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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Members of religious institutes within the Roman Catholic Church have been undergoing a tremendous change since the end of the Second Vatican Council in 1965. Since that time vast shifts in emphasis in religious life seem to dictate the importance of interpersonal communication (Krueger, 1969; Rooney, 1971; Casella, 1972; Pompilo and Krebs, 1972; Devaney and Domzall (Eds.), 1972; Strack (Ed.), 1973; Larkin, 1973; Dahm and Stenger (Eds.), 1974; Stenger and Zirker, 1974; Fuehles, 1974; DiCicco, 1975).\(^1\) This present study tried to investigate to what degree the perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute influences a religious' stated desire to remain in his religious institute. It was reasoned that if

---

the results would prove positive then both training and on-going awareness of the importance of interpersonal communication within a religious institute would be indicated and suggested.

Definition of Terms

Religious orders and congregations, collectively called religious institutes, are societies sui generis within the Roman Catholic Church. Their members are called religious. They live a community type of life based on rules and constitutions approved by Church authority. Through the profession and observance of public vows of obedience, chastity and poverty they try to follow Jesus on what Dag Hammarskjöld referred to as the "Way of Possibility".1 This

---
1 Hammarskjöld, D. Markings. N.Y.: Knopf, 1965, 120.
way of life is, in Church law, called religious life. 1

Community is understood as "a social unity whose members are permanently bound together by the common possession of vitally significant values and ends and by forms of love and responsibility." 2 The emphasis is that the bond of community is not only through the "common possession of vitally significant values or ends," but also "by forms of love and responsibility." 3

A community is a unity of persons who live with deep emotional involvement. They have their anxieties, fears, joys, suspicions; they love and feel rejected, etcetera. All of this emotional life is part of them and part of the messages they send out to and receive from their co-religious. Communication is meant to be a meeting of minds 4 and is the vital link which binds together the members of a community. Without communication, there is but an aggregation of individuals; with communication, there is a unified body. "Sheer rationality alone can never bring about a community, i.e., a meeting of minds." 5

2 Devaney and Domzall (Eds.) Participant's Manual, 128-129.
3 Ibid., 135.
4 Ibid., 127-128.
5 Ibid., 136.
Decade of Change

John Cogley says, "of all the major faiths, Roman Catholicism was undergoing the most far-reaching changes as the 20th century reached its closing decades."¹ G. Moran states that "the Roman Catholic Church has been going through a period of upheaval for more than a decade. There is every likelihood," he continues, "that the trauma will continue for many more years."²

A recent report in Time Magazine entitled "A Decade of Change" shows that "many Catholic habits and attitudes had changed."³ For example, 71 per cent of the Catholics surveyed in 1963, attended weekly Mass, while now (in 1974) only 50 per cent attend. Ten years ago, 45 per cent of Catholics surveyed approved artificial contraceptives, as opposed to 83 per cent currently. The Church's image, too, seems to have changed. Two-thirds of the respondents surveyed ten years ago stated that they would be very pleased if their son entered the priesthood; now only half of the Catholics questioned felt the same way.⁴

In agreement with these statistics, a paper on Roman Catholicism

---


⁴Ibid.
Catholicism in the United States, prepared by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and titled, "A review of the Principal Trends in the Life of the Catholic Church in the United States", reports that Catholics no longer live in isolation from the values of secular society and that there is evidence of a tendency to assimilate some secular values into the Catholic community.¹

During the last decade almost all religious institutes have been undergoing a tremendous change in membership. U.S. Men's Religious Superiors' Report (1972) -- the official publication of the Conference of Major Superiors of Roman Catholic religious institutes for men of the U.S.A. -- states that "one of the most obvious changes in recent years has been the widespread instability of members (within religious institutes). Large numbers of religious ... of all ages ... have withdrawn from religious life."²

The Catholic Almanac stated that "approximately 10 per cent of the (religious) institutes reported increases and more than 50 percent reported decreases in membership" in 1973.³ According to "L'Osservatore Romano" during recent years approximately five per cent out of 400,000 Catholic

¹National Catholic Reporter, July 5, 1974.
priests in the entire world left the active ministry.\footnote{Christ \textit{in der Gegenwart}. Herder: Freiburg, January 13, 1974, 10.} In France the decline of the French priesthood was called catastrophic. The number of priests diminished from 40,994 in 1967 to 36,294 in 1970. It was estimated that there will be 31,820 in 1975.\footnote{\textit{National Catholic Reporter}, May 17, 1974.}

A look at the statistics will show how both the Catholic population of the U.S.A. and the population in the religious institutes in the U.S.A. have changed. Table 1 and Figure 1 show the increase and decrease in per cent since 1965. Table 2 shows that the decline in numbers started with the seminarians first in 1966, followed by the religious sisters in 1967, next religious brothers and religious priests in 1968, and finally diocesan priests in 1970.

Table 2 shows also that while membership of religious institutes decreased, the total number of Catholics increased from 45,640,601 in 1965, to 48,465,438 in 1974. This means that there was, in 1965, one diocesan priest for 1,277 Catholics; one religious priest for 2,004 Catholics; one religious brother for 3,724 Catholics; one religious sister for 254 Catholics; and one seminarian for 932 Catholics. In 1974, there was one diocesan priest for 1,344 Catholics; one religious priest for 2,346 Catholics; one religious brother for 5,249 Catholics; one religious sister for 254 Catholics; and one seminarian for 932 Catholics.
TABLE 1
DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES
FROM 1965 - 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Diocesan Priests</th>
<th>Religious Priests</th>
<th>Religious Brothers</th>
<th>Religious Sisters</th>
<th>Total Seminarians</th>
<th>Total Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>35,725</td>
<td>22,707</td>
<td>12,271</td>
<td>179,954</td>
<td>48,992</td>
<td>45,640,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>36,058</td>
<td>20,654</td>
<td>9,233</td>
<td>139,963</td>
<td>19,348</td>
<td>48,465,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+333</td>
<td>-2,053</td>
<td>-3,038</td>
<td>-39,991</td>
<td>-29,644</td>
<td>+2,824,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ .9%</td>
<td>- 9%</td>
<td>- 25%</td>
<td>- 22%</td>
<td>- 60%</td>
<td>+ 6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 1960 - 1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Diocesan Priests</th>
<th>Religious Priests</th>
<th>Total Priests</th>
<th>Total Brothers</th>
<th>Total Sisters</th>
<th>Total Seminarians</th>
<th>Total Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>32,569</td>
<td>21,227</td>
<td>53,796</td>
<td>10,473</td>
<td>168,527</td>
<td>39,896</td>
<td>40,871,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>33,141</td>
<td>21,541</td>
<td>54,682</td>
<td>10,928</td>
<td>170,438</td>
<td>41,871</td>
<td>42,104,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>33,774</td>
<td>21,807</td>
<td>55,581</td>
<td>11,502</td>
<td>173,351</td>
<td>46,319</td>
<td>42,882,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>34,465</td>
<td>22,075</td>
<td>56,540</td>
<td>11,968</td>
<td>177,154</td>
<td>47,574</td>
<td>43,847,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>35,077</td>
<td>22,251</td>
<td>57,328</td>
<td>12,132</td>
<td>180,015</td>
<td>48,750</td>
<td>44,874,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>35,725</td>
<td>22,707</td>
<td>58,432</td>
<td>12,271</td>
<td>179,954</td>
<td>48,992</td>
<td>45,640,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>36,419</td>
<td>22,774</td>
<td>59,193</td>
<td>12,255</td>
<td>181,421</td>
<td>48,046</td>
<td>46,246,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>36,871</td>
<td>23,021</td>
<td>59,892</td>
<td>12,539</td>
<td>176,671</td>
<td>45,379</td>
<td>46,864,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>37,453</td>
<td>22,351</td>
<td>59,803</td>
<td>12,261</td>
<td>176,167</td>
<td>39,838</td>
<td>47,468,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>37,454</td>
<td>22,166</td>
<td>59,620</td>
<td>11,755</td>
<td>167,167</td>
<td>33,990</td>
<td>47,873,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>37,272</td>
<td>21,920</td>
<td>59,192</td>
<td>11,623</td>
<td>160,931</td>
<td>28,819</td>
<td>47,872,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>37,020</td>
<td>21,141</td>
<td>58,161</td>
<td>10,156</td>
<td>153,645</td>
<td>25,710</td>
<td>48,214,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>36,727</td>
<td>20,694</td>
<td>57,421</td>
<td>9,740</td>
<td>146,914</td>
<td>22,963</td>
<td>48,390,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>36,223</td>
<td>20,746</td>
<td>56,969</td>
<td>9,201</td>
<td>143,054</td>
<td>21,780</td>
<td>48,460,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>36,058</td>
<td>20,654</td>
<td>56,712</td>
<td>9,233</td>
<td>139,963</td>
<td>19,348</td>
<td>48,465,438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for 346 Catholics; and one seminarian for 2,504 Catholics.¹

This decline in religious, for example, had, as a consequence, an effect on the Catholic school system. Thirty-one elementary schools and twenty high schools of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, alone, have been forced to close in the last ten years. This is due, in part, to the lack of religious needed to staff the schools.²

These changes were largely initiated by Pope John XXIII and are summed up by the Italian word aggiornamento, (updating). The Twenty-first Ecumenical Council (1962-1965) -- called Vatican II and the first such Council after more than 90 years -- initiated by the same Pope and continued under his successor Paul VI put together the renewal of the Church in 16 decrees. It

set its seal on the chief movements of this century among theologians and Catholics at large--the biblical movement, the liturgical renewal, the lay movement. It decided to reform the liturgy, to round off ecclesiology (Church, Pope, Bishop, Deacon) and to intensify ecumenical work (Ecumenical Movement). A number of questions that the modern world puts to Christians were discussed (Tolerance, Jews and Christians, peace, the missions, mass communication).

The Decree on the Appropriate Renewal of Religious Life -- one out of the 16 decrees promulgated by Vatican II


²Chicago Tribune,January 7,1975,Sect.2,1.

-- deals exclusively with the revival (renewal) and updating of religious life within religious institutes. It states:

The appropriate renewal of religious life involves an adjustment of the community to the changed conditions of the times. Communities should promote among their members a suitable awareness of contemporary human conditions. The manner of living, praying and working should be suitably adapted to the physical and psychological conditions of today's religious.

Cogley says,

Many welcomed these changes as means for the renewal of the Roman Catholic spirit in modern times. Others in the conservative party of post-conciliar Catholicism appeared to be baffled and disheartened by the sudden shift. The differences between the two groups resulted in severe tensions and differences of opinion about how much re-adjustment of doctrine, discipline, and structure would be necessary to reach the goal of reform and renewal set down as the aim of the Second Vatican Council.

Toynbee believes that "the essential truths and means of salvation which religion offers to human beings need to be expressed in terms that convey them effectively to each successive generation in every variety of cultural climate." Religion cannot neglect the ever-present need for re-expression and clarification if it is to help human beings in life as best as it can. Even though the essence remains the same, there must be a distinction between the essential and ephemeral expressions of religion which is admittedly a sensitive

---


2 Cogley, op.cit., 71.
and possibly dangerous process.\(^1\)

"Today all the current religions ... find themselves in one common predicament. They all have to reorient themselves to an age in which, in all spheres of human life, the rate of change is unprecedentedly rapid."\(^2\) The dilemma of coping with this rapid change is a problem for all human beings, communities and institutions, but it is especially intense for those in religious life.

The way in which the different religions and religious institutes expressed themselves in generations past are now obsolete and undesirable. What was once acceptable and expected of religious life, is no longer accommodated by a society whose rapid change has surpassed all other generations.\(^3\) "For these reasons, all current religions ... have been losing their hold on the hearts and consciences and minds of their former adherents."\(^4\)

Few human beings get through life ... without experiencing crises--painful or pleasurable--that touch them on the quick: successes and failures, good deeds and sins, emotional ties with other human beings and bereavements of these.\(^5\)

Religious of today face as many, if not more, changes

\(^{1}\)Ibid., XXII.
\(^{2}\)Ibid., XIX
\(^{3}\)Ibid.
\(^{4}\)Ibid.
\(^{5}\)Cogley, op.cit., IX.
than their other fellow human beings. Society is changing rapidly; technology and science are moving ahead with such speed that the entire world is affected. Not only must modern-day religious deal with these every-day crises, but he has also to come to grips with his changing role in society. He is no longer considered as a special human being; his vocation to religious life is seen as one among other vocations rather than something very special or unusual; being allowed to dress as a layman, he does not enjoy anymore the respect and safety of his garb; he is challenged in his vocation to compete with his fellow human beings, et cetera.

Today's religious has also to come to grips with the new and often unfamiliar teaching of Vatican II.

For example, the council declared that the state has no power to limit the practice of anyone's religion except in the interests of preserving basic public order. The declaration has great significance in countries in which the church has long enjoyed special legal privileges and other faiths have been subjected to severe disabilities. Again, the decree on ecumenism encouraged dialogue between Catholics and other groups. Dialogue, it held, should replace polemics against other Christian churches, other religions, and even against irreligious and anti-religious movements, including Marxism.¹

A tremendous difficulty for today's religious was the dedivinization of ecclesiastical structure at Vatican II which had an immediate and penetrating effect upon the religious institutes because that structure was most vulnerable to the kind of criticism unleashed by Vatican II.

¹Ibid., 70.
One cannot "update" or slightly reform an organization that is held together on the belief it was divinely blueprinted. Because the rules were believed to be "holy and sacrosanct" it was even more difficult to achieve any kind of change. Also since the founder of a religious institute was usually declared a saint by the official Church—and religious institutes tried hard (and still do) to get their founders canonized—and because it was largely the founder's teachings which were imparted, it was even harder to change.¹

Together with today's society religious institutes are changing from a feudalistic, static and secure structure to a more democratic, dynamic, hopeful, yet insecure one. Two areas within religious life itself are taking new shapes, namely, authority and commitment. Whereas some religious personnel prefer that those under them forego their own personal goals in favor of the goals and activities of their organizations, still others support personal freedom rather than organizational aims.² "Blind obedience" is challenged by shared responsibility.

The meaning of commitment, too, is changing. Commitment to the religious life used to mean total giving of one's life and oneself to his order or congregation. But so total

¹Moran, op.cit., 7.

²"Editor's Comment." Brothers Newsletter, Summer, 1974, 4-5.
a commitment seems to be unacceptable to many involved in the Church today.¹

Regarding celibacy, close personal relationships with women, for example, seem to be accepted within the framework of that particular vow by some religious and not by others.² Thus a world-wide survey of the Capuchin order, the fifth largest order of men religious in the world, in 1973 -- some 9,991 of 13,155 Capuchins contacted responded to the survey³ -- concluded that friars will continue to find chastity a fundamental value, but that it will be "open to experience of friendship and of deep interpersonal relations, even if those imply risks." Thirty-five per cent of the friars believe "the lack of affective relationships with women constitutes an impediment to one's integral maturity."⁴ -- In this context E. H. Erikson's remark in Young Man Luther, namely, "the crisis of intimacy in a monk is naturally distorted in its heterosexual core"⁵ seems to be somehow validated by experience of those in religious life.

The same survey shows further that about a third of

¹Ibid., 4.


⁴Strack, op.cit., 134.

the Capuchins did not agree that "a friar must avoid every intimate relationship with persons of the opposite sex if he does not want to lessen the meaning of his vow of chastity." Some 60.7 per cent agreed they must "take the risk that can be involved in a human friendship" with a woman.\(^1\)

As far as the vow of poverty is concerned, now a certain amount of money is at the disposal of the individual in some religious institutes. The survey of the Capuchin order states that small (3-6 members) and medium (7-12 members) size communities are the most desirable to the respondents. Such communities, it says, must allow co-responsibility for all members in residence regarding financial matters and subsistence.\(^2\)

Today there is a trend within religious institutes to form communities which allow being human and which help to develop humaneness based upon the Gospel. To cite again the survey among Capuchins, 61.2 per cent strongly agree to a community type made up of members of the different Franciscan orders; 40.3 per cent agree to communities made up of members of different religious institutes; 49.6 per cent agree to a community where the employees are allowed to living-in; 48.3 per cent agree to communities made up of

\(^1\)Strack, op.cit.,134.

\(^2\)Ibid.,126.
religious and lay persons, and one-third agreed to communities made up by religious men and women.¹ There seems to also be a need for communities which allow limited commitment and which allow celibates, married couples, single and lay persons to live together.²

Curran (1971), citing Riesman, Marcuse, and McLuhan, says that in these times it is almost commonplace for man to be thought of as alienated and lonely. Many today are trying to overcome this loneliness and to achieve a sense of belongingness, a feeling of selfworth and of meaning. This includes those committed to religious life.³ Many priests are agreed on the fact that they feel alone; there are very few people with whom they communicate deeply or who know them well.⁴ A study conducted by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) in 1972, found that this feeling of loneliness, along with a desire to marry, can be an indication of whether or not a religious will leave his community.⁵

¹Ibid.
Both of the above mentioned studies about the priest in the U.S.A. made it clear that the American Catholic priest is not different from the average American male.¹ Thus, American priests and religious are, as part of the American society, faced with the same problems as the rest of society. A. Hacker (1970) in The End of the American Era claims that relative affluence and liberation from the constraints known by earlier generations have made Americans increasingly less willing to forgo personal pleasures. A. Wheelis (1958) in The Quest of Identity examines the implications and consequences of rapid social change and shows how the decline of the superego has contributed to personal unrest. Ph. Slater (1970) in The Pursuit of Loneliness believes that there are three human desires that are deeply and uniquely frustrated by American culture. One out of the three is the desire for community -- the wish to live in trust and fraternal cooperation with one's fellow human beings in total and visible collective entity.²

Last, but not least, the religious of today is also faced with a generation gap which adds to his difficulties.

A changed world, a changed society, a changed Church, a changed understanding of religious life led and are still

¹Kennedy and Heckler, op.cit., 3; NORC, op.cit., 311.
leading many religious into serious identity crises. And because everyone in religious life is somehow affected by all these different changes, there is no one to whom the confused religious may turn. It is difficult to get support from someone or something who is also uncertain.

**Interpersonal Communication as a Means**

**to Deal Effectively with Change**

In order to deal with this current identity crisis, loneliness and alienation, there must be real and genuine interpersonal communication between the members in a given religious institute. Devaney and Domzall (Eds.) in 1972 stated, "the crucial element in community living is communication. Unless the members can relate to one another with respect, trust and sincerity, it is impossible to build community."¹

It would be a great mistake to assume that because a person can talk, he is also communicating. If there is anything our present society needs badly it is true communication or the meeting of minds.² Payne (1973) informs us that


²Devaney and Domzall (Eds.), *Participant's Manual*, op. cit., 128.
Cl. Robinson "insists that communication is our greatest problem."\(^1\) A. Toynbee (1969) states in the previous mentioned source that "man has shown himself, during the first million years, to be as good at the technological manipulation of non-human nature as he is bad at managing his relations with his fellow human beings and with himself."\(^2\)

The generation gap between parents and children, the breakdown of marriages, international strife, civil strife, the slowdown in church and religious renewal is frequently due to lack of communication. Our time can be said to be in an epidemic of noncommunication.\(^3\)

At the beginning of the 60s a survey was made of five hundred married couples of upper-middle-class status. The results statistically showed that there was almost no real communication. Contrary to popular belief, alienation among those couples existed as it does in any other social stratum. "The point is that there is no magically 'enchanted evening' that restores one's ability to go out of himself to someone else."\(^4\) Marriage does not automatically establish

---


\(^2\) Cogley, op.cit., XX

\(^3\) Devaney and Domzall (Eds.), *Participant's Manual*, op.cit., 128.

\(^4\) Curran, op.cit., 42-43
communication between persons. "Likewise, if one imagines that celibacy is going to restore all our relationships with other people, he is caught in another myth." ¹

R. Schutz (1973), the Prior of the Community of Taizé, declared that he can discern a hunger for community within the youth who come to Taizé. He feels that young people long for a community where they can share their anxieties and hopes. Youth of today has a desire for a community with Christ. Strangely enough, he says, this phenomenon appears in a time when people think they cannot trust each other anymore. ²

If Schutz' statement is true, then why do young people not only not wish to join existing religious communities, but religious leave their communities in numbers not seen before? U.S. Men's religious Superiors' Report (1972) -- previously mentioned -- says,

Young religious need to experience in their own lives and their own situations ... supportive community life ... On the more personal level they need to feel accepted by the community ... Candidates seek community living which will contribute to their growth as persons, and which will allow them to develop their unique personality ... Candidates seem to reject ... absence of 'community' experience (and) lack of openness. ³

The Report asks the question, "Why do religious

¹Ibid.


³Crux Information Service, op. cit.
abandon their institutes?" And it answers: In many cases the quality of community living is manifested by ... symptoms such as loneliness, depression, or the need of deep interpersonal relationships. ... Experience has shown that ... isolation is deadly. ... There is a noticeable movement toward styles of living that are less 'controlled', more personal, more spontaneous.  

Small communities are said to be very common in the U.S.A. at the present time. Religious of such communities reported "greater personal growth because of closer, more intimate relationships existing in the small community."  

These new kinds of small communities are characterized by collegial government -- the local "coordinator" who is also the contact person with higher ecclesiastical or civil authority replaced the traditional "superior" --, greater personal interaction among its members, and more spontaneous prayer forms.  

Regarding polarization between traditional and modern attitudes and values, the Report suggests that the most effective remedy to polarization is communication among the parties affected. This truism has been confirmed in those communities that have succeeded in maintaining excellent communication among factions that tend to form.

---

1 Ibid.  
2 Ibid.  
3 Ibid.  
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Giffin and Patton (1971) tell us that during the last decade there has developed a new awareness regarding the potential value of interpersonal communication as the means by which a person may reach a more satisfying relationship with other human beings. The authors see the real potential of communication in interaction, where listening as well as talking occurs. The emphasis, they continue to say, on the human element as expressed in human relations reflects a very personal need of the individual in an automated and highly specialized society. It reflects one's need to be or to get in personal touch with others as well as being more aware of the need of others.1

Interpersonal Communication, Interpersonal Relationships and Community

Powell (1969) and Devaney and Domzall (Eds. 1972) differentiate five and six levels of interpersonal communication:

1. The Zero Level: there is no real communication. This is the conflict level, the win-lose level. Here the people are not trying to understand;

2. The Courtesy and Humor Level: one says, "Good morning. How are you?" The other answers, "Thank you." The communication score is nil;

---

3. The Level of Facts, Information and Instruction: the communication is impersonal;

4. The Level of Transaction: Here is where the sender voices his personal opinions, his feelings, his insights and reactions;

5. The Level of Expressing Feelings Regarding the Other Person One is Talking to: here, an I-thou relationship, according to M. Buber can evolve; and

6. The Level of Traumatic Encounter, which happens very seldom -- two people surviving an airplane crash would be an example -- and is not necessary for meaningful interpersonal communication.¹

Devaney and Domzall hold "that unless the members are communicating on levels three and four community will not happen."² Powell who labels his five levels as "Cliche Conversation", "Reporting the Facts about Others", "My Ideas and Judgments", "My Feelings (Emotions) or Gut-level Communication", and "Peak Communication" feels that "if friendship and human love are to mature between any two persons, there must be absolute and honest revelation."³


²Ibid., 135.

