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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The present study examines the role of intimacy in the life of celibate Catholic priests. Priests have long been subjects of much curiosity. Authors like Graham Green and Morris West, as well as movie producers and playwrights, have explored the intimate vagaries of priests. Few, if any, have looked at intimacy as a legitimate, open, indeed desirable dimension of priestly living within the confines of a commitment to celibacy. The implication is that intimacy is an aberrant dimension in the lives of celibate priests.

As will be discussed below, the notion that celibate priests should abstain from close personal relationships is neither uncommon nor without documented support. For many years seminaries taught future priests to avoid closeness. This instilled in generations of priests the understanding that priesthood and intimacy are incompatible. In the last two decades the attitude toward intimacy has undergone a remarkable change (Larkin & Broccolo, 1973; Bishops' Committee on Priestly Formation, 1984). This change is apparent in both seminary training and the professional milieu of ministry.

Since the renewal of the church following the close of the Second Vatican Council in 1965, there has been a dramatic shift in the thinking about intimacy in seminary education.
That which was feared as dangerous to a priestly vocation has become an integral dimension of preparation for the priesthood (Bishops' Committee on Priestly Formation, 1984). According to the new model of priestly formation, it is in the forum of intimate relationships, with both God and others, that one develops the skills and dispositions necessary for successful conduct of the ministry and for personal psychological health.

In addition to the change in the seminary philosophy of training, there has also been a change in the professional climate of ministry. During the last two decades, the identity of the minister has changed from authority figure who knows certain matters better than non-professionals to one who enters into egalitarian and often personal relationships with clients (Kleinman, 1984). Within this new forum of professional practice is a new requirement for intimate exchange.

Thus, in both training and professional practice the priest is called upon to utilize his capacity for intimate relationships. One's preference for close personal relationships is an important factor in training and professional practice. The present research sets out to discover how important a factor intimacy is in the life and work of priests.

In the pages which follow I plan to focus on a major study of American priests undertaken at Loyola University of
Chicago in 1972 and also to review more recent investigations. Based on the findings of this research concerning the issue of intimacy, I will discuss the changing role of intimacy in both seminary training and the professional lives of priests and hypothesize that a preference for intimacy is positively associated with personal adjustment and life satisfaction among priests. I am suggesting that the current mode of training and the professional environment attract individuals who are high in intimacy orientation. If this is true, then candidates for the priesthood who are high in intimacy would be more likely to persevere to ordination than those who are low in intimacy, and ordained priests who are high in intimacy would be more likely to be satisfied with their lives and their work than those who are low in intimacy.
CHAPTER II
PRIESTS AND INTIMACY

Priests: How are they different?

Though priests are a constant source of intrigue and fascination as evidenced by the novels of Graham Greene, motion pictures such as "The Hoodlum Priest," "The Thornbirds," and stage productions such as "Mass Appeal," research has indicated that priests are ordinary men. This is the conclusion of Kennedy and Heckler (1972) following an in-depth study of Catholic priests in the United States. "Many of their conflicts and challenges arise precisely because they are ordinary men who have to live as though they were not ordinary at all" (p.3). The Church, society, and the priests themselves have high expectations of one who is ordained. Laboring under these expectations are men of ordinary human powers and limitations.

According to the Kennedy and Heckler study, which is also known as the Loyola project, American priests are able to meet most of the demands placed upon them. Despite the great expectations of those surrounding the priest, he is able to perform his duties without undue stress. However, this performance is in no way exceptional. The priest does not stand out on either end of the job performance continuum. Priests who fail to meet the requirements of the profession or
who excel are similar in number to those in other professions.

Kennedy and Heckler report that just like other professionals who have been the subjects of psychological research, priests, in general, have the necessary psychological resources to conduct their work competently. Priests are psychologically "ordinary." The researchers conclude that there is no special psychology for priests.

That priests are very similar to their peers in other professions has been demonstrated in more recent research. Nestor (1989) found that priests age 30 to 45 are very similar to their married peers. In this sample of diocesan priests and Catholic laymen, Nestor found no significant differences between priests and married men on any of the personality variables of the California Psychological Inventory. Priests and married men showed similar levels of confidence, ambition, independence, sociability, self-assurance, self-acceptance, self-sufficiency, responsibility, conformity, self-control, desire to make a good impression, well-being, tolerance, achievement, and psychological-mindedness. Priests also tend to be as satisfied with their lives as their married peers. An initial finding that priests are higher in generativity than their married peers did not hold up after an item analysis and revision of the Loyola Generativity Scale which was the measure used in the study. Married men and celibate priests are equally generative.
However, there were some interesting non-significant trends which warrant further investigation. Nestor found a non-significant trend indicating that priests might be more comfortable with themselves and might be better able to understand the feelings of others than their married peers. That those involved in the ministry of the priest might be better able to empathize with others is no surprise, given the nature of the work. Another non-significant trend indicated that the priests might be more likely to see themselves as average people than the married men.

The Loyola Study

The Loyola study is the single most comprehensive and penetrating examination of priests to this date. A structured clinical interview and other projective and objective measures were used to collect the information. However, it is important to point out that the study cannot qualify as an experiment as no control groups were used. The purpose of the study was both fact-finding and heuristic. The authors had hoped that the study would generate controlled studies.

Professional clinical psychologists conducted the interviews according to guidelines, not preset questions, thus allowing both the interviewer and subject flexibility. The interview covered family life and relationships, developmental experiences, psychosexual development, self-concept, development of vocation, interpersonal relationships, faith, priesthood, celibacy, and the future. The interviewer then
evaluated the priest in eight areas: (1) the manner in which the priest acted during the interview; (2) the nature of his emotional relationships; (3) functioning in interpersonal relationships, psychosexual matters, self-perception, job-satisfaction, church, faith, religion, and priesthood; (4) the interaction of background, personality, and vocation; (5) the priest's future outlook; (6) Erikson's psychosocial modalities (described below); (7) diagnosis (if applicable); (8) adjustment.

The study focused on the priest's level of development and maturity and assessed these according to an Eriksonian (1963) schema. With the expressed purpose of avoiding the distortions created by using a psychiatric rating scale for a non-psychiatric population, the authors instead devised a system of rating normal individuals according to Erikson's eight stages of the life cycle: (1) basic trust versus basic mistrust; (2) autonomy versus shame and doubt; (3) initiative versus guilt; (4) industry versus inferiority; (5) identity versus role confusion; (6) intimacy versus isolation; (7) generativity versus stagnation; (8) ego integrity versus despair.

With this schema in hand, the interviewers noted basic themes which wove through a subject's narrative and which impeded or facilitated development. Using a five point scale, the interviewers rated the subject's level of development in each of the eight stages and rank ordered the eight stages
according to its prominence in the subject's presentation.

The subjects also completed the Loyola Sentence Completion Blank for Clergy (Sheehan, 1970), the Self-Anchoring Rating Scale of Maturity of Faith (Strunk, 1967), the Identity Scale (Henry & Sims, 1968), and the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrum, 1966).

Level of Development

Amidst the many similarities between priests and married men, one factor stands out. The Kennedy and Heckler study found that a large proportion of the priests in their sample had not developed into full maturity. Their operational definition of maturity was very loosely constructed. Maturity was assessed in terms of the success with which an individual negotiated developmental tasks. Usually this assessment was based on the developmental tasks described by Erikson (1963) such as identity versus role confusion or intimacy versus isolation. Using the information and evaluations obtained from the interviews, the researchers placed the priests in one of four categories: underdeveloped, developing, maldeveloped, and developed (Kennedy & Heckler, 1972). More than half of the sample (57%) fell into the category of underdeveloped.

According to the evaluation of the authors of the study, those who are underdeveloped have an identity which is closely tied to the role of priest as opposed to themselves as persons. They gravitate toward the priesthood because of the status afforded them by the profession. They are heavily
influenced by the expectations of others, instead of seeking to discover themselves. Their experiences of intimacy are few if any. Though they have many acquaintances and colleagues, they have few close friends. They fail to understand their own emotional lives, and though they are successful in their work, they are generally unfulfilled.

The next largest group, the developing priests (29% of the sample), strives to extricate themselves from emotional and social insularism. Having been previously stifled in their growth, these men have begun to address the problems of growth often as a result of a precipitating event or crisis. The controlling defenses which have restricted life experience are put aside in favor of a more profound exploration of self.

The maldeveloped was a small percentage of the sample (8%) who are psychologically maladjusted and who have suffered same for long periods of time. They tend to have covert intense hostile feelings, negative self-feelings, and disorganizing and disruptive sexual conflicts.

The developed also comprised a small percentage of the sample (6%). They have achieved growth rather than conflict-free behavior. Having faced and dealt with problems and having effectively worked through the appropriate stages of development, these priests demonstrate maturity and integration in their use of defenses which are generally adaptive and flexible. They possess and utilize a set of long-term values of an intrinsically religious character. They
balance independence and dependence. They have a healthy capacity to love, have accepted their own sexuality, and work productively. They are, in the researchers' words, "well put together" (p. 134).

The assessment of maturity was based on the impressions made by the priests on the professional interviewers. The authors attempted to explain what they mean by maturity by referring to Levine's (1942) signs: (1) ability to be guided by reality rather than by fear; (2) use of long-term values; (3) grown-up conscience; (4) independence; (5) capacity to love someone else but with an enlightened self-interest; (6) reasonable dependence; (7) reasonable aggressiveness; (8) healthy defense mechanisms; (9) good sexual adjustment and acceptance of one's own gender; (10) good work adjustment.

Based on the clinical assessments of experienced psychologists, 11 priests were described as developed, 39 as developing, 19 as maldeveloped, and 149 as underdeveloped. This last and largest category of priests is of particular interest. Though the authors opine that many American men are psychologically underdeveloped, these authors interpret the underdeveloped priests' immaturity to mean that they have not reached a level of personal growth which is expected of men at their age who have been carefully selected and trained for their profession. In view of the close scrutiny under which those training for the priesthood come and the long period of academic, spiritual, and professional preparation for the
priesthood, the relative immaturity of priests was unexpected, in the opinion of the authors.

Though there are many indices of psychological adjustment used in the Kennedy and Heckler study, the categories used to describe the overall functioning of the subjects are highly subjective. The study relied heavily on ratings based on clinical impressions in its appraisal of the priests, though self report measures such as the Personal Orientation Inventory (Shostrum, 1966) and the Identity Scale (Henry & Sims, 1968) were also used. The authors do not offer any benchmarks indicating satisfactory negotiation of stages of development.

In addition, the labels "maldeveloped, underdeveloped, developing, and developed" are not precise nor do they reflect any statistical properties. They are simply clinical evaluations provided by researchers whose neutrality is questionable. There is no indication of any attempts to assess the subjects and the clinical data with eyes blind to operative assumptions. Thus the possibility of bias was great.

The authors note that they focused on groups of men and not groups of variables. In assigning subjects to the four groups, the interrater reliability was not especially high. Often the authors reported no measures of interrater reliability. In their independent evaluations of 271 subjects, the authors did report modest interrater reliability ($r=.76$).
Assignment to developmental categories yielded a similarly modest interrater reliability ($r=.77$).

These methodological problems are exacerbated by the absence of control groups. Though Kennedy and Heckler concede that many American men are psychologically underdeveloped, they do not have evidence, either clinical or empirical, to substantiate that claim. Thus it is not known whether the results of this study apply to most men, some men, or all men. More specifically and importantly, without a comparison group, no firm conclusions can be drawn about the distinctive qualities of the priests studied.

**Underdevelopment and Intimacy**

Kennedy and Heckler conclude that the underdevelopment of priests is of an emotional nature. They have not successfully passed through all the stages of growth which lead to mature adult behavior. In order to cope with underdevelopment, the priests resort to sophisticated defenses such as intellectualization with obsessive features. They are able to think intelligently about life while avoiding the experience of conflict they might feel without this defense. This removal from the fundamental conflicts of life impedes maturation and prevents enjoyment of adult life.

In the estimation of the clinical psychologists who interviewed and evaluated the priests, underdevelopment is most apparent in the priests' interpersonal relationships. The interviews revealed that relationships between priests and
others tend to be distant, highly stylized, and frequently unrewarding. Priests report a desire to be close to other people but find the experience awkward and difficult. Underdeveloped priests tend to have few close friends and are uncomfortable about intimacy. Kennedy and Heckler see the intimacy problem as rooted in the underdeveloped priest's failure to arrive at a personal identity.

Underdeveloped priests use their intellectual capacities to justify their reasoning that others should be kept at a distance. They tend to identify with their roles while hiding their true personality. They have not been able to achieve an integrated psychosexual identity in the sense of having established a "quality of self-identification as a man" (p.31). Rather, they operate at an adolescent or pre-adolescent level of development.

The type of developmental delay evident in the majority of the subjects studied in the Loyola project is described in a case study presented by Erikson (1983). He describes an individual whose identity formation in adolescence was impeded by a premature commitment to celibacy. At the age of 37 this priest entered psychotherapy as he faced anew the issues of sexuality and sexual identity. "I want to have an affair," said this man who had previously referred to his sexual urges as "that leaky faucet" to be suffered secretly and with considerable embarrassment.
He was the only son of a postal worker and his wife. He grew up in a happy and secure home where anger and aggression were regarded as reprehensible. His father was gentle while his mother was more demanding and controlling. This priest learned early in his life to be respectful of his parents' wishes. He dated in high school but never allowed relationships to become intimate. He strove to be perfectly virtuous and his mother was the early judge of his progress; the church was the judge in his adult life.

In the conduct of his ministry, he became strongly attracted to two unhappily married women who had sought his counsel. He resisted entering into an intimate relationship with either. He tended to idealize women until he became involved in a sexual relationship with a woman who had been a long-time friend. In addition to giving him a more realistic understanding of women, this experience also allayed residual fears of homosexuality. Eventually he broke off the relationship in order to remain a priest. At this point he regarded his return to the celibate life as his own choice. The choice, free and real, was nonetheless costly as the priest lost not only his lover but also a male mentor, the relationship with whom had been disrupted by the latter's objections to the priest's sexual involvement. His dealing with the issues of intimacy and mentorship marked the successful completion of two adolescent tasks.
Sex for this priest had been largely an intellectual matter. He relied on repression of sexual and aggressive needs, intellectualization, and dependence on external approval for reassurance. Though he was satisfied with his life as a priest, it remained a fulfillment of his parents' fantasies and expectations until these critical events unfolded. "But he could never fully claim his own identity as a priest or as an individual until that sexual part of his being was clear to him, admitted to his consciousness as an integral position of his personality" (p.386).

In addition to the sexual awakening, the priest also addressed other adolescent tasks. He successfully worked through the termination of a mentor relationship, achieved final autonomy over professional identity, and abandoned dependencies on external rewards and controls while developing a secure sense of self.

This brief synopsis of one priest's life and developmental crisis is instructive. He used his commitment to the celibate life to avoid the challenges of intimate relationships. His work as a priest, though satisfying to him, was nonetheless a response to maternal expectations. The issues which precipitated his seeking psychotherapy were consonant with what Kennedy and Heckler found among the underdeveloped priests who comprised the majority of their subjects.
The lack of adequate development is not confined to matters sexual and interpersonal. It is also apparent in the priests' difficulty in articulating a deep level of personal religious faith. Kennedy and Heckler found that those who are underdeveloped have not successfully integrated a philosophy of life. Kennedy and Heckler see this as closely related to shallow living and underdeveloped personality. They suggest that these priests are able to retain a position of prestige which shelters them from developmental tasks and growth.

Celibacy

The Loyola project also suggests that celibacy exacerbates the problem of underdevelopment among priests. In the opinion of the authors:

"So much energy goes into adjusting to celibacy, so much effort into dealing with basically nonintegrated sexuality, that these men could hardly be described as more free to do their priestly work because of celibacy....As a condition of life, celibacy tends to reinforce the very aspects of these men which need development if they are to be more mature as individuals" (p.13).

Kennedy and Heckler found that most priests favor optional celibacy. This is not to say that most priests would marry if the law were changed. The majority would remain celibate by their own choice. In a more recent inquiry into motivation for celibacy, Nestor (1989) discovered in his sample of 36 diocesan priests that 32 of them were celibate primarily because church law requires it. Only four subjects cited primarily spiritual reasons for being celibate. Eighteen indicated that if the law of celibacy were changed to allow
active priests to marry, they would at least consider marriage in the future. Six of the eighteen said that they would definitely marry. Fourteen others expressed little or no desire to marry while three were not sure what they would do. These findings clearly indicate there is no uniform opinion about, or attitude toward, celibacy and that this mandated state of life contains within it a wide variety of interpersonal aspirations.

In his interpretation of a study of the American Catholic priesthood undertaken by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), Greeley (1972) also noted that the majority of diocesan priests favor a policy of optional celibacy for ordained ministers. Priests tend to appreciate the value of celibacy but feel that it may be harmful to some when it is mandated. Nestor (1989) did not find this to be the case in terms of life satisfaction. He found no difference in level of life satisfaction between those celibate for spiritual reasons and those who merely comply with church law on celibacy. However, this finding may be due to the small number of priests citing spiritual reasons compared with the large number citing legal constraints.

The interpersonal life of the priest and the role of celibacy are further illuminated by the NORC study. While authority is the area most often described by priests as problematic in the priestly ministry, the next most troublesome areas are difficulty in reaching people and
loneliness. Greeley sees these latter two points as closely connected to the intimacy issue described above.

