Jesuit Educational Quarterly

MARCH 1958

Vol. XX, No. 4

Our Contributors

On January 3–4 of this year the presidents of Jesuit colleges and universities met at Georgetown University. A statement on the Current Role of Jesuit Higher Education and a summary of a discussion on Federal Aid were issued and are presented in this issue.

The article on the Georgetown Latin Project by Father Thomas R. Fitzgerald of the Novitiate of St. Isaac Jogues, Wernersville, Pennsylvania, printed in the October issue of the *Quarterly*, has been the occasion of discussion and debate. In this issue Fathers William M. A. Grimaldi and Herbert A. Musurillo of Bellarmine College, Plattsburgh, New York raise some questions about the project and Father Fitzgerald has undertaken to answer them.

Father Raymond A. Devlin of St. Ignatius High School, San Francisco, and Father Daniel J. Leahy of Wheeling College present the findings of their survey of Jesuit high school guidance programs.

How many Jesuits are laboring in the educational apostolate? Father William J. Mehok concludes his global view of Jesuit educational institutions of the world and presents his findings on Jesuit academic personnel.

Father Edward B. Rooney, President of the Jesuit Educational Association, presents his annual report on the status of the special studies program in the American Assistancy.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

March 1958

CONTENTS

THE JESUIT EDUCATIONAL QUARTERLY, published in June, October, January, and March by the Jesuit Educational Association, represents the Jesuit secondary schools, colleges, seminaries, and universities of the United States, and those conducted by American Jesuits in foreign lands.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

EDWARD B. ROONEY, S.J.

Managing Editor

RICHARD D. COSTELLO, S.J.

Advisory Board

An editorial advisory board is composed of the regional directors of education in the several Jesuit provinces:

JAMES L. BURKE, S.J.	*New England Province*
PATRICK A. DONOHOE, S.J.	*California Province*
JOSEPH K. DRANE, S.J.	*Maryland Province*
DAVID R. DRUHAN, S.J.	*New Orleans Province*
HUGH M. DUCE, S.J.	*California Province*
EUGENE F. GALLAGHER, S.J.	*Wisconsin Province*
JOSEPH C. GLOSE, S.J.	*New York Province*
ROBERT F. HARVANEK, S.J.	*Chicago Province*
JOHN F. LENNY, S.J.	*Maryland Province*
JULIAN L. MALINE, S.J.	*Detroit Province*
JEROME J. MARCHETTI, S.J.	*Missouri Province*
LORENZO K. REED, S.J.	*New York Province*
GERALD R. SHEAHAN, S.J.	*Missouri Province*
ARTHUR J. SHEEHAN, S.J.	*New England Province*
WILLIAM M. WELLER, S.J.	*Oregon Province*

ADDRESS COMMUNICATIONS TO THE EDITOR

49 East 84th Street, New York 28, N.Y.

The Current Role of Jesuit Higher Education*

The universities and colleges in the United States under the direction of members of the Jesuit Order (Society of Jesus) are part of the total educational resources of America. Twenty-eight institutions of higher learning have been developed out of a four-century old tradition of scholarship and liberal education, a tradition which has had a definite part in shaping Western culture. As America moves from today's dawn into tomorrow's full morning of the satellite age, Jesuit colleges firmly purpose to continue joining their strength with that of other American institutions in meeting the educational challenge which confronts our country.

Missiles and satellites have turned all eyes skyward. Quite naturally it is the military, the scientific, the technological aspect presented by the Soviet challenge that has captured our concern and would monopolize our energies. But here upon this planet dwell the men who launch the missiles and the satellites—for purposes of good or ill. The explosive complications and frightening responsibilities that spring from mankind's discovery of cosmic power are human and moral. Accordingly, their solution must come from within man himself. The basic response of education to today's pressures lies not in a program of better ballistics (despite its importance) but in one that produces better men. Even though technological superiority is a condition for survival, its pursuit must not blind us to our reasons for survival. Any panic-inspired aping of an alien system could quickly destroy the very values we undertake to preserve.

It is with man and his motivation then that today's educators must most deeply concern themselves. This motivation derives from a twofold awareness: a sense of the enhancement of human dignity through growth in knowledge and wisdom; and a consciousness of the spiritual obligation incumbent on each human being to develop his God-given talents.

Respect for learning begins in the home. Understanding and stimulation there will supplement the effort of the school and create an environment in which a young person can develop his talent to the full and even

---

* A statement adopted at the Meeting of the Presidents of Jesuit Colleges and Universities of the United States, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., January 3–4, 1958.

take pride in the mastery of the more demanding subjects of the curriculum. Man's natural zest to make his own the truth and beauty of the arts and sciences is an innate yearning to take continually fuller possession of the universe entrusted to him by his Creator. If this desire is constantly encouraged throughout the years of primary and secondary schools, more of our most capable high school graduates will go on to college.

Whatever weight other motives may have had in inspiring the scientific renascence that has revitalized Russian education, we must admit that respect for learning and at least some freedom in its pursuit—inconsistent though this be with totalitarian ideology—did play a notable part.

There may seem to be more efficient ways to actualize latent human talent than the unwieldy system followed in our free democratic society in which persuasion and conviction precede choice. But whatever price must be paid to surpass Soviet science and technology it must not be the surrender of democracy nor denial of the proper autonomy of the individual citizen. Free motivation must do for America what mass compulsion has done for modern Russia.

America has sore need of all her human resources today. Talent must be discovered and encouraged and, if need be, assisted wherever it may be found. There is an immediacy regarding science education which all must recognize. Science and mathematics must receive new emphasis in the curriculum and a larger proportion of our talented youth—at least for the present—should be encouraged to specialize in fields related to the urgencies of the satellite age. Jesuit education will continue and deepen its characteristic concern with scientific and mathematical disciplines.

Jesuit colleges will expand within the framework of their resources and ideals to accomodate their proper share of the large college population expected in the 1960's. Even though continuing priority will be given to financial and academic support for the 9,000 devoted faculty members of American Jesuit colleges, expansion of physical plant will also be earnestly undertaken. Within the next few years a $102 million construction program will provide 91 new buildings on Jesuit campuses. This program is possible because of the loyal support of some 600,000 alumni of Jesuit schools, generous benefactors, industry and philanthropic foundations.

In its fifth century of dedicated educational work Jesuit institutions are proud to join with other American colleges and universities in the shared task of preserving and developing for coming generations the values and ideals that have made the Western world the bastion of freedom under God.

The Georgetown Latin Project: A Query

WILLIAM M. A. GRIMALDI, S.J.
AND
HERBERT A. MUSURILLO, S.J.

The following comments and queries are not made in a spirit of contention. They are presented because of serious concern for the program of Latin study in our schools, and an even deeper concern about something which may substantially affect the education of young Jesuits. Further we are anxious that possible participants in this project (p. 116)[1] thoroughly investigate its implications.

We do not question the value of the oral-aural method for modern language study; we do question whether the scope of the method may be extended to Latin. Further we would welcome this new approach, or any other, if it would help us achieve our goal more effectively in the study of Latin. We do think, however, that this is still to be shown, and that until such a program has been seriously and honestly tested with extreme care over a period of time no attempt should be made to introduce such a program on a large scale. Twice in the past, once in Latin and once in Greek, a partially tested program has been presented with unsatisfactory results.

The whole object of the program as presented both in Fr. Fitzgerald's article and in other communications which have come to us, is effective instruction in Latin. This immediately raises a number of initial queries: is Latin instruction at present ineffective; if so, is it due to the teacher, the student, or the method? Let us assume with the Georgetown Latin Project that Latin instruction is not fully effective, and that this is due to the method. We must then ask: what guaranty is offered that the oral-aural method is the solution? Somehow or other we are made to feel that this is the answer of "modern linguistics" to the problem. This is a bit unfair. Modern linguistics as practised today is a rather large field which includes among other things structural linguistics, historical, and comparative linguistics. Consequently, we would find it helpful to know who are the "experts" in the oral-aural method who are so certain of

[1] The numbers in parentheses in this article and the following article refer to the article of Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J., "The Georgetown Latin Project," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. 2 (October 1957), pp. 113–118.

success in languages such as Latin, and, we would have to add, Greek? This should be known in order that their contribution may be studied and evaluated. And it would seem that this is the intelligent way to proceed in a matter which is going to involve radical changes in method.

Further still, we are told that "competence in languages is acquired primarily through an oral-aural method." What kind of competence? Further, is it the competence that the study of Latin in the liberal arts curriculum desires? We assume (and so presumably does Fr. Fitzgerald, p. 118) that the study of Latin in or out of a Jesuit school is directed to the intelligent, competent, study of Latin literature and, with it, Roman culture and civilization. And we seriously question that this can be achieved by the oral-aural method. Both of the present authors have had some direct experience with this method (studied as p. 116 would have it), one of us in modern Greek, the other in German and French. In all honesty it must be said that neither was directly assisted in any noticeable degree in his ability to handle contemporary literature. We have had rather extensive indirect experience with both former students and contemporaries who have, as it happens, studied both at the Georgetown Institute of Languages and at the Berlitz School, or, better still, have lived for a year and longer with native families in Italy, France, Greece, Germany, and still find difficulties in their reading. And so we do legitimately wonder about those who found that the experience "made rapid, accurate reading truly possible" (p.114).

In short the oral-aural method is neither an open sesame to language study, nor is it a panacea.

Finally we come to the nub of the whole problem. No matter what else may be said of the oral-aural technique, basic to it is the attempt to duplicate the experience which would be had by living in a foreign country, i.e. intimate, continual, and intensive acquaintance with the language of that country. Any eminent success which has been attained by the method has been the result of an extremely intensive and extensive program of work. This kind of work in Latin in our prep schools must be shown to be possible. In any of the novitiates with which we have had acquaintance it is impossible. This is a matter which should be fully explored by those concerned with this program. For if the method cannot be administered as it should be, the cure could well be worse than the curse. Further, we would like to know whether there are any statistics on hand, and is their nature such that they would validate the transference of a method used with students who already have had two or more years of formal study in the language, to students who have had none (pp. 115–6). If, on the other hand, the method is meant solely for use in Jesuit novititates then this should be unequivocally stated. And then

it would be important to know how far the interest of the academic representatives (p. 116) actually represents the considered opinion of their various faculties.

Our primary objection, then, to Father Fitzgerald's presentation is that, so it seems to us, it assumes that the Georgetown method is valid in itself and can be immediately initiated (see Phases I–III) on a larger scale without very careful, long-term testing under controlled conditions. Such testing would give us results that could then be studied, evaluated, and compared with the achievements of our traditional methods. In the final analysis our reason for this whole query is that we suspect—though we are willing to yield to clear evidence and proof—that the oral-aural method cannot be completely transferred to the study of ancient languages and literature. We fear that its concern is precisely where linguists have put it—on the fact of communication rather than on its content and its message. And yet the primary study of literature either ancient or modern (a kind of study now called by some linguists, metalinguistics) is devoted to what the literature has to say.

Now what strikes us as particularly unfortunate is the fact that just when all students of literature, armed with the tools of modern criticism (linguistic, literary and psychological), seem on the brink of new discoveries, the proponents of the oral-aural approach would set us back to the study of Latin and Greek on the purely grammatical level. For it remains true, in the modern languages as well as in the ancient ones, that the complicated message of the novel, the epic or other similar literary forms, cannot be completely attained without prolonged study of the written text. A good example of this would be the difficulty one would face if one attempted to study the plays of Shakespeare or the novels of Dostoievski with primary emphasis on the recording or the tape. For however much these devices may be indispensable to communicate certain aspects of the literature (or simply, for example, to stimulate interest at a lecture), the ultimate work of textual explication must be the primary aim of the teacher of literature so far as we can see.

Thus we are again faced with the issue: is our study of Russian, for example, to enable us to speak it fluently as it is spoken in the Soviet Union today? Or is it to enable students to come in contact, as soon as possible, with the greater works of Russian Literature? Undoubtedly both approaches must at times be combined; but if, for example, my aim is to learn to speak Russian as soon as possible, then I would indeed be wasting my time by devoting to Pushkin or Tolstoi the severe literary analysis which those authors deserve. This would seem to be the only view of the situation which can support logical inquiry.

But this involves a further point. Even our study of grammar and

usage will be influenced by our ultimate aims. For example, most modern scholars agree that there is a very wide gap between the French of literature and the French of modern conversation. And this is even more true if we are thinking of the classics of eighteenth and nineteenth century French literature. I can thus teach my class to appreciate Baudelaire and Prévost without their knowing how to conduct a conversation in a modern Paris restaurant. And, contrariwise, I would not count it against the fluent speaker of French or the graduate of the finest of oral-aural courses if he knew nothing of Valéry or Proust. It would, of course, be a pity if our graduates from literary courses knew nothing about spoken French. But it is clear that there can be, and usually is, a difference of emphasis. An even more complicated problem faces us in teaching German. There is the problem of modern conversation (which in the view of some, at least, is a fairly easy hazard); but there is also the question of modern "scientific" German, which requires quite a specialized preparation of the normal student, involving syntax and vocabulary which he might normally never meet in conversation; finally, there is the special field of literary German, from Goethe down to Kafka and Mann, the comprehension of which would demand a whole new set of skills and techniques, literary as well as linguistic, which might not be called into play in either the conversational or the scientific German course. One's aim, again, and specific needs must always determine the choice of methods in each case, and it would be folly to try to legislate for teachers and all courses what their method should be. Results, achievement are, after all, the ultimate test.

Therefore in applying the oral-aural technique to the ancient languages, we must always ask ourselves what our specific aims are. In learning Sumerian, for example, oral techniques are at their greatest disadvantage; for although we may understand the meaning of a specific set of pictograms or hieroglyphics, there is quite a controversy on how they are to be pronounced; nor, in the view of many scholars, does it matter very much, at least in the present state of our knowledge. The chief aim in the study of the hieroglyphic languages (and the ancient Achaean languages written in what is called Linear A and Linear B would seem to fall under the same principle) will be the understanding of the meaning of the written symbols, and the objects or situations to which they refer. The decipherment of Linear B by Michael Ventris promises to revolutionize our entire approach to ancient Mycenaean civilization and the whole Homeric period. Again, this is a problem which must primarily be solved by literary-linguistic techniques.