³Powell, op. cit., 57, 62-85.
This means two persons have to communicate at the "Gut-level," otherwise there is nothing more than the "stickiness and discomfort of a phony relationship"\(^1\) or "emotional divorce."\(^2\)

There is a straight path from emotional divorce to spiritual divorce. S. Harris (1972) states that "the spiritual life cannot be healthy if the social life is built on superiority, selfishness, or callous indifference."\(^3\)

The spirituality within the Roman Catholic Church before Vatican II was basically an individualistic one. It can be quite accurately expressed by the often used slogan "Rette deine Seele (Save your soul)." It helped to create perfect individualists who lived side by side without much caring for each other. If they happened to be religious they wore the same garb and followed the same rules, but they did not communicate much with each other. As a natural consequence, not many real meaningful relationships were intended, let alone achieved, nor was there an understanding of the community as a meeting of minds.

Martin Buber, the author of the much-quoted saying, "community happens," also said, "if you make it happen."\(^4\)

\(^1\)Ibid., 63.

\(^2\)Ibid., 65

\(^3\)Harris, S. The Authentic Person. Niles, IL: Argus Communications, 1972, 128.

\(^4\)Devaney and Domzall (Eds.), Leader's Manual, op.cit., 140.
A community won't happen without communication. "Even though the actual community is composed of good people, willing, concerned and well-meaning"\(^1\) there will be no meeting of minds without real interpersonal communication between the members involved. Both personal and meaningful relationships between people need ongoing communication and development of communication as a means. Cessation of communication or neglect of communication leads to alienation and to the death of any given community.\(^2\)

A community depends upon the relationships of its members. The more growth-nurturing those relationships are the better off is that community. Curran (1971) calls such relationships "creative."

To be truly creative, the relationship must be such that it brings about the positive aspects for each person, so that each does not simply leave drained of and by the other; rather, each is encouraged in the direction of his own personal quest. Each person's life would be enhanced and his sense of self-esteem convalidated. ... (This would lead to) greater self-worth as they see themselves reflected in the other. The obvious opposite of this would be destructive and non-convalidating, where one's relationship with another would leave him less sure of himself, discouraged, less able to go ahead with whatever project he is working on, and more urged to withdraw.\(^3\)

In the end such relationships create more integration and

\(^1\)Devaney and Domzall (Eds.), Participant's Manual, op. cit., 128.

\(^2\)Curran, op. cit., 24.

\(^3\)Curran, op. cit., 25.
less segmentation.¹

Curran (1971) holds that the Christian solution to today's alienation is to give oneself to another person trustingly in communication. This giving of oneself is an ongoing process. It can be done only within the framework of a continuous communication. This alone leads to a community.²

Every human being needs at least one person who shows concern for him and whom he can trust. Otherwise he will stagnate.³ Fr. Hengsbach (1973) states that the man of today has one explicit wish; namely, to be understood correctly by his fellow human beings. Man is more sensitive than he was in former times and this is partially due to his loneliness. However, while the wish to be understood is growing increasingly, it seems that the ability to understand the other is decreasing.⁴

Basic to any relationship and commitment is trust, hope, love. The more a person invests of himself in a relationship, the more significance such a relationship will have. The more a person experiences what it means to trust

¹Ibid., 16.
²Curran, op. cit., 17.
and to be trusted, to see that his hopes are becoming ful-
filled as well as he becoming a person who fulfills the
needs of another person, the more he can let go of himself
and love and be loved.¹

The very moment, however, that people begin to take
the other for granted, any relationship begins to degrade.
Love, trust and hope are not static entities but dynamic
ones. They can only grow or die. They cannot stay the
same way. "The living human condition is constantly moving
and therefore, constantly needs to be redefined and re-
asserted. It needs to be constantly renewed or it dies."²

Communication is an ongoing process as is life it-
self. Community too, is constantly in a process of becoming
or dying. "Without a continued struggle to communicate one
to the other, to understand, to share, to strive to get to
know another better", any community as well as any relation-
ship between two persons loses its strength and ultimately
dies.³

E. Mounier says that a human being can develop as
a person only if he is in total contact with other persons,
i.e., if he is in an existence consisting of dialogue.⁴

²Ibid., 134-135.
³Ibid.
⁴Christ in der Gegenwart, 12 January, 1975, 16.
Theilhard de Chardin sees a person as a "communicative" being. Persons are beings meant to be with others. They are beings who are constantly calling each other. By communication, community with other human beings is achieved and this is how a person does develop and can develop.¹

Dulles (1971) goes one step further and says,

Communication is at the heart of what the Church is all about. The Church exists in order to bring men into communion with God and thereby to open them up to communication with each other. If communication is seen as a procedure by which communion is achieved and maintained, we may also say that the Church is communications ... The basic reality on which the Church is founded is a mystery of communication: the communication of divine life to men through the incarnate life of Jesus Christ.²

The model for the Church understood as "communications" is the Trinity, itself, which is said and believed as a divine community based upon a constant "communication" between the three Divine Persons.³

Interpersonal Communication within Religious Institutes before Vatican II

Interpersonal communication, however, within most


²Dulles, S. "The Church is communications." International Documentation on the Contemporary Church, 1971, 6, 69-70.

³Curran, op. cit., 15-17.
religious institutes until Vatican II was, to a great deal, restricted. Silence over long periods of the day was stressed;\(^1\) special friendships between members of a religious institute were discouraged\(^2\) as was the expression or even the very fact of having feelings. Almost any letter -- outgoing or incoming -- had to pass through the superior's office.\(^3\) To talk with a co-religious one was not allowed to enter his room, but had to talk at certain specified locations. A typical day, for example, within the two-year novitiate of a Jesuit -- a kind of introduction to religious life within the Society of Jesus -- started at 5:00 a.m. and was run by a tight schedule till 8:45 p.m. Except for two hours a day silence was to be maintained.

One out of the two hours for socializing was meant to be used only for conversation in Latin. During the periods of silence one could talk to a fellow novice only if there was a valid reason and then only in Latin.\(^4\)

A friend of the writer mentioned that when he was a novice in 1964 (religious institute known to the writer), he

\(^1\) *Constitutiones et Regulae Congregationis Sacerdotum sub titulo Sanctissimi Redemptoris.* Romae: Sumptibus Domus Generalitiae, 1936, #419, 463-480 et alia.


\(^3\) *Ibid.*, #93, 310, 311, 319, 997, et alia.

and his co-novices were observed during periods of socializing by their novice master who pretended to read a newspaper. If one sat too close to a fellow novice, he felt suspected and did not dare to talk with the same person during the next period of socializing.

This writer, during his novitiate (1949-1950), had to associate with others according to a day-to-day schedule, and then not with people of his own choice. Such tight structure was to discourage special friendships and thus help a person to love all his fellow religious in the same way. What this rule actually accomplished in quite a few religious is best expressed by D. Hammarskjöld's reflections about what he calls the "great" commitment. He says,

The 'great' commitment all too easily obscures the 'little' one. But without the humility and warmth which you have to develop in your relations to the few with whom you are personally involved, you will never be able to do anything for the many. Without them, you will live in a world of abstractions, where your solipsism, your greed for power, and your death-wish lack the one opponent which is stronger than they--love. Love, which is without an object, the outflowing of a power released by self-surrender, but which would remain a sublime sort of superhuman self-assertion, powerless against the negative forces within you, if it were not tamed by the yoke of human intimacy and warmed by its tenderness. It is better for the health of the soul to make one man good than 'to sacrifice oneself for mankind.' For a mature man, these are not alternatives, but two aspects of self-realization, which mutually support each other, both being the outcome of one and the same choice.\footnote{Hammarskjöld, op.cit., 133.}
For six years this writer lived in a community of approximately 100 members divided into five sub-groups (candidates for the brotherhood, novices, brothers, professed students and priests). There were also religious sisters and lay persons employed by the community as well as about 150 boys in grades 5-7. Silence was kept for most of the day, i.e., from 8:15 p.m. till 7:30 a.m. the following morning and from 1:30 p.m. till 4:30 p.m. During the silence periods one had to obtain special permission to talk to a fellow religious. The rest of the time was also spent in silence, though not as strict. Only 45 minutes after lunch and after dinner were allotted for talking.

During the six years of training for the priesthood, students were by and large not allowed to visit neighbors or personal friends, nor could they see their families.

Because communication was poor when the renewal of religious began, meaningful interpersonal communication, for many religious was not only an adjustment, but a skill which they had to learn. Religious institutes were and still are in a process of transcendence. Today's religious institutes find themselves facing the necessity to develop new channels of communication.

Frankl (1959, 1969) stresses the fact that man searches for meaning. If he finds meaning in life, he can sustain almost any situation in life. Frankl goes as far
as to call our age an "age of meaninglessness." 1 Religious
today live in the same age. Religious too, question the
meaningfulness of their lives and life styles. Meaning,
however, cannot be given, it can only be lived. 2 A person
by the example of his own dedication and devotion to the
truth and values he regards as meaningful for himself starts
to transmit his beliefs to his fellow human beings. This
initial non-verbal communication takes shape and develops
into meaningful person-to-person communication by the expe-
rience of trust in each other and through a living love re-
relationship. 3 Without a living example, the meaning of an ex-
perienced trust and love relationship cannot be communicated.

Till Vatican II, it was a common praxis in religious
institutes to convince people of their unworthiness and to
humiliate them. A verse from "Amazing Grace"; namely, "that
saved a wretch like me," verbalizes perhaps best that spirit-
uality. This writer experienced, for example, that as
late as the beginning 60s, a novice (religious institute
known to writer) had to stand in front of the refectory with
a heavy stone hanging from his neck, or he had to pro-
strate at the entrance of the refectory in order to be

1 Frankl, V.E. "The Task of Education in an Age of
Meaninglessness." Letter, S.S. (Ed.) New Prospects for the
Small Liberal Arts College. N.Y.: Teachers College Pres, 1968.

2 Frankl, op. cit., 87.

3 Christ in der Gegenwart, Freiburg, Germany: Herder,
stepped over by the entire community before lunch started. This practice was thought of as helping a person to become humble.

A person of today needs to be prized. Gill (1973), a priest-psychiatrist from Harvard University, holds that priests need to know they are doing well. Rogers in an article called "Some Elements of Effective Interpersonal Communication" says,

> when I am not prized or not appreciated I not only feel very much diminished, I am greatly diminished in my behavior. When I am prized, I blossom. In a group which is hostile or unappreciative I am just not much of anything. Prizing or loving, and being prized or loved is experienced by me as very growth enhancing.

"Modern man is victimized by a lack of selfworth." He needs to be prized rather than humiliated. Allison calls selfworth the basis of communication. Man of today depends on the convalidation from his fellow human beings here and now. At any given moment in the process of becoming a person, what a person is will be determined by his relationships with those around him whether they convalidate him or

1The New World, September 23, 1973, 1.

2Rogers, C.R. "Some elements of effective interpersonal communication," Western Behavioral Science Institute, La Jolla, California


4Allison, C.F.S. "Selfworth: The Basis of communication."

destroy him. "It is certain that a relationship will be only as good as its communication."¹

**Interpersonal Communication and the Future of Religious Institutes**

V. Frankl (1970) said that "the enthusiasm and idealism of American youngsters must be simply inexhaustible; otherwise I cannot understand why so many of them are joining the Peace Corps and Vista."² Yet almost all religious institutes have trouble recruiting new members. As Table 1 showed, there was the largest decline (-60%) in seminarians between 1965 and 1974. Kerkofs (1971) points out that young people seem to look for communities which are based on faith, life together and task (in that order) and are not willing to fill empty places within a given institution.³ Carl Rogers in an essay "The Person of Tomorrow" feels that the "New Man" values authenticity in interpersonal relationships as well as in religion. He hates phoniness which "is perhaps the deepest mark of the New Man." He wants human, flexible and adaptive organizations.⁴ He is looking for a new kind of community, closeness, intimacy and shared purpose. "He is

¹Powell, op.cit.,43.
³Kerkofs, op.cit.,26-27.
⁴Rogers, C., "The Person of Tomorrow," Center for Studies of the Person, La Jolla, California, 3.
seeking new forms of communication in such a community -- verbal and non-verbal, feelingful as well as intellectual."¹


The New Man is an open person, open to himself and others, close to his and others feelings.

He is able to communicate with himself much more freely than any previous man... He is also often able to express his feelings and thoughts to others, whether they are negative and confronting in nature, or positive and loving.²

Wheelis (1958) believes that the undermining of traditional values was one of the causes that led to personal unrest of modern man. He thinks "that man's old identity was not lost, but outgrown, and that, therefore, identity is not to be found; it is to be created and achieved in order to endure in our time."³ Religious today are searching for a new identity.

Self-identity is built upon values.⁴ A person is what he thinks, judges, feels and so on. To understand himself, a person has to communicate himself to another.⁵ To bring himself across truly to the other person, he has to first allow his feelings and emotions to arise so that they can be identified. For this very reason he needs a supportive environment which looks at feelings and emotions.

¹Ibid., 4.
²Ibid., 5.
³Wheelis, op.cit., 198-205.
⁵Powell, op.cit., 80.
as something natural. This again is quite different from the situation in religious institutes a few years ago when emotions could not surface because they were mostly considered as something one had better not possess, let alone show. Emotions and feelings were many times labeled as "good" or "bad" and considered a moral issue.

"A person is resonant to person." If a person wants another person to be open with him, he has to first open himself to that other person. He has to reveal his own feelings to the other person honestly and openly.

Young people today are much more aware of the loss of the value of identity. According to their experience the older generation is only talking at them. "They are demanding that you be what you say." Curran (1970) goes as far as to say that "an individual caught up in suppressing and not living the values he stands for (is) highly neurotic if not psychotic." The more a person tries to be and to become, the more he has to deal with emotions and instincts. Again a person has to find an environment which nurtures his endeavor toward self-identity.

Harris (1972) states that "it is not so much the

---

1 Ibid., 85.
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kind of disease a person gets as the kind of person who gets the disease." If a person is secure in himself, if he has found his identity, then he will be less threatened when he is asked to change his life style. Newman believes that "to grow is to change, and to grow really mature is to change often." Maturity again means going out to others, to communicate one's own person in order to establish a communion and thus a community. "Community depends upon communication as means to an end."

Importance of the Study

The situation of religious and religious institutes within a period of tremendous and radical change as outlined on the previous pages appeared to make it obvious that an investigation of interpersonal communication within religious institutes was important and useful. To the knowledge of this writer there was no specific study done in this particular field. Therefore, this research was meant to be exploratory in a two-fold sense; namely, first to stimulate interest in and awareness of interpersonal communication within religious communities as a crucial factor of building a community where people can grow and live as persons; and, second, to develop an instrument to investigate and measure this

---

1 Harris, op.cit., 126.

2 Curran, A Need for Listeners. op.cit., 22.

particular phenomenon in as valid a way as possible.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses of this study will be outlined next. The general hypothesis of this research was to find out whether or not the perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute had an influence on a religious' expressed desire to remain in his religious institute. The main hypotheses were:

1. There will be a strong positive correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "friendship within his religious institute."

2. There will be a strong positive correlation between "friendship within his religious institute" and "retention in his religious institute."

3. There will be a strong negative correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "loneliness."

4. There will be a strong negative correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "desire to marry."

5. There will be a strong positive correlation between "loneliness" and "desire to marry."

6. There will be a strong negative correlation between "loneliness" and "retention in his religious
7. There will be a strong negative correlation between "desire to marry" and "retention in his religious institute."

Whereas the dependent and independent characteristics of this study will be specified in detail in Chapter III, together with the procedures and methods used, it is important to define the term "religious" here a step further before going on to Chapter II. Religious -- the term taken as a noun -- is used for both male and female persons who are members of a religious institute. Among male religious in general, there are according to the Law of the Roman Catholic Church two categories; namely, brothers and priests. Religious women are usually called sisters. Although this study was concerned only with male religious who are priests, in Chapter II we included studies among religious brothers and sisters as well as diocesan priests and seminarians, in general, whenever this seemed to be related to the topic of this research; namely, retention within his religious institute as a function of perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute.
 CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The fact that a crisis exists among Catholic priests throughout the world is reflected in many articles, papers and books (Schallert and Kelley, 1970; O'Brien, 1971; Rooney, 1971; Men's Religious Superiors' Report, 1972; National Opinion Research Center (NORC), 1972; Tillard, 1973).1 The reasons given for this crisis seem to be many, but one in particular, namely the changes caused by the teaching of the Twenty-first Ecumenical Council (1962-1965)--called Vatican II--is thought of as the most important one. Because of these changes (e.g., adaptation of living, praying and working to the physical and psychological contemporary human conditions; religious were called to adultlike behavior rather than to childlike dependency on rules and superiors; shift from an authoritarian structure of religious institutes to a more democratic one) a large number of both diocesan and religious priests as well as religious brothers and
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sisters seem to have left the active ministry and/or their religious institutes.

Schallert and Kelley (1970) were hesitant to suggest that Vatican II affected either the rate or the number of dropouts, but stated that the resignees from the priesthood seem to be "qualitatively different today and this is in a significant way. The raison d'Être of leaving is radically different for those priests who left since Vatican II." The majority of the dropouts did not leave because they lost their vocation, but rather because they had to be faithful to themselves and the Church which talked about "aggiornamento (renewal)" but was very hesitant to follow through its proposed process of updating. In other words those dropouts love the Church and consider themselves still both as part of the Church and as priests.\(^1\)

The resignation figures, however, seem to indicate that the event of Vatican II was somehow the starting point. Thus, Fichter (1968) reports that the annual voluntary resignation rate for diocesan priests in the United States during the twenty-five years prior to Vatican II did not rise much above one-tenth of 1 percent. Studies done by the Gallup organization (1971) and the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) (1972) showed that the resignation rate reached one-half of one percent in 1966. By 1972 it rose to a figure

\(^1\)Schallert and Kelley, op. cit., 430.
between three and four per cent a year. Consequently, approximately eight thousand priests resigned during the period from 1966-1972.\(^1\) Resignations among religious priests have been more frequent than among diocesan priests, resulting in the loss of one-fourth of the clergy in some religious institutes.\(^2\)

**General Related Research**

Research in the social and behavioral sciences in religious careers have been broadening their horizons to include psychological and sociological studies of the priesthood. Quite a few studies and surveys were done to investigate the specific reasons why both diocesan and religious priests withdraw from the active ministry. To get an even better idea as to why these people left, one might go back a step and see what type of persons seem to be attracted to the priesthood and to religious life.

Sward (1931) found that a large number of introverted individuals, who also had feelings of inferiority, were attracted to religious life.\(^3\) Moore (1936) studies the rate of mental illness among priests.\(^4\) His findings support those

---


\(^2\)NORC, op. cit., 278.

\(^3\)Rooney, op. cit., 189.

\(^4\)Ibid.
of Sward, since he concluded that prepsychotic individuals often find appeal in the priesthood. The problems of emotional adjustment of both seminarians and priests were also indicated by the latter study.

In 1960 T. N. McCarthy concluded that there was a consistent pattern of traits among priests and seminarians which indicate that a person entering religious life has different personality traits from one who does not enter. His studies showed that those most likely to enter priesthood scored higher on neurotic scales than did other Catholics of the same age, the same educational and social background. The religious samples tended to be more submissive, introspective, dependent and self-conscious than a comparable sample taken from the laity. ¹

Lonsway (1967) did a study with 585 first year theology students. The Ss were from 29 seminaries and were almost equally divided between diocesan and religious. He compared these with a norm group of college students and found that the seminarians showed a greater need for independence, a more trusting attitude in interpersonal relations, and a greater degree of satisfaction with their personal lives. Tolerance of uncertainty, interest in social activities, eagerness to communicate with people, and deep concern for the feelings and welfare of others were all displayed by both religious and diocesan seminarians.

¹Ibid., 191.
Lonsway went on to compare the two groups of seminar­ians with each other and found that the religious were more anxious and worried, less practical and more social in orientation, more concerned with the rights of others, more liberal in religious views, more appreciative of the fine arts, and less masculine in their attitudes than the diocesan seminarians.¹

A study by Lee (1968) found that those who were more likely to persist in the seminary life were significantly more submissive than those who dropped out. The latter were higher in self-esteem and displayed greater creativity on tests. The seminarians who exhibited conformity of behavior and attitudes in social situations were more likely to stay. Because of these differences, those who left appeared to be the ones who did not get support from their peers.²

Moore (1936) was among the first researchers who studied the personalities of priests. His object was to study the rate of mental illness among priests, and he concluded "that prepsychotic individuals are frequently attracted to the priesthood."³ An excessive number of priests, he feared, might be developing serious emotional illness.⁴

¹Rooney, op. cit., 195.
²Ibid., 196-197.
³Ibid., 189.
⁴Ibid., 216.
Dunn (1965) reports that:

the consistency of MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) profiles obtained from religious samples is most striking...Religious tend to be more perfectionistic, worrisome, introversive, socially inept and in more extreme cases, perhaps isolated and withdrawn...Religious...show signs of defensive behavior typical of persons with neurotic tendencies.

