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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the goals of society is to develop normal, well-adjusted, mature personalities. Perhaps everyone has a general conception of normality. Specifically, however, what are the characteristics of a normal person?

Different answers have been given to this question. For example, Allport has listed three traits which he believes are possessed by all well-adjusted individuals: extension of the self, self-objectification resulting in a sense of humor, and a philosophy of life (1, p. 213). Polatin has given four characteristics of a normal personality: free of symptoms, unhindered by mental conflicts, satisfactory working capacity, and the ability to love someone else (16, p. 14).

Edward Shoben believes that the model of integrative adjustment is characterized by "self-control, personal responsibility, social responsibility, democratic social interest, and ideals . . ." (16, p. 135).

Jourard (13), Scott (17), and Tindall (20) also give descriptions of the normal personality.

Bonney has made a study of the normal personality. The highly normal individuals he studied were characterized by interpersonal attractiveness to other students as friends,
forthrightness and honesty of communication with others, capacity for self-assertion and for aggressive response against efforts to dominate or reject them, and strong motivations to maintain self-autonomy and to actualize their potentials (5).

A study by Heilbrun contrasted personality differences between adjusted and maladjusted college students (12). The Gough Adjective Check List and the judgment of psychologist were used as criteria. Results of the study showed that the groups differed significantly on a number of factors.

Obviously not all normal individuals are alike. While they have some traits in common, they also vary tremendously. While individuals experience a process of socialization similar in many respects, they also experience a process which is very unique.

Learning theory says that socialization is a learning process. According to this theory, all behavior is learned in accordance with certain principles. The type of personality an individual develops will depend upon what he learns. In turn, what he learns will be determined to a degree by the type of culture of which he is a part. Thus, normality will differ from one culture or society to another (2).

Martin and Stendler state the problem involved in the formulation of a basic personality in a complex society. The goals of socialization are not concepts agreed upon.
It is difficult in a society as complex as ours to describe a set of goals of socialization which are accepted by all segments of the population. A number of social scientists have considered the question of "the American character," or basic personality. On the basis of these studies, we can make some tentative statements about the kind of adult the American child is expected to become. These goals of socialization apply, of course, only to a "typical" American. In kind, degree, and number, goals vary from person to person, from group to group. We cannot assume that any particular adult, or any particular sub-group of adults, accepts these goals, or that all who accept them do so to the same degree and define the behavior that satisfies them in the same way (18, p. 176).

The Nature of the Problem

The problem to be dealt with in this present study grows out of learning theory. According to this theory, all behavior is learned. As the individual interacts with his environment, behavior results in accordance with certain principles. Different individuals interacting with different environments produce difference behavior. However, many times different individuals interact with a relatively similar environment to produce similar behavior. Thus, through this interaction similar and different personality traits emerge.

Religious groups, when compared with the larger social order, display certain peculiarities. These groups maintain themselves as ethnic or religious islands and socialize their children in ways quite different from the socialization of the majority group. The Amish illustrate some of the ways in which a subcultural group passes on its own way of life to its children. The Amish maintain their own identity and resist encroachment of cultural group values (15, p. 342).
The nature of the problem to be dealt with in this present study involves the religious personality. Specifically it involves the question as to the personality similarities and differences of students from a religious college and students from a state college.

The problem was first suggested by Merl E. Bonney who did a descriptive study of the normal personality at North Texas State University. In this study he selected a group of highly normal individuals and a group of below normal individuals. He then compared them on a variety of personality measurements.

In this present study a similar procedure was followed at a religious college. A group of highly normal individuals and a group of below normal individuals was selected. However, instead of comparing these groups with each other, they were compared with their corresponding group at North Texas State University. In this way, the personality differences and similarities between select groups of students at a religious college and a state college as determined by certain measurements emerged.

On the basis of prior research it is evident that the religious individual varies from the general population along certain personality dimensions. A general survey of this research will now be given in order to supply this present study with some perspective.
Related Literature

Prior research has shown the religious person to differ from the non-religious. For instance, Gregory in his study showed that the religious personality rated high on the California F Scale for Authoritarianism (11). In another study high and low authoritarians (as determined by the California F Scale) rated pictures of strangers on personality traits and subsequently rated themselves on the same traits. High authoritarians exhibited fear, suspicion, and morelistic condemnation of the strangers. Meanwhile they glorified their own virtue and ability (9).

Bateman and Jensen have concluded that persons with extensive religious training tend to express less anger towards the environment and are more apt to turn it upon themselves (3).

Religious students tend to be more anti-semetic than non-religious ones. A questionnaire designed to measure prejudice toward Catholics, Protestants, and Jews was given to 125 undergraduates half of whom belonged to religious clubs. The results showed that students who belong to religious clubs are more anti-semetic than students who do not belong to such clubs (4).

Symington has concluded that religious beliefs are negatively correlated with intelligence (19).

According to Cattell and Stice a conscientious person, in contrast to a casual one, views himself as correct in, and a guardian of, manners and morals (7, p. 13).
Cattell and Stice also found priests to be more simple and unpretentious than sophisticated and polished, more confident and self-secure than timid and insecure, more conservative than radical (7, p. 17).

Dreger found the religious persons he studied were conforming and ego defensive while the non-religious persons were more independent (10). Martin and Nichols gave this (14) summary of their findings concerning the religious person:

In general, then, we receive a generally negative picture of the religious believer. He is a conventional, conforming person to whom being socially acceptable means a great deal. He is rigid, prejudiced, unintelligent, suspicious, and generally pessimistic. Surprisingly the religious men seem to be more masculine than the irreligious.

