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ABSTRACT

Preference for hierarchical control (PHC) was studied among Catholic priests and religious (ordained and lay) and Baptist ministers in Louisiana and Gulf Coast area (n = 240). Groups represented decreasing strength of hierarchical church structure based on criteria of Mackey (1972). Strength of PHC, as measured by Cochran's (1975) Hierarchical Control Scale, should be influenced by the subject's membership involvement in church structure and his age. The Job Description Index (Smith, et al., 1969) measured job satisfaction (JS) as it related to PHC in the descending order of church structures. Because perceptions differ, JS was analyzed again as a function of the person's own perception of power in his group/church and his PHC. Lastly, the 16 Personality Factor Test (Cattell, et al., 1970) measured personalities of high and low PHC scorers.

Results indicated groups were different in PHC but not as hypothesized. PHC scores here were higher than all others reported in the literature except for policemen. Baptist ministers scored highest, followed by Catholic brothers and diocesan priests. Religious priests scored significantly lowest. Except for the last two groups, the order was essentially opposite than predicted. Age had a...
significant effect with older persons scoring higher on PHC. JS was not influenced when analyzed in relation to PHC and theoretical structure of church groups. JS was also not influenced when analyzed in relation to PHC and the person's own perception of power in his group/church. Perception of power by groups, however, did match that proposed in the research design and was negatively correlated with PHC and overall JS.

Those who had high PHC scores tended to be less assertive, less tenderminded, less imaginative, quite conscientious, more socially polished and more controlled. They had a significantly higher level of leadership qualities. Low PHC scorers were more assertive, imaginative, forthright, expedient and undisciplined.

Questions were raised about PHC scale, conceptualization of group structures and homogeneity of groups. Clarification of the PHC construct to include preference to be the controller as well as endorse control from above, explained present and past data. Further research was suggested to study questions implied in present results.
INTRODUCTION

Control is a broad and quite complicated construct. As basic as it is to human interaction, it remains a multifaceted concept, complex in its meanings and connotations to different types of people. Complicated by personality factors, attitudes, preferences, political and socio-economic philosophies, religious and theological interpretations and beliefs, it is related to and often confused with the concepts of "authority" and "power." In this respect it is involved with the continuing controversy between control and individual freedom—a controversy which is, in some ways, timeless but particularly relevant to contemporary society.

Rahner (1974) points out the contemporary uneasiness with and suspicion of control and power and yet the inability to survive without some form of authority. This is true in society considered generally and in structures of society considered as separate entities, e.g., families, schools, churches, governmental systems and other organizations which make up the fabric of society.

Sennett (1980) in his scholarly analysis of authority claims that the need for authority is basic, in that children need authority to guide and reassure them; and adults need it to fulfill an essential part of themselves. But there is a fear of authority that in its
breakdown or weakening society will be deprived of order and a fear of authority that in its existence it will be a threat to individual liberties. The need for authority increases the modern fear; will we give up our liberties, become overly dependent because we want so much for someone to take care of us?

In the political arena, the problem shows itself in such issues as the controversy between intervention versus "laissez-faire" processes in national and world politics. In the economic world, the effectiveness of governmental intervention and subsequent control of contingencies in our national and local economies are questioned, exemplified in the contemporary revolt in the area of taxation, and the tension between the use of mandatory or voluntary wage and price controls.

Child-rearing debates rage between permissiveness and strict-discipline, as do educational debates over open classrooms as opposed to more traditional structures of teacher-student interaction. Supreme Court decisions placing norms for obscenity and pornography under local control have brought both praise and criticism.

Traditional church structures have been battered by the same conflicting winds with some attempts by older churches to update themselves, giving more consideration to individual freedom, shared authority, co-responsibility and collegiality.
These are but a few of the visible evidences of the delicate balance in today's world between control and individual freedom. The tension resulting from the pull between these two factors can be considered as a fundamental problem in contemporary society. Indeed, society today is experiencing an age in which authority is often regarded as more functionally than structurally necessary and in which freedom and interdependence have become key concepts which mutually threaten but also substantiate each other.

When control becomes the dominant dynamic in an interaction, authority takes on the connotation and quality of "power." Authority and power are, however, two types of control that are essentially different; and furthermore, people have differences in their preferences for the use of one type over the other. This difference is probably true whether one is talking about controlling or being controlled. An important related phenomenon is the assumed fact that different personality profiles exist in those who have differing preferences. There have been a number of previous attempts to investigate, define, and elaborate facets of this phenomenon; however, definition of constructs has been a pervasive problem in this area.

Sennett (1980) recognized confusion between the terms authority and power. They have often been used interchangeably. Government officials and police officers, among others, have been called "authorities" when it was
seemingly their power that was predominant, as in: "The delinquent was picked up by the authorities." Yet authorities have been referred to in the sense of experts who were knowledgeable in appropriate areas. Furthermore, when a government official lacked the authority to engage in some venture, has it meant power, position, status, legitimacy? The root of the word "authority" in English is "author", giving it the positive connotation of originator, producer or source; yet the term "authoritarian" has been used to describe a person or system which is negative or repressive in connotation.

It was possible to clear up some of the confusion by adopting Katz and Kahn's (1967) definitions of the basic terminology in this area. Following the ideas of Cartwright (1959), they based the definitions on the concept of "influence."

**INFLUENCE** is an interpersonal transaction in which one person acts in such a way as to change the behavior of another in some intended fashion. This influence can be direct or indirect. It does not always result in the effects intended by the influencer.

**CONTROL** is influence which is successful because it is sufficiently strong that the intended behavior will result, resistances or counter influences not-withstanding.

**POWER** refers more to potential acts than to actual transactions. Power is the potential for influence characteristically backed by the means to coerce compliance.

**AUTHORITY** is the most restricted form of influence. It is simply legitimate power, accruing to a person by virtue of his role or his position in an organized structure.
Power has been more extensively delineated and defined by French and Raven (1959). They did their work with small groups and developed models of power structures which increased or decreased conformity in a power relationship. They found that power, real or perceived, was a pervasive aspect of social interactions considered on the level of the dyad, small group, large organization or on a larger scale, among nations. Organizations were seen to be structured according to power relationships. In groups of any size, some members were more powerful than others. All forms of interaction involved differences in the relative power of the participants to influence one another. Thus power differences entered into relations between supervisor and employee, parent and child, salesman and customer, politician and voter, doctor and patient, teacher and student.

Types of power delineated by French and Raven (1959) were associated with certain costs and rewards. Reward power was found to be contingent on ability of one person to mediate rewards to another person. Coercive power was based on ability to mediate punishments. Referent power was based on identification or desire to be like another person. Expert power was based on perceived possession of some special knowledge in a given situation. Finally legitimate power was based on acceptance of internalized norms and values which dictated that the person accept influence of another over him. Age, sex,
class, or position in a recognized hierarchy, designated status, were factors which determined legitimate power. Continuation of behavior based on exercise of legitimate power depends not on its observability but on persistence of the underlying norms and values involved. Legitimate power on occasion covered a broad area of behavior, but was more often narrow in scope and circumscribed by the limits of legitimization. Research by Cochran (1974) implied that legitimate power could be called authority (as in Katz and Kahn's definition) and that when it involved an organization or system, legitimate power resided on many levels of the system (not only at the individual level). In such a system a decision could be made on the appropriate level of the system most affected by that decision as opposed to decisions always passed down from above in a hierarchical structure. Such a system could be called an authority system.

The five types of power delineated by French and Raven differed in the extent to which they might be continually exercised and still remain effective. Changes in power relationships occurred through shifts in direct effects of rewards and costs and/or through creation of conditions that altered bases of power. These shifts could and did take place in organizations. Continued use of rewards might lead to satiation and loss of power or conversely to more dependence and increase of power. Changes in identification, in norms and values, in
knowledge affected bases of power as did changes in status, legitimacy or position. Where changes of this nature did not take place, the organization was seen as a very rigid hierarchical power structure. Where appropriate changes took place at appropriate levels, the organization had a less hierarchical authority structure.

Mackey (1972) suggested a useful distinction between "power structure" and "authority structure." He gave the following features of a power structure:

1.) a power-elite which employs a self-propagating principle, i.e., the power to designate successors lies solely with the power-elite. Others have a consultative role, but the effects of this consultation are not binding.
2.) the making of ordinances and decisions lies solely with the power-elite.
3.) control is maintained and fostered through force or threat of force. This force need not be physical.
4.) repetition of words such as "power," "guard," "defend," "obedience," "submission," abound in the literature and vocabulary of this system.

Such a power structure would characterize societies or organizations in which the population was relatively lacking in awareness of its freedom and responsibility. Power remained the effective structure in such an undifferentiated and uneducated system.
Continuing Mackey's distinction, an authority structure represented a more differentiated phase of human development. It was based on the following fundamental principles:

1.) legitimacy and authority of right or truth (or the pursuit of these) is held as basic.

2.) spontaneous acknowledgment and respect is given to those who have knowledge and talent and use it. This is expert or personal (charismatic) authority.

3.) necessary "institutional offices" rest not on power, but on presumed competence of the office holder which must be manifested.

4.) machinery exists for replacement of the office holder when there is evidence of lack of competence. Without this machinery it is a power structure.

5.) decisions are made on the level of the system by individuals who are most intimately affected by the results of the decision and are better qualified to make the decision.

The benefit of an authority structure such that Mackey described was that it took into account rights and dignity of individuals who are enabled to direct their own destiny in an orderly system. He suggested that in contemporary society the shift is away from power structures to adoption of authority structures as he
described them. He suggested that churches are among the very few remaining power structures, particularly the Roman Catholic Church, although documents from Vatican Council II should indicate some qualifications of this statement.

With this groundwork of terminology provided by social and organizational psychology research, it was easier to review research into more individual personality facets involved in this area of control, authority, and power.

After World War II, during the late 1940's, studies by Adorno, Frenckel-Brunswick, Levinson and Sanford (1950) developed the construct of "authoritarianism" and provided attitude scales which would measure what was called the "authoritarian personality." When Adorno, et. al., described authoritarian individuals, they were characterized by: rigid adherence to conventional middle class values; submissiveness to moral authorities; preoccupation with power and status; and general hostility toward people unlike themselves. Thus, prejudice was identified as a fundamental part of the "syndrome" of traits representing authoritarian personality, because belief in absolute authority appeared to justify feelings of intolerance and/or qualified tolerance toward others, particularly those not in the group. Adorno's whole investigation originated out of the western world's cultural shock at the extermination of Jews by the National Socialists and factors involved in how this could happen.
Adorno named the scale, Fасsicm Scale (F Scale) which showed the influence of the period on research.

