



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 6
Issue 3 May

Article 11

May 1979

Loneliness and Deprivation: The Case of Roman Catholic Priests

John F. Schnabel
West Virginia University

John P. Koval
DePaul University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Catholic Studies Commons, and the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Schnabel, John F. and Koval, John P. (1979) "Loneliness and Deprivation: The Case of Roman Catholic Priests," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 6 : Iss. 3 , Article 11.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol6/iss3/11>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



LONELINESS AND DEPRIVATION:
THE CASE OF ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS

John F. Schnabel
West Virginia University

John P. Koval
DePaul University

Abstract

Using Roman Catholic Priests as a test in order to control for deprivation in relationships of intimacy while maximizing the need for social network relationships, an examination was made of their differential experience of loneliness.

The evidence suggested repeatedly that priests were more likely to experience loneliness as a serious problem when they perceived that the social network which they regarded as most significant in their lives (the Church) placed some kind of structural limitation on the extent of their involvement in it. Factors, for example, which help determine the individual priest's place in the structure of the Church are: type of assignment, length of time ordained, and degree of integration into the network through mutual commitment; all of these factors correlate significantly with the experience of loneliness.

For priests experiencing serious loneliness, there were further significant correlations with a perceived deficit in intimacy, an expressed need for sexual intimacy, a desire to marry, and more frequent dating behavior.

While causal sequences could not be established with certainty, the use of Guttman scaling techniques and a logical ordering of the variables suggests strongly that an emotional response (in this case an exaggerated search for intimate relationships) may have been triggered by social deprivation (network exclusion) rather than by an emotional deprivation (in intimacy) as might have been expected.

Such a possibility has far-reaching implications and calls for further research. If an exaggerated search for intimate relationships can be triggered by social network

deprivation, that might shed light on a variety of other phenomena such as promiscuity and rape, especially in urban, industrialized societies whose character is such that secondary relationships become more pervasive and achieve such great importance in the minds and daily lives of the people.

LONELINESS AS A DEFICIT CONDITION

According to Weiss (1973:9-27), loneliness occurs when one experiences a deficit in the fulfillment of one or the other or both of two human needs. The first of these is the need for human intimacy or "bonding" or attachment. The second is the need for engaging social networks or socially integrating relationships. Research of these "causes" has been almost non-existent, however (c.f. Fromm-Reichman, 1959:1), and thus far Weiss' thesis remains in the realm of highly appealing conjecture.

In this paper we address Weiss' question by (a) holding emotional deficits constant and (b) applying some critical tests which, if the results are negative, would markedly diminish further consideration of network exclusion as a cause of loneliness. If the results of the tests are positive, however, then further examination of social network exclusion as a cause of serious loneliness is justified. As an added contribution, we propose to show the prevalence of loneliness among the members of one professional group and certain concomitants of that experience for those members.

DERIVATIVE ASSUMPTIONS

If Weiss is correct, the risk of loneliness is considerably lessened if both the need for intimacy and the need for an engaging social network are fulfilled. When a deficit occurs in either one, however, the risk is increased even though compensation may be attempted by the over-development of the other. One who is deprived of a relationship of intimacy, for example, may find "escape" in work. Similarly, one who is deprived of an engaging social network may attempt to compensate by over-reliance on some

strong emotional bond. Deficits in the fulfillment of both makes loneliness a high risk.

The element of personal valuation would be important in both instances. If a particular social network is to provide relief from loneliness, it must be valued as significant. Thus, the attempt to fill the hours of the widowed with activity would be fruitless unless the widowed person regards that activity as meaningful. By the same token, it follows that not just any relationship would satisfy the need for intimacy.

Even when an individual regards a particular network as significant, there is no guarantee that the network will be open to participation (c.f. Sorokin, 1947:175). The forced retiree may want to continue with work but is prevented from doing so. We have, then, what we would call "empirically open" and "empirically closed" networks. Going a step further, the perception of the individual is once more an important consideration. Even if the "significant" network is "empirically open," the individual may perceive it as closed. Though it is a misperception, like other perceptions, it is real in its consequences. Similarly the individual may misperceive an empirically closed network as being open.