Sunday School attendance and religious affiliation have not been found significant factors in predicting social acceptability. Caves (8) found that sociometric data obtained from the six grades of an elementary school failed to differentiate the Sunday School student from the absentee. Bonney found that in twelve elementary school classes and among 1100 students at North Texas State University church affiliation was not correlated with social acceptability. His conclusion:

Until contrary evidence is available, teachers and counselors had best assume that all of our major religious organizations, in spite of their differences in doctrine and practice, are turning out very much the same caliber of people in so far as this caliber is measured by desirability as associates by age-mates in school (6, p. 376).
Hypotheses

In light of the previous and related knowledge in the general field of the religious personality, the following hypotheses are submitted. They refer equally to the comparison between the highly normal groups and the below normal groups.

On a **Sixteen Personality Factor Test** there will be a significant difference between the two populations on five of the sixteen factors measured. It is predicted that:

The NTSU students will be more assertive while the DBI students will be more humble.

The NTSU students will be more happy-go-lucky while the DBI students will be more sober.

The NTSU students will be more expedient while the DBI students will be more conscientious.

The NTSU students will be more experimenting while the DBI students will be more conservative.

The NTSU students will be more casual while the DBI students will be more controlled.

On a **Child Development Scale** it is predicted that the DBI students will be significantly more dominating in their child rearing attitudes than will be the NTSU students.

On the basis of a **Personal Data Questionnaire** it is predicted that significantly more DBI students than NTSU students will admire a minister and report religious teaching as being a primary motivating force in their lives.
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CHAPTER II

PROCEDURE AND MEASUREMENTS

In the present chapter two subjects will be discussed: (a) selection of subjects; (b) and instruments of measurement.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this present study were selected from the student bodies at North Texas State University and Dallas Bible Institute. North Texas State University is a state supported school of approximately 10,000 students, located in Denton, Texas. It has an extensive undergraduate program of studies and graduate divisions in some departments.

Dallas Bible Institute is a private religious school of approximately 175 students, located in Dallas, Texas. It is strictly an undergraduate institution offering only a Bible major. It is denominationally unaffiliated.

The procedure for selecting the subjects for this study was the same in both schools. It consisted of the procedure suggested by Bonney (1, pp. 257-258) in which students rate their classmates.

At North Texas State University the subjects were selected from students in psychology classes on the sophomore,
junior, and senior levels. At Dallas Bible Institute the subjects were selected from the eighty-one students who were taking at least twelve credit hours in the day school.

At both schools a list of the students from which the subjects were to be selected was prepared. Each student was given a copy of this list along with a sheet of instructions and a rating scale. The appendix contains a replica of the instructions and rating scale used.

The students were asked to rate on the rating scale those students whom they knew fairly well. They were to rate them as to their normality on the basis of the criterion given in the instruction sheet. The instruction sheet mentioned five general characteristics of the normal personality.

A student's final standing was determined by calculating the frequency of his above normal and below normal ratings and then subtracting them. From the data obtained in the rating procedure two groups were selected from each school. One group consisted of twenty-five above normal individuals and the other group consisted of twenty-five below normal individuals. These groupings composed the upper and lower twelve per cent of the tested population at North Texas State University and the upper and lower thirty per cent of the tested population at Dallas Bible Institute.

The twenty-five students who were considered above average in normality were those who received the most student nominations. Conversely, the twenty-five students who were considered below average in normality were those who received
the least number of student nominations. The groups were well differentiated from each other. The Dallas Bible Institute group of above normal individuals received a total of 558 nominations while the below normal group received minus ninety-six nominations. This means that on the average each one in the high group received twenty-two nominations while each one in the low group received minus four nominations. The most nominations received by any one individual was forty-one while the least nominations received by anyone was minus twenty.

Instruments of Measurement

The following three instruments of measurement were used:

(a) the **Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire**; (b) the Child Development Scale; and (c) the Personal Data Questionnaire.

The **Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire** was developed by Raymond B. Cattell and Glen F. Stice. It consists of 187 questions to which the testee responds. According to the handbook which explains the test:

The 16 P. F. is the psychologist's answer, in the questionnaire realm, to the demand for a test giving fullest information in the shortest time about most personality traits. It is not merely concerned with some narrow concept of neuroticism or "adjustment," or some special kind of ability, but sets out to cover planfully and precisely all the main dimensions along which people can differ, according to basic factor analytic research. The present questionnaire meets a long-standing demand (2, pp. 1-2).
The Child Development Scale consists of thirty items taken from the Parent Attitude Survey devised by E. J. Shoben, Jr. (3, pp. 103-149). The original scale contained eighty-five items, seventy-five of which were arranged into three subscales: the Dominating (D) Scale, the Possessive (P) Scale, and the Ignoring (I) Scale.

The thirty items of the abridged scale used in the present study contained an equal number of each of these types of statements (ten of each). The subject was asked to rate each item of the Child Development Scale on a five point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The Child Development Scale is reproduced in the appendix of this thesis.

The Personal Data Questionnaire was constructed by Merl E. Bonney. It contains questions of a personal nature about the subject. The information provided in this questionnaire is used to shed further information on the subject of this present study. The appendix contains a copy of the Personal Data Questionnaire.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The present study was undertaken to determine in what ways students at Dallas Bible Institute (DBI) and North Texas State University (NTSU) were similar and different as measured by certain personality dimensions. The students from the two schools were above normal and below normal individuals who were put into these categories on the basis of student nominations. Three instruments were used in comparing these populations: Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16 P. F. Test); Child Development Scale (CDS); and Personal Data Questionnaire (PDQ). This chapter will present the results of these comparisons.