Adorno's research, although criticized on theoretical and methodological bases (McKinney, 1973), nonetheless led to further clarifying studies of authoritarianism and/or prejudice. Sennett (1980) stated that the value of Adorno's research was in the very questions it provoked. It put into question assumptions that other thinkers, such as Weber (1947) had made. What people were willing to believe was not simply a matter of the legitimacy of ideas, rules, and persons offered them. It was also a matter of their own need to believe. These needs were shaped by history and culture as well as by psychological predispositions. What people wanted from authority was as important as what authority had to offer.

An alternative to Adorno's theoretical explanation was proposed by Rokeach (1956) and supported by his and other research. Instead of a measurement of authoritarianism (F Scale) which appeared to be a quality of those on the right end of the so-called liberal-conservative continuum, Rokeach described a construct he called "dogmatism" and also developed an attitude scale to measure it. Rokeach's point was that authoritarian personality structure need not include only "right-of-center" ethnic prejudice but that people all along the continuum tended to dislike those who disagreed with their value or belief system rather than on the basis
of race or ethnic background. This was very much an issue during the 1950's because of civil rights problems that were rising to the consciousness and conscience of American society. Rokeach's work thus clarified the construct of prejudice and elaborated more on qualities of the "authoritarian" personality, but did little to advance the study of control or power facets of this construct.

Schutz (1958), developed a three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior, and constructed two scales which had a closer relationship to the study of control. His scale, called Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Scale-Behavior (FIRO-B Scale), was developed to measure how a person characteristically relates to other people. Schutz (1958) had found in his studies leading to the development of the scale that people tended to take certain predictable stances toward others. Schutz concluded that there were three main areas of interpersonal interaction: inclusion, control, and affection. Combined with behavior expressed toward others and behavior wanted from others, these three areas were expanded into six orientations: Expressed inclusion behavior, wanted inclusion behavior; Expressed control behavior, wanted control behavior; Expressed affection behavior, wanted affection behavior. The subscales "control-wanted" and "control-expressed" seemed applicable to the development of a construct focused on control versus individual freedom.
However, there has been little organized research with this scale.

In the 1960's, Rotter (1966) investigated what certain people believed about the nature of the world and/or expectations about how reward contingencies in the environment are controlled, either internally or externally. He called this construct "perceived locus of control," and developed the Internal-External Locus of Control Scale (I-E Scale) to measure the general expectancy of how control was exercised in the world, i.e., the way rewards or reinforcement existed, either external or internal to a person's conscious control. This scale correlated with the value an individual placed on perceived internal control (as opposed to control from outside) but it did not measure directly an individual's preference for internal or external control, which may have been more critical to the makeup of the personality of those who preferred these types of control.

In the 1970's, Cochran (1974, 1975) investigated further the construct of preference for control. She developed a scale which differentiated between what she called high and low preference for hierarchical control. An individual's preference for situations where decisions were made by those above in power or authority structures was distinguished from preference for decisions made by people on the level most affected by that decision, regardless of status, power, or authority.
Cochran's scale purported to sample a broad range of legal, moral and interpersonal situations measuring hierarchical control originating from any of several very different sources, including superior strength, prestige, experience, knowledge, tradition or precedent. Therefore the concept was not necessarily limited to the usual control mechanism of force or coercion.

Cochran found that her Hierarchical Control Scale helped differentiate between types of teachers, army enlisted men and police officers as well as educational psychology students by preference for educational milieu and political party affiliation. Furthermore, she found that her scale did not duplicate the I-E Scale, Dogmatism Scale, or the control subscales of FIRO-B.

Cochran placed her scale in present day culture where tension exists between a centrally controlled society and a full participative democracy with its accompanying individual freedoms. She suggested that today's authoritarians may be those who endorse centralized power as a way of maintaining a stable society. In this way, her scale might be appropriate for measuring preference for the two types of control structures described by Mackey as a power structure and an authority structure. In other words, a person scoring high on Cochran's scale of preference for hierarchical control might be a person who preferred Mackey's power structure. A low scorer on her
scale might be a person who prefers Mackey's authority structure. These hypotheses have not been tested.

The purpose of the present research was to investigate these hypotheses which would give added support to the construct validity of Cochran's Control Scale for differentiating high and low preference for hierarchical control. She hinted at this in her first research and scale development (Cochran, 1974) when she reported that her subjects (college students) tended to equate traditional, status quo authority (Mackey's power structure) with more control and to perceive innovative regulations as less controlling than conventional ones. In further research (Cochran, 1975) reported that her scale differentiated between policemen and a normative group of college students (police scored high on the scale); between army enlisted men by years of service (those longer in the service scored higher); between strong and mediocre advocates of open education (strong advocates scored higher); and between educational psychology students by preference for educational milieu (those with preference for more traditional or conventional milieus scored higher).

It seemed reasonable to hypothesize that the Cochran Control Scale would differentiate between people who live and function within power and authority structures that Mackey described. Because Mackey also suggested that the Roman Catholic Church was representative of the remaining power structures in society, a group of subjects
would be used from the Catholic Church and compared with a church group which more resembled an authority structure (e.g. the Baptist Church). These subjects would be chosen from among priests and ministers of the respective churches because of commitment and assumed preference for their church structure.

However, in recent years with rethinking done at its Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church has begun an attempt to change. Catholics were freed by the Council from a rather restrictive notion of authority at least in theory. The bishops gathered together in Rome, agreed on the following statement as official theory.

The will to play one's role in common endeavors should be everywhere encouraged. Praise is due to those national procedures which allow the largest number of citizens to participate in public affairs with genuine freedom. Authorities must beware of hindering family, social, or cultural groups, as well as intermediate bodies and institutions. They must not deprive them of their own lawful and effective activity, but should rather strive to promote them willingly and in orderly fashion. For their part, citizens both as individuals and in association should be on guard against granting government too much authority and inappropriately seeking from it excessive conveniences and advantages, with the consequent weakening of the sense of responsibility on the part of individuals, families, and social groups. (Vatican II, Church in the World, 1966)

These words of the bishops spoke eloquently for their opinion of societal structure. Bishops also seemingly had changed their view of the structure of the Church itself. This Council, which ended in the mid 1960's, set forth a different theoretical explanation of
authority. Statements from the Council dealt with such terms as: collegiality of the bishops, shared authority and shared responsibility, consultative processes in central and local Church government. Although slow in developing, central bureaucracy in Rome was being decentralized; consultative structures in governing and decision-making (in Rome, in each diocese and each parish) were being created and used; Canon Law was being revised to reflect a new emphasis on freedom and responsibility of individuals and local structures. Roman Catholics have seen differences in the way some things are done, for example, the liturgical service became less regulated from above and more in tune with local cultures. Despite a certain slowness in effecting actual change, and particularly attitude change, a broadening in the understanding of authority has occurred. How far it has spread into the real fiber of the "church structure" remained to be seen. Catholicism lacked a history of the corporate exercise of freedom and responsibility. Although developing, such corporate experience has been lacking on many levels of Church's structure. A difference has existed between theory and experience in the exercise of authority; this difference has been credited with at least a major part of defections from among the Church's membership and even from among the ranks of its clergy and religious.
Some bishops and priests changed more quickly than others; thus some dioceses and some parishes have instituted changes in structures for consultation, shared responsibility and broadened decision-making processes; others have been slower in doing so. Diocesan clergy (non-religious order priests), who have had most of the government, management, and hierarchical functions within church structure may be among the slowest to change.

In religious orders (or congregations) of men and women in the Roman Catholic Church (as differentiated from diocesan clergy), there had also traditionally been a rather highly structured system of authority but because of the community-living orientation of most of these groups, more consideration was given to local and individual decisions. This had especially been true since Vatican Council II. Non-ordained religious communities of men and women particularly had followed the spirit and guidelines of the Council in changing governmental structures of their respective congregations. A process of broadening authority structures of these religious communities has tended to make these less like power structures. More superiors have been elected than ever before. Representative legislative bodies (called Chapters) have been the highest authority in the system on every level of the structure. Subsidiary (the making of a decision by the level of structure most affected by that decision) has been a firmly established operating principle in religious
congregations. Individual decisions have been more the order of the day, so much so that some religious have felt too much consideration has been given to individual freedom and fulfillment and the common good overlooked and forgotten if not, in fact, endangered.

Thus an aim of this project was to investigate differences in preferences for hierarchical control which might exist among three groups of men committed in a special way to the work of the Catholic Church:

1.) Diocesan priests (local parish clergy who do not belong to a religious order, i.e., who do not live in communities or have religious vows). These men administer the church through participation in its hierarchical structure. They promise obedience to their bishop and promise to live celibate lives but do not commit themselves to religious poverty or common life as a style of living.

2.) Religious priests (ordained members of religious orders or congregations living in communities with religious vows of poverty, celibacy and obedience). These men do special works in the Church, e.g., education, social ministry, missionary work, as well as parish ministry. They are less involved in the
management of the hierarchical structures of the church.

3.) Lay religious brothers (non-ordained men living in communities with religious vows of poverty, celibacy and obedience). These men also do special works of ministry but since they are not ordained they have the least involvement in the hierarchical structure of the church.

These groups were selected because of their special commitment to their Church. Membership in or out of religious congregations and degree of involvement or potential involvement in the Church's hierarchical structure raised the question of differences in preference for hierarchical control. A power structure model would be more salient for Group 1 because of their greater involvement in the hierarchical structure of the Church, less salient for Group 2 because of less involvement in that structure, and least salient for Group 3, the least involved in hierarchical structures. Significant differences among these groups using Cochran's Control Scale would provide additional validity for the constructs used in her scale. It was hypothesized that Group I (diocesan ordained non-religious priests) would have the highest preference for control; Group 3 (non-ordained religious brothers) would have the lowest preference.

In the development of her scale, Cochran (1974) found that college students tended to equate traditional
status quo "authority" with more control and to perceive innovative regulations as less controlling than conventional ones. On the basis of such findings plus results of judgments about the nature of attitudes of persons as they grow older, it was further hypothesized that with increasing age of men in all groups, preference for hierarchical control would be greater. This hypothesis is plausible because older men in these groups are more and more committed to their church through effort and involvement already invested in their church. Commitment and involvement have tended to raise a person's positive attitudes toward the groups to which one belongs and the values for which it stands (Festinger, 1957, 1964; Brehm and Bohen, 1962). Many older priests and ministers, for example, would be pastors. Appointment to such positions depends greatly on age and time spent in lesser positions. Older men who have "put in their time," so to speak, would be more inclined to keep the status quo and to see hierarchical control as more preferable. Also, time and age would tend to have a selective effect in that those who had trouble with the system would have left is as they grew older. A further consideration might have been that the older the minister or priest, the more dependent he became on the status quo and his preference for hierarchical control would be stronger.

