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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The contemporary scenes of educational unrest are unparalleled in the history of the United States. Throughout the last decade, front-page space in all printed news media has spoken of massive, at times violent protests and demonstrations on the part of angry, confused teachers. Sporadically, in various cities and states the work of the educational process has been paralyzed due to work stoppage by teachers. Today, we are in the midst of evolutionary and revolutionary changes in the education world to which collective activism on the part of teachers in public and private schools has contributed its share.

The practice of employee groups organizing for collective action, has a long history nationally and internationally. It is unnecessary in this paper to trace the path of labor unions from the medieval trade guilds to the highly-organized, powerful unions of the present day. It is sufficient to state that the teachers' collective action has had its genesis in the upsurge of public employees seeking greater recognition and more control over the conditions of work. Collective action of teachers in the public sector has grown out of, and is patterned after, the collective bargaining model that has developed in business and industry; for it is a model that has been tried, tested, and proven successful in obtaining gainful benefits for its members.¹

The American public is aware of the degree to which unionism and militancy have pervaded the teachers' organizations, but it has not been as cognizant of the fact that this situation is rapidly becoming of serious concern in the Catholic schools of this country. As there are very few studies of this situation in Catholic schools, this study proposes to examine the status of teacher collective action in the Catholic schools against the background of collective teacher action as it has developed in the public schools in the United States. No study of teachers in the Catholic schools can by-pass the fact that many of the issues and problems confronting the public school teacher bear a striking similarity to those faced by the Catholic educator. In addition, teachers in Catholic schools have a number of unique problems not experienced by their colleagues in the public schools. These problems will be dealt with in subsequent chapters.

A cursory look at the background and reasons for collective action amongst the teachers in the public schools can begin in the postwar years and on into the year 1962, which is designated as the year of teacher liberation. There was ample evidence, although somewhat nebulous at the time, of a growing restiveness, frustration, and discontent pervading the ranks of teachers. They were consistently being exploited by the public "which wanted quality education at bargain prices." By 1962, a number of teacher strikes erupted across the country, shocking the public. Of the 110 teachers' strikes listed

\[2\]

by the Bureau of Labor Statistics during this period, 91 of these were by public school teachers and 19 by teachers in private schools.³

The culmination of this restiveness resulted in the evolution of a new movement in education termed "professional negotiations"⁴ which heralded a new era in school-staff relationships. The movement had all the ingredients for controversy, emotionalism, and militancy. To understand this movement, it is necessary to understand something of what has been happening in recent years to the teaching profession, to public education, and to the temper of the nation as a whole. There is no simple cause nor single solution. The factors involved are exceedingly complicated; and, to some extent, have come from a constellation of several social-educational forces: the more aggressive teacher, the more democratic administrator, the more open school system, the more affluent economy, and the more activist society. Paradoxically, these very forces which would seem to make formal negotiation procedures less necessary have produced the opposite effect. Some of these forces will be presented here briefly.


⁴This term is used by the National Education Association in distinction to "collective bargaining" used by the American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO), a rival teacher organization.

The emphasis on professionalism rather than on labor laws is stressed as the crucial distinction between the two terms which in reality can be used interchangeably, and is throughout this paper. According to Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow in their book, Collective Negotiations for Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1966), p. 9, "Collective bargaining is regarded as a procedure inherently limited to 'bread and butter' issues, whereas professional negotiations is thought to involve a much broader range of teacher concerns. This view is questionable, since there is no inherent reason why collective bargaining must be limited in this way. . . . The scope of professional negotiations agreements reached thus far is about the same as the scope of agreements supposedly reached by collective negotiations."
Traditionally, communities in which teachers have worked have not held the teaching profession in high esteem either socially or economically. Waller in his chapter on "Teachers in the Community," attributed this fact to the stereotyped image of the teacher and to the fact that teachers have political weight only in the world of children and not in that of adults.

Nothing in the way schools are built or run suggests respect for teachers as teachers, or as human beings. After visiting a number of classrooms, John Goodlad concluded that the schools are "anything but the 'palaces' of an affluent society." They looked "more like the artifacts of a society that did not really care about its schools, a society that expressed its disregard by creating schools less suited to human habitation than its prisons." This is reflected not only in the physical plants and salaries paid to the teachers, but in the unflattering stereotypes of teachers portrayed in American literature, films, and TV programs.

In a study of occupational prestige conducted by the National Opinion Research Center, teaching ranked thirty-fifth from the top, just below the building contractor and just above the railroad engineer. The status problem mainly affects male teachers, the great majority of whom teach in secondary schools. For women, teaching is a highly prestigious occupation; indeed, teaching is a low-status and low-paying occupation for men in large part because of the fact that it traditionally has been dominated by women, and so is regarded as a female occupation.

---


7Ibid.
Men today make up more than 50 per cent of the teaching force in public secondary schools: 491,784 men and 423,291 women. Their numbers are still rising while the turnover in the profession as a whole is decreasing. In 1959-60, men totalled 27.6 per cent; in 1970-71, they total 32.7 per cent. Forty-three per cent of the men teachers have a master's degree compared to 24 per cent of the women; and in the age range from 25 to 30, there is also an absolute majority of men teachers.\(^8\)

The male teachers today have grown up in a new social and economic milieu. They have a different concept of their roles and rights as teachers than do their counterpart, female teachers.\(^9\) Women often look upon teaching as a respectable way of making a living until marriage or as an escape from boredom with household chores or as a second career to be pursued after the children have grown. They cannot be expected to look upon teaching as a lifetime commitment. On the other hand, men have a firmer commitment to teaching as a lifetime endeavor; and with greater expectation to remain as classroom teachers for the foreseeable future, it seems to follow that they should be more anxious than women to have a greater control over the conditions under which they work. In addition, many of them are family men whose salaries are needed to support rather than implement household incomes as is somewhat the case with women teachers. Being more aggressive by nature, more combative, more inclined to question or criticize than women, it is not surprising that men wanted to


formalize through organizational activities the working conditions and to place certain restrictions on the powers of administrators and school boards.10

Teachers' salaries, even though they have risen considerably in recent years, still remain near the bottom of the professional category. Just a few years ago, the beginning male teacher with a bachelor's degree received a starting salary of only $5,519 compared to the average starting salary of $7,836 earned by men, with a bachelor's degree, beginning work in other fields.11 An additional example can be given of a strike staged by public school teachers in the affluent Montgomery County, Maryland (a "bedroom" suburb of Washington, D. C.), in February, 1968, which won them a minimum starting salary of $6,340, with a maximum of $12,870 for an experienced teacher with a master's degree; while at the same time, the average household income in the County was $13,653.12

Whereas other government employee groups have remained close to local political power bases and have obtained steady, substantial salary increases, teachers, through their diffidence, have tended to maintain a professional aloofness. Although the American Federation of Teachers13 had been competing with the National Education Association14 for teacher members since 1916,

---


12Koob and Shaw, op. cit., p. 90.

13Hereinafter referred to as AFT.

14Hereinafter referred to as NEA.
relatively few teachers were willing to be identified with white collar unionism through membership in the organization. Over the years, then, teachers witnessed many unionized blue collar workers, both skilled and unskilled, bypass them in earning power.

Basic to the recent teacher upheaval is the fact that teachers today are better trained and more articulate than at any time before in American history. It is almost universal today to require that every teacher, regardless of the age level of his pupils, must have a bachelor's degree for initial teaching service in the elementary schools. Increasingly, more school districts are demanding the master's degree as a condition for employment of new teachers. At the end of World War II, not more than 35 per cent of the teachers in public schools held degrees. But in 1970, it is estimated that approximately 96 per cent held one or more degrees and that the average preparation of all public school teachers was about 5 years of college.15 These figures indicate clearly that the era for the typical teacher equipped "with meager general and liberal education and a bag of tricks," was over. The profile of the nation's teacher had changed as well as his outlook and posture. Yesterday's debilitating affect of paternalistic treatment was also over.