PRIESTS AS A TEST CASE

Roman Catholic priests provide a convenient test case for the study of loneliness because of the variables that can be held constant. Few priests are ever permitted the benefit of emotional intimacy or bonding. There are broad restrictions and effective sanctions against the development of close personal associations with individuals of either sex. It is not explanatory, therefore, to suggest that priests are lonely because of restrictions against emotional attachments alone. The restrictions are universal, but loneliness is not. Moreover, the extensive anticipatory socialization procedures carried on by seminaries prepare candidates for the priesthood for this kind of deficit. Prospective priests know in advance, have practiced and accept the fact that mandatory celibacy will lead to intimacy deprivation.

Priests, then, have evaluated significance in advance. They trust that the social network to which they are committing themselves will provide them with the kinds of integrative significant relationships that will at least minimize if not prevent loneliness.

Study of priests, then, enables us to focus more specifically on deprivation in socially integrative relationships by holding relatively constant their deprivation in emotional bonding.

DATA

This study is based upon survey data from the 1774 Roman Catholic priests who responded to a study supported by the National Federation of Priests' Councils and conducted by John P. Koval and Richard Bell. The number of respondents represents a 63% response rate from the original national sample of 2830 priests who received questionnaires.

INDICATORS OF OPEN AND CLOSED NETWORKS

In an attempt to specify what might be potential indicators of open and closed networks and thus critical variables, the notion of career stages or career patterns offered a starting point. The development of a career through successive stages and the process of following particular patterns inherent in the career seemed to suggest some ways in which the specific social network might be opened up or closed off to its members as well as its aspirants. Lee Taylor (1968:292) has said that the notion of career patterns involves the elements of (a) longevity; (b) specificity of function; (c) commitment and (d) hierarchy.

LONGEVITY

Following Taylor's lead and developing logically the first of the list, it makes sense to suggest that for the

most part the longer one has been in a profession, the greater the likelihood of integration and the less the risk of social isolation. This occurs in part because the network holds its youngest aspirants "on trial" until they have proven themselves. It occurs, also, because longevity tends to produce greater commitment on the part of the individual to which the network responds favorably (c.f. Grusky, 1968:188-190).

Too much stock should not be placed in longevity alone as an indicator of network inclusion, however. The fact that some members may have been in a profession for a considerable length of time may mean only that they have become increasingly adept at adjusting to the stress of being excluded from meaningful participation. It is only as one of several indicators that longevity might prove useful. It is in that sense that the question of its correlation with loneliness is raised. If longevity does not correlate significantly and negatively with loneliness, then whatever inferences we might make about longevity, being a potential indicator of the kind of network exclusion that produces loneliness (c.f. Weiss) would immediately be discredited. Table 1 shows the relationship between longevity and the experience of loneliness among Roman Catholic priests.

It is quite clear from the table that there is a significant difference in the experience of loneliness depending upon one's length of time in the priesthood. Fifty percent of those who have been ordained four years or less experiencing loneliness as a serious problem. The percentage of those experiencing serious loneliness decreased with each advanced tenure grouping.

The use of longevity as a solitary indicator of network exclusion, however, is further diminished when age of respondents is correlated with loneliness. Table 2 shows that age, too, correlates negatively with loneliness, so that older priests tend to be less lonely than younger priests.

Again, alternative explanations are as viable as the one to which we are giving special attention. It is possible, for example, that as priests grow older, they

learn to live with and adjust to loneliness, so that it is no longer a problem for them. It is also possible that those for whom it has been a serious problem simply left the priesthood while they were young.

Whatever the reason, the experience of priests is different from the experience of the general population with regard to loneliness. Among priests, as Table 2 shows, there is a linear trend from the youngest priests who are the most lonely to the oldest priests who are the least lonely. In the general population (as reported by Weiss, 1973:29), the relationship of age with loneliness is curvilinear with the younger members and the older members experiencing the greatest loneliness and those in the middle years experiencing the least loneliness.

The strength of the negative linear relationship between loneliness and age suggests that age might be a confounding variable, and that in any further examination of possible indicators of network exclusion, the age of respondents ought to be controlled. Only if subsequent variables can be shown to correlate even when age is controlled, can any confidence be placed in their value as potential indicators.