A significant question to consider was how the men in these groups themselves considered the structure of
their respective church or religious group. Ideally, those who considered their group to be a power structure, should have a high preference for control from above; and those who considered their groups to be less a power structure and more an authority structure should have less preference for control from above. If this were not the case, then there should be a measurable level of dissatisfaction. Priests and ministers might show this discontent by the way they described their work and satisfaction with their job. Thus this research inquired into the subjects' perception of power in their church or religious group as well as a measurement of their job satisfaction.

Intelligence and degree of education would also have played a role in the strength of preference for hierarchical control, based on Mackey's (1972) theory that power structures were prevalent in more uneducated and undifferentiated systems. However, because of the general higher level of education and intelligence among clergymen and religious (due to the education requirements for ordination and/or profession of commitment) this variable was not regarded as a salient influence among the types of groups studied in this investigation.

Cochran's (1975) research did not report any attempts to delineate personality correlates with her preference scale. She also reported (personal communication 1980) that no such attempts have been made since 1975. What personality dimensions are active in
persons who have "high" or "low" preference for hierarchical control? This interesting question had not been investigated for Cochran's scale.

Some suggestions might reasonably have been found among studies done with the F-Scale and the authoritarian personality as well as with the Dogmatism Scale. However, Cochran (1974, 1975) reported that the Hierarchical Control Scale had a low correlation (r = .25) with the Dogmatism Scale and general measures of authoritarianism.

A review of the literature showed numerous studies in which authoritarians (in this case limited to high F-Scale scorers) were shown to have a tendency to maintain social distance from others (Triandis, et al., 1965); less likelihood of adjusting to changing demands of situations (Ziller, 1962); more tendency to mistrust others and to act in untrustworthy ways (Deutsch, and Newcombe, 1969), to "different" groups (Epstein, 1966), to minorities (Adorno, et al., 1950) to the handicapped (Cowen, et al., 1967); a tendency to use physical punishment and ridicule in controlling children (Hart, 1967); a preference for the use of harsh penalties and negative sanctions in controlling others (Dustin and Davis, 1967); likelihood of acting in a hostile way towards others at the behest of an authority figure (Elms and Milgram, 1966).

Studies with the Dogmatism Scale showed that high scorers are: slow in ability to change old beliefs and to learn new ones (Erlich and Lee, 1969), to accept new
approaches (Vacchiano, et al., 1969) and to develop new procedures (Fillenbaum and Jackman, 1961); highly similar to authoritarians in being militaristic and aggressive toward foreigners (Eckhardt and Newcombe, 1969); less likely to accept liturgical change (among Catholics) (Vacchiano, et al., 1969); more apt to dislike other religions (Berkowitz, 1962).

A compelling reason to search for personality correlates to the preference for control scale was the theory of Korman (1971) concerning the effects of high and low hierarchical environments on the behavior of individuals. After reviewing the literature he attempted to elucidate a theory to account for change in several variables: achievement, creativity and aggression in the organizational environment due to high or low hierarchical control.

Korman's theory proposed that people are motivated to seek a stable world; hence they will attempt to seek outcomes consistent with their belief systems. Belief systems are a function of environmental experience and learning. The consequences of the environment lead to belief systems and thus to behavior. For example, high hierarchical control of behavior, with its high programming and routine activities, leads to the belief that persons (both self and others) are less undesirable since they must be controlled and the belief that there are rules and principles which should be a permanent and universal guide
to behavior. These beliefs in turn lead to behavioral characteristics such as the following: low achievement, high aggression toward self and others, hostility toward change and variation, lack of creativity and problem solving activity. A low hierarchical control environment with fewer routine activities leads to sets of beliefs and behaviors which are the opposite of the above predictions.

Korman (1971) gave support for his theory by citing numerous studies showing that high hierarchical control environments lead to poor self-esteem, lack of trust in others, lower achievement motivation, higher aggressiveness, lower creativity and receptivity to change.

Korman's theory explained a major part of results from research in which hierarchical control or a related variable has been one of the experimental conditions. It was not the intention to test Korman's theory in this investigation, but to use it to give direction to a description of personality characteristics expected to be related to a construct of preference for hierarchical control, remembering Cochran's (1975) contention that preference for control did not correlated highly with other measures of control reported.

Research reviewed thus far came mainly from laboratory experiments with behavior measurements as dependent variables. Such methods were beyond the scope of this part of the present investigation. An objective personality measure of the type developed by Cattell, et.
al., (1970), i.e. the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire, was considered more appropriate to delineate characteristics of the construct in a broad way as a preliminary study.

Jacobs (1976) used the Sixteen Personality Factor Test (Cattell, 1970) to investigate personality correlates of the Locus-of-control scale (Rotter, 1966). He found that an individual who felt that he was controlled by his environment tended to be more tense, with feelings of guilt, self-conflict, suspicion and anxiety. Those who felt internally controlled tended to be more relaxed, self-assured, with higher self-concept, trust and less anxiety. These results, however, were based on low correlations between the two measures.

Cochran (1975) claimed that her scale and Rotter's scale did not measure the same dimension. Rotter (1966) stated that perception of locus of control contingencies either from environment or from internal processes was not the same as preference for the way control might be exercised. The two scales might measure different concepts. Locus of control studies have been numerous and varied in the last several years whereas preference for control scale has not been used frequently. Comparison and contrast of the two scales are important areas for research.

Results of a survey among a group of clinical psychologists suggested that those who have a higher
preference for hierarchical control would have the following qualities as measured by the 16 PF.* They would tend to be conservative, reserved, conscientious, shy and threat-sensitive, suspicious, group-dependent, controlled, apprehensive and regulated by external realities.

Likewise, it was suggested that those who have a lower preference for hierarchical control would tend to be: liberal, outgoing, expedient, somewhat heedless of rules, venturesome, trusting, self-sufficient, careless of social rules, in some self-conflict, self-assured and imaginative.

The final purpose of this study, then, was to study what personality factors as measured by the 16 PF (Cattell and Eber, 1962) would discriminate between higher and lower scorers on Cochran's scale of preference for hierarchical control. Results would be somewhat limited in general applicability because of the restricted nature of the sample but might indicate the direction for further studies.

Statement of the problem

Influence as a factor in society was accepted.

Control is successful influence but is exercised in various

*Survey done by the author among ten clinical psychologists to elicit their clinical judgment of the construct, preference for hierarchical control, in descriptive terms used by the 16 PF.
ways; two of these are power and authority (legitimate power). Organizations have existed in society which have been based on power and others on authority. Power structures have characteristics which make them very rigid and hierarchical. Authority structures, although maintaining order and control, do so with more participative and democratic processes. Persons involved, committed and working in these types of structure might have differences in the way they prefer control to be exercised. Those in a power structure should have a higher preference for hierarchical control than those in an authority structure. Cochran's hierarchical control scale should differentiate between persons in these two types of structure.

Churches have been traditionally known as power structures in society, particularly the Catholic Church. However, many churches have been founded as, or have become, participative authority structures, e.g., the Baptist Church. Thus persons committed to those churches (particularly priests and ministers) should differ on a measure of preference for hierarchical control.

Furthermore, the Catholic Church itself is changing and different groups among its committed workers (diocesan priests, religious priests, and religious brothers) live and work in different structures even within the overall power framework of the Catholic system. These men have varying amounts of commitment to the actual governing
structure or hierarchy of the Church. Thus, the three groups should differ in their preference for hierarchical control.

Cochran's research (1975) showed that age had an effect on the preference for control. Younger persons tended to have a lower preference for control across several groups studied. The effects of age were provided for in this study by an analysis of all groups on different age levels.

A further problem existed in that men in these church structures might have differing perceptions of the structure of their respective groups. Some measure of satisfaction, e.g., job satisfaction, should vary in relation to how well the men's perceptions of group structure matched their preference for control.

Personality correlates of the construct of preference for control needed investigation. No such personality research had been done with the preference for control construct. Although some trends are suggested in possible personality correlates, no specific hypotheses were constructed because of previous low correlations between Cochran's scale and other traditional measures of the control dimension.

Summary of Hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:**

Catholic priests would show a significantly higher preference for hierarchical control than Baptist ministers.
Hypothesis 2:
Catholic diocesan priests would have a significantly higher preference for hierarchical control than both religious priests and religious brothers.

Hypothesis 3:
There will be an increasing preference for hierarchical control with increasing age among all four groups.

Hypothesis 4:
A. Those in each of the four groups would vary in their job satisfaction as a function of their preference for hierarchical control and their position in the descending order of power structures as theorized in this study and based on the ideas of Mackey (1972), i.e. Catholic diocesan priests, Catholic religious priests, Catholic religious brothers and Baptist ministers. The higher the preference for hierarchical control and the higher the position in a power structure group as theorized, the greater would be the job satisfaction.

B. The same hypothesis was proposed for the within group analysis of the effect the individual's perception of the power structure of his group and his preference for hierarchical control had on his job satisfaction. The higher the preference for hierarchical control and the higher the perception of power within this group, the greater would be the job satisfaction.
METHOD

Subjects: Ss for this research were 60 Catholic diocesan priests, 60 Catholic religious priests, 60 Catholic religious Brothers, and 60 Baptist ministers in the Southeastern Louisiana and Gulf Coast geographical area. (Further demographic data are given in Appendix C)

Materials: Packets of mimeographed and printed materials were used in this study (Appendix A). Each packet consisted of an introductory letter, an information sheet, a questionnaire (Cochran's Hierarchical Control Scale), a religious group rating form, the Job Description Index, and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

The introductory letter attempted to elicit cooperation, explain the broad purpose of the study, provide for anonymity, promise access to results of the study and urge promptness in replying.

The information sheet contained important identifying data for classification of Ss into experimental groups, i.e., age, church affiliation and title or position within the church or religious group. Other relevant background data was requested, along with native country. To eliminate possible contamination from cultural differences, those born in the United States were preferred for use in the study; however, 9 non-native Ss were included, with a minimum of 5 year's residence in the United States required for inclusion. The average residency for the group of non-native Ss was 12 years.
Seven years was the shortest and 19 the longest period of residency for non-native Ss used.

The Hierarchical Control Scale (HCS) was used to measure the main dependent variable -- preference for hierarchical control. Scores ranged from 0 to 34, with higher scores, indicating higher preference.

Desirable features of the HCS were its reasonably high reliability, acceptable standard deviations and successful validity studies in which the HCS discriminated successfully between policemen and a normative group, army enlisted men by length of service, advocates of open education, education students by preference for educational milieu (Cochran, 1975). (c.f. Appendix C)

Cochran (1974, 1975) reported several measures of reliability for HCS: internal consistence \( r = .76; N\ 473 \); test-retest \( r = .87; N\ 40 \); alternate form \( r = .77; N\ 26 \). She also reported very low correlations with other scales:

- FIRO-B "Control Wanted" (Schutz) \( r = 0.05; N\ 496 \)
- FIRO-B "Control Expressed" (Schutz) \( r = .01; N\ 495 \)
- I-E Scale (Rotter) \( r = 0.13; N\ 508 \)
- Dogmatism (Rokeach) \( r = .24; N\ 130 \)

From this data she drew the conclusion that the HCS does indeed measure a unique construct; it is an independent measure.

