses to be tested.-- The investigator proposes to test the following hypotheses in connection with the stated problem:

1. There is a significant relationship between the personality characteristics of Protestant ministers-in-training, as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and problems related to the Protestant ministry.

2. There is a significant relationship between personality characteristics and certain personal factors: pastoral experience, age, marital status, educational status, number of children, number of brothers and sisters, father's occupation (professional versus non-professional), experience in industry and the trades, age at which the decision to enter the ministry was made, and veteran status.

3. There are significant differences between the personality characteristics of ministers-in-training and norms established for the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

4. There are no significant differences between the personality characteristics of ministers-in-training and those of five-year graduates.

5. There are significant differences between ministers-in-training and five-year graduates in terms of the problems which tend to disturb them.

These hypotheses will be tested in the light of the obtained data and conclusions will be drawn as to whether or not they have been substantiated.

Delimitations.-- The investigation was delimited in four respects. First of all, the subjects of the study were seminarians who were carrying full pastoral responsibilities while completing their training for the ministry. Assistant pastors, Sunday School superintendents, directors of Religious Education, and the like were excluded. The second limitation concerns the location of the seminaries from which the subjects were chosen, namely the metropolitan areas of Chicago and New York. The third limitation concerns the elimination of women seminarians from the study, since there were few involved. Fourth, the problems selected for the study were confined to those which were revealed by ministers themselves and which are directly related to the ministry. Similar problems of an ethical nature were excluded for reasons that are discussed in Chapter II.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

The study was conducted in the following seminaries in the fall and winter of 1952-1953: Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois; McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois; the Federation of Theological Schools in the University of Chicago which include Chicago Theological Seminary, The Divinity School of the University of Chicago, The Disciples Divinity House, and Meadville Theological School; and finally, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

The purpose of the investigation, as has been previously indicated, was to determine, first of all, how ministers-in-training exhibiting certain personality characteristics evaluated the problems which tend to disturb ministers in their work; secondly, determine the relationship of certain personal data items to personality characteristics of ministers-in-training; and third, determine the persistence of those problems and personality characteristics among five-year graduates of the same institutions who are now serving churches as pastors. A questionnaire was used to secure information deemed to be important by the investigator and by the administrators of the participating seminaries.

Construction of a problem evaluation instrument.-- As a first step in the construction of a problem evaluation instrument, the investigator compiled a list of

more than a hundred problems of ministers. These problems were secured from the personal experiences of ministers and seminarians in the field, and from pertinent literature. This list of problems was submitted to twenty ministers-in-training at Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio with the request that they evaluate each item in terms of the degree to which it disturbed them in their ministry, and the frequency of its occurrence. In addition, they were requested to indicate any evidence of overlapping, vagueness of meaning, or other possible weaknesses or error. As a result of the pretest, certain changes were made in the wording of some of the problems, overlapping problems were eliminated, and further additions were made to the list so that the revised list encompassed ninety-nine problems of ministers.

The second phase in the construction of a problem evaluation instrument consisted of the drafting of a preliminary questionnaire designed to measure the degree of disturbance and frequency of occurrence for each of the ninety-nine problems. This questionnaire was submitted to a group of 148 ministers-in-training at Garrett Biblical Institute who were serving churches as pastors in Indiana and Illinois. Written instructions accompanied the instrument, and the seminary faculty member representing Garrett Biblical Institute in the study was prepared to answer any queries. All replies were kept strictly anonymous by the

use of code numbers assigned to each respondent. A total of eighty-three completed this phase of the investigation, which was conducted by necessity on a voluntary basis.

The data thus obtained were utilized in the construction of a paired-comparisons measure of disturbance. The problems were ranked both on the basis of degree of disturbance and frequency of occurrence, and the thirty-five problems which ranked highest in both disturbance and frequency were chosen for the final disturbance evaluation instrument. Every item was paired with the two items on each side of it according to Guilford[1] and the paired comparisons thus obtained were then placed in the final instrument at random and in such a manner that a minimum of three comparisons separated the repetition of any one item.[2] A detailed account of the construction of the problem evaluation instrument is given in Chapter IV.

Collection of data.-- For purposes of final inquiry, the professors of pastoral theology in each of the seminaries were personally contacted by the writer, and were made acquainted with the problem. The final questionnaire was then submitted directly to the seminarians by mail, together with instructions to return the responses to the

---

[1]J. P. Guilford, Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1936. P. 236.

[2]Thomas C. McCormick, Elementary Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1941. P. 227.

author by the same means. The professors rendered effective assistance by expressing their endorsement and support of the study, and personally urging all the seminarians who had been contacted to participate in the study.

Lists of the five-year graduates of the same institutions who are now serving churches as pastors were obtained, and contact was established by mail. As before, the professors who served as seminary representatives rendered effective assistance by writing a letter of endorsement from their offices to each alumnus.

The survey material consisted of three sections: (1) a personal data inventory; (2) the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey with an answer sheet for machine scoring; and (3) a problem evaluation instrument. Each minister was asked to complete the survey material at his convenience, and then return it directly to the author in self-addressed envelopes which were provided. From the 156 seminarians contacted, 108 replies were received for a return of 69.2 percent. From the ninety-six ministers who were contacted by mail, sixty-five responses were received for a return of 67 percent. A more detailed discussion of the methods used in collecting the data will be found in Chapter V.

Analysis of the data.-- Responses to the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were machine-scored. The

responses to the problem evaluation instrument were scored with the aid of a simple hand-scoring device constructed by the writer. The personal data were also scored by hand. The scores from the three instruments were then recorded on a single information sheet with the code number of the respondent at the top, after which the code number and all scores were recorded on punched cards.

The required statistical computations were made on an I.B.M. 602A calculator. Product-moment coefficients of correlation were computed in accordance with the hypotheses previously indicated, and the significance of differences between seminarians and ministers in Temperament scores and in problem evaluations were determined. The correlations were tested for non-linearity of regression, and inter-correlations between the Temperament factors were determined to test the uniqueness of the factors on the Temperament survey among seminarians. Chapter VI presents a more detailed account of how the data were analyzed. The reader is referred to Chapter VIII for the conclusions pertinent to the entire study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

There are relatively few studies related to the personality and adjustment of ministers, and most of these have been carried out within the framework of the Catholic Church. In the opinion of the present writer, a review of the studies, first in Catholicism and then in Protestantism should provide some information pertinent to this study.

STUDIES IN CATHOLICISM

The earliest attempt to evaluate the personality traits of seminarians was made by Sward,[1] in which eighty Roman Catholic seminarians rated themselves on the Heidbrader scales for "introversion" and "inferiority complex." Comparative norms were established by presenting the same scales to college students, to a group of university faculty members, and to a group of business men. All ratings remained anonymous. The author concluded,

> It appears that emotionality in the form of introversion and inferiority attitudes may be regarded as a condition which predisposes an individual toward religious experience. The vocational choice of candidates for the Roman

---

[1]Keith Sward, "Temperament and Religious Experience," Journal of Social Psychology, II (October, 1931), 379-396.

> Catholic priesthood, therefore, may be in part a function of emotional drives which divert such individuals from the more usual social channels. This temperamental susceptibility is probably best described as a general tender-mindedness rather than as highly specific patterns of traits separable by hard and fast distinctions.[1]

McCarthy[2] conducted an extensive investigation of the personality traits of Catholic seminarians by giving the Bernreuter Personality Inventory, Bell Adjustment Inventory, the Vernon-Allport Scale of Values, and either the Otis Intelligence Test or the A.C.E. Examination to 229 major and minor seminarians for the purpose of helping to set up a personality testing program for seminarians. Three faculty members also rated each seminarian on a faculty rating scale which he constructed. Intercorrelations indicated two general factors: the schizoid factor, and a "general fitness for continuance in seminary life." The author found that the average seminarian manifested a little higher "neurotic tendency," a higher degree of self-consciousness and a more unsatisfactory total adjustment in comparison with the average student, as measured by the Bell Inventory. Scores for introversion and sociability were about the same, though the seminarians were somewhat more submissive. Religious

---

[1] Ibid., 392.

[2] Thomas J. McCarthy, "Personality Traits of Seminarians," Studies in Psychology and Psychiatry. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 1942, V, No. 4. Pp. 46.

interests of the seminarians were clearly dominant on the Vernon-Allport Scale of Values.

A similar study of women novices was conducted by Peters[1] who administered a battery of tests, including the A.C.E. Psychological Examination, the Bernreuter Personality Scale, the Vernon-Allport Scale of Values, and the Bell Adjustment Inventory, to 148 women novices. In addition, controlled interviews were set up using Moore's rating scale on ten pre-psychotic traits: deluded, cognitive ability, sulkiness, non-sociability, quarrelsomness, irritability, timidity, anxiety, depression, and retardation. Finally, three judges rated the novices on the following traits: sociability, leadership, emotional control, capacity to adjust, industry, and fidelity to duty. The author found that the novices scored significantly lower than the norm for self-sufficiency and dominance on the Bernreuter Inventory. There were no significant differences in neurotic tendency, and intelligence was apparently not an important factor among the desirable traits.

Bier[2] compared four groups composed of 208 medical

---

[1]Sister Richarda Peters, "A Study of the Inter-Relations of Personality Traits Among a Group of Novices in Religious Communities," Studies in Psychology and Psychiatry, V, No. 7. Catholic University of America, 1942. PP. 38.

[2]William C. Bier, A Comparative Study of a Seminary Group and Four Other Groups on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1948. Pp. 107.

students, 55 law students, 121 dental students, and 369 college students with 171 seminary students on the Minnesotal Multiphasic Personality Inventory. All the groups were matched with the seminary group, and the non-Catholic, marital status, and age factors were equated. The evidence indicated that all five groups made significantly higher scores than the norms for the scales, thus indicating maladjustment. The seminarians proved to be the most deviant portion of an already deviant population. The order of deviation from the norms, on the basis of the data, follows: (1) seminarians, (2) law students, (3) medical students, (4) dental students, and lastly, (5) college students.

An attempt was made by Burke[1] to determine the predictive value of certain measures for probable success in minor seminaries. The author visited three boarding-school minor seminaries and administered the Terman Test of Mental Ability - Form C, the Sims Score Card for Socio-Economic Status - Form C, the Religious and Disciplinary Home Environment Questionnaire, a Scale for Faculty Rating of Seminarians, the Washburne Social Adjustment Inventory, and the Vernon-Allport Scale of Values to 190 grade nine and 90 grade twelve students. He cites from the schools' records, the one embracing forty years and the other

---

[1]Henry R. Burke, Personality Traits of Successful Minor Seminarians. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. 65.

fifty-seven years, that of the 2,500 entrants in the two institutions, no more than 25 percent to 35 percent actually completed the seminary course and were ordained to the priesthood. The author concluded that no one measure or group of measures employed in the study can be used in the case of an individual to predict with any adequate certainty his survival or success. The best indices of probable success in the minor seminary are entrance examination scores on objective achievement tests, high grades in Latin and English for the first year, and a high score after one year on the "Scale for Rating a Seminarian" by the faculty. Interest inventories and blanks with the scales now available, the author concludes, can be only negatively useful with minor seminarians - perhaps to indicate to a quitting student in what occupation he has interests similar to those of people successful in that occupation. The Vernon-Allport Scale of Values was of no value in screening applicants.

Lhota[1] attempted to investigate the vocational interests of Catholic priests by the use of the Strong Interest Test. The test was given to 262 representative and successful priests, 208 diocesan theological students, 190 minor seminarians, and 133 students in a Catholic

---

[1]Brian Lhota, Vocational Interests of Catholic Priests. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1948. Pp. 40.

high school. Scoring weights ranged from plus 4 to minus 4, with a plus given when the percentage of priests who liked, disliked, or were indifferent to the item was greater than the percentage for men in general. When the percentage for priests was smaller than the corresponding percentage for men in general, the item was given a minus sign. Comparisons were then made with thirty-three other specific occupational groups. The author found few interests common to the clergy, carpenters, mathematicians, and forest service. The highest over-lap (62 percent) was found between ministers and school science teachers. The lowest figure was a 20 percent over-lap with those of insurance agents.

Two other studies of a minor nature are worthy of note here. The first is by Patterson[1] who conducted a study of student mortality in a preparatory seminary. On the basis of data from 238 boys, Patterson found that an inability to make proper personal adjustment was the most deciding factor among the majority of the candidates who withdrew from training during the first half of the twelve-year period. Other factors listed were: loss of desire to become a priest, mental unfitness, and lack of moral fitness. The author reports that the prep school suffered

---

[1]H. Patterson, A Study of Student Mortality at St. Anthony's and Suggestions for Improving the Situation. Unpublished master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1942. Pp. 53.

an approximate 80 percent loss in candidates for the priesthood during this period.

The second study concerns an effort by Eggert[1] to determine the significance of differences between seminarians and a lay group on a mental health test. The author administered a "Mental Health Analysis Test" to 163 minor seminarians in a boarding school and to a lay group numbering 172 students in a near-by Catholic school. The author concludes that any differences between the two groups could be accounted for by sampling errors, since the differences were not statistically significant.

STUDIES IN PROTESTANTISM

Research dealing with personality and adjustment of ministers in the Protestant churches is extremely limited. Moxcey[2] asked fifty-one superintendents and church officials to rate 487 ministers receiving appointments in New York conferences in 1916. The ministers were rated on sermon ability, pastoral ability, executive ability, and evangelistic ability. She concluded,

---

[1]Charles M. Eggert, Personality Traits in Seminarians. Unpublished master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1948. Pp. 35.

[2]Mary E. Moxcey, Some Qualities Associated With Success in the Christian Ministry. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University Press, 1922. Pp. 101.

> In the pastorate itself, in addition to the executive or general ability, and the closely linked ability to preach forceful and convincing sermons, the quality most closely associated with success is a tireless sympathy and a tireless energy in meeting the individual personal demands which make a good pastor.[1]

Johnson[2] administered the Bernreuter Personality Inventory to 150 seminary students in the course of several years, and to 150 successful insurance salesmen. An analysis of the results indicated that no trait characterized the student in religion as a whole, although the student group seemed to be more inclined toward self-sufficiency than the salesmen. Scores in the middle ranges, which apparently indicate greater poise and emotional maturity, were more frequent among the salesmen than in the student group. The author found further that dominance and self-sufficiency occurred more frequently among the students than any other trait dealt with in the Bernreuter Inventory.

Kimber[3] administered the California Test of Personality, the Minnesota Personality Scale, and the Kuder Preference Record to the students in a conservative Bible

---

[1] Ibid., p. 84.

[2] E. H. Johnson, "Personality Traits of Workers in the Field of Religion," Religious Education, XXXVIII (September-October, 1943), 325-329.

[3] J. A. M. Kimber, "Interests and Personality Traits of Bible Institute Students," Journal of Social Psychology, XXVI (November, 1947), 225-233.

Institute. The results indicated that the students had high social standards, a high sense of personal worth, and a large number of nervous symptoms. The outstanding interest of both men and women was in social service, as measured by the Kuder Preference Record. Computation and clerical interests were conspicuously low.

Felton[1] secured information from 1,978 ministerial students representing twenty of the major denominations in fifty-seven theological seminaries and church-related colleges concerning the factors which tended to influence young men to choose the ministry. Among lay people, he found that the pastor was the greatest influence, followed by mothers and then others. Missionaries plus evangelists scored higher in influence than Sunday School teachers and college teachers combined. The three major situations and events which influenced 1,573 toward the ministry were, in rank order: home training, pastor contact, and contemporary world need. Of the factors which tended to repel 1,334 students from the ministry, a lack of Bible knowledge, a feeling of unworthiness, and a lack of counsel and guidance were identified as being the primary disrupting influences by more than 50 percent of the total number. Low salaries were blamed by only 4.2 percent of the number,

---

[1]Ralph A. Felton, New Ministers, Monograph of the Department of the Rural Church. Madison: Drew Theological Seminary, 1949. Pp. 11.

and parental objections by only 2.1 percent. The largest number first decided on the ministry at the age of sixteen-eighteen years, which also represented the greatest concentration of those making their final decision. Of 1,709 ministerial students coming from rural and urban communities, the author found that, although the male population for the rural and urban districts was 45 percent and 55 percent respectively, only 33 percent of the student ministers came from rural homes, whereas 67 percent came from urban homes.

Cockrum[1] administered the Guilford-Martin Personality Inventory factors G.A.M.I.N.S.T.D.C.R. and the Kuder Preference Record to ninety-three ministerial students in a Texas seminary, fifty-three counseling students, and forty-eight education majors in an effort to determine personality traits and personal preferences. He found that the seminary students scored highest on social service, musical interests, outdoor, and literary factors. These findings agreed with national norms for clergymen. The seminarians also revealed a definite tendency toward sociability and seemed inclined toward meditative thinking. They were noticeably free from depression and scored well within the normal health range on emotional stability,

---

[1]Logan V. Cockrum, "Personality Traits and Interests of Theological Students," Religious Education, XLVII (January-February, 1952), 28.

although the counseling group scored considerably higher on this factor. Of the three groups, the seminarians seemed to be somewhat more nervous than the other two, although the differences among the three groups were slight.