Now there is no doubt but that the study of the ancient languages

which have a very complicated noun or verb structure (Hebrew, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, to name only a few) would be immeasurably helped by the use of the tape-recorder for the memorization of the forms. But there is still no substitute for some memorization of paradigms—this at least, however artificial, is easier than memorizing all the "situations" or their language equivalents, in which the entire range of forms occurs. The memorizing of the situations (or set colloquial patterns) is more practical, and can, indeed, be considerably reduced if we are thinking of a modern language. Many people can speak perfect French without being able to conjugate the verb form fully. But this is not the point in the comprehension of an ancient language; and we must master all the forms —or at least those that more frequently occur in our *literature;* for it is the written literature, and not the narrow scope of the spoken word, which is the criterion of what grammar and syntax we are trying to learn.

In our use, therefore, of the oral technique, we must not strain the gnat and swallow the camel. It would be ridiculous, in our view, to play over and over again on a recording a long complicated period from Cicero or a difficult passage from Virgil, until the student comprehended it, when we know that he could do it much faster by having the text before his eyes. Comprehension is, after all, the norm in this case; and since the genius of our modern languages is so different from that of the ancient ones, the student moves much more quickly on the road to complete comprehension if he *sees* the complex Latin or Greek sentence and sorts out its elements in the order that he is accustomed to, that is, for example, in the order: subject-verb-object. We are here touching on a very delicate problem; but surely, so far as comprehension is concerned, there is no need for the student to strain to catch by ear, as a Latin presumably would have done, the complicated structure of Horace's

nunc et latentis proditor intimo
gratus puellae risus ab angulo;

although he may, once he has struggled with the written text and comprehended its meaning, memorize the poem for oral delivery. But, to repeat, there seems to be no solid advantage in bypassing the very obvious and useful method of the classic textual approach.

In conclusion, therefore, our whole attempt in this discussion has been to urge prudence and discretion in the adoption of what may be, even for Latin studies, very useful techniques. But one must always be ready to discuss the advantages of the older, tested methods before we reject them. Indeed, our teaching of the ancient languages and of every subject in our curriculm must always be open to new and established gains in

the field of educational technique. But, as we have tried to point out, the Georgetown method still needs to undergo a period of controlled testing on a restricted basis. Our own view is that in the teaching of the ancient literatures we still have not fully utilized the findings of modern psychology and the new literary theory in our comprehension of the subtlety, symbolism and depth of the ancient pagan and Christian writers. If we wish to open up to our students the entire world of literature with its yet unsounded depths, we must use every proven, available tool and even invent new ones if necessary. But if we are too quick to reject older methods or are over-eager in our use of new ones, we shall run the danger of frustrating those very results which all of us so ardently strive for today.

A Reply to the Query

Thomas R. Fitzgerald, S.J.

Knowing that my article "The Georgetown Latin Project" provoked, in various places, both strong partisanship and rather strident antagonism, I am grateful that the two faculty members of Plattsburgh have approached the topic in a way that will make reasonable discourse possible. The moderate manner in which Father Grimaldi and Father Musurillo present their objections surely invites an equally courteous reply.

Much of the disagreement seems to stem merely from misunderstandings though there are two or three areas of raw collision. May the following pages sweep away the misunderstandings and at least delineate clearly the terrain of conflict.

I. The Basic Misconception

Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo insist upon the importance, nowadays, of the "tools of modern criticism (linguistic, literary and psychological)." They urge that there be utilized "the findings of modern psychology and the new literary theory in our comprehension of the subtlety, symbolism and depth of the ancient pagan and Christian writers." From these and similar statements only one conclusion seems possible. Father Grimaldi and Father Musurillo are presuming that not only novices but juniors would be obliged to study Latin according to the oral-aural method. This

I categorically deny, and certainly the Georgetown Project does not today envisage such an arrangement. If my exposé in any way occasioned this misunderstanding of the Georgetown program, I apologize. Because of this misconception Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo in a large portion of their article are tilting against a phantom.

Juniors would study Latin according to the same methods and techniques that are presently being employed. In particular I applaud the efforts of the Plattsburgh faculty and of many classicists (President Goheen of Princeton being a well known example) to apply to the ancient authors the methods of the New Criticism. I agree with Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo that students of literature, "armed with the tools of modern criticism (linguistic, literary and psychological), seem on the brink of new discoveries." What I cannot accept is their next statement, that "proponents of the oral-aural approach would set us back to the study of Latin on the purely grammatical level." I do not propose that Virgil, Cicero or Horace be studied from tapes rather than from the printed page. Nor do I hold that the ultimate objective of a juniorate Latin class is conversational Latin. Therefore what Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo have to say about the distinction between, for example, conversational French and literary French, and about aim and specific needs determining one's choice of methods, is certainly true but scarcely relevant.

The problem rather is with my expression "competence in languages" (p. 113). Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo want a definition of this competence, and they question whether it is "the competence that the study of Latin in the liberal arts curriculum desires." I had paraphrased competence in languages as facility in a language (p. 114), proficiency in reading (p. 115), and facility in reading (p. 117), but since obscurity remains I must try to clarify my position. By competence in languages I mean a reading ability in Latin equivalent to that possessed, as regards English, by a normal, twelve- or thirteen-year old parochial school student. This reading ability I shall henceforth call literacy, realizing of course that the term ordinarily also includes a basic writing skill, and sometimes signifies a high degree of learning. In speaking of literacy and literates I shall be referring only to the basic reading ability.

Literacy makes possible, at the first level of meaning, the comprehension of a text. It does not, of itself, give the student the further insights and perspectives which literary appreciation involves. Thus the merely literate student of Latin may almost totally fail in literary perception. If such be the case, he has not achieved an "intelligent, competent study of Latin literature and with it Roman culture and civilization," to quote Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo. For his grasp of meaning on a second

and more profound level no doubt " the findings of modern psychology and the new literary theory" will be of assistance.

But my attention is focused rather on the problem of literacy. If the student is, as regards Latin, virtually illiterate, able to understand Latin at the first level of meaning not at all or only imperfectly and after tortuous struggle, an enormous barrier stands between him and literary appreciation. What can be done about the problem of virtual illiteracy among Latin students? If this problem does not exist among the novices at Plattsburgh, then they and their teachers are indeed blessed. Such an idyllic condition surely does not prevail either in most novitiates in this country or in most of our colleges.

Our discussion should center upon this problem of virtual illiteracy. I do not see how literary appreciation is truly possible unless the illiteracy is removed. For resolving this problem among novices an oral-aural technique, if employed with professional competence, seems to offer greater promise than our present methods of instruction. If experience confirms this statement, then we should be willing to reappraise our Latin instruction on the high-school level (p. 118).

II. Three Areas of Conflict

Our real point of disagreement, I think, is on the nature of language-learning. Leonard Bloomfield has strongly influenced all American work in linguistics. His basic principle is that language- learning on the elementary level primarily consists in the *acquisition of habits*. A framework of automatic response must be built up. This cannot be done through the memorizing of abstract rules unless there is much practice in applying them. By repeated application of the rules habits can be formed, but for maximum efficiency an oral-aural technique should be employed.

It is not possible in these few pages to offer proofs for Bloomfield's basic principle. As far as I know, American linguists today take it for granted that the principle has been established beyond all reasonable doubt. So I refer those who wish to examine the evidence to Bloomfield's more important works.[1] The notion that elementary language-learning is primarily a matter of habits rather than of reasoning processes goes hard with all of us. Apparently Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo do not accept this principle, if I may judge by the general tenor of their remarks and particularly by what they say concerning the "memorizing of all the 'situations'". If however, we are going to deny the principle, then we had better gather some experimental evidence.

---

[1] Confer especially *Introduction to the Study of Language,* New York: Holt, 1913.

From this first point of conflict between the two Plattsburgh professors and myself a second follows. Not admitting the paramount importance of acquired habits for the achievement of literacy, Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo logically deny that an oral-aural method is the most effective way of coming into contact, as soon as possible, with the greater works of literature. But the source of our disagreement is back in the premise that asserts the importance of acquired habits, so there is little point in arguing about the conflict between our conclusions. It is not, of course, my intention to deny that the study of grammar, graded readings, and theme work can assist in the achievement of literacy. But I think that the oral-aural method also has a function, and a very significant one, in this quest.

A third disagreement centers around the amount of intensive and extensive work that the oral-aural technique would demand of novices. Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo assert that novices cannot possibly give to Latin the amount of time and effort that is requisite. To this the following qualifications are offered:

a) Americans employ more or less their own English sounds in pronouncing Latin. It is thus unnecessary to go through the extended phase of sound reproduction that is essential to, let us say, the army language program at Monterey.

b) Most novices, so far at least, have always had a couple of years Latin before admittance to the Society. Therefore they are not absolute beginners in the study of this language.

c) As long as any novice is employing the oral-aural system, he will not be able to study other subjects such as Greek or modern languages. The four or five class periods and four or five study periods of each week certainly will have to be devoted exclusively to Latin. The oral-aural drill, presumably, will be completed sometime during the first year of novitiate, but meanwhile the study of other subjects will have to be postponed.

d) The rather frequent emotional stress that makes it so difficult for novices to study during the earlier months of the religious life will, presumably, present less of an obstacle to the oral-aural method in which the emphasis will be upon acquisition of habits rather than upon reasoning processes.

Can oral-aural drill at the high-school level be sufficiently intensive and extensive? This is a more agonizing problem, but recent achievements by a few high schools in modern language study—the proper electronic equipment having been utilized—offer a basis for restrained optimism.

III. Two Further Misunderstandings

"We do think, however . . . that until such a program has been seriously tested with extreme care over a period of time no attempt should be

made to introduce such a program on a large scale." This caution, expressed several times by Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo in their paper, is based, I believe, upon two misconceptions.

First is the supposition that no serious work has as yet been accomplished in applying oral-aural methods to the teaching of Latin. As a matter of fact Professor Waldo E. Sweet, of the University of Michigan classics' department, has been working in this field since 1951. In 1952 and again in 1953 he directed workshops for Latin teachers. The participants assisted him in putting together *Experimental Materials,* two volumes that were subsequently used in a number of schools throughout the country. On the basis of classroom experience these volumes were substantially revised, whence resulted Sweet's *Latin: A Structural Approach,* published in the autumn of 1957. Furthermore Sweet's materials are at this moment being utilized at Milford Novitiate. It is said that Los Gatos Novitiate is working along the same lines, and that the structural approach has been introduced into the high schools of the California Province, but on this my information is not firsthand. It would appear that the time has come to participate in this effort to apply structural linguisitics to Latin instruction, and that prudence does not demand any further delay. Incidentally this Georgetown Project was proposed to the juniorate deans at Georgetown on Easter Monday, 1955, and they were invited to visit and examine The Institute of Languages and Linguistics. Discussion should not be interminable, and after three years it ought to be possible to take action without being guilty of excessive eagerness.

A second misunderstanding concerns the extent and precipitance of the Georgetown Project. Georgetown plans to limit itself, until September 1958, to preparing a course for novices. Only during the second year (Phase II), will the University attempt to deal with Latin at the high-school level, and it is frankly recognized that this undertaking will be much more difficult. During a third and perhaps subsequent years (Phase III) the new courses will be re-examined and revised as necessary. These Phases, which are described briefly in my original article (pp. 115–16) and which will consume three or more years, would seem to embody that "prudence and discretion" which Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo urge. Furthermore it is precisely because this undertaking is so difficult that no effort is being made to apply, just now, structural linguistics to the teaching of Ancient Greek. One language at a time!

IV. Minor Disagreements

Fr. Grimaldi and Fr. Musurillo state that oral-aural techniques are of little avail in the study of Sumerian and of the ancient languages written

in Linear A and Linear B Script.[2] With this I certainly agree, and would be willing to add the names of the equally esoteric Hittite, Akkadian, and Ugaritic. But because difficulties peculiar to these various languages preclude the employment of an oral-aural technique, we should not universalize to all ancient language, particularly to Latin.

I further agree that "the decipherment of Linear B by Michael Ventris promises to revolutionize our entire approach to ancient Mycenaean civilization and the whole Homeric period." But I do not see the relevance of the next sentence: "Again, this is a problem which must primarily be solved by literary-linguistic techniques." Surely Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo do not wish to imply that we will achieve our literary aims by adopting, in the juniorates, the methods of cryptography so successfully used by Ventris.[3]

Nor can they wish to imply that any literature, in the restricted sense, has been discovered among the 4000 Linear B tablets now available. Mycenaean Greek, so far, consists only of inventories. To quote a typical tablet: "So many (in all): thirty and a half pairs of old wheels, fit for driving; twelve pairs of old wheels for Followers (?), thirty-two pairs of wheels of Zakynthian type."[4]

Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo raised another objection. "We must then ask what guaranty is offered that the oral-aural method is the solution. Somehow or other we are made to feel that this is the answer of 'modern linguistics' to the problem. This is a bit unfair . . . Consequently we would find it helpful to know who are the 'experts' in the oral-aural method who are so certain of success in languages such as Latin (and we would have to add Greek)." I did not wish to convey vague feelings about "modern linguistics." What I said was that experts of the Georgetown Institute of Languages and Linguistics state that these linguistic techniques can be applied to the teaching of Latin (p. 115). One of these experts was mentioned by name.

Finally Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo write: "Further we would like to know whether there are any statistics on hand, and is their nature such that they would validate the transference of a language method used with students who already have had two or more years of formal study in the language to students who have had none (pp. 115–6)." This re-

---

[2] An inchoate philologian cannot but take umbrage when the language of Linear A is classified as Achaean, for some might then be led to believe that it is surely Greek. We must, however, wait upon its decipherment before knowing with certainty whether it is Greek or even Indo-European. Indeed, the claim has been seriously made, in recent months, that the language is Akkadian. Confer *Archaeology* 10 (1957), pp. 281–282.

[3] For a description of these methods confer Michael Ventris and John Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge: at the University Press, 1956, pp. 14–23.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 374.

quest puzzles me, for most oral-aural work in the modern language field has been done with those who had no previous formal study in the particular language.

V. Agreements and Conclusions

Father Grimaldi and Father Musurillo hold that the primary objectives of our Latin study are literary and cultural, not grammatical. From here a hearty Amen. With them I maintain that grammatical analysis is only a means to the primary objectives.