This upgraded competence has given teachers a feeling of self-confidence which will not permit them to be treated as subprofessionals as was prevalent in the past. The "new" teachers are younger and more willing to take chances in demanding changes which their more cautious predecessors had only

talked about. They are also more and more aware of society's increased expectations of public education and the unprecedented demand for excellence.

At a seminar held in New York in 1967, NEA President Elizabeth Koontz said that today's teacher is sufficiently frustrated and actively dedicated enough to do something about the many problems that stand in the way of successful efforts, be they problems of working conditions, staff relationships, or welfare of teachers.16

Kalkstein writes in a similar vein of the new breed of teachers:

A new generation of teachers is putting down the old rural idea and speaking out for its role in an urban society. They are revolting not against, but for--for recognition, for a new role, for a voice.17

This "new breed" of teachers is on the scene; but feel that many of the schools and institutions are headed by a "not so new" breed of antiquated and obsolete school administrators who seem to be the only ones having legitimate authority to make decisions. They want staff participation in decision-making. This factor is one of the major reasons why teachers throughout the United States have joined teachers' organizations. They realize the need to develop formal procedures for negotiations in order to have a voice in the development of educational policies. They resent creeping anonymity and the feeling that they are no more than cogs in a well-oiled bureaucratic machine or pawns in what they see as an economic and political game of chess.


One cannot overlook the fact that the American teachers have learned a lesson from the old-line labor unions, civil rights organizations, and even dissident students. For many years, they have admired and envied the effectiveness of the trade unions which have been organized for the purpose of promoting their interests within the law. They have seen the remarkable successes of their movement and have looked with considerable care at the methods by which they have achieved their results. They have also witnessed the amazing efficaciousness of organizations seeking to correct the evils of racial discrimination and of economic depression suffered by Negroes and other minorities. They have seen the rapidity of results in legislation which "direct-action" techniques of boycotts, demonstrations, and similar processes have achieved.

Teachers, identifying themselves as similarly lacking status, suffering financial difficulties, and denied a voice in determining their own fate, feel that strong methods seem to produce successes which the long-processes of polite petition and legislative lobbying do not attain as well, either in speed or in extensiveness.18

The aspirations of the two competing employee organizations, the AFT and the NEA, each with its own state and local affiliates, have contributed to the current restiveness of the educational enterprise. The AFT, with about 140,000 members had made militancy its keynote, had excluded administrators, and had leveled charges of "company-unionism" at the NEA, whose 1.1 million members included administrators as well as teachers. It succeeded in what

might never have come about through words alone: it forced the NEA to intensify its teacher-welfare efforts. Scores of "professional negotiation" agreements between local associations and boards of education were the direct result of the concessions and written contracts that AFT won for the New York teachers when they struck in 1961.19 "We provide the thrust and the NEA tries to take credit," claimed one of the AFT representatives, feeling that the union's aggressive efforts forced NEA to do likewise. Sanctions, on the other hand, are NEA's alternative to the strike, and they have proven effective in some states.

Actually, neither the goals nor the methods of the two organizations are very different. The NEA's substitution of "professional negotiations" for collective bargaining, its insistence that "sanctions" are professional and strikes are not, can be dismissed as semantic jokes. By 1971, the real differences between the two groups in terms of bargaining stance and tactics were fading fast. There is little observable differences between the two organizations' stated objectives and goals and the means used to attain them. "These days, both are equally tough."20

Whatever the final outcome may be regarding the two warring teachers organizations, they have served a number of useful purposes mainly that of enhancing the quality of education by upgrading the professional status of the teachers and by improving the conditions under which they work. They have also


"caused the total destruction of the past stereotype of the teacher as a genteel servant of the local board of education."\(^\text{21}\)

Finally, the history of legislation in this country cannot be discounted as another important factor in helping to bring about collective action amongst the public school teachers. As early as the 1800's, attempts were made by labor groups to organize teachers for the purpose of promoting the latter's interests, but the courts ruled such actions illegal by labelling them as "criminal conspiracy."\(^\text{22}\) It was not until 1935 when the Wagner Act, or the National Labor Relations Act, was passed which provided for the establishment of the National Labor Relations Board\(^\text{23}\) that labor's right to organize and bargain collectively was affirmed. In 1937, the United States Supreme Court found this legislation to be constitutional; however, public employees were not considered to be included, and as such did not have any rights of collective action.\(^\text{24}\)

Probably the most significant breakthrough came with President Kennedy's Executive Order 10988, issued in 1962, establishing the right of federal employees to organize and to negotiate with their employing units regarding personnel policies and working conditions. It authorized the intro-


\(^{22}\)Kinsella and Others, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 6.

\(^{23}\)Hereinafter referred to as NLRB.

\(^{24}\)Kinsella and Others, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 6.
duction of some of the major elements of collective bargaining in the federal service.\textsuperscript{25}

Although this order did not confer collective bargaining rights as understood in the context of private industry nor did it give federal employees the right to strike (in fact, it specified severe penalties for violation of the no-strike ban and the denial of recognition to organizations asserting this right), it did establish a pattern for the public employees to follow in seeking negotiation rights.\textsuperscript{26} Since the issuance of this order, organized labor has sought and obtained legislation in a number of states.

To date, the Catholic schools have not been as deeply involved in teacher unionism as have been the public schools. The Catholic schools, however, exist in the same society as the public schools; they are subjected to the same social trends, forces, and upheavals. Like the public schools, they are becoming more urbanized; they are being staffed with an increasing proportion of male teachers; and they are becoming increasingly laicized. Economic considerations weigh no less heavily on the minds of lay teachers in Catholic schools than they do on their public school associates. In short, there are no reasons why teachers in Catholic schools are not likely to become organized.

It is becoming more and more apparent that many factors point to a broad-scale unionization or an attempt at some sort of organization. This being a highly probable and most inevitable situation, a study of the present

\textsuperscript{25}\textsuperscript{25} Lieberman and Moskow, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 4; 493-502.

\textsuperscript{26}\textsuperscript{26} School Administrators View. \textit{...}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 16.
and prospective status of Catholic school collective activism in a large, metropolitan city, Chicago, provided a suitable topic for this dissertation. There were several reasons for this choice. First, Chicago is geographically at the nerve center of militant teacher action in both public and private secondary schools. Second, the strikes which took place in Catholic secondary schools in this city reached national prominence and one of them was the longest strike in the history of Catholic education. Finally, no such study of this area had been undertaken, and it is hoped that the present study will be of help to both those in administration of the secondary schools and those employed by the system.

The Purpose of the Study

Since collective negotiations is relatively a new situation in the Catholic school system, it was necessary to determine to what extent it really functioned in the Catholic schools, especially in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The purpose of the study reported in the subsequent pages was to research whatever data existed in the system on the subject as to the nature of the administrators and of the teachers, the dichotomy of lay and religious teachers, the attitudes of the entire teaching staff toward teacher organizations, the reasons for the existence of the organizations, the effects they have had thus far on teacher-administrator relationships, and the future of collective activism in the system.
The Research Instruments

The research instrument selected as the most practical means for carrying out this project was the questionnaire with structured and unstructured interviews supplementing it. The instrument was submitted to the faculty of the School of Education at Loyola University and was reviewed and accepted by three experienced and knowledgeable persons in the area under study.

It was realized that a long, detailed questionnaire for busy high school personnel would discourage response; yet, information as to the present and future of collective activity in Catholic schools of the Archdiocese was necessary. The research instrument is reproduced as Appendixes I, II, III of this dissertation.

Structured and unstructured interviews were used throughout the entire research period. In obtaining responses to the questionnaires, in soliciting unrecorded information about collective activity in the system, and in talking to people actively engaged in this type of work in the system, the unstructured interview was used very frequently. In making case studies of the schools which had been involved in strikes or in schools which had strong teachers' unions or associations, the structured form was used. This form is reproduced as Appendix IV.