In apparent contradiction of the findings of the Loyola study, Greeley's data suggest that priests are no less capable of friendship than their married male peers. In addition he reported that priests do not describe themselves as lacking intimate relationships. Greeley contends that priests do not have an abnormally low capacity for intimacy. Although this finding is different from that of the Loyola project, Greeley agrees that many priests may have only "vestigial capacities for intimacy" (p.142), but he hastens to add that this is likely the result of childhood upbringing. These men would have the same struggles if they married, he suggests.

These contradictory findings are likely the result of methodological differences between the Loyola study and Greeley's research. The critical methodological issue lies in Greeley's use of control groups which the Loyola study did not use. The Loyola study was primarily a clinical assessment of one group without the use of any controls. Thus the suggestion that celibate priests' struggle with nonintegrated sexuality contributes to their underdevelopment seems to be primarily an opinion for which no empirical support is offered. The same might be said of married or single individuals whose sexuality is not integrated.

Greeley also found that loneliness is the strongest predictor of resignation from the priesthood and that it is
related to celibacy. Loneliness is correlated ($r = .51$) with
desire to marry. However, loneliness is a sign of neither
weakness nor strength in an individual. It does not indicate
either a lack of stamina for a commitment or courage in the
face of authority which mandates celibacy.

**Intimacy and the Theology of Priesthood**

These interpersonal considerations are important factors
in the life of the celibate priest. The conduct of the
celibate life demands as frequent confrontation with the issue
of intimacy as does marriage. Indeed, theological and
spiritual reflections on the celibate life invariably point
to the importance of intimate relationships.

Marini (1972) points out that ordination to the
priesthood places one in a special relationship with other
priests and the entire church community. This builds on the
intersubjectivity that is essential and constitutive of the
human person. "The typical situation is then of a "we"
realized by love, where an "I" and "Thou" love one another
completely and aspire to a degree of mutual giving to the
point where the person is less a self-subsistent being than an
outgoing towards another. It is by subsisting in another that
a personal being is able to live in and for itself" (Marini,
1972, p.905).

Marini argues that Jesus elevated two types of
relationships to the level of a sacrament: conjugal union and
friendship. The role of intimate relationship in marriage need
not be explored here. Suffice to say that the "spiritual
dynamic of marriage is the development on the supernatural
plane of the conjugal union" (p.907). In other words, and not
surprisingly, human relationship underlies the sacrament of
marriage. This also applies to the sacrament of holy orders by
which one becomes a priest. Marini holds that the strength and
specific spirituality of the priest is the development in the
sacramental context of friendship which is the human
relationship underlying holy orders.

While Marini is primarily concerned with relationships
among priests and the fraternity that is part of the
theological understanding of the priesthood, this line of
reasoning extends beyond that group of peers to the priest's
relationships with the wider community. He writes:

In reality, the only fundamental requisite for complete
realization of the self is "intersubjectivity", that is
the fusion of persons, of minds in a triumph over the
inner isolation caused by our finite nature. The person
is fulfilled as soon as he succeeds in communicating on
a basis of equality with the spiritual being of another,
thus overcoming solitude (p.913).

In light of the necessity of relationships in human
living and most especially in the understanding of the
sacrament of holy orders, the concern about the interpersonal
life of priests as uncovered by the Loyola study is all the
more significant. The interpersonal deficit which may be
operating in the lives of certain priests has important
implications for healthy living. These deficits are
underscored in the life of the priest whose sacrament (holy
orders) has its foundation in human relationships.

Previous Research and The Present Study

Kennedy and Heckler expressed some surprise that a group of men who had received as thorough training as that which is required before ordination would be largely underdeveloped. That the underdevelopment is manifest in interpersonal relationships in general, and in the area of intimacy in particular, is the primary focus of the present study.

Previous research has attempted to determine qualities and/or traits which may predict perseverance in the ministry. Most often these studies compare seminarians who remain in training for the priesthood with those who drop out. Some are methodologically flawed. The following study by Banks, Mooney, Mucowski, and Williams (1984) is seriously flawed.

Banks et al. (1984) studied 94 men, age 20 to 57, who had applied to a religious order over the course of four years. Using the WAIS, the WAIS-R, the MMPI, the Personality Research Form (PRF), the Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory Priest/Minister Scale, the Academic Orientation Response Scale, and the Rorschach, the researchers found in their discriminant analysis that 8 of 57 possible variables discriminated between the 70 accepted and 24 rejected candidates. These variables were age, MMPI subscales for Schizophrenia and Social Introversion and PRF scores for Affiliation, Aggression, Harmavoidance, Exhibitionism, and Play. Candidates who were accepted were significantly lower in
Social Introversion and Exhibition but higher on Affiliation, Aggression, Exhibitionism, Harmavoidance, Play, and schizophrenia than those who were rejected. The 57 candidates who persisted in their training for at least one year tended to score significantly higher on Affiliation and lower on Dominance, Nurturance, and Harmavoidance. Also, the persisters were significantly higher on the Social Introversion Scale of the MMPI and lower on the Schizophrenia and Psychasthenia scales.

This study provides little insight into what distinguishes priests or candidates for the priesthood from those who do not persevere. The fact that 57 possible variables in a discriminant analysis yielded only 8 variables which discriminate between accepted and rejected candidates is barely more than what one would expect by chance alone. The large number of variables, the small sample, and the negligible number of discriminants compound the sources of error and thus render the results moot.

Despite the methodological weaknesses of the study, the researchers' use of the MMPI brings to the fore a traditionally popular instrument in the research on priests and seminarians. Unlike the other measures used in the Banks et al. study, the MMPI is a clinical scale. For instance, according to Greene (1980), in a non-psychiatric population, the higher scores on the social introversion scale suggest that persisters are likely to prefer to be alone or with a
small group of friends. Though they have an ability to interact, they prefer not to do so. In the Banks et al. study their lower scores on the schizophrenia and psychasthenia scales suggest that persisters are more conventional, realistic, comfortable with themselves, persistent, and success oriented than those who did not persevere in training for ministry.

Though the Banks et al. study is unconvincing for the methodological reasons mentioned above, the preference for aloneness to which it alludes has been uncovered in earlier studies. Sward (1931) found in his sample of seminarians and priests significantly more introversion, coupled with feelings of inferiority, than in the control group. Dunn (1965) found that seminarians and priests tend to be more introverted, socially inept, and sometimes more isolated and withdrawn than the norm. Cattell, Eber, & Tatsouka (1970) also found priests to be more introverted.

Kippes (1981) investigated the relationship between perceived level of interpersonal communication and loyalty among Roman Catholic religious. A random sample of 318 religious order priests in the Chicago area whose ages ranged from 27 to 86 years was given self administered questionnaires concerning perceived level of interpersonal communication within one's religious institute, friendship within one's religious institute, loneliness, problems coping with celibacy, desire to marry, and loyalty to one's religious
institute (i.e., plans regarding one's future relationship with the religious institute). The study showed that "perceived level of interpersonal communication" and "friendship within one's religious community" are highly correlated ($r = .79, p < .001$). Those who regarded the quality of their relationships within their own religious community as good were able to establish meaningful relationships with their fellow community members. Those who saw the quality of relationships within their community as poor tended to be more lonely ($r = -.41, p < .001$). However, the quality of relationships with community members did not have a significant impact on one's problems in coping with celibacy or with one's desire to get married. Friendship within one's religious community was a significant predictor ($r = .30, p < .01$) of one's decision to remain in the community. High levels of loneliness were significantly related to a decision not to remain ($r = -.29, p < .01$).

Unlike previous research (Greeley, 1972), the Kippes study distinguished problems coping with celibacy and desire to marry. The former was regarded as comfort with one's own sexuality and the latter as a longing for a fulfilling and meaningful relationship with a partner of the opposite sex. Within this framework the strongest predictors of loyalty are celibacy and loneliness.

The Kippes study brings forth another indication of the importance of interpersonal relationships in the priesthood.
As Kennedy and Heckler found interpersonal relationships and intimacy to be at issue in the underdevelopment of the majority of priests, Kippes demonstrated that interpersonal matters are strong predictors of whether one remains within one's religious institute.

The recurring concern about intimacy in the life of the priest has implications for adjustment and life satisfaction. The research of McAdams on intimacy motivation will be helpful in further understanding the issue of intimacy in the Catholic priest and is the foundation of the present study.

**Intimacy Motivation**

Intimacy motivation is defined as a recurrent preference or readiness for experiences of warm, close, and communicative exchange. The operationalization of intimacy motivation has been undertaken by McAdams (1985) and is rooted in the motivational psychology of McClelland (1951, 1984). There are various ways of conceptualizing the internal factors influencing behavior. James (1890) called instincts, drives, incentives, and motives "springs of action." McClelland proposed that as a spring of action, motives energize, direct, and select behavior and experience. McAdams contends that a motive is a more generic umbrella under which instinct, drive, and need fall. Instinct, drive, and need connote a reduction in tension and/or a more biologically based reality.

McAdams chooses to describe a motive as a "preference" in order to explain that the behaviors and experiences which are
set into motion are in fact energized, selected, and directed by the preference of the particular individual. Motives involve simply what people like to do, not necessarily what they do well.

McAdams' formulation of intimacy motivation is rooted in Bakan's (1966) synthesis of what the latter describes as the two modalities of human behavior: communion and agency. Agency refers to those behaviors whereby the person asserts individuality. It is manifest in self-protection, self-assertion, and self-expansion. It tends toward isolation, alienation, and aloneness. Agency bespeaks an urge to master.

Communion, on the other hand, refers to the participation of an individual in some larger organism of which the individual is a part and manifests itself in a sense of being at one with other organisms. Communion bespeaks noncontractual cooperation and a lack of separations.

Communion and agency exist in a dynamic tension as communion mitigates agency in healthy living. However, individual differences in motivational dispositions are influenced by which of the two tendencies is salient in one behavior and experience (McAdams, 1985).

The merger which is part of communion and intimacy motivation has been explored by Maslow, Buber, and Sullivan. McAdams utilizes Maslow's (1968) concept of "Being-Love" (B-Love) to explain intimacy motivation. B-Love is a welcoming of other into a mutually enjoyed, reciprocal union which is
gentle, unobtrusive and undemanding. B-Love is intrinsically enjoyable and is an end rather than a means. B-Love stands opposite Deficiency-Love (D-Love) which is a striving to fill a void or to complete what is lacking in one's interpersonal world.

Buber (1970) writes of the "I-Thou" relationship wherein two people are completely absorbed in what the other offers while remaining unique and separate communicators. The experience of the "I-Thou" relationship is a momentary episode in people's lives during which they offer total attention to the other.

The achievement of intimacy is a developmental process. Sullivan (1953) locates the development of a need for interpersonal intimacy during preadolescence and views this period as a critical point in the emergence of one's orientation toward interpersonal relations. As the need for intimacy develops, so too do the first experiences of loneliness. Loneliness stands opposite intimacy and is so terrible that it defies recall.

Intimacy motivation has been measured by a content analysis of Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) stories (McAdams, 1985). The intimacy motivation score is based on the presence or absence of 10 explicitly defined intimacy themes in the narrative. The 10 themes are as follows: (1) relationship produces positive affect; (2) dialogue; (3) psychological growth and coping; (4) commitment or concern; (5) time-space;
union; (7) harmony; (8) surrender; (9) escape to intimacy; (10) connection with the outside world.

People who are high in the intimacy motive are distinguishable from those who are low in the intimacy motive in several ways. McAdams and Constantian (1983) found that people who are high in intimacy motive spend more time thinking about interpersonal relationships than those who are low in intimacy motive. Using beepers to prompt the subjects to record their thoughts, feelings and behaviors on seven random occasions during the working day, the researchers gave a score of 1 when the person recorded that she or he was thinking about a specific person or interpersonal relationship and a score of 0 when no such information was recorded. References to one's girlfriend or boyfriend, friendship, people at a party or at work are examples of those items receiving a score of 1. The results indicated that the frequency of interpersonal thoughts was strongly correlated ($r = .52$) with intimacy motive. The subjects who were high in the intimacy motive were also more likely to be engaged in warm and close communication with another such as a conversation or letter writing ($r = .40$). These subjects tended to feel better about their interactions as they reported feeling happy, carefree or alert during these communications.

McAdams and Powers (1981) coded tapes of psychodrama. The protagonists in the psychodrama who were high in intimacy motive performed drama which communicated positive affect,
reciprocal dialogue, spontaneous participation among equals, and nonthreatening tender touching. These subjects were more likely to use the first person plural when referring to themselves and the group than were their peers who scored low in intimacy motivation.

In longer term relationships such as marriage and friendship, people high in intimacy motive describe their relationships in terms resembling those with which Bakan (1966) distinguishes the communal mode of existence. The communal mode entails a release of one's control over a relationship in favor of a merger with the other. The relationship is more marked by being than by doing. McAdams (1985) found that those who are high in intimacy motive tend to prefer one to one contact over experiences with groups. They also tend to listen and self disclose more in their friendships. They frequently talk with friends about personal issues and are more likely than their low intimacy counterparts to discuss friendships per se.

College students who are high in intimacy motivation very frequently described high points in their friendships as times when a significant self-disclosure occurs. On the other hand, they frequently described low points in friendship as betrayals of trust. They were also more likely than those low in intimacy motivation to have palpable fears of being separated from a best friend as a result of a move, injury, or death.
A person's capacity for intimacy has long been recognized as an indicator of adjustment and subjective mental health. Object relations theorists have argued that the internal representations of intimate others have a profound effect on interpersonal behavior and mental health (Blatt and Lerner, 1983; Fairbairn, 1952; Guntrip, 1973). Perlman, Fehr, and Duck (1986) found a positive relationship between intimacy and well-being. McAdams and Bryant (1987) reported that women who are high in intimacy motivation are happy and men who are high in intimacy motivation display a lack of both strain and uncertainty.

In a longitudinal study of intimacy motivation and adjustment, McAdams and Vaillant (1982) found that high intimacy motivation at age 30 was significantly associated with better adjustment at age 47. The subjects in the study were 57 middle aged men who had agreed to participate in the Grant Study of Adult Development. These men were graduates of Harvard College during the years 1942-44. They wrote TAT stories in the years 1950-52 and were interviewed in the late 1960s on the issue of psychological health. Those for whom adjustment data were intact in the late 1970s were the subjects in McAdams and Vaillant's study.

The researchers used nine indices of psychological adjustment: income, steady promotion, games, vacations, job enjoyment, psychiatric visits, drug or alcohol misuse, days of sick leave, and marital enjoyment. In addition to intimacy
motivation, three other motives were also measured. Achievement, affiliation, and power motives were not significantly associated with adjustment. However, high intimacy motivation at age 30 was a better predictor of psychosocial adjustment at age 47 than were achievement, affiliation, and power motives.

**Intimacy and Affiliation Motives**

The development of the construct of intimacy motive came about after repeated disappointment with the more venerable and better known construct of affiliation motive. Intimacy motive has manifested itself as a stronger predictor of behavior than the affiliation motive, and captures the "being" orientation to interpersonal relations while affiliation captures the "doing" orientation (McAdams, 1982). The differences between intimacy and affiliation motives are important to the present study.

Affiliation motive is the recurrent preference in thought and behavior for "establishing, maintaining, and restoring a positive relationship" (Atkinson et al., 1954, p. 406). It connotes a more active exercise of control in relationships and an anxious tendency to want to hold on to relationships. In Bakan's (1966) terms, affiliation taps into the agentic area of the communion-agency continuum. It carries less warmth and closeness than intimacy motivation.

Early experiments investigating the affiliation motive relied on methods of depriving subjects of security and
comfort in close relationships. In this way the experiments resembled those used to study achievement motive. Affiliation motive emerged as an active striving to attain a desired goal, namely a positive affective relationship with another person. The criteria for scoring affiliation motive in stories include instrumental striving in service of, anticipating success in, and encountering obstacles in the way of these positive affective relationships. Clearly the active, agentic, impact seeking behavior which Bakan describes as agency is salient in the affiliation motive.

McAdams and Constantian (1983) reviewed the research on affiliation motive. Affiliation motive is associated with anxious attachment and extreme concern about not offending others. People high in affiliation motive maintain a lot of contact with others. They make more nonbusiness phone calls and make more frequent communication with coworkers (Lansing & Heyns, 1959). They avoid making divisive statements while working on tasks with others (Exline, 1962), and are less accurate in their perceptions of interpersonal preferences in groups concerned with the feelings of the members (Exline, 1960). High affiliation people do not rate their marriages as important sources of satisfaction (Veroff & Feld, 1970; Veroff, 1982). The controlling and anxious qualities of affiliation motive lead McAdams to agree with Boyatzis (1973) that the evidence about people high in affiliation motive
points to a "fear of rejection" operating within the affiliation personality construct.

As indicated above, the affiliation motive has not been as useful or reliable a construct as intimacy motivation. McAdams (1982) showed that the intimacy motive has been a consistently valid predictor of theoretically related individual differences. However, in many studies, subjects high in affiliation motive are no different on the measures of interest from subjects low in the motive. For example, those who are high in affiliation motive and those who are low in affiliation motive were rated the same by their peers on a list of twenty-four adjectives. Also levels of affiliation motive failed to predict any differences in perceptual sensitivity to schematic faces and recall of intimacy themes in a story or autobiography (McAdams, 1979, 1982).

In addition to the greater reliability of the intimacy motivation construct than the affiliation motivation, intimacy motivation is the preferred construct for the present study precisely because of its "being" orientation as opposed to the "doing" orientation of affiliation motivation. The difficulties which priests display in interpersonal relationships rest not in action but in closeness. The Loyola study found that among the characteristics common to the underdeveloped group is a style of relationship which resembles the controlling and anxious dimensions of
affiliation motivation. Priests usually have a high degree of contact with others. Underdeveloped priests use the social approbation associated with their role in order to establish some kind of personal security. These individuals seek popularity and admiration rather than depth in interpersonal relationships. In the priesthood, the behavior and preferences captured by the intimacy motive seem to be associated with maturity and adjustment, as described by Kennedy and Heckler. On the other hand, according to the Loyola report, many underdeveloped priests behave and have preferences which are consonant with the affiliation motive.