O'Connell (1967) examined sociological influences upon the integration/alienation of a priest into religious life. He held that factors present prior to one's entrance to religious life affected his incorporation into that life. Using family background, present religious community and one's own personality type, he concluded that organizational status, age, personality type, respondent's estimation of the degree of happiness of his parents' marriage, and his estimate of his own degree of happiness during childhood were all significant factors in the integration/alienation of a member into his religious institutes.\(^2\)

Kennedy and Heckler (1971) did a psychological study of the Catholic priest. According to their findings they grouped the priests into four categories along a continuum of psychological development. The four categories were: Maldeveloped, Underdeveloped, Developing and Developed. The study was based on a sample of 719 priests, of whom 271 were

\[\text{Ibid., 191.}\]

finally included in the evaluation. The results showed that 19 or 7 per cent were classified as Developed, 50 or 18.5 per cent were classified as Developing, 173 or 66 per cent as Underdeveloped, and 23 or 8.5 per cent as Mal-developed.¹ The authors state that:

the chief area in which the underdeveloped priests manifest their lack of psychological growth is in their relationship with other persons. The relationships are ordinarily distant, highly stylized, and frequently unrewarding for the priest and for the other person ... Underdeveloped priests are genuinely uneasy about intimacy ... They do experience difficulty with their own personal identity ... It is indeed a moving experience to sense the lack of depth in the human relationships of many priests. What these men say about themselves over and over is that there are few people to whom they are close, few people who know them well.²

The main difficulties with which the priests had to deal were not so much intellectual as they were emotional in nature. The training in the seminary seemed to have ignored the development of personal identity, the ability to relate closely and responsibly with others, and self-confidence. Consequently, the researchers suggested that priests should be provided with an opportunity to grow and mature as persons. "They need ... to be stirred to deal with their growth problems and then assisted in every way to do this constructively."³

¹Kennedy and Heckler, op. cit., 51-52.
²Ibid., 9.
³Ibid., 177.
A recent study in the National Catholic Reporter (January, 1975) surveyed 100 priests and 100 ex-priests to see if and how they differed from each other and the American population, in general, in regards to personality factors. Priests on the average were more intelligent and better adjusted than the national average, but ex-priests scored higher on those two factors. Ex-priests scored even higher on enthusiasm and radical experimentation than either the general population or priests. (The author felt that the best priests were leaving, contradicting what Greeley has said.)

One of the theories tested was that people choose an occupation which fulfills their self image. Priests who are still active felt their self-image was being fulfilled, while ex-priests did not. Those who had left, however, had a better self-concept than those who remained in the ministry.

The study suggests that the Church needs to be more flexible so that it can attract the more adventurous, more enthusiastic personality which he feels is needed in today's ministry. The Church must rid itself of the stereotyped priest and must be willing to allow priests to develop their own personalities within their religious orders.

1 Wilson, R. "To stay or not to stay." National Catholic Reporter, January 10, 1975, 7,14.

Rooney (1971), in summarizing the results of research with personality inventories, stated that the priesthood is attracting more than its share of applicants with emotional problems. Those problems were said to increase as the training program progresses. The studies of Kennedy and Heckler (1971), NORC (1972), and Schmidtchen (1973), however, show that the American Catholic priest as well as the German Catholic priest is comparable to his fellow-citizen in psychological growth and well-being. Wilson (1975) goes even further and says that the American Catholic priest is on the average better adjusted than the national average male citizen. Larkin (1973) takes a somewhat middle-of-the-road position when he states that both the priest and his fellow-citizens are on the average emotionally underdeveloped. Yet, a segment of this underdeveloped population is seen as to be in a process of development towards emotional maturity.

Taking into account the many changes that priests have had to grow through during the last decade, an above average measure of flexibility must be attributed to American priests in general. Speaking of their German counterpart Schmidtchen states that the average German priest has
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1 Rooney, op. cit., 198.

2 Kennedy and Heckler, op. cit., 3; NORC, op. cit., 311; Wilson, op. cit., 7; Schmidtchen, G. *Priester in Deutschland*. Freiburg: Herder, 1973, 94.
developed a personality type which does not backtrack when faced with difficulties. When asked to quit or to press for reforms, the majority of the priests seem to stick to the second alternative.\textsuperscript{1}

In the light of the above findings, it seems possible that the reasons for an increase in the number of priests leaving is not necessarily due to emotional difficulties or instability, but in fact may be due to some other factors.

**Specific Research on Resignation**

Fichter (1961) studied the reasons of priests for leaving the active ministry and stated that the main reason was the breakdown of spiritual habits and values.\textsuperscript{2} Gill (1969), however, found that on the basis of clinical data, the defecting priests were psychologically unsuited for their jobs. The main reason for leaving the active ministry was their excessive dependency need.\textsuperscript{3} A study by Schneider and Hall (1970) investigated the reasons that priests depend on the system. The two reasons found, were said, to be the result of two interacting factors; namely:
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\textsuperscript{1} Schmidtchen, op. cit., 94.


\textsuperscript{3} Gill, J.J. "Depression: why we see it in priests." *Medical Insight*, December 1969, 21-32, 30.
1) a tendency for immature decision-makers who are passive, non-choosing individuals to enter the system, and 2) the tendency for the organization to create and reinforce acquiescence and non-choosing. The combination of some individuals with a tendency toward passivity creates a potent climate inhibiting psychological success.

The findings of Gill do not seem to be validated by the findings of Schneider and Hall, nor are they supported by Cyrns' data (1970). Cyrns compared an incidental sample of active and resigned priests regarding their scores on the Rokeach dogmatism scale. The results showed that resignees had significantly less dogmatic personalities than those who stayed. 2

A sociological study to explore the reasons for leaving the active ministry was conducted by Schallert and Kelley in 1970. The sample used 317 priests who had left the active ministry and 312 priests who continued in their active ministry. The subjects for concern most often mentioned by priests were: authority vs. obedience, the value of "personalism" vs. "total role incumbency", a dynamic view of structures vs. a static and rigid one, the belief in the inner vitality of Catholic dogma as opposed to a fixed or "ready-answer" type of mentality, orientation toward the world vs. an orientation away from the world, and alienation felt as powerless-

---

1 Rooney, op. cit., 212.

ness, normlessness, meaninglessness, self-estrangement and isolation. Yet, all of the reasons mentioned were shared by both groups. Also problems in areas such as sex, prayerfulness, discipline, ascetism, faith, hope, love and the presence or absence of the Christian community were not different for both groups.

To differentiate between the two groups the researchers changed their approach from rational-cognitive factors to more personal ones. The obtained results pointed in the direction of the "crucial other." It was found that this "crucial other" was not a woman but a superior or fellow religious to whom one might have turned for understanding or for establishing a meaningful relationship but did not succeed. The "crucial other" could have been an individual or a community who represents to the drop-out all that he, the drop-out, finds unacceptable or questionable in the Church. It is at this point that a latent decision to leave the clergy is made. It is usually then he meets someone entirely outside of the clerical stratum of the Church who seems capable of helping him to endure the kinds of frustrations he finds.

Thus the lack of understanding, acceptance and love were found to be the main factors for alienation and resignation from the active ministry. Some of the drop-outs reported
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1Schallert and Kelley, op. cit., 425.

2Ibid., 454.

3Ibid., 445.

4Ibid., 458-459.
having suffered rejection for years by the whole community to a degree which could not be alleviated by any significant other.¹

Another attempt to understand the reasons for staying or leaving the active ministry from a sociological viewpoint was made by the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) in 1972. Out of 64,000 American Catholic priests a sample of 7,260 was drawn. The response rate was 71 per cent or 5,155 usable forty-six page, self-administered questionnaires were returned. The main reasons for staying in the active ministry were a sense of vocation and happiness in one's work. The main reasons for leaving were the inability to live within the structure of the Church (53 per cent), the desire to marry (47 per cent), and the desire for personal growth (46 per cent). Five characteristics which were most predictive for both diocesan and religious priests were found. They were in order of importance: age, desire to marry, loneliness, work satisfaction, and "modern" values. In the case of religious priests only, the order was as follows: desire to marry, age, loneliness, recollection of family tensions, and "modern" values.²

The authors stressed the fact that there was no single factor that explains an individual's decision regarding his

¹Ibid.
²NORC, op. cit., 253, 281.
future. Yet, the principle reason given for resignation by both the active priests and the resignees was the desire to marry. The chief explanation, though not the only one, for the desire to marry was loneliness. For loneliness, the main reasons given were: low work satisfaction, "modern" religious values, and youthfulness. With regard to religious priests, the study concluded that the desire to marry and loneliness were the two predictors of whether or not a religious would remain in his religious institute.

Seidler (1974) investigated the relationships between priests and their bishops and differentiated three kinds of withdrawal: Resignation from the ministry, relocation to another diocese, and disillusionment and passivity. Relocation was found to be rare. Resignation, while still not common, was more frequent than relocation. Passivity, however, seemed to have affected over twice as many diocesan priests as did actual resignations in an average diocese. "The estimated diocesan median for passivity was 15 per cent and the highest was 57 per cent ... Those who mentally withdrew far outnumbered the priests who formally resigned."

---

1 Ibid., 266.
2 Ibid., 257.
3 Ibid., 262.
4 Ibid., 370.
There is strong evidence that there are men who remain in the active ministry or in their religious institutes, and yet are "psychological" drop-outs. Oftentimes they are more damaging to themselves and other religious than if they had completely left their ministry or religious institute. Schallert and Kelley (1970) go so far as to say that this is one of the most serious problems which the Church must face today, namely, the rehabilitation of the "drop-outs from within" who are simply not functioning as clerics.¹ Larkin (1973) refers to them as

the apathetic, who are unconcerned with the plight of their neighbor and yet piously say their daily Mass, read their breviary and fulfill their celibate commitment in the ivory tower of an uninvolved existence, are often cop-outs from within.²

It is because of these persons that Fuerst (1974) sees a decline in the number of applicants to the priesthood.³

Reasons for withdrawal mentioned by Seidler (1974) were: average number of years before receiving a pastorate, impersonal structural features which resulted in lack of fulfillment as well as in loneliness, and a stern and punitive emphasis on obedience by the bishop. Another interesting finding was that: "strong Catholic environment held

¹Schallert and Kelley, op. cit., 441.
²Larkin, op. cit., 4
down resignation rates, while high percentages of parishes run by religious clergy encouraged resignation.\(^1\) This seems to indicate that a strong Catholic environment helped diocesan priests to continue in the active ministry. The same environment, however, did not have an impact on religious priests to remain in their active ministry.

Schoenherr and Greeley (1974) like Seidler (1974) did a study on diocesan priests regarding their commitment. A sample of 3,045 American Catholic priests, i.e., the diocesan clergy of the NORC study in 1972, was used. Based on the findings of various commitment theorists (March and Simon, 1958; Homans, 1961; Katz and Kahn, 1966) the authors defined the role commitment process as

continuance in a role's socially organized pattern of action that results from a desirable net balance of rewards over costs realized by participating in this rather than some feasible alternative role.\(^2\)

Their findings showed that the cost of celibacy is currently a priest's principal consideration regarding his role commitment process. Again, the commitment does not rest on a single decision but is a sequence of decisions.

Thus, if he (the priest) sees marriage a desirable opportunity foregone, if the costs of loneliness outweigh the satisfaction that flow from his job assessed in terms of a modern set of values, and

\(^1\)Seidler, op. cit., 14.
\(^2\)Schoenherr and Greeley, op. cit., 409.
if movement is made easier by the fact of his being relatively young and inner-directed, the clergyman will probably decide to quit his position as a religious professional.\footnote{Ibid., 407.}

It was also found that if an individual is inclined to leave the active ministry because of personal reasons, he may be spurred on by the impact of other priests in the diocese who are planning to resign. Conversely, a priest who is not content with his rewards-cost balance and is relatively young, inner-directed, and modern in his values will be more inclined to stay if the diocese in which he works is fairly stable.\footnote{Ibid., 421.}

Good (1972) speaks about four fundamental resources -- force, prestige, wealth, and love -- which people and groups need to elicit cooperation, help and conformity from each other. The results showed that for continuing in the priesthood, wealth seems to be unimportant; force works more for gaining control within the given organization than for strengthening an individual's commitment.

Prestige in the form of self-esteem or being able to act according to one's values and ideals, is very important in the continuance decision. And love ... (namely) the absence of marital love expressed in the desire to marry, is most crucial ... for understanding commitment to the role of the priest.\footnote{Ibid., 423-424.}
Greeley (1974) did a second study about commitment to determine which structural characteristics of a person's position in an organization are most likely to encourage him to remain loyal when he is under pressure to disaffiliate.\textsuperscript{1} Observers (National Catholic Reporter, 1973; Seidler, 1975; Ritti, Ference, and Goldner, 1974) agree that the most difficult position in the Catholic priesthood is the role of the assistant pastor. Greeley (1974) found that there was a negative correlation between associate pastor and loyalty (-.33). There was also a negative correlation between associate pastor and satisfaction with supervision (-.61). When there was satisfaction with supervision, there was a positive correlation with loyalty (.32).\textsuperscript{2}

Because of the research, it was suggested that the role of associate pastor be abolished completely. If this were not possible, the length of one's term as associate pastor be substantially reduced, or the quality of supervision be improved.

\textsuperscript{1}Greeley, A.M. "Loyalty -- commitment under pressure: a deviant case analysis." Unpublished study, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, March 4, 1974, 6.

It was found that there was a positive correlation between being a member of a religious institute and loyalty (.31). There was also a strong positive correlation between being a member of a religious institute and satisfaction with supervision (.65). Satisfaction with supervision, in turn, correlated positively with loyalty (.39). It seemed, therefore, that the religious got along better with their supervisors. Thus, if religious institutes were to improve the quality of supervision, loyalty would also improve and because of this withdrawal rates would decline.¹

**Cross-cultural Studies**

In order to provide a broader scope of religious life today the findings of several cross-cultural studies follow.

During January and February of 1971 a survey was made among all the diocesan and religious priests in Germany. Of the 26,200 priests contacted, some 20,131, or 76 per cent, responded to the study. The questionnaire which was used consisted of 96 questions that were divided into six sub-groups or topics. One out of the six topics dealt with human relationships and membership in associations.²

¹Greeley, op. cit., 17-19.
²Schmidtchen, op. cit., XI.
The results of the study showed that the German priests hold a large number of different opinions both in pastoral and theological matters. This fact, it was said, will lead to a complicated stress situation within the Church in Germany. This is considered by some as being fatal and by others as a sign of hope. There was hardly one important issue which was not confronted by contrary viewpoints.

Two-thirds of the priests said that they have quite a few friends with whom they socialize frequently. One-third said that they have only a few friends. The older priests especially mentioned that they live in increasing isolation -- a trend which was recognized in the rest of the population too. One-third of the religious priests who worked in a diocese stated that for them belonging to their religious institute was important. Religious priests didn't seem to like to join associations of secular priests.\(^1\)

Younger diocesan priests preferred to join active groups which allowed them to make new and better friends. On the average, younger priests showed a greater tendency to socialize with people.\(^2\)

When asked what kind of "getting together" or community life should be continued and/or improved, 64 per cent said the regular social meetings between priests (usually

\(^1\)Ibid., 19.
\(^2\)Ibid., 20.
once a month), while 61 per cent considered discussions about faith and pastoral matters as meaningful. Only 17 per cent favored a "vita communis" of priests (priests living together in one residence or rectory) and only 9 per cent regarded a "vita communis" of priests and lay people as helpful or desirable. One-fifth of the young priests, however, were in favor of a community life between priests and laity as well as between priests only.¹

Lack of teamwork was the second largest obstacle to the priestly ministry. Lack of friendship and concern among fellow priests was listed as obstacle number six by both older and younger priests. Overcoming difficulties in the priestly life was dealt with mostly through prayer and by talking with friends and confreres. Teamwork with priests and lay persons were considered helpful, too. Older priests preferred informal talks whereas younger priests preferred more meaningful conversations.²

What did priests think their faithful need? Again, younger priests said people of today look for friendship and interpersonal relations, while older priests saw them looking for peace, security and order.³

¹Ibid., 20.
²Ibid., 159.
³Ibid., 44.
Young priests felt that it is important to train candidates for the priesthood in social work, psychology, and pedagogy, and especially in group dynamics and leading of groups (78 per cent as contrasted with 60 per cent of the total population).  

The survey concluded that priests under stress tend to prefer to confront the institution rather than themselves. Frustrations resulting from their profession and role in society seemed to be transformed into pushing reform of the institution. One feature was outstanding; that is the cry to gain more power and thus influence. Celibacy, which was one of the main issues, appeared not to be dealt with as a personal issue but was compensated for by a desire for more personal relationships to such an extent that all guidelines for past generations which were held as meaningful and helpful were now regarded as conservative and restricting.  

While the above-mentioned study took into consideration all of the diocesan and religious priests in the country, the following research dealt only with one province of a religious institute, namely Norddeutsche Pallottiner (1971).  

---

1Ibid., 61.  
2Ibid., 127.  
The results showed that 74 per cent felt that small communities will help their members to mature better than large communities. Forty-nine per cent of the lay people surveyed agreed with this. To the possibility of religious living together with lay people, 36.9 per cent of the religious and 56 per cent of the lay people responded favorably. Acceptance of members in such a situation for a certain amount of time was agreed with by 43.8 per cent of the religious and by 61 per cent of the lay people. "Living-in" time for lay people gained acceptance from 71 per cent of the religious and from 64 per cent of the lay people. Relationships between co-religious who live together were listed as good by 78 per cent of those surveyed; relationships between co-religious within the province were good according to 73 per cent. Climate within the local communities was cited as mediocre to bad by 45 per cent; the primary reason given for this was that there was no support when one made a mistake or was unsuccessful (44 per cent).¹

In 1973 a worldwide study of the Capuchin priests, brothers, and students -- the fifth largest Roman Catholic male religious order in the world -- , was made. Out of 13,155 Capuchins contacted 9,991 (76 per cent) responded to the survey. According to the results, the Capuchins,

¹Ibid., 5-7 (Part I), 9-10 (Part II).
themselves, believed that they were in a crisis situation. The oldest members felt this was a result of the changes during the last years, and therefore they resisted change. The younger members, however, felt that the only way to grow from this crisis would be via change.¹

An ideal life style was suggested by most of those who participated in the survey. The situation would consist of small (3-6 members) or medium (7-12 members) sized communities where each person is responsible for his own subsistence through his own work. Problems of the community would be discussed between the superior and the members of a given community before any final decisions were made. The community would be autonomous in itself and direct its own life style. Training of the Capuchins would be directed more toward interpersonal relations than toward religion per se.²

Besides the main questionnaire sent out to the 13,155 Capuchins, there was a subsample of 1,788, who received an instrument based on the achievement motive of McClelland. There was also a test by Eysenck. Results of the two tests again showed that there were two groups within the order. One group was characterized by the need for

¹Strack (Ed.), op. cit., 215-252.
²Ibid., 253-254.
acceptance and achievement and denied the need for power. Yet they delegated power to their order so that the order would be regarded highly by outsiders. They were afraid to change because any kind of change might alter the image of the order. Insecurity was their reaction to change. These members, it was said, might become even more conservative or may decide to leave. On the other hand, persons who admitted to and expressed the need for power asked for a change in the structure of the order itself and for more dynamic relations within the order.

The study suggested that what is needed today even more than a new structure is a new type of individual, one who can integrate the needs for acceptance, power, and achievement within his order, in himself, and within other interpersonal relationships. It should be a person who is willing to delegate power to his institution but who also accepts responsibility for the direction of his community. Because of this approach the model of change would not be based on only a few, but on all of the persons involved.

The report continued to say that unless the individual himself is willing to integrate all of the above-mentioned needs, such things as small communities, mature obedience, and pluriformity might be nothing more than defense mechanisms. A recommendation like this is even more interesting and surprising because one of the basic ideals
of the Capuchin or Franciscan tradition is radical powerlessness. The authors, however, believe that before someone can submit to powerlessness, he has to deal with his need for power first.¹

Some of the suggestions at the end of the study called for sensitivity training, not only for the students, but also for those in the entire order, and preferably on a regular basis. A second recommendation was an analysis of interpersonal processes within various communities. The purpose for this was to acknowledge that there will be differences within each community, but that these can be dealt with. It was suggested that either group facilitators come in from the outside or members of the community be trained as facilitators.²

Communication and its improvement were stressed as means to allow different life styles for different communities while still functioning as a large community. Continuous communication was regarded as a "sine qua non" for upholding unity while allowing pluriformity.

Ongoing communication as well as confrontation with society and life were stressed as means to make religious life of the Capuchins relevant for the world. To achieve this goal, a constant and revitalized education program, especially in regards to psychology and sociology, was listed

¹Ibid., 221-228.
²Ibid., 263-264.
as the second force -- youth being the first one -- for renewal. ¹

**Summary of the Main Reasons for Leaving**

In the following pages some of the main reasons for leaving or staying on in the active ministry and/or religious life mentioned throughout most of the research done in this particular area will be summarized and categorized.

As a first point this writer wants to mention that it is important to note that while the literature rarely differentiates between active diocesan and religious priests, there seems to be little difference between the two groups.²

Loneliness is cited by the NORC study (1972) and by Wilkes (1974) as the chief reason a priest would leave his ministry, whether or not it be to marry.³

Problems for the future were seen by the NORC study to be authority and sex.⁴ A Gallup Poll taken in April of 1971 found that 52 per cent of the Catholic priests surveyed responded "yes" when asked if Catholic priests should be allowed to wed.⁵ Data in the NORC survey showed that more than

---

¹Ibid., 252

²NORC, op. cit., 360, 370.


⁴NORC, op. cit., 316.

half of the priests in the United States would approve of a change in the celibacy regulation and over three-fifths expect such a change.\(^1\) About three-tenths of the diocesan priests under the age of 45 said there was a great chance they would marry if they had the choice.\(^2\)

This changed attitude towards celibacy makes a commitment to a celibate life more difficult. As cognitive consistency theories suggest, values must be believed in strongly by the members of a group, otherwise dissonance occurs.\(^3\)

Most of the research indicates that the problem of celibacy is most closely connected with the commitment process. People must believe strongly in the value of a sacrifice if they are to justify the cost. If the sacrifice of celibacy loses its rewards, then priests often seem to be forced to leave the active ministry in order to maintain a balance of values and commitment.\(^4\)

The above research indicates that loneliness and celibacy are the chief reasons that priests leave religious life today. But, as indicated in earlier studies, authority

\(^1\)NORC, op. cit., 234-235.

\(^2\)Schoenherr and Greeley, op. cit., 417.

\(^3\)Ibid., 422.