The religious group rating form was used to obtain each S's perception of the structure of the religious group to which he belonged. S was asked to identify statements which best described his group by writing "yes"
or "no" by each statement. Half of the 10 statements described a power structure, the other half described an authority structure (Mackey, 1972).

The Job Description Index (JDI) developed by Smith, et. al., (1969), measured satisfaction with present work and four other facets of the work environment: pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, and people worked with.

Each of the five sections of the index contained sets of evaluative and descriptive words to which the respondent indicated whether or not the item described the aspect of his work being rated. He was also permitted to indicate that he was undecided by placing a question mark (?) beside the item. "Yes" and "no" responses were weighted 3; undecided responses were weighted 1. Totals of these weights (ranging from 0 - 54) were obtained for each of the five sections.

Selection of the JDI as a technique for assessing job satisfaction was based on the extensive work of Smith, et. al., (1969). She reported high reliability for each subscale of the measure (without providing values for r) but low intercorrelations between subscales. Furthermore, Hall and Schneider (1973) reported success in measuring job satisfaction of priests using the JDI. However, because of unknown reliability for JDI a general question of satisfaction with his profession was asked of each S.
He was asked to rate his satisfaction on a seven point scale, a higher number indicating higher satisfaction.

The Sixteen Personality Factor Test (16 PF), Form A (Cattell, et. al., 1970) was used as the personality measure for this study because it is an objectively scorable test which gives a reasonably complete coverage of personality factors possible in a brief time. It is based on the "normal" population rather than a psychiatric one. Form A was used from six possible forms because it was most appropriate for fully literate persons (college level education). High reliabilities and a construct validity coefficient of .85 was reported.

Despite problems with the 16 PF reviewed in Buros (1972) the test was considered to measure psychologically meaningful entities in various life situations. Each of the "factors" measured a continuum of descriptions formed by factor analysis into personality "factors." Having a certain position on one dimension did not prevent an S from having any position whatever on any other dimension. Cattell, et. al. (1970), claimed that because of psychological reality of the factors more knowledgeable predictions can be made from them.

The 16 personality factors of the test are:

Factor A -- Reserved vs. Outgoing
Factor B -- Less intelligent vs. More intelligent
Factor C -- Affected by feelings vs. Emotionally stable
Factor E -- Humble vs. Assertive
Factor F -- Sober vs. Happy-go-lucky
Factor G -- Expedient vs. Conscientious
Factor H -- Shy vs. Venturesome
Factor I -- Toughminded vs. Tenderminded
Factor L -- Trusting vs. Suspicious
Factor M -- Practical vs. Imaginative
Factor N -- Forthright vs. Shrewd
Factor O -- Placid vs. Apprehensive
Factor Q_1 -- Conservative vs. Experimenting
Factor Q_2 -- Group-dependent vs. Self-sufficient
Factor Q_3 -- Undisciplined self-conflict vs. Controlled
Factor Q_4 -- Relaxed vs. Tense

Second Order Factors of the test are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extraversion</th>
<th>Neuroticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poise</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure: Packets of materials were hand delivered to 20 Ss in each of three age groups (51 and above, 36 to 50, 35 and under) (N=60) randomly selected from four lists: priests (diocesan and religious) furnished by the Catholic Archdiocese of New Orleans, religious brothers furnished by the Brother's Council of the Archdiocese of New Orleans, and personnel lists of Brothers of the Sacred Heart (New Orleans Province) and Baptist ministers furnished by Baptist Association of Greater New Orleans. Each S was asked to sign a consent form upon receipt of the packet. Anonymity was maintained by requiring no name on the returned packet of responses; however, names of those who received packets (and signed the consent form) were kept so that a reminder could be sent later when needed and results of the study could be sent to those requesting it. Other names were randomly selected from the lists as additional Ss were required to maintain the expected number of 20 Ss per group. When the lists were depleted, several subjects
were recruited from phone book lists of churches in nearby towns.
RESULTS

Percentage of returned questionnaires was excellent at 78% for the total group. Appendix B gives further information about the number of questionnaires given out with the return rate for each group and age level. Such high percentages of returns (one group had 85% return rate) was seen as a result of expenditure of time and effort in personal approach, hand delivery and request for cooperation.

Ss were divided into 4 experimental groups by church affiliation and position: Group DP - 60 Catholic diocesan priests; Group RP - 60 Catholic diocesan priests; Group RP - 60 Catholic religious priests; Group RB - 60 Catholic religious brothers; Group BM - 60 Baptist ministers. (See Appendix C for a further description of groups.) Ss were also classified by age into 3 levels: Age 1 (51 and above); Age 2 (36 to 50); Age 3 (35 and under). The dependent variable for the first analysis was preference for hierarchical control (PHC). A two-factor analysis of variance was performed to test the following hypotheses:

$$H_1 : M_{DP+RP} > M_{BM} \quad p < .05$$

$$H_2 : M_{DP} > M_{RP} > M_{RB} \quad p < .05$$

$$H_3 : M_{age 1} > M_{age 2} > M_{age 3} \quad p < .05$$
Table 1 shows mean scores for groups and age levels. Results of the ANOVA for PHC by group, age, and group X age, presented in Table 2, indicate strong main effects for group, F (3,228) = 14.77, p < .0001, and age, F (2,228) = 5.83, p < .003. Group x age was not significant, F (6,228) = 1.28, ns. Pair-wise t-tests were used as an aid in interpreting the pattern of means. Results of these tests indicated that the trend was opposite than predicted (see Figures 1 and 2), and hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported. The strong main effect for group shows that PHC does vary significantly across groups selected but not in the manner hypothesized.

Age levels had a strong effect on PHC. In general the older the individual in all four groups, the higher the PHC (see Figure 1). Thus, hypothesis 3 was supported.

For hypothesis 4, effects on job satisfaction were measured. Part A of that hypothesis proposed effects of PHC and group membership (as theorized in this study) on job satisfaction (JS). Within-group analyses of covariance, with PHC as the covariable, were used to test these effects.

To understand the results took two steps. First, effects of group order and PHC on JS were examined, and second, if any significant results were indicated, the slope of regression lines for PHC as a predictor of JS measures was studied. The hypothesis tested was expressed as follows: $H_{4A}^4: \beta_{DP} > \beta_{RP} > \beta_{RB} > \beta_{BM}$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>51 +</th>
<th>36-50</th>
<th>35 -</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Diocesan Priests</td>
<td>23.85\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Religious Priests</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>20.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Religious Brothers</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>23.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Ministers</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>24.85</td>
<td>24.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>23.83</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>22.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Priests</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>20.93</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Included are the means for the combined group of diocesan and religious priests.

\textsuperscript{a} n for each cell is 20
Table 2
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Preference for Hierarchical Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>220.87</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87.24</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group X Age</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Group Means for three age levels of four religious groups (BM-Baptist ministers; RB-Catholic religious Brothers; DP-Catholic diocesan priests; RP-Catholic religious order priests).
Figure 2. Group Means for three age levels of Baptist ministers and Catholic priests (diocesan clergy and religious order priests combined).
Tables 3 through 8 show results of these analyses of covariance, Beta values, and p, on a general job satisfaction measure and five specific aspects of job. Results indicated no significant effects either for theorized order of groups or for effects of PHC within groups. Hypothesis 4 A was not supported.

Job satisfaction measures were predicted to increase as a function of the level of PHC within the theorized order of power structure of the groups (i.e., BM, RB, RP, DP). An examination of results indicated that this did not occur. Despite the lack of significance, a further examination of the slopes indicating relationship between PHC and JS revealed four relationships that were significant (as tested by t-tests). PHC appeared to be a predictor of: satisfaction with opportunities for promotion and type of supervision for diocesan priests; satisfaction with work for religious priests; overall job satisfaction for religious brothers. However, the fact that four of 24 t-tests reached significance may not be greater than chance expectation. Thus, there seemed to be no clearly discernible relationship between PHC and JS within the theorized order of groups.

For part B of hypothesis 4, the study investigated each group's own perception of power in its group structure rather than the one proposed by the research design. The question was constructed in terms of what effect perception of power (hereafter called Power) and PHC would have on JS.
Table 3

Summary of Within-Group Analysis of Covariance for Overall Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC*GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beta</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{DP} )</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{RP} )</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{RB} )</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_{BM} )</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .05 \)
Table 4

Summary of Within-Group Analysis of Covariance for Satisfaction with Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.42</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>242.12</td>
<td>5.46 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC*GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53.24</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>44.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta<sub>DP</sub> 0.09
Beta<sub>RP</sub> 0.60 **
Beta<sub>RB</sub> 0.29
Beta<sub>BM</sub> 0.07

* p < .05
** p < .01
Table 5
Summary of Within-Group Analysis of Covariance for Satisfaction with People at Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.83</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC*GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34.58</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>68.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beta_{DP}</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta_{RP}</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta_{RB}</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta_{BM}</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Summary of Within-Group Analysis of Covariance for Satisfaction with Pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>362.21</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC*GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86.08</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>170.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta<sub>DP</sub> = .27
Beta<sub>RP</sub> = .80
Beta<sub>RB</sub> = .54
Beta<sub>BM</sub> = -.001

<sup>a</sup>Number of respondents to this measure varied across groups. DP = 58, RP = 45, RB = 22, BM = 60. Response to items on pay was considered inappropriate by many religious brothers and priests.
Table 7
Summary of Within-Group Analysis of Covariance for Satisfaction with Promotion Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>336.32</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>942.40</td>
<td>3.96 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC*GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>263.77</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>120(^a)</td>
<td>238.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{Beta}_{DP} \) 1.02 *
\(\text{Beta}_{RP} \) .64
\(\text{Beta}_{RB} \) .69
\(\text{Beta}_{BM} \) -.18

\( * p < .05 \)

\(^a\)Number of respondents to this measure varied across groups. DP = 59, RP = 55, RB = 50, BM = 54. Response to items on promotion opportunities were considered inappropriate by some members of all groups.
Table 8

Summary of Within-Group Analysis of Covariance for Satisfaction with Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>178.84</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>366.40</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHC*GROUP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>149.63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>212a</td>
<td>134.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beta<br>DP = .82 **
Beta<br>RP = .51
Beta<br>RB = .06
Beta<br>BM = -.04

*p < .01

*aNumber of respondents to this measure varied across groups. DP = 59, RP = 59, RB = 60, BM = 42. Response to items on satisfaction with supervision was considered inappropriate by many Baptist ministers.
Since these variables were all continuous, multiple linear regression analysis was used to investigate the relationship among the three. Resulting equations gave some indication of whether PHC, Power and the joint effect of the two are significant predictors of job satisfaction.