Intimacy and the Celibate Priesthood

The Kennedy and Heckler study (1972) was commissioned by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in response to the "radical and rapid social and moral changes in contemporary life." The rapid changes "suggest and foster fitting adaptations in the ministry of priests" (Bishops' Committee on Priestly Formation, 1971, p.1). The Kennedy and Heckler study focused on the personal lives of priests and concluded that the area of intimacy was of primary concern.

In the years following the 1972 study of priests, documents on the priesthood have repeatedly cited issues of intimacy which arise in the conduct of the celibate life. While it is no surprise that men would confront such issues, open discussion of intimacy and its importance in the celibate life is a relatively recent development. Larkin and Broccolo
(1973) pointed out that for priests, relationships were formerly considered accidental and accessory to the spiritual life. They existed on a solely private level which was distinct from spiritual and apostolic concerns.

Larkin and Broccolo observed that relationships abound in a priest's life, but they are not easily identified or neatly structured. Because relationships are so many in number and variable in type, their influence on the priest is not readily discernible. Close, intimate relationships are of particular concern because of the traditional caution about intimacy.

Past policies in priestly training and in the clerical life when coupled with certain earlier family experiences discouraged closeness, especially with women. He was trained to live a life apart, independent, other-worldly, solitary....On the whole priests tended to avoid close friendships and involvement. Even today when the attitudes toward real intimacy in the priest's life have changed to more positive, affirming ones, there are still legitimate personal misgivings because of the hazards involved and built-in difficulties because of the life style of the celibate priest (Larkin and Broccolo, 1973, p.28).

In the first years of ministerial work, priests tend to be satisfied with the excitement and rewards of the work. Priests often experience these benefits as adequate compensation for the lack of deep relationships. Eventually, work is not able to fulfill the interpersonal needs of the priest and he begins to search for more intimate personal friendship for fulfillment. Moreover, one discovers that the intimate dialogue which is required for human fulfillment is the
prerequisite for sharing faith, prayer, and ministry with others.

The 1977 document of the Bishops' Committee on Priestly Life and Ministry, As One Who Serves, also indicates that a close circle of friends is essential to the personal development and the ministry of the priest. Trusting, open, and warm relationships are "a significant support in living a life of discipleship" (p.65). The same applies to the priest's relationship with women. While noting that in the past close relationships between priests and women were discouraged, the document suggests that without openness to these relationships, the priest limits his emotional growth and his capacity to love others deeply and warmly.

The Bishops' Committee on Priestly Life and Ministry (1972) rightly recognized that a significant stressor in the life of a priest is the neglect of emotional needs and their relationship to the celibate life. When there is a lack of close, personal relationships in a priest's life, his sexuality often becomes conflict-ridden. This becomes acute when the priest concludes that there is no convincing reason for living a celibate life. Human closeness is essential to emotional vitality and a good self-image, the document states.

In 1989 The Bishops' Committee on Priestly Life and Ministry issued a document on the morale of priests. This document noted that while loneliness is a part of the human condition and therefore affects celibates and married people
alike, it is very frequently named by priests as a problem. The need for intimacy is often unsatisfied because of the distance created by the role of the priest. The integrity of the priest's public life and personal longings is sometimes threatened by the priest's natural need for closeness.

The Issue of Intimacy During Seminary Training

Larkin and Broccolo (1973) acknowledge one of the consistent themes which marked seminary training prior to 1970: the avoidance of intimacy. Indeed, the seminary program which prevailed prior to 1970 structured life in such a way that intimate associations would not form and exhorted candidates for the priesthood to be wary of close relationships. The Rule of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary in Mundelein, Illinois reflected that of the typical seminary in the United States in 1958.

Human relationships, especially of a close, communicative nature, were largely discouraged (Larkin and Broccolo, 1973). The perils of entering into even a casual relationship were well known to all students. Those who received training during these years knew the consequences of what was called a "particular friendship" (Rausch, 1991). While all were instructed in the ways of charity and love for others, this ethos did not include the nurturing of close, personal relationships which were disparagingly termed "particular friendships."
Seminary life was one of virtual seclusion. Little, if any, contact with the outside world was allowed. Even contact with family was strictly monitored. The Rule of St. Mary of the Lake Seminary (1958) was clear:

Visitors are restricted to immediate relatives on visiting Sundays. They are received in the aulas at 1:30 PM. Leave must be taken of them at 3:30 PM in the lecture halls (p.45).

The interpersonal restrictions were even more rigorously enforced in relationships outside the family:

The seminarian is expected to excuse himself immediately but politely from the company of any lay visitors he may encounter about the grounds. If there is any reason for visiting with them, he must first seek the permission of the prefect of discipline.

Conversation with the sisters should be had only when necessary and should be kept at a minimum. Profound respect and reverential reserve shall characterize conduct towards the sisters.

While courtesy is urged, students may have no dealings with the lay help. If there is need to consult them, permission must be obtained (p.45).

The greatest concern of the institution was about those people with whom seminarians had the most contact, namely one another. Silence and distance marked the typical interaction among seminarians. The Rule stated:

Students should associate freely with others in their own department and should avoid habitual association with the same few companions. There should be no exclusive friendships and no private aversions (p.46).

Visiting of rooms without explicit permission is forbidden under severe penalties.
Silence must be observed:
a. whenever a student is in a residence hall either in his room or in the corridor (silence is to begin immediately upon entering the residence hall);

b. when he enters the dining room until the prayer or reading is finished, and when the bell has sounded at the end of the meal until he has left the dining room;

c. whenever he is in the students' vesting sacristy or basement of the main chapel.

d. He is to remember in particular the time of the "great silence," from the bell for chapel in the evening until the close of the chapel exercises the following morning (p.42-43).

The Common Rule of Saint John's Seminary in Boston in 1946 listed visiting of another student's room under "flagrant violations of discipline" (p.72). The Rule did concede that there might be exceptions to the policy. A seminarian was required to seek the permission of his superiors before speaking with a fellow student in his room.

When by exception permission is granted to speak to another, one may not go beyond the threshold of the door. Permission to speak at the threshold is not to be presumed, but must be sought from a member of the Faculty.

Similarly, silence was strictly enforced:

a. At the sound of the second bell for the end of the recreation period he shall instantly observe silence.

b. He shall not speak with anyone on the stairs, in the corridor, classrooms, or library, in the toilet rooms, or while going from one exercise to another; nor shall he ever presume to engage another in conversation, save during the time of recreation.

c. He shall always ask permission of one of the Faculty to speak to another during study time or community exercises anywhere.
d. He shall remain in his room at his work during study periods, neither going out to disturb others nor encouraging others to waste their time and his.

e. He shall keep the "magnum silentium" at night, from night prayers until the blessing has been given at breakfast the next morning.

The Rule of St John Seminary, written in 1954 and 1960, was not much different from the 1946 edition. However, the two more recent editions did allow conversations in a subdued voice while traveling from one building to another. Also, a familiar prohibition about intimacy appeared in the 1954 and 1960 Rules:

...Towards the employees of the Seminary the seminarian shall be courteous and considerate, avoiding all intimacy and restricting conversations to matters of necessity (1960, p.41).

During recreation there shall be free association and no narrow or exclusive companionship among particular groups or individuals (1960, p.53).

While the requirements of courtesy and openness to others would dictate appropriate deportment in social situations like the ones just described, within the overall context of the seminary, the implication was clear. Intimacy was to be avoided even in its most primitive forms.

Despite the warnings against closeness and policies which kept human interaction at a minimum, the value of friendship was upheld during that time. Angrisani (1957), whose book It is I Who Beckon You was a major source of spiritual enrichment for seminarians before the Second Vatican Council, recognized friendship as something which Jesus himself treasured. The
Gospels are replete with stories about Jesus' significant relationships. The Hebrew Scriptures also speak of other close relationships, for example David and Jonathan in the Book of Kings.

Angrisani eloquently extols the virtues of friendship:

Friendship takes two people and makes them into a single soul: they have the same desires, they share their joys and sorrows, they support one another along the journey through life; even in the contrast of their characters they find a means of integrating and completing one another (p.243)

He goes on to exhort young men who are about to take up the life of celibacy:

You are destined for the priesthood, a life of perfect chastity, and friendship is a powerful means of giving vent to that insuppressible need for love which is natural to the human heart. With the voluntary renunciation of that love which makes man and woman "two in one flesh" and gives rise to new life cementing strengthening, broadening, perpetuating and protecting that self-same love, you need some sort of human substitute, one that draws its life blood from a source of love both pure and holy, and this will give your earthly heart those consolations you can never completely do without (p.243).

While on the one hand Angrisani extols the virtues of friendship and the importance thereof for men who give up the intimacy of marriage, he implies that expressions of affection may carry undertones of homosexuality and must be avoided. Particularly close friendships pose a threat to chastity and order in the seminary:

Be on your guard against any sort of an expression of affection in dealing with your companions. This excessive sensibility leads to particular friendships which are the
bane of seminary life and pave the way for more serious shortcomings in chastity....After all, what forms the foundation of particular friendships? Private conversation carried on between the two, little notes, gifts exchanged. Finally, what is the one thing particular friendships are afraid of? That they be found out or discovered. As you can see, these are all symptoms that should be sufficient to make you see the evil there is in such a thing (p.131).

Women posed an even more difficult problem and warranted more severe regulation. The apprehension about closeness with one's male peers was more emphatically expressed in prohibitions against even casual relationships with the opposite sex. Again, Angrisani is able to capture the feelings of the time:

Above all, then, avoid as you would a plague or pitch soiling your skin, any sort of genial or tender conversation with girls during vacation time. Such conversations are pointless and insipid, carried on for the whole purpose of prolonging that morbid sensation which begins to caress the spirit, and they constitute either the ruination or the gradual breakdown of one's virtue and vocation. The Holy Ghost gives us the following admonition: "Mind not the deceit of a woman. For the lips of a harlot are like a honeycomb dripping, and her throat is smoother than oil. But her end is bitter as wormwood, and sharp as a two-edged sword" (Proverbs 5:2-4).

And this remains true in all cases, even where good and pious girls are concerned, because such conversations tend to create an undercurrent of emotions that carries a charge of electrical energy which completely upsets the peace and tranquility of a heart consecrated to God (p.125).

It goes without saying, of course, that any sort of familiarity with girls would be a sure sign either that you never had a vocation or, if you did have one, that you have unfortunately lost it (p.132).
Approximately seventy percent of the priests interviewed in the Kennedy and Heckler study attended seminary prior to 1960 and therefore received training like that described above. In formulating recommendations, Kennedy and Heckler note the emphasis which seminary training placed on self control, sense of duty and docility, and the lack of attention paid to development of abilities to relate closely and responsibly with others. The institutional apprehension about closeness likely has an effect on the wide spread underdevelopment among priests.

Intimacy and Post-conciliar Seminary Training

The Second Vatican Council (1962 to 1965) brought sweeping changes to the church and the priesthood, especially seminary training. A cursory look at the 1976 Common Rule of Saint John's Seminary in Boston, Massachusetts indicates that the strict prohibitions which marked seminary life in previous decades had almost completely disappeared. The teaching of the Second Vatican Council on the church as a community found its way into the daily life of the seminarian. The 1976 Rule quotes the 1964 Vatican document *The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church* (Lumen Gentium):

In virtue of their common sacred ordination and mission, all priests are bound together in an intimate brotherhood, which should naturally and freely manifest itself in mutual aid, spiritual as well as material, pastoral as well as personal, in meetings and in a community of life, labor, and of charity (no. 28).
The Rule seeks to point out that community living is essential to preparation for the ministry because it is in this arena that the meaning of priesthood is experienced. The network of interpersonal relationships of which the seminary is comprised reflects the ecclesial community which priests serve. The *Program of Priestly Formation* (Bishops' Committee on Priestly Formation, 1971) notes that the constant and sometimes even abrasive relationships with other seminarians provide the experiences needed before undertaking the ministry.

The detailed regulations of conduct and the anxiety about human contact in the preconciliar seminary gave way to a seminary program in which close personal contact with members of the faculty and a communal life with other seminarians are vigorously encouraged. Similarly, friendships became an important part of the seminary experience. Friendships form the foundation of mutual support and cooperation in the 1976 Rule of Saint John's Seminary. This rule goes on to advise that discovering the meaning of relationships with both men and women is the way to develop as a fully human person with the spiritual and emotional freedom to minister to others.

*Spiritual Formation in the Catholic Seminary*, published in 1984 by the Bishops' Committee on Priestly Formation, describes the remarkable changes that took place in seminary programs. In recognizing that an individual lives in a number of environments and that growth takes in these various environments, the document emphasizes a dimension shunned in
previous seminary training: the interpersonal, i.e., "the range of intimate relationships and friendships, the place of soul searching" (p.7). The same Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary, whose rule was discussed above, is cited as an example of the new approach to interpersonal relationships. The program of priestly formation at Saint Mary of the Lake holds that:

The interpersonal environment, or the dimension of one-to-one intimacy, friendship, and sharing, requires an experience of dialogue with another person, as well as reflection on experiences of friendship and intimacy. The spiritual director, through the dialogue of spiritual direction, serves this dimension. Additionally, encouragement of friendship and reflections on the deep sense of friendship with Jesus as discipleship and with others is also served through spiritual direction, preaching, and conferences (p.7).

Though the spiritual director has long been a significant figure in the formation of candidates for the priesthood, the subject matter which is addressed in spiritual direction has changed. In the course of approximately twenty years, interpersonal relationships have moved from the realm of the suspicious and treacherous to the very core of the spiritual formation. The modern approach to training notes that real growth in the spiritual life occurs in the area of personal relationships, namely relationship with God, self and others.

Thus, programs of formation are designed to serve the process of interpersonal relationships. The level and qualities of the fundamental relationships noted above are a gauge and an indicator of growth in one's spirituality (p.9)
The authors of the document are careful to point out that in presenting this type of spiritual formation program they are not simply adopting modern personalist approaches and applying them to religious faith. Rather, the emphasis on personal relationship springs forth from the covenant relationship between God and his people. It is the self donation of God in this covenant that provides the foundation for the Christian ethic of love for God and neighbor. Citing The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Vatican, 1964) which indicates that "man (sic) cannot fully find himself except through a sincere gift of himself" (no. 24), the document locates this formulation of priestly formation within the long-standing tradition of the church. Interpersonal relationships are the ground for understanding the Christian life and ministering in the person of Christ.

The establishment of interpersonal relationships is accompanied by an increased ability to reflect on the relationships and articulate the experience.

Growth is made visible in an increased ability to speak of one's experiences, to make connections, to exhibit curiosity about these relationships. Growth will also imply a development of affectivity. In other words, the person will have feelings that spring from these relationships, a sense of bonding, and, at times, a struggle with those feelings. Growth will finally imply a greater and greater prizing or valuing of the relationships. Out of that valuing will spring commitments in action, more focused attention, and presence to the relationships (p.11).

This interpersonal schema has implications for the conduct of ministry. Ministry requires not only being able to
talk about (witnessing) one's relationship with God, self and others, but also a willingness to enter into relationship with the recipient of one's ministerial care. This applies to the relationship between spiritual director and seminarian as well to the relationship of priest and parishioner or client. This model of priestly formation is a radical departure from that espoused in earlier decades. The caution about, and fear of intimacy which marked previous seminary training have given way to a personalist model of formation which is rooted in the Scriptures. Personal relationship is the arena and measure of spiritual growth. The formation program seeks to facilitate the process of interpersonal relationships in a manner dramatically different from preconciliar times.

The New Professionalism

Not only has the program of priestly formation changed, but also the professional environment in which the priest works has changed. A shift in professional ministerial practice and identity has created a whole new manner of relating to others. The new professionalism poses a significant requirement to enter into intimate relationships.

Lynn (1965) wrote about the triumph of the professions in American life. This triumph was short lived; the next twenty five years would see an erosion of the status of professionals as authorities. E.C. Kennedy (lecture, 1988) observed that the American desire for a classless society, as discussed by de Tocqueville, would be facilitated by removing the authority of
trained individuals. The professions no longer retain that identity of which Hughes (1971) writes:

Professions profess. They profess to know better than others the nature of certain matters, and to know better than their clients what ails them or their affairs. This is the essence of the professional idea and the professional claim (p.374).

Kleinman (1984) undertook a study of a Midwest Seminary and found the professional model had been replaced by a more egalitarian structure among those studying for the ministry. Though the population she studied was not Catholic, the phenomena which she observed closely resemble the Catholic experience. According to Kleinman, the Protestant clergy responded to the beginning of deprofessionalization by developing an ideology that accommodated the modern situation and eschewed the professional stance described by Hughes. Kleinman observes:

They used relativistic ideas and the "secular" movement toward personalizing relations--the very forces that had led others to question the authority of ministers' knowledge and skills--to reestablish their work as a valued occupation

The clergy gradually developed a humanistic professional ideology, role, core activity, and rhetoric of autonomy. Their "new theology" relativized religion as one world view among many and suggested that there is no distinction between mundane and sacred realities... In addition, the subjective and personal became the basis for religious reality. The "new ministers" are counselors rather than preachers or moral standard setters. Their role is both personal and egalitarian-ministers treat their clients like peers. The new rhetoric of professional autonomy centers on "community;...(p.4).
The new professionalism which clergy and seminarians have adopted emphasizes the importance of interpersonal relations. In former times professionals relied on their professional identity in order to define their real selves. It was this manner of self definition which Kennedy and Heckler described as prominent among underdeveloped priests. This professional identity carried requirements as to how professionals should act even in situations unrelated to their work. The new professionalism allows the individual practitioner to define the real self not in terms of institutional roles but in terms of personal impulse. Kleinman synopsizes Turner (1976) and Sennett (1978) in stating:

...people have come to feel more like themselves in interpersonal rather than structural relations. People, then, not only feel that the "impulsive" is more "real" than the institutional, but also associate the former with interpersonal relations (p.10).