\(^4\)Ibid., 477.
is also an important factor. Thus, reasons for leaving the active ministry most frequently mentioned as "very important" by resignees were problems with the authority structure of the Church and the desire to marry.¹

While the authors found that loneliness and authority overlap, it seems that loneliness was the greater predictor of whether or not a religious will choose to marry and thus leave the active ministry.² The desire to marry was found to be a valuable alternative to a priest's current lifestyle. If loneliness outweighs his work satisfaction, then the priest will probably leave his religious role. Age and inner-directedness take secondary parts in his decision.³

The authority problem seemed to be more apparent in a diocese, i.e., for diocesan priests who are under the authority of a bishop than it is for a religious priest within a given religious institute. It was found that religious superiors are much more like their subjects whereas bishops seem to differ more from the average diocesan priest.⁴

Recommendations and Current Trends

Several suggestions were made by both researchers and experts in religious life to help priests and religious

---

¹NORC, op. cit., 276.
²Schoenherr and Greeley, op. cit., 416.
³Ibid., 412.
⁴NORC, op. cit., 359.
deal with their diverse difficulties in a meaningful and growth nurturing way. Recommendations were also made for preparing candidates for religious life to enable them to make a mature life commitment if they choose to do so.

To help the priests grow to maturity, Larkin (1973) suggested a spirituality based on the principal of interaction. Through interaction with other priests as well as laity, a priest can be helped to accept the challenge of seeing his entire life as a priest in "terms of the relationships to culture, people and Jesus himself."\(^1\) Spirituality has to be, therefore, entirely personal and totally interactional.\(^2\) Prayer, as important as it is for a priest and a religious, is not the total solution to all human problems.\(^3\)

Interaction seems to be called for also by the fact that:

> there is an increasing recognition that career development involves a series of choices made throughout the individual's life. These choices are made in an attempt to develop an identity as a person and as a member of a particular occupation; they are modified as the individual's self-concept and his image of the occupation change.\(^4\)

Therefore, it seems better not to concentrate on a single vocational decision which is based on similarity of members

---

\(^1\) Larkin, op. cit., 64.
\(^2\) Ibid., 59.
\(^3\) Ibid., 4.
\(^4\) Rooney, op. cit., 185.
of a given occupation regarding personality traits, interests, aptitudes, and values.¹

Interpersonal interactions also help to find one's own identity, because finding identity is considered as an ongoing process facilitated by interpersonal interactions. For a religious, it is especially difficult to find his own identity. Because he must be different as a religious and yet must still maintain a profession outside of this, it is often difficult to know which to place first, thus causing a problem with "professional identity." Religious training per se did not prepare those people to find a strong identity, yet without a strong identity and ego strength, it does not seem possible to live life as a religious.²

Stenger (1974) feels that a help in finding one's identity is training in meditation and communication; for both, real experts are needed. Because today's candidates do not seem as mature as former men, it is indicated not to suggest or force them to make a life commitment at an early age.³ The author reasons that a religious will hardly arrive at an authentic relationship with God without first achieving successful interpersonal relations. Celibacy, as much

¹Ibid.


³Ibid., 197.
as marriage, needs psychologically and spiritually mature people.\textsuperscript{1}

A religious candidate must be allowed to grow until he is able to make a life commitment. The supportive climate of a group where each interacts and shares with one another was suggested by a study on the Franciscan Novitiate (1975). The entire process of evaluation of the novices would be taken care of by the whole group. This would include immediate and accurate feedback and constructive confrontation given to each member of the group by the entire community. Through this all members of the community will get to know where they are in their growth, and any decisions to tell the novice that he is ready or not yet ready to take his vows would be on the part of the whole group, rather than on the part of the Novice Master alone.\textsuperscript{2}

A similar type of group situation was also suggested for candidates prior to their joining a particular order. Throughout their studies an ongoing group experience could help them to clarify their motivations and values and thus prepare them to make a mature decision regarding entering religious life or not.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., 199.

\textsuperscript{2}DiCicco, op. cit., 13, 19, 20.

\textsuperscript{3}Stenger and Zirker, op. cit., 200
Casella (1972) reports that since 1967 a certain seminary has been conducting weekly group sessions for its college freshmen and sophomores. The groups were led by a clinical psychologist. Their aim was "not designed to provide corrective personal psychotherapy but, rather a growth in self-awareness."\(^1\) The findings showed that the group experience clearly makes a contribution to the sense of community... The style of life sought after is certainly more dynamic... The groups appear effective in helping them to deal with each other as personalities... (and) can be a rich source for personal understanding. Many at first felt it would be difficult to expose themselves... because they all lived together, but the overall reaction has been that the risk is worth it and has had no bad after effects... The regular meetings between seminarians and faculty that developed in response to the group experience have proved a force for improved relationships... A plan is seriously considered to have the seminarians and faculty reside together... (Regarding one's vocation) his motives and goals are considered dynamically within the context of self-actualization and contribution to others.\(^2\)

Those findings seem to validate the suggestions made regarding renewal of training programs for seminarians in order to help a candidate to reach a mature decision regarding his vocation and to foster his decision once it is made (Rooney, 1971; Kennedy and Heckler, 1971; Stenger, 1964; Schmidtchen, 1973; Strack, (Ed.), 1973; DiCicco, 1975).\(^3\)

\(^1\) Casella, op. cit., 384.
\(^2\) Ibid., 388.
\(^3\) Rooney, op. cit., 218; Kennedy and Heckler, op. cit., 179; Stenger, op. cit., 28-31; Schmidtchen, op. cit., 194; Strack, op. cit., 263-264; DiCicco, op. cit., 8, 9, 13, 19-20.
Schallert and Kelley (1970) see the Catholic clergy living almost entirely within an organizational framework. Religious communities and rectories have taken on many of the characteristics of formal organizations. Personal relationships have traditionally been discouraged and considered secondary to the demands of the priestly role.\(^1\)

Larkin (1973) seems to agree when he says that

> the rectory or local religious house often leaves something to be desired. The quality of life there is frequently superficial; the men share common ministerial objectives but are otherwise disparate in age, interests and values. They are not necessarily friends in any deep sense of the word... However, the time comes when the priest is no longer "fulfilled" simply by the tasks he performs. He looks to personal friendship for fulfillment.\(^2\)

To help the priests to develop meaningful relationships, to work through the problems of intimacy and thus reach a level of emotional maturity which is matching their chronological age, an atmosphere of a loving community is needed. "In such a community love breaks down defenses, allows each person to be himself, and begets the return of love...(Such a community) is not an impersonal structure but...is the significant people in (one's) life."\(^3\)

Rectory life which allows and encourages the development of deep interpersonal relationships seems to be one

---

\(^1\)Schallert and Kelley, op. cit., 446.

\(^2\)Larkin, op. cit., 29.

\(^3\)Ibid., 30.
meant to strengthen loyalty of associate pastors. "Rectory life is a scandal," declared the newly ordained priests in a statement at a meeting of 600 New York archdiocesan priests.\(^1\) Thus Fichter (1968), Rooney (1971), NORC (1972), Larkin (1973) and Greeley (1974) stressed the importance of improving the interpersonal relationships between pastors and their associate pastors which their studies found to be lacking in quality.\(^2\)

Better interpersonal relationships between priests would not only decrease resignment from the active ministry, but would also attract more young people to the priesthood. Louis, Bowles and Grace (1967) reported that the image which priests projected to young people was a relatively unattractive one.

A large part of that image seemed related to inadequate interpersonal relations existing among priests and religious and between them and the laity...If priests and religious would relate to one another in a more warm and personal way it would...foster more vocations.\(^3\)

Improvement of interpersonal relations within religious institutes is also indicated by the fact that 86 per cent of the religious surveyed by NORC (1972) felt that

\(^2\)Fichter cited in Rooney, op. cit., 213; Ibid., 218; NORC, op. cit., 313; Larkin, op. cit., 7; Greeley, op. cit., 12.
\(^3\)Louis, Bowles and Grace in Rooney, op. cit., 206.
their happiness and success in the priesthood was due to their life as a religious. Fifty-five per cent gave attraction of the religious life as a reason for entering the priesthood, and 37 per cent reported that their membership in a religious community was as important to them as their ordination to the priesthood.\footnote{NORC, op. cit., \textit{361-362}.} Therefore, improvement of interpersonal relations could increase the satisfaction rate and thereby the loyalty rate of religious.\footnote{Greeley, op. cit., 17-19.}

Better interpersonal relations would also provide more support for a religious in his commitment process or struggle. The study of NORC (1972) showed that resignees at the time of their withdrawal from the active ministry neither faced much opposition nor did they get much support from their colleagues.\footnote{NORC, op. cit., \textit{280-281}.} A community where mutual support, sharing and intimacy are fostered could strengthen an individual's vocation and its stability.\footnote{Larkin, op. cit., 29, 63.}

\textbf{Training in Interpersonal Communication}

To improve interpersonal relationships both between the clergy themselves and between clergy and laity, training in interpersonal relationships was suggested. There
are some studies -- most of them from outside of the United States -- about group work available which will be presented next.

Pompilo and Krebs (1972) did a study in group dynamics with religious brothers who lived and worked with each other. Fourteen of them volunteered to join a sensitivity group which met for 20 weeks. The results showed that most of the brothers benefited from the sessions. This report was said to be "the first piece of literature attempting to evaluate the effects of a therapy-like experience on a group of healthy men who live and work together."\(^1\)

Connolly (1970) used a proto-type communication program in order to find out whether or not there was a relationship between actualizing changes in Church leaders and participation in a communication laboratory. The laboratory lasted five days and was designed to promote personal and community enrichment through better communication. The results of the study indicated that the participants increased their feeling awareness, and that this in turn led to a willingness to listen, deep personal sharing, and understanding the feelings of others.\(^2\)

\(^1\)Pompilo, op. cit., 151.

Selleck (1972) investigated the effect of the laboratory training method on the behavior of individuals in a religious institution. The findings showed that the experience was effective in changing an individual's attitude both toward his religion and members in his religious institution but not toward the religious institution itself.¹

Improvement in styles of communication was one of the benefits listed by military chaplains who had participated in various training courses in communication. Between 1971 and 1973, 27 per cent of the chaplains of the group in question participated in those courses.²

A study by Lindner in 1972-73, consisted of group-training of people in authority in one particular diocese. The results of the two-week sessions showed that such training programs can help to free the clergy from isolation and escaping an all-authoritarian life style. The relationships with other people were also improved.³


Stenger (1974) conducted groups on interpersonal communication with religion teachers and found that because of the training, the teachers understood not only the subject content better but also gained a more vital faith themselves.¹

A workshop with clergy and group leaders at a certain parish was reported by Roemer (1974). As a result of this training, the clergy found out how their behavior affected participants both in positive and negative ways. Opening up of the group members toward each other was reported as a second benefit.²

A model for associate pastors in a diocese in Germany was set up for group dynamics and interpersonal relations on a weekly basis. Improved communication was reported because of greater openness and dropping of defenses.³ Seminars in group dynamics were also held in a religious seminary. Participants, it was found, were more interested in being taught communication and cooperation skills than in getting involved in a personal experience regarding communication and cooperation. Yet, some seminarians reported at a later date that they were taking

¹Stenger, H. "Lebendiges Lernen in Religionslehrerkursen." In K-W. Dahm and Stenger (Eds.), op. cit., 99-112.


more courses in communication and their sensitivity had improved.¹

Certain groups with religious and diocesan priests were meant to reduce fear and anxiety. Because of the success, Polzien (1974) feels that such an experience can be applied to convent settings on a day-to-day basis. In this way training can be integrated in daily life situations.

When used in a convent setting, it was found that at first homogenous groups should be established. When members have become acquainted with each other, heterogeneous groups may be started. One of the improvements noted was that persons with a deep faith were able for the first time to talk about and share their beliefs.²

Dahm (1974) feels that real Christian existence can be experienced through group dynamics within the Church. Through being together with other persons in such a sensitive way, the love proclaimed by the Sermon on the Mount was realized. Similar feelings were not expressed by the faithful who did not participate.

Dahm mentions that through the rapid expansion of group dynamics in Germany since 1967, problems of authority


within the Church were helped. Group training has encouraged both a more democratic structure within the Church and a better kind of teamwork between the clergy and laity and among the clergy themselves. Along with this new attitude towards authority goes a feeling that there is a special need for training in communication before and after ordination. Instructors in the seminary were especially invited to change from a "lecture" or a "one-way communication" type to a more interpersonal encounter type of approach to the students. Listening was recommended to the clergy as a whole rather than feeding back ready-made answers.1

Areas Where Interpersonal Communication is a "sine qua non"

To help an individual deal constructively with his celibate commitment Vatican II states that:

above all, everyone should remember -- superiors especially -- that chastity has stronger safeguards in a community when true fraternal love thrives among its members.2

Strack (1973) reports that 58.2 per cent of the Capuchins surveyed mentioned celibacy as the most difficult vow of today. More than 57 per cent felt that it should be possible to talk about one's own difficulties regarding


2 Abbott, op. cit., 475.
celibacy with his community members in a free and open manner.\textsuperscript{1} To talk about this subject in a healthy and real way a person has to have the courage to do it himself first as well as a certain amount of assurance that the other party, namely, his co-religious will accept him as he is regarding that matter as well as being willing to enter into some meaningful dialogue. Training in interpersonal communication can be a help to do so.

The inability to communicate effectively about their own frustrations, needs and desires to those who are supposedly suited to understand such "problems of the soul" often seems to lead to feelings of isolation. The priest begins to feel alone and apart from the common goals and purposes of his group, and experiences a kind of "credibility gap" between himself and those in authority over him who have been rewarded for adherence to Church rules which would give him rank.\textsuperscript{2} Again, improved interpersonal communication skills could help both superiors and subjects to relate to each other and to understand one another in a better and healthier way.

\textsuperscript{1}Strack (Ed.), op. cit., 134.

\textsuperscript{2}Schallert and Kelley, op. cit., 452-453.
Tom Gumbleton, a bishop of Detroit, stated:

I need friends, male and female. I've always enjoyed being with people, and yet it was hard for me to let people really come into my life, because there was always the worry that something would go too far. But I can't grow as a person unless I love and am loved. Once you have worked through a clear and convincing rationale for celibacy -- something that makes it have very real personal meaning to you, not just a discipline that you agree to observe -- then you can make a clear and definite commitment to it.¹

To work towards such a meaningful commitment the support, help and sharing of a community who lives those values is necessary.²

The problem regarding authority would be lessened by men like Gumbleton. Among the wishes of the resignees toward their bishops was one which asked the bishops to communicate with their priests on a personal level, and to learn to listen, to accept them, and to love them as persons.³ This fits together with the suggestions of Kennedy and Heckler (1971), namely, priests need to be dealt with "in a more individual manner than was the case when seminary training was characterized by conformity."⁴

The NORC study (1972) indicated that if loneliness can be reduced then the resignation rate will decrease.⁵

¹ National Catholic Reporter, September 27, 1974, 9.
² DiCicco, op. cit., 4-5.
³ NORC, op. cit., 306.
⁴ Kennedy and Heckler, op. cit., 179.
⁵ NORC, op. cit., 266.
According to Larkin (1973) the roots of loneliness lie "in one's own lack of identity, alienation and the inability to share intimacy. This phenomenon is aggravated by ... (an) overwhelming impersonalism."¹ To help a person find his identity and to grow towards a mature sharing with other persons in an intimate way, certain basic skills of communication as well as a basic communication nurturing environment is necessary.

The Future of Religious Institutes and Interpersonal Communication

Tillard (1973) feels that religious institutes have lost their place within the Church and society. Thus, they must find a new place and function within both.² Such a new function and raison d'être would, according to the synod of the German Catholics, become a model of how people can live and work together in today's society. People of today seem to have lost the capacity and skills of living and working together in unity ("in Gemeinschaft"). To establish Gemeinschaft such communities have to find new channels of meaningful interpersonal communication.³

Improved and lived interpersonal communication is seen by Krueger (1969) as the only reason for existence of

¹Larkin, op. cit., 29.
any institution, especially the Church. The Church has to help her members to communicate with one another in a growth nurturing way. Otherwise, she does not and cannot fulfill her task; namely, to be a life giving force. True life needs for its growth open channels of communication. Here again is a raison d'être for religious institutes; namely, to show in a concrete way how the Church functions or can function in her cells.¹

For religious institutes to become a model of a "Lebens- und Werkgemeinschaft (living and working community)" for the Church and the rest of society, religious institutes have to reorganize themselves from secondary to primary structures. There is ample evidence in the literature for this trend to small communities (Rooney, 1971; Kerkofs, 1971; Lenzeder, 1972; Men's Superiors' Report, 1972; Strack (Ed.), 1973; Tillard, 1973; Larkin, 1973; Eppacher, 1973; Fuehles, 1974; Herbstrith, 1974).²

¹Krueger, op. cit., 104.
The advantages of such small communities are reported by Rulla (1971) who found:

On the basis of the review of literature (the following facts): smaller groups tend to show more attraction-cohesiveness, to have more possibilities for communication, to be helped toward a more efficient and satisfying participation of the members.

Regarding the size of a small community, a range between four and twelve was suggested by different authors (Eppacher, 1973; Strack (Ed.), 1973; Herbstrith, 1974). Those suggestions are supported by related research which says that most individuals have a limited capacity to establish relationships with others. Jennings (1960) has indicated that the average repertoire of choices for associating closely with others in working, etc., is about 8 and that this number is increased to about 12 when leisure time activities are included.

To live in such small communities is both a challenge and a risk. This calls for mature religious who are willing to grow as persons which includes pain and hurt. The insecurity regarding the outcome of such a new beginning is a great burden, yet it is the stimulus to search and thus become again a sign in the midst of a society which cannot help but keep searching for its existence and meaning.

---


2 Eppacher, op. cit., 21; Strack (Ed.), op. cit., 124; Herbstritch, op. cit., 2.

3 Rulla, op. cit., 379.
Summary of Related Literature

In recent years much research was conducted to explore the reasons for change in membership of Roman Catholic religious institutes. The survey of the Capuchin order (1973) was to the knowledge of this writer the only research which included the whole population of a given Roman Catholic male religious institute.\(^1\) Another study investigated the total population of a given province within a certain order ("Norddeutsche Pallotiner Provinz").\(^2\) The total of religious priests of a given country, Germany, was surveyed together with the diocesan clergy of this particular country.\(^3\) The majority of the studies in the related area, however, were based upon samples. One of the largest samples was that of the study of the National Opinion Research Center (1972) with a total population of more than 6,000 clergymen including 2,500 religious priests.\(^4\) The rest of the studies were conducted on a smaller scale. The amount of research done in this specific area points out the importance of the subject involved; namely, what makes diocesan and religious priests continue or leave their ministry.

---

\(^1\)Strack (Ed.), op. cit.
\(^2\)Scharrer, op. cit.
\(^3\)Schmidtchen, op. cit.
\(^4\)NORC, op. cit., 324-329.
It was found that the resignation rate was on its increase since 1965. The NORC study (1972) concluded that the resignation rate of priests increased from 0.6 per cent in 1966 to 3.2 per cent in 1969\(^1\) with no sign of decreasing resignation rate in the near future. The survey of the Capuchin order concluded that 1.2 per cent will most likely leave and another 10 per cent are not quite sure about their future in their order.\(^2\)

The main reasons for leaving were as follows: loneliness, problems with authority and sex, emotional immaturity, frustrations regarding the pace of renewal, inhibited growth of personality, and loss of identity. The suggestions made by the diverse researchers pointed in the direction of both solving the authority problem and providing an atmosphere where religious can mature as persons. As a means of achieving both objectives, education in, and application of, psychology and sociology were recommended. Recent literature stressed the areas of personal development, interpersonal communication and group dynamics.

As was stated previously, to the knowledge of this writer there was no explicit study conducted to

\(^1\)NORC, op. cit., 277-279.
\(^2\)Strack (Ed.), op. cit., 212.
CHAPTER III

METHOD AND DESIGN

Pilot Study

A pilot study was designed as a preliminary device to test the effectiveness of the questionnaire developed for this study. Information for the main and secondary characteristics of this study were to be collected by means of this questionnaire. A second reason was to find out, according to the results, whether or not there would be a significant difference between "the level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" at the local level and at the province level.\(^1\) Another purpose of the pilot study was to develop the reliability of the questionnaire, and to eliminate unnecessary or repetitive statements or statements that failed to differentiate.

There were three different questionnaires used: edition A, edition B, and edition C. The reasons for these different editions was to find out whether or not there

---

\(^1\)The structure of a religious institute is by and large as follows: local house (called "local community"), province and religious institute's central government. A religious of a given religious institute belongs usually to a province. Within a province there are several houses. A religious is usually appointed to one of the houses (local communities) of his province for a certain period of time. He might or might not be transferred to another house or houses. Usually he will be.
would be a significant difference between "the perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" at the local level and at the province level. Each edition was made up of three parts; i.e., Part I, Part II and Part III. Part I consisted of 27 questions and was mainly meant to gather biographical data. Part II of edition A and edition B had 79 statements whereas Part II of edition C had 92 statements. The statements of Part II were meant to gather the data of the main characteristics except for one ("retention in his religious institute").

In Part II of edition A, 15 of the 79 statements were directed towards "the perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" at the local level. In Part II of edition B, those 15 statements were directed towards "the perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" at the province level. Part II of edition C included both the 15 statements of Part II of edition A and 13 out of the 15 different statements of Part II of edition B. Thus, Part II of edition C consisted of 92 statements.

Part III consisted of five statements to gather information regarding "skills in interpersonal communication". The Ss had to either write out their responses to a given statement or rank the given answers in order of quality.

Part I and Part III were the same for editions A, B,
The main characteristics aimed at were as follows: "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute", "friendship within his religious institute", "loneliness within religious life", "desire to marry", "problems coping with celibacy", and "retention in his religious institute". The secondary characteristics were the following: "individual need for interpersonal communication", "training in interpersonal communication", "skills in interpersonal communication", "faith", "identity as religious", "satisfaction in religious life", "family tension", "age", and "community size".

The pilot study was conducted in June-July, 1974. Fortynine questionnaires were handed out to religious priests who were at that particular time not stationed or appointed to any religious house within the limits of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago. The surveyed

---

1The study was directed only towards religious priests. A religious priest belongs to a religious institute. By his ordination to the priesthood he enjoys according to the law of the Catholic Church a different status from a religious brother who might be a member of the same religious institute. He is also different from a secular or diocesan priest who does not belong to a religious institute, but to a diocese. A diocesan priest does not profess vows as does a religious priest.

2Because the main study was intended for religious priests within the boundaries of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago, this arrangement was made in order to avoid the possibility of sampling the same S twice.
religious priests were either participants of the 1974 Institute of Pastoral Studies at Loyola University of Chicago, or the Spiritual Exercise Institute at the Longwood Cenacle of Chicago, or visiting religious priests. All Ss volunteered their cooperation in the project.