Distribution and Sample

The questionnaires were sent out in May, 1970, to eighty-four high schools of the Archdiocese as listed in the Office of the Catholic School Board. Although anonymity and confidentiality were assured to each school, the schools were coded in order to provide a follow-up of those schools failing to
respond. This coding proved to be a saving factor in obtaining a sufficient number of responses. Accompanying the questionnaires was a letter explaining the purpose of the study, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to facilitate return. Regardless of size, facilities, or faculty, each of the schools received a questionnaire for the principal, one each for three lay teachers, and one each for three religious teachers, making a total of 588 questionnaires. The principals in each school were requested to select these teachers at random or by lot.

Due, perhaps, to poor timing or lack of time for busy administrators faced with the myriad tasks of bringing the school year to a close, the number of returns was about 40 per cent—a return deemed rather inadequate for this study. In July, therefore, telephone contacts were made to administrators who failed to respond. The results were negligible, and it was decided to wait the opening of schools in September.

With the passing of the early, busy weeks of the new school term, it became apparent that a personal visit would have to be made to each administrator from whom a response had not been received after the initial mailing or the subsequent telephone call. The visits were time-consuming but very revealing as administrators confessed to their reluctance to distribute the questionnaires to their staffs. Some of the comments made were: "We do not have any problems of this nature here and do not wish to give our staff ideas," "this questionnaire will rock the boat—it's dynamite," "our staff is content and not interested in unions," "the questions asked are too discriminatory; we have no division between the lay and religious faculty," "unions—it is a dirty word here," and so on and so forth.
Despite some of the discouraging, adverse encounters, a number of the administrators realized, or better understood, the real purpose of the study, and the final returns reached over 65 per cent. This was considered a good and representative sample to work with. The data were gathered and coded at an IBM computer center to facilitate analysis and to provide a basis for some possible correlation of data in the future.

**Dissertation Plan**

The study developed along three phases. In the first phase, a set of six hypotheses was drawn up from readings in current professional literature and from the opinions of men who had written or worked in the field of collective bargaining in Catholic schools.

The second phase evolved from an analysis of the questionnaires based upon the developed hypotheses. First of all, the questionnaires sought to obtain the composition and characteristics of the respondents. Secondly, an attempt was made to determine to what extent teachers' organizations existed in the secondary schools of the Chicago Archdiocese. Finally, the questionnaires yielded a response of the attitudes of the teachers toward each other, lay and religious, toward teacher organizations, the effects they have had thus far on staff relationships, and the possible direction these organizations and collective bargaining will take in the future.

In the third phase, case studies were made of four Archdiocesan high schools in which teacher strikes paralyzed the schools' function for a period of time. Since some of the principals and teachers involved in these strikes were still residents of the city or nearby areas, a structured interview was
developed to elicit their reactions to the teachers' organizations and the strikes. A sample of the interview form used can be found in Appendix IV.

Limitations of the Study

The problem of collective bargaining in Catholic schools is a new one, and in some cases unheard of in Catholic secondary schools throughout the nation. A great deal of evidence exists that points to a paucity of national research or written material on this problem in professional, Catholic literature. As a consequence, the responses made by the individuals were generally based either upon a limited knowledge or experience or upon no knowledge or experience with this problem. It would not be incorrect to assert that this is a general characteristic of the Catholic secondary schools across the country. Thus, at best, this dissertation can be considered only as an initial, pioneer study.

The study was limited to the secondary school administrators and teachers, lay and religious, in the geographic confines of the Archdiocese of Chicago. Some generalizations within the limits of sampling error were concluded about the collective activity of teachers in the secondary schools, but particularization about individual schools were avoided.

Data obtained through the use of a questionnaire are sometimes influenced by variables not anticipated. Although efforts were made to present a reliable research instrument and to insure content validity, such elements as the biases of the designer, the judges of the suitability of the instrument, and the language employed in the questions were bound to affect the results.
Furthermore, although a considerable number of interviews were taped, limitations of the study were inherent in the interview method itself. As so aptly put by Van Dalen, who states, "Many people are more willing to communicate orally than in writing, and therefore, will provide data more readily and fully in an interview than on a questionnaire." However, the interviewer can be influenced by the respondents' incidental comments, facial and bodily expressions, the inflections of the voice, and other mannerisms which can readily be misinterpreted.

It can be assumed that the responses reflect the true attitudes of the respondents. Nevertheless, stated and expressed attitudes are not necessarily true attitudes, particularly in issues such as the one undertaken in this study. They do carry an emotional overtone. While anonymity was assured, there was good reason to believe that some respondents were concerned that their responses would be identified. As a consequence, their answers were correct theoretically, but not the real ones personally.

In conclusion, it is anticipated that the conclusions and recommendations which will result from this study will be of use to all those who, in any way, may become involved in teachers' organizations or collective bargaining in the school system of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

---

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Administrators

Those persons, priests, brothers, sisters, or laymen who direct or manage the affairs of the Catholic secondary schools.

Archdiocese

An ecclesiastical unit or district which is under the jurisdiction of a Roman Catholic Archbishop or Cardinal.

Archdiocesan Secondary School

A secondary school which offers a program of studies approved by the state to the members of an archdiocese and is usually operated, supported, and controlled by the office of education of the archdiocese.

Attitudes

Systems into which the individual develops his cognitions, feelings, and action tendencies with respect to various things in his world, e.g., collective negotiations.

Collective Negotiations (Collective Bargaining; Professional Negotiations)

A method of determining conditions of employment by means of negotiations between representatives of the employee and the employer. The organization which represents the employees may be a professional association, a teachers' union, or a faculty senate or council.

Community Secondary School (Private)

A secondary school similar to an Archdiocesan high school which offers a program of studies approved by the state. It is usually founded, operated, and controlled by a religious order or community. Support is generally from tuition charges. Such a school is subject to the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of the archdiocese in which it is located.

Faculty Senate

A representative body of the total faculty of a Catholic secondary school which functions in an advisory or decision-making role in relationship to the administration of the school.
Grievance

A wrong, real or fancied, considered as ground for a complaint or a statement of dissatisfaction on the part of an individual or an organization with reference to management.

Grievance Procedure

A formal plan, specified in a collective agreement, which provides for the adjustment of grievances through discussions at progressively higher levels of authority in management and the employee organization, usually culminating in arbitration if necessary.

Impasse

A deadlock reached after a reasonable period of good-faith negotiation and which the parties are unable to resolve without "outside" assistance.

Lay Faculty Members (Lay Teachers)

Male or female teachers in a Catholic secondary school who are not members of a religious order or congregation or priests and, therefore, are members of the laity.

Mediator

A third party who attempts to bring together the parties in a dispute. A mediator usually has no power to force a settlement, but suggests compromise solutions.

National Catholic Educational Association (NCEA)

A voluntary organization comprised of educational institutions and individuals who are interested in Catholic education. The association aims to serve as a voice and forum for Catholic education.

National Labor Relations Board (NLRB)

Agency created by the National Labor Relations Act (1935) and continued through subsequent amendments. The functions of the Board are to define appropriate bargaining units, to hold elections to determine whether a majority of workers want to be represented by a specific union or no union, to certify unions to represent employees, to interpret and apply the Act's provision prohibiting certain employer and union unfair practices, and otherwise to administer the provisions of the Act.
No-Strike Clause

A provision of a contract in which an individual or organization agrees not to strike for the duration of the contract.

Parochial Secondary School

A school, similar to a diocesan secondary school, which offers a program of studies approved by the state and is usually operated, supported, and controlled by the pastor or by the pastors of a group of parishes for the members of the parish or parishes.

Picketing

Patrolling, usually near the place of employment, by members of the employee organization to publicize the existence of a dispute, persuade employees and the public to support the strike.

Recognition

The employer's acceptance of an organization as authorized to negotiate, usually for all members of a negotiating unit.

Religious Faculty Members (Religious Teachers)

Priests, brothers and sisters who are members of religious orders or congregations or of the diocesan clergy and serve as members of the faculty of Catholic secondary schools.

Strike

A concerted stopping of work or a withdrawing of workers' services so as to compel an employer to accede to workers' demands or in protest against terms or conditions imposed by an employer.