SPECIFICITY OF FUNCTION

Specificity of function suggested to us either that the importance of the tasks one performs within the group may affect the degree of social integration or that the degree of social integration might affect the importance of tasks one is called upon to perform. In either case, it is a potentially useful indicator. In the first instance, specificity of function would provide a direct measure of network inclusion. In the second instance, it would provide an indirect measure of the same phenomenon. We examined, therefore, the different kinds of work assignments of priests as they correlated with the experience of loneliness.

One of the problems in doing so was to establish some rank order of importance of assignments. Normally there is a considerable amount of subjective evaluation (both

individual and collective) in establishing the importance of work tasks, but that evaluation is not without its standards. Functional stratification theory points to at least one of those standards (c.f. Tumin, 1963:19-26). According to this standard, those whose work assignments represent a contribution to the whole network rather than to segmented parts of the network are those that would be most highly valued.

The more segmented the task, then, the less importance to the whole and hence the less valuable and lowest ranked. Using a criterion of evaluation based on the assumed contribution to the whole church and employing the categories in the questionnaire, the rank ordering of importance of work assignments for priests from most important to least important was as follows: (1) Chancery official; (2) Parish priest; (3) Seminary assignment; (4) Health and welfare agency; (5) Educational assignment and (6) Military chaplain.

Table 3 shows the relationship between work assignment and loneliness while controlling for age.

Though there is a definite pattern in that those whose work assignment is most important for the total network (chancery officials) experience the least loneliness, while those whose work assignment is most removed from and least important for the total network (military chaplains) experience the most loneliness, the pattern is affected in all cases by the age of the respondents. The younger the military chaplain, for example, the more likely he is to experience loneliness as a serious problem, but the older the military chaplain, the less likely he is to experience loneliness as a serious problem. This was true even though military chaplains of nearly every age group experienced considerably more loneliness than parish priests or chancery officials of the comparable age groups.

COMMITMENT

The third indicator of integration into a social network proposed earlier was commitment. Though commitment may be measured by the degree of conformity or deviance

that the individual manifests toward its goals, norms, and basic orientation, recognition must be made of the fact that commitment is both reciprocal and dynamic. Responses from the network affect subsequent responses of the individual which affect subsequent responses of the network, etc.. If individual overtures toward greater integration into the network are rebuffed, movements away from the network will often begin. As Merton (1957:270) has indicated:

What the individual experiences as estrangement from a group of which he is a member tends to be experienced by his associates as repudiation of the group, and this ordinarily evokes a hostile response. As social relations between the individual and the rest of the group deteriorate, the norms of the group become less binding for him. For since he is progressively seceding from the group and being penalized for it, he is less likely to experience rewards for adherence to the group's norms. Once initiated, this process seems to move toward a cumulative detachment from the group, in terms of attitudes and values as well as in terms of social relations.

Following this proposed pattern by Merton allowed us to suggest that in a network such as the priesthood which involves and regulates the sentiments and behavior of members in almost all of their selves and roles (what Merton called a "totalitarian group"; 1957:311), factors which initiate and further the cumulative detachment from the group might promote greater loneliness of the priest.

We examined tendencies to deviate, therefore, to see if they served as further correlates of loneliness, assuming that the individual who believes himself to be at odds with the basic orientation of the group (whether he is or not) is most likely to also assume he is excluded from the network and experience more loneliness. Establishing causality was again impossible, however, because of the alternative explanation that loneliness might have preceded deviant behavior, and that the specific deviant attitudes and behaviors might be further adjustment mechanisms to loneliness. Because of the dynamic referred to earlier (c.f. Merton), however, we could at least conclude that in

the absence of any significant correlations between deviant orientations, behaviors and loneliness, a social network exclusion explanation for loneliness would be further called into question.

In a matter as simple as social or political orientation, the correlations with loneliness among those who as individuals deviate from what they believe to be the social and political orientation of the network are significant. Priests generally believe that the Roman Catholic Church tends to be a "conservative" or "traditional" institution, oriented to and often defending the status quo regarding social and political issues (c.f. Gerassi, 1963:11-12; our data also show this to be true, though there is no need to repeat Gerassi's results). What is ironic here is that a substantial majority of priests in our sample identified themselves as liberal. Though they were a numerical majority, they believed that they held a minority orientation.