Out of the 49 questionnaires handed out, 27 were completed and returned. Edition A was completed by 11 Ss, edition B by 11 Ss, and edition C by five Ss. The 27 Ss were members of 13 different religious institutes.

As a result of the questionnaire, numerical values were assigned to the characteristics of interest as follows: "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" was made up by 21 questions and was scored on an integer scale (21-105); "friendship within his religious institute" consisted of 13 questions and was scored on an integer scale (13-65); "loneliness within religious life" was made up by two questions and was scored on an integer scale (2-10); "problems coping with celibacy" consisted of one question and was scored on an integer scale (1-5); "desire to marry" was made up by one question and was scored on an integer scale (1-5); and "retention in his religious institute" was made up by one question and was scored on an integer scale (1-5). A high score on a given scale indicated that, for example, a S perceived the level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute as high or had a strong desire to marry.
After assigning numerical values to the above mentioned characteristics, a correlation matrix using Pearson product moment correlation coefficients was determined for these characteristics (cf. Table 3).

Table 3 shows that there were significant positive correlations between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "friendship within his religious institute" ($r = .90$), between "loneliness within religious life" and "desire to marry" ($r = .67$), and between "problems coping with celibacy" and "desire to marry" ($r = .71$). Significant negative correlations were found between "retention in his religious institute" and "loneliness within religious life" ($r = -.65$), "retention in his religious institute" and "problems coping with celibacy" ($r = -.52$), and between "retention in his religious institute" and "desire to marry" ($r = -.70$).

A $\chi^2$ test was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" at the local level and at the province level. The results showed that there was no significant difference ($\chi^2 = 7.02$, $df = 4$, $p = .05$). Because there was no significant difference, the main study was directed toward the "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" at the local level.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</th>
<th>Friendship within His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Loneliness within Religious Life</th>
<th>Problems Coping with Celibacy</th>
<th>Desire to Marry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.90****</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness within Religious Life</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Coping with Celibacy</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Marry</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention in His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.65**</td>
<td>-.52*</td>
<td>-.70***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pearson r; number of Ss 13.

* P .10, two-tailed test.
** P .02, two-tailed test.
*** P .01, two-tailed test.
**** P .001, two-tailed test.
According to the results and the feedback received from the participants in the pilot study, the following alterations were made for the final questionnaire: Part I was rearranged according to topics and some questions were added; several statements of Part II were purposely changed to more personalized "speak-for-yourself-John" questions,¹ and Part III was dropped from the questionnaire for two reasons: first, it was felt that the rating according to a valid scale would be very difficult, and second, the questionnaire would be shortened and thus more acceptable. The final questionnaire (cf. Appendix I) consisted of Parts I and II. Part I had 33 items and Part II had 93 statements.

Main Study

The sampling procedure was based upon the following consideration: The error E in going from a sample proportion  to the full population proportion p (at a 95 percent confidence level) has a bound² given by

\[ (*) \quad E \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\frac{N-n}{N-1}} \]

where N is the population size and n is the sample size. According to (*) a sample size of n = 300 would have an error of no more than .05.

¹Payne, op.cit., 196-198
A mailing size of approximately 600 was selected so that a 50 per cent response rate would yield a sample size of approximately 300, and consequently, an error of no more than .05.

The Ss were 571 religious priests randomly selected from the 1,141 religious priests cited as being residents in the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago in 1974. Twenty-three Ss were found to be no longer stationed within the limits of the Archdiocese and were thus replaced by the person listed next to them.

The main study was conducted from November 6th, 1974 until January 15th, 1975. Prior to the actual questionnaires, 571 introductory letters were mailed first-class to all Ss involved in the study. Within a week after this, approximately 400 questionnaires were mailed first-class and the rest were delivered (in order to save postage). The questionnaires were coded for the purpose of sending follow-up letters to those who did not return or respond to the questionnaire. Together with each questionnaire a brief explanatory letter and a postcard with a Japanese design as an incentive was mailed. It was also mentioned in the letter that the results would be available for

---


those who wished. With each questionnaire there was also a return envelope addressed to Loyola University of Chicago, stamped "Postage will be paid by the Department of Guidance and Counseling, Loyola University of Chicago." The envelopes used to mail the questionnaires were stamped "This is the survey we wrote you about" on the lower left side.¹

About two weeks after this, follow-up letters together with questionnaires were sent to those who had not yet responded, namely, 346 Ss. This asked again for their cooperation in the study, explained the purpose of coding the questionnaires they received previously, and included another postcard with a Japanese design. Again the questionnaires were mailed first-class but were not coded.

Two weeks after the second mailing, approximately 50 phone calls were made to Ss who had not yet responded. Table 4 shows the response rate by mailing and Table 5 shows that out of the 330 returned questionnaires, 13 were blank, 14 were only partially completed, and 303 were fully completed. Two Ss refused to cooperate because the questionnaires were coded; two questionnaires were returned, saying the addressees were deceased; four questionnaires came back saying the addressees were unknown at that particular address, and three completed questionnaires apparently were lost in the mail.

¹Erdos, op. cit., 90.
TABLE 4

RESPONSE RATE BY MAILING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Questionnaires Mailed</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Response Rate (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First mailing</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second mailing</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5

TOTAL OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially completed</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned blank</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total usable</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows both the total overall response rate and the total usable response rate, namely, 57.79 per cent and 55.51 per cent respectively. Erdos (1970) found that out of 31 professional mail surveys using large questionnaires with more than two pages 17 or 55 per cent had a one-mailing response rate between 50 and 60 per cent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total overall response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total usable response rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The median response rate was 54 per cent.\(^1\) On a survey where the response to the first mailing was 50 per cent, the return after two mailings was found to be between 60 and 65 per cent. This second finding was based on 103 mail surveys.\(^2\) A response rate of 57.79 per cent falls a little below the percentage of what could have been expected according to the research of Erdos.

For analysis of the data the total usable responses, i.e., 317 questionnaires were included.

This study was initiated on the assumption that the perceived level of interpersonal communication within a given religious institute has an effect on whether a religious will remain in his religious institute or leave. It was assumed that if a religious is able to find a level of communication within his religious institute which enables

\(^1\)Erdos, op.cit., 257.

\(^2\)Ibid., 258.
him to communicate with his co-religious in a meaningful way, he will be able to establish meaningful relationships or friendships within his religious institute. These meaningful relationships will help him to cope with loneliness, celibacy,¹ and if existing, with a desire to marry, three "Gegebenheiten (realities)" which are probably part of any human existence. If, however, his perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute is so minimal that it does not allow him to communicate in a meaningful way, and thus establish meaningful relationships with his co-religious, then loneliness, celibacy, and eventually the desire to marry will grow stronger and might make him think of leaving his religious institute. This does not necessarily mean leaving the active ministry.

In Figure 2, we present graphically the model -- a path diagram -- on which the analysis of this research is based. The causal flow goes from the characteristics at the left side to those at the right side. It is assumed that each characteristic has a possible direct and indirect causal relationship with each characteristic to its right. This influence may be direct or it may flow through intervening variables. To illustrate this assumed causal relationship within our model we made the assumption that perceived level of interpersonal communication within his

¹Abbott, op.cit., 475; NORC, op.cit., 370, 316.
Figure 2. Model for causal analysis of religious priests' characteristics.
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religious institute has an influence on friendship within his religious institute, loneliness, problems coping with celibacy, desire to marry, and retention in his religious institute. This influence may be direct or it may flow through any characteristic that intervenes between perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and a later characteristic. Therefore, perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute may have both a direct impact upon problems coping with celibacy and an indirect impact via friendship within his religious institute and loneliness.

The direct paths as well as the indirect ones will be expressed by drawing lines from one characteristic to another as often as the data meet the self-imposed criteria. (For the moment, it may suffice to say that we established two criteria for including pathways; namely, Pearson $r \geq .20$ and beta $\geq .10$.) Although the direction of the assumed influence is already fixed by the position of a given characteristic, arrows will help to clarify the direction of the causality.

Multiple regression analysis is a method of examining the extent of the effect of several independent characteristics on one dependent characteristic by using principles of correlation and regression.¹ Thus, path diagrams or

path analysis, a particular form of multiple regression, is a technique for assigning a weight to a posited causal link. These weights are determined by setting up a system of linear regression equations, and the pathweights are the coefficients in these regression equations when the characteristics or variables are put in standardized form. In the system of equations the variables are ordered in consonance with their position in a causal diagram. Thus, path analysis is essentially multiple regression analysis with all the variables in standardized form. This standardization has the advantage that all the coefficients in the regression equation are usually between -1 and +1 and all the variables are in standardized units. If Y is regressed on the variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_i, \ldots, X_n$ with resulting beta weights $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_i, \ldots, \beta_n$, i.e.,

$$Y = \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_i X_i + \ldots + \beta_n X_n,$$

the interpretation of $\beta_i$ is that a shift of one unit in $X_i$ is accompanied by a shift of $\beta_i$ units in Y when all the other variables are held constant.

We also use the coefficient $R^2$ and $R^2$ change. $R^2$ is a measure of the impact of the independent variables on the dependent variable. $R^2$ measures the amount of variation of the dependent variable explained by variation in the independent variables. $R^2$ change shows the percentage each individual variable adds to the explanatory power of the model.
Definition of Characteristics and their Measurement

Next will be described the six main characteristics and the ten secondary characteristics examined in the main study. First, each characteristic will be defined, followed by a description of the scale used to measure them. The description of the six main characteristics appears in the order of causal precedence as outlined in Figure 2. The source of data for the individual characteristics in the questionnaire will appear in detail in Appendix II.

1. **Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication within His Religious Institute** refers to the expressed degree to which an individual experiences the quality of his relationships within his religious institute. It was scored on an integer scale (20 - 100) with a high score indicating a high quality of experienced relationships.

2. **Friendship within His Religious Institute** means that a religious says he has established one or more meaningful relationships within his own religious institute. This was measured on an integer scale (8 - 40), a high score indicating much success in this specific area.

3. **Loneliness** refers to the degree to which a religious feels he is forlorn and alone. This was measured on an integer scale (1 - 5), a high score indicating much loneliness.

4. **Problems Coping with Celibacy** means that an individual senses difficulties in remaining chaste. An in-
integer scale with a range from 1 - 5 was used, a high score indicating a high amount of difficulties in this specific area.

5. **Desire to Marry** expresses the manifested wish of a religious to change his status of being single. This was measured on an integer scale (1 - 5), a high score indicating some difficulties in this area.

6. **Retention in His Religious Institute** refers to the specific answer given by a religious regarding his future in his religious institute. An integer scale with a range from 1 - 5 was applied, a high score indicating a strong probability of remaining in his religious institute.

7. **Age** is the chronological number of years within a person's life span. Six categories, i.e., 26-35, 36-45, 46-55, 56-65, 66-75, and 76 and over were used. The range of the integer scale was from 1 - 6, a high score indicating high age.

8. **Family Tension** refers to how a religious recollects the relationship between him and his father, between him and his mother, and between his father and mother. This was measured on an integer scale (3 - 15), a high score indicating tense and strained relationships.

9. **Individual Need for Interpersonal Communication** expresses the explicit desire of a person to be able to relate to his co-religious in a meaningful and satisfying way. An integer scale (9 - 49) was applied, a high score
indicating a great need for interpersonal communication.

10. **Faith** is understood as engagement in visible religious acts per se., e.g., public worship, prayer and meditation. An integer scale with a range from 1 - 5 was applied, a high score indicating a great engagement in those religious acts.

11. **Identity as Religious** says a person knows what it means to be a religious. This was measured on an integer scale (2 - 10), a high score indicating a strong identity.

12. **Years in Religious Life** refers to the amount of years spent in religious life after taking first vows or promises. Five categories, i.e., 1-10, 11-20, 21-30, 31-40, and 41 and more were used. The range of the integer scale was from 1 - 5, a high score indicating many years in religious life.

13. **Education** refers to the academic degree obtained at the time this survey was conducted. An integer scale with a range from 1 - 3 was applied, a high score indicating a higher degree.

14. **Community Size** refers to the number of members of one's own religious institute in a given local community. Five categories were used, namely, alone by himself, 2 - 6 members, 7 - 12 members, 13 - 25 members, and 26 and more members. This was scaled on an integer scale (1 - 5), a high score indicating a large community.
15. **Training in Interpersonal Communication** refers to a religious' participation in workshops or courses for "Interpersonal Communication", "Interpersonal Relations", "Helping Skills" or similar ones. An integer scale (1 - 6) was applied, a high score indicating a large degree of participation in such courses or workshops.

16. **Satisfaction in Religious Life** expresses one's overall happiness as a religious; his physical and health needs are taken care of; his work is satisfying; his educational needs are met; the individual feels that he is accepted by and belongs to his religious institute; the structure of his religious institute is at least to some extent a democratic one, i.e., it allows participation in decision making, in establishing of goals and pursuing of common values, and he is esteemed within his religious institute. An integer scale (23 - 121) was applied, a high score reflecting a great satisfaction.

Before we go on to Chapter IV, we want to make two remarks. The first remark concerns the analysis of the data and the second remark concerns the limitations of two characteristics used in this research. The data of the present study -- both pilot and main study -- as presented in this chapter and the two following chapters were analyzed by multiple regression and simple correlation (Pearson r) analysis. The mathematical procedures were done by Loyola's IBM 360 Model 65 computer. The program
used was the "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)." ¹

The two characteristics which need special attention are perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and retention in his religious institute. Perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute, as outlined previously in this chapter, is the expressed degree to which an individual experiences the quality of his relationships within his religious institute. This means that this study did not attempt to measure the level of interpersonal communication by a standardized test which could have produced objective data that could have been used to make comparisons between different group climates. Measured only in this study was the degree to which an individual said he experienced the quality of interpersonal relationships within his own religious institute. The statements made are therefore only subjective and must be taken as such. Thus, it can be possible that one person perceived the quality of interpersonal communication as very high whereas another religious who lived in the same community perceived the same climate as very low and vice versa. The

truth in such a case could possibly belong to neither side if an objective measurement was used.

The second characteristic is retention in his religious institute. It should be stressed that this study was not concerned with staying or leaving the active ministry as a priest but only with retention in one's own religious institute. It could be quite possible that a religious might state that he will leave his religious institute which does not necessarily mean he will leave the active ministry. A religious who intends to leave or has already left his religious institute has still the alternatives of joining another religious institute or becoming a diocesan priest.

It was reasoned that a religious would be more likely to state, that he would "probably" or "definitely" leave his religious institute, due to the perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute, rather than to leave the active ministry. It was assumed that the active ministry is of a greater value than the membership within a religious institute. Thus, the perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute would discriminate more powerfully when membership within a religious institute is at stake than when continuing or leaving the active ministry.

In the following chapter the data achieved and analyzed, as previously stated above, will be reported.
The descriptive data will be presented first followed by the data related to the hypotheses of this study and the path analysis. At the end of the chapter a summary will be given of the findings and their relationships to previous related research.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The following are descriptive data regarding age, nationality, religious status, affiliation to religious institute, clerical status, position, level of education, years in religious life and retention in his religious institute. These are represented in Table 7 through Table 15. The information was gathered from 317 usable questionnaires from a total of 330 which were returned by religious priests randomly selected out of a total of 1,141 living within the boundaries of the Catholic Archdiocese of Chicago at the time the study was conducted.

Descriptive Data

Age: Table 7 shows that the largest group of respondents was between the ages of 56 and 65 (24.6%). Those between the ages of 36 and 45 comprised the second largest group (24.3%). The third largest group of respondents fell between the ages of 46 and 55 (21.1%). Ages 26 to 35 were represented next (17.4%), followed by those between the ages of 66 and 75 (9.2%), and those aged 76 and over (2.5%).

Nationality: Table 8 shows that more than 90 per cent of the respondents were citizens of the United States by birth. Five per cent were naturalized United States citizens and the remaining 4.5 per cent were foreigners.
### TABLE 7
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Adjusted Frequency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 and over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 8
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY NATIONALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Adjusted Frequency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Born</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalized</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Religious Status: As indicated in Table 9, all but one respondent who did not specify his status were religious priests.

### TABLE 9

**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY RELIGIOUS STATUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>317</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Affiliation: As shown in Table 10, the respondents were members of 32 different religious institutes.

Clerical Status: As shown in Table 11, most of the respondents (85.5%) were serving in a capacity other than Superior at the time of the survey. Those who were superiors comprised almost 14 per cent of the population.
TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Institute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustinian Fathers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilian Fathers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictine Fathers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessed Sacrament Fathers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmelite Fathers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarettian Fathers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Word Fathers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Fathers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscan Fathers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscan Conventual Fathers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenmary Home Missioners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross Fathers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Ghost Fathers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesuit Fathers</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salette Fathers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Fathers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryknoll Fathers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionaries of the Company of Mary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblates of Mary Immaculate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passionist Fathers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulist Fathers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precious Blood Fathers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemptorist Fathers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrectionist Fathers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests of the Sacred Heart</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionaries of the Sacred Heart</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalabrini Fathers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servite Fathers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society of Mary (Marists)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viatorian Fathers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincentian Fathers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Fathers of Africa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY CLERICAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clerical Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior at present</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position: As Table 12 indicates, the greatest number of respondents were serving in capacities other than pastor or associate pastor (80.4%). Associate pastors followed with 12.3 per cent, and pastors comprised 6.6 per cent.

TABLE 12
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY PRESENT POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Pastor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Level of Education**: Table 13 shows that 53.9 per cent of the respondents had completed a M.A. degree. Those possessing Ph.D. degrees followed with 22.4 per cent. A B.A., or equivalent, was held by 20.8 per cent of the population, and 2.3 per cent had completed other types of education.

**TABLE 13**

**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY HIGHEST EDUCATIONAL DEGREE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A., or equivalent</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A., or equivalent</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., or equivalent</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Years in Religious Life**: Table 14 shows that the largest group of respondents (26.8%) were in religious life between 31 and 40 years. The second largest group was comprised of those who were in religious life between 11 and 20 years (24.6%). The group of those in religious life between 21 and 30 years was next (21.8%) followed by those with more than 40 years in religious life (18.6%). The smallest group was comprised of priests who were in religious life between 1 and 10 years (5.7%).
TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY YEARS IN RELIGIOUS LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Religious Life</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (Per Cent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 -10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and more</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retention in His Religious Institute: Table 15 shows that more than 68 per cent of the respondents stated that they definitely will not leave their religious institute. Almost 35 per cent said they probably will not leave. Uncertain about their future were 5.5 per cent. Those who stated that they probably will leave comprised 1.3 per cent. Only one (0.4%) said he will definitely leave his religious institute. [Note: As it was mentioned earlier, retention here is meant only to reflect a religious' stated desire to remain or to leave his own religious institute and not (necessarily) the active ministry as such.]
TABLE 15
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Per Cent (Adjusted Frequency)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Related to Hypotheses**

Table 16 represents the Pearson product moment correlations between the six main Characteristics at the individual level.

**Hypothesis No. 1.**

It was hypothesized that there will be a strong positive correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "friendship within his religious institute." The results showed that there was a strong positive relationship of .79 (p = .001). Ss who perceived the quality of their relationships within their own religious institutes as being good seemed to have been able to establish meaningful relationships among their co-religious.

**Hypothesis No. 2.**

The second hypothesis, namely, that there will be a
TABLE 16
CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE SIX MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF RELIGIOUS PRIESTS
(Main Study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</th>
<th>Friendship within His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Loneliness</th>
<th>Problems Coping with Celibacy</th>
<th>Desire to Marry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.79***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Coping with Celibacy</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Marry</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention in His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Pearson r; number of Ss 252.

* P  .05, two-tailed test.
** P  .01, two-tailed test.
*** P  .001, two-tailed test.
strong positive correlation between "friendship within his religious institute" and "retention in his religious institute" was partially convalidated by the findings. Friendship seemed to have an impact on a religious' decision to remain in his religious institute. The relationship between the two variables was .21 ($p = .05$).

**Hypothesis No. 3.**

The third hypothesis, i.e., that there will be a strong negative correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "loneliness" was also supported by the findings ($r = -.42; p = .001$). Religious who perceived the quality of their relationships within their own religious community as low seemed to be very lonely.

**Hypothesis No. 4.**

The hypothesis that there will be a strong negative correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "desire to marry" was not supported at a significant level ($r = -.05$). It seems that the quality of one's relationships with his co-religious did not have a significant impact on a religious' desire to get married.

**Hypothesis No. 5.**

The fifth hypothesis, namely, that there will be a strong positive correlation between "loneliness" and "desire to marry" was not supported by the findings in a significant
Loneliness and the desire to marry did not seem to have an especially strong relationship.

**Hypothesis No. 6.**

Hypothesis six, i.e., that there will be a strong negative correlation between "loneliness" and "retention in his religious institute" was supported by the results of this study ($r = -0.33; p = 0.05$). Loneliness seemed to have a negative influence on a religious' decision to stay on in his religious institute.

**Hypothesis No. 7.**

The last hypothesis, namely, that there will be a strong negative correlation between "desire to marry" and "retention in his religious institute" was also supported by the findings of this study ($r = -0.31; p = 0.01$). It seemed to be obvious that a strong desire to marry is related to a religious' thinking of leaving his community.

**Data for the Path Diagram Relating Retention in His Religious Institute to Main Characteristics**

The positive relationships shown in Table 16 revealed that those religious priests who perceived the level of interpersonal communication within their religious institutes as being high were therefore able to establish meaningful relationships (friendships) within their religious institutes. They were inclined to state that their future in their religious institutes was more certain. The posi-
tive relationships also disclosed that those religious priests who stated that celibacy is a great problem for them personally also seemed to agree that the desire to marry is a subject of concern for them.

The negative relationships seemed to indicate that those religious priests who perceived the level of interpersonal communication within their religious institutes as being low and were not able to establish meaningful relationships (friendships) within their religious institutes were very lonely. The negative relationships also seemed to indicate that those who were lonely, who had difficulties remaining celibate and had a desire to marry, were more inclined to say that their future in their own religious institute was somewhat uncertain.