Results with Cattell's 16 PF Test

Cattell's 16 P. F. Test contains the following sixteen factors which are scored along a ten point scale from one extreme to the other:

- Reserved—Outgoing
- Less Intelligent—More Intelligent
- Affected by Feelings—Emotionally Stable
- Humble—Assertive
- Sober—Happy Go Lucky
- Expedient—Conscientious
Shy—Venturesome
Tough Minded—-Tender Minded
Trusting—Suspicious
Practical—-Imaginative
Forthright—-Shrewd
Placid—-Apprehensive
Conservative—-Experimenting
Group Dependent—Self Sufficient
Casual—Controled
Relaxed—-Tense

A comparison of the two populations at the respective levels was made on the basis of the group means tested by level of significance. With the present data the F Test which produced 12.29 was significant at the .001 level, 7.20 was significant at the .01 level, and 4.04 was significant at the .05 level. The degrees of freedom were one and forty-nine.

Factors Showing No Significant Differences for High Groups

The comparison of the highly normal individuals from the two schools on the 16 P. F. Test showed that they did not differ significantly on ten of the sixteen factors on the test. These factors were:

Less Intelligent—More Intelligent
Affected by Feelings—Emotionally Stable
Shy—Venturesome
Tough Minded—Tender Minded
Trusting—Suspicious
Practical—Imaginative
Forthright—Shrewd
Placid—Apprehensive
Group Dependent—Self Sufficient
Relaxed—Tense

The statistics for the comparison of the highs on similar personality traits are presented in Table I.

**TABLE I**

**SIMILAR PERSONALITY TRAITS OF HIGHS AS MEASURED BY 16 PF TEST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTSU</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>NTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Intelligent More Intelligent</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>1.7204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected by Feelings Emotionally Stable</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>3.6441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy Venturesome</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>3.9751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough Minded Tender Minded</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>2.7753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting Suspicious</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>3.1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Imaginative</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>4.1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright Shrewd</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>2.7381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placid Apprehensive</td>
<td>9.96</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>2.9186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Dependent Self Sufficient</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>4.0504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed Tense</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>3.8420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the basis of the F Test there is hardly any difference between the highly normal individuals from the two schools on three of the ten factors in which there is not significant difference. These factors are shy—venturesome, trusting—suspicious, and forthright—shrewd.

Cattell and Stice discuss in detail the sixteen factors measured by the 16 P. F. Test. The following explanation of these factors will be taken entirely from the Handbook for the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (1, pp. 11-19).

The shy individual is withdrawn, retiring in face of the opposite sex, aloof, cold, self-contained, apt to be embittered, restrained, conscientious, careful, considerate, and quick to see dangers. The venturesome person, on the other hand, is thick skinned, active, responsive, genial, friendly, impulsive, frivolous, emotionally and artistically interested, carefree, and does not see danger signals.

Presumably this shy—venturesome factor is a very important one in distinguishing suitability for those occupations demanding ability to face wear and tear in dealing with people and gruelling situations. On this basis it might be expected that students from a religious school would be more venturesome than students from a state school since their future vocations tend to provide more dealing with people. However, this was not the case.

The trusting—suspicious factor did not discriminate between the religious and secular students under consideration.
The trusting individual is accepting, outgoing, open, ready to take a chance, understanding and permissive, tolerant, soft-hearted, composed and cheerful. The suspicious person can be characterized as jealous, self-sufficient, suspicious, withdrawn, brooding, tyrannical, hard, and irritable.

The forthright—shrewd factor is associated with generalized mental alertness, health and efficiency. The forthright person is socially clumsy and natural, vague and sentimentally minded, warm, gregarious, spontaneous, unskilled in analyzing motives, content with what comes, trusts in accepted values, and has simple tastes. The shrewd person is polished, socially alert, exact, calculating, aloof, emotionally disciplined, esthetically fastidious, insightful regarding self, ambitious, and expedient.

Occupationally, the highest groups in shrewdness are time-study engineers, scientists, and pilots; the highest groups in forthrightness are priests, nurses, psychiatric technicians, cooks, and convicts. The fact that priests are more forthright than average might suggest a similar trait among religious students. This was not the case in the comparison of the two high groups, however.

The following factors approached a significant difference between the highs but fell just short of the 4.04 required for an .05 level of significance: affected by feelings—emotionally stable at 3.3104; tough minded—tender minded at 3.4650; and relaxed—tense at 3.3639.
The "affected by feelings—emotionally stable" factor is one of dynamic integration and maturity as opposed to general emotionality. A person who is affected by his feelings is dissatisfied emotionally, immature, unstable, lacking in frustration tolerance, changeable in attitudes, showing general emotionality, evasive on awkward issues and in personal decisions, neurotically fatigued, and worrying. The emotionally stable person, on the other hand, is emotionally mature, calm, phlegmatic, realistic about life, placid, has ego strength and little neurotic fatigue.

The emotionally stable factor is what the psychoanalysts are attempting to describe by the notion of ego strength. The DBI highs as a group scored higher on this ego strength factor than did the NTSU highs as a group but it was not significantly higher.

While no significant difference was found between the highs of the two schools, the DBI highs were more tough minded while the NTSU students were more tender minded. The tender minded individual is sensitive, effeminate, demanding, impatient, subjective, dependent, kindly, gentle, affected, hypochondriacal, and anxious. The tough minded person is realistic, hard, self-sufficient, expects little, relies on self, takes responsibility, acts on practical logical evidence, unaware of physical disabilities, and has few artistic responses though not lacking in taste.
While they did not differ significantly, the DBI high students were more relaxed with the NTSU high students were more tense. The relaxed—tense factor involves being irrationally worried, tense, irritable, anxious and in turmoil. The relaxed individual has low ergic tension, is phlegmatic and composed. The tense person has high ergic tension, is tense and excitable. Persons high in tension rarely achieve leadership and they take a poor view of the degree of group unity, orderliness, and the existing leadership quality, and receive few sociotelic votes.