Priests who consider themselves to be conservative, then, believe that they fit in, while those who consider themselves liberal do not. If there is any substance to a social network exclusion explanation for loneliness, then the latter should be experiencing more loneliness. Table 4 shows the significant linear relationship in that direction, even with age controlled.

Though older liberals again tend to be less lonely than younger liberals, liberals are more likely to be lonely in all age groups than conservatives. Moderates are less likely to experience loneliness as a serious problem than liberals in all age groups but more likely to experience it than conservatives. Similarly, those who admit to being conservatives are more likely to indicate that loneliness is no problem whatsoever than those who consider themselves moderates or liberals.

It was not possible from our data to establish time sequences to show that specific acts of deviance either preceded or followed isolation and loneliness. It was possible, however, to demonstrate that there is a correlation between not only basic orientations and loneliness but also between specific actions and

loneliness. Those who deviate from what they perceive to be the accepted norms are more likely to experience loneliness as a serious problem and those who experience loneliness as a serious problem are more likely to deviate from what they perceive to be the accepted norms. Table 5 presents a summary of significant correlations between perceived deviant activities and the loneliness of priests. Once again, there is an irony in the fact that in at least two of those activities, the "deviants" are a sizeable proportion of the whole.

Those most likely to engage in such activities as speaking out against the Church's position on celibacy, going out socially with a woman friend or counseling on contraceptives experience loneliness as a serious problem. Once more the results held even when controlling for age.

HIERARCHY

The hierarchy dimension suggested to us that the higher one is placed authoritatively in the network, the greater might be the integration (c.f. Dreyfuss, 1968:146). A bureaucracy does not normally place "outsiders" in its critical power positions. Data at our disposal, however, did not allow us to investigate this dimension.

LONELINESS AND SELF-REPORTED STRESSES

Thus far we have dealt with a series of variables that taken together could potentially connote relative inclusion or exclusion from a significant social network regardless of the perception of the individual member. Early in this paper, however, it was indicated that if individual members perceive even an open network as being closed, the effects of that perception may be as real as if the network were empirically closed to their contribution or participation. We examined, therefore, a number of the priests' self-reported stresses of the kind that can be said to be related to their perception of themselves as social network "outsiders." A list of the stresses and the correlation between each and the experience of loneliness is included in Table 6.

Even though the correlations are significant, caution must once more be observed in imputing the direction of causality. It is every bit as probable, for example, that loneliness could have precipitated a perception of a lack of support and encouragement from fellow priests as it is that the perceived lack of support and encouragement from fellow priests brought about a feeling of loneliness. Guttman scaling techniques applied to these stresses, however, provided at least a basis for some kind of a logical analysis. The ordering of the variables using those techniques is given in Table 7.

Analysis then suggested that nearly all who are frustrated in their efforts to work also experience a lack of support and encouragement from their fellow priests, though not all who experience a lack of support and encouragement from their fellow priests are frustrated in their efforts to work.

Since Guttman scaling does not permit temporal ordering, an appeal must be made to logic and reason to understand the relationship between the stresses and the report of loneliness. It is not difficult, however, to construct from these results a reasonable and logical progression clearly paralleling the increasing isolation outlined in the Mertonian hypothesis quoted earlier, terminating in a marked tendency toward loneliness as a serious problem. Such a construction might take the following form:

The young fledgling priest who has not yet been accepted into the inner circles of the new social world to which he has committed himself experiences structural exclusion that he interprets as a lack of support and encouragement from his fellow priests. As a consequence he becomes frustrated in his efforts to work--a not uncommon experience when one's best efforts seem to be unrewarded. He is alone and put on trial with the burden of proof on him that he has a contribution to make to the religious network. He interprets its failure to include him as intransigence and rigidity reflected in the Church's slow pace of change and its outmoded social and moral stands. Those in positions of authority and leadership are blamed

for this inflexibility, and the young priest considers himself alone in his efforts. This aloneness, especially in the absence of any other social supports, quickly assumes the form of loneliness.