The obtained results will be explained further using the model for causal analysis of religious priests' characteristics as outlined in Chapter III. We repeat, for the convenience of the reader, the explanation of the path coefficients outlined there. Multiple regression analysis is a method of examining the extent of the effect of several independent characteristics on one dependent characteristic by using principles of correlation and regression.1 Thus, path diagrams or path analysis, a particular form of multiple regression, is a technique for assigning a weight

---

1Kerlinger, op. cit., 603.
to the posited causal link. These weights are determined
by setting up a system of linear regression equations and
the pathweights are the coefficients in these regression
equations when the characteristics or variables are put in
standardized form. In the system of equations the variables
are ordered in consonance with their position in a causal
diagram. Thus, path analysis is essentially multiple re-
gression analysis with all the variables in standardized form.
This standardization has the advantage that all the coef-
ficients in the regression equation are usually between -1
and +1 and all the variables are in standardized units. If Y
is regressed on the variables \( X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_i, \ldots, X_n \) with
resulting beta weights \( \beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_i, \ldots, \beta_n \), i.e.,
\[
Y = \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots + \beta_i X_i + \ldots + \beta_n X_n,
\]
the interpretation of \( \beta_i \) is that a shift of one unit in \( X \)
is accompanied by a shift of \( \beta_i \) units in \( Y \) when all the other
variables are held constant.

We also use the coefficient \( R^2 \) and \( R^2 \) change. \( R^2 \) is
a measure of the impact of the independent variables on the
dependent variable. \( R^2 \) measures the amount of variation of
the dependent variable explained by variation in the indepen-
dent variables. \( R^2 \) change shows the percentage each individ-
ual variable adds to the explanatory power of the model.

To show more clearly how the model is understood there
will be a step by step analysis. The relationship be-
between the first two variables, namely, perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and friendship within his religious institute is expressed by the simple \( r \) (0.79) shown on Table 16, and is not considered as a step. Thus, Step 1 explains the relationships between the two variables just mentioned and loneliness. Step 2 adds the variable of problems coping with celibacy. Step 3 explains the relationships between the above mentioned variables and desire to marry. Step 4 ties together all the previously mentioned variables' relationships with retention in his religious institute.

Regarding the pathweights (beta weights) there was one criterion established, namely, to exclude all the pathweights \( \leq 0.09 \).  

Step 1. Table 16 showed that there was a strong positive relationship between perceived level of interpersonal communication and friendship within his religious institute (\( r = 0.79 \)). The correlation between perceived level of interpersonal communication and loneliness was \( -0.42 \). There was also a negative correlation between friendship within his religious institute and loneliness (\( -0.44 \)). The relationships of the three above mentioned characteristics are expressed graphically in Figure 3. Table 17 shows that

\[\text{Schoenherr and Greeley, op.cit., 412.}\]
Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication

Friendship within His Religious Institute

Loneliness

.79
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Figure 3. Path diagram relating loneliness to prior characteristics.
18 per cent of the variance were explained by the perceived level of interpersonal communication. Friendship explained 3 per cent.

### TABLE 17

**EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE ON LONELINESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas perceived level of interpersonal communication and friendship explained only one-fifth of the variance on loneliness, the data suggested that an improvement of the quality of both interpersonal communication and interpersonal relationships will result in less loneliness.

At this point we want to explain the path diagram a step further. Let $X_1$, $X_2$, $X_3$ represent, respectively, perceived level of interpersonal communication, friendship within his religious institute, and loneliness in standardized units. Then Figure 3 incorporates in diagramatic fashion the following two regression equations:
where $\beta_{21} = .79$, $\beta_{31} = -.20$, and $\beta_{32} = -.27$. Note that $\beta_{21} = .79$ is just the Pearson correlation coefficient of $x_1$ and $x_2$. The coefficient $\beta_{31} = -.20$ measures the direct impact of perceived level of interpersonal communication on loneliness. (The path of perceived level of interpersonal communication to loneliness with weight $\beta_{31} = -.20$ is called a "direct path"). To measure the indirect impact of perceived level of interpersonal communication on loneliness through friendship within one's religious institute, we look at the individual impact of perceived level of interpersonal communication on friendship within one's religious institute, $(\beta_{21} = .79)$ and of friendship within one's religious institute on loneliness $(\beta_{32} = -.27)$; this sequence of paths is referred to as an "indirect path" from perceived level of interpersonal communication to loneliness. The numerical impact of the indirect path plus the impact of the direct path should combine to yield the simple correlation $r$ between perceived level of interpersonal communication and loneliness. If we let $r_{12}$, $r_{13}$ represent, respectively, the simple correlation between perceived level of interpersonal communication and friendship within one's religious institute and between perceived level of interpersonal communication and loneliness, we can view the interaction of the direct and
indirect path mathematically as follows: substituting equations (1) and (2) we obtain

\[ x_3 = \beta_{31} x_1 + \beta_{32} r_{12} x_1. \]

Since

\[ x_3 = r_{13} x_1, \]

we have

\[ r_{13} = \beta_{31} + \beta_{32} r_{12}, \]

i.e., the total impact of perceived level of interpersonal communication on loneliness can be viewed as a result of the path diagram as partitioned into a direct influence (\( \beta_{31} \)) and an indirect influence through friendship within his religious institute (\( r_{12} \cdot \beta_{32} \)).

It will be noted that there is one vertical line with an arrow pointing into loneliness with a .89 at its base. This line is called a "residual path." The number indicates the amount of variance in loneliness not explained by the model. The value given is achieved by subtracting the explained variance \( R^2 \) from 1.00 and then taking the square root. For example, in Table 17 we see that .21 of the variance of loneliness was explained by perceived level of interpersonal communication and friendship within his religious institute. Thus, 1.00 - .21 = .79 and the square root of .79 is .89. This means that 21 per cent of the variance in loneliness is explained by perceived level of
interpersonal communication and friendship within his religious institute, and 79 per cent of the variance remained unexplained by the model.

The advantage of a path diagram as presented in Figure 3 and the following figures is that it enables us to consider simultaneously the direct paths by which a given characteristic is influenced by prior variables. It also enables us, by considering the given $R^2$ changes presented in the specific tables, to find out whether or not a certain characteristic influences a subsequent characteristic via an intermediate characteristic, e.g., friendship within his religious institute which is between perceived level of interpersonal communication and loneliness. We see in Table 17 that 18 per cent of the variance in loneliness was explained by perceived level of interpersonal communication alone. Friendship within his religious institute explained an additional 3 per cent, yet the beta of friendship within his religious institute on loneliness (-.27) was greater than that of perceived level of interpersonal communication on loneliness (-.20). Therefore, it can be assumed that a great deal of the impact of friendship within his religious institute upon loneliness was due to perceived level of interpersonal communication. In other words, part of the influence of perceived level of interpersonal communication upon loneliness was exercised in an indirect way, namely, via friendship.
As a final remark we want to stress that a small $R^2$ change, however, does not indicate that the characteristic which causes this rather small addition to the explanatory power of the model is unimportant.

**Step 2.** Table 16 showed that there were negative correlations between perceived level of interpersonal communication and problems coping with celibacy (-.10) and between friendship within his religious institute and problems coping with celibacy (-.08). There was a positive correlation between loneliness and problems coping with celibacy (.15). The relationships of the four characteristics are outlined graphically in Figure 4. Beta weights $\leq .09$ have been omitted from the model. There was one direct path from loneliness to problems coping with celibacy (.14). This seemed to indicate that an increase in loneliness might have as its result an increase in problems coping with celibacy.

Table 18 shows that perceived level of interpersonal communication, friendship within his religious institute and loneliness explained only 2 per cent of the variation on problems coping with celibacy.
Figure 4. Path diagram relating problems coping with celibacy to prior characteristics.

(Note: All paths below .10 have been omitted from this figure.)
Table 18
EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE ON PROBLEMS COPING WITH CELIBACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3. The correlation matrix of Table 16 showed that there were only minor negative correlations between perceived level of interpersonal communication and desire to marry ($-.05$) and between friendship within his religious institute and desire to marry ($-.05$). The relationship between loneliness and desire to marry was a small positive one ($+.06$). The correlation between problems coping with celibacy and desire to marry was a strong positive one ($+.57$). Those relationships will be presented graphically in Figure 5. Again beta weights $\leq .09$ have been omitted from the model. There was only one direct path (beta $\geq .10$) into desire to marry, namely, from problems coping with celibacy ($+.57$). This finding suggested that an increase of problems coping with celibacy will most likely result in a stronger desire to marry. Problems coping with celibacy alone explained one-third of the variance on desire to marry as outlined on Table 19 ($R^2$ Change = .33). The remaining three characteristics or variables did almost nothing to explain the variance on the
Figure 5. Path diagram relating desire to marry to prior variables.

(Note: All paths below .10 have been omitted from this figure.)


desire to marry.

**TABLE 19**

EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE ON DESIRE TO MARRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Coping with Celibacy</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 4. Table 16 showed that there were significant positive correlations between perceived level of interpersonal communication and retention in his religious institute (.26) and between friendship within his religious institute and retention in his religious institute (.21). There were significant negative correlations between loneliness and retention in his religious institute (-.22), between problems coping with celibacy and retention in his religious institute (-.42), and between desire to marry and retention in his religious institute (-.31). The relationships of the six characteristics are outlined graphically in Figure 6. Again beta weights ≤ .09 have been omitted from the model.

Table 20 gives an overview of the fact that the whole
Figure 6. Path diagram relating retention in his religious institute to prior variables. All paths below .10 have been omitted from this figure.
### Table 20

EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE ON RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Coping with Celibacy</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Marry</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The multiple $R^2$ corresponding to each variable is derived from the regression equation estimating the effects on retention in his religious institute of that variable and all others antecedent to it -- those above it in the table -- but not intervening between it and the dependent variable -- those below it in the table. The value for perceived level of interpersonal communication is thus the $r^2$.¹

¹ Number of $S$s 252.

¹ Schoenherr and Greeley, op.cit., 412.
model used in this study (cf. Chapter III, Figure 2) explained almost one-fourth of the variance on retention in his religious institute. The data revealed that 7 per cent of the variance on retention in his religious institute is explained by the perceived level of interpersonal communication. Loneliness added 2 per cent, problems coping with celibacy contributed 14 per cent, and desire to marry explained 1 per cent. An examination of the path diagram in Figure 6 shows how the characteristics' relationships explained retention in his religious institute.

There were three direct paths (beta ≥ .10) on retention in his religious institute, namely, one from perceived level of interpersonal communication (.21), the second one from problems coping with celibacy (-.31) and the third one from desire to marry (-.11). The obtained values suggest that an increase both of problems coping with celibacy and desire to marry will have a negative influence on a religious' plan for remaining in his religious institute. On the other hand, an improvement of interpersonal communication will most likely have a positive impact on a religious' plan for remaining in his religious institute.

Data for an Expanded Path Diagram Relating Retention in His Religious Institute to Main and Secondary Characteristics.

As was said previously, the model for causal analysis of religious priests' characteristics could explain approximately one-fourth of the variance on retention in his religious institute. In order to explain that variance better,
the secondary characteristics outlined in Chapter III were examined.

Table 21 shows the Pearson product moment correlations between the main and secondary characteristics and retention in his religious institute. As a self-imposed criterion, it was decided that values of $r \leq .20$ would not be taken into consideration for further computation and analysis unless a specific reason and interest would suggest an inclusion of a weaker, but statistically significant correlation.\(^1\) Four secondary characteristics, namely, age (.34), identity as religious (.59), years in religious life (.29), and satisfaction in religious life (.25) met this criterion. All of the main characteristics qualified also; i.e., perceived level of interpersonal communication (.22), friendship within his religious institute (.30), loneliness (-.30), problems coping with celibacy (-.39), and desire to marry (-.27). Those nine characteristics were again computed with the dependent variable, namely, retention in his religious institute. It was decided to drop those secondary characteristics with a beta $\leq .10$.\(^2\) The results shown on Table 22 revealed that only two of the secondary characteristics, years in religious life (.16) and identity as relig-

\(^1\)Schoenherr and Greeley, op.cit., 412.

\(^2\)Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Family Tension</th>
<th>Individual Need for Interpersonal Communication</th>
<th>Faith</th>
<th>Identity as Religious</th>
<th>Years in Religious Life</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Satisfaction in Religious Life</th>
<th>Community Size</th>
<th>Training in Interpersonal Communication</th>
<th>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</th>
<th>Professional Relationship</th>
<th>Friendliness with Religious Institute</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
<th>Problem Coping with Conflict</th>
<th>Desire to Marry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Tension</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Need for Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</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>Faith</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</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>Identity as Religious</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17*</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>Years in Religious Life</td>
<td>.23****</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03</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>Education</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</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>Satisfaction in Religious Life</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</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>Community Size</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</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>Training in Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16**</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>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.15</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>Professional Relationship</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</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>Friendliness with Religious Institute</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</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>Consultant</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</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>Problem Coping with Conflict</td>
<td>.23****</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</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>Desire to Marry</td>
<td>.34****</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</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>Notation in Religious Institute</td>
<td>.34****</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</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>

*Pearson r; number of N=116.

Significance levels:
- .10, two-tailed test.
- .05, two-tailed test.
- .02, two-tailed test.
- .01, two-tailed test.
gious (.41), met the second criterion. Those two characteristics combined with the six main characteristics were computed again.

**TABLE 22**

EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE ON RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE (EXPANDED MODEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity as Religious</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Religious Life</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction in Religious Life</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Coping with Celibacy</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Marry</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple $R^2$ corresponding to each variable is derived from the regression equation estimating the effects on retention in his religious institute of that variable and all others antecedent to it -- those above it in the table -- but not intervening between it and the dependent variable -- those below it in the table. The value for age is thus the $r^2$. Any apparent errors in subtraction are due to rounding.

Number of Ss 114.
Table 23 gives an overview of the fact that the final model explained 37 per cent of the variance in the scores on the five-point scale which was used to measure future plans regarding retention in one's own religious institute. The data revealed that 27 per cent of the variance on retention in his religious institute was explained by identity as religious. Years in religious life added 4 per cent while perceived level of interpersonal communication, loneliness, and problems coping with celibacy contributed each 2 per cent. An examination of the path diagram in Figure 7 will show how the characteristics' relationships explained retention in his religious institute.

The relationship between identity as religious and years in religious life is given by the simple Pearson $r$ as seen in Table 24.

After having omitted all paths below .10, Figure 7 shows that there was a direct path from identity as religious to perceived level of interpersonal communication (.29). Thus, it would be expected that an increase of the level of identity as religious will have a positive influence on the perceived level of interpersonal communication. A higher level of interpersonal communication in turn will most probably show a very strong positive influence on friendship within his religious institute (.76). Years in religious
TABLE 23
EXPLANATION OF VARIANCE ON RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE^a
(EXPANDED FINAL MODEL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>R^2 Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity as Religious</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Religious Life</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Coping with Celibacy</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Marry</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Number of Ss 246.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Identity as Religious</th>
<th>Years in Religious Life</th>
<th>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</th>
<th>Friendship within His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Loneliness</th>
<th>Problems Coping with Celibacy</th>
<th>Desire to Marry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity as Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Religious Life</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Level of Interpersonal</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendship within His Religious Institute</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.79****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loneliness</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.45****</td>
<td>-0.47****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Coping with Celibacy</td>
<td>-0.39****</td>
<td>-0.29****</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Marry</td>
<td>-0.28****</td>
<td>-0.35****</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.56****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention in His Religious Institute</td>
<td>0.52****</td>
<td>0.25****</td>
<td>0.25****</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>-0.24**</td>
<td>-0.41****</td>
<td>-0.31****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.10, two-tailed test.
**P < 0.05, two-tailed test.
***P < 0.01, two-tailed test.
****P < 0.001, two-tailed test.

* Pearson r; number of Ss 246.
life, however, seemed to have a negative effect on friendship within his religious institute (-.11). Thus, the longer a person was in religious life the fewer meaningful relationships he seemed to experience.

There were two direct paths going into loneliness, one from perceived level of interpersonal communication (-.19) and the second one from friendship within his religious institute (-.31). The results seemed to indicate that an increase both of the perceived level of interpersonal communication and of friendship within his religious institute will decrease loneliness.

Regarding problems coping with celibacy, there were three direct paths, namely, from identity as religious (-.35), years in religious life (-.25), and loneliness (.16). Whereas an increase in loneliness will most likely result in a greater amount of problems coping with celibacy, a higher level of identity as religious seems to lessen those problems. Further, the longer a person will be in religious life the fewer his problems regarding celibacy probably will become.

The desire to marry seemed to get stronger the more the problems coping with celibacy grew (.47). Again, it seemed that the longer a person will be in religious life the less desire to marry he will have (-.21).
There were five direct paths going into retention in his religious institute. The greatest impact on retention in his religious institute was exercised by identity as religious (.39). The stronger a religious' identity as religious will be the more likely he will remain in his religious institute. Both the perceived level of interpersonal communication (.15) and years in religious life (.14) had a positive impact on retention in his religious institute. The results suggested that an increase of both perceived level of interpersonal communication and years in religious life will have a positive impact on retention in his religious institute. However, both problems coping with celibacy (-.16) and loneliness (-.12) showed a negative influence on retention in his religious institute. Thus, a decrease both of problems coping with celibacy and of loneliness will most probably have a positive impact on retention in one's own religious institute.

To handle the presented multivariable model regression coefficients were used. Percentage tables can be used up to three or four variables, but beyond that number the use of such tables does not help very much to explain a rather complicated situation. As a reference, however,

1NORC. op.cit., 264.
percentage tables regarding the dependent and the main independent variables will be found in the Appendix III.

**Summary of Findings**

The general hypothesis of this study stated that the perceived level of interpersonal communication within a given religious institute has an effect on whether a religious will remain in his religious institute or leave. The study has served to confirm this general hypothesis in a moderate way. Both the simple correlation coefficient and linear regression coefficient showed positive relationships between perceived level of interpersonal communication and retention in his religious institute ($r = .25; \beta = .15$). (Note that the results in this section are based on the expanded model as found on Table 24 and Figure 7).

The direct impact of perceived level of interpersonal communication upon a religious' decision to continue in his religious institute was moderate and significant. Further analysis revealed that this variable also influenced retention in his religious institute, via two indirect paths. The first one flowed through friendship and the results indicated a very strong relationship ($\beta = .76$) and the second one flowed through loneliness and was indicative of a fairly strong relationship ($\beta = -.19$). Those two indirect paths were also predicted and thus confirmed.

It was reasoned that if the level of interpersonal communication would be perceived as high, then the establishment of meaningful interpersonal relationships within
one's own religious institute would be guaranteed. Again both the simple correlation coefficient and the linear regression coefficient supported this hypothesis very strongly (r = .79; beta = .76). Persons who reported that they perceived the level of interpersonal communication as high tended to agree that they experienced meaningful relationships within their own religious institutes.

Friendship within his religious institute in its turn was thought of as strengthening an individual's decision to remain in his religious institute. There was a moderate positive relationship between those two variables as far as the simple correlation coefficient was concerned (r = .20). The diagnosis of the path diagram, however, did not reveal a significant direct influence of friendship within his religious institute upon retention in his religious institute (beta = -.08). The relationship between the two variables seemed to be an indirect one. It flows probably through loneliness upon which friendship within his religious institute had a very strong impact (beta = -.31).

It was hypothesized that a religious who says he is very lonely will also tend to state that his perceived level of interpersonal communication is very low. Both the simple correlation coefficient and the linear regression coefficient supported this hypothesis (r = -.45; beta = -.19). In both instances, the results were significant.

Two hypotheses concerned loneliness. The first one predicted a strong positive relationship between loneliness
and desire to marry. This hypothesis was not supported in a significant way both by the simple correlation coefficient and by the linear regression coefficient ($r = .08; \beta = -.00$). The second hypothesis predicted a strong negative relationship between loneliness and decision to continue in his religious institute. The findings supported this hypothesis. Both the simple correlation coefficient and the linear regression coefficient were significant ($r = -.24; \beta = -.12$). Loneliness seemed to have a negative effect upon retention in his religious institute.

It was assumed that loneliness will have an influence on problems coping with celibacy. The more a person experiences loneliness, the more his problems coping with celibacy will increase. The path diagram showed that this seemed to be the case ($\beta = .16$). Loneliness had a significant influence upon problems coping with celibacy.

Problems coping with celibacy were expected to have a strong negative influence upon retention in his religious institute. Indeed the results supported this reasoning quite strongly. The simple correlation coefficient as well as the linear regression coefficient were negative in a significant way ($r = -.41; \beta = -.16$). Problems coping with celibacy also had a strong impact on the desire to marry especially regarding the linear regression coefficient ($\beta = .47$).

The desire to marry did not have a strong impact on retention of a religious in his religious institute as it
was hypothesized. The simple correlation coefficient was significant and moderately strong whereas the linear regression coefficient failed to be significant ($r = -0.31$; $\beta = -0.04$).

To summarize the findings up till this point, i.e., the interactions of the six main characteristics, one can say that the perceived level of interpersonal communication, loneliness and problems coping with celibacy seemed to be most decisive for a religious' decision to continue in his religious institute. Especially, concerns with celibacy seemed to play a crucial part.

Taking a look at the two variables -- identity as religious and years in religious life -- which met the two self-imposed criteria ($r \geq 0.20$; $\beta \geq 0.10$) and were thus added to the original model so as to say that years in religious life had not only a direct significant influence upon retention in his religious institute but its influence flowed also in a strong indirect way through problems coping with celibacy into retention. The most remarkable finding was the part identity as a religious played. Identity as religious had not only the strongest positive simple correlation with retention ($r = 0.52$) but also exercised by far the strongest positive influence upon retention both in one direct and three indirect paths. The indirect paths revealed that identity as religious had a great influence on three out of the four remaining variables with a direct path
into retention, namely, years in religious life ($r = .11$), perceived level of interpersonal communication ($\beta = .29$) and problems coping with celibacy ($\beta = -.35$). The order of the extent of its influence upon those three variables was corresponding to the order those variables in their turn played as important influential parts upon retention. (Beta of problems coping with celibacy upon retention was -.16; beta of perceived level of interpersonal communication upon retention was .15 and beta of years in religious life upon retention was .14).

The findings of the expanded model revealed the importance of identity as religious for retention in his religious institute followed by problems coping with celibacy, perceived level of interpersonal communication, years in religious life and loneliness. While identity as religious, perceived level of interpersonal communication and years in religious life had a positive impact upon retention; problems coping with celibacy and loneliness had a negative one.