Thayer[1] analyzed the data derived from a testing program by the Foreign Missions Conference in which tests of intelligence, neurotic tendency, dominance, interests, and social attitudes were given to two hundred Missionary appointees of various denominations during the years 1931-1933. These tests had been supplemented in 1931 by a candidate secretary's rating, and in 1932-1933 by a test of self-sufficiency. Detailed and contemporaneous field ratings were obtained from sixty-nine of these appointees, and general but delayed field ratings for seventy-six others. The author reported that the three tests of intelligence, religious qualities, and freedom from neurotic tendencies predicted field success with a correlation of .53, which was significant at the .01 level. The ratings by the field secretaries proved to be worthless as predictors of success.

Perhaps one factor which has contributed to a dearth of research on the personality and adjustment of Protestant

---

[1]Clarence R. Thayer, "The Relationship of Certain Psychological Test Scores to Subsequent Ratings of Missionary Field Success," Religious Education, XLVIII (May-June, 1953), 190-191.

ministers was the publication of the Report of the Committee on Personality and Aptitude, American Association of Theological Schools in 1946.[1] In evaluating the efficacy of personality and diagnostic tests for the admission of students to the seminary, the committee reports,

> Careful consideration of the status of existing tests of personality leads the committee to conclude that the administration of any such tests would not be of assistance in the selection of students for entrance to seminary... To add to these devices [current methods of selection], one more which is grounded on the same conceptions of the personality and aptitude needed in the churches would be only to fasten down the existing stereotypes more firmly yet, and close the door to such distinctive personalities as might be expected to make a contribution to the more creative tasks of the church of tomorrow.[2]

Although the current status of research for the purpose of student selection remains inadequate, an increasing interest in the personality and adjustment of ministers is again evident, but from the point of view of guidance and counseling rather than from that of the selection of candidates for the ministry.

One problem which is worthy of the attention of church leaders has to do with the nature of certain groups of church leaders who may wish to impose their views on others, so that an effort could be made to evaluate the

---

[1]Hugh Hartshorne, Report of the Committee on Personality and Aptitude, Bulletin 14, American Association of Theological Schools, 1946, 54-56.

[2]Hartshorne, op cit., 54-55.

stand they might take in terms of its validity. The only study known to the writer which seems to bear on this problem is that by Richardson[1] who administered three instruments; namely, an inventory of doctrinal emphasis, the Guilford-Martin Personnel Inventories Objectivity, Agreeableness, and Cooperativeness, and a personal data inventory to 141 third-year graduate theological students in seven theological schools of the American Baptist Convention. Richardson found that a positive relationship between fundamentalism-modernism and unreadiness-readiness to associate with others having differing views existed at the .01 level of significance.

SUMMARY

A review of the related literature dealing with the personality and adjustment of ministers seems to indicate that,

1. There seem to be basic differences existing between Catholic and Protestant seminarians on certain personality characteristics, although the evidence does not merit sweeping conclusions at this time.

2. No investigation has been conducted on the

---

[1]Harold W. Richardson, A Study of the Readiness of American Baptist Theological Students Holding Opposing Fundamentalist and Modernist Theological Views to Associate in Religious Groups With Those Differing From Themselves. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1952. Pp. 195.

problem presented in Chapter I.

3. A study of the personal and environmental factors which may tend to produce maladjustment and tensions in ministers remains as a virtually untouched field in which further research is greatly needed.

CHAPTER III

HOW PROBLEMS WERE SECURED

Since no instrument had ever been devised to evaluate the problems of ministers, it was necessary for the investigator to construct one. The purpose of this chapter is to inform the reader of the process by which the items which were used in the final evaluation instrument were obtained.

Construction of the preliminary questionnaire.-- In order to obtain an inventory of the problems of ministers, the author examined the pertinent literature related to the church and the ministry. Other items were secured by oral and written communication with seminarians and ministers, and church executives were asked to contribute from their experience with churches and with ministers. Finally, the writer was in a position to draw from his own experience in the ministry. As a result, 121 items were brought together for a pre-test.

Since the purpose of the preliminary measuring device was to select items for use in the final problem evaluation instrument, it was necessary to determine what criteria would be used for the selection of such items. It was decided that items would be selected on the basis of the degree to which they caused concern to the minister, and frequency of occurrence. In order to measure all the

items on the basis of these criteria, two separate measuring devices were constructed. A five-point rating scale similar to that suggested by Guilford[1] was devised for the recording of disturbance evaluations. Raters were asked to record their reactions to the question: "To what degree does this item disturb you?" The scale intervals were described by the following terms: "Very little," "Little," "Somewhat," "Much," and "Very much."

A frequency occurrence evaluation was also included in the preliminary questionnaire. Raters were asked to answer the question: "Does this item occur in your ministry?" In making this evaluation, if the problem occurred in the respondent's ministry, he was instructed to answer "Yes." A "No" answer was to be recorded if the problem did not occur. If the problem was not clear, or the respondent was uncertain, he was instructed to encircle the symbol "?."

The 121 problems were then submitted to twenty-one ministers-in-training at the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio for a pre-test. As a result, certain over-lapping items were eliminated and other problems suggested by these individuals were included. The revised list of the problems of ministers then numbered

---

[1]J. P. Guilford, Psycgometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1936. P. 272.

ninety-nine and these were incorporated in the preliminary questionnaire.

Administration of the preliminary questionnaire. The preliminary questionnaire was administered in February, 1952, to 148 ministers-in-training at Garret Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois, who were serving churches as pastors in Indiana and Illinois. Detailed written instructions accompanied the questionnaire.[1] In order that the respondents might remain anonymous, two procedures were adhered to: (1) code numbers were assigned and respondents were requested not to sign their names; and (2) a self-addressed and stamped envelope was provided each respondent for mailing the results directly to the investigator. The subjects were urged to add and evaluate any problems which they believed should be included in a list of this sort. Completed questionnaires were received from ninety-seven of the respondents for a 65 percent return. The responses of fourteen seminarians were rejected, however, on the basis of their failure to meet the delimitations for the study. In Table I the reader will find a summary of the data obtained from the preliminary questionnaire.

Analysis of the data.-- Since the degrees of concern

---

[1]The reader will find a copy of the preliminary questionnaire in the Appendix.

ranged from a low of "0" to a high of "4," the mean score for each item could hypothetically range from 0.00 to 4.00. Mean scores for the items are found in column one. The rank of each item, determined on the basis of its mean score, is found in column two. The last three columns of the table are devoted to the frequency of occurrence, in which the number of "yes" responses, the percent of "yes" responses from the total, and the rank of the items in terms of their frequency of occurrence.

On the basis of these data, thirty-five items were selected for use in the final instrument. These items, indicated in Table I by an asterisk (*), were chosen on the basis of their high degrees of concern and frequency of occurrence.

TABLE I

DEGREE OF CONCERN AND FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE OF NINETY-NINE PROBLEMS AS JUDGED BY EIGHTY-THREE MINISTERS-IN-TRAINING

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
*Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study	2.38	1	69	86	1
*Inability to remember names	1.93	2	59	74	5
*Insufficient time to be with your family	1.91	3	59	74	5
*Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program	1.81	4	68	85	2
*Feeling that some ministers' approaches to religion are hurting the profession	1.75	5	55	69	10
*Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money	1.69	6	58	73	7
*Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs	1.60	8	56	70	9
*Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation	1.60	8	48	60	23
*Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God	1.58	9	54	68	13
*Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum	1.56	10	44	55	35

*Indicates items selected for the final problem evaluation instrument.

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
*Feeling of resentment against the crowd-drawing tactics of some individuals and groups	1.55	11	43	54	40
*Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress	1.50	12	56	70	9
*Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls	1.48	14	58	73	7
*Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with	1.48	14	44	55	35
*Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings	1.45	16	50	63	18
*Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict	1.45	16	50	63	18
*Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you	1.44	17	52	65	15
*Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity	1.41	18	45	56	30
*Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits	1.40	21	54	68	13
*Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage	1.40	21	53	66	14

*Indicates items selected for the final problem evaluation instrument.

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
*Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life	1.40	21	49	61	21
*Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister	1.39	22	46	58	27
*Difficulty in making the gospel truths "live" in the face of present-day difficulties	1.38	23	54	68	13
*Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister	1.36	24	48	60	23
*Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection	1.35	26	51	64	16
*Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos	1.35	26	49	61	21
*Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking	1.34	27	43	54	40
*Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister	1.30	28	43	54	40
*Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time	1.26	29	44	55	35
*Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness.	1.25	31	44	55	35
*Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times	1.25	31	43	54	40

*Indicates items selected for the final problem evaluation instrument.

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
*Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers	1.24	34	47	59	26
*Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church	1.24	34	45	56	30
Feeling that the church is more interested in getting contributors than in proclaiming the gospel	1.24	34	42	53	42
*Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen	1.22	35	49	61	21
*Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church .	1.21	36	47	59	26
Tendency to favor the young people in preference to others	1.19	37	40	50	45
Feeling that most people conceive of Christianity as a "pie-in-the-sky" reward ..	1.18	38	40	50	45
Feeling that your laymen conceal their real thoughts from you	1.15	40	40	50	45
Community attitude that interference in existing conditions is not your function as a minister ...	1.15	40	37	46	55
Feeling that a Protestant Church really stands or falls on the personality of the minister	1.11	41	38	48	51
Difficulty in offering prayers during sick calls.	1.09	43	45	56	30
Feeling that the church is no longer sure of what it stands for	1.09	43	36	45	59

*Indicates items selected for the final problem evaluation instrument.

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
Tendency to tell people what they ought to do	1.06	45	39	49	48
Feeling that the minister is the last person people come to for counsel	1.06	45	38	48	51
Feeling that your wife is expected to do more than other members of the church	1.05	46	35	44	62
Tendency to avoid those who draw heavily on your time.	1.03	47	47	79	26
Feeling that you are a receptacle for the minor problems of church and church school administration	1.00	49	43	54	40
Feeling that the church is a receptacle for feelings that cannot be expressed elsewhere	1.00	49	29	36	71
Feeling that secular organizations seem to be more effective in serving the needs of people than the churches	0.99	50	37	46	55
Feeling that the pastor's major task seems to be that of preserving harmony in the church	0.98	52	42	53	42
Difficulty in making church membership classes meaningful	0.98	52	38	48	51
Feeling that some laymen have a clearer perception of Christianity than you do	0.96	53	25	31	80
Feeling of a lack of true Christian spirit among the ministers in the community	0.95	54	31	39	69
Dislike making pastoral calls	0.93	55	36	45	59

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
Difficulty in counseling couples who plan to marry.	0.90	57	37	46	55
Feeling that when people criticize the church they are applying it to your work as a minister	0.90	57	36	45	59
Feeling of inadequacy in the pulpit	0.89	59	39	49	48
Feeling that you are not a good mixer	0.89	59	34	43	64
Feeling that laymen take pity on your supposedly reduced economic condition	0.88	60	35	44	62
Feeling of a lack of the Presence of God in your services	0.86	62	37	46	55
Feeling that you are forced to compete with other churches for new members .	0.86	62	34	43	64
Inability to rid yourself of a lack of concern for the needs of people in foreign lands	0.81	65	44	55	35
Tendency to cut short contacts with the aged and infirm	0.81	65	36	45	59
Feeling of a lack of concern for people and their problems	0.81	65	31	39	69
Feeling that nothing you do will change peoples' attitudes or habits	0.79	66	39	49	48
Feeling that much of what you say are platitudes ...	0.78	68	33	41	66
Feeling of inferiority when in social groups outside the church	0.78	68	33	41	66
Difficulty in making decisions in church affairs	0.76	70	35	44	62

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
Feeling that the fight against secularism and materialism is a losing battle	0.76	70	28	35	75
Tendency to avoid difficult Counseling situations	0.74	74	32	40	67
Feeling that your ministry is of primary concern only to women in the church ...	0.74	74	27	34	79
Feeling that the lay leadership in the church is in the hands of people who are least qualified to do the work	0.74	74	23	29	83
Dislike speaking to ladies' groups	0.74	74	21	26	87
Tendency to put off making hospital calls	0.65	75	28	35	75
Feeling that the primary function of the church seems to be to give Divine sanction to the values that exist in society at the time	0.64	76	22	28	85
Resentment against being called upon to do things that have nothing to do with your ministry	0.63	80	28	35	75
Feeling that your laymen are disappointed in you as a minister	0.63	80	27	34	79
Feeling of inferiority when among leaders of business and industry in the community	0.63	80	27	34	79
Feeling that you are denied pleasures given to others.	0.63	80	20	25	90
Feeling of conflict between your profession and your preferred personal habits.	0.60	81	27	34	79

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
Feeling that background and connections are more important for success than ability	0.54	82	23	29	83
Tendency to feel apologetic about your work as a minister	0.53	83	22	28	85
Tendency to cut short your contacts with those who are in the lower social strata	0.50	84	28	35	75
Feeling that the ministry is not what you thought it would be when you entered it	0.49	85	18	23	94
Tendency to avoid contact with individuals having deep personal problems ...	0.48	89	29	36	70
Feeling of repulsion toward making calls on the critically ill and dying	0.48	89	21	26	87
Feeling that your minister associates are inferior as a group to professional people in other fields ...	0.48	89	20	25	91
Feeling that the church is a fellowship of the weak and infirm	0.48	89	18	23	94
Feeling that laymen are relieved when you close pastoral calls	0.43	91	20	25	91
Feeling that perhaps life would be more fulfilling if you were in some other line of work	0.43	91	19	24	92
Feeling that you must favor the more well-to-do members of the church	0.37	92	23	29	83
Feeling of envy for the Catholic brethren who enjoy full congregations regularly	0.36	94	16	20	95

TABLE I (Continued)

Problems	Degree of Concern		Frequency of Occurrence		
	Mean	Rank	Number	Per Cent	Rank
Tendency of young people to draw away from you	0.36	94	15	19	96
Feeling that you are obligated to subscribe to things you do not believe in	0.35	96	20	25	91
Hesitancy in fully accepting minority group members as companions and co-workers	0.33	96	14	18	96
Feeling that the ministry seems to be for those who cannot succeed in or are fearful of participating in other areas of economic life	0.28	97	11	14	99
Temptation to tell risque stories and swear mildly to impress others with your masculinity	0.24	98	11	14	99
Difficulty in resolving emotional "crushes" which lay women may have toward you	0.19	99	11	14	99

SUMMARY

A total of 121 problems of ministers were secured from every source available to the investigator. These items were incorporated in a questionnaire and submitted to a group of ministers-in-training at the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio for a pre-test. As a result, ninety-nine items were chosen and incorporated in

a preliminary questionnaire which was designed to measure both, the degree of concern and frequency of occurrence of each item.

The preliminary questionnaire was administered to a group of ministers-in-training at the Garret Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois, and the data thus obtained were employed in the selection of thirty-five problems for use in the final problem evaluation instrument.

CHAPTER IV

INSTRUMENTS USED IN THE FINAL INQUIRY

The final inquiry consisted of three parts: (1) a personal data inventory, (2) the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Scale, and (3) a problem evaluation instrument.[1] This chapter will be devoted to a discussion of the construction of the personal data inventory and the problem evaluation instrument, and the reasons for selecting the Temperament Scale.

CONSTRUCTION OF A PERSONAL DATA INVENTORY

Since one of the basic parts of this study deals with an investigation of the relationship between the personality characteristics of ministers and certain personal factors, it was necessary to construct a personal data inventory for the final inquiry. The choice of the personal data items was governed by the expressed desire for such information on the part of the directors of field work training in the cooperating seminaries, as well as by the writer's own interest. It is felt that such items as pastoral experience, age, marital status, number of children, educational status, seminary status,

---

[1]The reader will find a copy of the final inquiry entitled, "A Survey of the Opinions of Ministers Concerning Problems in the Protestant Ministry" in the Appendix.

number of brothers and sisters, father's occupation (professional versus non-professional), experience in the trades and/or industry, age at which the respondents decided on the ministry as a career, and veteran status, are the most important. The inventory was prepared in such a manner that each item could be answered by a check (x), or a short response.[1]

SELECTION OF A PERSONALITY INVENTORY

One of the decisions which had to be made in the investigation involved the selection of a personality inventory. The investigator found it necessary to take several factors into account in making such a selection. The first factor involved the limitations of existing instruments for personality measurement. Allport[2] evaluated the efforts which have been made in personality measurement up to the present time and concluded,

> The greatest failing of the psychologist at the present time is his inability to prove what he knows is true. No less than the literary artist he knows that personality is an intricate, well proportioned, and more or less consistent mental structure - but he can't prove it.[3]

---

[1] A copy of the personal data inventory is included in the Appendix.

[2] Gordon Allport, The Nature of Personality: Selected Papers. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1950. Pp. vii-220.

[3] Ibid., p. 204.

This tacit recognition of the inadequacies of present-day measures of personality and the difficulties attending current efforts in personality measurement are further emphasized by Cattell[1] and Ellis.[2] The second factor which this writer had to take into account were the limitations of his own experience which, combined with the wide geographical location of the respondents, eliminated the use of projective techniques. The third factor involved the selection of a paper-and-pencil inventory which would provide the needed information and yet be acceptable to ministers who would be asked to participate voluntarily in the study.

Of the inventories previously used in studies related to the ministry, the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Bernreuter Scale, the Guilford-Martin Personality Inventories, and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey stand out for consideration. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory was rejected because it is essentially an instrument which attempts to differentiate between normals and abnormals, and thus might be unacceptable to the respondents. Of those remaining, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was chosen

---

[1]Raymond B. Cattell, Description and Measurement of Personality. New York: World Book Company, 1946. P. 5.