The fact that the youngest priests experience the most loneliness supports the logic of this progression of stresses. The fact that liberals in a structure that they perceive to be conservative experience more loneliness than those who are conservative supports it. The fact that those who engage in non-conforming activities experience more loneliness supports it.

The whole of the progression is a kind of "sociopathic individuation process" carrying the young priest along by the responses of his one significant community from primary non-conformity to a non-conforming career and from exclusion to estrangement to loneliness.

If the logic of this explanation is appropriate, then it might also be suggested that it is after the priest experiences the loneliness of estrangement from the social network that he becomes most acutely aware of a deficit in intimacy or bonding. Guttman scaling demonstrated that a valid scale exists when loneliness is considered in connection with the intimacy stresses: (a) the need for sexual intimacy and (b) desire to marry. These results are reported in Table 8.

The presence of a valid scale tells us that those who desire to marry are almost certain to admit to a need for sexual intimacy and a feeling of loneliness. Those priests who admit to a need for sexual intimacy are almost certain to be experiencing loneliness but do not necessarily desire to marry. Those priests experiencing loneliness do not necessarily admit to either a need to sexual intimacy or a desire to marry. Attempts to reverse the order did not produce a valid scale.

A desire to marry sometimes occurring without an expressed need for sexual intimacy, and an expressed need for sexual intimacy sometimes occurring without an admission of serious loneliness, but serious loneliness occurring often enough without either an expressed need for

sexual intimacy or a desire to marry suggests logically that the prevalent form of loneliness may be the result of a deficit in integrative social relationships rather than a deficit in emotional bonding.

BEHAVIORAL CORRELATES OF THE EXPERIENCE OF LONELINESS

Table 9 shows that the greater the experience of loneliness among priests, the more likely it is that they are engaging in dating behavior.

To appreciate the importance of this behavior, one must be aware of not only the commitment to celibacy which each priest has made, but also the intense pressure for avoidance of close personal friendships that is placed upon the Roman Catholic priest. That it is decidedly deviant is attested by the fact that 73% of the priests answered that they had never engaged in dating behavior since the time that they were ordained. Given the implications associated with dating behavior and its association with courtship, for a priest to admit (even in the anonymity of a questionnaire) that he is dating must mean that he has faced up to some rather crucial identity questions and could well mean that he now perceives himself as a secondary deviant. It can hardly be argued that the priest misunderstood the meaning of "dating" when the questionnaire carefully distinguished between dating and "going out socially with a woman friend" as a separate category of behavior.

The pattern of responses to this question as correlated with loneliness and reported in Table 9 is again consistent. Those who experience loneliness as a serious problem are those who are much more likely to be engaging in dating behavior. The tendency to engage in dating behavior even occasionally or seldom is very slight among those who experience no problem with loneliness. Those who experience loneliness as annoying are more likely to be dating than those who experience loneliness as no problem, but less likely to be dating than those who experience loneliness as a serious problem.

While it still cannot be established which came first,

either way the results are supportive of a call for further examination of social network exclusion as a strong contributor to serious loneliness. If loneliness came before dating behavior, then one must still ask what was the source of the loneliness. If loneliness came after dating behavior, that could provide evidence that engaging in deviant activities further excludes the priest from his significant social network.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It has been shown that in a population group where emotional bonding can be held constant, the experience of serious loneliness characterizes a large number of the members. Further, it has been shown that this experience of serious loneliness correlates with deficits in integrative relationships within significant social networks. Further correlating with loneliness and the deficit in integrative relationships is a perceived deficit in intimacy.

Using Roman Catholic Priests as a test case, it was discovered that those factors which help determine the individual priest's place in the structure of the Church such as length of time ordained, type of assignment, and commitment, all correlate significantly and negatively with loneliness. Guttman scaling techniques helped to establish that nearly all Priests who are concerned with a deficit in intimacy are experiencing loneliness; though of priests who are experiencing loneliness, not all are concerned with a deficit in intimacy.

Loneliness of priests correlates significantly with a desire to marry and an expressed need for sexual intimacy and is accompanied by more dating behavior than characterizes the non-lonely priest.