Factors Showing Reliable Differences for High Groups

The highly normal students when compared on the 16 P. F. Test showed a reliable difference on the following six traits:

Reserved—Outgoing
Humble—Assertive
Sober—Happy Go Lucky
Expedient—Conscientious
Conservative—Experimenting
Casual—Controlled

Of these six factors on which the highs showed a reliable difference, four of them were significantly different at the \( .001 \) level while the other two showed a difference at the \( .01 \) level. This is a high degree of difference between the two populations. Table II summarizes these differences.
TABLE II
DISSIMILAR PERSONALITY TRAITS OF HIGHS MEASURED BY 16 PF TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>DBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>3.1749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>4.1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>3.5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>14.84</td>
<td>3.5313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Go Lucky</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>2.6461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td>3.1658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level
***Significant at the .001 level

Significant at the .01 level, the NTSU highs were more outgoing while the DBI highs were more reserved. The outgoing person is typically good natured, easy going, ready to cooperate, attentive to people, soft hearted, kindly, trustful, adaptable, warm hearted, and sociable. Reserved people tend to be aggressive, grasping, critical, obstructive, cool, aloof, hard, precise, suspicious, rigid, and cold. Just why this difference between the highs obtained is not clear.

In the humble—assertive factor the DBI highs were more humble while the NTSU highs were more assertive. This was significant at the .001 level. This factor is the well-known one of dominance which has been investigated by Maslow, Allport, and others.
The humble person is submissive, dependent, kindly, soft-hearted, expressive, conventional, easily upset, self-sufficient and mild. The assertive person is aggressive, competitive, independent minded, self-assured, hard, stern, solemn, unconventional, tough, attention getting and dominant. Whether the humility in this factor is the same as the Christian virtue may be questioned. However, if it is perhaps this best explains why the religious students were significantly more humble than the secular ones.

Significant at the .001 level, the DBI students were more sober while the NTSU students were more happy go lucky. The happy go lucky person is enthusiastic, talkative, cheerful, serene, frank, expressive, quick and alert. The sober person is glum, serious, silent, introspective, depressed, concerned, brooding, incommunicative, smug, languid, and slow.

Happy go lucky individuals have generally had an easier, less punishing, more optimism-creating environment, or they have a more happy go lucky attitude through less exacting aspirations. In either case it might be expected that a religiously directed student would be more sober than a non-religious person.

The expedient—conscientious factor is characterized most by energy and persistence. Significant at the .001 level, the DBI highs were more conscientious while the
NTSU highs were more expedient. To be conscientious is to be persevering, determined, responsible, emotionally mature, consistently ordered, attentive to people, persistent, and to have character or super-ego strength. To be expedient is to lack rigid internal standards, to be casual, undependable, quitting, fickle, frivolous, demanding, impatient, relaxed, indolent, and obstructive.

On the whole it would seem that this factor best depicts the regard for moral standards, the tendency to drive the ego and to restrain the id, which are most frequently regarded as marks of the super-ego. It is well know that religious people are super-ego controlled. It might be expected that the DBI highs would be more conscientious than the NTSU highs.

The NTSU highs were more experimenting while the DBI highs were more conservative, significant at the .01 level. Experimenting persons tend to be radical, well-informed, inclined to experiment with problem solutions, and less inclined to moralize. The conservative theological position of the DBI highs might serve as a basis for expecting them to lean toward conservative trends. Priests have been shown to be more conservative and if generalization is possible the religious student might be expected to be conservative.

The highs differed significantly on the casual—controlled factor at the .01 level. The NTSU highs were more casual while the DBI highs were more controlled.
The casual person is uncontrolled, lax, and has poor self-sentiment formation. The controlled person is strong in will power and has high self-sentiment formation. The controlled person shows socially approved character responses, self control, persistence, foresight, considerateness of others, and conscientiousness. It would be expected that the religious student would be more controlled in his attitude since religion provides standards, mores and external regulations.

Factors Showing No Significant Differences for Low Groups

A comparison of the below normal individuals from the two schools on the 16 P. F. Test revealed some similarities and some dissimilarities. The lows did not differ significantly on the following personality factors:

Reserved—Outgoing
Less Intelligent—More Intelligent
Affected by Feelings—Emotionally Stable
Tough Minded—Tender Minded
Trusting—Suspicious
Practical—Imaginative
Forthright—Shrewd
Group Dependent—Self Sufficient
Relaxed—Tense

The data for the factors showing no significant differences for the low groups are contained in Table III.
TABLE III
SIMILAR PERSONALITY TRAITS OF LOWS AS MEASURED BY 16 PF TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean NTSU</th>
<th>Mean DBI</th>
<th>Standard Deviation NTSU</th>
<th>Standard Deviation DBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>2.8800</td>
<td>3.3718</td>
<td>1.1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Intelligent</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>2.0199</td>
<td>3.2292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected by Feelings</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>3.9951</td>
<td>3.2633</td>
<td>2.7936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Stable</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>2.9257</td>
<td>3.3970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough Minded</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>2.7902</td>
<td>2.9257</td>
<td>3.3970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender Minded</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>2.9257</td>
<td>3.3970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusting</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>2.7902</td>
<td>2.9257</td>
<td>3.3970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2.7463</td>
<td>2.9257</td>
<td>3.3970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>2.6484</td>
<td>3.5829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>2.7463</td>
<td>3.5829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forthright</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>1.8521</td>
<td>3.1354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewd</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>1.8521</td>
<td>3.1354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Dependent</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>3.6075</td>
<td>3.0013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Sufficient</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.6075</td>
<td>3.0013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>3.9698</td>
<td>3.8157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highs from the two school were similar on ten of the personality factors in the 16 P. F. Test while the lows were similar on nine of the factors. The highs differed from the lows in being similar on the shy—venturesome and placid—apprehensive factors. The lows were different on these factors. The lows differed from the highs in being similar on the reserved—outgoing factor. The highs differed on this factor. Why there should be such similarity within the high group but not within the low group and conversely is not clear. The three factors are not significant in separating the highs from the lows of either school.
Factors Showing Reliable Differences for Low Groups