Union

An organization of workers formed to advance the interests of the workers particularly with respect to wages and working conditions, as a trade union or labor union.

United States Catholic Conference

Formerly known as the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC). An agency of the archbishops and bishops of the United States to organize, unify, and coordinate Catholic activities for the general welfare of the Catholic Church. Its secretariat headquarters is in Washington, D. C.
The American Catholic schools today constitute a large, important, but little-known educational system. At the present time, it is the largest sector of American private education. If little has been known of the history of this important educational system, still less has been written about the details which govern and regulate the system. Recently, two eminent sociologists referred to "the abominable state of data collection in American Catholicism: what information is gathered is usually inaccurate and always incomplete." ¹ Catholics and non-Catholics alike have relied largely on isolated experiences with one or two schools plus a combination of rumor, anecdotal evidence, and in some cases prejudice, as their sources of information.

Within the last decade, however, models and concepts of the American Catholic school system have been hotly debated and seriously questioned among Catholics. Under fire were the goals and functions of the schools, the financial problems besetting the schools, the rapid urbanization and laicization of the schools, and the problems of lay-religious teachers within the schools. Federal and state governments have also contributed to these arguments when local Catholic groups have appealed to the state legislatures for financial

support for their schools. The discussions have been hindered, but not quieted, by the dearth of basic, factual information about the American Catholic schools.

An outgrowth of these debates and discussions have resulted in a number of studies, articles, and books which have concerned themselves primarily with providing some helpful information about the issues related to Catholic schools. These publications have given answers to many questions regarding Catholic education; and in the words of one writer, they provided a long-overdue look into all those schools which seem to be found on every second corner in cities such as New York, Chicago, and Boston, but have somehow managed to remain as mysterious as Hindu temples to the millions of Americans who pass them every day.2

On the current problem of collective negotiations in Catholic elementary and secondary schools, there are no formal studies or research recorded. Several meetings of Catholic educators throughout the nation have suggested studies of this nature to identify attitudes within the system and to suggest directions for those concerned. In November, 1967, a Symposium on Catholic education, held in Washington, D. C., under the sponsorship of the National Catholic Education Association,3 sparked the idea for collective negotiations by suggesting that there be "direct negotiation of salary scales and other contractual conditions between educational administrators and individual members of religious communities."4


3Hereinafter referred to as NCEA.

Another major public conference sponsored by the Education Department of the United States Catholic Conference\textsuperscript{5} was held in Washington, March 17-19, 1968. Superintendents and major religious superiors were invited from all parts of the country to discuss collective negotiations in Catholic schools. The important issue was not the advisability of accepting collective bargaining --this was accepted as a reality for the parochial school--"but its best form for church-related schools." There was no question of the right to bargain, "but the precise role of religious in any form of collective representation."\textsuperscript{6} One of the recommendations made at this Conference asked that the "USCC encourage and sponsor studies of the position of religious in the lay teacher union or association picture. This is a key problem and a difficult one to resolve."\textsuperscript{7}

During the last few annual NCEA conventions, attention of its membership in several sessions has been focused on collective bargaining in Catholic schools and the particular role of the religious faculty members in such negotiations.

It is the purpose of this chapter to review some of the books, studies, articles, and reports which resulted from these significant events, especially as they apply to the various aspects of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{5}Hereinafter referred to as USCC.


One of the most comprehensive publications, especially as it relates to Catholic schools, was written by Father Robert Reicher, a veteran labor mediator and an outstanding authority on labor-management problems. According to him, teachers' unions, teacher associations, and faculty senates are in operation in church-related schools; yet, a power vacuum exists among the faculties since there is no nationwide or region-wide bargaining agent nor is there a mass union movement among parochial school teachers. The educational world has witnessed the aggressive work of the AFT and its affiliated groups within the schools during the last few years, and it is possible that eventually they may become interested in the Catholic school system. At present, however, the demands on their finances, on their organizing skills and personnel are so great in the public schools that they cannot really mount a major organizing drive in the private school systems.

I would also say that the union has not yet understood nor developed an approach to the religious faculty members of our school systems. I do not say this in criticism because I am a long supporter of the labor movement, including the AFT, but this crucial problem of religious representation has not been carefully considered by the AFT.

Professional associations of teachers in Catholic school systems have only recently been established. The major professional association for teachers and administrators in church-related schools, the NCEA, has not as yet engaged in any bargaining process as have the NEA or the AFT for teachers in public schools. The faculty senates and local teacher associations are as diversified and independent as the number of secondary schools in existence.

---

8 Reicher, op. cit., p. 11.

9 Conference Report, ... op. cit., p. 2.
While no clear and universally accepted pattern has developed in the Catholic school system and regardless of what form of bargaining is chosen, associations and unions will increase pressure on school management in the foreseeable future. The very demands and climate of the times make this inevitable. Before collective bargaining, as it is known in the public sector, comes into being, experimentation and development will be necessary.

Regarding the present legal status of collective bargaining in Catholic schools, E. Riley Casey10 spells out the current federal and state laws, as well as the operation of labor relation statutes. On the federal level, the NLRB has not exerted jurisdiction over Catholic schools because their activities are "noncommercial and intimately connected with charitable and educational purposes."11 Thus, federal law does not directly regulate labor-management relations in parochial schools.

State laws governing labor relations exist in fourteen states and one territory. While they protect the rights of employees to organize into unions and to engage in collective bargaining, a number of the states expressly exclude religious organizations from coverage. Only one state, Wisconsin, has a labor relations law applicable to teachers in Catholic schools. In all states having general labor relations laws, their terms limit them to public school

10E. Riley Casey, "Collective Bargaining in Catholic Schools," NCEA Bulletin, Vol. 64, No. 4 (May, 1968), pp. 3-7. Mr. Casey is an attorney in Washington, D. C., who represents management clients throughout the U. S. in labor relations matters. He is also General Counsel of the National School Boards Association.

11Ibid., p. 4.
teachers. In short, therefore, teachers in Catholic schools have no legally protected right to engage in collective bargaining.12

Since the NLRB refuses to accept jurisdiction over labor disputes in not-for-profit corporations, some argue that there is no obligation to recognize a union and to bargain collectively in the Catholic schools. Reicher, on the other hand, negates this viewpoint by stating that "the moral right, however, obviously precedes any legal support of this right."13 Catholic school administrators should become familiar with the content of papal social thought and use the ideas and principles found there as guidelines in dealing with the problems and issues related to collective bargaining.

Papal social thought can be found in the letters and encyclicals written by the Popes. The ones most applicable specifically to collective bargaining can begin with Leo XIII's landmark On the Conditions of the Working Class (RERUM NOVARUM):

The most important of all are Workingmen's Unions; . . . . Such Unions should be suited to the requirements of this our age— an age of wider education of different habits, and of far more numerous requirements in daily life. . . . We have spoken of them more than once; yet it will be well to explain here how notably they are needed, to show they exist of their own right, and what should be their organization and their mode of action.14

12Ibid., p. 5.


Pope John XXIII begins his encyclical by quoting from Pius XI's letter On the Reconstructing of the Social Order (QUADREGESIMO ANNO) which reaffirms the right to form unions or associations and to engage in collective bargaining:

...workers alone, or of groups of both workers and owners, to organize is a natural one.

...it is advisable that certain elements taken from a contract of partnership be introduced into the work contract. The result would be that the wage earners become involved in ownership or management, or sharers to some extent in profits.15

Continuing with the encyclical, John XXIII adds his own statements to those of Pius XI:

We defend the desire of employees to participate actively in the management of enterprises in which they are employed.