The paper, then, consisted of examining a series of variables in such a way as to rule out further consideration of social network exclusion as a cause of loneliness, if possible. In all cases, this procedure failed which suggests that exclusion from significant social networks and not merely a deficit in emotional

attachments is worthy of further research as a cause of serious loneliness. This is especially important, not only in the hope of greater understanding of a widespread condition in urbanized and industrialized society, but also in view of what it might portend for planners.

The practical implications of what this study has suggested are many. For those concerned with problems of the priesthood in our day, this analysis offers the possibility that alterations in the Church's structure which could incorporate the young priest into the Church's work in a meaningful way early in his career, might relieve many of the stresses that correlate with serious loneliness and the desire for the development of specific interpersonal relationships.

In a wider application, this analysis suggests that examination should now be made of the possibility that our efforts at overcoming loneliness in the general population have been partially misdirected. Neither busy-work (which is not a "significant" contribution) nor attempts to provide opportunities for the lonely to meet and develop intimate bonds may suffice. It would probably not take a massive reorganization of society to provide opportunities for the young and the old (who are the most lonely) to be meaningful contributors to significant social networks.

If it is true, as this study hueristically suggests, that an emotional response (exaggerated search for intimacy) may be triggered by a social deficit (network exclusion) rather than only by an emotional deficit (intimacy deprivation), this could certainly throw some illumination on a variety of other phenomena in industrialized society such as rape, the search for "affairs" and promiscuity as exaggerations of the need for intimacy to compensate for social network exclusion, or even upon suicide as a response to what is going on outside the individual's reach rather than emanating from a defect in personality.

REFERENCES

- DREYFUSS, Carl
1968 "Prestige Grading: A Mechanism of Control."
Pp. 145-59 in Barney Glaser (ed.),
Organizational Careers. Chicago: Aldine.
- FROMM-REICHMANN, Frieda
1959 "Loneliness." Psychiatry, 22:1-9.
- GERASSI, John
1963 The Great Fear. New York: The Macmillan
Company.
- GRUSKY, Oscar
1968 "Career Mobility and Organizational
Commitment." Pp. 188-190 in Barney Glaser
(ed.), Organizational Careers. Chicago:
Aldine.
- LOPATA, Helena Z.
1968 "Social Psychological Aspects of Role
Involvement." Sociology and Social Research
53:285-299.
- MERTON, Robert K.
1957 Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe:
The Free Press.
- SOROKIN, Pitirim
1947 Society, Culture and Personality. New York:
Harper and Brothers.
- TAYLOR, Lee
1968 Occupational Sociology. New York: Oxford
University Press.
- WEISS, Robert S.
1973 Loneliness: The Experience of Emotional and
Social Isolation. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Table 1. Relationship Between Length of Time Priests Have Been Ordained and Their Experience of Loneliness (Percents)

| Loneliness | LENGTH OF TIME ORDAINED | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | (N=239) 4 years or less | (N=319) 5-10 years | (N=263) 11-15 years | (N=231) 16-20 years | (N=157) 21-25 years | (N=157) 26-30 years | (N=112) 31-35 years | (N=102) 36 years or more |
| (1) No Problem for me | 18 | 20 | 33 | 39 | 43 | 48 | 62 | 64 |
| (2) Annoying | 32 | 34 | 35 | 35 | 39 | 39 | 28 | 25 |
| (3) A Serious Problem | 50 | 46 | 33 | 26 | 18 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 100 | 101 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 101 | 100 |

p < .001

Gamma = -.402

AGE

| LONELINESS | AGE | | | | (N=154) 60 or older |
|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| | (N=153) Under 30 | (N=545) 30-39 | (N=483) 40-49 | (N=303) 50-59 | |
| (1) No Problem for Me | 16 | 22 | 35 | 47 | 66 |
| (2) Annoying | 28 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 24 |
| (3) A Serious Problem | 56 | 45 | 31 | 18 | 10 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 101 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

p < .001 Gamma = -.476

Table 2. Relationship Between Age of Priests
and Loneliness (Percents)

Table 3. Relationship Between Work Assignment of Priests and Loneliness with Age Controlled.