My first article was based upon the unexpressed premise that today Latin instruction is not fully effective. This position the two Plattsburgh professors seem to accept, albeit a little begrudgingly. Therefore I shall not belabor this point,—the small number of Arts degrees being granted by most of our colleges certainly indicates Latin has ceased to be the badge of a Jesuit college education.

With Fathers Grimaldi and Musurillo I agree that the real problem lies not with teacher or student but with method. But I do not wish to imply that the more traditional method is of itself invalid or intrinsically faulty. Rather the times are changing; Latin is not being given and cannot be given that dominant position it once held in our curricula. More subjects must now be studied, and some of them have, for quite a few years, been gaining in importance and urgency. There is no indication that this trend will be reversed. In this day of Sputniks all signs intimate that the natural sciences and mathematics will get an increasingly prominent role in our curricula, whether we like it or not. If there are now at hand new methods that will simplify the process of learning languages, let us utilize these methods. In an era when the student will necessarily give less time to Latin, every effort must be made to compensate for this time deficiency with streamlined techniques.

As was recently observed, that obscure location in the curriculum to which Sanskrit previously laid sole claim is in real danger of having a second tenant, Greek. And Greek's old position of lesser eminence has been taken over by the former lord of the liberal arts college, Latin. All of us engaged in teaching Latin and Greek are concerned over the decline in classical studies. To Father Grimaldi and Father Musurillo, both personal friends, I am grateful for this opportunity to have an open and candid dialogue on these problems that concern all of us. We dispute not over the ultimate aims, but over the best means to the end. If there be any Latin teacher who believes that the position of classical studies is unimpaired and that all is well, to him I say: it's later than you think.

Survey of Jesuit High-School Guidance Programs

RAYMOND A. DEVLIN, S.J.
AND
DANIEL J. LEAHY, S.J.

During the school year 1955–1956 a questionnaire was submitted to all the Jesuit high schools in the United States in an endeavor to get a picture of the guidance programs in operation. The counselors and principals generously cooperated with the survey, and an analysis of their replies has been made. A copy of the questionnaire and a digest of the replies are given at the end of this article. The questionnaire was, for the most part, based on the study of guidance made by the Fordham Guidance Institute in the summer of 1949.[1]

The Institute considered educational, vocational, and personal guidance, the last named embracing, for the purposes of the Institute's program, moral, spiritual, and psychological factors. Besides exploring in some detail these individual elements of a guidance and counseling service in our high schools, colleges, and universities, the Institute strongly recommended the systematic organization of them all. As Father Bunn stated in his report to the annual meeting of the Jesuit Educational Association on April 10, 1950:

> I feel that our primary aim was achieved, namely, the awareness of the need for an organized program of guidance. How this awareness will be translated into the establishment of such a program in all our schools will depend on the energy and influence of the men who attended the Institute, the cooperation of our administrators and the continuous training of new candidates. I feel that most of our places have at present the agencies needed for such an organization. The difficulty or rather the task is to put these elements together as an organized group under one head. This group would have the management and execution of the student personnel program.[2]

The questionnaire sought to obtain information about the use of the counseling instruments recommended by the Institute; and in particular, about the degree of systematic organization that existed between the

---

[1] Jesuit Educational Association, Executive Committee, *A Complete Jesuit Guidance Program . . . Jesuit Guidance Institute, Fordham University, Summer, 1949.* Edited by Rev. Thomas A. McGrath, S.J., under direction of Rev. Edward B. Bunn, S.J., Washington, Georgetown University, 1951. (The supply of this publication seems to have been exhausted.)

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. xxi.

various counseling agencies, educational, vocational, and religious. Thus, the questions asked were divided into the following categories:

I. Personal data
II. Organization
III. Religious guidance
IV. Educational guidance
V. Pre-induction guidance
VI. Vocational guidance
VII. Guidance testing program
VIII. Evaluation

The questionnaire contained eighty-two separate questions, most of them answerable by a simple yes or no. For the expenditure of time which the respondents had to make in answering, it was felt that the project would serve a multiple purpose. Besides revealing the actual guidance picture in our high schools, the questionnaire was comprehensive enough to serve as a checklist for evaluating a school's guidance practices. As a matter of fact, at least one school made the questionnaire the program of a counselors' meeting to review the practices in the school.

A pilot study in the high schools of the California Province in November, 1955, uncovered no serious weaknesses in the questionnaire; so it was distributed to all the Jesuit high schools of the country in February, 1956.

Two copies of the questionnaire were sent to the principals; they were invited to fill out one themselves and to transmit the other to the counselors for answering. In the case of two schools, where the counselors did not respond, the principals' answers in their entirety were used. In other cases, the principals' answers supplemented the responses of the counselors.

Replies were received from 66 of the 94 counselors listed by the Jesuit Educational Association in a tabulation given to the authors, and from 12 principals for a total of 78 reports. They represented 33 out of the 41 high schools then in operation. The schools represented were distributed by provinces as follows:

Province	*Total Number of Schools*	*Total Number of Schools Represented in Replies*
New England	4	2
New York	8	7
Maryland	5	4
New Orleans	4	2
Chicago	3	2
Detroit	2	2
Wisconsin	3	3
Missouri	3	3
California	4	4
Oregon	5	4
Total	41	33

Before applying the results of the questionnaire to the entire country, one must first ask whether the response represented a broad enough sample. Regarding the number of schools replying, the question can be answered affirmatively since the response represented 80 percent of the schools. Whether the sample is representative for those provinces where only a 50 percent response was made is another question.

Is the sample representative as far as counselors is concerned? It will be recalled that 70 percent of them replied; but the question may still be asked whether only those answered who regarded their guidance procedures as successful or whether there was any pronounced bias in this respect. It may be inferred that the sample was not biased in favor of successful systems, since in answer to the direction, "Please give an objective appraisal of the over-all effectiveness of your present guidance program," the opinions expressed showed a somewhat normal distribution from good to bad, as will be seen below in section VIII.

I. Counselors' Personal Data

The median length of service of counselors in the schools came to 4 years. That is to say, the average counselor had been counseling for 4 years, either in the school he was in at the time of the survey, or in other schools besides. As to professional training, about 41 of the counselors stated that they had had some professional training, while the rest reported none. In this connection, it is interesting to note that two non-Jesuit counselors reported in the survey. One was a vocational (non-religious) specialist, with some credits in guidance work, who handled the vocational counseling in the school. The other, a layman psychologist on the staff, had four years of graduate studies in psychology, and at one time had been the staff psychologist at a Naval Hospital.

Revealing was the teaching load that counselors were carrying in addition to their guidance duties. The following table shows the number of grades (9, 10, 11, 12) that they counsel, together with the number of hours of teaching:

Number of Grades Counseled	*Number of Counselors*	*Average Number of Class Hours Taught*
1	30	15
2	17	7
3	2	16
all 4	17	7
Total	66	

Thus, the typical counselor was assigned only one grade to advise and taught 15 hours of class besides.

II. Organization of the Guidance Program

In order to bring clearly into view the organization of the guidance program in the high schools, the next block of questions dealt with the co-ordination of the various officials concerned with counseling in the school. The questionnaire asked for information on the specialization of functions, on the records kept to assure continuity, and on the means used to achieve coordination of all factors in the program.

All the counselors acknowledged that it was clearly recognized in their schools that the Principal, under the Rector, was responsible for all phases of guidance. As for the question whether immediate responsibility for various phases of counseling was vested in separate officials, the majority of schools reported that this was the case. The following table shows how these various functions were divided between officials in the 23 schools with this specialization:

Function	*Student Counselor (Spiritual Father)*	*Principal*	*Various Officials*
Religious, spiritual, personal . .	19	–	4
Educational	3	11	9
Vocational	10	4	9
Guidance testing	3	8	12

The division of functions was not, however, clear-cut in all cases. In the table the column headed "various officials" indicates that the authority was shared by more than one official.

The use of specialists at least to some extent was fairly common. A number of schools reported that they used the neighboring Jesuit college psychological testing bureaus not only for testing, but also for counseling purposes, especially vocational. Two schools had vocational counselors as such. About 70 percent of all schools had physicians associated with the school, but only 45 percent had a psychologist thus associated, whose services were readily available.

The "class-teacher" or the homeroom guidance system was by no means universal as an auxiliary part of the guidance program, for only 17 out of the 33 schools in the survey reported such a system. As might be expected, where the class teacher was relied on to carry part of the counseling function, one student counselor was usually assigned to undertake counseling of all four years, but this was not always the case. Usually the homeroom or class teachers were responsible to the principal in the

matter of guidance. In some schools, the first 15 minutes of the first class-period were devoted to counseling by the teacher.

However, the majority of the schools had no set period for counseling by the class teacher. Most of the comments submitted by counselors in the survey mentioned the fact that the effectiveness of the counseling done by class teachers was limited by the haphazardness of the procedure, since a good deal of the program and its application was left up to the judgment of the teacher, who was often preoccupied with other duties. Often, too, if a homeroom period was assigned for counseling, it was often taken up with fringe activities such as ticket selling.

What use was made of group counseling aside from the class-teacher system? Only 18 out of the 33 schools reported it was in use regularly; in most schools it was used sporadically. This type of counseling usually was done for the students grouped according to the grade they were in. In many cases, any group guidance was given in the religion or other class periods. The subject matter of these group talks covered the whole range of counseling—retreat preparation, morals, motivation and habits of study, manners, preparation for the armed services, religious vocations, career choices, norms for college entrance requirements, and scholarships. The counselors and the principals usually conducted these talks.

A specialized type of group counseling—the orientation program for incoming freshmen—was reported by 18 schools.

The survey next considered the operation of the individual counseling system, and asked whether interviews were systematically arranged for all students, or only certain classes. The counselors reported that almost all schools had a system of regularly scheduled interviews, and students were obliged to present themselves for these interviews. However, not all schools had prescribed interviews for all students, as the following table shows:

Grades Systematically Interviewed	*Number of Schools*
All years	22
Senior and junior	4
Senior only	2
Three years (unspecified)	2
Total	30

As to the frequency of the interviews, the counselors reported that these occurred twice each year, on the average. Usually they took place during regular class periods.

In an organized counseling system it is evident that some records of

the student should be kept available for the counselors to insure continuity and coordination of counseling functions. The Fordham Guidance Institute recommended that these records be cumulative. In this survey it was found that in only about half the schools did the counselors keep such records. Usually they included such data as entrance test scores, grades, rank in class, and information about parents, but not always were such records kept up to date on a cumulative basis. In many cases the information was kept on cards in the principals' offices only.

Again, in only half the schools did the counselors make up case studies of problem students, and most of these studies were made informally, in consultation among officials. At that, such studies were made rarely.

If a guidance program is to be an organized program, the question of coordination of all factors is worth investigating. Therefore the question was asked: "If more than one person is assigned to the guidance program, which official is responsible for coordinating the activities of the program?" This was the response:

Official	*Number of Schools*
Counselor	13
Principal	14
Director of guidance	1
Unspecified	5
Total	33

After these preliminary questions on the organization of the guidance program in general, the questionnaire moved on to specific areas of counseling, and asked for information on the methods used to give religious, educational, and vocational guidance. The replies are summarized in the following sections.

III. Religious Guidance

The Sodality, the annual closed retreat for seniors, the school retreat, and efforts to secure vocations to the priesthood and brotherhood were all considered as special aspects of the religious counseling program, and questions about them were included. Practically all counselors regarded the students' annual retreat as a form of religious guidance. About 80 percent of the schools had a senior closed retreat, and 8 of these schools had closed retreats, for other groups in the student body, most commonly for sodality members.

The relationship of the Sodality to the guidance program was indicated by the fact that in about 20 out of the 33 schools in the survey, the same

officials, the student counselors, direct both programs. Where there was more than one Sodality in the school, the senior student counselor coordinated the activities of the Sodalities.

A number of ways to stimulate vocations were included in the questionnaire, and most of the counselors reported that they were using them, such as direct suggestions to likely candidates, talks on vocations by Ours and members of other religious congregations and orders, as well as "Vocation Week" programs.

IV. Educational Guidance

In this area of the survey the questions centered around the guidance of deficient students and the means used to stimulate all students to optimum performance in studies. Included also were questions about precollege guidance.

First, as to the counseling of those deficient in studies. Failing students are easy to spot, and means can be taken to help them in the usual ways. It is not always as easy to discover those students who are working far short of their capacity. According to the reports from the counselors, only about half the schools made any formal studies of the relationship between an individual student's known scholastic ability and his achievement as measured by school grades.

When it comes to specific measures to help the deficient student, it appears that about 45 percent of the schools maintained after-school study hall to encourage and help them. Much the same picture is shown with regard to remedial courses; only 15 schools gave special courses in reading, 10 in study methods, 9 in English grammar, 12 in Latin, and 13 in mathematics.

Educational counseling presents a more active scene when we move on to look at efforts designed to help our students choose a college and to show them where to obtain scholarship aid. Practically all schools gave group talks to seniors about college entrance requirements; about two-thirds of them also gave them to juniors to start them thinking early about college life. Likewise, nearly all schools interviewed individuals in order to check credits and courses required for specific college programs. This was done in the junior year in about 10 schools, in the senior year in 13 schools, and in some others, even earlier.

In counseling the students to make a wise choice of college, the schools have found it helpful to make available to them a collection of college catalogs, which are usually placed in the student counselor's office. On the other hand, only a few (10) had a "College Night" program, at which college representatives could come and set forth their policies and op-

portunities. Apart from college night programs, most schools had the practice of permitting college representatives to address their students. In the academic year 1954–1955, the schools on the average had about 3 such college speakers, most of them from Jesuit colleges.

All of our schools, it seems, post opportunities for scholarships on the bulletin boards, and about two-thirds of them had special programs to help prepare the students for scholarship examinations. One school had a special class which met every morning at 8:10 for this purpose; another had informal refresher sessions in College Board subjects; still another school urged all seniors and juniors to take the College Entrance Examination Board examinations.

Finally the questionnaire sought to learn what was being done to get our graduates to go to Catholic colleges. The questionnaire listed a number of such means: group talks on the value of Catholic college education; encouraging alumni now in Catholic colleges to return to school to discuss their advantages; efforts to arrange scholarships to Catholic colleges; and maintenance of good liaison with local and regional Catholic colleges. Nearly all schools reported that they were making these particular efforts, except that only about half the schools asked alumni to return to talk to the students.