[2]Albert Ellis, "The Validity of Personality Questionnaires," Psychological Bulletin, XLIII (September, 1946), 425.

since it is more refined than the Guilford-Martin Inventories and offers five advantages over its predecessors: (1) it consists of a single booklet of items, (2) a single answer sheet is adequate for all ten factors included in the study, (3) it provides for an efficient scoring method, (4) it covers those factors proved to have the greatest utility and uniqueness, and (5) it condenses and omits scores where inter-correlations are sufficiently high to warrant doing so. The traits included in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey are: G - General Activity, R - Restraint (which is opposite to the former R - Rhathymia), A - Ascendance, S - Sociability (formerly called "Social Extraversion," E - Emotional Stability (opposite to a combination of the former traits "Cycloid Disposition" and "Depressive Tendencies"), O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness (former trait of Agreeableness), T - Thoughtfulness (formerly called "Thinking Introversion"), P - Personal Relations (formerly "Cooperativeness"), and M - Masculinity. Since a detailed explanation of each factor is included in the manual for the Survey, it need not be included here.

Another change worthy of note in the revised Temperament Survey involves a shift from the "true-false" response to a "Yes-?-No" response to each item. This change was made as the result of an unpublished polling study which indicated the need for a "?" category. The choice of the

three hundred items in the scale was made on the basis of new item analyses. As a check on their uniqueness, correlations with other traits where variance was to be minimized were also determined. In commenting on the relation between the Temperament Survey and the Guilford-Martin Inventories, Guilford writes, "The evidence which arose in connection with corresponding scores in the previous inventories can be applied with confidence to the scores on the present survey."[1]

CONSTRUCTION OF A PROBLEM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

The method for selecting thirty-five problems of ministers for use in the final problem evaluation instrument has already been described in Chapter III. The present chapter will be devoted to a discussion of the procedures involved in the construction of the final problem evaluation instrument.

The method of paired comparisons.-- Since the study required the determination of the relationship of personality characteristics to each problem and each personal data factor, it was believed that the method of paired comparisons would provide the information desired. Thurstone discusses the method by saying,

---

[1]J. P. Guilford and W. S. Zimmerman, The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, Manual of Instructions and Interpretations. Beverly Hills: Sheridan Supply Company, 1949. P. 8.

> The stimuli whose magnitudes are to be measured are presented to the subject in paired comparisons. For each comparison he decides which of the two is the stronger. It is assumed that each of the stimuli has an unknown mean magnitude for the group and that there is a standard error of observation for each stimulus. Every judgment is assumed to be the result of determinable factors; namely, the two stimulus magnitudes and the two standard errors of observation.[1]

Guilford has indicated that the chief objection to the method of comparing each item with every other item is too time-consuming and fatiguing to the judges. He discusses the psychological basis for reducing the number of pairs by saying,

> There is nothing sacrosanct about pairing each stimulus with every other one in the series. To do so probably does tend to emphasize the unity of the continuum in question in the minds of the judges. And yet some stimuli in long series are so far apart psychologically that the proportions of judgments approach 1.0; hence the differences are so unreliable as to be useless for the computation of scale values.[2]

Uhrbrock and Richardson[3] devised a method which, by using key items, affected a 50 percent reduction in the number of paired comparisons. Thus the number of comparisons would be reduced from 595 to 295 for thirty-five items.

The investigator was of the opinion, however, that this number of comparisons would still prove to be

---

[1]L. L. Thurstone, "The Method of Paired Comparisons for Social Values," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXI (January-March, 1927), 397-398.

[2]Guilford, op cit., p. 235.

[3]R. S. Uhrbrock and W. W. Richardson, "Item Analysis," Personnel Journal, XII (October, 1933), 141-54.

prohibitive in order to secure the maximum cooperation of ministers for the study. Guilford suggested a method of effectuating a much greater reduction on the number of comparisons by saying,

> A greater saving (reducing the number of pairs of stimuli) might be made by taking a cue from Thorndike. Having established the rank order of the samples ... he obtained paired comparisons between neighboring pairs of stimuli. The plan might be extended somewhat, pairing every stimulus with a limited number of its neighbors on each side. Since scale separations coming from proportions near .500 carry the greatest weight in fixing final scale values, the proportions from relatively close neighbors are what we want. Proportions from remote pairs of stimuli carry little weight and may very well be eliminated from consideration.[1]

In adapting this method to the present investigation, the writer ranked the thirty-five items in the order of their disturbance and frequency scale values obtained from the first phase of the study. Each item was then paired with the two items which were on either side of it, with the exception of items one, two, thirty-four, and thirty-five. Item one was compared with items two, three, four, and five; and item two was compared with items one, three, four, and five. In like manner, item thirty-four was compared with items thirty-one, thirty-two, thirty-three, and thirty-five; and item thirty-five was compared with items thirty-one, thirty-two, thirty-three, and thirty-four. A total of seventy-two

---

[1]Guilford, op cit., p. 236.

comparisons was thus obtained.

In order to maintain the greatest possible spacing between the recurrence of any item so that the influence of repetition might be reduced to a minimum, the investigator listed the comparisons in random order and in such a manner that a minimum of three comparisons separated the use of any one item. This was done by assigning each comparison a number from one to seventy-two, and placing them in the instrument in the order indicated by a standard table of random numbers.[1] Each item also appears first and last an equal number of times. The order for the presentation of pairs is given in Table II.[2]

---

[1]T. C. McCormick, Elementary Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1941, p. 227.

[2]The reader will find a copy of the paired comparisons instrument in the Appendix.

TABLE II

RANDOM ORDER FOR THE PRESENTATION OF PAIRS IN THE PAIRED-COMPARISONS INSTRUMENT

Order	Pairs	Order	Pairs	Order	Pairs	Order	Pairs
1.	13-15	19.	23-25	37.	31-33	55.	7-8
2.	35-32	20.	11-13	38.	3-4	56.	19-20
3.	12-14	21.	1-3	39.	5-7	57.	35-31
4.	2-3	22.	14-15	40.	17-18	58.	22-23
5.	28-29	23.	24-26	41.	12-13	59.	28-30
6.	9-10	24.	18-20	42.	20-21	60.	8-10
7.	17-19	25.	8-9	43.	24-25	61.	14-16
8.	33-34	26.	30-31	44.	16-17	62.	15-17
9.	29-31	27.	13-14	45.	11-12	63.	5-6
10.	21-23	28.	1-5	46.	3-5	64.	23-24
11.	9-11	29.	19-21	47.	32-33	65.	27-29
12.	33-35	30.	15-16	48.	7-9	66.	26-28
13.	10-12	31.	10-12	49.	6-8	67.	2-4
14.	4-6	32.	25-26	50.	16-18	68.	25-27
15.	2-5	33.	32-34	51.	22-24	69.	31-32
16.	30-32	34.	29-30	52.	1-4	70.	18-19
17.	6-7	35.	26-27	53.	27-28	71.	21-22
18.	34-31	36.	20-22	54.	34-35	72.	1-2

SUMMARY

A final questionnaire consisting of a personal data inventory, a personality survey, and a problem evaluation instrument was devised. Personal data items required for the testing of hypotheses were included. The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey was selected because of its superiority for the present investigation. The paired-comparisons method was used with the pairs presented in random order.

CHAPTER V

COLLECTION AND TABULATION OF THE DATA

The preceding chapter dealt with the procedures for the construction of the necessary instruments for the study. This chapter will present the methods used for the collection and tabulation of the final data.

SELECTION OF THE SUBJECTS

The seminarians chosen for the present investigation were confined to those who were serving churches as pastors, and who were attending one of the selected seminaries in two metropolitan communities. The participating seminaries were selected for three reasons: (1) they represent major denominations essentially liberal in theological thought; (2) the student bodies in these seminaries are inter-denominational in character; (3) they are located in similar geographical settings. Table III indicates the distribution by schools of seminarians selected to submit the final data, and of seminarians completing the project.

TABLE III

DISTRIBUTION BY SEMINARIES OF THE SEMINARIANS SELECTED TO ANSWER THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE, AND OF SEMINARIANS COMPLETING IT.

School	Number of Seminarians Selected	Number of Responses Received
Garrett Biblical Institute	41	30
McCormick Theological Seminary	60	34
Federation of Theological Schools, University of Chicago:		
Chicago Theological Seminary	16	13
Divinity School	22	17
Disciples Divinity House	4	3
Meadville Theological School	1	1
Union Theological Seminary	12	10
Total	156	108

Of the 156 seminarians who were asked to submit their responses, a total of 108 completed the questionnaires for a return of 69.3 percent. Since an effort to determine the persistence of both personality characteristics and the problems which disturb ministers was considered to be

a part of the study, it was felt that five-year graduates of the same institutions would provide information which might reflect the experience factor. Table IV concerns the distribution by schools of the five-year graduates who are now serving churches and who were requested to submit their responses, and of those five-year graduates who completed them.

It might be of interest to note that responses were received from sixty-five of the ninety-six ministers who were contacted for a return of 67.7 percent. These returns were highly comparable to the returns from the seminarians, both from the point of view of total returns and in terms of the participating schools.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The investigator concurred with the feeling of the seminary faculty representatives that the best way to introduce the questionnaires would be through their offices and classes, at which time an explanation of the importance of the study might be made and their own request for the support of the study might be made known. At the same time the study was to be given further recognition through chapel announcements and informal gatherings.

TABLE IV

DISTRIBUTION BY SEMINARIES OF THE FIVE-YEAR GRADUATES SELECTED TO ANSWER THE FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE, AND OF THE GRADUATES COMPLETING IT.

School	Number of Ministers Selected	Number of Responses Received
Garrett Biblical Institute	35	27
McCormick Theological Seminary	18	7
Federation of Theological Schools, University of Chicago:		
Chicago Theological Seminary	11	9
Divinity School	5	4
Disciples Divinity House	3	1
Meadville Theological School	1	0
Union Theological Seminary	23	17
Total	96	65

Instructions to respondents.-- Instructions for completing the questionnaire were included with the forms. In addition, a personal letter was sent to each respondent by the investigator stating the nature and purpose of the

project. The respondents were informed that, although their participation was on a voluntary basis, it was important for the success of the study that they participate. The subjects were also informed that the project would require about two and one-half hours, and that they could complete the questionnaire at their convenience, although they were urged to complete it as soon as possible. The seminarians were asked not to discuss the study before completing their responses.

Anonymity of responses.-- Fischer[1] concludes, on the basis of a study of 102 upperclass women students in psychology using Mooney's Problem Check List, that the use of signatures might have an inhibitory effect on the honesty and frankness of the people responding to them. Since the cooperation of the seminary administrators was essential but at the same time posed a problem of possible misunderstanding, the investigator felt that a simple but effective technique for anonymity was necessary. Each respondent was assigned a code number which appeared on the questionnaire, together with instructions to mail the completed questionnaire directly to the investigator in an enclosed self-addressed and stamped envelope.

---

[1]Robert P. Fischer, "Signed Versus Unsigned Personal Questionnaires," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXX (June, 1946), 220-25.

In order that the maximum number of responses might be secured, follow-up letters were sent directly to those who were late in submitting their responses. Form letters of thanks and acknowledgement were sent to the respondents and seminary representatives for lending their support to the project.

SCORING THE RESPONSES

The responses to the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were machine scored, and the raw scores were placed on the answer sheets. The investigator constructed a simple hand-scoring stencil for each of the seventy-two comparisons in the problem evaluation instrument. The total score for each of the thirty-five items represented the number of times it had been selected as disturbing the minister more than the item with which it was compared. Since comparisons were made by each item with two items on either side of it, the scores could range from zero to four. The personal data inventory was also hand scored. All of the data were then placed on a single information sheet with the code number of the respondent at the top. In this manner the process of transferring the data to punched cards was greatly facilitated.[1]

---

[1]A copy of the information sheet is found in the Appendix.

RECORDING THE DATA

All information obtained from the final questionnaire was recorded on punched cards in the following manner:

1. Serial numbers of respondents: columns 1-3 inclusive.

2. Personal data scores: columns 4-16 inclusive.

3. Guilford-Zimmerman raw scores: columns 17-36 inclusive.

4. Problem evaluation raw scores: columns 37-71 inclusive.

5. Experimental and control identification: column 72.

SUMMARY

One hundred fifty-six seminarians and ninety-six five-year graduates of six theological schools in Chicago and New York were contacted for the study. Arrangements were made with seminary authorities for their cooperation and support, and the materials were distributed directly to the respondents. Code numbers were used to preserve anonymity. Routine contacts were made with the respondents and administrators involved. One hundred eight qualified seminarians and sixty-five ministers submitted the requested data. The responses were machine scored and hand scored, and the information was recorded on punched cards.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the principle statistical procedures which were employed in the analysis of the data. The discussion will be primarily concerned with four phases of data analysis: (1) interpretation of responses to the final inquiry; (2) determination of the significance of certain coefficients of correlation; (3) determination of the significance of differences between the responses of seminarians and those of five-year graduates on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and the problem evaluation instrument; and (4) determination of the significance of differences between the seminarians from the participating schools on the survey and on the problem evaluation responses.

Interpretation of responses to the final inquiry.--Since it was desired to secure certain information from the totality of the personal data responses, means for certain items were computed by the use of a formula suggested by Garrett[1] for ungrouped data. Standard deviations were also computed for these scores using the

---

[1]Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1947, p. 32.

short method suggested by the same author for ungrouped data.[1]

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey scores of both the seminarians and the five-year graduates were analyzed, and means and standard deviations were computed in the same manner for each factor in each group. The significance of differences between the means of the seminary group scores and the norms established for the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were tested by the critical t ratio. Another formula suggested by Garrett[2] was employed for this procedure, and the results were interpolated from a table.[3]

The problem evaluation responses were interpreted in terms of raw scores for both groups, with each score simply being the number of times the problem was evaluated as being more disturbing than that with which it was compared. Means and standard deviations were computed for each problem in both the seminarian and five-year graduate groups in the same manner as previously described, and the significance of the differences were determined by the same procedure.

Determination of the significance of certain coefficients of correlation.-- The product-moment method

---

[1] Ibid., p. 63, formula 13.

[2] Ibid., p. 198, formula 29.

[3] Ibid., p. 190-191, table 29.

of correlation was used to determine the linear relationship between each of the ten Guilford-Zimmerman traits and each of the problem evaluation scores and personal data factors.

A major saving in time and effort on the operation was suggested by Dwyer when he wrote, "It is possible to apply the cumulative technique in getting product moments involving two variables."[1] It was decided that the I.B.M. 602A computer would provide the maximum information for the computation of the desired results. The following values were obtained automatically from the ungrouped data:

1. ξx = cumulation of the deviations of the personality scores from their means.

2. ξy = cumulation of the deviations of the problem evaluation scores and the personal data responses from their means.

3. ξxy = cumulation of the product of these two deviations.

4. ξx^2 = cumulation of the squared of the deviations of the personality scores from their means.

5. ξy^2 = cumulation of the squares of the deviations of the problem evaluation scores and the personal data responses from their means.

6. Lxx = A value which is equal to $N\xi x^2 - (\xi x)^2$, a portion of the formula for r using ungrouped data.

7. Lyy = A value which is equal to $N\xi y^2 - (\xi y)^2$.

---

[1]Paul S. Dwyer, "The Computation of Moments with the Use of Cumulative Totals," The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, IX (December, 1938), 301.

8. Lxy = A value which is equal to $N\Sigma xy-(\Sigma x)(\Sigma y)$. When this value is negative, the coefficient of correlation is likewise negative.

9. N = Number of cases.

These values greatly simplify the computation of the coefficients of correlation. The basic formula for ungrouped data suggested by Croxton[1] is as follows:

$$r = \frac{N\Sigma xy - (\Sigma x)(\Sigma y)}{\sqrt{\left[N\Sigma x^2 - (\Sigma x)^2\right]\left[N\Sigma y^2 - (\Sigma y)^2\right]}}$$

Transposing the values:

Lxy for $N\Sigma xy-(\Sigma x)(\Sigma y)$,

Lxx for $N\Sigma x^2-(\Sigma x)^2$, and

Lyy for $N\Sigma y^2-(\Sigma y)^2$, we have

$$r = \frac{Lxy}{\sqrt{Lxx}\ \sqrt{Lyy}}$$

These values were recorded and the coefficients of correlation were then calculated.

The reliability of each coefficient of correlation thus obtained was tested against the null hypothesis, which implies that no true difference exists between two variables. Garrett[2] proposed a method which enables an investigator to determine the significance of an r

---

[1]Frederick E. Croxton and Dudley J. Cowden, Applied General Statistics. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946, p. 932.

[2]Garrett, op cit., p. 299.

directly from a table. The first step in the use of this method was to determine the number of degrees of freedom. Since the quantity (N-2) represents this number, the number of degrees of freedom was found to be 106. By means of the procedure described by Garrett, the .05 and .01 levels of significance were determined to be .195 and .254 respectively. This is interpreted to mean that in only five of one-hundred trials would an r as large as - .195 appear by accidents of sampling if the population r were actually .00; and only once in one hundred trials would an r of .254 appear if the population r were .00.