Perception of power was measured by a religious group rating form. Results of this scale indicated how each group perceived the power existing in its church or religious group. On a scale of 0 to 10, with a higher score indicating a perception of greater power, Baptist ministers judged their group to have the lowest power structure (M = 1.17). Religious brothers were higher in their perception (M = 2.98), followed by religious priests (M = 3.02). Diocesan priests judged their structure to have the highest power (M = 4.40).

Tables 9 through 12 present Beta values for predictor variables (PHC, Power, and the joint effect of PHC and Power) on six criterion measures of JS for the groups in this study. The Beta values are applicable to the following equation: $JS = \text{Intercept} + \beta_1 \times \text{PHC} + \beta_2 \times \text{Power} + \beta_3 \times \text{PHC} \times \text{Power}$. A survey of the tables reveals only one variable in each of three groups (work, promotion, pay) which has significant Beta values for predictor variables. However, the fact that only three of 24 equations reveal significant Beta values is not greater than chance expectation and hypothesis 4 B was not supported.
Table 9

Beta Values, F, and p for PHC, Power\textsuperscript{a} and PHC\textasteriskcentered Power on Six Criterion Measures (JS) for Diocesan Priests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JS</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>PHC $\beta_1$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Power $\beta_2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PHC\textasteriskcentered Power $\beta_3$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>5.81**</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>5.19*</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>6.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>33.08</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-10.51</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>5.93**</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results of a Multiple Linear Regression with the following regression equation:

JS = Intercept + $\beta_1$ x PHC + $\beta_2$ x Power + $\beta_3$ x PHC\textasteriskcentered Power.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

a "Power" denotes perception by the group of its own power structure.
Table 10

Beta Values, F, and p for PHC, Power and PHC*Power on Six Criterion Measures (JS) for Religious Priests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JS</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>PHC $\beta_1$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Power $\beta_2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PHC*Power $\beta_3$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.81</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>56.10</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-36.63</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>8.58**</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>7.09**</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>7.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-7.17</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results of a Multiple Linear Regression with the following regression equation:

\[ JS = \text{Intercept} + \beta_1 \times \text{PHC} + \beta_2 \times \text{Power} + \beta_3 \times \text{PHC*Power}. \]

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

a "Power" denotes perception by the group of its own power structure.
Table 11
Beta Values, F, and p for PHC, Power\(^a\) and PHC*Power on Six Criterion Measures (JS) for Religious Brothers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JS</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>PHC(_{\beta_1})</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Power(_{\beta_2})</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PHC*Power(_{\beta_3})</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>50.05</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>55.83</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-3.94</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>33.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-3.43</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-5.57</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>63.89</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-8.66</td>
<td>3.75*</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results of a Multiple Linear Regression with the following regression equation:

\[
JS = \text{Intercept} + \beta_1 \times \text{PHC} + \beta_2 \times \text{Power} + \beta_3 \times \text{PHC*Power}.
\]

* \( p < .05 \)
** \( p < .01 \)

\( a \) "Power" denotes perception by the group of its own power structure.
Table 12

Beta Values, F, and p for PHC, Power$^a$ and PHC*Power on Six Criterion Measures (JS) for Baptist Ministers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JS</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>PHC $\beta_1$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Power $\beta_2$</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>PHC*Power $\beta_3$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Satisfaction</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>42.42</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>48.46</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>56.78</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-24.80</td>
<td>5.20*</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>4.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>62.10</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-23.14</td>
<td>3.77*</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>61.60</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-12.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Results of a Multiple Linear Regression with the following regression equation:
    $JS = \text{Intercept} + \beta_1 \times \text{PHC} + \beta_2 \times \text{Power} + \beta_3 \times \text{PHC*Power}.$

* p < .05
** p < .01

a "Power" denotes perception by the group of its own power structure.
For the final analysis, Ss were classified into 5 groups (quintile rank) on the basis of strength of preference for hierarchical control. Dependent variables were 16 primary personality factors and 7 second order factors of the 16 PF Test. Table 13 presents the ANOVA summaries of the PHC quintile rank for the significant personality factors. This was an exploratory investigation into personality characteristics of those scoring higher and lower on the PHC construct. Six primary factors (Factors E, G, I, M, N, Q3) and one second order factor (Leadership) were significantly different across quintile ranks. (See Table 14.)

Figure 3 shows profiles of the highest (5th quintile) and lowest (1st quintile) ranks on all factors of the 16 PF Test with the significant factors starred.

Table 14 shows the means for high and low ranks of PHC on significant factors of the test. Those who have a low PHC tend to be more assertive, forthright and undisciplined. Those who have a stronger PHC tend to be less assertive, quite conscientious, less tenderminded (while still well toward high average for this factor), less imaginative, more practical, more shrewd and polished socially, more controlled. High PHC scorers also are significantly higher on the second order factor, Leadership, than low PHC scorers.
Table 13
Summary of Analysis of Variance of PHC Quintile Rank for Personality Factors Which Reached Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Factor</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Humble vs Assertive</td>
<td>PHC Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Expedient vs Conscientious</td>
<td>PHC Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>8.51***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Toughminded vs Tenderminded</td>
<td>PHC Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>4.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Practical vs Imaginative</td>
<td>PHC Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>3.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Forthright vs Shrewd</td>
<td>PHC Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Undisciplined vs Controlled</td>
<td>PHC Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.11</td>
<td>6.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>PHC Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>3.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05
** ** p < .01
*** *** p < .001
Figure 3. Profiles for high (5th quintile) and low (1st quintile) ranks on all personality factors of the 16 PF with significant factors starred. (Sten score range has higher and lower stens excluded from the figure for graphic purposes.) Average stens for the 16 PF range between 4.5 and 6.5.
Table 14
Mean Values of Significant Personality Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality Factor</th>
<th>Mean Low PHC</th>
<th>Mean High PHC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E Humble vs Assertive</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Expedient vs Conscientious</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Toughminded vs Tenderminded</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Practical vs Imaginative</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Forthright vs Shrewd</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>6.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₃ Undisciplined vs Controlled</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Preference for hierarchical control among groups in this study did not manifest itself as predicted. With the exception that religious priests had a lower preference for hierarchical control than diocesan priests (as predicted), the order was essentially reversed.

All groups in the study scored higher than groups not expected to have a high preference for control from above, e.g., college students ($M = 15.67$). In fact, the mean of the total sample in this study ($M = 22.64$) was higher than all groups sampled by Cochran (1975) except police officers ($M = 24.72$). Appendix D gives a summary of data for all groups sampled by Cochran. Catholic priests, brothers and Baptist ministers in their respective groups had a higher preference for control from above than all college students sampled (even those 41 years old and older), army enlisted men (even those with the highest number of years of service), educational psychology students (even those who preferred the most traditional educational milieu) and higher than any reported group by political party affiliation.

Religious priests were different from other groups in this study and results showed the youngest age level (below 35) of that group to differ most. This difference was significantly lower but even the mean of the youngest
group (18.00) was generally higher than many groups sampled by Cochran.

It is interesting to note, furthermore, that results of this study showed that Baptist ministers, a group predicted to be lowest of the groups based on its low hierarchical organizational structure, were highest in their preference for control and similar to reported preference scores of police officers. Although Catholic brothers were not as high as ministers, their preference scores were also very similar to those of policemen.

Implications of these results raise questions about Cochran's Hierarchical Control Scale but also questions concerning the theorized structure of the groups. Does HCS measure what it claims and are the structures and preferences of the groups conceptualized in a correct way?

There did appear to be clearly definable ways to classify the organizational structures of the groups used here. Although results showed little indication that the theoretical analysis influenced preferences in the predicted way, perception of power in each group did match the theory proposed. Catholic diocesan priests judged their group to have highest power, followed in order by religious priests, religious brothers and Baptist ministers. Furthermore, perception of power by group correlated negatively \((r = -0.18, p < 0.05)\) with PHC. Although the subjects perceived power in their respective
groups in the same way as the theoretical analysis did, their PHC was generally the opposite. Catholic priests perceived themselves as belonging to a more power-oriented organizational structure than other groups in the study (M = 4.40), but they had a lower preference for exercise of hierarchical control. Baptist ministers perceived their organizational structure to be very minimally power-oriented (M = 1.17), but their preference for control was very strong. Religious priests were significantly lowest in their preferences for control but their perception of power in their religious group was high, second only to diocesan priests. Religious brothers' perception of power in their group was low, as predicted, but their preference for control from above was high.

When job satisfaction (JS) was analyzed, most measures were not significantly different across groups, indicating priests, brothers and ministers had little dissatisfaction with their jobs or careers. Furthermore, even with a negative correlation between perception of power and preference for control and a negative correlation between the general JS measure and perception of power, lack of strong correlation coefficients suggested that priests, brothers and ministers were not unhappy with their work even though they found themselves in a structure which did not match their preference for control.

One way to explain these results would be to imply that changes are occurring in the groups themselves and,
therefore, PHC reflects these changes. This explanation, while possible, seems unlikely in view of the fact that individuals themselves perceived power in their groups in agreement with that theorized and, even despite their differences in PHC, were generally not unhappy with their work, at least as measured by job satisfaction.

It was reasonable to assume that there were many levels of motivation at work which might help explain these results. Spiritual or religious motivations would certainly be salient for priests, brothers and ministers. These men might indeed by able to draw on spiritual motives to settle contradictory feelings in their lives. Or it might simply have been that dissatisfaction with job was difficult for priests, brothers and ministers to admit, even anonymously.

However, the question still remained: Do results here represent a contradiction, with conflicting feelings to be reconciled; or are they an acceptable phenomenon?

A more probable explanation might be found in questioning what HCS measures. What is preference for hierarchical control? The research reported by Cochran (1974, 1975) indicated that this construct described a preference for the way control should be exercised in society. This description left unclear whether the preference was for control exercised by or over the person preferring. If PHC indicated the latter (i.e., the subject preferred himself to be controlled from above), then
results were truly contradictory. However, if the construct meant the former (i.e., the subject preferred to be in a controlling position), then results of this study were more understandable.

All groups here had a high PHC score. They all preferred to be in control with Baptist ministers highest in this preference followed by religious brothers and diocesan priests. Religious priests preferred to be in control the least of the four groups. Is it reasonable, therefore, to propose that ministers, brothers and priests preferred to have control rather than be controlled? Are these men in positions of control where they want to be?

Similarly, the PHC scores of other groups reported by Cochran (1975) could be reasonably understood by the same explanation. Police officers could be seen to prefer being in control, as would education majors interested in more traditional classroom structures. Army enlisted men also might be interested in being in control, particularly as their years of service increase. All of these persons would appear to have a personal involvement in maintaining control over groups in society, in whatever way that control might be interpreted by each group.