The below normal students when compared on the 16 P, F. Test showed a reliable difference on each of the following seven personality factors:

- Humble—Assertive
- Sober—Happy Go Lucky
- Expedient—Conscientious
- Shy—Venturesome
- Placid—Apprehensive
- Casual—Controlled

The data for this dissimilarity are found in Table IV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>NTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>4.5343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sober</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>4.4346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Go Lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedient</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>4.5141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturesome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placid</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>3.2263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>3.6878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>2.8576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level
***Significant at the .001 level
The DBI lows were as a group more apprehensive while the NTSU lows as a group were more placid. This was significant at the .05 level which is not highly significant. It is interesting, however, because it might be expected that a religious individual would experience in greater degree the inner calm prof erred by Christianity. Perhaps the poorly chosen student in a religious school is more anxious about himself than one in a corresponding category in a state school.

The placid individual is confident, secure, cheerful, resilient, tough, placid, expedient, rudely vigorous, and given to simple action. The apprehensive person is timid, insecure, depressed, worrying, anxious, sensitive, tender, easily upset, exacting, fussy, moody, lonely and brooding.

Occupationally placid type individuals include professional athletes, electricians, firemen, nurses, priest, and salesmen. Apprehensive type individuals include senior clerks, writers, waitresses, and editorial workers.

The low groups differed on the following factors at the .05 level of significance: the NTSU lows were more happy go lucky while the DBI lows were more sober; the NTSU lows were more experimenting while the DBI lows were more conservative; and the NTSU lows were more casual while the DBI lows were more controlled.

Significant at the .01 level, the NTSU lows were more expedient while the DBI lows were more conscientious.
Significant at the .001 level, the lows from NTSU were more assertive while the lows from DBI were more humble; the NTSU lows were more venturesome while the DBI lows were more shy.

The above factors in which the lows showed a difference were discussed more thoroughly in the consideration of the comparison between the high groups. It is evident that the comparison of the highs from both schools and the comparison of the lows from both schools revealed nearly identical similarities and differences. Both the highs and the lows were similar on the following factors from the 16 P. F.:

- Less Intelligent---More Intelligent
- Affected by Feelings---Emotionally Stable
- Tough Minded---Tender Minded
- Trusting---Suspicious
- Practical---Imaginative
- Forthright---Shrewd
- Group Dependent---Self Sufficient
- Relaxed---Tense

The highs and the lows when compared with their respective group both differed on the following factors from the 16 P. F.:

- Humble---Assertive
- Sober---Happy Go Lucky
- Expedient---Conscientious
- Conservative---Experimenting
- Casual---Controlled
Results with the Child Development Scale

The Child Development Scale consists of thirty statements to which the student responds. It has ten statements for each of the three dimensions in the scale. These three dimensions are: possessive, dominating, and ignoring.

The Child Development Scale revealed significant differences between the highs of the two colleges. Table V reveals these differences.

**TABLE V**

DISSIMILAR PERSONALITY TRAITS MEASURED BY CHILD DEVELOP. SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTSU</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>NTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>4.8209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>37.84</td>
<td>4.3634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>23.56</td>
<td>28.32</td>
<td>4.3458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level**

**Significant at the .001 level**

Significant at the .01 level, the DBI highs were more possessive than the NTSU highs. Significant at the .001 level, the DBI highs were more dominating and ignoring than the NTSU highs.

On the Child Development Scale a possessive student would agree with an item like "Babies are more fun for their parents than older children." A student scoring high on the dominating scale would agree with such statements as "It is wicked for a child to disobey his parents" or "A child should
always believe what his parents tell him." A sample item in the ignoring category is "Children should not interrupt adult conversation." See the study by Drews and Teahan (2).

It was expected that the religious students would be more dominating in their attitudes than secular students. Prior studies give some basis for this. A religious person adheres to a more structured life than a non-religious person since he has an external standard to which to relate. It is a very authoritative standard. It is not surprising that this frame of reference would tend to influence his attitudes about child rearing.

The Child Development Scale revealed a significant difference between the below normal groups. Table VI reveals the results of the comparison between the low groups.

**TABLE VI**

**COMPARISON OF LOWS ON CHILD DEVELOPMENT SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>F Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NTSU</td>
<td>DBI</td>
<td>NTSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>5.0119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>27.16</td>
<td>36.52</td>
<td>4.0167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>27.24</td>
<td>4.3200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Significant at the .001 level

Significant at the .001 level, the DBI lows were more dominating in their child rearing attitudes than the NTSU lows. There was no significant difference between the lows in the comparison of the possessive and ignoring traits.
It is highly significant that the students from the religious college in both the high and the low groups were more dominating in their child rearing attitudes than were the students from the state school. The difference in both comparisons was significant at the high level of .001.

Results with the Personal Data Questionnaire

The Personal Data Questionnaire revealed supplementary information about the two populations. The items contained in the questionnaire may be examined in the appendix where the complete format is given. Only part of the information obtained from the questionnaire will be discussed here.