In order to determine whether the relationship between the Guilford-Zimmerman scores and the problem evaluation scores and personal data items might be non-linear, it was necessary to devise some method for checking the possibility of non-linearity for ungrouped data. The investigator felt that the simplest method of checking would be to construct scattergrams of a sample of correlations which might be representative of the whole. Since it was felt that the following correlations might tend to be non-linear if non-linearity existed at all, ten scattergrams were constructed for each of the following groups: (1) those correlations dealing with problem evaluations having low means and low standard deviations; (2) those dealing with problems having high means and low standard deviations; and (3) those dealing with problems

having average means and high standard deviations. It was assumed that, if curvi-linearity was not evident in this sample, its existence in the rest of the correlations would be due to chance. A description of the results is presented in Chapter VII.

In order more adequately to interpret the correlations which might be indicated, it was thought necessary to determine whether the responses of the seminarians on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey indicated that the factors were unique, or whether they might be highly interrelated in this specialized group having common interests and purposes. The results appear in Chapter VII.

Determination of the significance of differences between seminarians and five-year graduates on personality and on problem evaluation responses.-- One of the hypotheses previously presented in this study concerns the significance of differences between the seminarians and the five-year graduates on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. In order to determine whether significant differences existed, the investigator computed the means and standard deviations for each of the Guilford-Zimmerman factors in the same manner as previously described. The significance of differences were then determined by the use of the t test by means of the formula

suggested by Garrett.[1] The significance of differences between the two groups on each of the problem evaluation scores was also determined in the same manner. A detailed description of the results is presented in Chapter VII.

Determination of the significance of differences between the seminarians from the participating schools on the Guilford-Zimmerman Survey and on the problem evaluation responses.-- Since it was indicated that an analysis of the responses of the seminarians in terms of the participating schools would be of substantial value to the administrators of those schools, this activity was deemed to be a part of the study. To this end, the means of each personality factor and each problem evaluation were computed for the seminarians from each school in the same manner as previously indicated. Standard deviations were then computed, also in the same manner as before, for those means which most widely deviated from the average for the entire population. The significance of the differences was then tested by use of the t as before. The results of this analysis are presented in Chapter VII.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 198, formula 29.

SUMMARY

Means and standard deviations were computed for the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament scores and the problem evaluation scores of all the seminarians and the five-year graduates of the same institutions. The significance of the differences between the means of the seminary group scores and the norms established for the Guilford-Zimmerman were tested by the use of the *t*. The method of cumulative totals for ungrouped data was employed to determine the product-moment coefficients of correlation between personality scores and problem evaluations of seminarians, and between personality scores and personal data responses of the same group. The reliability of each coefficient was tested against the null hypothesis. Inter-correlations between the personality factor scores by the seminarians were determined. Scattergrams of a sample of the correlations were constructed as a check for non-linearity. The significance of the differences between the seminarians and the ministers on each personality factor and each problem evaluation was tested, as was the significance of differences between the participating schools on each of these factors.

CHAPTER VII

FINDINGS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

This chapter concerns the presentation and interpretation of the final data. The discussion is divided into four parts: (1) An analysis of responses to the final inquiry; (2) the determination of the significance of coefficients of correlation between certain variables; (3) determination of the significance of differences between the responses of seminarians and five-year graduates on certain variables; and (4) the significance of differences between the seminarians from each of the participating schools and the averages for the total group on certain variables.

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE FINAL INQUIRY

The investigator felt that valuable information might be obtained for the participating seminaries if certain responses of the seminarians to the final inquiry were viewed in their totality. The following discussion deals, then, with an analysis of the responses of the seminarians to the personal data inventory and the Guilford-Zimmerman scale.

The personal data responses.-- In order to secure the desired information, the responses were grouped and means were determined for certain items in the personal

data inventory. Tables V to XV present the results of this analysis.

Table V is concerned with the pastoral experience of the respondents. It should be noted that those seminarians who had less than eight months of experience in the ministry were automatically excluded from the study. Of the 108 respondents who qualified, forty-one indicated that they had experience of more than the usual three-year seminary training period. The average for the group was 3.5 years.

Table VI presents data concerning the ages of the respondents. The mean age was 28.9 years. Only two were twenty-two years of age or younger, and only three were forty years of age or older. The age span from twenty-three to thirty-four years includes ninety-one of the responses.

Table VII concerns the marital status of the respondents. Eighty-seven of the 108 respondents, or 80.6 percent, were married.

The number of children among the respondents is presented in Table VIII. Seventy-three, or 84 percent of the married respondents, report having one or more children. The mean number for the married group is 1.6 children.

The educational status of the group is given in Table IX. Since the A.B. or B.S. degree is required for entrance into the represented schools, all the seminarians

TABLE V

LENGTH OF PASTORAL EXPERIENCE OF 108 RESPONDENTS

Years	Frequency	Percent
One	35	32
Two	26	24
Three	6	6
Four	6	6
Five	8	7
Six	13	12
Seven	4	4
Eight	1	1
Nine or more	9	8
Total	108	100.0

Mean = 3.5 years.
Standard deviation = 2.53

TABLE VI

AGES OF RESPONDENTS

Years	Frequency	Percent
22 and younger	2	2
23-24	17	16
25-26	18	17
27-28	24	22
29-30	17	16
31-32	9	8
33-34	6	6
35-36	2	2
37-38	6	6
39-40	4	4
41 and older	3	3
Total	108	100.0

Mean = 28.9 years.
Standard deviation = 4.71

TABLE VII

MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	21	19.4
Married	87	80.6
Total	108	100.0

TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF RESPONDENTS

Children	Frequency	Percent
Not married	21	19.4
None	14	13.6
One	31	28.4
Two	25	23.1
Three	13	12.0
Four	3	2.7
Five	1	0.8
Six or more	0	0.0
Total	108	100.0

Mean number of children among those married = 1.6
Standard deviation = 1.17

TABLE IX

ACADEMIC DEGREES HELD BY RESPONDENTS

Degrees	Frequency	Percent
A.B. or B.S.	100	100.0
M.A. or M.S.	14	13.1
Ph.D.	2	1.7
Work toward Ph.D.	5	4.6

possessed one of these degrees. Twenty-one, or 20 percent, held advanced degrees.

In Table X, the seminary status of the respondents is presented. A preponderance of seminarians serving churches is found in the second and third years, which is to be expected.

Table XI, which deals with the number of brothers and sisters possessed by the respondents, indicates that only twelve reported having no brothers and/or sisters; whereas fifty-seven, or more than half, reported having one or two brothers and/or sisters in the family. The evidence indicates that there is no preponderence of "only children" among seminarians studying for the ministry. The mean number is 2.5 brothers and/or sisters.

Table XII presents the fathers' occupations, which were divided into professional and non-professional groups. Professions such as the ministry, teaching, medicine, law and the like were included in the professional group; whereas occupations like farming, manufacturing production and supervision, the trades, and business were included in the non-professional group. It is worthy of note that 84 percent of the seminarians reported that their fathers were engaged in non-professional occupations. It would seem, therefore, that on the basis of these returns, the widely held belief

TABLE X

SEMINARY STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

Seminary status	Frequency	Percent
First year	19	17.5
Second year	35	32.5
Third year	54	50.0
Total	108	100.0

TABLE XI

NUMBER OF BROTHERS AND/OR SISTERS OF RESPONDENTS

Number	Frequency	Percent
None	12	11
1-2 brothers and/or sisters	57	53
3-4 brothers and/or sisters	24	22
5-6 brothers and/or sisters	10	9
7-8 brothers and/or sisters	3	3
9 or more brothers and/or sisters .	2	2
Total	108	100

Mean = 2.5
Standard deviation = 1.98

TABLE XII

OCCUPATIONS OF THE RESPONDENTS' FATHERS

Father's Occupation	Frequency	Percent
Professional	22	20.5
Non-professional	86	79.5
Total	108	100.0

TABLE XIII

EXTENT OF FULL-TIME INDUSTRIAL AND/OR TRADES

EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS

Years	Frequency	Percent
None	50	46.3
1-2	20	18.5
3-4	16	14.8
5-6	12	11.1
7-8	2	1.9
9 or more	8	7.4
Total	108	100.0

Mean = 2.2 years of experience
Standard deviation = 2.89

that ministers tend to come from the professional classes is not substantiated.

The extent of industrial experience among the seminarians is presented in Table XIII. Almost half of them indicated that they have had no full time industrial and/or trades experience as defined in the study. Of those having experience, a total of forty-eight reported having an average of 4.1 years of experience in industry and/or the trades. The mean was 2.2 years of experience.

The age when the decision was made to enter the ministry as a career is the subject of Table XIV. There is a wide distribution of ages when the decision was reached, with the preponderence of decisions falling in the 17-22 period. It should be noted that there is no evidence here of a bi-modal distribution centering in the teens and in the later twenties as was thought to exist. The mean age for making the decision was 23.6 years.

Table XV presents the veteran status of the respondents. Sixty-one, or almost 60 percent, indicated that they had some experience in the Armed Forces.

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.-- Tables XVI to XXVII present the scores obtained by the respondents on the ten factors of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. As was indicated in Chapter VI, the significance of the differences between the means of these scores and the norms established for the Survey

TABLE XIV

AGE WHEN THE DECISION WAS MADE TO ENTER THE MINISTRY AS A CAREER

Age	Frequency	Percent
14 years and younger	5	4.6
15-16 years	11	10.3
17-18 years	13	12.1
19-20 years	22	20.2
21-22 years	15	13.9
23-24 years	12	11.1
25-26 years	11	10.2
27-28 years	7	6.5
29-30 years	3	2.8
31 years or older	9	8.3
Total	108	100.0

Mean = 23.6 years
Standard deviation = 4.76

TABLE XV

VETERAN STATUS OF RESPONDENTS

Veteran status	Frequency	Percent
Veteran	61	56.5
Non-veteran	47	43.5
Total	108	100.0

was tested by the critical ratio of *t*. The results of the tests are presented in Table XVI.

The respondents scored significantly above the norm for the restraint, ascendancy, sociability, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness, thoughtfulness, and personal relations factors. There were no significant differences on the general activity and masculinity factors. Thus it would appear that, as a group, the seminarians seem to exceed the norms of those characteristics deemed favorable for the ministry. A more detailed analysis of the distribution of scores on each of these factors is given in succeeding tables.

Table XVII is concerned with the General Activity scores. A high score indicates strong drive, energy, and activity. A very high score may indicate manic behaviour in which there is usually much random activity and wasted effort. A very low score, on the other hand, may represent a hypothyroid condition, anemia, or other physical causes of inactivity. The scores are widely distributed, but there seems to be evidence of a somewhat bi-modal distribution with concentrations around the 17-18 and the 11-12 brackets. The evidence seems to reflect the possible existence of two groups of seminarians: (1) the active, athletic group, and (2) what might be termed the aesthetic group.

TABLE XVI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY FACTORS AND NORMS ESTABLISHED FOR THOSE FACTORS

Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factors	Means	Norm	t
General activity	18.09	17.00	1.65
Restraint	20.22	16.90	4.20*
Ascendancy	18.36	15.90	4.39*
Sociability	21.81	18.20	5.73*
Emotional stability	20.19	16.90	5.77*
Objectivity	20.44	17.90	4.88*
Friendliness	19.44	13.80	9.89*
Thoughtfulness	22.40	18.40	6.90*
Personal relations	20.04	16.70	5.76*
Masculinity	19.42	19.90	-.90

*Significant at the .01 level.

The distribution of scores on the Restraint factor is given in Table XVIII. A high score on this factor indicates an over-restrained, over-serious individual. A low score would reflect a happy-go-lucky, carefree type of individual. The scores are fairly widely distributed, with a concentration around the 21-22 bracket.

Scores for the Ascendancy factor are presented in Table XIX. A high raw score for this factor indicates a tendency to dominate or over-ride others, whereas a low score is interpreted as a tendency to be submissive to others. There seems to be no evidence of a concentration of scores around any single interval, but rather a fairly even distribution from the 13-14 bracket to the 25-26 bracket.

The Sociability factor is the subject of Table XX. The high and low scores indicate the contrast between the person who is at ease with others, enjoys their company, and readily establishes intimate rapport, versus the withdrawn, reserved person who is hard to get to know. Although the concentration is in scores ranging from 22 to 26, it is interesting to note the extremely wide distribution of scores on a factor which would seem to be essential for the ministry.

In Table XXI the reader will find a frequency distribution of scores for Emotional Stability. A high score indicates optimism, cheerfulness, and emotional stability.

TABLE XVII

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE GENERAL ACTIVITY SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY.

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	3
27-28	8
25-26	11
23-24	9
21-22	10
19-20	12
17-18	13
15-16	7
13-14	9
11-12	13
9-10	7
7-8	1
5-6	4
3-4	1

TABLE XVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE RESTRAINT SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY.

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	0
27-28	3
25-26	13
23-24	18
21-22	20
19-20	19
17-18	16
15-16	9
13-14	6
11-12	1
9-10	2
7-8	0
5-6	1
3-4	0

TABLE XIX

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE ASCENDANCE SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY.

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	0
27-28	2
25-26	14
23-24	10
21-22	13
19-20	17
17-18	13
15-16	12
13-14	11
11-12	9
9-10	6
7-8	0
5-6	1
3-4	0

TABLE XX

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE SOCIABILITY SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	7
27-28	14
25-26	22
23-24	20
21-22	12
19-20	7
17-18	8
15-16	6
13-14	2
11-12	4
9-10	1
7-8	2
5-6	2
3-4	1

A very low score is a sign of poor mental health in general; in other words, a neurotic tendency. The seminarians scored from 3-4 to 29-30, with the concentration of scores around the 23-24 bracket, indicating a generally healthy emotional stability as a group on the basis of these returns.

Table XXII presents data for the Objectivity factor. High scores mean less egoism; low scores mean "touchiness" or hypersensitivity. The concentration of scores for the seminarians range from 17-18 to 23-24.

Scores for the Friendliness factor are presented in Table XXIII. A high score may mean a lack of fighting tendencies to the point of pacifism, or it may mean a healthy, realistic handling of frustrations and injuries. It may also mean an urge to please others, a desire to be liked. A low score means hostility in one form or another. At best, it means a fighting attitude. It is interesting to note that there seem to be three points of concentration: (1) 25-26 bracket, (2) 19-20 and 21-22 brackets, and (3) the 13-14 bracket. The concentration in the lower bracket might be worthy of consideration in the light of the requirements for the ministry.

Table XXIV is concerned with the Thoughtfulness factor. High scores indicate introversion and reflectiveness, whereas low scores are indicative of extroversion or a high degree of inter-action with the social environment.

TABLE XXI

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE EMOTIONAL STABILITY SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	1
27-28	5
25-26	16
23-24	22
21-22	16
19-20	14
17-18	10
15-16	9
13-14	6
11-12	2
9-10	2
7-8	2
5-6	2
3-4	1

TABLE XXII

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE OBJECTIVITY SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	4
27-28	5
25-26	9
23-24	22
21-22	19
19-20	17
17-18	13
15-16	7
13-14	5
11-12	2
9-10	3
7-8	1
5-6	0
3-4	1

TABLE XXIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE FRIENDLINESS SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	0
27-28	8
25-26	18
23-24	9
21-22	16
19-20	18
17-18	5
15-16	9
13-14	10
11-12	8
9-10	5
7-8	0
5-6	1
3-4	1

TABLE XXIV

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE THOUGHTFULNESS SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	2
27-28	13
25-26	19
23-24	22
21-22	21
19-20	14
17-18	10
15-16	5
13-14	0
11-12	2
9-10	0
7-8	0
5-6	0
3-4	0

It is significant that the distribution of scores ranges almost wholly from 15-16 up to the possible maximum, indicating that seminarians as a group tend to be highly reflective and/or introvertive.

Table XXV presents data for the Personal Relations factor. A high score means tolerance and understanding of other people and their weaknesses. A low score indicates fault-finding and a tendency to be critical of others and of institutions generally. The low scoring person is not likely to get along with others. The range of scores for the seminarians was extremely wide, with the concentration of scores from 17-18 to 25-26. A relatively large number of seminarians, however, tend to score low on this factor.

The Masculinity factor is the subject of Table XXVI. On the positive side, a high score means that the person behaves in ways characteristic of men and that he is likely therefore to be better understood by men and to be more acceptable to them. If the score is very high it may mean that the person is unsympathetic and callous. Low scores, on the other hand, may indicate characteristics which might be identified as feminine tendencies. The scores of the seminarians were concentrated in the 17-22 brackets with only one scoring extremely low. None scored extremely high.

TABLE XXV

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE PERSONAL RELATIONS SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	1
27-28	7
25-26	18
23-24	19
21-22	10
19-20	17
17-18	12
15-16	6
13-14	6
11-12	1
9-10	6
7-8	3
5-6	1
3-4	1

TABLE XXVI

DISTRIBUTION OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS ON THE MASCULINITY SCALE OF THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Raw Score Interval	Frequency
29-30	0
27-28	0
25-26	9
23-24	9
21-22	23
19-20	27
17-18	22
15-16	8
13-14	8
11-12	1
9-10	0
7-8	1
5-6	0
3-4	0

CORRELATION OF FINAL INQUIRY VARIABLES

Correlation of Guilford-Zimmerman scores with the problem evaluation responses.-- Product-moment coefficients of correlation were determined between each of the ten Guilford-Zimmerman factors and each of the thirty-five problem evaluation responses. The resulting correlation coefficients are presented in Table XXVII.