The influence of age could also be explained in the same way. Younger individuals might not prefer having control (as well as not being in a society that controls them); but as they grow older they might become more interested in maintaining the status quo, or at least they
might see the need for more control and in being a part of that control.

Did this clarified interpretation of PHC help explain the differences among the groups in this study? Why were Baptist ministers higher in PHC than Catholic priests and brothers and why were brothers higher than priests? If the explanation rests in controlling more than in being controlled then Baptist ministers would have to be seen as wanting positions of control as opposed to what was theorized in this research.

Is the Baptist minister's position one of control? Many ministers responded spontaneously with extra responses to questions concerning supervision by stating that no one supervised them. They were their own boss. Also in questions concerning opportunities for promotion, ministers frequently wrote in responses which indicated that they considered themselves to be as high in the ministry as they could go. Looked at in this way, Baptist ministers are in positions of control or at least prefer being in control.

Brothers presented a more difficult case. The position of brothers in Catholic Church structure has not traditionally been one of control or power. In fact, the non-ordained brother in most monastic orders has been largely subservient to ordained clerics. However, the sample of brothers in the present research was from groups which were not dominated by clerics but were largely groups of non-ordained men with almost complete involvement in an
educational apostolate. The type of education these men are committed to can be looked upon as being traditional and conservative. It is probable that the brother as teacher is very committed to being in control of his class and in maintaining order. A brother finds himself in a position of complete control in his classroom and his school. Thus it is reasonable that brothers in this sample score higher on PHC.

Interpreting the PHC construct, therefore, as "preferring to be in control" furnished Cochran's scale with further clarification in understanding exactly what preference is measured.

Furthermore, when priests, brothers and ministers are stating their preference for being in control, they appear to be satisfied with their job and work. PHC is correlated positively with overall JS (r = .14, p < .05); however, general JS is correlated negatively with the group's perception of power (r = -.31, p < .05). This negative correlation could be interpreted as an indication of unwillingness to be controlled. Perception of power might have been seen by the individuals as the structure of the group controlling them. As structures were seen to be more power-oriented, job satisfaction tended to go down.

Personality factors of high PHC scorers found in this research tended to support the interpretation of PHC as preferring to be in control. Such persons were found to be more conscientious, moralistic and staid. They were
more persistent, more practical and regulated by external realities. They were also more shrewd; more polished, more calculating and more socially aware. They were more interiorly controlled, compulsive and socially precise. They had in general more of the qualities that cluster around leadership, including being average in assertiveness, more accommodating and more conforming.

This cluster of personality characteristics of strong PHC scorers helped to clarify what Cochran's HCS scale measures. It appears that PHC refers to endorsement of a power structure as a way of maintaining control in society with the implication that the endorser wants to do the controlling rather than be controlled. In this interpretation, Cochran's "authoritarian" may be seen as a person who prefers the exercise of control in society and wants to be a controller in that structure. The control, however, is exercised in a socially acceptable way through somewhat less assertiveness, more accommodation and more social awareness. The high PHC controller is more in control of his own impulses, is more polished, shrewd, compulsive and precise.

Could Catholic diocesan and religious priests have perceived the power situation they were in, and yet wanted control to be exercised differently in society, i.e., outside their groups? Was this their way of expressing what they would prefer to see happening without actually allowing themselves to be dissatisfied with their own
position? Similarly, Baptist ministers and Catholic religious brothers apparently perceived their power situations to be less strong and more similar to what we have termed an authority structure and generally preferred control to be exercised in society more from above, which was the more power-oriented stance. In each of these cases, what was seen in one's own group was not necessarily what was preferred for the way things ought to be in society. What was good for the goose in this case was not good for the gander. Those who were not in power structures but preferred control from above might have actually been indicating a desire to have more control over the "world" or "others in society" and yet put themselves in living structures in which there is less control over their own lives. "It's good for them but not for me."

Further research is needed to investigate the accuracy of such statements. Use of the control-wanted and control-expressed scales of Schutz's (1958) FIRO-B may give valuable information regarding control in these or similar groups.

An additional problem in interpreting results was that ministers, priests and brothers in this study may not have perceived the PHC scale as having anything to do with their own religious group which was an implied connection made in this research. Had the scale asked more direct questions about hierarchical control in religious groups and churches, the results may have been different. For
example, results of the "religious group rating form" did ask subjects to rate their group on the power-authority
dimension; however, the PHC scale did not ask questions in
direct relationship to church or religious group structure.
Yet, if direct questions had been asked, a greater social
desirability factor in replying to the questionnaire might
have influenced the results. Therefore, the more general
PHC Scale was probably more appropriate.
A further investigation of the items of the scale
reveals a number of choices or decisions which seem related
to the training of children (17 of 34 items relate to what
children should be allowed to do or how they should be
treated.) If the scale was indeed interpreted in this way
by the subjects, those among the groups studied who have
more to do with training children could have been
expressing their values toward such training. Could this
have been the case with Baptist ministers, who have their
own families with children to raise and with Catholic
brothers who in this sample were mainly in the work of
educating and training youth? These were the two highest
scoring groups on the preference for control scale. In
fact, if the salient factor involved is training children,
then the high scores of Baptist ministers would make sense
as an expression of their values in relation to child
rearing and education. Results for other groups in exact
descending order of PHC (Catholic brothers, diocesan
priests and religious priests) would also be explainable on
the basis of their involvement in education and training of children. However, these are untried hypotheses and need further research.

Personality factors for low and high scorers on PHC reveal profiles which, in the main, seem consistent with previous investigations concerning effects of high and low hierarchical control on the behavior of individuals. Korman's (1971) review of studies indicates that high hierarchical control of behavior leads to low achievement, high aggression toward self and others, hostility toward change, lack of creativity and problem solving activity, a belief that people should be controlled and that there are rules and principles that should guide behavior. Low hierarchical control leads to beliefs and behaviors opposite of the above qualities. Results in Korman's review were mainly from behavioral observations in laboratory experiments and were difficult to compare with results of this research.

However, a close examination of significantly different personality factors for high and low scorers on PHC showed (see Table 15) that those who preferred more hierarchical control were less assertive (although still average in assertiveness), more accommodating and conforming, more conscientious, moralistic and staid. They were more persistent, less tenderminded (although above average in tendermindedness), less imaginative, more practical and down to earth, more regulated by external
Table 15

Description of Significantly Different Personality Factors for Low and High PHC Scorers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16 PF Factor</th>
<th>Low Preference for Control</th>
<th>High Preference for Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Sten</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>assertive, aggressive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>stubborn, competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>expedient, disregards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(low average)</td>
<td>rules, feels few obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>tenderminded, sensitive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>overprotected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>imaginative, absent-minded,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(high)</td>
<td>careless of practical matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>less shrewd, more forthright,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(average)</td>
<td>genuine, socially clumsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>undisciplined self-conflict,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(low average)</td>
<td>lax, follows own urges,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>careless of social rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>qualities that cluster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(low average)</td>
<td>around leadership factor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
realities. They were more shrewd and polished, more calculating, more socially aware. High PHC scorers were definitely more controlled, compulsive and socially precise. They had in general more of the qualities that cluster around the leadership factor.

Those who preferred less hierarchical control were assertive, aggressive, stubborn and competitive. In general they showed weaker superego strength, i.e., they were more expedient, with a strong tendency to disregard rules and feel obligations less strongly. They were quite tenderminded and sensitive with a strong quality of being overprotected. Low PHC scorers were more imaginative, more absent-minded, careless of practical matters. They were less shrewd, more forthright, unpretentious, more genuine, but socially clumsy (although still average in these last four qualities). Low PHC scorers tended to have more undisciplined self-conflict; they followed their own urges more; they were lax and careless of social rules. In general, they had fewer qualities involved in the leadership factor.

The largest inconsistency with Korman's (1971) results appeared in relation to leadership. His analysis pointed to less creativity, more aggression and low achievement for those in high hierarchical environments. Present results showed more leadership qualities, less assertiveness, more accommodation among those who preferred more hierarchical control. There is no difference in
creativity between high and low PHC scorers. In fact, both
groups were above average in creativity.

The lack of comparability between present results
and Korman's (1971) reported studies was due to different
methodologies (laboratory vs. questionnaire studies), and
measurement instruments (different personality tests and
definitions of personality variables). Despite this
obvious limitation, there were questions proposed by the
data which may serve as the basis for further research.
The most significant questions involved why the two groups
were significantly different on combinations of factors
which seem to involve leadership, self-integration,
superego strength and were not significantly different on
factors such as conservatism (both tended to be
conservative, which fact may have been a result of the
sample used here), group dependency (both tended to be
group dependent), trust (both groups were average in
trust). Further studies with different subject populations
and/or groups which better estimate the general population
might show differences on these additional personality
variables.

Present results also differed from Jacobs' (1976)
findings in his study of the locus-of-control scale using
the 16 PF as a personality measurement. Contrary to
Jacobs' results for those who feel either controlled by the
environment or more internally controlled, present results
showed no significant differences in measures of anxiety,
tension, apprehension, guilt-proneness or suspicion. Not only did the high and low PHC scorers show no differences, both groups were within the normal range on each of these factors. The homogeneity of the samples may have contributed to this, but it may also be possible that anxiety, tension and guilt are really not related to preference for hierarchical control.

It was interesting to note that the survey done among clinical psychologists to elicit their clinical judgment of high and low PHC scorers in terms of the 16 PF variables was accurate in terms of the following factors: conscientious vs. expedient, controlled vs. impulsive, practical vs. imaginative. However, factors such as: conservative vs. liberal, shy vs. venturesome, trusting vs. suspicious, group-dependent vs. self-sufficient, secure vs. insecure, were not differentiating factors between the two groups even though judged to be so by the group of clinicians. Other factors such as: humble vs. assertive, toughminded vs. tenderminded, and forthright vs. shrewd did differentiate between the two groups but were not predicted to do so by the clinicians.

The quintile ranking used in the analysis of the personality variables in this research was a very stringent division which placed the greatest distance between high and low scorers on PHC. The analysis however, was not always clear in its interpretation because the effect was not always due to 1st and 5th quintile ranks alone. A more
parsimonious yet not so powerful division of the PHC scores would have been a median split. Future analysis of similar data might profitably use such a division.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The present research investigated preference for hierarchical control (PHC) among Catholic diocesan priests, Catholic religious priests, Catholic religious (non-ordained) brothers and Baptist ministers in southern Louisiana and the Gulf Coast area. Groups were arranged in this order to represent descending strength of hierarchical church structure based on criteria of Mackey (1972). It was hypothesized that strength of preference for control from above, as measured by Cochran's (1975) Hierarchical Control Scale, would be influenced by church structure and position to which the subjects had committed their lives and careers. Age was also hypothesized to have an influence on preference for control. The Job Description Index (Smith, et al., 1969) measured various aspects of job satisfaction as it related to preference for control in the descending order of church structures. Since clergymen sampled might not see church organizational structure as theorized, they were asked to give their perception of power in their own religious group/church. In each group, job satisfaction was analyzed a second time as a function of the person's own perception of power and his preference for control. Lastly, the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (Cattell, et al., 1970) measured personality factors of those who scored high and low on PHC as a
preliminary study of persons on these two levels of this preference variable.