With the diminution of authority rooted in the special knowledge of the professional, ministers have placed greater value on interpersonal relationships in the conduct of their work. Relying on one's real self and not one's professional self puts a whole new emphasis on interpersonal relations in the identity of the professional. While professional role once determined the person, now the person determines the professional role. This personalization of the professional role requires that ministers appreciate and affirm what clients say. The quality of the interpersonal relationship is key. The premium placed on self-disclosure similarly requires
a non-evaluative response from the minister to the client's self-disclosure. In this arena the professional personalizes the relationship with the client. "They professionalized the personal by personalizing the professional" (Kleinman, 1984, p.11).

The religious professional retains the claim to specialness by locating professional identity within a community. The interpersonal matrix of the community supplies that important sense of being distinctive. It serves the dual purpose of legitimating the work of ministry as a profession and complying with modern humanistic notions.

Kleinman found that it is incumbent upon a student at Midwest Seminary to integrate the professional role self and the real self, with the latter shaping the former. Students are encouraged to use the total personality in ministry. Personal qualities, in great part, determine and predict how good a minister one will be. The seminary program attempts to help the student achieve a higher level of "personhood" (p.27). These personal and interpersonal considerations outstrip intellectual matters as indicators of progress in professional formation.

Though Kleinman admits that Midwest Seminary is, in some respects, an extreme example, her findings concur with those of Carroll (1971) which indicate that the move to a humanistically-oriented education is widespread among graduate professional schools of theology. However, Kleinman does argue
that the consequences of deprofessionalization seen in their extreme forms illuminate the more subtle manifestations found elsewhere. She suggests that this atypical example facilitates our understanding of the impact of deprofessionalization on typical seminaries.

Kleinman's concession that Midwest Seminary is an extreme example of the new interpersonalism in professional formation is an understatement of the controversy which surrounds the development of this new model. Not surprisingly many would object to the new professionalism. Others would argue that an integration of the professional self and the real self is needed. The specific arguments are beyond the scope of this paper. Nonetheless, it seems clear that new thinking and practice have entered the professional arena. The impact of this change is a major consideration in the present study.

The Kleinman study is important to the present topic of intimacy motivation and the Catholic priest because of the centrality of interpersonal relationships which the researcher discovered at Midwest Seminary. The professional minister immerses him or herself in intimate personal relationships with members of the community. One's proficiency in establishing relationships which value self disclosure and egalitarianism is seen to be a predictor of success in the ministry. At Midwest Seminary an inability to be open to relationships and establish intimate connections is recognized by faculty and students alike as serious, if not critical,
lacunae in the personal and professional development of a minister. Indeed, the personal and professional development of the minister are seen as one reality.

The Present Study: Statement of Problem and Hypotheses

The program of priestly formation undertaken in seminaries and the new professionalism which has emerged in the ministerial world represent changes of great proportion. These two changes underlie the present study of intimacy, personal adjustment, and Catholic priests.

The 1984 document of the Bishop's Committee on Priestly Formation, *Spiritual Formation in the Catholic Seminary*, articulates a trend which began approximately at the time of the Second Vatican Council (1962 to 1965). It captures a radical change in the philosophy of training and personal development of the Catholic priest. In earlier times interpersonal relationships were regarded with suspicion. While concessions were made to friendship as a virtue, intimate connections were at best frowned upon and at worst were regarded as treacherous and unmanly. In more recent times the program of spiritual formation not only views interpersonal relationships more kindly, but also sees them as critical factors in the development of ministerial skills and interiority. Those who successfully enter close interpersonal relationships will be better able to establish ministerial relationships and develop a relationship with God.
The Kleinman study focuses on deprofessionalization and its impact on one profession: ministry. Its relevance to the present study is the psychological, not sociological, implications of the study. Kleinman is clear in her description of what is valued in the present ministerial environment. The capacity for close, self-disclosing interpersonal relationships has become a major qualification for those seeking to become pastoral ministers. Intellectual concerns are placed in the background of interpersonal concerns.

The present study is of celibate men who are ordained Catholic priests. The celibate commitment, wherein one forgoes the exclusivity of a genital relationship, is nonetheless, in the case of a priest, a position rich in interpersonal possibilities, as enunciated by Marini (1972) above. One can argue that a celibate priest gives up marriage for the sake of ministry. Schillebeeckx (1968) has argued that celibacy is pursued because of the urgency of the ministry. The present understanding of the profession of ministry, as outlined by Kleinman, is heavy-laden with interpersonal dynamics. The celibate priest forgoes marriage in order to pursue a different manner of intimacy in the ministry.

The professional Zeitgeist in ministry during the last two decades which emphasizes the interpersonal, and the astounding change in attitude toward the interpersonal in the education of priests, suggest the hypothesis that there are
differences between priests trained prior to Vatican II and those trained after the council (Rausch, 1991). More specifically, it is predicted that priests trained prior to 1970 are less likely to enter into close, communicative personal relationships as described by McAdams (1985) and therefore have lower scores on a variety of measures of intimacy than those trained after 1970. In other words, the younger priests are expected be higher in intimacy than the older priests. It would seem that formation programs which systematically discouraged personal contact and intimacy with others would effectively select for individuals lower in intimacy. The second part of this hypothesis is that the young control group is not expected to be higher in intimacy than the old control group. Thus the first hypothesis is that young priests should be significantly higher in intimacy than older priests and that young controls should not be significantly higher in intimacy than older controls.

The second hypothesis looks at one dimension of the composite intimacy variable used in the present study, namely social intimacy as measured by the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (Miller and Lefcourt, 1984). Given the interpersonal climate in modern seminary training and the prohibitions against special relationships in previous training models, the second hypothesis predicts that young priests should be higher in social intimacy than the older priests, but that the young
controls should not be higher in social intimacy than the older controls.

Greeley (1972) has argued that loneliness is the strongest predictor of resignation from the priesthood and is significantly correlated with desire to marry. Therefore, one would infer that loneliness and desire to marry would also have a significant effect on who leaves the seminary. At the same time a program and a profession which encourage intimacy and personal relationships are more likely to retain candidates who are inclined toward close, communicative relationships than a program and profession which discourage same.

Because of the demands of the ministry as it now stands and as described by Kleinman (1984) and Carroll (1971), it is reasonable to hypothesize that those priests who prefer close personal relationships are more satisfied with their lives than those who do not. Thus, the third hypothesis is that priests who are high in intimacy are more satisfied with their lives than those who low in intimacy and that this difference does not apply to the control group.

The fourth hypothesis concerns vocational satisfaction. With the documented professional demand for interpersonal resourcefulness placed upon priests, it is predicted that priests who are high in intimacy are also more satisfied with their vocations than those who are low in intimacy.
McAdams and Vaillant (1982) have shown in a longitudinal study that men who are high in intimacy motivation tend to be better adjusted than those who are low in intimacy motivation. Their finding and the critical role of intimacy and interpersonal relationships in seminary formation and the ministerial profession suggest a fifth hypothesis that priests who are high in intimacy would also be better adjusted than those who are low in intimacy. The sixth hypothesis is that intimacy is a stronger predictor of personal adjustment for those ordained in 1970 and before (young) than for those ordained after 1970 (old), but should not be a stronger predictor of personal adjustment for young controls than for old controls.

The present study grew out of the Kennedy and Heckler study and improved upon it in several ways. The Kennedy and Heckler study was not an experiment per se because of its lack of any control groups. The present study used non-ordained men as the control in the investigation of the priests. Though this does not eliminate cohort effects, it is an improvement upon previous research.

The Kennedy and Heckler study relied heavily on the clinical judgment of trained professionals and relied less on validated standardized measures in arriving at the results and conclusions of their investigation. By utilizing validated standardized measures of intimacy motivation, intimacy behavior, personal adjustment, and life satisfaction, the
present study capitalized on the heuristic contribution of the Kennedy and Heckler study and improved on its objectivity. The subjective conclusions of the earlier study were tested in the present study by more objective means.

The present study focused on the major finding of the Kennedy and Heckler study concerning intimacy in the life of priests. The early study provided a valuable overview of the lives and personal development of priests which opens the door to further investigation under controlled conditions. The present study was an improvement on the previous research not only in its use of control groups, but also in its operationalization of intimacy by means of the intimacy motivation/interpersonal communion construct and other measures. Also, unlike earlier research, the present study examined the relationship between intimacy and adjustment and life satisfaction.

The major variable in the present study was intimacy. Intimacy was a composite of five measures. First it was comprised of the preference for close personal relationships which directs behavior as captured by the intimacy motivation construct and measured here by interpersonal communion. Second, intimacy has a behavioral component which, in the present study, was measured by the degree of intimacy an individual experiences in one specific relationship. This was measured by means of the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (Miller & Lefcourt, 1982). The behavioral component also included a
wider range of social relationships. The Social Support Questionnaire (Sarason, Levine, Bashan & Sarason, 1983) measured the breadth and quality an individual's relationships. Finally, the nurturance and affiliation scales of the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1967) measured behavioral manifestations of intimacy motivation. This particular operationalization of intimacy accounts for internal motives and actual fulfillment of the preference for close personal relationships.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects in the study were two groups of celibate Catholic priests of the Archdiocese of Chicago and two groups of Catholic laymen. The first group consisted of priests who have been ordained fewer than 20 years. Those Chicago priests who were younger than 45 years of age and who had been contacted for an earlier study of priests in that age group (Nestor, 1989) were not contacted again, regardless of whether they had chosen to participate in the earlier study or not. The second group consisted of priests ordained 20 years or more. The control groups were male parishioners of a medium size (1,200 families) Catholic parish in a northern suburb of Chicago. The first group of laymen ranged in age from 26 to 45. The second group was age 46 or older. Laymen age 46 or younger who had been contacted for an earlier study (Nestor, 1989) were not contacted again, regardless of whether they had participated in the previous study or not.

Information such as age, number of years ordained, race, and current position was obtained from the sample of priests. The laymen were asked their age, marital status and length of marriage, if applicable, number and length of previous marriages, number of children, race, and occupation.
Demographic information appears in the Appendix (Table 1).

In order to obtain information about the type of seminary in which the priests studied, i.e. preconciliar or postconciliar, they were asked to rate on a five point scale (0= not characteristic; 5= very characteristic) how characteristic the following situations were of their seminary training:

- Particular friendships were largely discouraged.
- Visiting rooms without explicit permission was forbidden.
- The great silence was observed from evening until morning.
- Relatives could visit only on Sundays.
- Interpersonal relationships were an important consideration in the program of spiritual formation.
- Intimacy with others was seen as an indicator of growth in preparation for ministry.
- The seminary community was organized into "cams" which provided social and spiritual opportunities to the members.
- Close, personal relationships were encouraged.

These descriptions of seminary life were designed to determine how prevalent the interpersonal model of training and ministry was in their seminary education. The term "cams" is used to describe the organization of small quasi-communities of students in the seminary and would be readily recognizable to any priest who had been exposed to the postconciliar model of training.
Procedure

The subjects were chosen at random from the computer generated roster of the priests of the Archdiocese of Chicago according to date of ordination. The control subjects were likewise chosen at random from the computer list of adult male parishioners according to age. All subjects were first contacted by letter in which the study was explained and their participation was requested. Those who returned the enclosed letter of consent indicating their willingness to participate were sent the testing materials. The cover letter reiterated the purpose of the study, namely, to examine personality variables, adjustment, and life commitments. Subjects were advised that the questionnaires would take approximately one hour to complete and that their responses would remain anonymous and confidential. The information would be coded by number rather than name in order to ensure confidentiality. Subjects were asked to return the questionnaires within one week. In the initial mailing 200 young priests (ordained 20 years or fewer) and 200 old priests (ordained more than 20 years) were contacted. Similarly 200 laymen age 45 or younger were contacted as were 200 laymen age 46 or older.

The Priests

Of the 400 priests contacted, 104 completed the questionnaires. The average age of the priests was 49.39 years. The youngest priest respondent was age 26 and the
oldest was age 71. The priest sample was almost entirely caucasian (98%) with only one respondent of Hispanic heritage. One subject did not give a specific race. The priests were ordained an average of 23.25 years. The length of experience as an ordained priest ranged from 1 to 45 years. (See Appendix Table 1.)

The priests tended to be well educated. Forty-nine percent of the priests reported having a master's degree. Forty-six percent earned degrees beyond the master's level. Five percent had a bachelor's degree only. The results of t-tests indicated no significant differences on any of the variables used in the study between priests who earned a bachelor's or master's degree and those who earned degrees beyond the master's level.

Seventy-four percent of the priests were involved in parish ministry. The rest of the group was involved in a variety of ministries including administration, education, and tribunal (ecclesiastical court). Ten percent reported a combination of ministerial responsibilities. The priests whose ministry was outside the parish tended to be better educated (\(M=4.74\)) than the priests whose primary work was parish ministry (\(M=4.31\)), \((t=3.34, p<.001)\). This was not surprising as extra-parochial ministry often requires additional schooling and an advanced degree.

The parish priests appeared to be more satisfied with the support they receive from the people in their lives (\(M=5.59\))
than did the priests who were not in parish work ($M=5.29$), ($t=2.20$, $p=.03$). Parochial ministry often entails a wide range of personal contacts and relationships of various types. However, the two groups did not differ in their estimates of the number of people available to them for personal support ($t=.56$, $p=.58$). Satisfaction with the personal support one received was not related to the number of supportive friends one could list. Quantity was not necessarily associated with quality.

In response to questions designed by Loftus (1973) about their position regarding celibacy, forty-six percent of the priests expressed some openness to the prospect of marriage. If the celibacy law were to change to permit active priests to marry, twenty-nine percent reported that they would not marry at this time but might consider it at some future time. Fifteen percent would probably marry. Two percent would definitely marry. Twenty-three percent would definitely not marry at any time and twenty-four percent would probably not marry at any time. Seven percent reported that they don't know what they would do.

There were no significant differences on any of the demographic variables in the study, except age, between the 46% who considered marriage a possibility and the 47% who did not consider marriage a likely option. The priests who saw little likelihood of ever pursuing marriage tended to be significantly older ($M=51.63$) than those who would consider
marriage if the law of celibacy were changed ($M=46.23), (t=2.03, p=.045). Of course, there is an important cohort effect to be considered here. One would logically expect that marriage is generally a less likely option for older men than for younger men.

In order to obtain additional information about the model of training used during their seminary years, the priests were asked to respond to questions about the type of relational life that was allowed, encouraged, or perhaps for some, discouraged in their seminary training. This was used as an index of the interpersonal environment of their seminary and as an additional indicator of when the change in seminary training took place. As expected, there were significant differences between the young and old priests in the level of intimacy and the structure of the interpersonal environment in their seminary training.

Using the median age of 47, the priests were split into young and old groups. The young priests, age 47 and younger, who were trained in the new system which encouraged close interpersonal relationships, reported significantly higher levels of interpersonal contact ($M=27.73$) in their seminary experience than did old priests ($M=11.78), (t=13.54, p.<.001).

Before this information about training had been ascertained, it had been proposed that priests approximately age 45 and younger would have been trained in the new system and those older than 45 would have been trained in the old
system. The questionnaire investigating seminary life was designed to determine the accuracy of age 45 as the dividing point between those trained in the new and old systems. (The change in training took place in approximately 1970.) One year passed between the time when age 45 was proposed and the time of data collection. With this one year correction taken into consideration, the new estimated age (46) for dividing the two groups was only one year less than the actual age (47) suggested by the responses to the questionnaire as the point at which the interpersonal environment of the seminary changed. As indicated above, 47 was also the median age of the priests. The t-tests performed after doing a median split of the priest group according to age, length of years ordained, and level of intimacy in their seminary training yielded similar results. The t-test using a median split of age 47 indicated that the younger priests experienced significantly more intimacy in their seminary training (M=27.73) than did older priests (M=11.78), (t=13.54; p<.001). The same difference in seminary training was found between priests ordained fewer than 22 years (M=28.08) and those ordained 22 years or more (M=12.35), (t=13.09; p<.001).

The Control Group

Initially a control group of four hundred men was contacted and invited to participate in the study. Eighty-nine completed the questionnaires. However, there was a substantial discrepancy between the response rate of the young and old
controls. Thirty-five respondents were younger than age 48 and 54 were age 48 or older. In order to increase the number of subjects in the young control group to a level approximately equal that of the other groups, a second sample of 100 men age 47 or younger was randomly selected from those remaining on the same list of control subjects used in the first mailing. Out of this group of 100 men who were contacted, 12 completed the questionnaires and thus raised the number of young control subjects to 47.

The average age of the control group was 47.39 years and was not significantly different from the priest group in age. The youngest layman was age 26 and the oldest was age 77. Like the priests, the control group was almost entirely caucasian (88%). Five percent were Hispanic, 4% were Asian, and 3% were members of the African American or other racial groups. (See Appendix Table 1.)