Any interpretation of the findings in a study of this sort must be carefully worked out in order to avoid, as Kenney points out, "the pitfalls easily overlooked by the unwary, while they are cantering gaily along upon their arithmetic."[1] The necessity further to interpret the coefficient of correlation in the light of the study is stressed by Kenney when he writes, quoting from an article by Crathorne,

> The methodological side has been developed until we can find correlation coefficients by simply turning a crank, but the explanation of the meaning of the result after we find it, needs a brain... No amount of mathematical training and ability can take the place of the judgment and common sense that comes from a knowledge of the field in which the problem lies.[2]

Commenting further on the proper interpretation of the coefficient of correlation, Kenney quotes Wilson

---

[1]John F. Kenney, Mathematics of Statistics. New York: D. Van Ostrand Company, 1947, p. 225.

[2]Kenney, op cit., p. 226.

when he writes,

> Correlation is a mutual affair between two variables... Strictly y is not correlated with x, or x with y, but x and y are correlated... Further, the value of the correlation coefficient depends on the group for which it is determined or on the universe of which that group is a fair example... There is no such thing as the correlation coefficient per se.[1]

An attempt will be made to present the findings of this study from the point of view which has been expressed here. We shall now turn to Table XXVII.

A negative relationship significant at the .01 level was found between item 2 "Inability to remember names," and Sociability, which seems to indicate that the more sociable the seminarian, the less he may tend to be disturbed by the problem of remembering names. The negative relationship between Personal relations and item 6 "Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money," which is significant at the .05 level, seems to be evidence that a general criticalness of institutions and people is reflected in a criticalness of people for a seeming lack of support of their minister and their church.

The negative relationships which exists between item 13 "Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls," and factors General activity, Ascendancy, and Sociability, which are significant at the .01 level, and

---

[1]Kenney, op cit., p. 226.

TABLE XXVII

PRODUCT-MOMENT COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN SCORES AND SCORES ASSIGNED TO THIRTY-FIVE PROBLEMS BY 108 SEMINARIANS.

Problems of Ministers		Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factor[a]									
No.	Description	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
1.	Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study	-12	-06	11	01	07	-03	-05	-04	-01	-11
2.	Inability to remember names	-06	08	-18	-33**	-01	14	05	-12	14	02
3.	Insufficient time to be with your family	04	13	02	12	12	07	03	-06	07	15
4.	Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program	-02	-02	07	15	01	06	14	09	09	12
5.	Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession	15	-11	01	10	-15	-12	-02	16	-05	-07
6.	Feeling that you receive the leftovers of the laymen's time and money	10	-12	12	07	-04	-11	-16	-13	-21*	-11

[a]Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendency, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XVII (Continued)

Problems of Ministers		Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factor[a]									
No.	Description	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
7.	Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs	-03	08	-14	-19	-10	-01	-10	04	-06	12
8.	Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation	05	-02	15	05	08	-09	-10	03	-11	-14
9.	Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God	-19	05	01	10	08	-02	09	-02	12	-02
10.	Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum	02	04	06	-04	00	10	08	12	07	-04
11.	Feeling of resentment against the crowd-drawing tactics of some individuals and groups	15	-13	07	15	-11	03	-05	00	-06	-01
12.	Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress	-02	-03	00	-02	02	-06	-02	-03	-15	11

[a]Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendancy, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Problems of Ministers		Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factor									
No.	Description	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
13.	Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls	-31**	16	-34**	-30**	04	04	11	-21*	26**	-02
14.	Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with	19	-14	12	10	07	13	02	06	04	-03
15.	Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings	27**	-06	33**	27**	07	-07	-11	23*	-24*	01
16.	Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict..	-19	14	-16	-19	-17	-20*	-20*	00	01	-05
17.	Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you	-14	-10	03	-05	-06	09	14	-24*	12	-01
18.	Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity	12	16	-04	08	09	15	27**	22*	04	12
19.	Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits	-05	-03	-13	-14	06	-05	-10	-08	-01	-01

[a]Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendancy, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Problems of Ministers	Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factor[a]									
Description	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
20. Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage.	02	-11	07	-04	-07	-03	-06	01	02	-15
21. Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life.	15	04	-02	16	-05	-13	-14	11	-17	09
22. Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister	02	-18	-02	08	01	-02	08	-19	01	-05
23. Difficulty in making the gospel truths "live" in the face of present-day difficulties	-18	20*	07	-07	12	21*	17	06	11	11
24. Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister	-09	01	-08	-19	00	-05	-09	-10	04	-09
25. Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection	06	02	-07	-03	00	-01	00	06	-01	00
26. Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos	05	-23*	03	18	00	-03	03	-04	-04	-18

[a]Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendancy, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Problems of Ministers	Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factor[a]									
Description	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
27. Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking	-12	16	06	01	09	-19	-20*	01	-16	00
28. Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister	02	-07	18	07	-01	26**	22*	-09	12	15
29. Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time	04	-02	-17	-01	-02	01	05	-02	10	-02
30. Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness	06	02	-05	-10	-25*	-18	-22*	06	-16	-06
31. Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times	08	-10	15	08	21*	14	05	00	12	16
32. Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers	-15	11	-17	-17	12	07	17	00	24*	03

[a]Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendancy, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

*Significant at the .05 level **Significant at the .01 level.

TABLE XXVII (Continued)

Problems of Ministers		Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factor[a]									
No.	Description	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
33.	Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church	03	01	01	-03	-13	-20*	-24*	10	-26**	-15
34.	Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen	-09	03	-09	-01	-17	-18	-14	-05	-20*	-08
35.	Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church	16	01	20*	18	12	24*	19	04	11	03

[a]Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendancy, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at the .01 level.

with Thoughtfulness at the .05 level, seems to indicate that the less active, submissive, less sociable individual tends to be more concerned about whether he is saying the proper thing to the sick than is his counterpart. The positive relationship between this item and Personal relations, which is significant at the .01 level, seems to be an indication that seminarians who are tolerant and understanding, and who are sensitive to human weaknesses, also may tend to be concerned about saying the right thing during a visit with the sick. This concern, however, seems to stem from a different sort of feeling than that which was previously described.

The positive relationships between item 15 "Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings," and General activity, Ascendancy and Sociability, which were significant at the .01 level, and with Thoughtfulness, which was significant at the .05 level, seem to indicate that seminarians who are more active, dominant, and reflective are more disturbed by the feeling of a lack of dedication by the laymen to the church than are those who are the opposite. The negative relationship, significant at the .05 level, between this problem and Personal Relations seems to indicate that the greater the tendency to be generally critical of people, the more this problem is apt to be disturbing. The combination of dominance and criticalness, therefore, seems to

be related to the feeling that people are not being sincere in their support of the teachings of the church.

The negative relationship between item 16 "Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict," and factors Objectivity and Friendliness, significant at the .05 level, might be an indication that seminarians who seem to be hypersensitive and less friendly may be apt to avoid contacts involving personality conflicts. The negative relationship, significant at the .05 level, between item 17 "Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you," and Thoughtfulness seems to be an indication that extravertive individuals who are busy interacting with their environment may be apt to be more disturbed by the feeling that the profession is too demanding than are the reflective type of individuals. This may in turn be an indication that overt activity without a realization of the meaning of that activity may tend to lead to a feeling of never-ending pressure.

The positive relationship between item 18 "Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity," and Friendliness, significant at the .01 level, and Thoughtfulness, significant at the .05 level, seems to indicate that reflective and friendly individuals tend to be more sensitive to what they think is charity. Whether this dislike is related to a desire to be pleasing to others and liked by them, or whether it is related

to a realistic handling of personal affairs is not clear. For the reflective individual, charity might perhaps be seen as a degrading force which would undermine the influence of the ministry in the lives of people.

A positive relationship exists between item 23 "Difficulty in making the gospel truths 'live' in the face of present-day difficulties," and Restraint, which is significant at the .05 level. This factor, combined with an almost equally high negative correlation between the same item and General activity may be an indication that this problem is related to a general low output of effort and activity. The positive relationship, significant at the .05 level, between this problem and Objectivity seems to be an indication that persons having fewer ego feelings or greater humility, also tend to be disturbed by a feeling of inability to interpret the gospel adequately for the modern age. The negative relationship between item 26 "Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos," and Restraint, which is significant at the .05 level, seems to indicate that the more carefree, impulsive individual may be apt to be disturbed more by this problem than would the restrained, serious person.

The relationship between item 27 "Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking," and Friendliness is negative and significant at the .05 level, which seems to

indicate that individuals who tend to be less friendly may be apt to feel that their efforts are unappreciated by the laymen. A positive relationship exists between item 28 "Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister," and Objectivity, which is significant at the .01 level, and Friendliness, which is significant at the .05 level. This relationship may be an indication that persons who are more humble and who tend to be pacifistic seem to be more disturbed by a feeling that laymen lose sight of the real purpose of the ministry in favor of building up the church, than are the more egoistic, less friendly, less outreaching individuals who tend to have more of a fighting spirit.

The negative relationship, significant at the .05 level, between item 30 "Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness," and Emotional Stability and Friendliness, may indicate that individuals having neurotic tendencies and who are less friendly tend to evaluate themselves in terms of the number of people who come to church more than do their counterparts. The positive relationship, significantly at the .05 level, between item 31 "Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times," and Emotional Stability seems to indicate that the emotionally stable person may be apt to react more strongly to the feeling that the church is not

meeting the needs of the times than do the less stable individuals.

The positive relationship between item 32 "Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers," and Personal Relations, which is significant at the .05 level, may be an indication that individuals who are able to understand and are sensitive to the feelings of others may be apt to be more hesitant in making introductory calls on strangers. This may reflect a feeling of projecting oneself into the lives of others, which they are hesitant to do. The negative relationships which exist between item 33 "Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church," and Personal Relations, significant at the .05 level, seem to indicate that the more "touchy," less friendly, and more critical individuals tend to experience this feeling more than the objective, friendly, and tolerant individuals. The negative relationship which exists between item 34 "Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen," and Personal Relations, significant at the .05 level, in addition to the pattern of negative relationship on all the other factors except one; namely, Restraint, seems to indicate that individuals who are less tolerant and understanding, more introvertive and submissive, more neurotic and less friendly, may be apt to experience this feeling of being watched more than others. Positive relationships

exist between item 35 "Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church," and the factors Ascendancy and Objectivity, significant at the .05 level, seem to indicate that the more dominant, more objective individuals may be apt to experience more conflict over money-raising activities in the church than the submissive, sensitive individuals. This may reflect a resentment against money-raising activities as degrading to the church and what it stands for. In all, significant relationships were found to exist between each of seventeen problems and one or more personality characteristics at the .05 or .01 level of significance. Thus the null hypothesis has been partially refuted in approximately half the problems in the study.

Several things must be pointed out, however, concerning these findings. First, they are significant only in terms of variation from zero correlations, and have no meaning for individual prediction. Second, the size of the correlations does not indicate the presence of a very high degree of relationship even in terms of the group. Third, these findings are not applicable to Protestant seminarians as a total group, but only to seminarians similar to the participants in the study.

On the other hand, since the sample was not large, a much larger sample would in all probability indicate many more correlations which would achieve the .05 level of

significance. This is especially true when it is considered that many correlations almost achieved this level of significance on the basis of present returns. Essentially, it might be said that seminarians as a group who are attending the participating schools indicate a relationship between certain problems which disturb them and certain personality characteristics. The nature of the problems which disturb them, then, might therefore provide clues to certain personality factors which they might be aware of in order to achieve the highest degree of self-understanding which is so essential for an effective ministry.

Although inter-correlations between the Guilford-Zimmerman factors indicated the presence of a high degree of uniqueness for each trait in the validation studies, it was suspected that inter-correlations based on the responses of a like-minded, specialized group such as the seminarians are, might reveal a much lower degree of uniqueness between the personality factors. In order to test this possibility, inter-correlations between the Guilford-Zimmerman factors were determined on the basis of the responses of the seminarians. The results are presented in Table XXVIII.

In general, the inter-correlations are gratifyingly low in all cases except the following: Sociability and Ascendancy (.60), Emotional Stability and Objectivity

TABLE XXVIII

INTERCORRELATIONS OF SCORES ON THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

BASED ON THE RESPONSES OF 108 SEMINARIANS

	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
G	---	.35	.31	.32	.14	-.04	-.17	.02	-.13	-.06
R	.35	---	-.27	-.31	.04	.00	.27	.23	.02	.16
A	.31	-.27	---	.60	.22	.23	-.17	.14	.01	.03
S	.32	-.31	.60	---	.20	.32	.10	.06	.17	.08
E	.14	.04	.22	.20	---	.58	.27	.12	.37	.22
O	-.04	.00	.23	.32	.58	---	.63	-.24	.67	.41
F	-.17	.27	-.17	.10	.27	.63	---	-.06	.56	.19
T	.02	.23	.14	.06	.12	-.24	-.06	---	-.24	-.08
P	-.13	.02	.01	.17	.37	.67	.56	-.24	---	.35
M	-.06	.16	.03	.08	.22	.41	.19	-.08	.35	---

Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendancy, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

(.58), Friendliness and Objectivity (.63) and Friendliness and Ascendancy (.56). It should be borne in mind, however, that S and A, and E and O, were correspondingly high in the original validation of the instrument. The fact that the E score embraces two emotional factors (D - depression and C - cycloid disposition) may have something to do with the relatively high intercorrelation on that factor. A high degree of unique contribution by each factor is still indicated, however, by the high .63 in intercorrelations between the scores. It can be said, therefore, that the Guilford-Zimmerman factors possess a substantial degree of uniqueness for a seminary population.

Since there was a possibility that the correlations between the Guilford-Zimmerman factors and the problem responses might be non-linear, it was necessary to determine some means by which this possibility might be investigated with ungrouped data. In order to do this, scattergrams were constructed of a sample of thirty correlations involving low, average, and high means with low and high standard deviations. There was no evidence to indicate the existence of a non-linear relationship in any of the correlations tested. Since correlations involving these factors were thought to be most likely to have a non-linear relationship, it was felt that the absence of non-linearity in the sample could be taken as evidence

that any non-linearity which might exist in the remaining correlations might be due to chance.

Correlation of the Guilford-Zimmerman scores with personal data responses.-- The correlations between these variables are presented in Table XXIX. The data indicate that there are no significant relationships between the Guilford-Zimmerman scores and these personal items: (1) past experience, (3) number of children, (4) education, (7) father's occupation, (9) veteran status, and (11) age of decision for the ministry as a career.

Significant positive relationships were found at the .01 level of significance between Masculinity and marital status, Ascendancy and number of brothers and sisters, and General Activity and age. Thus it would seem that married seminarians may tend to be more masculine, seminarians having brothers and sisters may be apt to be more dominant, and older seminarians may tend to be more active. Significant positive relationships at the .05 level of significance were found between Objectivity and seminary status, Emotional Stability and industrial experience, and Friendliness and age. These relationships would seem to indicate that seminarians in the upper levels may tend to be less sensitive and egoistic, seminarians having industrial experience may be apt to be more emotionally stable, and older seminarians may be apt to be more friendly and more realistic in handling frustrations.

TABLE XXIX

PRODUCT-MOMENT COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION BETWEEN GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN SCORES AND PERSONAL DATA INVENTORY RESPONSES. (N = 108)

Personal data item		Guilford-Zimmerman trait									
No.	Description	G	R	A	S	E	O	F	T	P	M
1.	Pastoral experience	06	03	13	00	09	03	15	00	06	04
2.	Marital status	02	02	16	06	08	12	13	12	14	28**
3.	Number of children	11	04	18	03	05	00	13	08	04	15
4.	Education	09	08	07	02	10	05	10	13	04	03
5.	Seminary status	09	04	18	12	09	24*	18	06	18	12
6.	Number of brothers and sisters ...	06	07	26**	10	02	14	00	13	01	03
7.	Father's occupation	01	08	09	00	10	03	09	05	05	02
8.	Industrial experience	09	08	04	13	20*	14	14	09	18	19
9.	Veteran status	07	03	01	01	14	15	01	14	12	19
10.	Age	25**	07	08	02	10	18	22**	05	15	10
11.	Age of decision for the ministry as a career	19	02	01	01	02	06	05	09	04	12

*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at the .01 level.

Key: G - General Activity, R - Restraint, A - Ascendancy, S - Sociability, E - Emotional Stability, O - Objectivity, F - Friendliness, T - Thoughtfulness, P - Personal Relations, M - Masculinity.

There are no negative relationships indicated. On the basis of the evidence, therefore, it would seem that, except for a few instances, the null hypothesis is sustained.

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SEMINARIANS AND FIVE-YEAR GRADUATES ON CERTAIN VARIABLES

In order to determine the persistence of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey factors with experience in the ministry, the significance of the differences between the scores of the seminarians on the scale and those of the five-year graduates was tested by the use of the *t*. The results are presented in Table XXX.