| LONELINESS: | AGE Under 30 | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------|------------------|----------|--------|---------------------|
| | Military | Educational | Health & Welfare | Seminary | Parish | Chancery |
| No Problem | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Annoying | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Serious Prob. | 0 | 56 | 100 | 100 | 55 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 100 | 100 | 101 | 101 | 0 |
| "N" | 0 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 121 | 0 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 30-39 | | | | | |
| | Military | Educational | Health & Welfare | Seminary | Parish | Chancery |
| No Problem | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| Annoying | 0 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 34 | 0 |
| Serious Prob. | 0 | 56 | 100 | 100 | 55 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 100 | 100 | 101 | 101 | 0 |
| "N" | 0 | 105 | 15 | 25 | 296 | 15 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 40-49 | | | | | |
| | Military | Educational | Health & Welfare | Seminary | Parish | Chancery |
| No Problem | 21 | 34 | 21 | 38 | 41 | 31 |
| Annoying | 36 | 26 | 32 | 28 | 28 | 39 |
| Serious Prob. | 43 | 40 | 47 | 34 | 31 | 31 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 101 |
| "N" | 14 | 62 | 19 | 32 | 276 | 13 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 50-59 | | | | | |
| | Military | Educational | Health & Welfare | Seminary | Parish | Chancery |
| No Problem | 50 | 55 | 50 | 0 | 62 | 100 |
| Annoying | 50 | 25 | 30 | 33 | 27 | 0 |
| Serious Prob. | 0 | 20 | 20 | 67 | 12 | 0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 101 | 100 |
| "N" | 4 | 20 | 10 | 3 | 234 | 1 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 60 & older | | | | | |
| | Military | Educational | Health & Welfare | Seminary | Parish | Chancery |
| No Problem | 0 | 50 | 25 | 100 | 79 | 100 |
| Annoying | 0 | 50 | 75 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| Serious Prob. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Total | 0 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 0 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 112 | 1 |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Not Controlled, | | | | | | r = .120 (p < .001) |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Controlled, | | | | | | r = .071 (p < .01) |

Table 4. Relationship Between the Social and Political Views of Priests and Loneliness with Age Controlled.

| LONELINESS: | AGE: Under 30 | | |
|---------------|-----------------|----------|--------------|
| | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative |
| No Problem | 6 | 19 | 0 |
| Annoying | 31 | 33 | 50 |
| Serious Prob. | 63 | 48 | 50 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 100 | 48 | 2 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 30-39 | | |
| | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative |
| No Problem | 7 | 26 | 50 |
| Annoying | 32 | 38 | 23 |
| Serious Prob. | 61 | 36 | 27 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 307 | 205 | 26 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 40-49 | | |
| | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative |
| No Problem | 13 | 49 | 67 |
| Annoying | 34 | 29 | 14 |
| Serious Prob. | 54 | 22 | 19 |
| Total | 101 | 100 | 101 |
| "N" | 187 | 242 | 36 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 50-59 | | |
| | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative |
| No Problem | 34 | 62 | 81 |
| Annoying | 32 | 30 | 16 |
| Serious Prob. | 34 | 8 | 3 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 53 | 203 | 37 |
| LONELINESS: | AGE: 60 & Older | | |
| | Liberal | Moderate | Conservative |
| No Problem | 50 | 81 | 88 |
| Annoying | 35 | 16 | 3 |
| Serious Prob. | 15 | 3 | 9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 26 | 88 | 32 |

Correlation Coefficient With Age Not Controlled, $r = .450$ ($p < .001$)

Correlation Coefficient With Age Controlled, $r = .369$ ($p < .001$)

Table 5. Relationship Between Deviant Activities and the Loneliness of Priests With Age Controlled.