A variety of other means were used to interest the students in entering a Catholic college. There were editorials in the school paper, publicity via the bulletin boards, Sodality projects, class talks, distribution of literature such as the Dulles pamphlet, and visits to nearby Catholic colleges. In one school each boy was given a catalog to a local Catholic college in his junior year. Some schools used delaying tactics in some cases by requiring a note from parents, or a personal interview with them; and these efforts, it is said, often resulted in a change of heart. Several schools sent letters to all parents on the value and necessity of a Catholic college education.

V. Pre-Induction Guidance

It seems that in the case of guidance for entrance into military life, the schools were quite active, for nearly all counselors in the survey reported that they provided the students with information about the current provisions of the Selective Service Law, opportunities in the various branches of the Armed Forces, and possibilities in the ROTC program. A comparatively small number of schools, on the other hand, had any special program of preparation for older students who faced immediate induction soon after graduation. A few schools reported that they had panel discussions to explain life in the Service, but for most schools the need did not seem urgent, since most of their graduates went on to college.

VI. Vocational Guidance (Other Than Religious)

The Fordham Guidance Institute made a strong recommendation that the high school provide counseling for careers, and remarked that an efficient high-school guidance program should send most of the boys on to college with some idea of their future careers. It noted that this would give the student an incentive for serious work in his studies.[3] With this in mind, the questionnaire sought to determine what measures were used to implement a vocational counseling program. The questions dealt with such means as the provision of information about careers by pamphlets, informative talks by outside speakers, tours of industrial plants, and other businesses, and perhaps a general round-up by means of a "Vocational Week" or month.

It was found that in 32 out of the 33 schools, the students were tested for vocational interest, and in the same number of schools the students were interviewed to discover their vocational interests. This was done in the senior year in 12 schools, in the junior year in 12 others; and other schools had these interviews.

Nearly all schools provided collections of career pamphlets for their students, available usually in the student counselors' offices. Asked in the survey to list the various manuals on careers which they had found useful, most counselors named the Science Research Associates series, but with the caution that some of their pamphlets on dating and marriage were not in accord with Catholic morality. Father Lord's pamphlets were recommended by a good number, next in popularity being a series published by Manhattan College, New York.

As far as providing information and incentive for choosing a career by having outside speakers address the student body, it seems that this means had caught on with only about half the schools. The schools which did have outside speakers reported having about 6 speakers on the average during the academic year 1954–1955. Few schools arranged to have their students make tours of local industries, aside from visits made by science clubs. The picture is not much different with respect to a general campaign such as a "Vocation Week" or month. Only about 12 out of the 33 schools in the survey had such programs.

As might be expected from the nature of our course, very few schools had job placement service, either for terminal students, or for alumni.

---

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

VII. Guidance Testing Programs

It will be recalled that the Fordham Guidance Institute recommended a minimal testing program for high schools. This included three tests before entrance: an intelligence test, and arithmetic and English tests. Shortly after entrance there should be a reading test, and at the end of third year, or at the beginning of fourth, an interest inventory, and an aptitude test.[4]

Every school included in the survey, with one exception, had some sort of testing program. The counselors were asked if, in their opinion, the guidance testing programs in their schools were systematic, and in 23 out of the 33 schools, they replied in the affirmative on this point. There follows a tabulation of the types of tests used.

	Number of Schools	
Test	*Having Test*	*Not Having Test*
Intelligence	32	1
Reading ability	25	8
Vocational interest	32	1
Personality or adjustment	13	20
Specific ability	17	16

VIII. Evaluation of the Guidance Program by the Counselors and Principals

The last section of the questionnaire asked for a general appraisal of the guidance program in the school by the principal and counselors. They were somewhat restrained in their appraisals, indicating that they believed that their programs were on the whole good, but could stand improvement. The following table gives the range of critical opinion in response to the question: "Please give an objective appraisal of the over-all effectiveness of your present guidance program."

Number of Counselors and Principals	*Rating of School Guidance Set-up*
7	Very effective
18	Quite effective
29	Satisfactory
10	Rather unsatisfactory
3	Very unsatisfactory
11	No opinion given
78	Total

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 36–37.

The counselors and principals provided some particulars of their appraisals by supplying the answers to various other questions. They were asked which phase of the guidance program they considered most effective, and so also with the phase they considered least effective, and why it was ineffective. With regard to improvements, the questionnaire asked for a list of major reforms which had been introduced within the last three years, and what improvements were planned for the future.

There was no doubt which part of the guidance program the counselors and principals considered most effective; it was the opportunity provided in the interview to talk to a priest. Next after the interview they rated the spiritual program most effective.

When it came to the aspects of the counseling program considered least effective there was little unanimity, for almost every part of the guidance program came in for its share of criticism. What were the reasons for this lack of effectiveness? There seemed little doubt that it had to do with the problem of personnel; there were too few counselors, and there was not enough time to interview the student body adequately. A number of counselors criticized the lack of professional training in themselves, and this together with a lack of appreciation of counseling aims on the part of teachers and officials was a block to good guidance programs.

Lastly, in answering the question about the improvements made in the last few years and plans for future improvement, the counselors and principals stated that they have been trying to improve the personnel situation by assigning more counselors and by improving their training. Major reforms were planned in guidance testing, remedial programs, and group guidance and homeroom counseling programs.

It may be well to mention the fact that a majority of counselors and principals neglected to answer this question about major improvements being planned. A table showing the number of counselors and principals omitting answers in this section follows:

Evaluation Question	*Number Not Responding*
Overall appraisal of program	11
Most effective phase of program	15
Least effective phase of program	26
Major obstacles to counseling	24
Improvements in last three years	30
Improvements planned	48

It will be recalled that 78 counselors and principals filled in the questionnaires. It may be that a majority of the counselors preferred to leave the description of improvements to the principals, but not all of the principals returned questionnaires.

IX. Summary and Conclusion

This survey tried to find out some of the facts about the organization of the high school guidance program and to discover what systematic aids to a thorough coverage of the student body were employed. It also sought to find out whether our counselors were using at least the commonly accepted procedures in counseling their students.

A summary table showing the number of schools using various technical aids to the program will perhaps be of value in getting an over-all picture:

	Number of Schools with this Feature
Specialization of counseling	23
Class-teacher counseling	17
Group counseling	18
All students interviewed	22
Cumulative records	18
Comparison of grades and scholastic ability	17
Guidance testing	32

When we turn to particular features of the educational, religious, and vocational guidance program, we find that about 80 percent of the schools had senior closed retreats and regarded these as part of the counseling program. On the educational side, nearly all schools had group talks about college entrance requirements, and interviewed their students to check their records for college. Nearly all had college catalogs available for the use of the boys. Only 45 percent of the schools had after-school study hall for deficient students, or had any remedial courses for them. Only about 10 schools had "College Nights". About two-thirds of the schools had special programs to prepare students for scholarship examinations.

Nearly all schools gave information on Selective Service and opportunities in the ROTC. Not much special preparation for students facing immediate induction was thought necessary.

As for vocational counseling, we find that nearly all schools provided collections of pamphlets about careers, and nearly all had vocational testing and interviewed the students about their careers. Only about half the schools had any program of informative talks by successful business men, or arranged tours of local industries. Only about 12 schools had "Career Days" or months.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN SURVEY OF JESUIT HIGH SCHOOL GUIDANCE PROGRAM

Editorial Notes: Where it was convenient, answers to the questions shown below have been summarized and placed after the question, using the coding shown below. Some of the answers submitted by the respondents were not in usable form, and some were contradictory to other answers. In these cases the replies were edited where possible. Not all respondents answered all questions.

Coding: S: school C: counselor Y: Yes N: No

Reporting data:

Number of counselors reporting: 66
Number of principals reporting: 12
Number of schools represented in these replies: 33

I. *Personal Data*

1. Name of Counselor

2. Name of School

3. How many years have you been a counselor, in this or other schools? *4 (median)*

4. What professional preparation for guidance and counseling have you had?

Attended guidance institutes, 12 C; Master's or Doctor's degree, 4 C; other courses in psychology, counseling, and allied fields, 23 C; other preparation, 2 C; none, 27 C.

5. What year, or years, of high school do you counsel? *cf. text.*

6. In addition to counseling, how many class periods a week do you teach? *cf. text.*

II. *Organization*

7. In your school is it clearly and practically recognized that the principal, under the rector, is responsible for all phases of guidance? *68 C, Y.*

8. Is immediate responsibility for various phases of guidance vested in separate officials? *23 S, Y.*

9. If yes, designate by title the officials responsible for these phases:

9A. Religious, spiritual, personal *19 S, counselor; 4 S, various.*

9B. Educational *3 S, counselor; 11 S, principal; 9 S, various.*

9C. Vocational *10 S, counselor; 4 S, principal; 9 S, various.*

9D. Guidance Testing *3 S, counselor; 8 S, principal; 12 S, various.*

9E. Other (specify)

10. Is a physician associated with the school and readily available as a consultant? *23 S, Y.*

11. Is a psychologist associated with the school, and readily available as a consultant? *15 S, Y.*

12. If more than one person is assigned to the guidance program, which official is responsible for co-ordinating the activities of the program? *13 S, counselor; 14 S, principal; 1 S, Director of Guidance; 5 S, unspecified.*

13. What means are taken to achieve this co-ordination?:

13A. Regularly scheduled consultation? *13 S, Y.*

13B. Written reports? *11 S, Y.*

13C. Written directives? *14 S, Y.*

13D. Informal chats? *29 S, Y.*

13E. Other (specify)?

14. Is there a homeroom system, or a "class-teacher" system of guidance? *17 S, Y.*

15. Is a special period in the school day or school week assigned for homeroom or class-teacher guidance? *10 S, Y.* Please explain

16. To which official are homeroom or class teachers responsible in the matter of guidance? *10 S, principal.*

17. Is group counseling practiced (beside the homeroom or class-teacher system)? *18 S, Y.*

18. If yes, what is its specific purpose?

19. What groups are scheduled for group counseling?

20. Which official conducts this group counseling? *9 S, counselor; 6 S, counselor and principal; 3 S, others.*

21. Is there an orientation program for incoming Freshmen? *18 S, Y.*

22. Do you have a system of scheduled individual interviews? *30 S, Y.*

23. For which classes? *22 S, all years; 4 S, senior and junior; 2 S, senior; 2 S, 3 years unspecified.*

24. Are the students of these classes obliged to present themselves for the interview? *30 S, Y.*

25. How many times a year is a single individual routinely scheduled for an interview? *2 (median).*

26. Are the routinely scheduled interviews conducted: 26A. before *6 S, Y;* 26B. during *28 S, Y;* or 26C. after *11 S, Y* class?

27. Does the student counselor have for each student a cumulative record card? *37 C, Y.*

28. Does this record card include the following information?:

28A. entrance-test scores? *32 C;* 28B. grade-school marks? *14 C;* 28C. standard test scores? *34 C;* 28D. academic grades of years completed? *35 C;* 28E. academic grades of current year? *33 C;* 28F. personality ratings by teachers *11 C;* 28G. student's rank in class *21 C;* 28H. data on parents? *36 C;* 28I. other

29. Are case studies made of "problem" students? *36 C, Y.*

30. If yes, are these studies: 30A. formally written up? *5 C, Y;* 30B. made informally in consultation among officials? *25 C, Y;* 30C. other *6 C, Y.*

31. Are such case studies made: 31A. in most cases? *7 C, Y;* 31B. rather frequently? 31C. or only rarely? *17 C, Y.*

32. Are follow-up procedures employed to obtain information about the success of graduates? *31 C, Y.*

33. Are follow-up studies employed to obtain information about the success of drop-outs? *4 C, Y.*

34. Are these follow-up studies (32, 33) conducted: 34A. regularly? *10 C, Y* ; 34B. irregularly? *21 C, Y.*

III. *Religious Guidance*

35. Is the Sodality regarded as a form of religious and spiritual guidance? *64 C, Y.*

36. Is the moderator of the Sodality a person distinct from the guidance officers? *13 S, Y.*

37. If there is more than one Sodality, does some one moderator or other official have the responsibility for co-ordinating the activities of the several Sodalities? *25 S, Y.*

38. Is the students' annual retreat regarded as a form of religious guidance? *32 S, Y.*

39. Is there an annual closed retreat for Seniors? *28 S, Y.*

40. If any other classes have an annual closed retreat, please specify. *8 S, Y.*

41. What special efforts are made to promote vocations to the religious life and to the secular clergy?:

41A. Direct suggestion to likely candidates *55 C, Y.*

41B. Encouraging spirit of self-sacrifice through Sodality, Guard of Honor, etc. *66 C, Y.*

41C. Talks on vocations by Ours *62 C, Y.*

41D. Talks on vocations by members of other religious orders or congregations *26 S, Y.*

41E. "Vocation Week" programs *21 S, Y.*

41F. Other (specify)

IV. *Educational Guidance*

42. Which official has the immediate responsibility for following up students whose school work is unsatisfactory? 42A. principal *32 S;* 42B. assistant principal *10 S;* 42C. student counselor *8 S;* 42D. other (specify)

43. Are formal studies made of the relationship between an individual student's known scholastic ability and his achievement as measured by school grades? *17 S, Y.*

44. Are appropriate survey or diagnostic tests administered to deficient students? *17 S, Y.*

45. Is after-school study hall maintained for deficient students? *15 S, Y.*

46. Are special courses designed for deficient students in: 46A. remedial reading? *15 S;* 46B. study methods? *10 S;* 46C. English grammar? *9 S;* 46D. Latin? *12 S;* 46E. mathematics? *13 S;* 46F. other (specify)

47. Are group talks concerning college-entrance requirements given to: 47A. Seniors? *29 S;* 47B. Juniors? *22 S;* 47C. Sophomores? *5 S;* 47D. Freshmen? *3 S.*

48. Are individuals interviewed to check credits and courses required for specific college programs? *32 S, Y.*

49. If yes, at what stage of the high-school course? *13 S, seniors; 10 S, juniors; 5 S, sophomores; 1 S, freshmen; 3 S, unspecified.*

50. Do you make available to students a collection of current college catalogs? *31 S, Y.*

51. If yes, where is the collection shelved?: 51A. in principal's office *13 S;* 51B. in student counselor's office *25 S;* 51C. in library *15 S;* 51D. elsewhere (specify)