The control subjects also reported the highest level of education completed. Thirty-six percent of the control group had earned a bachelor's degree while 21% earned a degree beyond the master's level. Twenty-two percent finished their formal education upon graduating from high school. Three percent had obtained an associate's degree. There was a significant difference in education between the priests (M=4.42) and the control group (M=3.10) as the priests had more schooling (t=8.88; p<.001).
The control group reported incomes ranging from below $10,000 to above $70,000. Thirty-one percent earned salaries in the range of $20,000 to $39,000. Forty percent earned more than $50,000. Eleven percent had incomes below $20,000. Those men with incomes above $40,000 tended to be better adjusted (M=38.16) than those with incomes below $40,000 (M=67.52), (t=3.17; p<.002) (High score means low adjustment.)

Eighty percent of the control group was married. Seventeen percent was single and two percent was divorced. The average length of marriage was 16.1 years and the length of marriage ranged from 1 to 49 years. Seventy percent of the control group had one or more children.

Measures

In order to test the hypotheses of the study, various measures of intimacy, adjustment, and satisfaction were used. The intimacy variable used in this study was a composite of five measures of intimacy. The first of the five was interpersonal communion which is a modification of the intimacy motive and is described below. In addition to this one projective measure, four other objective measures of intimacy were used: nurturance, affiliation, social intimacy, and perceived level of support. Personal adjustment and satisfaction were measured by self report instruments. All are described below.
Interpersonal Communion

Interpersonal communion was measured by the subjects' descriptions of two key events in their lives: a peak experience and a critical experience. McAdams' (1985) instructions for reporting peak and critical experiences were used.

Peak experience. "Many people report occasional "peak experiences." These are generally moments or episodes in a person's life in which he or she feels a sense of transcendence, uplifting, and inner joy or peace. Indeed, these experiences vary widely. Some people report them to be associated with religious or mystical experiences. Others may find such a 'high' in vigorous athletics, reading a good novel, artistic expression, making love, or simply talking with a good friend. These experiences have been characterized as ones of wholeness, perfection, completion, aliveness, richness, beauty, uniqueness, or insight. Please describe in detail (4-5 sentences) something akin to a peak experience that you have experienced sometime in your life. Please be specific. We would like to know what happened, who was there, what you were thinking, and how (if at all) the experience changed you."

Critical experience. "During the course of life, a person often faces a critical moment which causes one to change the direction of his or her life or to see life in a new way. This moment of decision can be addressed in either a satisfactory or unsatisfactory manner. The outcome may be positive or negative. Turning points may include a new relationship, a change in an existing relationship, a new job, marriage, the birth of a child, an experience of death, a conversation, and/or a religious experience. Please describe in detail (4-5 sentences) a turning point in your life. Please be specific. We would like you to describe the critical situation, what decision (if any) you made, who or what was involved, what happened, what you were thinking, how you were feeling, and how the experience changed you."

The construct interpersonal communion is developed from McAdams' (1985) formulation of intimacy motivation. Intimacy motivation has been traditionally measured on the basis of
subjects' response to TAT-like pictures. The scorer determines whether each of the ten explicitly defined content categories measuring the intimacy motive listed below appears in the written stories. When one of these categories appears in a story, it is given a score of 1. The scores are summed to give a final intimacy motivation score.

The thematic categories in the intimacy motive scoring system are as McAdams describes (1984):

+A: Relationship Produces Positive Affect (Intimacy Imagery 1). An interpersonal encounter precipitates, facilitates, or is decidedly connected with a positive affective experience on the part of at least one of the characters: love, friendship, happiness, peace, or tender behavior connoting positive affect.

Dlg: Dialogue (Intimacy Imagery 2). Characters communicate with each other in a reciprocal and noninstrumental manner.

The following eight categories are termed "subcategories," and they can be scored only if either Intimacy Imagery 1 or Intimacy Imagery 2 is present in a given story.

Psy: Psychological Growth and Coping. An interpersonal encounter promotes psychological growth, self-fulfillment, adjustment, coping with problems, or the like.

CC: Commitment or Concern. A character feels a sense of commitment or concern for another (others) that is not rooted in guilt or begrudging duty.
TS: Relationship Transcends Time-Space Limitations. Two or more characters are engaged in a relationship that transcends the usual limitations of time and/or space.

U: Union. The writer makes explicit reference to the physical or figurative coming together of people who have at one time or another been apart.

H. Harmony. Characters find that they are in harmony with each other. They are "on the same wavelength," their actions are "in synchrony," one "truly understands" another, they find "something in common," they share similar views and so on.

Sr: Surrender of Control in Relationships. A character finds that interpersonal relations are subject to control that is in some way beyond him or her. He or she surrenders to this outside control.

Esc: Escape to Intimacy. Characters actively or mentally escape from a nonintimate situation or state to another situation or state that affords the experiencing of happiness, peace, liberation, fulfillment, meaning, and so on in the context of interpersonal relations.

COW: Connection to Outside World. Characters relate to the nonhuman, external world in an intimate fashion.

In the present study an alternative approach to the TAT-like cards and scoring system was used. McAdams (1990) has proposed a scoring system for interpersonal communion which is a development and a simplified version of the method described above. This method uses reports of significant experiences
rather than responses to TAT-like cards.

According to this method, each significant event or episode is scored for the presence or absence of each of four themes of communion. The themes are love/friendship, dialogue/sharing, care/support, and unity/togetherness. The maximum communion score for a single episode would be 4. The sum of the scores for the significant events is the overall interpersonal communion score. These four themes are related to the 10 themes which underlie intimacy motivation.

McAdams (1990) describes the themes which comprise interpersonal communion in much the same way as he describes the themes which comprise intimacy motivation. They are as follows:

Love/friendship. An actor experiences positive affect as the result of an interpersonal relationship. Positive affect refers to any of the following classes of emotional experience: (1) feeling of love (romantic, platonic, or otherwise), affection, compassion, sympathy, fondness, tenderness, etc.; (2) feelings of friendship, etc., (including special names for friendships such as "chums," "cronies," "comrades," "dear (close, good, etc.) friends;" simply "friends does not qualify); (3) feelings of happiness, joy, enjoyment, good cheer, excitement, merriment, good spirits, hilarity, exuberance, conviviality, mirth, etc.; and (4) feelings of peace, contentment, serenity, satisfaction, etc. Also included are examples of tender behaviors that generally
denote positive affect in interpersonal relationships, such as kissing, hand holding, laughing, caressing, smiling, making love, and others. Finally, Love/Friendship also includes examples of an actor "missing" another person or experiencing "sadness" at the loss of or separation from another person, the implication being that the interpersonal relationship must be associated with positive affect if its loss or suspension brings about sadness (e.g., grief, mourning, unhappiness, melancholy). Love/Friendship closely resembles the "relationships produces positive affect (A+) category in McAdams (1985) thematic coding system for "intimacy motivation," used with TAT stories.

Dialogue/Sharing. An actor experiences a reciprocal and noninstrumental form of communication, dialogue, or sharing with another person or with other persons. Such an experience involves verbal or nonverbal exchange among (between) actors that appears to exist as an end in itself, communication for communication's sake. The communication does not further a particular extrinsic goal or function to implement a particular instrumental task. Therefore, such examples as interviewing a person for a job or planning strategies for a political campaign would not score for Dialogue/Sharing. Dialogue/Sharing involves noninstrumental communication and implies reciprocity, give-and-take, rapport, and listening. It may include such phenomena as diverse as chatting about the weather to sharing ideas on the problems of society.
Generally, examples of simply "talking" or "chatting" do score for this theme unless the writer explicitly states that the conversation was (1) instrumental or (2) not reciprocal (e.g., one person is not listening to the other). Conversation (1) about an interpersonal relationship or (2) for the purpose of helping another person also score for this theme, even though they are technically "instrumental" forms of dialogue. To score for Dialogue/Sharing, the conversation does not have to produce positive affect, though of course it may. However, a conversation that involves heated arguments or other expressions of anger, disgust, or contempt does not score for this theme. Dialogue/Sharing closely resembles the intimacy motivation scoring category of Dialogue (Dlg) used for TAT stories.

Care/Support. An actor cares for or is cared for by another actor. Care may involve offering assistance, help, aid, comfort, support, or therapy, providing for the physical, material, social, or emotional welfare or wellbeing of another person. The category is reflected in two themes in McAdams' (1985) coding system for intimacy motivation: "psychological growth and coping" (Psy) and commitment and concern" (CC), used for TAT stories. It also captures Murray's (1938) needs for "succorance" (receiving help) and "nurturance" (giving help). Murray described "succorance" in this way: to have one's needs gratified by the sympathetic aid of an allied or (other); to be nursed, supported, sustained, surrounded,
protected, advised, guided, indulged, forgiven, consoled;" "to have always a supporter" (p.182). For nurturance, Murray wrote: "to give sympathy and gratify the needs of a helpless O: an infant or any O that is weak, disabled, tired, inexperienced, infirm, defeated, humiliated, lonely, dejected, sick, mentally confused." Care/Support often involves offering psychological assistance or promoting the psychological development, fulfillment, or coping of the other person, or receiving such an offering.

Unity/Togetherness. An actor experiences a sense of oneness, unity, harmony, synchrony, togetherness, or solidarity with other people, or indeed with the world as a whole. The interpersonal environment come to envelop the individual self; self merges with others, and ego boundaries are blurred. An actor feels that he or she is now part of something larger that the self, part of an encompassing group or interpersonal context that serves to unify people, to bring them together. Unity/Togetherness is captured in McAdams' (1985) intimacy motivation themes of "Unity" (U), "Harmony" (H), and Connection to Outside World" (COW).

**Construct Validity of the Intimacy Motive**

Because the interpersonal communion construct is relatively new and untested, and because of its similarity to the intimacy motive, the present study relies on the evidence demonstrating the construct validity of the intimacy motive. Support for the construct validity of intimacy motivation
comes from several sources. Peer ratings indicate that those who score high in intimacy motivation are more likely to be described as natural, warm, sincere, appreciative, and loving than those low in intimacy motivation (McAdams, 1980; McAdams and Powers, 1981). College students who are high in intimacy motive are perceived by others as more sincere, warm, and less dominant in interpersonal relationships than their peers. Those who are higher in intimacy motivation demonstrate the type of gentle "being" orientation described by Maslow (1968).

In an experiment using psychodrama, McAdams and Powers (1981) found that subjects who scored high in intimacy motive exhibit warm, close, communicative interactions. In performing psychodramas, these subjects behave in a communal and egalitarian manner. They more often speak in the first person plural, endorse the individuality of others, and issue few commands.

McAdams (1982) found that intimacy motivation influences the processing of autobiographical material. Those who are high in intimacy motivation regard close, warm, communicative interactions to be particularly rewarding and are more likely to remember these interactions than those who are low in intimacy motive. Intimacy motivation is significantly correlated with themes of interpersonal intimacy in recollections of peak experiences ($r = .44, p < .001$) and great learning experiences ($r = .56, p < .001$).
Intimacy motivation also has a relationship to the manner in which individuals process information. McAdams (1979) offered evidence that college students who score high in intimacy motivation are either more likely to detect differences in facial expression or are more likely to base judgments about a person on facial expressions. Though either conclusion is possible, it is clear that people high in intimacy motivation attend to environmental cues that indicate an opportunity for interpersonal exchange.

In a study of recall, McAdams and McClelland (1980) found a significant correlation between intimacy motivation and recall of facts in a story replete with intimacy facts ($r= .56$, $p< .001$). No such relationship existed between intimacy motivation and recall of facts in a story of neutral content. In a similar study the same researchers found that subjects high in intimacy motivation and low or moderate in power motivation (Winter 1973) recall significantly more facts having to do with warmth, closeness, and communication. Subjects low or moderate in intimacy motivation and high in power motive recall more facts about characters having an impact on others.

Reliability

In order to establish interrater reliability, a trained scorer, who knew none of the hypotheses or details of the study, rated the written accounts of the subjects' peak and turning point experiences for the presence or absence of the
four themes of interpersonal communion described above. His rating were highly reliable as he had an interrater reliability with an expert scorer of .83.

**Miller Social Intimacy Scale**

The second variable in the intimacy composite is social intimacy as measured by the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (MSIS: Miller and Lefcourt, 1982). The MSIS was developed from systematic interviews with 22 male and 28 female undergraduates. The interviews explored the nature and function of their relationships with friends, family, and acquaintances. From this material the researchers culled the defining characteristics of intimate relationships. Lonely subjects consistently described friendships which lacked these characteristics. A ten point frequency and intensity scale was designed to capture both the frequency and the depth of interactions. Social desirability items were also included.

Examples of test items include: "How often do you show him/her affection?" "How much do you feel like being encouraging and supportive to him/her when he/she is unhappy?" "How important is it to you that he/she understands your feelings?" Subjects describe their closest relationship in terms of these questions. The sum of the ratings is the index of maximum level of intimacy being experienced at the present time.

Seventeen items (6 measuring frequency and 11 measuring intensity) showed inter-item and item-total correlations
greater than .50. These items comprised the final version of
the scale. Cronbach alpha of .91 indicates that the 17 item
list assesses a single construct. The test-retest reliability
over a one month period was .84 and .96 over a two month
period. This indicates stability in the maximum level of
intimacy experienced over time. The MSIS also showed high
convergent validity. Subjects who reported high levels of
trust and intimacy in their closest relationship on the
Interpersonal Relationship Scale (Schlein, Guerney, and
Stover cited in Miller and Lefcourt, 1982) scored high on the
MSIS ($r$=.71, $p<.001$). Similarly, self descriptions of
loneliness on the UCLA Loneliness Scale were significantly
correlated with low scores on the MSIS ($r$=−.65), $p<.001$). The
MSIS scores for descriptions of subjects' closest friends were
significantly greater than those of subjects' casual friends
($t$=9.18, $p<.001$). Married students' scores were significantly
higher than those of unmarried students ($t$=8.17, $p<.001$).
Married students scored significantly higher than those
subjects whose marriages were troubled ($t$=6.41, $p<.001$).
Unmarried students also scored significantly higher than
subjects in troubled marriages ($t$=2.56, $p=.02$), thus
indicating that marriage per se is not a valid indicator of
intimacy.

In a study of social intimacy and stressful life events,
Miller and Lefcourt used a modified version of Adams and
Hoffmann's (1960) interview method and the MSIS with 117
undergraduates. Subjects were asked to discuss their views on three topics for seven minutes. The topics were anticipating marriage in the future, the merits of traditional marriage as opposed to living together, and extramarital sex. The subjects were exposed to varying degrees of attention from the interviewer. The interviews were rated by two independent judges for degree of disclosure. Also the duration of eye contact was measured.

The results indicated that subjects who score low on the MSIS show a significantly greater decrease in disclosure in the second interval of the experiment during which reinforcement had ceased than in the control condition in which reinforcement was consistent. Subjects high in social intimacy declined significantly in disclosure only in the control condition. Low scorers on the MSIS became less disclosing in general after the first three minutes of the interview. Low scorers on the MSIS declined markedly in their disclosures when the interviewer ceased to show interest.

The authors inferred that people who have close relationships with others may work to maintain interactions more often than those for whom relationships are more distant. The amount of attention paid to an individual affects people differently, according to their level of intimacy with others.

After collecting information on life events of undergraduate men and women by means of the Coddington Life Events Checklist (1972) and the Profile of Mood States
(McNair, Lorr, and Droppleman, 1971), Miller and Lefcourt found that the lower the intimacy score and the higher the negative life events score, the higher the mood disturbance. The absence of positive events was more highly associated with mood disturbance for those who lacked an intimate relationship than for those who had an intimate relationship. Subjects high in intimacy experienced the lowest levels of mood disturbance in general. These results were confounded by the significant correlation between negative life events and mood disturbance \((r = .41, p < .005)\) which suggests that subjects recall more aversive events or evaluate past events more negatively as a result of their current distress. Also, the study does not establish whether individuals experience stress as a result of lack of intimacy or vice versa.

Though use of the MSIS is not widely reported, it is appropriate for the present study as an indicator of the intensity of present intimacy. In addition, it can be applied to marital and non-marital, same sex and opposite sex relationships.

**Social Support Questionnaire**

The third component of the intimacy variable is the perceived level of support a person receives in a wide range of relationships. The MSIS measures the level of intimacy between a subject and one other person. Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason (1983) devised the Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ) as a means of measuring a wider range a
relationships which the subject regards as supportive. In response to 27 questions such as "Whom can you really count on to listen to you when you need to talk?" and "Who do you feel would help you if you were married and had just separated from your spouse?" subjects list up to nine people for each question and then rate their satisfaction with that support. The SSQ yields two indexes. The first index is simply the mean number of people listed in response to each question. The second index is the mean satisfaction score for the 27 items. Coefficient alpha for mean number of relationships was .97 and for mean satisfaction .94. Test-retest reliability over a four week period was .90 for the number of relationships and .83 for level of satisfaction. Neither score correlated significantly with social desirability.

The SSQ provides a global assessment of the breadth and quality of a person's relational world. Although it is not a measure of intimacy per se, it does complement the behavioral index of intimacy which the MSIS provides and the internal state which intimacy motivation taps. In conjunction with the previously described measures, the response to the SSQ is a good index of the number of relationships in which the subject has potential opportunities for intimacy. An abbreviated (12 item) version of the SSQ was used in the present study.

**Personality Research Form**

The last two components of the intimacy variable are nurturance and affiliation. These were measured by the
similarly named scales of the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1967). The Personality Research Form (PRF) is 352 True or False statements which yield 22 personality scales. The scales were derived from a list of needs proposed by Murray (1930). The scales are abasement, aggression, cognitive structure, endurance, impulsivity, play, succorance, achievement, autonomy, dependence, exhibition, nurturance, sentience, understanding, affiliation, change, dominance, harm avoidance, order, social recognition, infrequency, and desirability. The last two, infrequency and desirability, are validity scales.