| LONELINESS : | <u>Age Under 30</u> | | | <u>Age 30-39</u> | | | <u>Age 40-49</u> | | | <u>Age 50-59</u> | | | <u>Age 60 & Older</u> | | |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| | Have Decided To Do | Considering Doing | Too Improbable To Consider | Have Decided To Do | Considering Doing | Too Improbable To Consider | Have Decided To Do | Considering Doing | Too Improbable To Consider | Have Decided To Do | Considering Doing | Too Improbable To Consider | Have Decided To Do | Considering Doing | Too Improbable To Consider |
| <u>"GOING OUT SOCIALLY WITH A WOMAN FRIEND"</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Problem | 6 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 11 | 25 | 21 | 18 | 45 | 38 | 50 | 66 | 55 | 50 | 79 |
| Annoying | 38 | 11 | 32 | 30 | 23 | 39 | 27 | 21 | 30 | 34 | 25 | 27 | 18 | 50 | 16 |
| Serious Prob. | 57 | 89 | 50 | 60 | 66 | 36 | 52 | 61 | 25 | 28 | 25 | 8 | 27 | 0 | 5 |
| Total | 101 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 101 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 69 | 18 | 54 | 243 | 35 | 226 | 125 | 18 | 282 | 47 | 8 | 215 | 11 | 2 | 124 |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Not Controlled, $r = .345$ ($p < .001$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Controlled, $r = .243$ ($p < .001$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>"COUNSELING COUPLES ON THE USE OF CONTRACEPTIVES"</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Problem | 7 | 0 | 55 | 11 | 27 | 48 | 18 | 24 | 69 | 36 | 70 | 72 | 50 | 80 | 85 |
| Annoying | 33 | 33 | 18 | 33 | 46 | 34 | 35 | 40 | 18 | 40 | 30 | 22 | 34 | 10 | 12 |
| Serious Prob. | 60 | 67 | 27 | 56 | 27 | 18 | 47 | 36 | 13 | 24 | 0 | 6 | 16 | 10 | 3 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 133 | 3 | 11 | 427 | 26 | 67 | 277 | 25 | 144 | 98 | 10 | 171 | 32 | 10 | 97 |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Not Controlled, $r = .513$ ($p < .001$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Controlled, $r = .373$ ($p < .001$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <u>"SPEAKING OUT ON CELIBACY"</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| No Problem | 6 | 0 | 18 | 8 | 5 | 26 | 10 | 11 | 49 | 15 | 33 | 65 | 80 | 50 | 77 |
| Annoying | 25 | 33 | 42 | 23 | 31 | 41 | 33 | 18 | 29 | 39 | 33 | 27 | 0 | 50 | 17 |
| Serious Prob. | 69 | 67 | 40 | 68 | 64 | 34 | 57 | 71 | 22 | 46 | 33 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 6 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 101 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| "N" | 39 | 24 | 65 | 179 | 77 | 257 | 101 | 45 | 299 | 26 | 12 | 246 | 5 | 2 | 131 |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Not Controlled, $r = .411$ ($p < .001$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Correlation Coefficient With Age Controlled, $r = .313$ ($p < .001$) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Coefficient | * |
|-------------|---|
| .526 | Lack of Support and Encouragement from Fellow Priests |
| .486 | Frustrated in Efforts to work |
| .475 | Slow pace of change since Vatican II |
| .438 | Disappointment in Church's stand on social and moral issues |
| .417 | Lack of leadership from those in authority |
| --- | Loneliness |

* Correlation Coefficient used is Pearson's "r".

Table 6. Correlations Between Loneliness and Social Network Stresses

1. Lack of Support and Encouragement from fellow priests
2. Frustrated in Efforts to work
3. Slow pace of change since Vatican II
4. Disappointment in Church's stand on social and moral issues
5. Lack of leadership from those in authority
6. Loneliness

Table 7. Order of Social Network Stresses
Besetting Roman Catholic Priests

1. Loneliness
2. Need for Sexual Intimacy (.565 Correlation with Loneliness)
3. Desire to Marry (.586 Correlation with Loneliness)

Coefficient of Reproductibility = .910

Coefficient of Scalability = .692

Table 8. Order of Intimacy Stress
Using Guttman Scaling Technique

| Frequency of Dating | (N=519) Priests for Whom Loneliness is No Problem | | (N=499) Priests for Whom Loneliness is Annoying | | (N=528) Priests for Whom Loneliness is Serious Problem | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | |
| (1) Never | 86 | | 77 | | 56 | |
| (2) Seldom | 5 | | 12 | | 16 | |
| (3) Occasionally or often | 8 | | 12 | | 28 | |
| TOTAL | 100 | | 101 | | 100 | |

$p < .001$

Gamma = $-.464$

Table 9. Frequency of Dating Since Ordination Among Priests Differentially Experiencing Loneliness (in percent)