**Findings Related to Previous Research**

Fitcher's (1961) hypothesis, namely, that resignation from the active ministry is the result of a breakdown of spiritual habits and values is not supported by this study. Faith actualized in time spent for prayer and meditation did not show a significant impact upon retention in his religious institute ($r = .18$; $\beta = .02$).¹ Schallert and Kelley's

¹Schoenherr and Greeley, op.cit., 408.
(1970) conclusion that the "crucial other" makes a difference whether or not a priest will withdraw from the active ministry was slightly supported. Friendship within his religious institute influenced a religious' future plans via loneliness. A higher degree of friendship within his religious institute most likely will decrease the amount of loneliness, the less loneliness the stronger will be the decision to continue.¹

The NORC Study (1972) found that the main reasons for staying in the active ministry were a sense of vocation and happiness in one's work.² These findings were supported by the present study. Sense of vocation, in our terminology identity as religious, and satisfaction in religious life which included work satisfaction were positive correlated with retention in his religious institute ($r = .59$ for identity as religious and $r = .25$ for satisfaction in religious life).

The NORC survey listed as the five most powerful predictors regarding future plans of a religious priest in order of importance: desire to marry, age, loneliness, family tension, and "modern" values.³ This study found as the most powerful characteristics in order of importance --

¹Schallert and Kelley, op.cit., 458-459.
²NORC, op. cit., 253.
³Ibid., 368-369.
"modern" values were not dealt with -- identity as religious, problems coping with celibacy, perceived level of interpersonal communication, years in religious life, and loneliness. The desire to marry was not found to be a strong predictor of whether or not a religious will remain in his religious institute.

The NORC study also concluded that in the years ahead most of the serious problems priests will be faced with will center around power and sex.\textsuperscript{1} The present study did not deal with power, i.e., authority and thus cannot make any statement regarding this subject. But the issue of sex dealt with in problems coping with celibacy and desire to marry seems to be a very important one. The findings of this study support such a concern. Celibacy is indeed a crucial factor regarding retention in his religious institute. The importance of this particular factor was apparent throughout the analysis of the data.

Wilson (1975) found that priests who are still active felt that their self-image was being fulfilled, while ex-priests did not.\textsuperscript{2} This finding seems to be supported by the very strong impact which identity as religious had upon retention in this present study. The importance of identity as religious also supports the findings of Kennedy and Heckler (1971) who suggested to give

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., 316

\textsuperscript{2}Wilson, op.cit., 7, 14.
both candidates for the priesthood and priests, themselves, the opportunity to establish their own identity.\(^1\)

Stenger and Zirker (1974), Rooney (1971), and the study on the Franciscan Novitiate (1975) stressed the importance of allowing a candidate for religious life to grow in a supportive climate until he feels mature enough to make a life commitment.\(^2\) The relationships between identity as religious and perceived level of interpersonal communication and between identity as religious and retention in his religious institute found in this study seem to support those directions.

The advantage of small communities suggested by Rooney (1971), Kerkhofs (1971), Lenzeder (1972), Men's Superiors' Report (1972), Strack (Ed.) (1973), Tillard (1973), Larkin (1973), Eppacher (1973), Fuehles (1974), and Herbstrith (1974) was not supported by this present study.\(^3\) The relationship between community size and retention was minimal \((r = .12; \text{beta} = -.03)\). There was only one correlation found which had some importance, namely, between community size and problems coping with celibacy.

\(^1\) Kennedy and Heckler, op.cit., 174-179.

\(^2\) Stenger and Zirker, op.cit., 196; Rooney, op.cit., 185; DiCicco, op.cit., 13, 19, 20.

\(^3\) Rooney, op.cit., 215; Kerhofs, op.cit., 15, 49; Lenzeder, op.cit., 204; Crux Information Service, op.cit.; Strack (Ed.), op.cit., 124, 126; Tillard, op.cit., 184; Larkin, op.cit., 66; Eppacher, op.cit., 91; Fuehles, op. cit., 7; Herbstrith, op.cit., 2, 4.
(-.20). This negative correlation would rather suggest that the smaller the community size, the more problems regarding celibacy might be experienced and the less stable will be a religious' plan for remaining in his religious institute. Or it might be possible that those with more problems regarding celibacy happened or chose to live in small communities.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this exploratory study was to investigate to what degree the perceived level of interpersonal communication within a given religious institute influences a religious priest's stated desire to remain in his religious institute. In particular the relationships between perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and loneliness, and between perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and desire to marry were thought of as being crucial regarding their impact upon retention in his religious institute. A thorough examination of those two relationships was considered to result in a better understanding of the importance of interpersonal communication within a given religious institute. It was reasoned that if the results would prove positive, then both training and ongoing awareness of the importance of interpersonal communication within a religious institute would be indicated and suggested.

The research sample for this exploratory study consisted of 571 religious priests who were randomly selected from the 1,141 religious priests who were cited as being residents within the boundaries of the Catholic Archdiocese
of Chicago. Three-hundred-and-thirty (330) responded to the questionnaire mailed to them. Three-hundred-and-seventeen (317) questionnaires were found as usable, yielding a response rate of 55.51 per cent. The age of the Ss ranged from 27 to 86 years.

The procedure was as follows: a questionnaire tested and refined by means of a pilot study was sent to all of the randomly selected Ss. Through the questionnaire, the information of six main characteristics and ten secondary characteristics was gathered. The six main characteristics were: "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute", "friendship within his religious institute", "loneliness", "problems coping with celibacy", "desire to marry", and "retention in his religious institute". The ten secondary characteristics were: "age", "family tension", "individual need for interpersonal communication", "faith", "identity as religious", "years in religious life", "education", "community size", "training in interpersonal communication", and "satisfaction in religious life". The obtained data were analyzed through Pearson product moment correlation coefficients and linear regression coefficients and were processed by an IBM 360 Model 65 computer.

The hypotheses were as follows:

The general hypothesis of the study set forth that the perceived level of interpersonal communication within a
a given religious institute has an effect on whether a religious will remain in his religious institute or leave.

The specific hypotheses were as follows:

1. There will be a strong positive correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "friendship within his religious institute."

2. There will be a strong positive correlation between "friendship within his religious institute" and "retention in his religious institute."

3. There will be a strong negative correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "loneliness."

4. There will be a strong negative correlation between "perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute" and "desire to marry."

5. There will be a strong positive correlation between "loneliness" and "desire to marry."

6. There will be a strong negative correlation between "loneliness" and "retention in his religious institute."

7. There will be a strong negative correlation between "desire to marry" and "retention in his religious institute."

The results showed that:

(a) the perceived level of interpersonal communication within a given religious institute had a moderate effect
on whether a religious will state that he will remain in his religious institute or leave ($r = .25$; beta = .15);

(Note that the results in this section are based on the expanded model as found on Table 24 and Figure 7.)

(b) there was a strong positive relationship between perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and friendship within his religious institute ($r = .79$);

(c) there was a significant positive correlation between friendship within his religious institute and retention in his religious institute ($r = .20$);

(d) there was a strong negative relationship between perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and loneliness ($r = -.45$);

(e) there was no significant negative correlation between perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute and desire to marry ($r = -.04$);

(f) there was no significant positive relationship between loneliness and desire to marry ($r = .08$);

(g) there was a significant negative correlation between loneliness and retention in his religious institute ($r = -.24$); and

(h) there was a significant negative correlation between desire to marry and retention in his religious institute ($r = -.31$). Thus, besides the general hypothesis,
hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 6 and 7 were confirmed whereas hypotheses 4 and 5 were not supported in a significant way by this study.

The linear regression analysis between the six main variables and the two qualified secondary variables (identity as religious and years in religious life) showed that identity as religious, perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute, and years in religious life had a direct positive impact upon retention in his religious institute. Problems coping with celibacy and loneliness had a negative direct influence upon retention in his religious institute. The order of importance was the following: identity as religious (beta = .39), problems coping with celibacy (beta = -.16), perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute (beta = .15), years in religious life (beta = .14), and loneliness (beta = -.12). Friendship within his religious institute and desire to marry did not show a direct significant influence upon retention in his religious institute.

Limitations of this Study

This study was exploratory. To the knowledge of this writer, there were no explicit studies done to investigate the level of interpersonal communication within a Roman Catholic male religious institute. There was also no in-
strument available which could have been used to measure the level of interpersonal communication. Both the "Communication Skills Scale" (Connolly, 1970) used at the Communication Center at St. Louis\(^1\) and the scale developed by Carkhuff (1969) for assessing discrimination were not usable for the purpose of this study.\(^2\) Thus an instrument had to be developed.

The second part of the instrument was purposely made up of loaded statements in order to discriminate more effectively than was done in the pilot study as well as to shorten the instrument without losing any information needed. Some of the respondents, however, resented those loaded statements. Several others complained that the instrument was too lengthy. Both points had somewhat negative influences on the outcome. A third negative influence was exercised by coding the questionnaires of the first mailing which was interpreted as non-confidential by quite a few recipients who either reacted by not answering the questionnaire or by complaining about it in written or oral form. Uncoded questionnaires would supposedly have had a greater response rate, but would have cost more.

\(^1\)Carney, E., Co-director of Communication Center #1 in St. Louis, Mo., by written correspondence.

Conclusions

The results of this study indicated that the resignation rate of religious from their religious institutes is not increasing. Less than 2 per cent of the religious priests surveyed stated that they either definitely or probably would leave their religious institute. (cf. Table 15). As this study was concerned with retention within his religious institute and not with retention within the active ministry as such -- the active ministry was thought of a greater value than membership in a given religious institute -- it can be assumed that the resignation rate would have been even less when the same religious priests would have been asked whether or not they would remain in the active ministry. It seems that the resignation process had reached its peak in the late sixties and earlier seventies. This does not, of course, change the fact that religious institutes will most probably experience further decline in membership due to an imbalance between death rate and joining of new members.

Those religious who were most likely to remain in their religious institutes were those who stated that they know who they are, who they are supposed to be, and what their role is as religious. They were those who are convinced that their personal vocation is to be a religious (r of identity as religious = .59). Those men reported that they were able to establish meaningful relationships or friendships within their religious institutes (r = .33),
experienced satisfaction in religious life ($r = .29$), spent a fair amount of time in prayer ($r_{\text{of faith}} = .26$), and perceived the level of interpersonal communication within their own religious institute as being high ($r = .24$). (Cf. Table 21 and Figure 7 for the given results in this section.)

Men who declared they know who they are had less problems coping with celibacy ($r = -.44$) and less desire to marry ($r = -.21$). It should be mentioned that neither chronological age ($r = .16$), nor years in religious life ($r = .08$), nor education ($r = .04$), nor loneliness ($r = -.16$) had a significant relationship with identity as religious. Identity as religious, in other words, did not seem to be the natural product of years lived or spent in religious life, nor the outcome of education, nor was it much influenced by the degree of experienced loneliness.

Friendship within his religious institute, however, and the quality of those relationships, together with a reasonable amount of time spent in prayer and satisfaction, had, as we have mentioned above, a positive relationship with identity as religious. To strengthen either side means to increase the probability that a religious will remain in his religious institute. Further, the stronger the identity as religious will be, the less problems with celibacy and the less desire to marry might be expected. If someone asks how to increase identity as religious and thus retention in his religious institute, one could answer by en-
couraging friendship and prayer life. Friendship, in its turn, could be best helped by an atmosphere which furthers genuine and meaningful interpersonal communication.

Religious who were most likely to state that they will remain in their religious institutes were those who also perceived the level of interpersonal communication within their own religious institutes as high ($r = .22$). The quality of the experienced relationships within a given religious institute did not only improve meaningful relationships ($r = .76$), as it was mentioned above, but also influenced a religious' decision to remain in his religious institute both in a direct (beta = .15) and an indirect positive way. Namely, it seemed to decrease loneliness (beta = -.19), which had a negative direct influence upon retention in his religious institute (beta = -.12) and thus strengthened retention. The better the climate of interpersonal relationships within a given religious institute, the more meaningful relationships seem to be possible, the less loneliness will be experienced, and the stronger retention is likely to become. Again, if someone asks how to increase the degree of retention, one could answer by improving interpersonal communication within a religious institute.

Years in religious life were also a strong indicator whether or not a religious will remain in his religious institute ($r = .29$; beta = .14). The longer a person had
been in religious life the more likely he was to state that he will remain in his religious institute and the less he had problems with celibacy ($r = -.19$; beta $= -.25$) or a desire to marry ($r = -.25$; beta $= -.21$). These findings seem to be more or less natural. Therefore, years in religious life as such do not offer much help if one asks how to increase the retention rate because the problem is not the amount of years but the quality of life which motivates a person to invest himself in a given life style.

Religious who were most likely inclined towards leaving their religious institutes were those with problems coping with celibacy ($r = -.39$). Those problems played the greatest negative part regarding retention in his religious institute (beta $= -.16$). Problems coping with celibacy which seemed to be increased by the amount of loneliness experienced (beta $= .6$), was the most powerful factor toward an increase in the desire to marry (beta $= .47$). Thus, if someone asks how to diminish problems coping with celibacy and thus to increase retention, one could say both by improving the quality of interpersonal communication and by increasing friendship within a given religious institute which, in turn, will most probably result in a direct decrease of loneliness and an indirect decrease of problems coping with celibacy. An open atmosphere and meaningful interpersonal relationships seem to help both to reduce problems regarding celibacy and to strengthen retention within a given religious institute.
Religious who experienced a high degree of loneliness were less likely to state that they will remain in their religious institutes ($r = -.30; \beta = -.12$). Again, as it was stated above, both the level of interpersonal communication and friendship within his religious institute can probably be considered as the most powerful factors to decrease the degree of loneliness ($r = -.33$ and $r = -.44; \beta = -.19$ and $\beta = -.31$). Low quality of interpersonal communication and lack of meaningful interpersonal relationships or friendships will most probably increase the degree of loneliness. Thus, if one asks how to reduce the amount of loneliness, one could answer both by improving the quality of interpersonal communication and by encouraging meaningful relationships or friendships within a given religious institute.

In conclusion, one can say those religious who were most likely to state that they will remain in their own religious institutes were those who had a strong identity as religious ($r = .59; \beta = .39$), perceived the level of interpersonal communication within their own religious institutes as being high ($r = .22; \beta = .15$) and spent many years in religious life ($r = .29; \beta = .14$). Those religious who were most inclined to state they might leave their religious institutes were those with a greater amount of problems coping with celibacy ($r = -.39; \beta = -.16$) and those who experienced a great deal of loneliness ($r = -.30$;
Whereas family tension ($r = .09$), individual need for interpersonal communication ($r = .08$), education ($r = .05$), training in interpersonal communication ($r = -.06$) and community size ($r = .12$) seemed to have less of an important impact upon retention in his religious institute than the previously-mentioned factors, interpersonal communication within a given religious institute proved to be helpful for strengthening retention in his religious institute both directly ($r = .22$; beta = .15) and indirectly. It lessened the amount of loneliness (beta = -.19) and improved interpersonal relationships (beta = .76). To improve the quality of interpersonal communication means, most probably, to increase the retention rate. Friendship, in its turn, will most likely help to reduce the degree of loneliness (beta = -.31) and through loneliness will have an impact upon problems coping with celibacy and thus an indirect positive influence upon retention. Again, to improve and to encourage friendship seems to be a positive means to strengthen retention of a religious within his religious institute.

**Recommendations**

The vital part identity as religious played in this research leads to the obvious conclusion that identity as religious should be considered carefully. A three-fold investigation into this phenomenon seems to be appropriate,
i.e., a psychological, sociological and spiritual or theological. What makes a religious state that he has an identity? How did he arrive at his identity? What helped him to achieve identity? How is he different from colleagues who do not have such an identity? What kind of a personality does such a person have? What does identity specifically mean to such a person? With whom does such a person identify himself? And is such a religious the type of person with whom, for example, the youth of today is willing to identify? Such questions might well be further examined.

As previously mentioned, age, years in religious life, community size, family tension, education, training in interpersonal communication, individual need for interpersonal communication, and loneliness did not interact with identity as religious in a crucial or significant way. Friendship within his religious institute, satisfaction in religious life, faith, and perceived level of interpersonal communication within his religious institute had a positive impact upon identity as religious in the order listed. Problems coping with celibacy and desire to marry had a negative impact. The relationship between problems coping with celibacy and identity as religious was the strongest one among both the positive and negative correlations and might also be further examined.

The areas of perceived level of interpersonal com-
munication within a given religious institute, friendship within his religious institute, and loneliness need to be examined further regarding both their mutual interactions and their relationships with identity as religious and problems coping with celibacy. It seems crucial that an open and growth nurturing atmosphere be provided to deal effectively with these problem areas. Rather than suppressing or denying the issues involved, this approach would serve to stabilize the retention rate by facing the issues and working through them in meaningful and responsible ways.
BIBLIOGRAPHY
BOOKS


Constitutiones et Regulae Congregationis Sacerdotum sub titulo Sanctissimi Redemptoris. Romae: Sumptibus Domus Generalitiae, 1936.


**PAMPHLETS**


**PERIODICALS**


Brothers Newsletter, Editor's Comment, 1974, 16, 2(Summer), 4.


Dulles, A. The Church is communications. International Documentation on the Contemporary Church, 1971, 6, 68-82.


Moran, G. Revelation is in all our relationships. *New Catholic World*, 1973, 216, 100-103.


Pompilo and Krebs, R. A time-limited group experience with a religious teaching order. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 1972, 2, 139-152.


Wilson, R. To stay or not to stay. National Catholic Reporter, January 10, 1975, 7; 14.
UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL


Rogers, C. The person of tomorrow. Center for Studies of the Person, La Jolla, California.

Rogers. Some elements of effective interpersonal communication. Western Behavioral Sciences Institute, La Jolla, California.


November 14, 1974

Dear Colleagues:

I am currently working on my doctoral dissertation at Loyola University. My primary concerns are the prevailing atmosphere in religious communities and how to improve religious life.

I feel that interpersonal communication within a community has an effect on relationships in that community. The enclosed questionnaire attempts to deal with those subjects.

Since you are a religious, I would greatly appreciate your filling out the questionnaire and returning it to me in the envelope provided as soon as possible. Filling out the questionnaire will only take about half an hour of your time. If it is not possible for you to complete the questionnaire, could you please fill out the first part and return it to me? I can assure you that all information will remain confidential.

I am more than willing to share my findings if you would like.

Upon completion of the project in the United States, I hope to do cross-cultural studies in both Germany and Japan.

Sincerely,

Fr. Waldemar Kippe, CSSR
1444 West Glenlake Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60660
338-6064 or 670-3042

P.S. The enclosed postcard is in appreciation for your kindness. It is a souvenir from Tokyo, Japan where I did mission work for sixteen years.
QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON ANY SHEET.
PLEASE RESPOND FREELY AND FRANKLY.
THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.
PLEASE FILL IN THE BLANKS WHERE APPROPRIATE.
IN ALL OTHER QUESTIONS CIRCLE ONE CODE, UNLESS MORE THAN
ONE IS APPROPRIATE.
ANY FURTHER REACTIONS AND COMMENTS WOULD BE WELCOME. PLEASE NOTE
THEM ON THE FINAL BLANK SHEET WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE
WHOLE QUESTIONNAIRE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

PART I

1. Name of your religious order or congregation: ____________________________
   Please indicate also the initials of your order or congregation ________________

2. Age: __________

3. Are you a United States citizen? CIRCLE ONE CODE.
   01 Yes, U.S. born
   02 Yes, naturalized
   03 No. PLEASE SPECIFY: ____________________________

4. Number of years in religious life since you took your first vows or promises: ___

5. Status: 01 Priest 02 Other

6. At present you are the man in charge (superior) of your local community
   or province:
   01 Yes 02 No

7. In the past you have been the man in charge (superior) of one of your local
   communities or province:
   01 Yes 02 No

8. Total number of years you have served as the man in charge (superior) of
   one of your local communities or province: __________________

9. What is your present position? CIRCLE ONE.
   01 Pastor
   02 Associate Pastor
   03 Other. PLEASE SPECIFY: ____________________________
10. Highest educational degree you have obtained. PLEASE CIRCLE ONE.
    01 B.A., S.T.B. or equivalent
    02 M.A., S.T.L. or equivalent
    03 Ph.D., S.T.D., D.D., J.C.D. or equivalent
    04 Other

11. Are you currently engaged in any degree-program at any college or university? PLEASE CIRCLE ONE.
    01 None
    02 M.A. or equivalent
    03 Ph.D. or equivalent

12. To what extent do you feel you are utilizing your unique skills and abilities in your present assignment? CIRCLE ONE.
    01 Not at all
    02 Very little
    03 To some degree
    04 Very much
    05 Completely

13. How much time do you spend in prayer and meditation alone or with others including saying or attending mass on an average day? CIRCLE ONE.
    01 30 minutes or less
    02 Between 30 and 60 minutes
    03 Between 60 and 90 minutes
    04 Between 90 and 120 minutes
    05 More than 120 minutes

14. During the past two or three years how often have you experienced each of the following? CIRCLE ONE CODE ON EACH LINE.

   Often  Occasionally  Once  Never
   1. An overwhelming feeling of being at one with God or Christ.  04  03  02  01
   2. A deep feeling of being personally loved by Christ here and now.  04  03  02  01
3. A sense of being afraid of God.  

4. A feeling of being tempted by the devil.  

5. Felt as though you were very close to a powerful, spiritual force that seemed to lift you out of yourself.  

6. A feeling of being abandoned by God.  

7. Other. PLEASE DESCRIBE.  

---

15. Are there "shared prayers" in your local community? CIRCLE ONE.  

01 No  
02 Once a month  
03 Once a week  
04 Once a day  
05 Twice or more a day  

16. Do you have someone with whom you can discuss your faith life (spiritual director)? CIRCLE ONE.  

01 Yes  
02 No  

If your answer was "Yes", PLEASE CIRCLE ONE OF THE FOLLOWING. How often do you see this person?  

01 Once a week  
02 Once a month  
03 Once every three months  
04 Other. PLEASE DESCRIBE.  

17. Number of religious of your OWN order or congregation--including yourself--who live in the same residence (local community) with you:  

18. In addition to meal times, how much time do you spend socializing with members of your local community? CIRCLE ONE.  

01 60 minutes or more a day
19. In addition to meal times, how much time would you wish to spend for socializing with members of your local community? CIRCLE ONE.

01 More than one hour a day
02 One hour a day
03 Between 30 and 60 minutes a day
04 Between 15 and 30 minutes a day
05 15 minutes or less a day
06 One hour a week
07 Less than one hour a week
08 Never

20. Number of years you have been living in your present local community (residence): __________

21. Please rate your present local community (residence) in comparison to former community in regards to personal relationships. CHECK ONE.