Hogan (1983) reports that the high content validity and homogeneity were attained by evaluating the scales according to three criteria: endorsement frequency between 5 and 95 percent; high correlations with the provisional key for each scale; and low correlations with a social desirability scale.

Each scale has 16 items. Scale intercorrelations are modest. Odd-even reliabilities range from .50 to .89, a respectable showing in light of the heterogeneity of item content of the scales. The traits measured by the PRF correlate with similar traits measured by the California Psychological Inventory and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (Anastasi, 1982).

Though the PRF norms are based on a sample of 1,000 male and 1,000 females college students form across North America, the instrument is useful to the present study because of its
capacity to obtain a behavioral measure of some of the dimensions of intimacy motivation such as nurturance and affiliation. Thus these two scales of the PRF were used in the present research.

The Symptom Checklist-90 (SCL-90)

Personal adjustment was measured by the SCL-90. The SCL-90 is a self report inventory of psychiatric symptoms. It grew out of a more general item pool found in the Cornell Medical Index (Wilder, 1948) and is able to measure clinical states which are subject to therapeutic intervention. Its original form (Hopkins Symptom Checklist) contained 58 items. Research on the original instrument revealed four to six factors that account for most of the variance. The factors which most consistently emerged were depression and anxiety. The other factors were somatic concerns, obsessive compulsive themes, and interpersonal sensitivity.

With the addition of 32 items which measure symptoms of more severe psychopathology, the SCL-90 was born. These additional items tap psychotic symptoms, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, and hostility.

Derogatis, Lipman, & Covi (1973) describe the dimensions tapped by the SCL-90 as follows:

(1) Somatization. Distress which arises from perceptions of bodily dysfunction. These include cardiovascular, gastrointestinal, respiratory, and other systems involving the autonomic nervous system. Also symptoms related to anxiety
such as headaches, backaches, and other pain located in gross muscular anatomy are measured.

(2) Obsessive-compulsive. These are behaviors, impulses, and thoughts which are experienced as unremitting, irresistible, and ego-alien.

(3) Interpersonal sensitivity. Feelings of personal inadequacy and inferiority which arise, especially in comparison with other people. These are feelings of self-depreciation, marked discomfort in interpersonal interactions, and heightened self consciousness which cause distress.

(4) Depression. Depressive symptoms include dysphoric affect and mood, withdrawal of interest from activities, lack of motivation and energy, feelings of hopelessness and futility, and suicidal ideation.

(5) Anxiety. Indicators of anxiety are restlessness, nervousness, tension, trembling, and panic.

(6) Hostility. This dimension includes thoughts, feelings, and action which bespeak annoyance, temper, and urges to break things.

(7) Phobic anxiety. These are fear of open spaces, crowds, public places, and social settings.

(8) Paranoid ideation. Projective thinking, hostility, suspiciousness, delusions, grandiosity and loss of autonomy mark this dimension.

(9) Psychoticism. This includes auditory hallucinations,
thought broadcasting, external though control, and external thought insertion.

The SCL-90 purports to provide a profile of the individual. However, its capacity to do so is questionable as Hoffmann and Overall (1978) have found. Their argument that the SCL-90 is not a multi-dimensional instrument but rather an indicator of more global distress is presented below.

Derogatis et al. (1976) undertook an investigation of the concurrent validity of the SCL-90. They used the Goldstein (Brauzer and Goldstein, 1973) method of symptomatic volunteers. Symptomatic volunteers are research subjects who share the background and cultural characteristics of private practice clients and are experiencing depression and anxiety. They are volunteers in the sense that they volunteer for a clinical drug trial with medication which may provide relief for their symptoms.

The subjects included in the study were selected for primary neurotic affective symptoms and were free of schizophrenia, drug and alcohol abuse. They took the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and the SCL-90, among other tests. The Wiggins and Tyrone scores of the MMPI were used in the study.

The Somatization scale of the SCL-90 found high convergent validity with Body symptoms (.66), Organic symptoms (.62), Poor health (.58), and the standard Hypochondriasis (.48) and Hysteria (.57) scales of the MMPI.
The Obsessive-compulsive scale of the SCL-90 does not have a directly comparable component in the MMPI. The Psychasthenia scale, which taps compulsive, phobic, and obsessive symptoms, and the Schizophrenia scale, which taps thought disorder, most closely approximate the Obsessive-compulsive dimension of the SCL-90. Also Wiggins' Organic symptoms (difficulty with concentration, memory, and speaking coordination) are similar to this dimension of the SCL-90. These MMPI scales are correlated ($r=0.54$) with the Obsessive-compulsive scale of the SCL-90.

Interpersonal sensitivity enjoys a $0.64$ correlation with the Wiggins Poor Morale and a $0.63$ correlation with Depression. The Depression scale of the SCL-90 is highly correlated (0.75) with its Wiggins counterpart in the MMPI. The Anxiety scale of the SCL-90 was not as highly correlated with the Tyrone Anxiety scale of the MMPI (0.57). Hostility on the SCL-90 is correlated with Resentment and Aggression on the Wiggins' scale (0.68). Phobic anxiety on the SCL-90 has a 0.50 correlation with Wiggins Phobias scale on the MMPI. Paranoid ideation has a slightly better correlation with its Tyrone counterpart suspicion and mistrust (0.56). Psychoticism on the SCL-90 has a 0.64 correlation with the standard Schizophrenia scale of the MMPI.

In a study of chemotherapy and depressed patients undertaken by Lipman, Covi, and Shapiro (1977) using the SCL-90, eight factors emerged: Interpersonal Sensitivity, Phobic
Anxiety, Retarded Depression, Anger-Hostility, Somatization, Obsessive-Compulsive, Agitated Depression, and Psychoticism.

In a study of British men remanded to prison for psychiatric reports, Wilson, Taylor, & Robertson (1985) found that the SCL-90 correlated well with other measures of mental states. Obsessive compulsive (.41), Interpersonal sensitivity (.44), Depression (.62), Psychoticism (.63), and Paranoid ideation (.53) were correlated with equivalent scales on the Comprehensive Psychopathological Rating Scale (CPRS) (p<.001). However, the SCL-90 did fail to distinguish psychotic from non-psychotic individuals. Only the Paranoid ideation scale could distinguish psychotic patients (t=2.74, p<.01).

Earlier studies also suggest that the SCL-90 is better equipped to detect neurosis than psychosis. Rickels, Garcia, & Fisher (1971) reported that the SCL-90 can place individuals in broad diagnostic groups. In their study of gynecological patients, they found the SCL-90 to be a valid instrument for distinguishing psychiatric patients from those who did not suffer psychiatric illness. Similarly, Derogatis, Lobo, Folstein, & Abeloff (1981) found that it could distinguish disturbed psychiatric patients from those who did not suffer from psychiatric illness.

Hoffmann and Overall (1978) noted that the previous research on SCL-90 focused on patients selected for symptoms of anxiety and/or depression. They studied the statistical properties and structure of the SCL-90 in a clinic population
unselected for diagnosis but representative of general psychiatric outpatient population. Their findings indicated that the SCL-90 tends to measure a unitary global complaint factor. In this population of outpatients with various diagnoses, the instrument did not differentiate as clearly the specific factors it was previously reported to measure. The authors reported that the total score on the SCL-90 is reliable (Spearman-Brown split-half reliability between odd and even items was .976). The alpha coefficient for the entire test was .975. The total score correlated with each factor as follows: Depression .928; Somatization .746; Phobic Anxiety .831; Functional Impairment .789; and Hostile Suspiciousness .906.

Because so large a portion of the variance accounted for by the first unrotated factor, (i.e. 6.45 times as much variance as the next largest factor and more than twice the variance of the next six factors combined), the SCL-90 is recommended as a measure of more general complaint or discomfort rather than a measure of specific psychopathological dimensions. The total score derived from the summation of all items is a useful measure of a more global psychological distress.

The SCL-90 is only slightly different from the HSCL-90 (Lipman, Covi, & Shapiro, 1977, 1979). Cyr, McKenna-Foley, & Peacock (1985) treated them as identical inventories in their review of the research on the factor structure of the SCL-90R.
(The SCL-90R is a minor alteration of the SCL-90. Two items are replaced and seven are slightly modified.) Like Hoffmann and Overall (1978), and later Clark and Friedman (1983) who studied a sample of unselected VA outpatients, Cyr, McKenna-Foley and Peacock dispute the multidimensionality of any version of the Symptom Checklist and argue that it is a better measure of general psychological distress than of distinct dimensions of psychopathology.

The SCL-90 is used in the present study as an index of global adjustment. Though the measure is ordinarily for psychiatric inpatients, it can be applied to non-psychiatric populations. Its apparent weakness as a means of assembling a psychological profile of an individual is of no concern in this study. This weakness and its inability to distinguish psychotic and nonpsychotic individuals seem to suggest that the SCL-90 is oriented toward less specific descriptions. Its capacity to convey a sense of an individual's well being and neurotic behavior, which research has demonstrated, makes it appropriate for the present investigation.

The Satisfaction With Life Scale

The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) consists of five self report items. These five items were drawn from an original scale of 48 items. After dropping affect items, those with loadings less than .60, and semantically similar items, the Satisfaction With Life Scale emerged. The items of the tests are: (1) In
most ways my life is close to my ideal; (2) The conditions of my life are excellent; (3) I am satisfied with my life; (4) So far I have gotten the important things I want in life; (5) If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

Respondents rate each item on a seven point scale ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree. Research on the instrument has demonstrated that it does not evoke a social desirability response set. The test is highly correlated with subjective well-being scales such as the Differential Personality Scale (.68), the Andrews Withey (.68), the Campbell (.75) and interview estimates of life satisfaction. The test-retest correlation is .82.

The scale is useful because it taps a cognitive judgmental process and is not confounded with affective variables. As Diener et al., 1985) point out, judgments of satisfaction are made according to an internal standard set by the person. Against this standard, an assessment of one's own circumstances is made. The measure is designed to elicit the subject's personal judgment of well-being rather than utilizing experimenter criteria for same. The SWLS seeks to measure satisfaction with life as a whole, rather than satisfaction with specific domains of life. The applicability of the SWLS is not limited to certain populations such as the elderly, but is useful for different age groups.

In order to obtain a measure of satisfaction with specific areas of interest, the Diener scale was adjusted to
assess satisfaction with both career and intimacy of friendships. Thus subjects responded to the following items on a seven-point scale as described above: 1) In most ways the level of intimacy in my life is close to my ideal; 2) The conditions of my intimate relationships are excellent; 3) I am satisfied with the level of intimacy in my life; 4) So far I have gotten the important things I want in the intimate relationships in my life; 5) If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing about my intimate relationships.

To assess career and vocational satisfaction, the Diener scale was adjusted as follows: 1) In most ways my choice of career or vocation is close to my ideal; 2) The conditions of my career or vocation are excellent; 3) I am satisfied with my career or vocation; 4) So far I have gotten the important things I want in my career or vocation; 5) If I could choose my career or vocation over, I would change almost nothing.

In order to have a measure of the intimacy demands and opportunities available to the priests in their pastoral work, five items were added to the priest questionnaire. These were designed to assess the nature of the ministerial environment in which the priests work. The items are as follows: 1) My pastoral work gives me ample opportunities for close personal relationships; 2) In most ways I am satisfied with the level of intimacy in my pastoral work; 3) So far I have gotten the important interpersonal things I want in my pastoral work; 4) In my pastoral work people are generally open to forming close
personal relationships; 5) My pastoral work generally requires me to enter into close personal relationships.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The primary focus of the study was the difference in intimacy between young and old Catholic priests. The groups were distinguished by the type of seminary training they received. Priests trained before 1970 formed the older group and priests trained in 1970 and after formed the younger group. The two control groups consisted of males of similar age. The means and standard deviations of the principal variables of the study appear in Table 1 according to age and vocation. The statistical procedures used were multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the Fisher Z-transformation of Pearson Product Moment correlations.

Correlations Among Variables

Pearson correlations were computed among the variables used in the study (Table 2). The key variables are the five which comprised the dependent variable, intimacy. Table 3 provides the correlations among these five: Affiliation (Aff), nurturance (Nur), perceived level of support (Sup), social intimacy (Sint), and interpersonal communion (Comm) for the entire sample. Tables 4 and 5 contain the same information for
Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Intimacy, Satisfaction, and Adjustment for Young Priests, Old Priests, Young Controls, and Old Controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priests</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff (Affiliation)</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur (Nurturance)</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sint (Social Intimacy)</td>
<td>136.63</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup (Perceived Support)</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm (Interpersonal Communion)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int* (Intimacy)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swl (Satisfaction with Life)</td>
<td>25.05</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swv (Satisfaction with Vocation)</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj** (Adjustment)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>32.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intimacy is the composite variable as determined by summing Z-score conversions of affiliation, nurturance, social intimacy, perceived support, and interpersonal communion.

Key: Aff= affiliation  
Nur= nurturance  
Sint= social intimacy  
Sup= perceived support  
Comm= interpersonal communion  
Swl= satisfaction with life  
Swv= satisfaction with vocation  
Adj= adjustment (** high score means low adjustment)
Table 2

Correlations Among the Variables in the Study for the Entire Sample (only significant correlations reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Educ</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.13&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.14&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Swl</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.64&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.72&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.30&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.33&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Swi</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.45&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Swv</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.33&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.32&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.14&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.32&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ssup</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.20&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adj</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aff</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.42&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.14&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.68&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Nur</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.68&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sup</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.63&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sint</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.62&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Comm</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Int</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 2 continued)
Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N range = 177 to 182</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em> &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>b</em> p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>c</em> p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Educ = education; Swl = satisfaction with life; Swi = satisfaction with intimacy; Swv = satisfaction with vocation; Aff = affiliation; Nur = nurturance; Sup = perceived level of support; Ssup = satisfaction with support; Sint = social intimacy; Adj = adjustment; Comm = interpersonal communion; Int = intimacy (composite of Z-scores of Aff, Nur, Sup, Sint, and Comm).
Table 3

Correlations Among the Dependent Variables of the MANOVA for the Entire Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>.42&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Sint</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>.15&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N range 187 to 205

<sup>a</sup>p<.05
<sup>b</sup>p<.01
<sup>c</sup>p<.001

Key: Aff=affiliation
Nur=nurturance
Sup=perceived support
Sint=social intimacy
Comm=interpersonal communion
Table 4
Correlations Among the Variables in the Study for the Priest Group (only significant correlations reported)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.97&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ord</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.78&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Swl</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.63&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.81&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.38&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Swi</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.69&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.59&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.37&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.38&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Swv</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.61&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.39&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.38&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Swpi</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.29&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.52&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.36&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.51&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ssup</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.28&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.29&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.32&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sint</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 4 continued)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p &lt; .05</th>
<th>N range 88 to 105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 0

rd = number of years ordained; Edu = education; Sem = intimacy in seminary training; Swl = satisfaction with life; Swi = satisfaction with intimacy; Swv = satisfaction with vocation; Swpi = satisfaction with intimacy in the pastoral setting; Aff = affiliation; Nur = nurturance; Sup = perceived level of support; Ssup = satisfaction with support. Sint = social intimacy; Adj = adjustment; Comm = interpersonal communion; Int = intimacy (composite of Z-score transformations of Aff, Nur, Sup, Sint, and Comm)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.49&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Swl</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.66&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.64&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.43&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.21&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.20&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Swi</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.41&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.55&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Swv</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.17&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.26&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ssup</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.38&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.47&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.22&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.47&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adj</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.34&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.19&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>.46&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.64&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.30&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.73&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.48&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sint</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.70&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.53&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 5 continued)
Table 5 (continued)

N range 89 to 101

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 R&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Educ=education; Swl=satisfaction with life; Swi=satisfaction with intimacy; Swv=satisfaction with vocation; Aff=affiliation; Nur=nurturance; Sup=perceived level of support; Ssup=satisfaction with support; Sint=social intimacy; Adj=adjustment; Comm=interpersonal communion; Int=intimacy (composite of Z-scores of Aff, Nur, Sup, Sint, Comm)
the priest and control groups respectively, as well as correlations among the other variables in the study. As Table 3 indicates, the five components of the intimacy variable have a significant level of association among them. The correlations do indicate that the five measures have an ample level of association to be components of the composite variable, intimacy.

Four measures of satisfaction were used in the study: satisfaction with life, satisfaction with intimacy, satisfaction with vocation or career, and satisfaction with intimacy in the pastoral setting. Each of the latter three was a modification of Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin's (1985) Satisfaction With Life Scale. On a scale of 1 to 7, all subjects rated their satisfaction with life in general, intimate relationships, and career or vocation. In addition, the priests rated their satisfaction with intimacy experienced in the pastoral setting. The priests' responses to the four measures were highly correlated. Table 6 shows the associations among the four variables for the priests and Table 7 shows the associations among the applicable variables for the control group.

Intimacy

The main hypothesis of the study predicted that young priests, i.e., age 47 and younger who had been trained in a
Table 6  

Correlations Among Measures of Satisfaction for Priests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction With</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Pastoral Intimacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

**Correlations Among Measures of Satisfaction for Control Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction With</th>
<th>Vocation</th>
<th>Intimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001 for all correlations
seminary environment which encouraged close personal relationships would be higher in intimacy than priests who were older than age 47. It was also predicted that the same difference in intimacy would not be found between young and old controls.