Differences at the .05 level of significance were found in only the Thoughtfulness factor, which seems to indicate that five-year graduates tend to be less reflective and/or introvertive and have a greater degree of interaction with their environment than do the seminarians, thus reflecting a shift from a preoccupation with ideas to activities and people. Another factor worthy of note is the difference, although not significant at the .05 level, between seminarians and five-year graduates on the Friendliness factor. It would seem that five-year graduates tend to be somewhat more distant in their relations with others than the seminarians. This may reflect the tendency among the graduates to be slightly

TABLE XXX

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS AND 65 MINISTERS ON THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Factors	Seminarians		Ministers		t
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
General Activity	18.09	6.39	18.70	6.29	.60
Restraint	20.22	3.81	19.82	3.82	.66
Ascendancy	18.36	5.06	18.08	4.71	.36
Sociability	21.81	5.78	22.21	4.24	.51
Emotional Stability .	20.19	5.31	20.69	5.58	.57
Objectivity	20.44	4.84	20.27	5.16	.21
Friendliness	19.44	5.54	17.87	5.29	1.78
Thoughtfulness	22.40	3.58	20.79	4.27	2.52*
Personal Relations ..	20.04	5.61	19.35	4.68	.86
Masculinity	19.42	3.43	18.90	3.47	.59

*Significant at the .05 level.

withdrawn from laymen, for personal or professional reasons. The most striking fact which stands out from the analysis is the high degree of similarity between the two groups, which might be an indication that experience in the ministry seems to have relatively little effect on the temperament factors as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman scale. It might also be posited that the denominations which these schools represent tend to draw candidates for the ministry who score higher than the norm on the factors previously discussed.

The problem evaluation instrument.-- Scale values and standard deviations for the problem evaluation responses submitted by both the seminarians and the five-year graduates are presented in Table XXXI. The scale values are the mean number of times a certain problem was evaluated as being more disturbing than the problems with which it was compared. The items are listed in the same order as their previous rank, since comparisons were made only with adjacent items. It should be noted that the item scores for the seminarians range from 1.16 to 3.07, and the standard deviations from 1.10 to 1.48. Thus there was a wide range in scale values, and the standard deviations remained relatively constant. The item scores for the five-year graduates ranged from .94 to 3.18, and the standard deviations from 1.02 to 1.45, thus indicating a wide range in means and a similar constancy in

TABLE XXXI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS OF SCORES OBTAINED BY 108 SEMINARIANS AND 65 MINISTERS ON THE PROBLEM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Number	Problems[1]	Seminarians		Ministers		t
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
1.	Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study	2.59	1.26	2.77	1.15	1.06
2.	Inability to remember names	1.16	1.29	.94	1.06	1.29
3.	Insufficient time to be with your family ...	1.69	1.28	1.66	1.34	.15
4.	Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program	2.61	1.11	2.55	1.11	.35
5.	Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession	2.75	1.21	2.58	1.27	.85
6.	Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money	1.75	1.24	2.02	1.32	1.35
7.	Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs	1.58	1.34	1.89	1.45	1.41

[1]The problems of ministers are listed in the same order as that derived from the responses of seminarians in the first phase of the study.

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Number	Problems	Seminarians		Ministers		t
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
8.	Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation	1.82	1.39	1.40	1.26	1.91
9.	Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God	2.21	1.21	2.06	1.15	.88
10.	Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum	2.35	1.44	2.26	1.39	.41
11.	Feeling of resentment against the crowd-drawing tactics of some individuals and groups	1.34	1.10	1.31	1.08	.18
12.	Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress	2.33	1.31	2.66	1.39	1.50
13.	Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls	1.86	1.48	1.60	1.45	1.18
14.	Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with	2.13	1.34	2.05	1.37	.36
15.	Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings	2.26	1.29	2.34	1.21	.47
16.	Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict	2.04	1.35	2.26	1.34	1.00

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Number	Problems	Seminarians		Ministers		t
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
17.	Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you	1.95	1.20	1.68	1.26	1.35
18.	Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity	1.35	1.32	1.48	1.32	.59
19.	Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits	2.57	1.28	2.40	1.24	.85
20.	Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage	1.85	1.24	2.16	1.32	1.55
21.	Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life	1.65	1.30	1.71	1.35	.30
22.	Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister	1.84	1.22	1.44	1.27	2.00*
23.	Difficulty in making the gospel truths "live" in the face of present-day difficulties ...	2.87	1.22	2.98	1.10	.65
24.	Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister	1.97	1.41	1.81	1.21	.80
25.	Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection	1.23	1.22	1.19	1.18	.24
26.	Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their egos.	2.23	1.17	2.03	1.32	1.00

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXXI (Continued)

Problems Number	Seminarians		Ministers		t
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation	
27. Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking	2.04	1.21	2.34	1.05	1.76
28. Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister	2.35	1.27	2.16	1.15	1.12
29. Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time	1.47	1.33	1.42	1.19	.25
30. Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness	1.82	1.23	2.23	1.29	2.05*
31. Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times	3.07	1.19	3.18	1.13	.65
32. Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers	1.81	1.42	1.24	1.23	2.59**
33. Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church	2.34	1.11	2.79	1.02	2.65**
34. Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen	1.28	1.29	1.48	1.31	1.00
35. Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church	2.10	1.29	1.61	1.18	2.88**

*Significant at the .05 level. **Significant at the .01 level.

standard deviations.

A comparison of the responses of the seminarians with those of the five-year graduates seems to indicate a high degree of similarity on all but five items. At the .01 level of significance, item 32 "Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers," disturbed seminarians more than ministers; item 33 "Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church," disturbed five-year graduates more than seminarians; whereas item 35 "Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church," disturbed seminarians more than five-year graduates. At the .05 level of significance, the five-year graduates were disturbed more than seminarians by item 30 "Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness,"; whereas seminarians were disturbed more than the five-year graduates by item 22 "Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister."

A consideration of these differences should not overshadow the fact that a large number of problems exist which tend to greatly disturb seminarians and five-year graduates alike. These problems are presented in rank order, according to the degree to which they disturb both groups:

Item 31, Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.

Item 33, Difficulty in making the gospel truths 'live' in the face of present-day difficulties.

Item 5, Feeling that some ministers' approaches to religion are hurting the profession.

Item 4, Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.

Item 1, Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study.

Item 19, Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits.

Item 10, Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum.

Item 28, Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister.

Item 12, Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.

Item 15, Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings.

These problems seem to be indicative of certain conditions in the ministry to which more attention might be given. A discussion of these conditions, together with some recommendations for their alleviation, will be included in Chapter VIII.

ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS ON CERTAIN VARIABLES.

Since a detailed analysis of the responses by schools was deemed to be of substantial value to the participating seminaries for counseling and evaluation purposes, the responses from the larger groups are included as a part

of this study. The identity of the schools is concealed by the use of numbers I - V.

Differences between seminaries on the Guilford-Zimmerman scores.-- The scores by the major participating schools on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey are presented in Table XXXII. It should be noted that there are no significant differences between the participating schools and the averages for all groups on all ten factors. It might be said, therefore, that the null hypothesis has been sustained within the limits of this study, although the size of the samples renders this conclusion of little or no value.

Differences between seminaries on the problem evaluation instrument.-- The scores of the major seminaries on the problem evaluation instrument are presented in Table XXXIII. As before, there were no significant differences between any of the participating schools and the averages for all schools on any problem in the instrument, although the size of the samples would again be a factor which must be taken into consideration. The reader is referred to the table for any desired information on the responses of any group.

TABLE XXXII

A COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES BY SEMINARIES ON THE

GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Temperament Factors	Average	I	II	III	IV	V
General Activity	18.09	18.59	17.80	16.13	19.23	21.80
Restraint	20.22	20.44	20.50	18.13	19.62	19.70
Ascendancy	18.36	19.53	17.50	17.06	19.00	19.90
Sociability	21.81	23.09	21.40	20.38	20.92	23.30
Emotional Stability	20.19	22.35	18.00	18.56	19.15	23.20
Objectivity	20.44	21.97	19.87	19.88	18.31	19.70
Friendliness	19.44	19.71	20.60	17.88	18.38	17.70
Thoughtfulness	22.40	21.85	21.70	23.25	23.74	22.40
Personal Relations	20.04	20.74	20.40	18.44	19.00	18.80
Masculinity	19.42	21.06	18.33	18.31	18.62	19.30

TABLE XXXIII

A COMPARISON OF THE RESPONSES BY SEMINARIES ON THE PROBLEM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT

Problems	Avge.	I	II	III	IV	V
1. Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study	2.59	2.59	2.43	2.81	2.62	2.60
2. Inability to remember names	1.16	1.12	1.13	1.00	1.38	1.10
3. Insufficient time to be with your family	1.69	1.59	1.70	1.81	1.23	1.80
4. Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program	2.61	2.85	2.57	2.06	2.85	2.70
5. Feeling that some ministers' approaches to religion are hurting the profession	2.75	2.76	2.83	3.00	2.54	2.20
6. Feeling that you receive the leftovers of the laymen's time and money	1.75	1.62	1.77	1.75	1.77	2.20
7. Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs	1.58	1.50	1.80	2.00	1.08	1.40
8. Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation	1.82	1.91	1.57	1.63	2.38	1.80
9. Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God ...	2.21	2.53	2.30	1.25	2.00	2.70
10. Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum	2.35	2.12	2.20	3.19	2.77	1.50

TABLE XXXIII (Continued)

Problems	Avge.	I	II	III	IV	V
11. Feeling of resentment against the crowd-drawing tactics of some individuals and groups ...	1.34	1.03	1.43	2.13	1.08	1.50
12. Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress	2.33	2.41	2.17	1.69	2.46	3.10
13. Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls	1.86	2.26	1.80	1.31	2.31	0.80
14. Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with	2.13	1.88	2.37	2.88	1.54	1.90
15. Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teaching	2.26	2.41	1.97	2.19	2.08	3.20
16. Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict	2.04	1.71	2.07	2.50	2.46	1.70
17. Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you	1.95	2.03	2.10	1.44	2.00	2.00
18. Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity	1.35	1.26	1.63	1.06	1.38	0.90
19. Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits	2.57	2.97	2.13	2.38	2.62	2.90
20. Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage	1.85	1.56	2.13	2.56	1.54	1.60

TABLE XXXIII (Continued)

Problems	Avge.	I	II	III	IV	V
21. Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life	1.65	1.47	1.50	2.00	1.69	1.80
22. Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister .	1.84	1.94	2.07	1.13	1.92	2.10
23. Difficulty in making the gospel truths 'live' in the face of present-day difficulties	2.87	2.97	2.67	3.00	2.69	3.00
24. Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister	1.97	2.15	1.93	1.31	2.23	1.70
25. Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection	1.23	1.03	1.10	1.94	1.23	1.20
26. Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos	2.23	2.06	2.37	2.38	2.23	3.00
27. Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking	2.04	2.41	1.97	2.00	1.85	1.80
28. Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister	2.35	2.50	2.13	2.25	2.23	2.30
29. Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time	1.47	1.38	2.03	1.13	1.69	0.50

TABLE XLIII (Continued)

Problems	Avge.	I	II	III	IV	V
30. Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness	1.82	1.38	2.03	2.06	1.77	2.30
31. Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times	3.07	3.15	2.70	3.13	2.92	3.60
32. Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers	1.81	2.09	1.73	1.19	2.31	1.40
33. Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church	2.34	2.47	2.50	2.25	2.00	2.30
34. Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen	1.28	1.09	1.20	2.06	1.23	1.00
35. Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church	2.10	2.12	2.13	1.81	2.23	2.20

SUMMARY

All responses were subjected to a detailed analysis, and the following information was secured: for the seminarians, (1) the mean pastoral experience was 3.5 years; (2) the mean age of the respondents was 28.9 years; (3) 80.6 percent of the respondents were married, and of these 83.9 percent had children which averaged 1.6 children per couple; (4) 19.4 percent held advanced degrees; (5) the respondents had an average 2.5 brothers and sisters each; (6) only 20.4 percent reported their father's occupation as professional in nature; (7) almost one-half indicated a lack of full-time industrial and/or trades experience, but the average of those reporting such experience averaged 4.1 years; (8) the average age when the decision was made to enter the ministry as a career was 23.6 years; and (9) 56.3 percent indicated a veteran status. Significant differences between the means of scores obtained by the seminarians and the norms established for the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey were found in eight factors: restraint, ascendancy, sociability, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness, thoughtfulness, and personal relations. Significant relationships were found between certain problems and certain personality factors. Intercorrelations between the Guilford-Zimmerman factors indicated a high degree of uniqueness between the traits, based on the scores of the seminarians. Significant

positive relationships were found between certain Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament scores and certain personal data items related to the seminarians. Scattergrams of a sample of correlations seemed to indicate no evidence of non-linearity of regression. A comparison of the responses of the seminarians with those of the five-year graduates on the Guilford-Zimmerman scale indicated significant differences on only one factor, that of Thoughtfulness. Significant differences were found between seminarians and five-year graduates on only five problems, which indicates a high degree of similarity between the two groups. No significant differences were found to exist between the means of the responses from each of the participating seminarians and the averages for all respondents on either the Guilford-Zimmerman scores or the problem evaluation instrument, although the sizes of the samples prohibits the formation of any conclusions on this factor.

CHAPTER VIII

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a summary of this investigation and to discuss some conclusions which may be drawn from the data.

SUMMARY OF THE INVESTIGATION

The investigation attempted to accomplish three basic purposes: (1) test the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between the personality characteristics of ministers-in-training, as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and problems related to the Protestant ministry; (2) determine whether a significant relationship exists between the personality characteristics of ministers-in-training and certain personal data items such as pastoral experience, age, marital status, number of children, education, seminary status, number of brothers and sisters, father's occupation (professional versus non-professional), industrial experience, veteran status, and age of decision for the ministry as a career; and (3) determine whether there are significant differences between seminarians and five-year graduates on personality characteristics and on the problems of ministers. A review of the literature pertinent to the study indicated that no similar investigation had been conducted.

A total of ninety-nine problems of ministers, obtained from all available sources, was used in the construction of a preliminary questionnaire. This instrument was designed to measure the occurrence of the item, as well as the degree to which it disturbed the minister. The instrument was subjected to a pre-test at Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, and was then administered to 148 seminarians at Garrett Biblical Institute who were serving pastorates in Indiana and Illinois. Thirty-five items were thus obtained from eighty-three responses for use in a final problem evaluation instrument.

The final inquiry consisted of a personal data inventory, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and a paired comparisons measure of the problems of ministers derived as described above.

A total of 108 seminarians and sixty-five ministers from seven theological schools completed the inquiry. The responses were recorded on an information sheet and then coded and punched on cards. A frequency distribution was prepared for each item of the final inquiry, and correlation coefficients were computed between each of the temperament factors and each of the problem and personal data scores. Each coefficient of correlation was tested against the null hypothesis, and scattergrams were constructed of a sample of correlations as a test for non-linearity of regression. Inter-correlations between the temperament scores of the

seminarians were computed as a test of the uniqueness of the factors for the seminarian group. The seminarians and five-year graduates were compared on both the Guilford-Zimmerman scale and the problem evaluation instrument to determine whether significant differences existed between the groups on these instruments. The responses of the seminarians were also compared in terms of the participating schools to determine whether significant differences existed between the seminaries, and to provide data for use by the field work directors who lent their support to the study.

Data obtained from the final inquiry may be summarized as follows:

1. Sixty-one of the 108 seminarians indicated that they had two years or less of pastoral experience; however, the average experience for all respondents was 3.5 years (Table V).

2. The mean age of the seminarians was twenty-nine years, and the majority were from twenty-three to thirty years old (Table VI).

3. A total of 80.6 percent of the seminarians were married (Table VII).

4. Of the married seminarians reporting, 84 percent indicated that they had children, the average being 1.6 children per couple (Table VIII).

5. Advanced degrees were held by 19.4 percent of the seminarians (Table IX).

6. One-half of the seminarians serving as pastors were in their third year of study (Table X).

7. Eighty percent of the seminarians indicated that they had one or more brothers and/or sisters, the average being 2.5 brothers and/or sisters (Table XI).

8. The responses indicated that the fathers of 79.5 percent of the seminarians were engaged in non-professional occupations (Table XII).

9. The relative lack of industrial and/or trades experience is reflected in the fact that 46.3 percent reported having no full time industrial and/or trades experience, the average being 2.2 years for the entire sample (Table XIII).

10. The mean age at which the decision to enter the ministry as a career was made was 23.6 years. A fairly normal distribution of ages was found, with a concentration around the 19-20 year group. The range was from fourteen to over thirty years. There was no evidence of bi-modality (Table XIV).

11. Of the total seminarians reporting, 56 percent indicated that they had veteran status (Table XV).

12. The seminarians obtained scores significantly higher than the norms for restraint, ascendancy, sociability, emotional stability, objectivity, friendliness,

thoughtfulness, and personal relations. No significant differences were found between the scores for general activity and masculinity, and the norms (Table XVI).

13. Significant relationships were found between seventeen problems and certain personality characteristics (Table XXVII):

A. Item 2, "Inability to remember names," was negatively related to Sociability, significant at the .01 level.

B. Item 6, "Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money," was negatively related to Personal Relations, significant at the .05 level.

C. Item 13, "Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls," was negatively related to General Activity, Ascendancy, and Sociability at the .01 level, and to Thoughtfulness at the .05 level. This problem is also positively related to Personal Relations, significant at the .01 level.

D. Item 15, "Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings," was positively related to General Activity, Ascendancy, and Sociability at the .01 level, and with Thoughtfulness at the .05 level. The problem is also related negatively to Personal Relations at the .05 level.