52. What special efforts do advisers make to induce students to attend Catholic colleges?:

52A. Group talks on value of Catholic-college education *32 S, Y.*

52B. Encouraging alumni now in Catholic colleges to return to school to discuss advantages *19 S, Y.*

52C. Efforts to arrange scholarships to Catholic colleges *32 S, Y.*

52D. Maintenance of good liaison with local and regional Catholic colleges *32 S, Y.*

52E. Other (specify)

53. Is information posted regarding opportunities for scholarships to:

53A. Catholic colleges? *33 S, Y;* 53B. non-Catholic colleges? *11 S, Y.*

54. Are special programs provided to prepare students for scholarship examinations and competitions? *20 S, Y.*

55. Does the school organize a "College Night" program, at which representatives of colleges are present to explain the opportunities and requirements for admission to their institutions? *10 S, Y.*

56. If yes, are representatives of non-Catholic colleges:

56A. invited? *10 S, N;* 56B. permitted? *10 S, N.*

57. Do parents attend these programs:

57A. regularly? *4 S, Y;* 57B. occasionally? *4 S, Y.*

58. Apart from organized "College Nights," do representatives of colleges come to your school to talk to your Seniors about attending college? *30 S, Y.*

59. Representatives of how many colleges talked at your school during the academic year 1954–1955? *3 (median).*

V. *Pre-Induction Guidance*

60. Is information provided students: 60A. on the current provisions of the Selective Service Law? *29 S;* 60B. on the opportunities in the various branches of the Armed Forces? *27 S;* 60C. on the opportunities in R.O.T.C. program? *29 S, Y.*

61. Is there any special program of preparation for older students who face induction soon after graduation? If yes, please describe briefly. *8 S, Y.*

VI. *Vocational Guidance*

62. Is there a collection of career pamphlets and other vocational information available to students? *30 S, Y.*

63. If yes, where is this collection shelved?: 63A. in principal's office *6 S;* 63B. in student counselor's office *25 S;* 63C. in library *19 S;* 63D. in vocational guidance counselor's office *4 S;* 63E. elsewhere (specify)

64. Please indicate any specific series of pamphlets or any regular guidance service which you find particularly useful. *cf. text.*

65. Is there a program of informative talks on careers by outside speakers? *18 S, Y.*

66. During the academic year 1954–1955 how many speakers appeared on the program? *6 (median).*

67. Are vocational tours of industrial or other occupations arranged for students? *16 S, Y.*

68. Is there a "Vocations Week" or "Vocations Month," during which a special program on the choice of a vocation is developed? *12 S, Y.*

69. Are students interviewed to discover their vocational interest and to help them prepare for careers? *30 S, Y.*

70. If yes, in which academic years? *12 S, senior; 12 S, junior; 2 S, sophomore; 4 S, freshman.*

71. Is there a job-placement service: 71A. for terminal students about to graduate? *4 S, Y;* 71B. for alumni? *3 S, Y.*

VII. *Guidance Testing Program*

72. Is there a systematic program of testing for guidance? *23 S, Y.*

73. Which official has immediate responsibility for guidance testing? *3 S, counselor; 8 S, principal; 12 S, other various officials.*

EDITORIAL NOTE: For analysis of answers to following questions, confer text.

74. By which official are the tests: 74A. administered? 74B. scored? 74C. analyzed?

75. Please outline your testing program by filling in the following blanks:

Type of Test	*Specific Test Used*	*Given to Students in Which Year?*	*Given to ALL Students in That Year?*
75A. Intelligence			
75B. Reading ability			
75C. Vocational interest			
75D. Specific ability			
75E. Personality or adjustment			
75F. Other (Specify)			

76. Comments on testing programs

VIII. *Evaluation*

77. Please give an objective appraisal of the over-all effectiveness of your present guidance program: 77A. very effective ; 77B. quite effective ; 77C. satisfactory ; 77D. rather unsatisfactory ; 77E. very unsatisfactory

78. What particular phase of your guidance program do you consider most effective?

79. What particular phase of your guidance program do you consider least effective?

80. What have you found to be the major obstacles to effective counseling in your school? Please describe in order of importance.

80A.

80B.

80C.

81. What major improvement or improvements in the guidance program have you introduced within the last three years?

81A.

81B.

81C.

82. What major improvements in the guidance program are you planning definitely to introduce?

82A.

82B.

82C.

Jesuit Academic Personnel, 1956-57

William J. Mehok, S.J.

In an earlier study, an attempt was made to define and classify Jesuit educational institutions, to outline and apply a technique of investigation for determining the student enrollment of these institutions, and, finally, to draw a few conclusions from that investigation which might prove useful in a future more detailed study.

Briefly, the general conclusions of that study were these:

> Members of the Society of Jesus throughout the world are responsible for the education of 600,000 students, enrolled in 2,000 schools which are under the direction of 759 local administrations.[1]

What follows will be a further development of that report, and in a few instances a clarification and correction of what was written then.

We shall start with Mark Hopkins greatly simplified definition of a school: "A university consists of a log with a teacher at one end and the pupil at the other." Viewed objectively, this description lends itself to quantitative treatment since we can, and have to a limited degree, count the number of logs and the number of pupils seated on them. Yet to be ascertained are the number of teachers seated at the other end of these logs. This is the aim of the present report.

More important than the number of teachers, pupils and physical plants is their excellence and also what is taught and how well it is taught; but until we have a clear idea of the quantity we cannot make an intelligible evaluation of their quality. Progressing with this program in view, we shall attempt to compute the number of Jesuits engaged in the ministry of formal education.

By far the greater number of Jesuits engaged in teaching are attached to some school administered by the Society, but there are a few listed under non-academic institutions who also teach. For the sake of completeness and to insure greater precision we shall carry this distinction throughout the survey.

Of those Jesuits listed in province catalogues under academic institutions, most of them teach in schools administered by the Society, but a few teach in schools not so administered. In the non-academic institu-

---

[1] Mehok, William J., S.J., "Jesuit Educational Institutions of the World: 1956–57," *Jesuit Educational Quarterly*, Vol. XX, No. 1 (June 1957), pp. 44–57.

tions, by far the greater proportion teach in schools not administered by the Society, but by some other agency such as the State or the diocese. The untangling of these formalities will be left to a later date, and for the present we shall make no distinction between teaching in Jesuit schools and teaching in schools not administered by the Society.

Moreover, the writer is not unmindful of the fact that without the cooperation of their devoted lay co-workers, Jesuit schools could not carry out the extensive educational apostolate that they do. However, for the present, we shall prescind from the lay teachers in Jesuit schools and center our attention exclusively on Jesuit academic personnel.

With the field thus narrowed, we are ready to define, or at least describe, what we mean by a Jesuit academic worker. In the first place we must include those Jesuits who are actually devoting their time to the imparting of formal instruction to a definite group of students according to a fixed time schedule and according to some pre-arranged curricular plan.

In addition to these teachers (and often conjointly united in the same person) there are other functions essentially linked to the purposes of our education which will here be treated under the designation of administration. Strictly academic administrators, such as prefects of studies, deans, and principals, are quite obviously to be here included.

Since our objectives in educational work include not only the intellectual but also the moral and spiritual formation of our students, we must include student counselors, chaplains or spiritual fathers of students.

Traditionally in the Society the office of prefect of discipline has been separated, conceptually at least, from that of prefect of studies. This officer shall be considered as part of the academic staff.

The reasons for including or excluding officers who are primarily concerned with general administration and the management of the temporal affairs of the school are not clear cut and, hence, from here on one must be explicit but sometimes arbitrary. Accordingly, for purposes of this survey, we shall include rectors, superiors, ministers and procurators as academic administrators in academic institutions and exclude them in non-academic institutions.

The reason for excluding the clerical, maintenance and custodial staff is quite firmly founded in general practice.

Many conflicting claims apply to general supervisors of education not attached to a definite institution, directors of Sodalities, alumni directors, Brother buyers and other officers whose work is not connected immediately and directly with students. At the risk of criticism and until there is a definite, consistent and objective basis for including them, these shall be excluded *qua tale* from our definition of academic personnel.

Briefly, and in terms of inclusion and exclusion as teachers and/or administrators, the general norms followed in the survey are these:

I. For academic institutions: A. Included are—1) any Jesuit teaching at least part-time in any school; 2) all academic administrators, prefects of studies, prefects of discipline, directors of personnel and educational guidance; 3) general administrative officers such as rectors, presidents, vice-presidents, ministers and procurators; 4) spiritual directors of students such as student counselors, student chaplains, spiritual fathers of students even though these students be Jesuits; 5) other persons such as registrars, librarians of a school, athletic coaches. B. Excluded are—1) all Jesuit scholastics and priests who are in regular studies outside the time of regency or military service, teachers of convert classes, teachers of catechism in the church, teachers of catechism to domestics; 2) general academic supervisors not connected with a definite institution, such as province prefects of studies; 3) directors of alumni activities, fund raising, public relations; 4) Sodality directors *qua tale,* spiritual fathers of the community; 5) secretaries, house librarians, buyers, custodial and maintenance staff. II. For all other than academic institutions: A. Included are—same as above in so far as the norms apply. B. Excluded are—1) rectors, superiors, ministers, procurators; 2) same as above in so far as the norms apply.

With these general notions as to who are to be included and who are to be excluded from a Jesuit academic staff, we might say a word as to the amount of time they should devote to their academic jobs in order to make them eligible for inclusion. If by a full-time academic worker we mean one whose principal external ministry is teaching and/or administering in any school, and by part-time we mean one whose principal external work is some other ministry, then we include in this survey those who are at least part-time educational workers. The reason for this will be apparent as the explanation proceeds. Even *UNESCO*, as much as it wanted to confine educational statistics to full-time teachers only, was forced by lack of detailed information to include part-time teachers and full- and part-time administrators.

Hence, until more detailed information is available and for purposes of this survey, we shall understand as member of an academic staff any Jesuit priest, scholastic or brother who teaches full- or part-time in any school and/or who works full- or part-time in the administration of any school. Unless a distinction is made, for the sake of avoiding unnecessary repetition, the terms "teacher" or "teaching" will hereafter be used to designate a teacher or administrator or both functions combined in the same person.

In the survey referred to previously, the universe or whole was all Jesuit institutions, whether educational or otherwise, and the frame or unifying principle was the most immediate Jesuit superior properly so called. It was found that there were 1057 institutions, 298 of which had no schools administered by the Society and 759 which had at least one such school. The latter 759 academic institutions were made up of 2,000 schools, or about 2.64 schools per rector or superior. This dichotomy proved adequate for purposes of estimating enrollment in Jesuit schools; but must be elaborated for purposes of dividing Jesuit personnel since there is a third, although small, group which was earlier excluded as non-pertinent.

This third group consists of: 1) persons subject to a superior but not actually living in houses of the Society. Such would be scholastics in military training who are not listed under either academic or non-academic institutions. 2) All provincials' curias which are listed separately from the above two major groups, members of which curias are not counted among them. This is true whether they live in houses presided over by a rector or not. In the latter case, the provincial acts in place of a superior properly so called. Finally, 3) "dispersi", military chaplains, "extra domos". Although we may not have been entirely successful, owing to deficiencies in information available, our attempt was to see that every Jesuit was included in one and only one of the three basic groups which we shall designate as academic institutions, non-academic institutions, and others.

TABLE 1

Estimated number of Jesuits laboring in the territory under the scope of a survey of Jesuit teaching personnel. Year beginning 1957

GRADE	*Universe estimate (1)*	*Universe proportion (2)*	*Sample proportion (3)*	*Difference (2) and (3) (4)*
Priests	16,641	.51239	.52009	−.00770
Scholastics	10,336	.31826	.30953	.00873
Brothers	5,500	.16935	.17038	−.00103
TOTAL	32,477	1.00000	1.00000	.00000

(1) Estimate of total number of Jesuits laboring in all territories of the Society except those of the Slavic Assistancy. (Croatia, however, is included in the survey). Year beginning 1957.

(2) Proportionate distribution of *(1)*.

(3) Proportionate distribution of a systematic sample of 20 province catalogues drawn from the whole which consists of 62 province catalogues. Year beginning 1957.

(4) Difference computed by subtracting *(3)* from *(2)*.

All the province catalogues for the year beginning 1957 were not available at the time this survey was made (February 24, 1957), and a direct

count was almost impossible owing to the confusion in count as a result of the creation of new provinces, especially in India, and for other reasons. An estimate was the best we could make of the number of Jesuits laboring in the territory of the provinces which come under the scope of this survey. This estimate appears in column (1) of Table I. Roughly, this estimate was based on the following factors: 1) expected increase of appropriate provinces over the full-count total for the year beginning 1956; 2) omission of the Slavic Assistancy, except Croatia, for which we have a recent catalogue; and 3) an estimate, based on last year's count, of the number of Socii of the Slavic Assistancy laboring in the territory of the provinces under the scope of this survey.

A systematic sample of 20 province catalogues was drawn from the whole which is 62 province catalogues, and the number of priests, scholastics and brothers falling into the different categories of institutions under which they were listed was counted. The results of this count are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Distribution of 10,154 Jesuit priests, scholastics and brothers in a systematic sample of 20 province catalogues arranged by grade in the Society, type of institution and proportion within grades. Year beginning 1957.

	Academic (1)	*Non-Academic* (2)	*Other* (3)	TOTAL (4)
PRIESTS:				
Number	4,469	704	108	5,281
Proportion	.84624	.13331	.02045	1.00000
SCHOLASTICS:				
Number	3,113	2	28	3,143
Proportion	.99045	.00064	.00891	1.00000
BROTHERS:				
Number	1,494	159	77	1,730
Proportion	.86358	.09191	.04451	1.00000
TOTAL:				
Number	9,076	865	213	10,154
Proportion	.89383	.08519	.02098	1.00000

(1) Listed under institutions having at least one school.
(2) Listed under institutions not having any school.
(3) Not listed in *(1)* nor *(2)* but laboring in territory of provinces surveyed. Includes Provincial's curias, "extra domos," military chaplains, military service, "dispersi."
(4) Sum of *(1)*, *(2)* and *(3)*.