We have no doubt, however, that workers should be allowed to play an active part in the affairs of an enterprise--private or public--in which they are employed. At any rate, every effort should be made that industrial enterprises assume the characteristics of a true human community whose spirit influences the dealings, duties and role of each of its members.16

Culminating the thoughts presented in the encyclicals, the assembled bishops of Vatican II approved the following:

Among the basic rights of the human person must be counted the right of freely founding labor unions. These unions should be truly able to represent the workers and to contribute to the proper arrangement of economic life. Another such right is that of taking part freely in the activity of these unions without risk of reprisal.17

---


16 Ibid., p. 27.

Administrators in general are unhappy about the prospects of dealing with unions. Because unions are able to bring about significant improvements in salaries and working conditions, administrators feel that they will be faced with even more serious financial problems than the ones they now have to cope with. Consequently, their response to unions is usually one of either grudging acceptance or outright hostility. Mooney\(^{18}\) writes that teachers, to achieve legitimate goals in the face of administrative rigidity, will resort to strikes or threat of strikes unless a reasonable alternative is developed. The alternative he suggests is the establishment of "labor-management committees" which would meet at regular intervals so that a continuous process of negotiation would make the "traditional collective bargaining...no longer be the only means for resolving disputes."

More effective than committees would be the change in the structural pattern of Catholic school administration—a "long overdue recognition of the need of a functional (not theoretical) partnership with the laity." McCluskey cited by Healy\(^{19}\) implies that lay persons can and should do the same or complementary kinds of jobs as those done by sisters, brothers, and priests. This is not confined to teaching only, but to administration as well. The Washington Symposium reaffirms this by stating that

Professional competence should be a primary criterion in filling teaching and administrative positions in every area of Catholic


education. Professionally qualified lay men and women, clergy and religious, should be equally eligible for every type of teaching or administrative position.\textsuperscript{20}

The principle to be accepted by all Catholic schools is the idea of merit assignment or promotion on the basis of merit. The habit of reserving certain jobs to clergy or religious is so firmly entrenched in some areas that to question its relevance or prudence is tantamount to being guilty of audacity. Yet, if Catholic schools are to survive, it will soon become necessary to find competent laymen to staff them as well as money to pay them.

The phenomenal expansion of the Catholic school system during the 1940's and 1950's required the hiring of lay teachers to staff the burgeoning institutions. Even though the number of religious increased, the number available was nowhere near the number needed to staff the schools. Thus, in the school year 1964-65, out of a full-time teaching force of all United States Catholic schools totalling 171,198, there were 59,246 lay teachers; whereas for 1970-71, the number of lay teachers had risen to 85,873, out of a teaching force of 165,770.\textsuperscript{21}

The Notre Dame Study, sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, identified certain factors that needed consideration by Catholic school leaders. Among these were:

The negligible participation by lay teachers in the administration of Catholic schools strongly affects the status of the lay

\textsuperscript{20}Sheridan and Shaw, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{21}National Catholic Education Association, "Catholic Education 1969/An Overview" and from the research department of the NCEA Office.
teacher. Careful consideration should be given to determining whether a lay principal is anomalous to the concept of a Catholic school staffed by lay and religious teachers.22

Within the same trend of thought, Schuster23 claims that the real "plums" in the educational enterprise are administrative positions. This kind of "career opportunity" is not as readily available to the lay teachers in the Catholic school as are such opportunities for teachers in public schools. The absence of a career opportunity encourages men, and frequently the best, to think that they have "no abiding home in the Catholic school."

According to Koob and Shaw, as professionalism becomes more and more the hallmark of American education, Catholic schools will have to allow lay people the opportunity to advance "as far and as fast as their ability permits;" otherwise, it will be difficult to retain competent lay teachers and to attract new laymen of outstanding ability.24

The retardation of the clerical-lay partnership has not been due to the absence of charity or the lack of good will on the part of those responsible for assigning or hiring administrators. It stems in part from the history of the American Catholic school system, which for decades depended for its existence upon the willingness and availability of clergy and religious who with courageous generosity, sacrifice, and devotion assumed the burden of supporting and maintaining the schools.


24Koob and Shaw, op. cit., p. 85.
The European class tradition, the isolation of American Catholics from the public school movement, the general poverty of the Catholic community—all these factors enter into the historical explanation. In the immigrant church, parents delegated absolute control of the school to their pastors, perhaps without truly being aware of the fact.25

This has been the traditional Catholic school system which is gradually disappearing as the religious wearing habits and Roman collars are being replaced in the school room by lay men and women.

Newer developments, however, are coming into the picture for Catholic schools which are hastening the alteration of this traditional cultural pattern of the people. One of these is in the area of decision and policy-making. As more and more lay boards of education take their place as policy-making bodies in the control structure of Catholic education, schools will no longer "belong" to any one segment of the Catholic community but rather to the community as a whole. The latest study of the status of the school boards indicates that their are 106 diocesan boards in existence and a fast-growing proportion of lay men and women sitting on the boards.26 Less and less, then, will religious and clergy identify Catholic schools as "ours" in an exclusive sense; "ours" will of necessity include laymen on an equal footing with priests, brothers, and sisters.

In all fairness, it must be mentioned that in a recent survey of superintendents27 a breakthrough in the administrative ranks has been ob-


26Ibid., p. 115.

27Healy, op. cit., p. 54.
served. Two dioceses now have lay superintendents and eight others have lay assistant superintendents of schools. In 1968, there was a total of ninety-six lay people in administrative positions in the central offices of eighty-five diocese. Thirty-eight schools had lay principals and a hundred thirty-nine had lay assistant principals. Although these numbers are small, they take on significance as one realizes that this state of affairs was unheard of or unthinkable five years ago. This can be considered a major step toward a full participation of laymen in Catholic education as blueprinted in Vatican II.

One of the most perplexing problems of collective bargaining in the Catholic schools is referred to by some writers as the "lay-religious dichotomy." The integration of lay and religious teachers into the same bargaining unit brings the dichotomy into the area known as "divided loyalties" for the religious employee: loyalty to fellow teachers with whom the individual religious has common social and professional interests; and loyalty to the order or the bishop, imposed by reason of religious vows. Most laws, under industrial labor relations, prohibit the inclusion in a bargaining unit representation by any union "of any employee who might have divided loyalties."

The only realistic approach to this situation, according to Casey, is to eliminate any differences in status between religious and lay personnel.

...it is obvious that Father Jones and Mr. Smith, both of whom teach history and social studies in an archdiocesan high school, have a strong community of interest. And in his professional life

28Casey, op. cit., p. 8.
Father Jones has a great deal more in common with Mr. Smith than he does with Monsignor Jackson, the archdiocesan director of education.29 He further explains that "collective bargaining is a matter related to the employment relationship;" therefore, if a "community of interest" (common location and similar duties and functions) exists between a group of teachers "in the terms and conditions of their professional lives, the teachers should be treated the same, whether they are wearing a button-down or a turned-around collar."30 Otherwise, schools could not run harmoniously and would be torn by dissension if religious were given favors or denied rights available to the lay faculty members, or if there were any other disparate treatment of others.

Persons knowledgeable on the subject of collective bargaining are alike in their convictions that religious teachers should participate in the teachers' organizations. They feel that a mature religious faculty member possesses professional competence which warrants his participation in associations or organizations; however, they differ in their judgments as to the manner of participation or the exact role religious should play in the organization.