01 Better
02 Same
03 Worse
04 Does not apply

22. What do you regard as an ideal number of members in a local community you would like to live with? PLEASE INSERT NUMBER. __________

23. Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your future in your religious order or congregation, in religious life as such, and in your priesthood? CIRCLE ONE CODE IN EACH COLUMN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY ORDER OR CONGREGATION</td>
<td>RELIGIOUS LIFE AS SUCH</td>
<td>PRIESTHOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely will not leave</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I probably will not leave</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am uncertain about my future</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I probably will leave</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely will leave</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. How do you evaluate your present life as a religious? Below is a set of descriptive opposites. First, DECIDE WHICH SIDE YOU AGREE WITH and then circle the point which reflects the strength of your agreement on each line. CIRCLE ONLY ONE CODE ON EACH LINE.

CIRCLE:  O--when you agree STRONGLY this way
         0--when you agree SOMEWHAT this way
         --when you agree only SLIGHTLY this way

1. Generally self-fulfilling 0 o . o 0 Generally self-negating
2. Intellectually frustrating 0 o . o 0 Intellectually satisfying
3. Emotionally satisfying 0 o . o 0 Emotionally retarding
4. Spiritually impairing 0 o . o 0 Spiritually enriching
5. Psychosexually healthy 0 o . o 0 Psychosexually unhealthy
6. Culturally narrowing 0 o . o 0 Culturally expanding

25. If you had the choice again, would you enter your religious order or congregation, religious life as such, or the priesthood? CIRCLE ONE CODE IN EACH COLUMN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MY ORDER OR CONGREGATION</td>
<td>RELIGIOUS LIFE AS SUCH</td>
<td>PRIESTHOOD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Every family is not only a whole unit, but a number of "two-somes (specific relationships between two family members)." For each of the following "two-somes" in the family in which you grew up, check the category which best describes the relationship. CIRCLE ONE IN EACH ROW. IF NO SUCH "TWO-SOME," CIRCLE "DOES NOT APPLY."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very tense and strained</th>
<th>Somewhat tense and strained</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat close and intimate</th>
<th>Very close and intimate</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mother and father</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother and me</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Father and me</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Are your parents or one parent still living? CIRCLE ONE.
   01 Yes, both living
   02 Yes, father living
   03 Yes, mother living
   04 No, both dead

If your answer was "YES", is your present relationship with your parent or parents helpful for being a religious? CIRCLE ONE.
   01 Very helpful
   02 Somewhat helpful
   03 Neutral
   04 Somewhat detrimental
   05 Very detrimental

28. Do you have brothers and sisters who are still living? CIRCLE ONE.
   01 Yes 02 No

If your answer was "Yes", is your present relationship with them helpful for your being a religious? CIRCLE ONE.
   01 Very helpful
   02 Somewhat helpful
   03 Neutral
   04 Somewhat detrimental
   05 Very detrimental

29. Do you have friends who presently encourage or influence you to be a religious? CIRCLE ONE.
   01 Yes 02 No

30. Indicate from among which of the following groups you presently get the most support to be a religious? CIRCLE ONE.
   01 Parent(s)
   02 Brothers and sisters and relatives
   03 Co-religious
   04 Other male religious or clergymen
   05 Religious sisters
31. Indicate from among which of the following groups you get the least support to be a religious? CIRCLE ONE.

01 Parent(s)
02 Brothers and sisters and relatives
03 Co-religious
04 Other male religious or clergymen
05 Religious sisters
06 Laymen
07 Laywomen

32. Please indicate whether or not you took a course or participated in a workshop in "Interpersonal Relations," "Interpersonal Communication," "Counseling," or in an "Encounter Group" or "Sensitivity Training," etc. CIRCLE ONE.

01 Yes 02 No

If your answer was "Yes," PLEASE CIRCLE AS MANY CODES AS APPROPRIATE AND INSERT HOW MANY TIMES YOU PARTICIPATED.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Relations or Interpersonal Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>COURSE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 _____ times</td>
<td>01 _____ times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling</strong></td>
<td>02 _____ times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encounter Group, Sensitivity Training or T Group</strong></td>
<td>03 _____ times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other. PLEASE SPECIFY.</strong></td>
<td>04 _____ times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Please complete the following statements as quickly as possible. Express your real feelings.

a. A friend ________________________________________

b. A religious ________________________________________

c. My local community ________________________________________

d. My best friend ________________________________________
e. My community at large (province) ____________________________

______________________________
f. The person who understands me best ____________________________

______________________________
PART II

PLEASE NOTE.
ALL OF THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS CAN BE ANSWERED BY DRAWING A CIRCLE AROUND ONE OF THE NUMBERS "ONLY" IN THE RIGHT HAND MARGIN FOLLOWING EACH STATEMENT. DISREGARD THE VALUE OF NUMBERS IN RESPONDING. THEY ARE FOR ANALYSIS. AVOID MARKING "UNCERTAIN" IF POSSIBLE.

THE NUMBERS INDICATE THE FOLLOWING:

5 = Strongly agree
4 = Agree somewhat
3 = Uncertain
2 = Disagree somewhat
1 = Strongly disagree

EXAMPLE:
Most religious of today in the United States wear their habits whenever they appear in public.

5 4 3 2 1

IF YOU CHANGED YOUR CHOICE IN MARKING BE SURE TO ERASE OR TO SCRATCH IT OUT COMPLETELY.

EXAMPLE: 5 3 2 1

1. I don't feel free to talk about my personal problems in my local community.

2. The residence (local community) where I live is a place where I can relax, be myself, entertain if I wish and share with my co-religious as well as with others.

3. I have a clear idea of what I as a religious of today am supposed to be and to do.

4. The lack of a really close friendship within my religious community at large (province), for me, would be a very strong reason for leaving my order or congregation.

5. Within my local community there is an on-going process of searching for, elaborating and clarifying common goals and values.

6. I want very much to have a more honest communication within my local community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My local community members actually understand me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Within my local community I have a real need for a fellow religious with whom I can talk just for fun once in a while.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I have a great need for sharing my goals and values with my local community members.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Essentially my local community is a democratic group. The good ideas of the members are recognized, accepted and welcomed.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I feel that it is very important for a religious to have a special friend within his local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>It is very hard to get to know people in my local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I have little chance to influence policies and decisions that affect my work within my local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Within my community at large (province), I have a great need for a fellow religious I can talk to, and who is willing to listen to me and my problems.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I actively encourage boys to enter religious life.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My local community members make a great effort to listen to me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I have a great need to talk freely about important and controversial issues within my local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Within my community at large (province), I have a fellow religious who is willing to talk to me just for fun once in a while.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I am very lonely.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My local community members avoid each other.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I have a chance to share in actual decision-making in my local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I have a great need for a special friendship within my local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Within my community at large (province), I have a fellow religious I can talk to, and who is willing to listen to me and my problems.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Most of the religious who left our order or congregation did so because they could not find or establish meaningful close relationships within our order or congregation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I am happy today as a religious.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Essentially my community at large (province) is a democratic group. The good ideas of the members are recognized, accepted and welcomed.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel that it is very important for a religious to have a special friend within his community at large (province).</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I am always informed about on-going activities within my local community.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am convinced that being a religious is my personal vocation.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Within my community at large (province) I have a great need for a fellow religious with whom I can talk just for fun once in a while.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I have plenty of opportunities to try out my own ideas within my local community.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>The group of persons among whom I find it most difficult to make close friends--people I feel free to talk with about personal things--is my local community.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>For most members of my local community, the desire to marry is a serious problem.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>My local community members never make an attempt to share their values and goals with each other.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Regardless of their personal qualities, I tend to discourage boys from entering my religious order or congregation now and advise them to wait until the future is more certain.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Within my local community I feel a real need for a fellow religious I can talk to, and who is willing to listen to me and my problems.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I want to talk with my local community members not only if there is a serious problem, but also just for mere fun.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Within the next six months I seriously intend to get some training in order to relate better with my local community members.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>My local community is too large in numbers to allow development of meaningful relationships among its members.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>There is a great lack of understanding among the members of my local community.</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. It is very hard to get to know people in my community at large (province).
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

42. The residence (local community) where I am living right now is more a dormitory or hotel with everyone living next door to each other, having little in common except living under the same roof.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

43. I talk freely about important and controversial community issues within my local community.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

44. I would like very much for my local community members to talk more with each other rather than watch TV programs.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

45. My community at large (province) takes good care of my physical and health needs.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

46. There is a poor communication between the members of my community at large (province).
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

47. There is a great lack of caring among the members of my community at large (province).
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

48. Loneliness within my religious order or congregation would be a very strong reason for me to leave my religious order or congregation.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

49. I talk with my local community members not only if there is a serious problem, but also just for mere fun.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

50. I have a special friend within my community at large (province).
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

51. My local community members don't try hard to get into meaningful conversations with each other.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

52. Within my local community everything is done too hurriedly to allow the establishment of meaningful and deep personal relationships.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

53. Most of the religious who left our order or congregation did so because they had a strong desire to get married.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

54. I always get constructive help in my local community when I make a mistake.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

55. I have little change to feel that I've accomplished something within my local community.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

56. There are many close relationships within my local community.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1

57. I think that the current apostolic works of my local community are relevant and are truly meeting the needs of the people.
   SA: 5  AU: 4  UD: 3  SD: 2  1
58. Most of the members of my local community are very lonely.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

59. My local community members don't listen to each other.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

60. There is a great lack of caring among my local community members.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

61. I no longer want to discuss the values and goals of my religious order or congregation because our rules are up-to-date.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

62. My local community is friendly, fully accepts me as a person, and gives me a sense of belonging.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

63. My local community members like to talk with each other very much.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

64. Celibacy is a great problem for me.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

65. I am very happy with my present work as a religious.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

66. My local community takes good care of my physical and health needs.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

67. Many times I would like to talk to one of my local community members, but seeing him watching TV, I don't feel free to start a conversation.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

68. The group of persons among whom I find it most difficult to make close friends--people among whom I feel free to talk about personal things--is my community at large (province).  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

69. I have plenty of opportunities to try out my own ideas within my community at large (province).  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

70. My educational needs are being met within my religious order or congregation.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

71. Most members of my local community lack a clear idea of what a religious of today is supposed to be and to do.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

72. I have a chance to share in actual decision-making in my community at large (province).  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

73. Avoiding conflicts is more important in my local community than talking over problems.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

74. I have a great need and want to talk freely about my personal problems with my local community members.  
   SA | A | U | D | SD 
   5  | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Within my local community I have a fellow religious I can talk to, and who is willing to listen to me and my problems.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>My community at large (province) is friendly, fully accepts me as a person, and gives me a sense of belonging.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>I have a special friend within my local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Most of the religious who left our order or congregation did so because they were very lonely.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Even if I left my religious order or congregation I am sure that at least two fellow religious of my community at large (province) would still keep in contact with me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>I think the current apostolic works of my community at large (province) are relevant and are truly meeting the needs of the people.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>I have little chance to feel that I have accomplished something within my community at large (province).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Within my local community there are plenty of opportunities to discuss frustrations and difficulties.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Most of the religious who left our order or congregation did so because they had difficulties remaining celibate.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>There is poor communication between my local community members.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>I would like very much to have my local community members reach out more to me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>The desire to marry is no problem at all for me.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>There is not enough reward and recognition given for doing good work in my local community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>I no longer get the satisfaction I previously had from being a religious.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>I want very much for my local community members to try harder to understand what I am saying.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>I would like very much to have my local community members reach out more to each other.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>My present amount of work is a great hindrance towards socializing with my local community members.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
92. My local community members trust each other very much.

93. There is a great lack of real close relationships within my community at large (province).

YOUR COMMENTS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION AND KINDNESS.
APPENDIX II

SOURCES OF DATA OF THE CHARACTERISTICS
The sources of the data in the questionnaire for the six main and ten secondary characteristics defined in Chapter III will be presented here. The sequence of the characteristics will be the same as in Chapter III.

1. **PERCEIVED LEVEL OF INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION WITHIN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE**

**Source:** The index was arranged from Question 1, 5, 6, 7, 16, 20, 28, 34, 40, 43, 51, 54, 59, 63, 73, 82, 84, 89, 90, and 92 of Part II.

The response categories were: Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.

1. I don't feel free to talk about personal problems in my local community.

5. Within my local community there is an on-going process of searching for, elaborating and clarifying common goals and values.

6. I want very much to have a more honest communication within my local community.

7. My local community members actually understand me.

16. My local community members make a great effort to listen to me.

20. My local community members avoid each other.

28. I am always informed about on-going activities within my local community.

34. My local community members never make an attempt to share their values and goals with each other.

40. There is a great lack of understanding among the members of my local community.

43. I talk freely about important and controversial community issues within my local community.

51. My local community members don't try hard to get into meaningful conversations with each other.
54. I always get constructive help in my local community when I make a mistake.

59. My local community members don't listen to each other.

63. My local community members like to talk with each other very much.

73. Avoiding conflicts is more important in my local community than talking over problems.

82. Within my local community there are plenty of opportunities to discuss frustrations and difficulties.

84. There is poor communication between my local community members.

89. I want very much for my local community members to try harder to understand what I am saying.

90. I would like very much to have my local community members reach out more to each other.

92. My local community members trust each other very much.

2. FRIENDSHIP WITHIN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

Source: The index was constructed from Question 12, 32, 39, 52, 75, 77, 79, and 85 of Part II. The response categories were as follows:

Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.

12. It is very hard to get to know people in my local community.

32. The group of persons among whom I find it most difficult to make close friends—people I feel free to talk about personal things—is my local community.

39. My local community is too large in numbers to allow development of meaningful relationships among its members.

52. Within my local community everything is done too hurriedly to allow the establishment of meaningful and deep personal relationships.

75. Within my local community I have a fellow religious I can talk to, and who is willing to listen to me and my problems.

77. I have a special friend within my local community.

79. Even if I left my religious order or congregation I am sure that at
least two fellow religious of my community at large (province) would still keep in contact with me.

85. I would like very much to have my local community members reach out more to me.

3. LONELINESS

Source: The index was constructed from Question 19 of Part II. The response categories were as follows: Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.

19. I am very lonely.

4. PROBLEMS COPING WITH CELIBACY

Source: The index was built from Question 64 of Part II. The response categories were as follows: Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.

64. Celibacy is a great problem for me.

5. DESIRE TO MARRY

Source: The index was constructed from Question 86 of Part II. The response categories were as follows: Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.

86. The desire to marry is no problem at all for me.

6. RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

Source: The index was constructed from one item of Question 23 of Part I. The response categories were as follows: I definitely will not leave, I probably will not leave, I am uncertain, I probably will leave, and I definitely will leave.

23. Which of the following statements most clearly reflects your feelings about your future in your religious order or congregation, in reli-
gious life as such, and in your priesthood?

A. My order or congregation.

7. **AGE**

Source: The index was based on Question 2 of Part I.

2. Age.

8. **FAMILY TENSION**

Source: The index was constructed from Question 26 of Part I. The response categories were as follows: Very tense and strained, Somewhat tense and strained, Neutral, Somewhat close and intimate, Very close and intimate, and Does not apply.

26. Every family is not only a whole unit, but a number of "two-somes (specific relationships between two family members)." For each of the following "two-somes" in the family in which you grew up, check the category which best describes the relationship.

A. Mother and father.
B. Mother and me.
C. Father and me.

9. **INDIVIDUAL NEED FOR INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION**

Source: The index was constructed from Question 18 and 19 of Part I and from Question 9, 17, 37, 38, 49, 61, and 74 of Part II. The response categories for Question 18 of Part I were as follows: 60 minutes or more a day, Between 30 and 60 minutes a day, Less than 30 minutes a day, One hour or more a week, Less than one hour a week, and Never. The response categories for Question 19 of Part I were as follows: More than one hour a day, One hour a day, Between 30 and 60 minutes a day, Between 15 and 30 minutes a day, 15 minutes or less a day, One hour a week, Less than one hour a week, and Never. The response categories for the seven questions
of Part II were as follows: Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.

18. (Part I). In addition to meal times, how much time do you spend socializing with members of your local community?

19. (Part I). In addition to meal times, how much time would you wish to spend for socializing with members of your local community?

9. I have a great need for sharing my goals and values with my local community members.

17. I have a great need to talk freely about important and controversial issues within my local community.

37. I want to talk with my local community members not only if there is a serious problem, but also just for mere fun.

38. Within the next six months I seriously intend to get some training in order to relate better with my local community members.

49. I talk with my local community members not only if there is a serious problem, but also just for mere fun.

61. I no longer want to discuss the values and goals of my religious order of congregation because our rules are up-to-date.

74. I have a great need and want to talk freely about my personal problems with my local community members.

10. **FAITH**

Source: The index was constructed from Question 13 of Part I. The response categories were as follows: 30 minutes or less, Between 30 and 60 minutes, Between 60 and 90 minutes, Between 90 and 120 minutes, and More than 120 minutes.

13. How much time do you spend in prayer and meditation alone or with others including saying or attending Mass on an average day?

11. **IDENTITY AS RELIGIOUS**

Source: The index was constructed from Question 3 and 29 of Part II. The response categories were as follows: Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.
3. I have a clear idea of what I as a religious of today am supposed to be and to do.

29. I am convinced that being a religious is my personal vocation.

12. **YEARS IN RELIGIOUS LIFE**

*Source:* The index was constructed from Question 4 of Part I.

4. Number of years in religious life since you took your first vows or promises.

13. **EDUCATION**

*Source:* The index was constructed from Question 10 of Part I.

10. Highest educational degree you have obtained.

   A. B.A., S.T.B. or equivalent.
   B. M.A., S.T.L. or equivalent.

14. **COMMUNITY SIZE**

*Source:* The index was constructed from Question 17 of Part I.

17. Number of religious of your OWN order or congregation—including yourself—who live in the same residence (local community) with you.

15. **TRAINING IN INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION**

*Source:* The index was made up from four items of Question 32 of Part I. The response categories were "Yes and No" and "How many times."

32. Please indicate whether or not you took a course or participated in a workshop in "Interpersonal Relations", "Interpersonal Communication", "Counseling", or in an "Encounter Group" or "Sensitivity Training", etc.

   A. Yes - No.
   B. Interpersonal Relations or Interpersonal Communication.
   C. Counseling.
   D. Encounter Group, Sensitivity Training or T Group.
16. **SATISFACTION IN RELIGIOUS LIFE**

The index was constructed from Question 12 and the six items of Question 24 of Part I, and Question 2, 10, 13, 21, 25, 31, 42, 55, 57, 60, 62, 65, 66, 70, 87, and 88 of Part II. The response categories were as follows: for Question 12 of Part I: Not at all, Very little, To some degree, Very much, and Completely; for Question 24 of Part I: Strongly agree this way, Somewhat agree this way, Slightly agree this way, and for the questions of Part II: Strongly agree, Agree somewhat, Uncertain, Disagree somewhat, and Strongly disagree.

12. (Part I). To what degree do you feel you are utilizing your unique skills and abilities in your present assignment?

24. (Part II). How do you evaluate your present life as a religious?

A. Generally selffulfilling - Generally self-negating.
B. Intellectually frustrating - Intellectually satisfying.
C. Emotionally satisfying - Emotionally retarding.
D. Spiritually impairing - Spiritually enriching.
E. Psychosexually healthy - Psychosexually unhealthy.
F. Culturally narrowing - Culturally expanding.

2. The residence (local community) where I live is a place where I can relax, be myself, entertain if I wish and share with my co-religious as well as with others.

10. Essentially my local community is a democratic group. The good ideas of the members are recognized, accepted and welcomed.

13. I have little chance to influence policies and decisions that affect my work within my local community.

21. I have a chance to share in actual decision-making in my local community.

25. I am happy today as a religious.

31. I have plenty of opportunities to try out my own ideas within my local community.

42. The residence (local community) where I am living right now is more a dormitory or hotel with everyone living next door to each other, having little in common except living under the same roof.
55. I have little chance to feel that I've accomplished something within my local community.

57. I think that the current apostolic works of my local community are relevant and are truly meeting the needs of the people.

60. There is a great lack of caring among my local community members.

62. My local community is friendly, fully accepts me as a person, and gives me a sense of belonging.

63. I am very happy with my present work as a religious.

66. My local community takes good care of my physical and health needs.

70. My educational needs are being met within my religious order or congregation.

87. There is not enough reward and recognition given for doing good work in my local community.

88. I no longer get the satisfaction I previously had from being a religious.
APPENDIX III

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS REGARDING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DEPENDENT AND INDEPENDENT CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EXPANDED PATH DIAGRAM
### TABLE 25

**AGE BY RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>I definitely will not leave</th>
<th>I probably will not leave</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>I am uncertain about my future</th>
<th>I probably will leave</th>
<th>I definitely will leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 and over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(304)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>66-75</th>
<th>76 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total N**
(304)
TABLE 27

RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY AGE
(Per Cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>46-55</th>
<th>56-65</th>
<th>66-75</th>
<th>76 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N (304)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 28
YEARS IN RELIGIOUS LIFE BY RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Religious Life</th>
<th>I definitely will not leave</th>
<th>I probably will not leave</th>
<th>I am uncertain about my future</th>
<th>I probably will leave</th>
<th>I definitely will leave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 and over</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total N</strong></td>
<td><strong>204</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(300)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 29
RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY YEARS IN RELIGIOUS LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>1-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(300)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 30
RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY YEARS IN RELIGIOUS LIFE
(Per Cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>1-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.7a</td>
<td>95.5a</td>
<td>97.7a</td>
<td>94.9a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N (300)

a Less than one hundred per cent due to missing data, i.e., 17 Ss.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Perceived Level of Interpersonal Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N (307)
TABLE 32
RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY FRIENDSHIP
(Per Cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Friendship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N (266)

a Missing percentage due to missing data, i.e., 51 Ss.
TABLE 33
RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY LONELINESS
(Per Cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>&quot;I am very lonely.&quot;</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N
(292)
## TABLE 34

RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY CELIBACY
(Per Cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N (287)

"Celibacy is a great problem for me."
TABLE 35  
RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY DESIRE TO MARRY  
(Per Cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>&quot;The desire to marry is no problem at all for me.&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N  
(283)
TABLE 36

RETENTION IN HIS RELIGIOUS INSTITUTE BY IDENTITY
(Per Cent)

Identity combined from two statements, namely, "I have a clear idea of what I as a religious of today am supposed to be and to do," and "I am convinced that being a religious is my personal vocation."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retention in His Religious Institute</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will not leave</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will not leave</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably will leave</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely will leave</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N (288)
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