The items to be included in this summary are the following:

1. Are you married?
2. How many children were there in your family, counting yourself?
3. In reference to your parents, are they divorced?
4. In reference to the person or person whom you have most admired, looked-up-to, or tried to emulate in some way check as many of the items below as you believe apply to you:
   A priest or minister
   A college teacher
5. In reference to church or other kinds of religious influences, during childhood and high school years did you attend Sunday School or some other kind of religious service once a week or nearly so?
6. While you were growing up was your mother quite active in church affairs?
7. While you were growing up was your father quite active in church affairs?
8. As you look at the chief sources of motivation in your life do you rate the following as being very important?

a. Desire to live up to religious teaching
b. Desire to render some kind of service to help other people
c. Desire to know things just for the sake of knowing
d. Desire for a college degree
e. Desire for good financial security

Results with the High Groups

The first comparison to be made with the results of the information obtained from the Personal Data Questions will be with the high groups. Table VII contains the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>WTSU</th>
<th>DBI</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you married?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children in family?</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are parents divorced?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Person most admired?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>2.946**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest or minister</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>1.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A college teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attend church weekly?</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mother active in church?</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>1.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Father active in church?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sources of motivation?</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please parents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>5.075***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live up to religion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to help others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level
***Significant at the .001 level
Those consisting the NT3U highs were nine males and sixteen females. At DBI the highs were made up of ten males and fifteen females. Six of the NT3U highs were married; five of the DBI highs were married. The NT3U highs came from families with an average of 2.64 children; the DBI highs came from families with an average of 3.2 children. Only one NT3U high had divorced parents; three DBI highs had divorced parents.

Significant at the .01 level, more DBI highs than NT3U highs admired a minister. This would be expected since religious students would more likely identify with a religious figure. More NT3U highs than DBI highs said they admired a college teacher, but this was not statistically significant. The t Test had to produce 2.060 to be significant at .05 level, 2.787 to be significant at .001 level.

Surprisingly more NT3U highs attended religious services regularly while growing up than did the DBI highs. The comparison was twenty-two to twenty-one. Both parents of the DBI highs were more active in church affairs as they were growing up than the parents of the NT3U highs. This was not statistically significant.

Nineteen DBI highs considered the desire to please parents highly motivating while fifteen NT3U highs did.
Significant at the .05 level, twenty-one DBI highs were highly motivated to serve others while thirteen NTSU highs said that they were. This would be in keeping with the humanitarian aspects of religion.

Results with the Low Groups

The comparison between the below normal individuals from the two colleges on the Personal Data Questionnaire revealed some significant differences. The results of this comparison are found in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII
COMPARISON OF NTSU AND DBI LOWS ON PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Lows</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>T Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you married?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Children in family?</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are parents divorced?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Person most admired?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest or minister</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A college teacher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Attend church weekly?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mother active in church?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Father active in church?</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chief sources of motivation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live up to religion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire for knowledge</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attain college degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial security</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level
***Significant at the .001 level
Those making up the NTSU lows were twenty-one males and four females. The DBI lows comprised ten males and fifteen females. Only one of the DBI lows was married while six of the NTSU lows were married. The NTSU lows came from families with an average of 2.25 children. The DBI lows came from families with an average of 4.75 children. There were four lows from each school who came from homes of divorced parents.

Significant at the .001 level, more DBI lows than NTSU lows admired a minister. Ten of the DBI lows said they admired a college teacher while nine of the NTSU lows said the same. This was not significant statistically. Twenty-one of the DBI highs said they attended religious services weekly while growing up whereas sixteen from the NTSU lows did the same. This fell short of significance. Both parents of the NTSU lows were more active in church affairs as the lows were growing up than were the parents of the DBI lows. This, however, was not a reliable difference.

The motivating forces of the lows were quite different. Significant at the .001 level, twenty-two DBI lows considered religion highly motivating while only seven NTSU lows thought so. At the .01 level of significance, seventeen of the NTSU lows desired to know things just for the satisfaction of knowing whereas only seven of the DBI lows felt this way. Significant at the .05 level, fifteen NTSU lows and seven DBI lows wanted a college degree and financial security.
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CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Prior research has shown that the religious individual is different from the general population along certain personality dimensions. The religious person is more conforming, ego defensive, rigid, prejudiced, suspicious, and generally pessimistic.

The question involved in this present study concerned the religious personality. Specifically, this study was conducted to determine in what ways students at Dallas Bible Institute and North Texas State University are similar and dissimilar.

In order to answer this question students were chosen from the two colleges. The students were put into two categories on the basis of student nominations. At Dallas Bible Institute twenty-five students were put into the category of below normal in personality and twenty-five students were put into the category of above normal in personality. The same was done at North Texas State University.

After these groups were formed, the below normal students at Dallas Bible Institute were compared with the below normal students at North Texas State University. The above
normal students at Dallas Bible Institute were compared with the above normal students at North Texas State University.

The three personality measurements used in making the above comparisons were: the *Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire*, the Child Development Scale, and the Personal Data Questionnaire. The comparison on the 16 P. F. Test and the Child Development Scale was made on the basis of group means tested by the F Test as to level of significance. The comparison on the Personal Data Questionnaire was made on the basis of proportions tested by the t Test as to level of significance.

On the basis of prior and related research certain hypotheses were formed. In relation to the 16 P. F. Test it was predicted that the DBI students would as a group be more humble, sober, conscientious, conservative, and controlled. It was predicted that the NTSU students would be more assertive, happy go lucky, expedient, experimenting, and casual. These hypotheses involved the comparison of both groups and they were confirmed.