While Father Reicher feels that religious should be in every way members of a teachers' association where they do exist in a Catholic diocese, he, nevertheless, feels that certain elements of the religious situation would have to be preserved. These concern themselves with matters close to the essence of religious life and would not affect the association as a whole nor

29Ibid.
30Ibid.
impeded the lay teachers from reaping benefits from the association. For example: the need to preserve the religious superior's right to assign a religious according to the needs and work of the community of which the religious is a member.

\[...\text{this right of assignment must be one of the non-negotiable with respect to any bargaining between a teachers' association and management. This is not an element that belongs to the labor-management situation; it is essentially something between the religious and his religious superior.}\]

Writing about the teachers collective action in Brooklyn, Brother Peter Clifford contends that the nature of religious life would not permit religious teachers to join a militant teachers group or to pay dues to a teachers' organization if it would be necessary for the teachers' organization to adopt "an adversative position against the bishop or the superintendent or the principal." 32

Yet, religious have a basic right as teachers and professionals to belong to any professional association which would engage in any kind of formal bargaining with the management of the school system "in which he is working and this right cannot be waived for him by other people" as is the case with some teachers associations who would exclude religious.

\[...\text{It would be a very anomalous situation if lay teachers, while proclaiming in one breath their right according to the encyclicals to association and collective bargaining, would deny to religious}\]


his right to belong to these associations and engage in the same privileges.33

According to Murray, teachers need affiliation with a professional organization in order to avoid pitfalls "by drawing upon the assistance of the negotiating facilities and personnel of professional unions."34 It would be foolish for the Catholic schools to ignore the benefits that can be gained from the expertise and experience that a union can offer. He cites a number of precedents for combining lay and religious classroom teachers in a single bargaining unit, such as, the Catholic schools in Canada, nursing organizations of laywomen and religious in our country, as well as, many social work agencies who have combined both groups successfully.35

The need for a single bargaining unit in Catholic schools is quite obvious. The uniqueness of Catholic education and the peculiar uniqueness of religious life along with the present difficulties already inherent in the system would inevitably end in competition rather than cooperation, thus widening the breaches in the faculty rather than integrating the teaching staff into a whole. Beneficial results from a single, highly professional teachers' association could be a source of great unity and strength in achieving the objectives of the school. Separate associations might be disastrous.36


35Ibid., p. 22.

36Gray, loc. cit., Vol. 27, No. 2, pp. 33-34.
One of the principal objections raised for excluding religious centers around the possible lack of motivation religious may evidence in bargaining for salaries when their salary does not seem to be directly affected by the bargaining. Gray states that this does not "change the fundamental concept of a professional workers' association nor delimit the fundamental right of the religious teacher to belong to it," for there are many things beyond the purely economic benefits and compensation questions. Religious teachers should be consulted on professional issues (curriculum, school regulations, working hours, choice of textbooks, etc.) which lay teachers may include in negotiating proposals. Lay teachers cannot be the unauthorized spokesmen for the religious staff members when proposing to the diocese changes in working conditions, educational planning, and decision-making.

One solution to the lay-religious dichotomy suggested by Clifford would be to discuss separately, negotiable fiscal demands from non-negotiable professional issues. Murray concurs with this suggestion that compensation of religious teachers and control of personnel assignments of members of religious communities along with "similar matters...be safely placed outside the scope of negotiations."

Other major complications result in that no two religious communities are alike in respect to their constitutions and roles. There are some in-

---

37 Ibid., p. 33.

38 Clifford, op. cit., p. 11.

39 Ibid.

40 Murray, op. cit., p. 32.
stances where the religious superior was also the school administrator and had to play two roles. As a principal his relationship with both lay and religious teachers was "familiar but not necessarily familial." In the confines of the community, the relationship was collegial and familial. It was possible that such a person would not always distinguish between these two functions and would attempt to impose his interests or even his prejudices as the "will of the superior" and force compromise by means of religious vows.\textsuperscript{41} Besides, this dual role playing by one man as school administrator and then as superior can cause confusion and at times provocation. More and more, these two jobs of religious superior and institutional administrator are assigned as separate functions.\textsuperscript{42}

The religious vows were never meant to rob the individual of his personal freedom or uniqueness. The vows do not come under the purveyance of union or association. What is expected under poverty and obedience is the communal apostolate that the individual "has made a conscious agreement to choose for himself." Permission to join any teachers' organization would probably be given as openly and casually as is now accorded for joining any other American professional education association. Difficulties may crop up as they do among the lay faculty wherever money or budgeting are involved. In a similar way, the vow of obedience does not extend to an individual's conscience in matters of voting or reacting to the business affairs of any organization.\textsuperscript{43}

\textsuperscript{41}Murray, op. cit., p. 23.

\textsuperscript{42}Koob and Shaw, op. cit., p. 87.

\textsuperscript{43}Gray, loc. cit., p. 33.
Not all writers, however, shared this rather positive attitude toward religious joining unions or associations. One in particular, Joseph J. Lynn, found that "religious membership in teachers' unions must be classed as dangerous and incompatible with the religious life" for reasons that they are unnecessary and "in conflict with the basic principles of the religious life." To Lynn, unionization produced a "distinct and wide division between labor and management," whereas the relationship between religious and their superiors should be "based on motives of obedience and love, not on the legalistic terms of labor contracts."

Religious indeed are and should be union members. They have their own union—the order to which they belong. It has been the most effective union the world has ever seen. I fail to see why we should dismantle such an organization in favor of the AFL-CIO type of organization. Why...cast aside a basic facet of our religious lives and substitute union negotiation for the obedience and mutual cooperation that is the bedrock of our consecrated lives.

He is not opposed to laymen forming their own unions:

...as lay teachers in a Catholic school, laymen must have a grave concern for their financial position; they must out of self-protection measure out their days and their hours and their efforts in terms of dollars and cents.

But, religious lead another kind of life, and their concerns for material necessities of life are cared for through commitments made by their superiors with diocesan authorities or other competent agencies. The superiors

---


45 Ibid., p. 29.

46 Ibid.
have the responsibility of seeing that religious work within the ground rules of "health and efficiency with relation to the time they must devote to other obligations of their personal religious lives and the sacred ministry." This assumption by religious superiors of the material and spiritual needs for all members of a particular teaching order is viewed by the laity as a blanket for security for the religious in contrast to their own insecurity, the responsibility for which is assumed by each lay person. Mary Perkins Ryan asks, "Are not education, food, shelter, clothing, the expenses of illness and old age, and even vacations provided for religious?" Many religious are convinced that they "work for the love of God," while lay teachers work for a salary. Ryan claims laymen also love God and are teaching for the love of God; otherwise, they would have chosen some other profession. This attitude confuses two quite different orders of final causes. Since religious and lay teachers alike, on the socio-economic level, work for subsistence; they should receive a compensation sufficient to enable them to continue working and to develop themselves.

Although laymen and religious may be engaged in the same apostolate of educating, Carney feels that their commitments are not identical and that the "religious is more deeply committed to this than the layman." He suggests that some "clear ideas on the apostolate and its ensuing obligations be formulated" by those proposing solutions to the complex question of unionization in Catholic schools.

The problems of Catholic education must be viewed as those not only of management-labor but also of the apostolate. A truly moral solution would be one that, reached in an attitude of openness and frankness, guarantees the rights and duties of all concerned. At least the foundation for it lies in Vatican II's call for dialogue, the formation of diocesan associations, cooperation between laity, religious, and clergy, and coordination of activities.  

Koob and Shaw aptly summarize this problem of lay-religious dichotomy by commenting that "as long as religious teachers remain economically on a different footing from lay teachers" and are "far more concerned with improving professional status than with salaries and benefits"—perhaps all that can be said now is that teachers do have a right to organize; ideally, they should choose a form of organization whose goals are not exclusively economic, and which encourages cooperation among all educational personnel instead of dividing them into hostile camps; but where efforts have been made in good faith, and have failed, Catholic school lay teachers must be accorded the right to go it alone, using union organization and union tactics to press for fair treatment.

There are practically no completed dissertations on collective negotiations in Catholic schools to be found across the country as far as can be determined.

At present a study is underway by Brother Thaddeus Olsen, based on the premise that since lay and religious teachers seem to have a different role in the Catholic secondary schools, it may be assumed that there would be differences in their attitudes regarding collective negotiations in these

---


49 Koob and Shaw, op. cit., p. 95.

schools. He made a study of the attitudes of administrators, religious faculty members, and lay teachers in 1239 Catholic secondary schools in 31 of the largest dioceses in the United States. The study is highly statistical in that the frequency and percentages of the responses of administrators, religious teachers, and lay teachers to all the items on the attitudinal questionnaire were categorized, tested, and noted in tables. At the writing of this dissertation, conclusions and recommendations have not been determined.