Before we proceed to draw conclusions from this sample, we have a right to ask if this part of the whole is representative of the entire group. We do not know the proportionate distribution according to the three

classes of institutions since that is what we are here seeking. We do know the proportionate distribution of priests, scholastics and brothers in the whole; and hence, if the sample is representative of the whole, it should not differ from the whole with regard to the known characteristics by more than chance fluctuation. The extent of chance fluctuation has been worked out mathematically and reduced to easily applicable tables. We shall not go into detailed explanation beyond pointing out the conclusions applicable here.[2] Column (2) of Table 1 shows the proportionate distribution of the whole by grade in the Society and column (3) of the same table shows the corresponding proportionate distribution of the sample or part used to represent it. Column (4) shows the difference between the previous two columns. The conclusion of the statistical test applied says that there is no statistically significant difference between the two beyond what would normally be expected. If the two groups (the whole and the part used to represent it) are not significantly different on the one basis (distribution by grade), it would be most unusual that they should be significantly different on the basis about which we are here inquiring (distribution by type of institution). We may safely proceed on the reasonable assumption that the sample will yield results concerning the unknown factor of the whole which are quite accurate. The extent of this accuracy will be pointed out later.

Turning again to Table 2, we see the distribution of 10,154 Jesuits according to grade in the Society and the type of institutions under which they are listed. The first row for each grade gives the absolute number and the second row gives the proportion of that number to the total for the entire grade. There are several possible methods by which we could proceed, but we have chosen the one which utilizes all available pertinent reliable information.

The simplest method is to find the average per sampling unit (province catalogue) and multiply this average by the total number of sampling units. Such procedure would lead us to conclude that there are 31,477 members in the estimate for the total whereas the best estimate of the total number is 32,477. Hence this method was discarded.

Since we know the total number is 32,477, we can use this information to correct the sample. This procedure is known as a ratio estimate. One form of its use would be to find the proportion of each cell (e.g., 4,469 priests in academic institutions is a cell) to the total number of the sample and multiply this proportion by the total number of Jesuits. Were we to

---

[2] The test used here and later is an application of the chi-square formula for testing agreement between observed and expected results. It is clearly explained and illustrated in: Garrett, Henry E., *Statistics in Psychology and Education,* New York: Longmans, Green and Co. (fourth edition), 1955, pp. 254–266.

apply this form of ratio estimate, the sum of all Jesuits in all grades and in all types of institutions would total up to the true figure, 32,477; but the subgroups would be 16,891, 10,052 and 5,534 for priests, scholastics and brothers respectively instead of the true figures given in column (1) of Table 1. Hence, we also discard this method in favor of a more precise one.

Accordingly, we can use this previous information on totals for subgroups to correct the sample and make it conform to what we know about the subgroups. This is what was done and the procedure is known as a ratio estimate based on subgroups or components of the grand total. The method labors under this difficulty that the sample, after undergoing correction by known data, might be changed so drastically as to become significantly different from the sample originally drawn. Should this be the case, then the original sample would have to be discarded or supplemented by more sampling units; but if the original sample does not differ significantly from the corrected sample, then we can attribute the insignificant difference between the original and corrected sample to error normally expected in sampling. The chi-square test was applied to these two distributions and showed a difference so slight that it can be disregarded. The sample, then, is representative of the whole both before and after it has been corrected to conform to known data.

The ratio estimate based on subgroups was computed by multiplying the best estimate of the subgroups found in Table 1, column (1) by the proportion rows of Table 2 for the corresponding subgroups, and the best estimate of the distribution of the Society by grade and type of institution is found in the rows designated "Estimated number" of Table 3. For example, the total number of priests (16,641 of Table 1 column (1) multiplied by the proportionate part of the sample found in academic institutions (.84624, Table 2 "Proportion" row) gives us the best estimate of the number of priests in that cell (14,082, Table 3, "Estimated number" row). This operation was repeated for each cell.

It is to be noted that now there is no possibility of statistical error vertically, that is, it is not possible for a priest to have been counted as a scholastic or brother. There is a possibility of statistical error horizontally, that is, it is possible for a priest to have been included in an academic institution when he should have been included in the non-academic or other cell.

The purpose of what has been said thus far is to erect a scaffold wherewith to estimate the number of Jesuits engaged in the ministry of teaching and/or administering schools. The steps in the process of erecting such a scaffold have been quite straightforward and the definitions so simple that little was left to subjective interpretation. Anyone following the

same procedure would arrive at virtually the same conclusions. Hence, for this first part of the study, nonstatistical error can be considered as practically non-existent. The apparent complexity of this process is required for reasons of greater precision, ease in discovering and correcting errors and for certain practical reasons which will help later in expediting and checking a more detailed study.

TABLE 3

Estimate of number of Jesuits by grade in the Society and type of institution; proportion teaching by type of institution, and number teaching. Year beginning 1957.

GRADE	*Academic* (1)	*Non-Academic* (2)	*Other* (3)	TOTAL (4)
PRIESTS:				
Estimated number . .	14,082	2,219	340	16,641
Proportion teach . . .	.69983	.11929	.02778	(.60868)*
Number teach	9,855	265	9	10,129
SCHOLASTICS:				
Estimated number . .	10,237	7	92	10,336
Proportion teach . . .	.15898	.00000	.00000	(.15741)
Number teach	1,627	0	0	1,627
BROTHERS:				
Estimated number . .	4,750	505	245	5,500
Proportion teach . . .	.06353	.02381	.00000	(.05709)
Number teach	302	12	0	314
TOTAL:				
Estimated number . .	29,069	2,731	677	32,477
Proportion teach . . .	(.40538)	(.10143)	(.01329)	(.37165)
Number teach	11,784	277	9	12,070

(1) Listed under institutions having at least one school.
(2) Listed under institutions not having any school.
(3) Not listed under *(1)* nor *(2)*, but laboring in territory of provinces surveyed.
(4) Absolute numbers, sum of *(1)*, *(2)* and *(3)*. Proportions computed after this addition process.

* All proportions in parentheses ( ) are weighted proportions. They take into account the best estimates of the size of the groups on which they are based.

When it comes to determining what a teacher or school administrator is and deciding whether this particular Jesuit should be included as a member of the school's academic staff or not—that is where the subjective

element enters. Two persons, provided with the same directions, going through the province catalogue entries of the same members of the Society, would be prompted by their background, experience and alertness to come up with a different number of teachers and non-teachers. Until there are simple, clear, standard and objective definitions to guide us, this danger of discrepancy, or error, is ever present. All care has been taken to minimize this error, but there is no easy way to measure it. Strictly speaking, this is non-statistical error and is not considered in what follows although its presence should be known. We are, therefore, stretching credibility by prescinding from non-statistical error and confining the use of that term to statistical error or error due to chance.

Presupposing this, three different samples were drawn systematically, one for academic institutions, one for non-academic institutions and one for other Jesuits not listed under either of these. These samples were tested in various ways to detect divergence from the normal and all were found not to deviate significantly in those characteristics for which we had previous reliable information.

Thus, for example, the sample for academic institutions had the same proportion of schools as we had previously ascertained by a complete count; that is, there was virtually the same proportion of institutions having only one school, the same proportion having two schools and the same proportion having three or more schools. Likewise, the average number of Jesuits per school was about the same in this sample as had been estimated by a different and larger sample. The proportionate distribution of the various grades in the Society did not differ significantly from another and better estimate of that relationship. In short, the three samples conformed quite well to previously known full-count information or to best estimates based on different samples. The samples under consideration here showed no significant difference from what had previously been established.

If these three samples drawn from the three types of institutions do not differ significantly from the whole or its constitutive parts in those features for which we have other and more reliable information, then it is reasonable to assume that they do not differ significantly in features for which we do not have a known criterion. Admitting the validity of this reasoning, we can use the three samples to establish a criterion which would not differ significantly from the true value were it known. That is what is done in estimating the number of teaching Jesuits by means of these three samples.

Specifically, the steps were these. The number of all priests in the sample for academic institutions was 1,206 and the number in the same institutions who were teaching was 844. The ratio of teaching priests to

total priests in this cell is .69983. This ratio was entered into Table 3, column *(1)*, row "Priests, Proportion teaching." Now our best estimate for the total number of priests in that cell is 14,082. Assuming that the ratio .69983 is valid for the whole as it is for the part, then the total number of priests listed in academic institutions who are teaching or administering some schools is 14,082 times .69983, which equals 9,855. This figure is entered in Table 3, column *(1)* row "Priests: Number teaching."

Similar ratios were computed for priests in non-academic institutions and other and also for scholastics and brothers in these types of institutions, and appropriate estimates were made for each cell. The number teaching was summed up horizontally and vertically and ratios computed. These ratios (which are indicated in Table 3 in parentheses) for total row and total column are different (but not significantly so) from what would have been computed directly from the samples. They are known as weighted ratios since they take into account better estimates of the size of the terms on which they are based than do the samples. If the true ratio of teaching Jesuits in either the total row or total column were known, it would come closer to the weighted ratio than it would to the unweighted ratio based on the sample alone. Hence, the figures in Table 3 are the best estimate we can compute from a combination of previously known accurate information and ratios derived from the samples used.

Popularizers of statistics frequently stop at this point with the result that has won for statisticians their unmerited high place in the rank of liars. It is not the fault of statisticians that their press agents have misinterpreted them. Hence, the following section on statistical error is equal in importance to the estimates, and the estimates should not be used without some understanding of their probable error.

We might begin by cautioning the reader to think of an estimate, not in terms of a point, but rather of an interval about a point, within which interval the true value is expected to lie with a known probability.

Since, on the one hand, our definition of an administrator included rectors, ministers and procurators for academic institutions and excluded them from all others, we ought to carry through this distinction in estimating error; and since, on the other hand, a certain magnitude is required in the subgroups to give a reliable measure of error, we should eliminate all unnecessary subdivisions. Accordingly, the "non-academic" and "other" groups have been combined in Table 4, which table gives the standard errors of the various estimates.

First, we have a right to ask, how accurate are the totals for the number of Jesuits in the various grades of the Society? For example, how accurate are we in saying that the total number of priests included in the study is 16,641. The statistical error is given as zero, since that figure is based on

the equivalent of a full-count. Even if this figure were actually 16,621 or 16,661, the effect on the other estimates of error would not amount to an increase or decrease of one person provided this new total were divided between academic and all other institutions in the same proportion as is 16,641. For the sake of clarity, we shall assume that the figures in the total by grades column are true figures.

TABLE 4

Estimates of standard errors of number of Jesuits and number of Jesuits teaching and/or administering schools arranged according to grades in the Society and listing under academic institutions or otherwise. Year beginning 1957.

GRADE	ACADEMIC		ALL OTHER		TOTAL	
	Number (1)	*Error* (2)	*Number* (3)	*Error* (4)	*Number* (5)	*Error* (6)
Priests	14,082	± 68	2,559	± 68	16,641	± 0
Teaching . .	9,855	± 177	274	± 33	10,129	± 181
Scholastics . .	10,237	± 16	99	± 16	10,336	± 0
Teaching . .	1,627	± 125	0	± 1	1,627	± 125
Brothers . . .	4,750	± 38	750	± 38	5,500	± 0
Teaching . .	302	± 58	12	± 7	314	± 59
TOTAL	29,069	± 79	3,408	± 79	32,477	± 0
TEACHING . .	11,784	± 224	286	± 34	12,070	± 227

(1) Estimated number of Jesuits listed under institutions having at least one school and estimated number teaching and/or administering schools.
(2) Standard errors of estimates in *(1)*.
(3) Number of Jesuits and number teaching listed elsewhere than under institutions having at least one school.
(4) Standard errors of *(3)*.
(5) Sum of *(1)* and *(3)*.
(6) Standard errors of *(5)*.

Our next logical question is, how sure are we that these 16,641 priests are distributed 14,082 in academic institutions and 2,559 in all others? The standard limits of error are ±68; that is, the academic group could be 14,014 or 14,150 or points in between, but the non-academic group must be between 2,627 and 2,491 and both must total 16,641. The same holds true, *mutatis mutandis,* for the scholastics, brothers and all three grades combined.

Our next question is, how accurate are the estimates for the number of Jesuits teaching? The limits of error are given in standard form in Table 4 immediately following the estimated number teaching. For ex-

ample, the number of priests teaching in academic institutions might fall between 9,678 and 10,032[3], as we shall here explain.

A standard error tells us that if a survey were repeated, using the same procedure and sample size, twice out of three repetitions we would get values within the standard limits of error. This can be demonstrated mathematically to mean that the chances are two out of three that the true value being sought would fall within these limits. Thus, for all Jesuits, two times out of three trials we would find that the estimated total number of teachers would fall within the limits 12,070 ±227 or between 11,843 to 12,297. The chances are two in three that the true number of teaching Jesuits lies within the above interval

TABLE 5

Relative and absolute estimates of error at various levels of confidence of Jesuits teaching and/or administering any schools, by grades in the Society and as listed under all classes of institutions combined. Year beginning 1957.

GRADE	STANDARD ERROR		5% LEVEL		1% LEVEL	
	Relative (1)	*Absolute* (2)	*Relative* (3)	*Absolute* (4)	*Relative* (5)	*Absolute* (6)
Priests	.011	181	.021	355	.028	466
Scholastics . .	.012	125	.024	245	.031	322
Brothers . . .	.011	59	.021	116	.028	152
TOTAL	.007	227	.014	445	.018	585

(1) Standard error given as a proportion of respective subgroups and groups.
(2) Standard error given in terms of number of Jesuits to respective subgroups and group.
(3) (4) Standard error multiplied by constant, 1.960, giving assurance that were the survey repeated using a different sample of equal size, only 5 times in 100 repetitions would the result fall outside the interval plus or minus the 5% limits of confidence.
(5) (6) Standard error multiplied by constant, 2.576, giving assurance that only once in 100 repetitions of the survey would the result fall outside the 1% confidence limits.