A 2 X 2 (Vocation By Age) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test this hypothesis. Normal probability plots and stem and leaf plots for each of the five measures (affiliation, nurturance, perceived level of support, social intimacy, and interpersonal communion) which comprised the dependent variable, intimacy, revealed fairly normal distributions. The box plots revealed one extreme score for each of three dependent variables (interpersonal communion, perceived level of support, and affiliation). Nurturance and social intimacy had two and three extreme scores respectively. These were investigated and found to have been recorded accurately. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p<.001$) and thus indicated that the five dependent variables were correlated. Box's M statistic ($\chi^2(45)=70.17$, $p=.02$) indicated that the variances and covariances of the five dependent variables failed to meet the criterion of homogeneity. In addition, the univariate homogeneity of variance tests indicated that the nurturance (Cochran's $C(45,4)=.38$, $p=.02$), social intimacy (Cochran's $C(45,4)=.38$, $p=.02$), and interpersonal communion (Cochran's $C(45,4)=.38$, $p=.01$) variables violated the assumption of homogeneity of
variance. The results of the MANOVA should be considered in light of these violations.

The results of a multivariate analysis of variance using five dependent variables, namely nurturance, affiliation, perceived level of support, social intimacy, and interpersonal communion, and two independent variables, namely vocation and age, did not support the hypothesis. The interaction of age and vocation was not significant (Wilks' lambda=.98, F(5,178)=.81, p=.542.) The analysis indicated that vocation did not interact with age in the impact it had on intimacy scores. There was not a greater difference between young and old priests than between young and old controls on intimacy.

At the same time there was strong evidence that vocation itself had an effect on level of intimacy. The priests were significantly higher in level of intimacy (Wilks' lambda=.80, F(5,178)=8.67, p<.001) than the controls. Univariate F-tests showed significantly higher affiliation (F(1,178)=17.10, p<.001), nurturance (F(1,178)=8.20, p<.005), and perceived level of support (F(1,178)=26.01, p<.001) for the priests than for the control group (Table 8). An interesting trend toward significance was also found for age. Young men approached significantly higher levels of intimacy than the older men (F(5,178) = 2.16, p = .061). Table 9 indicates that higher levels of nurturance and social intimacy among young men than among older men contributed to this trend toward significance which suggests an affect of age on intimacy.
Table 8
Univariate F-Tests for Effect of Vocation With 1,178 Degrees of Freedom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypoth SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>237.43</td>
<td>2471.14</td>
<td>237.43</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>57.09</td>
<td>1239.24</td>
<td>57.09</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Intim.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>67776.65</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>380.77</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Support</td>
<td>117.27</td>
<td>802.29</td>
<td>117.27</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>347.69</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Hypoth. SS</td>
<td>Error SS</td>
<td>Hypoth MS</td>
<td>Error MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>2471.14</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturance</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>1239.24</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.Intim.</td>
<td>3551.12</td>
<td>67776.65</td>
<td>3551.12</td>
<td>380.77</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Support</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>802.29</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>347.69</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned above, the Box-plots indicated that affiliation, perceived support, and interpersonal communion each had one extreme score and nurturance and social intimacy had two and three extreme scores respectively. The MANOVA was recomputed without these extreme scores in order to see whether their exclusion would change the results. The results of the reanalysis were essentially the same as those of the original analysis. As in the previous MANOVA there was a significant effect of vocation on intimacy ($F(5,164)=9.26$, $p<.001$). However, the significant trend for age did not appear in the reanalysis ($F(5,164)=1.57$, $p=.17$). Like the original analysis, the reanalysis showed significantly higher levels of affiliation ($F(1,168)=18.41$, $p<.001$), nurturance ($F(1,168)=10.01$, $p=.002$), and perceived support ($F(1,168)=27.28$, $p<.001$) for the priests than for the controls.

Social Intimacy

In addition to assessing the role of the composite variable, intimacy, as described above, the study also examined the role of social intimacy by itself. The second hypothesis concerned only the social intimacy component of the intimacy variable. Social intimacy was measured by means of the Miller Social Intimacy Scale (MSIS). The MSIS measures the depth of intimacy one experiences in relationship with one's closest friend. It was predicted that young priests would score higher on the MSIS than the old priests, but that the
young controls would not score higher than the old controls.

For the entire sample, social intimacy and age had a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.22, p < .01$). Age accounted for approximately four percent of the variance in social intimacy. A $2 \times 2$ (Age By Vocation) analysis of variance was performed. The predicted interaction of vocation and age was not significant ($F(1, 190) = 0.08; p = .78$). However, consistent with the results of the multivariate analysis of variance and the negative correlation of age and social intimacy reported above, there was a significant main effect of age on social intimacy scores. Young men reported higher levels of social intimacy ($M = 136.33$) than older men ($M = 126.48$) ($F(1, 190) = 11.50; p < .001$). The omega squared indicated that six percent of the variance in social intimacy was explained by age (Table 10).

**Life Satisfaction**

The third hypothesis concerned life satisfaction. It was predicted that priests who were high in intimacy would be more satisfied with their lives than those who were low in intimacy. A summary of the means and standard deviations for satisfaction with life, satisfaction with vocation, and personal adjustment according to intimacy level, age, and vocation appear in Table 11. Intimacy and satisfaction with life were correlated ($r = 0.25; p < .001$) for the entire sample, thus indicating that intimacy accounted for six percent of the variance in life satisfaction. As in the previous MANOVA, the
Table 10

2 x 2 (Vocation By Age) Analysis of Variance of Social Intimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>( w^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>103.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4,532.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4532.92</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc X Age</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.63</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>74,874.97</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>394.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations for Life Satisfaction (Swl), Vocational Satisfaction (Swv), and Adjustment (Adj) as a Function of Intimacy Level, Age, and Vocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priests</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YLI</td>
<td>OLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.17</td>
<td>25.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>38.33</td>
<td>38.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>41.89</td>
<td>26.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: YLI= young low intimacy
     OLI= old low intimacy
     YHI= young high intimacy
     OHI= old high intimacy

# high score means low adjustment
five measures of intimacy comprised the intimacy variable. Z-scores for each of the five variables were calculated, added together, and divided by five. By means of a median split of the intimacy variable, the priests were placed into low or high intimacy groups.

In order to investigate whether there is, in fact, a difference in life satisfaction between priests who are high in intimacy and priests who are low in intimacy, and to assess the impact of age and vocation, a 2 X 2 X 2 (Intimacy By Vocation By Age) analysis of variance was performed. There was no significant difference in life satisfaction between priests who were high in intimacy (M=27.31) and controls who were high in intimacy (M=26.22) (F(1, 174)=.07; p=.96). All subjects, regardless of vocation, who reported being more satisfied with their lives were higher in intimacy than subjects who reported less satisfaction with their lives (F(1, 174)=11.39; p=.001) (Table 12).

The analysis of variance indicated a trend toward significance for the two way interaction of age and intimacy (F(1, 174)=3.60; p=.059). The analysis of simple effects displayed in Table 13 shows that young men who were high in intimacy (M=26.42) might be more satisfied with their lives than young men who were low in intimacy (M=21.17) (F(1, 174)=17.08; p<.01). But older men who were high in intimacy (M=27.18) may not be more satisfied with their lives than older men who were low in intimacy (M=25.46)
Table 12
2 X 2 X 2 (Intimacy By Vocation By Age) Analysis of Variance Of Satisfaction With Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$w^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>398.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>398.43</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>191.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>198.18</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Voc</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Age</td>
<td>126.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>126.07</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc X Age</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Voc X Age</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5,983.52</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Simple Effects Analysis of Interaction of Age and Intimacy on Life Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>597.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>597.60</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>65.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65.36</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5,983.52</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>34.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Means, N, and Standard Deviations for Each Cell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTIMACY</th>
<th>YOUNG</th>
<th>OLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOW INTIMACY</td>
<td>21.17 (35)</td>
<td>25.46 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD:7.50</td>
<td>SD:4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH INTIMACY</td>
<td>26.42 (57)</td>
<td>27.18 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD:5.50</td>
<td>SD:5.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(F(1,174)=1.87; p=n.s.). Intimacy may have a different effect on the life satisfaction of men according to their age.

There were, however, significant main effects for both intimacy and age on life satisfaction. Men who were high in intimacy (M=26.87) tended to be more satisfied with their lives than those who were low in intimacy (M=23.97) (F(1,174)=11.39; p<.001). Intimacy accounted for six percent of the variance in satisfaction with life. Also, older men tended to be more satisfied with their lives (M=26.22) than younger men (M=24.65) F(1,174)=5.46; p=.021). Age accounted for three percent of the variance in satisfaction with life (Table 12).

Satisfaction With Vocation

The fourth hypothesis predicted that priests who are high in intimacy should be more satisfied with their vocations than those who are low in intimacy. For the entire sample intimacy and satisfaction with vocation were correlated (r=.32; p<.001). Intimacy explained ten percent of the variance in satisfaction with vocation. As predicted, priests who were high in intimacy were significantly more satisfied with their vocations (M=29.44) than those who were low in intimacy (M=24.42), (t=2.61; p=.01). Omega squared indicated that for the priests intimacy explained 15 percent of the variance in satisfaction with vocation.

In order to investigate whether the impact of intimacy on vocational satisfaction was distinctive of priests, and to
assess the impact of age, a 2 X 2 X 2 (Intimacy By Vocation By Age) analysis of variance was performed. The results of the analysis revealed main effects for vocation and intimacy. The priests (M=26.93) were significantly more satisfied with their vocation than the controls (M=23.81) (F(1,174)=7.36; p<.001). Vocation accounted for four percent of the variance in satisfaction with vocation. Men who were high in intimacy (M=27.38) were significantly more satisfied with their vocation than men who were low in intimacy (M=23.31) (F(1,174)=16.45, p<.001). Intimacy explained nine percent of the variance in satisfaction with vocation. There was no significant interaction of the effect of vocation and intimacy on satisfaction with vocation. Thus, the relationship between intimacy and satisfaction with vocation was not a relationship which distinguished priests from controls (Table 14).

**Personal Adjustment**

The fifth hypothesis predicted that priests who are high in intimacy should be better adjusted than those who are low in intimacy. For the entire sample intimacy and personal adjustment were not significantly correlated (r=.09; p=.13). However, a 2 X 2 X 2 (Intimacy By Vocation By Age) analysis of variance yielded some interesting results. There was, in fact, a main effect for vocation such that the priests tended to be better adjusted (M=34.27) than the control group (M=46.19) (F(1,166)=5.80; p<.017) (Table 15). (High score means low adjustment.) Although priests were significantly
Table 14

2 x 2 x 2 (Intimacy By Vocation By Age) Analysis of Variance of Satisfaction With Vocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>w^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>606.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>606.20</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>271.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>271.27</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Voc</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Age</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.58</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc X Age</td>
<td>75.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.51</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Voc X Age</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>6,300.42</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>36.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15

*2 x 2 x 2 (Intimacy By Vocation By Age) Analysis of Variance of Adjustment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>w²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>117.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>117.03</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocation</td>
<td>6,622.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,622.09</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>773.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>773.24</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Voc</td>
<td>2,838.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,838.77</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Age</td>
<td>685.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>685.05</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc X Age</td>
<td>329.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int X Voc X Age</td>
<td>802.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>802.21</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>189,425.49</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1,141.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
better adjusted than the control group, the hypothesis that the level of intimacy affects the level of personal adjustment of priests was not unequivocally supported.

**Intimacy As A Predictor of Personal Adjustment**

It was also hypothesized that intimacy would be a stronger predictor of personal adjustment for the young priests than for the old priests, but it would not be a stronger predictor of personal adjustment for the young control group than for the old control group. Scores on the SCL-90 were the measure of personal adjustment. The Pearson correlation of intimacy with adjustment for the young priests was .07 and was non-significant. Similarly the correlations of personal adjustment with intimacy for the older priests ($r=.20$), the young control group ($r=.16$), and the old control group ($r=.18$) were non-significant. A test of the difference between correlation coefficients using the Fisher $z$-transformation of the correlations (Morrison, 1976) indicated that the correlation between adjustment and intimacy for the young priests was not significantly different from the same correlation for the old priests. Thus, contrary to the hypothesis, intimacy was not a stronger predictor of personal adjustment for the young priests than for the old priests.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

This study of the differences in intimacy between young and old priests was inspired by the dramatic change in the training of priests that has taken place since 1970. The new model of training of priests incorporates far more opportunities for intimacy than did the old model of training. In addition to the change in training, there has been a change in the professional climate of ministry. Both young and old priests currently work in a professional climate which places great emphasis on intimate relationships. The study tested hypotheses about the impact of training on intimacy and the impact of intimacy on life satisfaction, vocational satisfaction, and adjustment of young and old priests.

In this study priests scored higher in intimacy than their non-ordained male peers. However, because there was no significant difference between young and old priests, it is reasonable to infer that training did not have an effect on their level of intimacy. The difference between young and old priests in level of intimacy, which essentially is the difference in level of intimacy between priests trained in the new system and priests trained in the old system, was the same as the difference in level of intimacy between young and old priests.
controls. Young men in this sample showed a trend toward significantly higher levels of intimacy than older men.

In the area of social intimacy, which in this study is the depth of intimacy a person experiences in relationship with his closest friend, young men scored significantly higher than older men. Thus age affected intimacy scores, but the hypothesized interaction of vocation and age was not supported. The difference in intimacy according to age was not distinctive of priests.

The impact of intimacy on satisfaction with life was significant, but again the impact of level of intimacy on satisfaction with life was not unique to priests. Both priests and control subjects who were high in intimacy were more satisfied with their lives than those who were low in intimacy. A trend toward significance was observed in the effect of the interaction of age and intimacy on life satisfaction, suggesting that in this study young men who were high in intimacy might also have been more satisfied with their lives than young men who were low in intimacy, but that this difference in life satisfaction according to level of intimacy probably would not apply to older men. However, the study did show that older men were more satisfied with their lives than younger men.

Priests were significantly more satisfied with their vocation than other males. Level of intimacy had a significant impact on satisfaction with vocation, but this impact applied
to the control subjects as well as to the priests. Men who were high in intimacy were significantly more satisfied with their vocations than those who were low in intimacy.

The results of the study indicated that intimacy and adjustment were not related. Though the priests were better adjusted than the control group, there was no difference in personal adjustment between the priests who were high in intimacy and those who were low in intimacy. Likewise there was no difference in personal adjustment between controls who were high in intimacy and controls who were low in intimacy. Also, contrary to predictions, intimacy was not a stronger predictor of personal adjustment for the young priests than for the old priests.

Intimacy in the Lives of Priests

Though the hypothesis that intimacy is higher among young priests than old priests but not higher among young controls than old controls was only partially supported, the finding that priests were higher in intimacy than controls, contradicts the findings of Kennedy and Heckler (1971) who assessed fifty-seven percent of priests they studied as underdeveloped and concluded that these underdeveloped priests "are genuinely uneasy about intimacy" (p. 9). Kennedy and Heckler conceded that priests are like men in general in that they have difficulty with close, personal relationships. Indeed, this difficulty in interpersonal relationships is widely reported, especially when men are compared with women.
(McAdams, 1989). (The implications of the gender difference in intimacy will be discussed below.)

The results of the present study suggest that regardless of the general deficiencies that men show in intimate relationships, priests were more likely to enter into close relationships than their male peers. The priests experienced significantly higher levels of intimacy in their relationships than other men. While some of this difference can probably be attributed to the wider exposure of the priests to potential relationships and potential intimacy in the exercise of their ministry, the data indicated nonetheless that priests regard a larger number of people as close friends upon whom they can rely and in whom they can confide. The priests were more likely to count on these important others for support and acceptance than other men did in their lives. In addition, the priests demonstrated more eagerness to enter into relationships of varying depths and they reported that they enjoy providing support, nurturance, care, and concern to others more than other men did. On all of the dimensions of intimacy examined in this study, the priests were either significantly better equipped than the controls for close relationships or, at least, were equal to the controls in the practice of engaging, developing, and sustaining close relationships.

It is important to note that on the Miller Social Intimacy Scale, which measures, among other things, readiness
for expression of affection, self disclosure, and closeness to a significant other, the priests were as intimate as the married and single men who comprised the control group. The Miller Social Intimacy Scale taps some behaviors, for example expressions of affection, which are more commonly found in married subjects than unmarried subjects (Miller and Lefcourt, 1982). Despite the instrument's apparent bias in favor of married people, there were no significant differences between the priests, all of whom were single, and the controls, eighty percent of whom were married, in their level of social intimacy.

Interestingly, but not surprisingly, priests who named a woman as their closest friend were higher on the Miller Social Intimacy Scale than priests who named a man as their closest friend. (See Appendix Table 2.) This difference, based on the sex of one's closest friend, is further evidence of the bias of the Miller Scale in favor of opposite sex relationships. Also, in validity studies of the Miller Social Intimacy Scale married subjects scored significantly higher than unmarried subjects (Miller and Lefcourt, 1982). This validational research and the significant difference between priests whose closest friend is a woman and priests whose closest friend is a man underscore the importance of the finding that priests were as intimate as the controls on the Miller Social Intimacy Scale. One could speculate that on a measure which is free of
a sex bias the priests might have an advantage over controls in intimate relationships.

Training and Intimacy

Because young priests had been trained in a more intimate setting than the older priests, it had been expected that younger priests would be more intimate than the older priests but that the same difference would not apply to young and old controls. The anticipated effect of training found no support in this study. In fact, both young priests and young controls were more intimate than older priests and older controls. As Erikson (1963) points out, the intimacy issue is generally a greater concern in early adulthood than in middle and later adulthood. The data collected in the present study would support Erikson's observation and would thus indicate that this developmental issue is similarly manifested in the behavior and concerns of both priests and controls.