Another related dissertation by Joseph H. Georgen and John J. Keough, related case studies of forty teachers' strikes in United States between 1955 and 1965. The study examined the issues and outcomes of these strikes and concluded that the strikes usually represented teachers' self-interests. In strikes where salary was an issue, the issues were still matters more directly connected with teacher welfare than student welfare. Conditions which related directly to the students such as, improvement of supervised study, curriculum development, and students' right generally did not appear as issues during strike threats nor at the time of the strike. To an even lesser degree were such matters of student welfare either direct or indirect outcomes of teachers' strikes.

Strikes did tend to occur more than once in the school districts studied; once a school district had a strike, there was a "high probability" that it would have a second strike.

A geographical pattern for the strikes studied not attributable to chance was found to exist. Clusters of strikes were observed in industrial, metropolitan areas. Concomitant factors found in these areas were families with a history of union association, aggressive assertion of workers' demands and fiscal dependence of school boards.

Although the study attempted to create a clearer understanding of a serious contemporary problem in American education, the information gathered about this complex social phenomenon disclosed literally hundreds of potential research projects on this particular subject which await researchers. The authors list only eight possible areas for future study.

From the foregoing literature, the opinions of men and women who have written or worked in the field of collective bargaining, particularly in Catholic schools, have been gathered; and a set of six hypotheses which appear to be basic elements of teachers' organizations as found in the Catholic school system throughout the nation have been constructed. In subsequent chapters, these hypotheses will be tested by applying them to the Catholic secondary schools in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

I. In the Catholic school system, no clear and universally acceptable pattern has developed, nor is one likely to emerge in the immediate future for collective negotiations.

II. In the Catholic school system, the factors that led to the formation of teachers' unions or associations are basically the same as those that have led to the formation of militant teacher organizations throughout the country.

III. In the Catholic school system, a strong relationship exists between the improvement in the quality of instruction and the organization of teachers' unions or associations.
IV. In the Catholic school system, the principals feel no concern that the recognized teachers' union or association would present a real threat to their position as administrator or as professional educational leader.

V. In the Catholic school system, the participation of religious teaching personnel in collective negotiations presents many practical difficulties.

VI. In the Catholic school system, it is important that in collective negotiations the negotiating process which involves financial issues be separated from the discussion process on professional issues.
The Chicago Archdiocesan school system is the fourth largest system in the United States, including public metropolitan systems, such as those in New York City or Los Angeles; and first across the nation in the line-up of the Catholic schools. In this Archdiocese, there are three types of Catholic schools:

- **Parish schools** - those owned and operated by individual parishes. Although they are nominally under the direction of the archdiocesan superintendent of schools, they are, for all practical purposes, autonomous units. The principal of each of these schools must deal directly with the local pastor, and the teachers are paid by the same local pastor.

- **Community-owned schools** - those operating within the archdiocese with the approval of the Bishop; however, they are owned and administered by the religious communities. These schools maintain a distant, even a tenuous, relationship with the archdiocesan superintendent.

- **Archdiocesan schools** - those owned by the archdiocese. These schools form a system under the superintendent but are operated by religious communities under contract with the Bishop.

Almost all elementary schools in the Archdiocese of Chicago are parish schools. About one-third of the secondary schools are parish-run. The majority of the larger high schools are private institutions owned and operated by individual religious communities. Thus the responsibility for supervision of such schools rests with the religious community and not with the Archdiocesan...
School Board or School Office officials. Final authority on all questions at issue in a particular school is retained by the superior of the individual religious community which staffs the school. As a result, there are many differences in admissions, funding, and personnel policies in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The School Study Commission of the Archdiocese, established in June of 1970 to recommend future directions for Catholic schools, coined the phrase "non-system" for the secondary schools of the Archdiocese because they lacked a uniform set of school policies. Policies were, and still are, very different in each of the eighty-four high schools and are very confusing to parents since schools in the same geographic area may solve similar problems in completely different ways.

In 1970-71 school year, the number of religious teachers and the head count of lay instructors in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese reached a common level. Of the total number of teachers in the eighty-four schools, 1,969 were religious and 1,901 were lay teachers.¹

Eighty-one schools of the total of eighty-four responded to the survey. This represents 96.5% of the schools surveyed with 19 or 23% parish schools, 56 or 67% community-owned schools, and 6 or 7% archdiocesan schools responding to the questionnaire. The administrators who responded in these schools numbered 73 or 87%. Of these, five were lay administrators, four men and one woman; the rest, 68 were all religious.

¹Statistics supplied by the Archdiocesan School Office.
Three of the schools refused outright to participate in the survey. All the other secondary schools in the Archdiocese received six questionnaires to be answered by three religious and three lay teachers. The total number of questionnaires for the religious teachers was 243, while that of the lay teachers was 228, this latter number being slightly lower for the lay teachers as eight of the schools had fewer than three lay teachers. Accordingly, there were 156 or 64.2% of the religious teachers and 136 or 60% of the lay teachers who returned the questionnaires.

Since the initiation of this dissertation, four of the schools have been closed. Questionnaires from these schools had been received prior to their closing, and their responses have been incorporated in this analysis.

Several observations should be made regarding the number and type of respondents. Three schools, community-owned and all girl, refused to answer or to distribute the questionnaires despite repeated requests and personal contact. In eight of the schools, again community-owned, only the principal answered the questionnaire. The reasons given for the failure to respond as requested were: fear of being misquoted, misrepresented, or fear of "rocking the boat;" separate questionnaires for lay and religious teachers were obnoxious to them; school policies adopted did not permit the answering of any questionnaires because of former unfortunate consequences; questionnaire answers would tread on dangerous grounds, giving teachers ideas; and finally, a lack of relevance of the questionnaire to the concerns of the school.

A point not to be overlooked in this same matter is that of the small high school, those whose enrollments were below 400 students. In 1969-70,
there were 16 of these schools in the Archdiocese with some of these schools employing only one or two lay teachers. Here, it may also be added that in some cases the principal distributed the questionnaires to the religious teachers only—these, for the most part, were considered "safe." He was unwilling to submit the questionnaires for reasons mentioned above to the lay teachers. In other cases, the teachers, lay and religious, from lack of interest or time, failed to answer or to return the questionnaire. Thus, in thirteen schools only one religious teacher responded, and in nineteen schools, only one lay teacher responded. All of this, then, accounts for the number of returns from the religious and lay faculties.

From Table I-A, on the next page, it is obvious that the secondary schools in the Archdiocese employ more female than male teachers which is not an uncommon practice in Catholic schools. Administrators in these schools tend to hire teachers according to sex, depending on whether the school they are hiring them for is an all girl or an all boy. In the Archdiocese of Chicago, there are 44 all girl, 25 all boy, and 12 co-ed high schools.

The marital status of the lay teachers in Table I-B is insignificant regarding numbers, with married males outnumbering the females by a slight margin of eight. However, it does reflect the fact that salary scales, although rapidly gaining momentum in Catholic schools, are still below those received by teachers in public schools. For the female, the teaching career is usually terminated at marriage. Secondly, the opportunity for advancement to administrative positions is rather restricted for lay people in Catholic schools. Most of the high schools are community-owned and key positions in
TABLE I - CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Religious Teachers N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lay Teachers N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A) Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B) Marital Status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male: Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female: Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C) Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or under</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.7+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D) Highest Level of Education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A. +</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. +</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. - Ed.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E) Years of Teaching Experience:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 +</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Median, not including "No Response."
administration are reserved for members who belong to the same community. These factors are not an incentive for many men to consider a marriage contract. This situation today is changing. More and more men are making teaching in the Catholic schools a lifetime career since salaries, fringe benefits, and opportunities for advancement to administrative positions, if not equal to, are, nevertheless, keeping very close to those obtainable in the public schools.

The median age range for administrators is 40-49 (43.8%), for religious teachers, 40-49 (23.7%), and lay teachers, 29 or under (49.3%). Table I-C shows that lay teachers are younger in age than the religious staff. This is the case in almost every Catholic secondary and elementary school in the Archdiocese. As matters now stand, this situation is unlikely to change much in the near future as vocations among the younger people are rapidly decreasing. Many religious of retirement age are continuing to teach in order to fill the vacancies.