Results indicated that sampled groups were different in their preference for hierarchical control but not in the manner hypothesized. PHC scores for church groups in this study were higher than all others reported in the literature except policemen. Baptist ministers scored highest on PHC, followed closely by Catholic religious brothers. Catholic diocesan priests were third and Catholic religious priests scored significantly lowest of the four groups. Except for reversal of the last two mentioned groups, the order was essentially opposite of that hypothesized. Age had a significant effect on PHC as hypothesized with older persons scoring higher on PHC. Job satisfaction was not influenced when analyzed in relation to preference for control and proposed theoretical structure of the selected church groups. Individual job satisfaction measures were not influenced when analyzed in relation to preference for control and the person's perception of power in his own religious group/church. Perception of power by groups, however, did match the one proposed in the research design, i.e., Catholic diocesan priests saw their church as having most power exercised from above; they were followed respectively by Catholic religious priests, Catholic religious brothers and Baptist ministers. This perception of power correlated negatively with preference for hierarchical control, and also
correlated negatively with a general measure of job satisfaction.

Results suggested that preference for hierarchical control was not immediately seen as related to church organizational structure and/or position among priests, religious, and ministers. Although they accurately perceived the place their respective religious group/church had along the continuum of power structure vs authority structure, each group apparently preferred control to be exercised in essentially the opposite fashion, without reporting any significant amount of dissatisfaction with work or job.

Reasons for this opposite trend were discussed in relation to the validity of the PHC construct and scale. This research tended to support the PHC construct as one that measures a preference for control from above in society but clarified the construct to indicate that the preferring person wants to be in control ("I am the controller.") The structure of the groups was reanalysed to attempt to explain the results with this clarification. The clarified PHC construct did appear to explain present results and also past data reported by Cochran (1975).

Changes in the structure of the religious groups or churches selected, although not completely ruled out, were considered not to be a reasonable explanation of results. The groups themselves agreed with the theorized power structures proposed. Effects of motivation beyond the
materialistic values implied in job/work satisfaction were discussed in relation to the apparent contradiction.

In future research, more direct items about preference for control in church groups might help clarify these issues but this approach might also create a greater bias from clergymen's desire to give the socially expected response.

This research supports Cochran's Hierarchical Control Scale with suggested clarifications. Further replication or similar studies with other control-related scales might confirm that the religious groups in question should indeed be seen as having the indicated preferences as defined more clearly by this research. This and future research would have interesting and relevant implications for the churches and religious groups studied.

This research helped further clarify what the PHC scale measures by delineating several personality factors in high and low PHC scorers. It appeared that strong preference for hierarchical control implied a practical, down-to-earth, accommodating, conforming person who is controlled, compulsive, precise, socially polished and shrewd. This can be described as a stable person, with greater leadership potential, but one who is somewhat less sensitive, less imaginative. This is the type of person seemingly that Cochran might describe as today's "authoritarian", one who endorses centralized power as a
way of maintaining a stable society and one who wants to exercise that control.

Lower preference for hierarchical control implied a person who is more sensitive, more imaginative, forthright, genuine, unpretentious. This person is more inclined to be socially clumsy, disregarding rules and practical matters. He experiences more self-conflict and follows his own urges more. On the other hand, he is assertive, aggressive, competitive, stubborn. This profile, while being described as more lively, spontaneous, and impulsive, is more similar to an adolescent profile.

Probably because of homogeneity of the sample, other expected personality factors did not differentiate between high and low PHC, for example, conservative vs. liberal, trustful vs. suspicious, shy vs. venturesome, group-dependent vs. self-sufficient, secure vs. insecure. Further research with broader samples of the population might indicate whether these additional factors do in fact help describe the preference for control construct.


Rokeach, M. Political and religious dogmatism: An alternative to the authoritarian personality. Psychological Monographs. 1956, 70, No. 18 (Whole No.425).


Thompson, W. M. Authority and magisterium in recent Catholic thought. Chicago Studies, 1977 (Fall) Vol. 16, No. 3, 278-298.

Townsley, J. L.  Personality characteristics of innovative teachers as measured by the Cattell 16 PF. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern Cal., 1973.


Wexler, G. J.  Personality characteristics of innovative teachers as measured by the Cattell 16 PF. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1977.

APPENDIX A
Materials
Dear Sir:

You have been randomly selected to participate in a project to study preferences of persons committed to religion. I am a psychologist who is interested in investigating various factors involved with these preferences and I need your responses and those of many others to help me understand these factors. I hope that you will take a little time (less than an hour) to answer the questionnaires and forms included in this packet.

There are several different sections included in this packet. Each section has directions to help you in answering. The only overall instruction you need is to remember to do the forms in the order that they are arranged. The green booklet is to be done last. Please keep the order, complete each section before going on to another section and do not go back when you have finished a section.

Please do not put your name on any of these pages. I prefer that you be completely anonymous and respond freely. However, please be very attentive to complete the other information requested about you and your background.

Although you may want to remain anonymous, you may also be interested in hearing the results of this study. You may mail in your responses separately and then contact me by letter or by phone and I will be happy to provide you with a summary of the results when they are available. So often we are asked to participate in such studies and never seem to get anything in return for our effort. I promise to give you results if you ask. Please do so separately from your response to insure your anonymity.

Thank you for your cooperation. I know your time is valuable. May I ask you to do it now instead of putting it off and letting this sit on your desk. It takes less than an hour. Just mail the responses in the envelope provided.

Thanks again.

Raymond L. Houck
1930 Robert E. Lee Blvd.
New Orleans, LA 70122
Phone 288-4969
Please fill out this information to give us important data about yourself - but do not put your name.

Age ____________

Education (Mark the highest level attained):

High School_____ B.A./B.S._____ M.A./M.S._____ Higher____

Religious Affiliation___________________________

Are you a convert? ____________________________

From what religion? ____________________________

Position held in your church Length of time in this

Layman____

Elder____

Religious Priest____

What is your main work?

Religious Brother____

Priest____

Minister____

What is your approximate yearly salary? ________________

What is your ethnic background? _______________________

What is your political party affiliation? _________________

Parents:  Mother: living__________ Father: living ________

religion__________ religion ________

occupation__________ occupation ________

Number of brothers______ Number of sisters_____

Your birth order (e.g. oldest, 2nd, 3rd, etc.) ________________

What is the country of your birth? _______________________

If you are not a native of the U.S., how long have you resided here? ________________
The questions which appear below are designed to help find out how people feel about some organizational patterns in our society. For each item determine which of the two alternatives corresponds most closely to your own opinion and indicate your preference by circling either (a) or (b). If there are instances where you agree with both alternatives or do not completely agree with either one, mark the alternative that is more acceptable than the other. Please respond to every question. Do not give your name.

1. In college classes should class attendance be
   (a) something a faculty member has a right to require, or
   (b) outside the instructor's jurisdiction if students meet other course requirements?

2. In a business organization is a good vice-president
   (a) an honest critic of the president, or
   (b) a strong supporter of existing policies?

3. In elementary school should a good teacher
   (a) schedule blocks of free time so that students can choose some of their own activities, or
   (b) keep students busy with work he knows will be useful to them in the future?

4. Should colleges that receive money from the government for research work mostly on
   (a) problems that the government wants solved, or
   (b) any problem which seems worthwhile to the college research team?

5. When young children receive toys should they usually
   (a) be taught how to play with them, or
   (b) be assisted only if they ask for help?

6. Should a good leader come into a planning meeting
   (a) expecting that the staff will jointly outline steps to be taken, or
   (b) knowing what steps need to be taken to reach a desired goal?

7. Should women who want a more active part in the socio-political structure of this society
   (a) join together to form active womens groups, or
   (b) become active in existing organizations which have both women and men members?

Go on to the next page...
8. At dinner should children usually
   (a) choose to eat only what they want, or
   (b) be expected to eat what is served?

9. Would a guaranteed annual wage
   (a) encourage people to be less responsible, or
   (b) provide security which would promote more self-reliance?

10. In college classes would the amount of useful material presented be likely to increase more if
    (a) students worked with instructors to determine course content, or
    (b) instructors prepared class presentations with greater care?

11. Ordinarily, should children be allowed to stay out of school
    (a) on some occasions when they just don't feel like going, or
    (b) only if they are clearly ill

12. If you saw someone stealing cosmetics from a store display would you most likely
    (a) go about your business without getting involved, or
    (b) tell the sales clerk?

13. Do you prefer health care that is
    (a) paid for by the individual, either through direct payment of bills or by payments of health insurance premiums, or
    (b) free from clinics which are supported by the government?

14. When a twelve year old child has a bedroom of his own should he
    (a) be permitted to clean it or not as he chooses, or
    (b) care for it as his mother expects him to?

15. Should jurymen be chosen from among
    (a) adults who volunteer, or
    (b) every intelligent adult as his turn comes up?

16. Most of the time should college students
    (a) study a curriculum that has been planned by an experienced instructor, or
    (b) choose their own study topics?

17. If children and parents want to watch different TV programs at the same time on the same set should
    (a) the children be the ones to see what they want, or
    (b) the parents make the decision about what is watched?

Go on to the next page...
18. If you had a three year old child would you prefer to 
   (a) provide him with play opportunities around his own 
       home so that he would learn your own family 
       values, or 
   (b) enroll him in a good day care center where he 
       would be exposed to a diverse range of social 
       values?

19. If you passed a car parked at the curb in a No Parking 
    Zone and noticed a ticket on the windshield would you 
    think that 
    (a) policemen should be doing something better with 
        their time, or 
    (b) some driver got what was coming to him?

20. If you were caring for an incurably ill family member 
    who begged you to stop his medication so that he could 
    die, would you want to 
    (a) honor his request, or 
    (b) try to sustain his life anyway?

21. If a public high school student was not conforming to 
    the school dress code, should the incident 
    (a) cause him to be sent home from school, or 
    (b) be ignored by the school authorities?

22. Will teen-aged clubs be more successful if they 
    (a) make their own rules, or 
    (b) receive direction from a competent advisor?

23. Should sex education in the schools be 
    (a) a required course for all students, or 
    (b) attended only by students who have parents' consent?

24. When a child neglects to say "thank you" after 
    receiving gifts should the parent 
    (a) overlook the incident, or 
    (b) remind him to use his manners?

25. Should children be taught that the religious 
    traditions of their family are 
    (a) more suitable for them than are those of other 
        religions, or 
    (b) one of a number of religions which they might find 
        satisfying?