In reference to the Child Development Scale it was predicted that the DBI students would be more dominating than the NTSU students, both in the high and low groups, and this prediction was confirmed.

In reference to the Personal Data Questionnaire it
was predicted that the DBI students would to a greater degree than NTSU students report that a minister was most admired in their lives and that religious teaching was a very important motivation in their lives. These predictions proved accurate.

There were other differences between the groups besides the predicted ones. The 16 P. F. Test revealed that the DBI highs were more reserved while the NTSU highs were more outgoing. The DBI lows were more shy and apprehensive while the NTSU lows were more venturesome and placid. The differences were confirmed as being significant. The Child Development Scale revealed that the DBI highs were not only more dominating than the NTSU highs but they were also significantly more possessive and ignoring. This difference was at a high level of significance.

In addition to the predicted differences on the Personal Data Questionnaire others were obtained. Significantly more DBI highs than NTSU highs felt the desire to perform some service to help others was highly motivating. More NTSU lows than DBI lows felt that knowledge, a college degree, and financial security were important motivating forces.

It is evident from the above summary that normality is a very relative consideration and in all cases must be judged on the cultural, sub-cultural, and group levels.
What is normal in one group may be abnormal in another.

Highly normal individuals from two contrasted colleges are both similar and unique. They are similar in many personality factors. This gives some basis for believing that highly normal individuals possess a general personality syndrome. However, normal individuals are unique in many ways due to their differentiated backgrounds.

The ways in which the students at DBI differ from the students at NTSU are true to expectations. These differences make up the uniqueness of the two groups as a whole.

Some interesting questions are raised by this study. Do students go to a religious school because they have certain personality traits or do they acquire them as the result of their affiliation with the religious school? Perhaps both possibilities are true to a degree. Another question to ponder is whether a religious population attending a state university would differ significantly from students at a religious school.

A very crucial question is whether the religious students studied in this present research have the traits which will enable them to function efficiently in the vocation to which they feel called. Is the type religious student pictured in this study the type individual who is best equipped to handle the discipline of religious work? Ultimately the answer to this question is a value judgment. However, it could be tested on this basis.
To summarize, this study depicts the student at DBI as being humble, sober, conscientious, conservative, controlled, dominating, identifying with a religious leader, finding religion highly motivating. The NTSU student, on the other hand, was assertive, happy go lucky, expedient, experimenting, casual, and easy going. These factors differentiate the above normal and below normal student at DBI from the above normal and below normal student at NTSU when measured by the instruments used in this present study.
APPENDIX I

RATING SCALE INSTRUCTIONS

You are being asked to help in developing a method for studying psychologically healthy people. Most people we know are psychologically healthy. We call such people normal, well-adjusted, or mature. All these words mean essentially the same thing. We also know that people vary with respect to how healthy they are psychologically. Most of us fall within the average or typical range of health. Some of us are above average in psychological health and some are below average. Our present interest is in learning to what extent people agree on the level of psychological health of people they know fairly well. When we think of how healthy a particular person is, we generally have in mind certain kinds of information. For example, a person with high psychological health is one who (a) typically is energetic and characterized by feelings of well-being or happiness, (b) typically makes friends easily, enjoys the company of others, and is well liked by most others, (c) typically has goals and works efficiently toward achieving those goals, (d) typically is not unduly critical of others nor of self, and (e) typically guides his or her behavior by sound judgment, is able to make constructive decisions and to act upon these decisions.
It seems clear that all of these statements would be essentially true of someone with a high degree of psychological health. To a lesser degree they would be true of a person with about average psychological health and to an even smaller degree of persons with below average health.

On a separate page given you there are five copies of a seven-point scale of psychological health ranging from exceptionally high to exceptionally low. You are asked to look at the list of names given to you and to select the names of five persons whom you are to rate on the scales given on the separate page. It will be best for this study if you will choose persons whom you know quite well regardless of whether or not you are friendly with them, and it will also help if you will choose persons whom you would rate at widely varying points on the scale continuum. If you cannot select five, please rate less than this number, even if it is only one or two.

You need not sign your name. You are to make a check (X) on the short line below the number on the scale which best describes your over-all assessment of each person you rate. The value of these data will depend on how candid and realistic each rater can be. In no instance can these ratings either help or injure any student. This study is being conducted for research purposes only and consequently the results will not be made known to any individual, except eventually as a group summary report.
### APPENDIX II

## RATING SCALES

1. Name of person being rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One of Well</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>One of Few</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>The Few</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>One of Few</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>The Few</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Name of person being rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One of Well</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>One of Few</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>The Few</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>One of Few</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>The Few</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Name of person being rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One of Well</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>One of Few</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>The Few</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>One of Few</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>The Few</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Name of person being rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One of Well</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>One of Few</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>The Few</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>One of Few</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>The Few</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Name of person being rated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One of Well</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>One of Few</th>
<th>Below</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>The Few</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poorest</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>One of Few</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>The Few</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

CHILD DEVELOPMENT SCALE

Directions: Please check (x) one of the listed alternatives under each item. Check only one. You will notice that the listed alternatives do not follow a consistent sequence. There are no right or wrong answers, so answer according to your own convictions.