For some purposes, these limits of confidence are not sufficiently certain. By employing standard constants, we can arrive at any degree of confidence, short of absolute certainty, by increasing the size of the interval. For general purposes the 5% limits of confidence are sufficient. Turning to Table 5, one finds the standard limits given relatively and absolutely, that is, in terms of the proportion to total in the cell and in terms of the number of Jesuits teaching to number of all Jesuits in the

[3] The effect of ± 68 in the line above can be disregarded since at most it would make a difference here of only one person. That is, the standard error for priests teaching would be ± 176 if the number of priests in this class were 14,014 and ± 178 if it were 14,150.

cell. If either of these were multiplied by the constant, 1.960, then we would have an estimate of error such that only five times in a hundred repetitions of the survey would the proportion or number of teaching Jesuits fall outside the 5% limits of confidence, or the chances are 95 out of 100 that the true value would lie within the 5% confidence limits.

If we wanted to be almost certain of the true number of Jesuits teaching, we would multiply the standard error by the constant, 2,576. In this event, only once in 100 repetitions would the estimate fall outside the 1% limits of confidence, with consequent deductions about the true value of that for which we have only an estimate.

All this is very fine, but can also become very confusing. We want to know whether this is a good survey, a mediocre one or a bad one. If one follows the meagre hints given in the textbooks, this would be classed as good or even very good. Most examples given in textbooks are quite content with a relative error of 5% at the 1% level of confidence, whereas the present survey has a relative error of only 1.8% at that level of confidence.

One might argue further: as long as you got the standard error down to .7%, why not make it an even ½% by increasing the size of the sample. Unfortunately, there comes a point of diminishing returns after which an increase in sample size does not produce too great a decrease in relative error. In the present instance, the equivalent of a simple random sample of 4,104 would have been needed to achieve the .7% standard relative error. To lower this to ½%, a sample size of 7,184 would have been required. To lower it to 1/10%, a sample of 31,212, or nearly the whole universe, would have been required.

A general principle in sampling is that it is inefficient, needlessly costly in time and money, to strive for statistical precision which is greater than the non-statistical precision of the survey. We do not know the non-statistical error of the present survey, but inferring from the great number of borderline instances in judging whether a Jesuit was a teacher or not leads the writer to suspect that the non-statistical error is greater than the statistical error. This situation, as indicated before, cannot be remedied until a clear, simple and objective definition of a teacher and/or administrator has been formulated. Until this is done, or until it is proved that the non-statistical error is less than the statistical error, the present survey is about as reliable as present information warrants. Higher statistical precision would engender a false confidence since it would be offset by the unknown non-statistical error.

Here are some of the perplexing problems that produce non-statistical error. In a certain province, a large number of Jesuit philosophers and theologians teach catechism in the neighboring parochial school. Had

these been priests outside of regular studies, scholastics during regency or brothers, they would have been considered teachers; but, since we want to make this survey consistent with other full-count studies (e.g., "Numerus Scholasticorum in Assistentia ——, a. 1957", *Memorabilia* Vol. X., Januario 1957, p. 15, 16 and others to follow), Jesuits in regular studies were habitually excluded as teachers regardless of the general principles applicable to others.

Another instance of possible non-statistical error is the arbitrary decision to exclude priests teaching catechism to domestics.

Again, Jesuit directors of alumni activities in the United States would qualify as administrators under the same title as do procurators or registrars or some other officers; yet, the function of these persons in countries other than the United States was unknown to the writer, and hence all alumni officers not otherwise engaged in teaching or administrating schools were habitually excluded.

Sodality directors, unless they also teach or act as student counselors or qualify under some other title, have been excluded. Frequently, these persons have no direct contact with the students but merely happen to live in the school. Furthermore, they are often regional directors and hence every school in the city or province would have equal right to include them as part of their staff. The same reasoning was followed in excluding general supervisors of schools, such as province prefects of studies. This exclusion is in no way meant to depreciate their contribution to education, but is demanded by the nature of their relationship to the individual school in question. It is better to exclude them now and make them the subject of a special survey than to mix them in with others to whom they bear little resemblance.

The point stressed by these examples is that if these instances of possible ambiguity arose and were dealt with in terms of inclusion or exclusion, there were undoubtedly others, so few in number that they were missed or classified now one way now another. In some instances an error in classification might tend toward overestimating the number of teachers and in others toward underestimating them and thus cancel out each other. We do not know, nor have we any realistic way of estimating, whether or not this cancellation amounts to zero. It is this difference, or bias, that must be recognized even though it cannot be measured. The insidious feature of non-statistical error is that it is not lessened by an increase in sample size. Such an increase merely introduces new sources of this error, such as fatigue if one person does the classifying, memory lapse if the time from beginning to end of the classifying process is great, and error arising from having to apportion the classifying to more than one individual who might have a different understanding of the same in-

structions. If the sampling error is sufficiently large, this unknown non-sampling error is covered. Furthermore, the difference has a 50–50 chance of being neutralized if the bias is in one direction and the sampling error is in the other. Hence, the general principle of not striving for statistical precision greater than the non-statistical precision.

One might quarrel with the procedure followed, namely that of estimating a figure for the entire Society rather than separate ones for the various provinces or Assistancies and then combining them. Statistically speaking, this would be a very inefficient procedure. To arrive at a reasonably accurate estimate for a province or Assistancy, the process here described would have to have been repeated as many times as there are provinces or Assistancies. This is true since the reliability of an estimate depends more on the absolute number in the sample than it does on the proportion of the thing being sampled. Since what we have learned here is what we might consider the normal state of health of Jesuit education, it applies to most of the provinces and Assistancies and we would be merely repeating the same diagnosis to prove the same thing. Continuing the medical analogy, a doctor can much more surely and readily diagnose a departure from normal health if he knows in general what the attributes of normal health are in advance rather than to have to construct his criteria from a waiting room full of patients. The symptoms of suspected illness make themselves immediately known. The doctor's task is to analyze these symptoms of suspected illness and determine whether there is a real or only apparent departure from the normal. This same procedure of checking a suspected departure from the normal is the ordinary and most efficient method of statistics

In summary, then, over one third of all Jesuits are engaged at least part-time in the apostolate of teaching. Nearly two thirds of the priests of the Society are so employed, 16 percent of the scholastics, and 6 percent of the coadjutor brothers. This latter was higher than was expected, but one must remember that many brothers on the missions take their turn in the classroom, corridor, dining room and dormitory along with the priests and scholastics. Also, many provinces have formally constituted courses of training for young brothers even after novitiate, and the teaching and supervision of these schools is handled in great part by the older brothers.

Much remains to be done especially in making a detailed study of the teaching-only, administering-only and both teaching and administering functions of members of the Society. A most interesting field opens itself in the possible correlation between the extent of Jesuit formal educational endeavour and number of vocations to the priesthood and religious life. This leads to the need of a regional breakdown of Jesuit education. Al-

though most Jesuit teachers work in schools which are also administered by the Society, by far the greater proportion of teachers listed under non-academic and other institutions work in State and non-Jesuit schools. Undoubtedly, regional differences between academic and all other institutions is great in those countries where private groups are hampered in their freedom to teach. Finally, clearer definitions and more exact information may make it possible to find the proportion of full- and part-time teachers. These and many other questions are still to be answered, but it is sincerely hoped that the present survey offers some contribution to our knowledge of one of the principal ministries of the Society.

Federal Aid to Education*

The Presidents of Jesuit colleges and universities are in agreement that the lost potential talent from our elementary and high schools should through testing, counseling and a scholarship program, be given the opportunity to complete their education; that the improvement and expansion of the teaching of science and mathematics should be provided for both at the secondary and college or university levels; that the critical shortage of Americans proficient in certain currently significant foreign languages should be corrected. If these objectives can be attained only through federal aid, then that aid should be made available on an across-the-board basis, for all students and for all institutions. Where because of state constitutional provisions such across-the-board distribution is precluded, provision should be made for direct grants from the Federal Government to individuals or institutions affected. Unless such provision is made, the program could not achieve its purpose because it would by-pass a very large pool of individual talent and of educational facilities.

---

* A summary of discussion on the administration's program of aid to education at the Meeting of Presidents of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., January 4, 1958.

Status of Special Studies

1957–1958

Edward B. Rooney, S.J.*

For the past three or four years the columns of Catholic newspapers and reviews have all too often been used by Catholic educators as public laundermats for the washing of academic linen. Some of these public washings have been all to the good. But even aside from the fact that the picture of Catholic education conveyed by such public washings has frequently been distorted by impassioned oratory and by over-emphasis on certain valid but incomplete criteria, the act has been repeated so often that it has become shopworn. In the opinion of some, this negative criticism of Catholic education by Catholics has reached the stage of threatening positive harm by undermining the confidence of the Catholic people in their educational institutions. It would seem then that the time has come for a campaign to emphasize the positive.

Surely a solid, sustained program of special studies is one of the more positive ways of preparing scholars. An annual report on the Status of Special Studies in the American Assistancy should provide some antidote to the exaggerated talk about the short-comings of Catholic education. This year's report should be especially encouraging as a study of the tables here given will show.

I. Comparative Statistics, 1953–1958

	1953–54	*1954–55*	*1955–56*	*1956–57*	*1957–58*
Full-time Graduate Students	181	212	208	227	247
Priest Graduate Students	152	175	149	162	158
Scholastic Graduate Students	29	37	59	65	89
Candidates for Ph.D.	121	145	123	131	133
Candidates for Other Doctor	13	13	22	28	22
Candidates for M.A.	22	20	24	22	44
Candidates for M.S.	9	17	16	26	30
Candidates for Other Masters	3	3	1	1	3
Candidates for Other Degrees	3	4	6	5	4
Special Studies but No Degree	10	10	16	14	11

---

* Tabular material throughout this article was prepared under the direction of Richard D. Costello, S.J.

II. Major Fields

	Calif.	*Chicago*	*Detroit*	*Maryland*	*Missouri*	*N. Eng.*	*N. Orl.*	*N. York*	*Oregon*	*Wisc.*	*Total*
Anthropology	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	2 Ph.D.
Biology	1 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	5 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8 Ph.D.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.	.....	1 M.S.	.....	2 M.S.	4 M.S.
Business Administration	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.B.A.	.....	.....	1 M.B.A.
Byzantine Studies	1 S.T.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 S.T.D.
Chemistry	1 Ph.D.	.....	3 Ph.D.	3 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	3 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	.....	2 Ph.D.	17 Ph.D.
	.....	.....	1 M.S.	.....	1 M.S.	2 M.S.	.....	1 M.S.	.....	.....	5 M.S.
Communication Arts	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
	.....	.....	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.
Economics	.....	.....	.....	2 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	4 Ph.D.	.....	.....	6 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 M.A.	4 M.A.
Education	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	3 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.
Engineering	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.	1 B.S.	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.	2 M.S., 1 B.S.
English	2 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	3 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	.....	2 Ph.D.	.....	.....	12 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	5 M.A.	1 M.A.	1 M.A.	5 M.A.	.....	.....	13 M.A.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 No Deg.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 No Deg.
Geophysics	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	2 Ph.D.
History	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	3 Ph.D.	6 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	3 M.A.	6 M.A.
—American	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
—European	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
—Latin American	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
—Medieval	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
Journalism	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.
	.....	.....	1 M.S.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.
Languages: Classical	.....	2 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	3 Ph.D.	.....	2 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	.....	12 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 M.A.
—Modern European	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3 M.A.	3 M.A.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 No Deg.	.....	.....	1 No Deg.	.....	2 No Deg.

—Oriental	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5 No Deg.	.....	.....	.....	.....	5 No Deg.
—Semitic	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2 M.A.	.....	.....	2 M.A.
Labor Relations	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
Law	.....	.....	.....	1 S.J.D.	.....	1 S.J.D.	.....	.....	.....	1 S.J.D.	3 S.J.D.
	1 LL.M.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 LL.M.	.....	.....	2 LL.M.
Library Science	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.
Linguistics	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
Mathematics	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	2 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	4 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A	.....	.....	.....	.....	2 M.A.
	.....	1 M.S.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.	1 M.S.	.....	.....	3 M.S.
	1 No Deg.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 No Deg.
Music	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 No Deg.	.....	1 No Deg.
Philosophy	3 Ph.D.	3 Ph.D.	.....	2 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	7 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	20 Ph.D.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.	.....	.....	1 M.A.	2 M.A.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 No Deg.	1 No Deg.
Physics	1 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	.....	5 Ph.D.	.....	3 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	14 Ph.D.
	1 M.S.	2 M.S.	1 M.S.	.....	.....	1 M.S., 1 B.S.	1 M.S.	2 M.S.	1 M.S.	1 M.S.	10 M.S., 1 B.S.
Political Science	3 Ph.D.	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	2 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	9 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.	.....	2 M.A.
Psychology	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	5 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2 M.A.
Sacred Scripture	1 S.S.L.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 S.S.L.	.....	.....	2 S.S.L.
Social Sciences	.....	.....	1 M.S.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.
Social Work	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 M.S.
Sociology	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.	2 Ph.D.
	1 M.A.	.....	1 M.A.	.....	.....	.....	.....	2 M.A.	.....	.....	4 M.A.
Theology: Ascetical	.....	.....	.....	1 S.T.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 S.T.D.
—Dogmatic	4 S.T.D.	1 S.T.D.	2 S.T.D.	1 S.T.D.	1 S.T.D.	1 S.T.D.	1 S.T.D.	2 S.T.D.	1 S.T.D.	1 S.T.D.	15 S.T.D.
—Moral	.....	.....	.....	1 S.T.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 S.T.D.
Canon Law	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 J.C.D.	.....	1 J.C.D.
Viticulture	1 Ph.D.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1 Ph.D.
Total	37	12	20	30	19	34	12	44	11	28	247

III. Schools*

	California	*Chicago*	*Detroit*	*Maryland*	*Missouri*	*New England*	*New Orleans*	*New York*	*Oregon*	*Wisconsin*	*Total*
Biblical Institute	1							1			2
Boston College						3					3
Brooklyn Polytechnic								1			1
California	3				2	1					6
Cambridge					1						1
Catholic University			2	4		3	2	1			12
Chicago								1		2	3
Columbia	1			1				1	2	1	6
Detroit			1								1
Duke								1			1
Fordham	3		1	2		8	1	9		1	25
Freiburg		1									1
Georgetown	3	1					1	8	1	1	15
Goethe University				1							1
Gregorian	3		1	5	1	1	1	2	2	2	18
Harvard	1		1	2		2	2	1			9
Illinois		2					1				3
Indiana		1									1
Institute Catholique	1				1						2
Iowa			1								1
Iraq						4					4
John Carroll		2									2
Johns Hopkins	1					3		2			6
Laval								1			1
London	1						1				2
Louisiana State									1		1
Louvain	2		1					3			6
Loyola, Chicago	2	1	5	1	1					1	11
Loyola, L. A.	1										1
Mainz				1							1
Marquette					1		1			4	6
M.I.T.	1	1				4					6
Mexico, U. of	1										1
Michigan			2								2
Minnesota					1					1	2
Missouri									1		1
Munich	1										1
Munster							1				1
N.Y.U.				1				1			2
N. Carolina				1							1
Notre Dame								1		1	2
Oriental Institute	1										1
Ottawa				1							1
Oxford	1							3			4
Paris									1		1
Pennsylvania				3							3