E. Item 16, "Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict," was negatively related to Objectivity and Friendliness at the .05 level.

F. Item 17, "Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you," was negatively related to Thoughtfulness at the .05 level.

G. Item 18, "Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity," was positively related to Friendliness at the .01 level, and to Thoughtfulness at the .05 level.

H. Item 23, "Difficulty in making the gospel truths 'live' in the face of present-day difficulties," was positively related to Restraint at the .05 level.

I. Item 26, "Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos," was negatively related to Restraint at the .05 level.

J. Item 27, "Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking," was negatively related to Friendliness at the .05 level.

K. Item 28, "Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister," was positively related to Objectivity at the .01 level, and to Friendliness at the .05 level.

L. Item 30, "Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness," was negatively related to Emotional Stability and Friendliness at the .05 level.

M. Item 31, "Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times," was positively related to Emotional Stability at the .05 level.

N. Item 32, "Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers," was positively related to Personal Relations at the .05 level.

O. Item 33, "Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church," was negatively related to Personal Relations at the .01 level, and to Objectivity and Friendliness at the .05 level.

P. Item 34, "Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen," was negatively related to Personal Relations at the .05 level and negatively to all other factors except one; namely, Restraint.

Q. Item 35, "Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church," was positively related to Ascendancy and Objectivity at the .05 level.



14. Inter-correlations between the Guilford-Zimmerman factors were gratifyingly low, thus signifying a high degree of uniqueness in each factor (Table XXVIII).

15. Significant relationships were found between six personal data items and certain personality characteristics (Table XXIX):

A. Item 2, "Marital status," was positively related to Masculinity at the .01 level.

B. Item 5, "Seminary status," was positively related to Objectivity at the .05 level.

C. Item 6, "Number of brothers and sisters," was positively related to Ascendancy at the .01 level.

D. Item 8, "Industrial experience," was positively related to Emotional Stability at the .05 level.

E. Item 10, "Age," was positively related to General Activity at the .01 level, and to Friendliness at the .05 level.

16. There was no evidence of non-linearity of regression.

17. The correlations were found to have no value for individual prediction, nor are they deemed to be applicable to seminary groups outside the scope of the study.

18. Significant differences were found between seminarians and five-year graduates on only one factor in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey; namely, Thoughtfulness. Seminarians scored significantly higher on the Thoughtfulness scale at the .05 level (Table XXX).

19. Significant differences were found between seminarians and five-year graduates on only five problems of

ministers (Table XXXI):

A. Seminarians scored higher than the five-year graduates on item 22, "Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister," and on item 32, "Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers." The differences were significant at the .05 level.

B. Seminarians scored higher than the five-year graduates on item 35, "Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church." This difference was significant at the .01 level.

C. Five-year graduates scored higher than seminarians on item 30, "Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness," which was significant at the .05 level.

D. Five-year graduates scored higher than seminarians on item 33, "Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church," which was significant at the .01 level.

20. Certain problems were found greatly to disturb five-year graduates and seminarians alike, and are presented in rank order:

Item 31 Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.

Item 33 Difficulty in making the gospel truths 'live' in the face of present-day difficulties.

Item 5 Feeling that some ministers' approaches to religion are hurting the profession.

Item 4 Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.

Item 1 Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study.

Item 19 Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits.

Item 10 Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum.

Item 28 Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister.

Item 12 Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.

Item 15 Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings.

21. No significant differences were found among the participating schools and the averages for the entire sample on either the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey or the problem evaluation instrument. The size of the respective samples, however, renders such a conclusion open to question without further evidence (Tables XXXII and XXXIII).

REFLECTIONS CONCERNING THE INVESTIGATION

Significant linear relationships were found to exist between some factor or factors in the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey and seventeen of the thirty-five problems which disturb ministers; thus, the first working hypothesis concerning the relationship between personality characteristics and the problems of ministers was partially supported. There was very little support for the second hypothesis dealing with the relationship between the Temperament scores and the personal data items. The third hypothesis dealing with the significance of the differences between the Guilford-Zimmerman scores of the seminarians

and the norms established for the scale found support in eight of the ten factors. The fourth hypothesis was substantiated in that no significant differences were found between the scores of the seminarians and the five-year graduates on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. The fifth hypothesis, which dealt with the significance of differences between the seminarians and five-year graduates on the problem evaluation instrument, found very little support from the evidence. No attempt was made to determine cause-and-effect in the relationships, nor was such an attempt deemed to be part of the study.

An analysis of the problems which disturbed both seminarians and ministers alike seems to reflect certain basic conditions which might merit careful study by Protestant churches and seminaries. In all probability, the most obvious consideration is the economic pressures which beset the parish minister. Much has already been written on this problem so that it need not be discussed here.

A second consideration involves the feeling that the church is ineffective and lagging in the present day. Whether the core problem is one of keeping abreast of a fast-moving age, whether it is one of re-defining the function of the church for our time, or whether it is a problem of returning to the objectives and ideals of the historic church, the evidence seems to indicate that much

needs to be done in this area in order to promote a stronger feeling of accomplishment and unified purpose within the Protestant ministry.

A third consideration concerns the disturbed feelings among many seminarians and five-year graduates alike, which are caused by the tactics of some ministers in the name of religion. The evidence does not indicate whether these feelings reflect tensions already present in the minister, or whether they are based on evidences of harm done to the dignity of the office by such practices. The study seems to indicate only the need for some sort of activity in the churches and seminaries which might alleviate these feelings in the name of brotherhood.

A fourth consideration involves the need on the part of seminaries and denominations to cope with the wide gulf which seems to exist between pastor and layman. Granted that the minister should be the leader of his people toward the Kingdom of God, the evidence seems to indicate that disillusionment in people, and therefore the ministry, is apt to be a major problem. Perhaps a fuller understanding, on the one hand, of the minister's position which is bound to make him more deeply and immediately concerned about human failing than the laymen are apt to be; and on the other hand, a clarification of, and new emphasis on, the real significance of the minister's role as the patient, loving shepherd of his flock might be of help in alleviating these tensions.

A fifth consideration concerns the problem of providing inviolable time for disciplined study and activity in the ministry. Perhaps study programs, seminars, and the like in local associations and on the district levels might provide added incentives for a more concentrated effort.

The findings of this study seem to indicate, first of all, that some problems in the ministry are related to certain personality factors in the ministers themselves. If this is true, then the nature of the problems which disturb the seminarian may well be clues to certain personality characteristics within himself which he would do well to recognize in order to achieve the high degree of self-understanding which is so essential to an effective ministry. Secondly, the problems of seminarians are very much the same sort of problems which tend to plague experienced ministers in the field. If this also is true, then much might be done on the seminary level to cope with these factors before the young minister leaves the confines of the seminary to be on his own.

A third consideration involves the conclusion that personality characteristics seem to undergo very little change with experience in the field. This should tend to dampen the hope of younger men that frustrations and difficulties in personal relations will tend to disappear

once they leave the seminary and are out in the field as graduate ministers. This factor also points to the urgent need for the development of self-understanding during the time when the seminarian has the benefit of understanding and wise counsel from faculty and administrators.

It is recognized that this study should be supplemented by extensive research in order to determine more fully the impact of the minister's own personality on the pastoral situation. It would seem, first of all, that tests of a paper-and-pencil variety do differentiate between certain personality factors. Perhaps an instrument to measure such factors, and designed for ministers, therefore may be of value in this area.

A second possibility involves a more intensive analysis based upon a much larger sample of combinations of personality factors as they are related to certain types of problems, which may provide more information on the inter-relationship of these factors than we have at the present time.

It is hoped that further efforts along these lines will be possible, since it is only by this means that we will be able to arrive at self-understanding and adequately cope with those stresses in the ministry which tend to magnify the pressures which already exist for the minister in his pastoral work. Perhaps, through this study, a beginning has been achieved.

APPENDIX I

Preliminary Questionnaire

Code_____

WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THIS EVALUATION INSTRUMENT PLEASE RETURN IT TO:

Rev. John C. Whitcomb
2907 Trumbull Street
Flint, Michigan

A SELF-ADDRESSED AND STAMPED ENVELOPE IS ENCLOSED FOR YOUR CONVENIENCE.

* * * * * * * * * - * *

You are asked to express your feelings concerning the problems of ministers because of your experience and your position as a pastor. The author of this study is deeply grateful to you for your expression of your own feeling. When the study is completed you will be furnished a summary of the findings.

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE EVALUATION

1. Here is a list of problems faced by ministers in their work. You are asked to answer the following two questions for each item:

   a. (ITEM EVALUATION): Does this problem disturb you?

   b. (FREQUENCY JUDGMENT): Does this problem occur in your ministry?

2. In making the item evaluations, encircle the number which indicates the degree to which the item disturbs you. Use this scale:

   0 - Very little
   1 - Little
   2 - Somewhat
   3 - Much
   4 - Very much

3. In making the item frequency judgments, encircle the word "yes" or the word "no", whichever expresses your answer to the question: "Does this problem, feeling, or tendency occur in your ministry?"

   NOTE: Do not base your judgments on a single, isolated incident; but rather on the basis of your total experience.

4. Encircle the "?" if the item is not clear to you.

5. At the end of the evaluation instrument space is provided for you to add and evaluate any other items which you believe should be included in a list of this sort.

6. Be sure to complete all evaluations and frequency judgments.

7. Please do not discuss the instrument with others before you have completed it. Do not sign your name - - your responses will remain strictly anonymous.

EVALUATIONS AND JUDGMENTS

	ITEM EVALUATION To what degree does this item disturb you?					FREQUENCY JUDGMENT Does the item occur in your ministry?		
	Very little	Little	Somewhat	Much	Very much			
	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of inferiority when in social groups outside the church.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your ministry is of primary concern only to the women of the church	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you are a receptacle for the minor problems of church and church school administration. . . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister.. . . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Resentment against being called upon to do the things that have nothing to do with your ministry.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to avoid difficult counseling situations	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that nothing you do will change people's attitudes or habits	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict. . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to avoid those who draw heavily on your time	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?

ITEM	ITEM EVALUATION					FREQUENCY JUDGMENT		
	VL	L	S	M	VM	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you must favor the more well-to-do members of the church. . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your wife is expected to do more than other members of the church.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that some laymen have a clearer perception of the meaning of Christianity than you do	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Hesitancy in fully accepting minority group members as companions and co-workers	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to cut short contacts with the aged and infirm	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the church is a fellowship of the weak and infirm	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to favor the young people in preference to others	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that laymen are relieved when you close pastoral calls	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to put off making hospital calls	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in offering prayers during sick calls	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Insufficient time to be with your family	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of conflict between your profession and your preferred personal habits	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you are obligated to subscribe to things you don't believe in.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the ministry is not what you thought it would be when you entered it	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?

ITEM	ITEM EVALUATION					FREQUENCY JUDGMENT		
	VL	L	S	M	VH	Yes	No	?
Dislike making pastoral calls.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Community attitude that interference in existing conditions is not your function as a minister.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to cut short your contacts with those who are in the lower social strata.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to avoid contacts with individuals having deep personal problems.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in resolving emotional "crushes" which lay women may have toward you.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of inferiority when among leaders of business and industry in the community.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that much of what you say are platitudes.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of repulsion toward making calls on the critically ill and dying. . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Temptation to tell risque stories and swear mildly to impress others with your masculinity.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the ministry seems to be for those who cannot succeed in or are fearful of participating in other areas of economic life. . . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that laymen take pity on your supposedly reduced economic condition.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in counseling couples who plan to marry.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you are denied pleasures given to others.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of a lack of the Presence of God in your services.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in making church membership classes meaningful.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Dislike speaking to ladies' groups. . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the lay leadership in the church is in the hands of people who are least qualified to do the work.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the church is a receptacle for feelings that cannot be expressed elsewhere.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in making decisions in church affairs.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?

ITEM	ITEM EVALUATION					FREQUENCY JUDGMENT		
	VL	L	S	M	VM	Yes	No	?
Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to feel apologetic about your work as a minister.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your minister associates are inferior as a group to professional people in other fields. . . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the church is more interested in getting contributors than in proclaiming the gospel.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the pastor's major task seems to be that of preserving harmony in the church.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency to tell people what they ought to do.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organizations play politics for their own advantage.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you are forced to compete with other churches for new members.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of a lack of true Christian spirit among the ministers in the community.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Inability to remember names.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Tendency of young people to draw away from you.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the primary function of the church seems to be to give Divine sanction to the values that exist in society at the time.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you are not a good mixer.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of inadequacy in the pulpit. .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of a lack of concern for people and their problems.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of resentment against the crowd-drawing tactics of some individuals and groups.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?

ITEM	ITEM EVALUATION					FREQUENCY JUDGMENT		
	VL	L	S	M	VM	Yes	No	?
Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister. .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your laymen conceal their real thoughts from you.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the fight against secularism and materialism is a losing battle.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Inability to rid yourself of a lack of concern for the needs of people in foreign lands.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs...	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that your laymen are disappointed in you as a minister. . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the church is no longer sure of what it stands for.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that a Protestant church really stands or falls on the personality of the minister.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that background and connections are more important for success than ability.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that most people conceive of Christianity as a "pie-in-the-sky" reward.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that perhaps life would be more fulfilling if you were in some other line of work.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling of envy for the Catholic brethren who enjoy full congregations regularly.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that when people criticize the church they are applying it to your work as a minister.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church. . .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in making the Gospel truths "live" in the face of present day difficulties.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?

ITEM	ITEM EVALUATION					FREQUENCY JUDGMENT		
	VL	L	S	M	VM	Yes	No	?
Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the minister is the last person people come to for counsel. .	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that secular organizations seem to be more effective in serving the needs of people than the churches	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos.	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
_____	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
_____	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
_____	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
_____	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
_____	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?
_____	0	1	2	3	4	Yes	No	?

APPENDIX II

Final Survey Material

Problem Evaluation Instrument
Personal Data Inventory
Information Sheet
Profile Chart

A SURVEY OF THE OPINIONS OF MINISTERS CONCERNING PROBLEMS IN THE PROTESTANT MINISTRY.

John C. Whitcomb

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

1. This survey is divided into three parts. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT ALL THREE PARTS BE COMPLETED FOR VALID RESULTS.

2. Please do not discuss the survey with others before you have completed it.

3. Do not sign your name - - your responses will remain strictly anonymous. However, for statistical purposes you have been assigned a code number, and the problems have code numbers. Be assured that noone will have access to the code numbers or the names of ministers participating in the study.

PART I: PERSONAL DATA

Directions.

Please check the appropriate response to each of the items on the accompanying personal data sheet. In answering item 3, for example, if your age at last birthday was 28, you should place a check (x) inside the parenthesis before "27-28 years."

PART II: THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

Scales of this sort have their obvious weaknesses, but they have been found, through many studies, to be of value in differentiating personality characteristics. Thus such a scale is used here for this purpose.

Directions

1. Record your results on the answer sheet which is provided for this purpose. Please do not write on the booklet itself. Note that the questions read down, but the answers are recorded across the page on the answer sheet! THIS IS IMPORTANT!!

2. Since "yes" and "no" responses only are scored, too many of the statements marked "?" will tend to destroy the validity of the score. Please try to have no more than five marked "?" on either side of the answer sheet. Make every effort to arrive at a definite decision.

3. The pencils which are included here are I.B.M. Electromagnetic. Please do not make any dot or mark other than your answer on the sheet. Erase any desired changes thoroughly.

PART III: THE PROBLEM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT.

This is a forced-choice instrument. Each comparison that you are asked to make is different. Ineach case, choose that problem which is likely to disturb you the most. Place a check mark (x) in the parenthesis.

For example, in the following comparison, suppose you were to feel that problem 12 is likely to disturb you more than problem 19. Your comparison would look like this:

89. 12 (x) Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.
19 ( ) Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits.

BE SURE TO ANSWER ALL 73 ITEMS.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Evaluations

1. ( ) Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls.
( ) Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings.

2. ( ) Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church.
( ) Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers.

3. ( ) Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.
( ) Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with.

4. ( ) Inability to remember names.
( ) Insufficient time to be with your family.

5. ( ) Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church more than they are in a minister.
( ) Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time.

6. ( ) Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God.
( ) Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum.

7. ( ) Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you.
( ) Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits.

8. ( ) Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.
( ) Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession.

9. ( ) Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church.
( ) Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen.

10. ( ) Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time.
( ) Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.

11. ( ) Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life.
( ) Difficulty in making the gospel truths "live" in the face of present-day difficulties.

12. ( ) Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God.
( ) Feeling of resentment against the crowd-drawing tactics of some individuals and groups.

13. ( ) Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church.
( ) Inner conflict over the money-raising activities in the church.

14. ( ) Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum.
( ) Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.

15. ( ) Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.
( ) Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money.

16. ( ) Inability to remember names.
( ) Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession

17. ( ) Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness.
( ) Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers

18. ( ) Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money.
( ) Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs.

19. ( ) Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen.
( ) Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.

20. ( ) Difficulty in making the gospel truths "live" in the face of present-day difficulties.
( ) Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection.

21. ( ) Feeling of resentment against the crowd-drawing tactics of some individuals and groups.
( ) Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls.

22. ( ) Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study.
( ) Insufficient time to be with your family.

23. ( ) Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with.
( ) Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings.

24. ( ) Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister.
( ) Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos.

25. ( ) Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity.
( ) Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage.

( ) Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation.
( ) Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God.

34.

( ) Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness.
( ) Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.

35.

( ) Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls.
( ) Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with

36.

( ) Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study
( ) Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession.

( ) Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits.

37.

( ) Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life.

( ) Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings.

38.

( ) Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict.

( ) Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum.

39.

( ) Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.
( ) Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection.
( ) Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos.

( ) Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers.
( ) Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen.

( ) Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time.
( ) Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness.

( ) Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos.
( ) Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking.

( ) Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage.
( ) Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister.

( ) Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.
( ) Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church.

( ) Insufficient time to be with your family.
( ) Difficulty in getting th laymen to see the worth of the church program.

( ) Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession.
( ) Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs.

( ) Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you.
( ) Feeling that trade discounts offered to mineters are poorly disguised charity.

( ) Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.
( ) Difficulty in saying the right thing during sick calls.

( ) Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage.
( ) Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life.

( ) Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister.
( ) Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection.

( ) Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict.
( ) Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you.

( ) Feeling of resentment against the crowd drawing tactics of some individuals and groups.
( ) Discouragement over the church's seeming lack of progress.

( ) Insufficient time to be with your family.
( ) Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession.

( ) Feeling that people who seem to have the most are the least interested in the church.
( ) Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers.

( ) Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organizations for support of various programs.
( ) Feeling that people want to hear a good speaker on Sunday morning more than to worship God.

( ) Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the lay men's time and money.
( ) Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation.

( ) Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict.
( ) Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity.

( ) Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister.
( ) Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister.

( ) Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study.
( ) Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.

4. ( ) Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking.
( ) Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church more than they are in a minister.

5. ( ) Feeling that you and your family are under close surveillance by the laymen.
( ) Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church

6. ( ) Resentment against the continuing demands of higher-ups in the church organization for support of various programs.
( ) Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation.

7. ( ) Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits.
( ) Feeling that higher-ups in the denominational organization play politics for their own advantage.

8. ( ) Inner conflict over the ethics of money-raising activities in the church
( ) Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.

9. ( ) Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister.
( ) Difficulty in making the gospel truths "live" in the face of present-day difficulties.

60. ( ) Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church more than they are in a minister.
( ) Tendency to interpret fluctuations in church attendance from Sunday to Sunday as an indicator of your pulpit effectiveness

61. ( ) Feeling that there are but a handful of real Christians in the entire congregation.
( ) Feeling that the church is confining itself to a narrow social stratum.

62. ( ) Feeling that the denominational organizations are not facing squarely the real issues the nation has to contend with.
( ) Tendency to avoid those with whom you have a personality conflict.

63. ( ) Feeling that most laymen give only lip service to the church and its teachings.
( ) Feeling that you are unable to do the job required of you.

64. ( ) Feeling that some ministers' unrealistic approaches to religion are hurting the profession.
( ) Feeling that you receive the left-overs of the laymen's time and money.

65. ( ) Difficulty in making the gospel truths "live" in the face of present-day difficulties.
( ) Feeling that your personal faith is inadequate for a minister.

66. ( ) Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking.
( ) Feeling that people wonder what you do with your time

67. ( ) Feeling that the church is an outlet by which certain laymen are able to feed their own egos.
( ) Feeling that people are more interested in someone who can build up the church than they are in a minister.

68. ( ) Inability to remember names.
( ) Difficulty in getting the laymen to see the worth of the church program.

69. ( ) Feeling that your private life is open to public inspection.
( ) Feeling that laymen do not appreciate the work and time required of you for effective preaching and speaking.

70. ( ) Feeling that the church is not keeping up with the times.
( ) Hesitancy in making introductory calls on strangers.

71. ( ) Feeling that trade discounts offered to ministers are poorly disguised charity.
( ) Feeling that your pastoral calls are only social visits.

72. ( ) Inability to keep the burdens of the church out of your home life.
( ) Feeling that you are not worthy as a minister

73. ( ) Difficulty in keeping a disciplined schedule of study.
( ) Inability to remember names.

PERSONAL DATA INVENTORY

Code _____

1. Do you have all the responsibilities of a pastor at the present time, although the church may be a part time charge? Yes____ No____.

2. How many years of experience have you had as a pastor, if any? (NOTE: Do not include experience in any other office in the church)

A minimum of eight months constitutes the minimum requirement for one year's service in cases where partial years are involved.

( ) One Year
( ) Two years
( ) Three years
( ) Four years
( ) Five years
( ) Six years
( ) Seven years
( ) Eight years
( ) Nine years
( ) Ten years
( ) More than 10 years.

3. Age at last Birthday.

( ) 22 years or under
( ) 23-24 years
( ) 25-26 years
( ) 27-28 years
( ) 29-30 years
( ) 31-32 years
( ) 33-34 years
( ) 35-36 years
( ) 37-38 years
( ) 39-40 years
( ) More than 40 years.

4. Sex

( ) Male
( ) Female

5. Marriage status

( ) Single
( ) Married

6. How many children do you have, if any? _____.

7. Educational status (Please check the degrees you hold)

( ) A.B.
( ) B.S.
( ) M.A
( ) M.S.
( ) Ph.D.
( ) Other, having full degree status.

8. Seminary status

( ) First year
( ) Second year
( ) Third year

9. How many brothers and sisters do you have?

( ) None
( ) 1-2 brothers and sisters
( ) 3-4 brothers and sisters
( ) 5-6 brothers and sisters
( ) 7-8 brothers and sisters
( ) 9-10 brothers and sisters
( ) 11-12 brothers and sisters
( ) More than 12 brothers and sisters

10. What is your father's occupation? _____.

11. What was your father's occupation during your boyhood and teens? _____

_____

12. How many years, if any, have you worked in industry and/or the trades full time? (NOTE: This is not to count summer vacations or other temporary employment.) A minimum of eight months employment is required here in order to count one year in cases of partial years.

( ) None
( ) 1-2 years
( ) 3-4 years
( ) 5-6 years
( ) 7-8 years
( ) 9-10 years
( ) More than 10 years.

13. How old were you when you decided to enter the ministry as a career?

( ) 14 years of age and younger
( ) 15-16 years of age
( ) 17-18 years of age
( ) 19-20 years of age
( ) 21-22 years of age
( ) 23-24 years of age
( ) 25-26 years of age
( ) 27-28 years of age
( ) 29-30 years of age
( ) Over thirty years of age

14. Are you a war veteran? Yes_____ No_____

INFORMATION SHEET

Code:

G.-Z. Scores:

1. Gen. Act.-G:
2. Res. - R:
3. Asc. - A:
4. Soc. - S:
5. Em. St. - E:
6. Obj - O:
7. Friend. - F:
8. Thought.- T:
9. Pers. rel.P:
10. Masc. - M:

Problem eval.

Item 1:
" 2:
" 3:
" 4:
" 5:
" 6:
" 7:
" 8:
" 9:
" 10:
" 11:
" 12:
" 13:
Item 14:
" 15:
" 16:
" 17:
" 18:
" 19:
" 20:
" 21:
" 22:
" 23:
" 24:
" 25:
" 26:
" 27:
" 28:
" 29:
" 30:
" 31:
" 32:
" 33:
" 34:
" 35:

Personal data

Past. exp:
Age:
Mar. status:
M.
S.
No. of child.:
Education:
Sem. status:
No. bro.& sis:
Path. occup.
P.
Non-p:
Indus. exp:
Decis. for min:
Vet. status:

PROFILE CHART FOR THE GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY

SCALED SCORES FOR MEN

Name _____ Date _____

C SCORE	G General Activity Energy	R Restraint Seriousness	A Ascendance Social Boldness	S Social Interest Sociability	E Emotional Stability	O Objectivity	F Friendliness Agreeableness	T Thoughtfulness Reflectiveness	P Personal Relations Cooperativeness	M Masculinity (of emotions and interests)	CENTILE RANK	NEAREST T SCORE
10	30 29	30 29 28 27	30 29	30	30 29	30 29	29 28 27 26	30 29 28	30 29 28	30 29 28	99	75
9	28 27	26 25	28 27 26	29 28	28 27	28 27	25 24 23	27 26	27 26	27		70
8	26 25	24 23	25 24 23	27 26	26 25	26 25	22 21	25 24	25 24 23	26 25	95 90	65
7	24 23 22	22 21	22 21	25 24	24 23 22	24 23	20 19 18	23 22	22 21	24	80	60
6	21 20 19	20 19 18	20 19 18	23 22 21	21 20 19	22 21 20	17 16	21 20	20 19 18	23 22	70 60	55
5	18 17 16	17 16	17 16 15	20 19 18	18 17 16	19 18 17	15 14 13	19 18	17 16	21 20	50 40	50
4	15 14 13	15 14	14 13 12	17 16 15 14	15 14 13 12	16 15 14	12 11 10	17 16 15	15 14	19 18	30	45
3	12 11 10	13 12 11	11 10 9	13 12 11 10	11 10 9	13 12 11	9 8	14 13 12	13 12 11	17 16 15	20	40
2	9 8 7	10 9	8 7 6	9 8 7 6	8 7 6	10 9 8	7 6 5	11 10 9 8	10 9	14 13	10 5	35
1	6 5	8 7 6	5 4	5 4 3	5 4	7 6 5	4 3	7 6 5	8 7 6	12 11 10		30
0	4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2	3 2 1 0	2 1 0	3 2 1 0	4 3 2 1	2 1 0	4 3 2 1	5 4 3 2	9 7 5 3	1	25
	Inactivity Slowness	Impulsiveness Rhathymia	Submissiveness	Shyness Seclusiveness	Emotional Instability Depression	Subjectivity Hypersensitiveness	Hostility Belligerence	Thoughtlessness Extraversion	Criticalness Intolerance	Femininity (of emotions and interests)		

Copyright 1949, SHERIDAN SUPPLY COMPANY, Beverly Hills, California

APPENDIX III

Letters of Communication

2907 Trumbull St.
Flint, Michigan

Dear Sir:

The Michigan Congregational Conference has been greatly concerned about the high rate of turn-over among its ministers - a condition which finds a striking parallel in the seminaries of both Protestant and Catholic organizations. As a result, a research project is under way at a cost of about $1000 which is designed primarily to do two things: first, determine the impact of the minister's own personality on the pastoral situation; and second, more accurately pinpoint the problems which most disturb seminarians and experienced ministers so that more effective counsel and study can be undertaken on the seminary level.

At the present time Oberlin, Garrett, McCormick, the Federation of Theological Schools at the University of Chicago, and Union are participating in the study. As an alumnus, I am wondering whether you would submit the necessary information from your own experience on the following forms: the Guilford Temperament Survey, the minister's problem check list, and the personal data sheet. The estimated time for the completion of all three forms is a maximum of 1-1/2 hours.

It is keenly realized that there are many demands for your time, and that some of the things asked for are of a rather personal nature. The need for the study, however, is such that we feel the request is justified. Be assured that your replies will remain strictly anonymous. The code numbers are used only for statistical and checking purposes.

Since the cost is substantial, your cooperation is earnestly solicited. If you feel, however, that you cannot participate in the study, please do not destroy the materials. Send them to me by putting a fresh stamp and my address on the outside envelope. I shall then return the stamps to you.

One further point - - would you find it possible to complete the instruments in the next two weeks at the latest, and as soon as possible? The statistical procedures are lengthy and much must be done to complete the project in the estimated time.

I would be very grateful to you for your cooperation in this important undertaking.

Sincerely yours,

John C. Whitcomb
Minister
Michigan Congregational Conference

2907 Trumbull St.
Flint, Michigan

Code ____

Dear Sir:

Some of the respondents have indicated that it would be helpful to know more about the study - its purpose and the reasoning behind the technique utilized in the paired-comparisons instrument.

We have a problem of serious proportions in the Protestant churches of America - and that is a loss of from 1/3 to more than 1/2 of our seminary graduates within three years or so after graduation from seminary. The Catholic church is experiencing the same loss in about the same ratio - one study of more than 1000 major and minor seminarians indicated a loss of 30 percent from all causes - through school and after graduation.

We greatly need more information on which we can base our selection and counseling procedures on the seminary level and perhaps in church conference activity. This study is an effort to determine the underlyingfactors which may exist in each of the problems that disturb the minister. The project deals neither with the quantity of problems, nor with any evaluation of individuals. I hope to get some answers to the question of whether the dominant factor in any problem is the minister's own personality or whether the problem is centered strictly in the operational situation.

A further word on the paired-comparisons technique. You have already received an explanatory letter dealing with the responses. Let me say again that: to make an arbitrary choice of one or the other of equal-appearing items is statistically sound for purposes of this study. Therefore, please do not be disturbed about an inability to make a choice between two items which seem to be equal - - arbitrarily choose one or the other.

Since there is no money in the church field for research purposes, the cost of this effort is my own. Only by this means can we of the Protestant church gradually build up a resource of primary research data with which to chart a course for the future.

Your participation, then, will not only promote a research which has gained the acceptance of top research men in the field of psychology and education at the University of Michigan, but it will make a substantial contribution about which there is a recognized need. The investment of money and two years of effort on this problem will then be more than worth while .

May I receive your responses as soon as you can find it possible to send them?

Most cordially yours,

John C. Whitcomb
Michigan Congregational Conference

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, Gordon, Personality; A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Henry Holt and Sons, 1937. Pp. xiv + 588.

Allport, Gordon, The Nature of Personality: Selected Papers. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, Inc., 1950. Pp. vii + 220.

Bier, William C., A Comparative Study of a Seminary Group and Four Other Groups on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1948. Pp. 107.

Burke, Henry R., Personality Traits of Successful Minor Seminarians. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1947. Pp. 65.

Cattell, Raymond B., Description and Measurement of Personality. New York: World Book Company, 1946. Pp. xx + 602.

Cockrum, Logan V. "Personality Traits and Interests of Theological Students," Religious Education, XLVII (January-February, 1952), 28.

Croxton, Frederick E., and Cowden, Dudley J., Applied General Statistics. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1946. Pp. v + 944.

Eggert, Charles M., Personality Trends in Seminarians. Unpublished master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1948. Pp. 35.

Ellis, Albert, "The Validity of Personality Questionnaires," Psychological Bulletin, XLIII (September, 1946), 425.

Felton, Ralph A., New Ministers. Madison, New Jersey: Monograph from the Department of the Rural Church, Drew Theological Seminary, 1949. Pp. 39.

Fischer, Robert P., "Signed versus Unsigned Personal Questionnaires," Journal of Applied Psychology, XXX (June, 1946), 220-225.

Kenney, John F., Mathematics of Statistics. New York: D. Van Ostrand Company, 1947. Pp. vii + 260.

Garrett, Henry E., Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1947. Pp. xii + 465.

Guilford, Joy P., Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1936. Pp. ix + 566.

Guilford, Joy P., and Zimmerman, Wayne S., The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey: Manual of Instructions and Interpretations. Beverly Hills: Sheridan Supply Company, 1949. Pp. 1 - 11.

Hartshorne, Hugh, "Report of the Committee on Personality and Aptitude," Twelfth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools, Princeton, New Jersey. Bulletin 14, 1946, 54-56.

Hudson, R. Lofton, "The Emotions of the Minister," Pastoral Psychology, II (May, 1951), 32-37.

Johnson, E. H., "Personality Traits of Workers in the Field of Religion," Religious Education, XXXVIII (September-October, 1943), 325-329.

Kimber, J.A.M., "Interests and Personality Traits of Bible Institute Students," Journal of Social Psychology, XXVI (November, 1947), 225-233.

Lhota, Brian, Vocational Interests of Catholic Priests. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1948. Pp. 40.

McCarthy, Thomas J., "Personality Traits of Seminarians," Studies in Psychology and Psychiatry, V, No. 4, Catholic University of America, 1946. Pp. 46.

McCormick, Thomas C., Elementary Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1941. Pp. vii + 353.

Moxcey, Mary E., Some Qualities Associated With Success in the Christian Ministry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1922. Pp. 101.

Patterson, H., A Study of Student Mortality at Saint Anthony's and Suggestions for Improving the Situation. Unpublished master's thesis, Catholic University of America, 1942. Pp. 53.

Peters, Sister Richarda, "A Study of the Inter-Correlations of Personality Traits Among a Group of Novices in Religious Communities," Studies in Psychology and Psychiatry, V, No. 7, Catholic University of America, 1942. Pp. 38.

Putsch, Robert W., "The Elements of Hostility in Parish Work," Pastoral Psychology, II (February, 1951), 42-48.

Richardson, Harold W., A Study of the Readiness of American Baptist Theological Students Holding Opposing Fundamentalist and Modernist Theological Views to Associate in Religious Groups With Those Differing From Themselves. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1952. Pp. 195.

Ross, Robert T., "Optimum Orders for the Presentation of Pairs in the Method of Paired Comparisons," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXV (May, 1934), 375-382.

Stolz, Karl Ruf, The Church and Psychotherapy. Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943. Pp. 1 - 312.

Sward, Keith, "Temperament and Religious Experiences," Journal of Social Psychology, II (October, 1931), 374-396.

Thayer, Clarence R., "The Relationship of Certain Psychological Test Scores to Subsequent Ratings of Missionary Field Success," Religious Education, XLVIII (May-June, 1953), 190-191.

Thurstone, L.L., "The Method of Paired Comparisons for Social Values," Journal of Abnormal Psychology, XXI (January-March, 1927), 384-400.

Wise, Carroll A., "The Pastor as Counselor," Pastoral Psychology, II (February, 1951), 9-14.

Wise, Carroll A., "The Value of Clinical Training for Religious Education," Religious Education, XXXVIII (May-June, 1943), 160-168.