1. Independent and mature children are less lovable than those children who obviously want and need their parents.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Mildly Agree
   - Uncertain
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Mildly Disagree

2. Parents should sacrifice everything for their children.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Mildly Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Uncertain
   - Mildly Agree

3. A child should have strict discipline in order to develop a fine, strong, character.
   - Uncertain
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Mildly Disagree
   - Strongly Agree
   - Mildly Agree

4. Children should not be punished for doing anything they have seen their parents do.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Uncertain
   - Mildly Agree
   - Mildly Disagree
   - Strongly Agree

5. A Child should be seen and not heard.
   - Mildly Disagree
   - Strongly Agree
   - Mildly Agree
   - Uncertain
   - Strongly Disagree

6. The most important consideration in planning the activities of the home should be the needs and interests of the child.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Uncertain
   - Mildly Agree
   - Strongly Agree
   - Mildly Disagree
7. The weaning of the child from its emotional ties to the parents begins at birth.  
   | Uncertain | Mildly Agree | Strongly Disagree | Mildly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
   |           |              |                   |                |                |

8. Babies are more fun for parents than are older children.  
   | Mildly disagree | Strongly Agree | Mildly Agree | Uncertain | Strongly Disagree |
   |                |                |              |          |                  |

9. Children should be allowed to make only minor decisions for themselves.  
   | Strongly Disagree | Uncertain | Mildly Agree | Strongly Agree | Mildly Disagree |
   |                  |          |              |                |                |

10. Strict discipline weakens a child's personality.  
    | Uncertain | Strongly Agree | Mildly Agree | Mildly Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
    |          |                |              |                |                  |

11. Children should be allowed to play with any youngsters they like.  
    | Mildly Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Uncertain | Mildly Agree | Strongly Agree |
    |                |                  |          |              |                |

12. Parents are generally too busy to answer all of a child's questions.  
    | Mildly Agree | Uncertain | Strongly Disagree | Mildly Disagree | Strongly Agree |
    |              |          |                  |                |                |

13. When they can't have their own way, children usually try to bargain or reason with their parents.  
    | Strongly Disagree | Uncertain | Mildly Agree | Strongly Agree | Mildly Disagree |
    |                  |          |              |                |                |

14. Quiet children are much nicer than little chatter-boxes.  
<pre><code>| Strongly Disagree | Uncertain | Mildly Agree | Strongly Agree | Mildly Disagree |
|                  |          |              |                |                |
</code></pre>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A child should be allowed to enter any occupation he or she wished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>In the long run it is better after all for a child to be kept fairly close to his mother's apron strings.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A child should always believe what his parents tell him.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>It is sometimes necessary for the parent to break the child's will.</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Children should not annoy their parents with their unimportant problems.</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>It is wicked for a child to disobey its parents.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Children should not interrupt adult conversation.</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Children should have as much freedom as their parents themselves.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Children should not be required to take orders from their parents.</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Children should be allowed to choose their own religious beliefs.</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Parents are not entitled to the love of their children unless they earn it.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The best child is the one who shows lots of affection for his mother.</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Children should be allowed to choose their own friends without restriction.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Children should be allowed to manage their affairs with little supervision from adults.</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Children should have the opportunity to express their opinions to their parents.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. A child should stand on his own two feet as soon as possible.</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name ___________________________ Age ______ Sex ______

2. Are you married? Yes No

3. If married about how long have you been married: (check one)
   (a) 6 months ____________
   (b) 2 years ____________
   (c) over 2 years ____________
   If married and now divorced, check here ______

4. How many children were there in your family, counting yourself: (circle one)
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

5. Do you belong to a fraternity or a sorority? Yes No

6. What is your father's occupation? ____________________________

7. In reference to your parents: (answer yes or no)
   A. Are they divorced ______
   B. Do they live apart even though not divorced ______
   C. Is your mother dead ______
   D. Is your father dead ______
   E. During your childhood and high school years did you live for a year or more in a home other than that of your natural parents ______
   F. Before coming to college, if your home was broken by divorce, separation, or death about how old were you when this condition occurred ______
   G. Does it seem to you that you have for many years been much closer, more identified with, and more influenced by one parent than by the other?
      Both about the same ______
      More by father than by mother ______
      More by mother than by father ______
8. In reference to the person or persons whom you have most admired, looked-up-to, or tried to emulate in some way check as many of the items below as you believe apply to you.

Your Mother
Your Father
A close relative
A minister or priest
A Sunday School teacher or choir director
A director of a community youth group
An athletic coach
An elementary school teacher
A high school teacher
A college teacher
A close friend in high school of the opposite sex
A close friend in high school of the same sex
A close friend in college of the opposite sex
A close friend in college of the same sex
An older adult friend (not included above) in your community
An older adult friend (not included above) in your college community
A person well known in public life in your state or in the nation, but not necessarily a personal acquaintance.
An historical character
A character in literature
List any others ____________________________

9. In reference to church or other kinds of religious influences:

A. During childhood and high school years did you attend Sunday School or some other kind of religious service:

Once a week or nearly so
Once or twice a month
About 4 or 6 times a year
Very seldom or never
Quite regularly during childhood but not in high school

B. While you were growing up was: (circle one)

Your mother quite active in church affairs? Yes No
Your father quite active in church affairs? Yes No
10. As you look at the chief sources of motivation in your life, how do you rate the following items in degree of importance, using the following scale: (circle one)

- Very Little Importance—1
- Some Importance----------2
- Very Important--------3

A. Desire to please one or both parents
B. Desire to live up to religious teachings
C. Desire to live up to your own inner standards and self-expectations
D. Desire to please a girl friend or a boy friend
E. Desire for a college degree
F. Desire for good financial security
G. Desire to know things just for the sake of knowing
H. Desire to achieve something for which you will someday be publicly recognized
I. Desire to render some kind of service to help other people

As you look back over your life does it seem to you that certain kinds of influences have been too strong and persistent for your own good? Yes No

If so, list these influences below: ___________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

11. We would like to have a statement in your own words in reference to what you consider to be the most significant sources of motivation in your life. How do you account for your present level of attainment? Anything you can write about your motivations, frustrations, goals, etc. will be appreciated.
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