III. Schools* *(continued)*

	California	*Chicago*	*Detroit*	*Maryland*	*Missouri*	*New England*	*New Orleans*	*New York*	*Oregon*	*Wisconsin*	*Total*
Princeton	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	2
Sacred Heart (Frankfurt)	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
St. Joseph's (Beirut)	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1
St. Louis	5	2	1	4	9	2	1	5	.	13	42
Scranton	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Sorbonne	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	2
S. California	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	1
Stanford	2	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	4
Texas	.	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Toronto	1	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1	.	3
Wisconsin	1	.	1	.	1	1	.	1	.	.	5
Woodstock	.	1	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Yale	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1	.	.	1
Total	37	12	20	30	19	34	12	44	11	28	247

* *Anthropology* at Chicago, Indiana; *Biology* at Catholic University, Fordham (2), Marquette (2), M.I.T., St. Louis (3), Scranton, Stanford; *Business Administration* at N.Y.U.; *Byzantine Studies* at Oriental Institute; *Chemistry* at Boston College, Brooklyn Polytechnic, California, Catholic University (4), Fordham (4), Illinois, Loyola (Chicago) (4), M.I.T., Pennsylvania, St. Louis (4); *Communication Arts* at Detroit, Michigan; *Economics* at Columbia (2), Georgetown (4), Marquette (2), N.Y.U., St. Louis; *Education* at Chicago, Columbia, Fordham, Minnesota; *Engineering* at M.I.T., St. Louis (2); *English* at California, Fordham (7), Harvard, London, Loyola (Chicago), Loyola (L. A.), Marquette, Michigan, Minnesota, N. Carolina, Oxford (2), St. Louis (5), Wisconsin (2), Yale; *Geophysics* at California (2); *History* at Catholic University, Columbia, Louvain, Loyola (Chicago), Notre Dame, St. Louis (6), Toronto; *American History* at Wisconsin; *European History* at Georgetown; *Latin American History* at University of Mexico; *Medieval History* at Johns Hopkins; *Journalism* at Iowa, Missouri; *Classical Languages* at Cambridge, Fordham (3), Goethe University, Harvard (3), Illinois (2), Oxford (2), Princeton (2), Toronto; *Modern Languages* at Fordham, St. Louis (3), Sorbonne, Stanford; *Oriental Languages* at Iraq (4), St. Joseph's (Beirut); *Semitic Languages* at Johns Hopkins (2); *Labor Relations* at Wisconsin; *Law* at Chicago, Columbia, Harvard (2), Georgetown; *Library Science* at California; *Linguistics* at Sorbonne; *Mathematics* at Catholic University (2), Harvard (2), Loyola (Chicago), Notre Dame, Pennsylvania (2), St. Louis, Stanford; *Music* at Harvard, Paris; *Philosophy* at Fordham (3), Freiburg, Gregorian (4), Laval, Louvain (5), Munster, St. Louis (7), Toronto; *Physics* at Boston College, Catholic University (4), Georgetown (2), John Carroll (2), Johns Hopkins (3), Louisiana State, M.I.T. (3), Marquette, St. Louis (6), Stanford, Texas; *Political Science* at Duke, Georgetown (7), London, St. Louis (2); *Psychology* at Fordham (2), Loyola (Chicago) (2), Mainz, Ottawa, St. Louis; *Sacred Scripture* at Biblical Institute (2); *Social Sciences* at Loyola (Chicago); *Social Work* at Boston College, S. California; *Sociology* at Columbia, Fordham (2), Loyola (Chicago), St. Louis, Wisconsin; *Ascetical Theology* at Gregorian; *Dogmatic Theology* at Gregorian (11), Institute Catholique (2), Sacred Heart, Woodstock; *Moral Theology* at Gregorian; *Canon Law* at Gregorian; *Viticulture* at California.

IV. Degree Sought

	California	*Chicago*	*Detroit*	*Maryland*	*Missouri*	*New England*	*New Orleans*	*New York*	*Oregon*	*Wisconsin*	*Total*
Ph.D., new	7	2	2	9	4	3	2	7	3	4	43
Ph.D., cont.	11	6	10	17	4	11	4	18	2	7	90
S.T.D., new	1	.	1	2	.	.	.	.	.	.	4
S.T.D., cont.	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	14
Other Doctor, new	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Other Doctor, cont.	.	.	.	1[5]	.	1[5]	.	.	1[1]	1[5]	4
M.A., new	7	.	2	.	7	3	.	6	.	9	34
M.A., cont.	2	.	.	.	1	1	1	3	1	1	10
M.S., new	1	3	3	.	2	1	4	3	.	1	18
M.S., cont.	1	.	1	.	.	4	.	2	1	3	12
Other Master, new	1[3]	.	.	.	.	.	.	2[3,4]	.	.	3
Other Master, cont.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Other Degree, new	1[6]	.	.	.	.	2[2]	.	1[6]	.	.	4
Other Degree, cont.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
No Degree, new	1	.	.	.	.	3	.	.	1	1	6
No Degree, cont.	.	.	.	.	.	4	.	.	1	.	5
Total	37	12	20	30	19	34	12	44	11	28	247

[1] J.C.D.
[2] B.S.
[3] LL.M.
[4] M.B.A.
[5] S.J.D.
[6] S.S.L.

We are happy to report that the upward trend in the number of special studies of which we spoke last year has continued. The total of 247 full-time special students means an over-all increase of 20 over last year, and is the highest since the all-time high or 254 in 1949–1950. While priest special students show a decrease of 4, there are 24 more scholastics engaged in special studies than last year. In terms of provinces, only one province shows a decrease; three remain the same as last year, while six provinces show an increase. New York, California, and New England top the list with 44, 37, and 34 students respectively.

Our Jesuits are working in 40 different fields of study, at 59 different institutions, 22 of them Catholic and 37 secular. With the current emphasis on science it is interesting to note that we have 25 special students in physics, 22 in chemistry, 12 in biology and 9 in mathematics. Actually the most popular fields are English, physics and philosophy with 26, 25, 23 students in that order.

St. Louis with 42 Jesuit students again leads the Catholic institutions in the number of special students. It is followed by Fordham 25, Gregorian 18, Georgetown 15, Catholic University of America 12, Loyola (Chicago)

11, Louvain 6. Among secular institutions Harvard jumped ahead this year with 9 students, Johns Hopkins, Columbia, and M.I.T. and California have six each, Wisconsin has 5 and Oxford 4.

These are only the high lights of our 1957–1958 report. A further study of our tables will, no doubt, reveal other interesting data, according to each ones own field of interest.

Through correspondence with province prefects we have learned that of last years 227 full-time special students 135 are continuing their studies this year. Sixty-one have either received their degrees or will receive them at the next commencement; 24 have not yet completed their requirements and 7 discontinued special studies.

While graduate studies are not the only road to scholarly activity, they are certainly one of the best. Hence the report on special studies program is an indication that superiors and officials of the American Assistancy have done much to emphasize the positive way toward Catholic scholarship.

What scholarly productivity will come from this program in another story. The annual reports on Jesuit Scholarly Publications which we have been publishing during the past years in the January issues of the *Jesuit Educational Quarterly* give some indication of scholarly productivity. Should we be satisfied with such results? It seems to me that our scholars, especially those who had the advantage of special studies should answer that question.

It would be interesting to make a study on the actual relationship between our special studies program and scholarly production among Jesuits. Let us hope that future reports on special studies will continue to prove the American Jesuit emphasis on positive helps to scholarship; and that the Jesuit scholars themselves will give the best and most positive answers to the complaint about lack of scholarly productivity.

News from the Field

J.E.Q. INDEX: A topical index for Volumes XI through XX is being prepared and will be distributed with the June issue.

CHANGES IN DIRECTORY: Father Michael P. Walsh has become president of Boston College succeeding Father Joseph R. N. Maxwell. Father Andrew H. Bachhuber is now rector of St. Mary's College, Kansas, while Father Linus J. Thro has become rector of the Fusz Memorial, Bellarmine House of Studies, at St. Louis University.

JESUIT PRESIDENTS MEET: On January 3–4, 1958, a meeting of the presidents of Jesuit colleges and universities was held. A statement on the Current Role of Jesuit Higher Education and a summary of a discussion on Federal aid to education are printed in this issue. The assembled presidents also approved the establishment of a national Jesuit Commission on Research to coordinate and extend the research activities of Jesuit institutions of higher education throughout the United States. The commission will be an integral part of the Jesuit Educational Association, and will undertake research projects in science, engineering, the humanities, and other areas, drawing on the facilities and personnel of the member institutions. While concerned primarily with basic research, the commission will also serve business, industry, and governmental agencies. Ralph E. Trese of the University of Detroit Research Institute has been named executive director of the commission. The office of the commission will be located on the campus of the University of Detroit. The nine-man board of directors will be composed of Jesuit and lay representatives from the member schools.

TO KNOW AND SPREAD THE TRUTH: On Sunday, December 8, 1957, the Archdiocese of Boston conducted a special observance of the Golden Jubilee of Father Arthur Sheehan, Province Prefect of studies for high schools of the New England Province. Archbishop Richard J. Cushing presided and preached a sermon in which he paid tribute to Father Sheehan for his labors on behalf of Catholic education in New England and praised him as a priest whose "dominant interest has been to know and spread the truth." "A man like Father Sheehan who can work co-operatively and smoothly with others," said the Archbishop, "is worth infinitely more than one who must be the center of everything and who exacts painful and dangerous personal reward for his contribution to the common good."

SCHOLARS OF MERIT: Among the semi-finalists of the National Merit Scholarship competition were 163 students from Jesuit high

schools. The total Jesuit high school population is 28,693 or approximately 3.8 percent of the total Catholic high school population, but Jesuit high school students earned 163, or 27 percent, of 606 places won by Catholic high school students.

FIRST AT THE BAR: The University of Detroit School of Law, the only Catholic law school in Michigan, was reported as being first in the results of the Michigan State Bar examination. Recently the American Bar Association referred to this law school as "offering a discriminative program in a distinctive school to a well-selected group of students."

COSTS OF ATTENDING COLLEGE, a pamphlet published by the U.S. Office of Education, is an interesting study of a problem fast becoming critical. Copies may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

SUMMER INSTITUTES for secondary-school science teachers will be held at the Oak Ridge Institute for Nuclear Studies, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, this summer. The institutes will be sponsored by the National Science Foundation. One institute for 48 secondary-school science teachers will study the fundamentals of physical science, science experiments, radioisotope techniques, science related disciplines, challenges in physical science, and techniques in teaching science. Another institute for 40 teachers will study a new program for high-school physics.

SUMMER INSTITUTES IN THEOLOGY will be held this year at Boston College. Father Paul Henry, S.J., of the Institut Catholique of Paris will lecture on "The Christian Idea of God and its Problems in History, Speculative Thought, and Catechetical Teaching", June 30–July 11, and Father Gustave Weigel, S.J., of Woodstock College will lecture on "Contemporary Theologies of the Church", July 14–25. For further information write to Chairman, Theology Department, Boston College, Chestnut Hill 67, Massachusetts.

INSIGHT, a book by Father Bernard J.F. Lonergan (Province of Upper Canada), Gregorian University, Rome, will be the occasion of a series of lectures and discussions at St. Mary's University, Halifax, N.S., August 4–15. Father Lonergan will lecture each morning and discussions will be conducted each evening. *Insight* has been considered a major contribution to modern thought and provocative of serious study and discussion.

NINETY-FIVE PERCENT of the 1957 Class of Xavier High School, New York, entered college. The class also won a total of $455,600 worth of scholarships.

CRADLE OF VOCATIONS: According to a recent survey of the years 1947–1956, 239 graduates of Boston College High School answered the call of Christ on graduation or a few years later. Seventy-two entered

the Society of Jesus, 48 entered religious orders or congregations, and 119 entered seminaries for the diocesan clergy. Archbishop Cushing has recently pointed out that one-fifth of the seminarians of St. John's Major Seminary, the diocesan seminary of Boston are B.C. High graduates.

VOCATIONS: There was an increase in the total number of vocations reported among last (school) year's high-school students over the previous year.

	Jesuit Novitiates	*Other Religious Families*	*Diocesan Seminaries*	*Totals*
Totals 1956–1957*	154	42	73	269
Totals 1955–1956	146	30	81	257
Average per school 1956–1957	3.76	1.02	1.78	6.56
Average per school 1955–1956	3.65	.75	2.03	6.43

* Forty-one schools counted. McQuaid Jesuit High School (Rochester, N.Y.) and Jesuit High School (Portland, Oregon) had no graduates. Last year forty schools were counted, Jesuit High School (Portland), McQuaid Jesuit High School (Rochester), and Chaplain Kapaun Memorial High School (Wichita, Kansas) having no graduates. (It should also be noted that Holy Rosary Mission High School reported one vocation to the Society.)

Vocations from Jesuit colleges and universities showed an increase of 11 over the previous year.

	Jesuit Novitiates	*Other Religious Families*	*Diocesan Seminaries*	*Totals*
Totals 1956–1957	111	135	110	356
Totals 1955–1956	98	131	116	345

Vocations to the Society increased by 13, while vocations to the diocesan clergy decreased by 6. The number of vocations to other religious orders and congregations showed an increase of 4 over last year. However it should be noted that the number of vocations to congregations of men decreased by 17, while the number of vocations to congregations of women increased by 21. The most popular congregations of men were *Trappists*–18 (Boston College reported 7 Trappist vocations), *Maryknoll*–13, *Benedictines*–9.

Jesuit Educational Quarterly

INDEX TO VOLUME XX

June 1957 to March 1958