26. Should religious groups 
    (a) send missionaries to underdeveloped countries, or 
    (b) limit their influence to their own communities?

Go on to the next page...
27. Is the best reason for taking an eight year old child shopping
   (a) to be sure the clothes fit him properly, or
   (b) so that he can help choose the clothing he will wear?

28. When young children start to walk and pick up objects around the house, should parents
   (a) teach them not to touch objects which belong to adults, or
   (b) accept the possibility that some things may be broken or disrupted?

29. If the U.S. government were going to try to help underdeveloped countries would it be better to
   (a) supply money to be used by the countries as they saw fit, or
   (b) send necessary materials, plus personnel to oversee the work?

30. Should parents of teen-agers
   (a) allow their children to decide what to tell them about their activities, or
   (b) make certain that they know as much as possible about what their teen-agers are doing?

31. Will abolishing the death penalty
   (a) tend to increase the number of serious crimes, or
   (b) have no effect on the crime rate?

32. Would a better way to provide economic equality be to
   (a) supply ghetto communities with administrative services, or
   (b) provide financial support and allow communities to establish their own organizations?

33. If parents have reason to question the honesty of their child's friend, should they
   (a) express their disapproval but allow the child to keep the friend if he chooses, or
   (b) tell the child that he may not play with that person?

34. If parents give children spending money should it be
   (a) as an allowance, at regular intervals, or
   (b) when they have succeeded at some task such as completing their household chores?

End of this section.

Please make sure you are finished with the previous section of this booklet before going on. Do not return to previous sections once you have passed on to the next part.
Please provide the following information:

For these statements put a yes for those that best describe the religious group/church to which you belong and a no for those statements that do not:

____ A select group of influential people above me governs my entire religious group/church.

____ My religious group/church gives recognition and respect to those who have special knowledge and/or expertise.

____ In my religious group/church, necessary institutional positions are filled by people who are selected by the group as competent rather than through appointment by superiors.

____ My cooperation is maintained by fear of exclusion from the religious group/church.

____ Sufficient mechanisms exist in my religious group/church for replacement of the incompetent leader.

____ In my religious group/church, superiors ask my advice, but it seems to go unheeded.

____ In my religious group/church, decisions are made by those most affected by the outcome of the decisions.

____ In my religious group/church, defense and guarding the truth is more important than a search for truth.

____ Present leaders in my religious group/church select their own successors and appoint all top positions.

____ My religious group/church allows participation of all members in the decision-making processes.

On the following two pages, please rate your job under the various aspects given. Consider only the job that you do for your religious group/church. Do not rate other professional or occupational roles you perform apart from your work/ministry in your church or religious group.

Go on to the next page...
THE
JOB
DESCRIPTIVE
INDEX

Bowling Green State University, 1975

Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time? In the blank beside each word given below, write
for "Yes" if it describes your work
for "No" if it does NOT describe it
if you cannot decide

WORK ON PRESENT JOB

Fascinating
Routine
Satisfying
Boring
Good
Creative
Respected
Hot
Pleasant
Useful
Tiresome
Healthful
Challenging
On your feet
Frustrating
Simple
Endless
Gives sense of accomplishment

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay? In the blank beside each word, put
if it describes your pay
if it does NOT describe it
if you cannot decide

PRESENT PAY

Income adequate for normal expenses
Satisfactory profit sharing
Barely live on income
Bad
Income provides luxuries
Insecure
Less than I deserve
Highly paid
Underpaid

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe these? In the blank beside each word put
for "Yes" if it describes your opportunities for promotion
for "No" if it does NOT describe them
if you cannot decide

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION

Good opportunities for promotion
Opportunity somewhat limited
Promotion on ability
Dead-end job
Good chance for promotion
Unfair promotion policy
Infrequent promotions
Regular promotions
Fairly good chance for promotion

Please go on to the next page
Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision? In the blank beside each word below, put:
y if it describes the supervision you get on your job
n if it does NOT describe it
? if you cannot decide

SUPERVISION ON PRESENT JOB

Asks my advice
Hard to please
Impolite
Praises good work
Tactful
Influential
Up-to-date
Doesn't supervise enough
Quick tempered
Tells me where I stand
Annoying
Stubborn
Knows job well
Bad
Intelligent
Leaves me on my own
Around when needed
Lazy

Think of the majority of the people that you work with now or the people you meet in connection with your work. How well does each of the following words describe these people? In the blank beside each word below, put:
y if it describes the people you work with
n if it does NOT describe them
? if you cannot decide

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB

Stimulating
Boring
Slow
Ambitious
Stupid
Responsible
Fast
Intelligent
Easy to make enemies
Talk too much
Smart
Lazy
Unpleasant
No privacy
Active
Narrow interests
Loyal
Hard to meet

In general, how do you rate your overall satisfaction on your present job? Place a check at the appropriate place on the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW SATISFACTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turn to the next page...
Please make sure you are finished with the previous section of this booklet before going on. Do not return to previous sections once you have passed on to the next part.

In the green booklet which follows are some questions to see what interests you have and how you feel about things. On most items there are no "right" or "wrong" answers because people have the right to their own views. All you have to do is answer what is true for you.

A separate answer sheet is provided for this section. Please do not put your name on the answer sheet. Put only your age and sex. Use pencil only. Be sure each mark is black and fills the entire space. Erase completely any answer you wish to change.

First, read the four EXAMPLES below and mark your answers on the answer sheet where it says EXAMPLES. Fill in the box completely.

EXAMPLES:

1. I like to watch team games.
   a. yes,  
   b. occasionally,  
   c. no.

2. I prefer people who:
   a. are reserved,  
   b. (are) in between  
   c. make friends quickly

3. Money cannot bring happiness.
   a. yes (true),  
   b. in between,  
   c. no (false).

4. Adult is to child as cat is to:
   a. kitten, b. dog  
   c. baby.

In the last example there is a right answer--kitten. But there are very few such reasoning items.

Keep these four things in mind:

1. Give only answers that are true for you. It is best to say what you really think.

2. Don't spend too much time thinking over each question. Give the first, natural answer as it comes to you. Of course, the questions are too short to give you all the information you might like, but give the best answer you can under the circumstances.

3. Answer every question one way or the other. Don't skip any.
4. You should mark the a or c answer most of the time. Mark the middle b answer only when you feel you have to, because neither a nor c seems to be right for you.

You may begin now and continue to the end. When you have finished the green booklet, the questionnaire is completed. Mail the entire packet and answer sheet in the envelope provided.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study.

Here was inserted a copy of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Form A (1967-68 Edition R) and an answer sheet for computer scoring. These items are copyrighted by the Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Box 188, Champaign, Illinois 61820. All rights reserved.

The Hierarchical Control Scale appears in the preceding pages through the permission of Nancy Cochran, Ph.D., Northwestern University, Department of Psychology, Evanston, Illinois 60201.

The Job Description Index appears in the preceding pages through the permission of Bowling Green University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403. Permission was granted to copy the Index and to rearrange the parts for better inclusion in the packet of materials.
CONSENT FORM

In order to understand more about preferences, attitudes, and personal qualities of people committed to working for their church and/or religious group, I would like you to answer a number of questions about yourself. The results of this project will be useful to you, to your church or religious group, and to those in various disciplines which help train religious leaders.

Your answers will be kept confidential. In fact, no individual responses will be reported. Results are analyzed only as group data. However, your individual responses are needed to add accurate meaning to the group data.

Since you are not required to sign the questionnaires and forms you answer and return, you will remain completely anonymous.

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please indicate below and put your address and/or phone number and I will see that you are contacted about the outcome.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Respondent's signature:__________________________________

Date: __________________

Witness' signature:______________________________________

I would like a summary of the results of this study:_____

Send to me at:__________________________________________

_____________________________________________________

city state zip

Or phone me at:________________________________________
APPENDIX B
Percentage of Returns
### APPENDIX B

Percentage of Returns for Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>% Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Priests</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Priests</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Brothers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Ministers</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Diocesan Priests Out</th>
<th>Diocesan Priests In</th>
<th>Religious Priests Out</th>
<th>Religious Priests In</th>
<th>Religious Brothers Out</th>
<th>Religious Brothers In</th>
<th>Baptist Ministers Out</th>
<th>Baptist Ministers In</th>
<th>Total Out</th>
<th>Total In</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

Demographic Data for Subject Population

Groups: Identified by religious faith and church position.

- Catholic Diocesan Priests (DP)
- Catholic Religious Priests (RP)
- Catholic Religious Brothers (RB)
- Baptist Ministers (BM)

Ages: 35 and below, 36 to 50, 50 and above

Arrangement of group and age cells with n for each cell.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>35 -</th>
<th>36-50</th>
<th>51 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
<td><strong>240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographical Information about Subjects

- **Diocesan Priests:** 56 from New Orleans Metropolitan Area Area including Jefferson Parish 4 from the Thibodaux-Houma area

- **Religious Priests:** All 60 from New Orleans Metropolitan Area including Jefferson Parish Although selected from 14 different communities of priests, these men did not identify themselves by religious community in their response.

- **Religious Brothers:** 37 from Louisiana including: 23 from New Orleans Metropolitan Area, 7 from Thibodaux-Houma, 7 from Covington 18 from Mississippi (Bay St. Louis) 5 from Alabama (Mobile)
These men were selected from 5 different communities. Although they did not identify themselves by community in their response, the postmarks indicated they were overwhelmingly from one community dedicated almost exclusively to educational ministry.

Baptist Ministers: 45 from New Orleans Metropolitan Area including Jefferson Parish
15 from Baton Rouge
All 60 of these men belonged to the Southern Baptist Convention.

**Type of Ministry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ministry</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th></th>
<th>RP</th>
<th></th>
<th>RB</th>
<th></th>
<th>BM</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish Ministry (Pastoral)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retreat Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk (Monastery Duties)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Ministry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Years of Service as Priest, Minister or Brother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Highest Education Level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>BA/BS</th>
<th>MA/MS</th>
<th>Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One religious priest did not report his education.
## Non-native Born Citizen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Years residing in U.S.</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12, 14, 11, 9, 7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13, 10</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Convert From Another Religious Faith

- Diocesan Priests: 0
- Religious Priests: 3
- Religious Brothers: 0
- Baptist Ministers: 8
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### Appendix D

**Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on Hierarchical Control Scale for Two College Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>473</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (year)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and over</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>510</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (year)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and over</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Means and Standard Deviations of Scores on Hierarchical Control Scale for Several Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nassau County Police Officers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Enlisted Men, by Years of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yr. or less</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 6 yr.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 10 yr.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more yr.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Education Advocates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support goals &quot;very much&quot;</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support goals &quot;some&quot;</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology Students, by Preferences for Educational Milieu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Instruction</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.73</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Party Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, no preference</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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