Nonetheless, there is another important plausible alternative to the Eriksonian interpretation. Kennedy and Heckler's sample consisted entirely of priests trained in the system which frowned on and actively discouraged close, personal relationships. It is reasonable to suspect that the interpersonal deficit they uncovered was, in part, related to training. Those who have not practiced intimacy during a critical and lengthy formation process are probably not good candidates for close, self-disclosing, supportive relationships in the conduct of their ministry or their
personal life following their training. Though Kennedy and Heckler conjecture that the priests may not be different from their male peers in their capacity for intimacy, the present investigation clearly shows that the priests, young and old, were superior to the controls in this regard. Even those trained in the old system demonstrated a greater inclination toward intimacy than the controls.

A possible explanation for this is threefold. First, this may reflect the effect of the Zeitgeist of ministry, which emphasizes intimacy. Second, for the last twenty years the program of priestly formation, which has used interpersonal relationships as an important indicator of suitability for ministry, has had an effect on all priests. The intimacy model of training and an intimate professional climate have elicited and enhanced a more intimate response from priests of all ages. Third, formation does not end with ordination and completion of seminary training. The professional Zeitgeist, spiritual literature emphasizing the importance of intimacy in the life of a celibate (Goergen, 1979), and possibly the impact that priests trained according to the new model have on older priests who were trained very differently are probably significant factors in the ongoing development of priests and their level of intimacy.

One might suggest that in the priesthood intimacy has trickled up from the young, for whom it is an age appropriate critical issue in the Eriksonian sense, to the old, for whom
it appears to have been integrated into life. It is also likely that the professional demands of ministry, which require a readiness for intimacy, have been a factor in changing the overall picture of priests in intimate relationships. Potvin (1985) reports a significant decrease in interpersonal inadequacy in candidates for the priesthood since 1966. The problem which Kennedy and Heckler uncovered has apparently improved during the last twenty years. To paraphrase a nautical expression, the rising tide of intimacy has lifted all priests.

There was a possible selection factor involved in the finding of the present study that priests were more intimate than other males. One might infer from all this that men who choose the priesthood, especially those who have done so in more recent years, tend to have a greater inclination toward intimacy. In addition, the more experienced priests in the study, i.e., older priests who have remained in the ministry through a period of dramatic change, might score higher in intimacy than those who have resigned during the last twenty years. It is important to note, however, that priests often resign from the ministry in order to marry. This argues in favor of an alternative hypothesis that those who resign from the priesthood seek more intimacy and therefore marry. These rival hypotheses raise questions about the possible effect of selection factors and would be an interesting focus of further research.
Life and Vocational Satisfaction

Priests were very much like other men in the area of life satisfaction. Priests and controls who were more intimate were also more satisfied with their lives. It was hypothesized that this relationship between life satisfaction and intimacy would be distinctive of priests, but there was no evidence to support this hypothesis. Although the relationship between intimacy and life satisfaction was not distinctive of priests, intimacy as a correlate of life satisfaction for priests is still an important finding. Those who have invested in relationships evaluated their lives as having fulfilled their expectations. This applied to priests no less than to other men in the study. Thus capacity for intimacy would be an important factor to consider in assessing which candidates are likely to succeed and be content as priests.

When satisfaction was extended to career, work, or vocation, significant differences between priests and controls emerged. Priests were significantly more satisfied with their work than controls. This is consistent with a non-controlled study by Hemrick and Hoge (1991) who found that eighty-six percent of diocesan priests ordained five to nine years were either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their work. Hoge, Shields, and Verdieck (1988) also report a significant improvement in the morale of priests since 1970. Priests in 1985 reported being significantly happier and less likely to leave the priesthood than priests in 1970.
Intimacy played an important role in the level of satisfaction with work or vocation. Men in general who were high in intimacy were significantly more satisfied with their work than those who were low in intimacy. Again, intimacy as a predictor of satisfaction with vocation was not distinctive of priests. Nonetheless, it appears that the thinking underlying the hypothesis is valid: that one would probably be more satisfied with priestly work if he were prepared and willing to respond to the intimacy demands one encounters in ministry.

**Personal Adjustment**

McAdams and Vaillant (1982) found that intimacy motivation was significantly associated with adjustment. The results of the present study did not support that finding. Though priests were better adjusted than the control group, the intimacy scores were not a predictor of personal adjustment. McAdams and Vaillant had used items such as health, occupational promotion and enjoyment, income, marital enjoyment, and vacations as their measure of adjustment. The present study relied on the SCL-90, a widely used and validated measure of global adjustment, and utilized separate measures for satisfaction with life, work, and intimacy. McAdams and Vaillant used a broader measure of adjustment which included relational and occupational factors. The results of the present study indicated that intimacy is related to occupational satisfaction but not to overall
adjustment. The evaluative component, which the satisfaction with vocation (occupation) instrument used in the present study taps, is a refinement of the broader measure of adjustment used by McAdams and Vaillant. It is the evaluation of one's work that is positively associated with adjustment.

A post hoc analysis indicated that the evaluative component also applied to intimacy and adjustment. There was a significant positive correlation between adjustment and satisfaction with intimacy. It appears that the closeness which one experiences is not necessarily associated with adjustment, however. Rather, it is one's evaluation of that closeness that has an impact on personal adjustment. Men who evaluated their intimate life as satisfactory were better adjusted than those who evaluated their intimate life as unsatisfactory.

Social desirability and psychological mindedness may have been factors in the priests appearing better adjusted than other men. Being significantly better educated than the control group in this study, the priests may have been more discrete and less disclosing in their response to the SCL-90 than the control group. The psychological mindedness that often develops in ministers may have given the priests a more discerning eye in their approach to the SCL-90 and thus a more guarded response. Also the very nature of the profession of the priests, which involves moral leadership, status in the community, and consequently considerable pressure to look good
in the public eye, may have had a distinctive influence on their response to potentially embarrassing questions concerning suicide, anger, and thought processes.

In an earlier study using the California Psychological Inventory (Gough, 1987), Nestor (1989) found no difference between priests and married men in both the desire to create a good impression and psychological mindedness. Though it is plausible that the same pattern of no difference between priests and other men in social desirability and psychological mindedness generalizes to the SCL-90, a future study should investigate possible social desirability effects and the impact of psychological mindedness in responding to the SCL-90.

Priests and Intimacy: Different Stories

In addressing the issue of intimacy in the lives of priests, authors generally presume that this is an area marked by struggle and deficiencies. Stereotypical portraits of celibate priests who are isolated and lonely are very common (Mahoney, 1991). Hassler (1985) presents a priest talking about the popularity and respect he enjoys among his people, but also the loneliness and isolation. Explaining his life to a visiting bishop, the parish priest says, "...the priest gets nothing but worshipful smiles and esteem...I'm standing up there at Christmas saying that I love my people, and I'm wishing I had a friend among them. I'm held in esteem by them all, but what's esteem worth in the end? ...I'd exchange all
the esteem in the world for a single friend" (p.219).

Mahoney (1991) is similarly pessimistic in her descriptions. The majority of priests she describes suffer hurt and fear as a result of earlier relationships having gone awry. They avoid any kind of emotional entanglement and some turn to alcohol and power to assuage their loneliness and pain.

Unsworth (1991) interviewed forty-two priests concerning a variety of matters. One priest's comments capture the commonly held notion about priests and close relationships. "It's hard to get guys like us to talk about ourselves, or least the personal stuff....They brought in a guy from Texas, a priest psychologist. We were supposed to confront celibacy and sexual issues...We all kept our cards close to our chest. Nobody in the class spoke. There was no revelation of any sort" (p.157).

On the other hand, writers like Livingston (1992) report that despite the pervasive potential for isolation and consequently loneliness, many priests do choose to enter into satisfying, intimate relationships. Her observations are strongly supported by the results of the present study. Indeed, the empirical data corroborate what Livingston has seen in her work with hundreds of priests. The data indicated that not only do priests attain higher levels of intimacy than their lay male peers, but also they are likely to maintain intimate relationships with women. The intimacy between
priests and women has well known precedents in the Christian tradition. Outstanding saints such as John of Cross, Francis de Sales, and Francis of Assisi were involved in very intimate relationships with women who also became saints. The relationships between John of the Cross and Teresa of Avila, Jane de Chantel and Francis de Sales, and Francis of Assisi and Clare are familiar examples of intimacy between priests and women.

Gender and Intimacy

The results of this study of intimacy in the lives of young and old Catholic priests raise the issue of sex differences in intimacy. Research has consistently shown that women are more intimate than men (Hite, 1987; Perlman, Fehr and Duck, 1986; McAdams, 1984; Gilligan, 1982; Lewis, 1978). The question arises as to how priests, who are more intimate than their male peers, compare with women in their level of intimacy.

Kleinman (1984) has described the emerging demand on church leaders to be more intimate in their professional relationships. This trend may be associated with the observation that women usually represent the larger proportion of church membership and that women are usually more active in church work than men. Thus many priests are likely to have more extensive contact with women than with men in their ministerial work and, given the intimate nature of ministry,
they are likely to be challenged more frequently than other men to enter into close relationships.

Hite (1987) reports that the recurring complaint among women is that men do not know how to be intimate. A topic for future research is whether women would have the same complaint about priests. It is plausible that the greater inclination among priests than other men toward close, personal relationships may be connected to the large number of women participating in the intimate world of a priest. Women may be an important factor in the professional climate of ministry which emphasizes intimacy and women may also have contributed to the superiority of priests, compared with their male peers, in intimate matters. They may be among the primary teachers of priests in the ways of intimacy.

Research has also revealed that candidates for the priesthood tend to be emotionally closer to their mothers than to their fathers (Potvin, 1985). This deeper emotional involvement with women might be an important factor in explaining the greater capacity of priests than other men for intimacy. Jackson (1990) found that priests who are experiencing stress are likely to turn to a woman for support. The apparent influence of women in the shaping of the intimate lives of priests and the question whether priests differ from other men in their emotional closeness to their mothers warrant further study.
As mentioned above, there is a general presumption that priests, like other males, are deficient in interpersonal relationships. The results of the present study contradict that notion. The frequent contact with women may be a factor in the relative superiority of priests over their male peers in interpersonal relationships. At the same time, that frequent contact with women, who are described in the research as much more inclined toward close, personal relationships than men, might also highlight the appearance of a deficiency in the priests' intimate behavior.

In the present study the data indicated that priests do well in interpersonal relationships. They may appear less able than they actually are because they are more frequently involved in relationships with women than many other men are. Therefore they may be evaluated according to a higher standard than other men and evaluated more frequently than other men. Surely there are other professionals who work closely with women. But the professional minister works closely with women in a climate that is often more intimate than that found in most other professions. Though priests are more able than other men in interpersonal relationships, the demands on priests for an intimate response may be greater than on other men and may cause them to appear less able than they actually are.

A post hoc analysis revealed that priests who were highly satisfied with the intimacy they experience in their pastoral
life scored significantly higher in affiliation, nurturance, perceived level of support and social intimacy than those who were less satisfied with the intimacy they experience in their pastoral life (See Appendix Table 3). It seems that there might be an important relationship between pastoral work and intimacy in general. It is likely that the intimacy which a priest experiences in his pastoral work is largely with women. This area of pastoral intimacy and gender would be a worthwhile topic for future research.

Past and Future Research: Methodological Concerns

The rather dramatic change in priests' intimate behavior between 1970, when Kennedy and Heckler collected their data, and the present raises some interesting questions about cohort effects and method. In regard to both of these issues the 1970 study and the present study have weaknesses and strengths.

The present study and a recently completed study by Hemrick and Hoge (1991) revealed major improvements in the level of satisfaction of priests since 1970. Unfortunately, these more recent findings of Hemrick and Hoge in comparison with those of the Kennedy and Heckler study must be stated conditionally because neither Hemrick and Hoge nor Kennedy and Heckler used control groups. Therefore, both studies lacked the statistical information with which one could make sound comparisons between 1970 and the present and between priests and other men.
An important question about cohort effects looms. As Hemrick and Hoge suggest, the years surrounding and including 1970 were a particularly strained period in the modern history of the church. This period saw not only a change in training, but also enormous changes in worship and church law. The debate about issues of human sexuality and reproduction, as well as about issues of authority in the church, were exceptionally intense and divisive in 1970. That strain likely had a substantial impact on the life and morale of priests, many of whom eventually resigned from the priesthood during that period (Stewart, 1978). The departures not only indicated widespread dissatisfaction during that period but also probably had an effect on those who remained. The sample from which Kennedy and Heckler collected their data, though geographically more diverse than that of the present study, may not be representative of previous or subsequent generations of priests because of the special circumstances of the time.

The possibility of a cohort effect is evident in a study of theological attitudes. The findings of Hoge et al. (1988) provide some support for the suggestion that the 1970 sample of priests was indeed subject to important cohort effects. They had expected that with advancing age priests would become theologically more conservative. Instead, they found that despite the attrition of many priests between 1970 and 1985 who were presumably more liberal than those who remained, the
theological profile of the remaining priests was constant throughout that period. Hoge et al. think that this is a possible indication of distinctive, if not unique, circumstances that influenced priests in this cohort. The aforementioned issues of contraception, sexuality, and authority emerged with great urgency during the late sixties and early seventies. The intensity of the debate may have had a notable and enduring impact on theological attitudes and the priests themselves of that period.

There are also other methodological issues which arise out of the present study. The sample used in this study consisted of a specific presbyterate which was largely urban and suburban. In this sample one is less likely to find priests as geographically isolated from other priests as those in rural dioceses frequently are isolated from one another and other people. It would seem that urban and suburban priests would have more opportunities for close, personal relationships than those who are in less populous areas. Since intimacy is associated with satisfaction with life and work, it follows that diminished opportunities for intimacy might translate into decreased satisfaction with life and work. Thus one might expect that the inclusion of rural priests in the sample might have a distinctive effect on intimacy and satisfaction scores. The relationship between intimacy and indices of satisfaction in a more representative sample of priests is a topic for further study.
A final word concerns the differences in method between the Kennedy and Heckler study and the present study. With the exception of one projective measure, the present study used all self-report measures. Kennedy and Heckler used some self-report measures but relied most heavily on clinical observations and assessments made by a number of clinicians. The likelihood of bias, inconsistency, and expectancy effects increases substantially when such an assessment modality is utilized (Kazdin, 1980). Considering the fact that more recent studies offer a psychological portrait of priests that is very different from the priests described in the 1970 study, the possibility exists that bias influenced Kennedy and Heckler's findings.

Of course, self-report measures, like those used in this study, also have shortcomings. Just as Kennedy and Heckler may have been subject to experimenter bias, the subjects in the present study may have presented socially desirable responses in their assessment of their own behavior and attitudes. However, it is important to note that the subjects in this study were given only a vague impression of the purpose of the study (i.e., examining personality variables and adjustment). They were also assured anonymity and confidentiality. These steps minimize the subjects' incentive to distort responses.

Priests: How are they different?

Previous research has shown that priests are very much like their male peers. The present study has uncovered some
important differences between priests and other men. Priests in this study were more intimate, more satisfied with their vocations, and better adjusted than their male peers. The impact of intimacy per se on measures of satisfaction was the same for priests as it was for other males. High levels of intimacy for priests and other men were associated with high levels of satisfaction with life and vocation. The present study has shown that high levels of intimacy distinguish priests from other men. Though training in intimate relationships may not have had a unique impact on young priests, it is plausible that the training of young priests in this manner and professional climate have had a more general effect on the level of intimacy of all priests. The study also suggests an important role for intimacy as a predictor of success and contentment in the priesthood.
REFERENCES


readings (pp.252-276). Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Corporation.


Common Rule of St. John's Seminary. 1946

Common Rule of St. John's Seminary. 1954.


Common Rule of St. John's Seminary. 1976.


Table 1

Demographic Data on Subject Samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>38.60</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>61.49</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ#</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>35.02</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>27.73</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swpi</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssup#</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ssup</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Priests were significantly better educated (p<.001) and more satisfied with the level of support they receive (p<.05) than the control group.

Key: Age=age  
Educ= education  
Ord= number of years ordained  
Sem= seminary intimacy  
Mar= length of present marriage  
Swpi= satisfaction with intimacy in pastoral work  
Ssup= satisfaction with support
Table 2

**Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values For Priests According To Sex of Their Closest Friend**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47.25</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>51.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ord</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>26.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>17.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swl</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>26.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swv</td>
<td>27.82</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>26.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swpi</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>25.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aff</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nur</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSup</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>5.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sint</td>
<td>130.20</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>137.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj#</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>37.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P<.05; ! two-tailed test; # high score means low adjustment

**Key:** Educ= education; Ord=number of years ordained; Sem=seminary intimacy; Swl= satisfaction with life; Swv=satisfaction with vocation; Swpi= satisfaction with intimacy in pastoral work; Aff=affiliation; Nur=nurturance; Sup=perceived level of support; SSup=satisfaction with support; Sint=social intimacy; Adj= adjustment; Comm= interpersonal communion
Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for Priests According to Level of Satisfaction With Intimacy in Their Pastoral Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Satisfaction</th>
<th>High Satisfaction</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordination</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>13.62</td>
<td>25.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem. Intim.</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>20.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sat.</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>28.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intim. Sat.</td>
<td>17.94</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>25.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. Sat.</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>29.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurturancem</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per. Supp.</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. Supp.</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. Intim.</td>
<td>128.27</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>136.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment#</td>
<td>37.13</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>33.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

***p<.001

! two tailed test

# high score means low adjustment
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