Table I-D points to the collegiate and professional preparation of the staff members in the secondary schools. The median educational level indicates that the religious teachers outrank the lay teachers in advanced training with 55 (76.4%) administrators and 77 (49.4%) religious teachers having master's degrees or more, whereas only 34 (25%) of the lay teachers have this advanced degree.

An important characteristic of any school staff is presented in Table I-E--experience. Most easily identified is the high median of religious teachers' total years of experience in the secondary schools which is between 16-20 years, as compared to that of the lay teachers which is between 6-10 years.
Despite these many years of experience, it is important to note in Table II-F, page 52, that 60 (83.3%) of the administrators, 104 (66.7%) of the religious teachers, and 101 (74.3%) of the lay teachers have been in their present positions for a period of only 1-5 years. This is a relatively high rate of turnover which does cause some serious problems at the secondary level.\(^2\)

The short tenure of the religious teacher can be ascribed in part to the policy of the religious communities who annually review the assignments of each of their members. Changes in assignments become necessary to meet the overall needs and commitments of the various communities. In particular, this change affects the school principals who are often also the spiritual superiors of local communities, for canonical rules that govern the communities require that a spiritual superior may not continue in this capacity for more than six years. Seeing the unfortunate affects of the ruling and to give the principal's position more stability, some of the communities have already adopted a policy under which a religious other than the superior is assigned the responsibility of the principal. This circumstance is especially true at the secondary level and in larger schools.

Religious and lay teacher applications for state certification in Table II-G are about equally applied for. The reasons given most frequently for not having a certificate are: never applied for it and the lack of credits in practice teaching. Until recently, most of the religious teachers had no need for a state certificate; but with the possibility of state aid to private

\(^2\)A similar observation was made by Neuwien, op. cit., p. 93.
### TABLE II - CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators N</th>
<th>Administrators %</th>
<th>Religious Teachers N</th>
<th>Religious Teachers %</th>
<th>Lay Teachers N</th>
<th>Lay Teachers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F) Years of Teaching and Administration in Present School:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83.6+</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>66.7+</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>74.3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 +</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Median, not including "No Response."

| **G) State Certification:** |                  |                  |                      |                      |                |                |
| Yes                      | 95               | 60.9             | 93                   | 69.1                 |                |                |
| No                       | 59               | 37.9             | 40                   | 28.7                 |                |                |
| No Response              | 2                | 1.2              | 3                    | 2.2                  |                |                |
| **Total**                | 156              | 100.0            | 136                  | 100.0                |                |                |

Of Those Without Certification, The Following Are Requirements Lacking Or Reasons Checked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Administrators N</th>
<th>Administrators %</th>
<th>Religious Teachers N</th>
<th>Religious Teachers %</th>
<th>Lay Teachers N</th>
<th>Lay Teachers %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Professional Education Courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Course Requirements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Applied For It</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reasons</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Checked more than one answer.

| **H) Contracts Required For Teaching Positions:** |                  |                  |                      |                      |                |                |
| Yes                                  | 34               | 21.7             | 122                  | 89.7                 |                |                |
| No                                   | 115              | 73.7             | 10                   | 7.3                  |                |                |
| No Response                          | 7                | 4.6              | 4                    | 3.0                  |                |                |
| **Total**                            | 156              | 100.0            | 136                  | 100.0                |                |                |
schools, this attitude is bound to change, for one of the requirements for receiving state aid will depend on the number of teachers having state certificates.

An interesting observation can be concluded from the responses found in the question of signed contracts for teaching positions, both lay and religious in Table II-H. Teaching contracts for religious teachers are of recent origin, a result of Vatican II, symbolizing the updating of the religious educational institutions. They are still rejected by the majority of religious whose life styles consider the signing of contracts contrary to the tenets of religious commitment. On the one hand, contracts put increased stress on professional standards at the schools involved, and this is laudable. On the other hand, in many cases contracts may bring with them some less desirable effects as they relate to the religious teachers.

If a contract is to be denied a religious for one reason or another, it could have serious repercussions on the religious community involved, such as "allowing a cold-hearted professionalism to supersede the charity owed one's fellow-religious." Suspicions, rightly or wrongly, may arise, perhaps, that old grievances are being revenged via a politely polished letter or a private interview in the principal's office. Such a situation can very easily arise and can have an enormous effect, spiritually and otherwise, on the life of any religious community. Factions form quickly within the community leading to a

---

bitterness which has far-reaching consequences in a given community. For these and other reasons, Table II-H shows that 115 (73.7%) of the religious teachers do not sign a contract, while only 10 (7.3%) of the lay teachers do not. Lay teachers would not be affected to this extent, for they can seek employment far removed from their present situation and among people to whom they are little known.

In the past, religious were generally trained to accept jobs which were assigned to them; there was little attention given to personal inclination or even fitness for the assignment. This practice was frequently applied even to lay teachers by administrators in need of teachers to "fill a slot." The old "who's available now?" system of handing out assignments seems to have been gradually abandoned as presented in Table III-I, page 55, wherein 117 (75%) of the religious teachers and 117 (86%) of the lay teachers have more than 1/2 of their teaching assignments in their major field.

Contrary to frequently heard comments about the low salary scale for lay teachers in Catholic schools, it is interesting to note in Table III-J that 105 (77.2%) of the lay teachers find their salaries adequate so that there is no need to "moonlight" by holding down a second job. In the year in which this survey was taken, 1969-1970, the Summary of Statistics From the Annual Report stated that the average salaries in the boys' schools in the Archdiocese of Chicago ranged from $9,109 to $6,700. Average salaries in the co-educational and girls' schools ranged from $9,995 to $5,900. The median average salary for

---

### TABLE III - CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I) Teaching Assignments in Major Field:</th>
<th>Religious Teachers</th>
<th>Lay Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1/2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One half</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1/2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| J) Supplemental Income Necessary:      | | |
|                                        | Yes | 20.6 |
|                                        | No  | 77.2 |
|                                        | No Response | 2.2 |
| Total                                  | 136 | 100.0 |

| K) Intent to Remain in Catholic Education: | | |
| Yes                                      | 98  | 72.1 |
| No                                       | 27  | 19.8 |
| Uncertain                                | 9   | 6.6 |
| No Response                              | 2   | 1.5 |
| Total                                    | 136 | 100.0 |

**Teachers Leaving Catholic Schools But Remaining in the Teaching Profession:**

|            | | |
| Yes         | 19 |
| No          | 6  |
| Uncertain   | 1  |
| No Response | 1  |
| Total       | 27 |
boys' schools was $8,050.00. In the previous year, 1968-69, it was $7,456.00. This represents an increase of 7.9%. Over a two-year period there was an increase of 17%. The median average salary for co-educational and girls' schools was $6,604.00. In the previous year, 1968-69, it was $6,418.00. This represents an increase of 2.9%. Over a two-year period, however, there was an increase of 19%.

In conjunction with the salaries, the intent of lay teachers to remain in Catholic education was answered in the affirmative by 98 (72.1%)—Table III-K; and of the 27 (19.8%) who would not remain in Catholic schools, nineteen would remain in the teaching field. Most of the latter preferred teaching in the public school system where higher salaries, greater stability, greater opportunities for advancement, and retirement policies were strong determinants for the change. With one teacher uncertain, six said they would seek employment in related areas, such as, textbook publishers, curriculum developers, consultants, and even industries completely unrelated to the educational field.

The lay teachers were asked to respond to the question: "What led you to seek a teaching position in a Catholic secondary school?" The three principal reasons selected in the order of importance were:

1. I prefer to work in a school committed to a Catholic philosophy of education.

2. There are fewer disciplinary problems in Catholic secondary schools.

3. There was a position available, not available in public schools at the time.
Other responses given in the descending order of importance were:
The lay teacher is needed to help fill positions formerly staffed by religious;
I did not meet the requirements for a teaching position in a public school;
there were fewer demands made on teachers in Catholic secondary schools than
in public schools; convenience of the school's location; pleasant atmosphere
of the school; higher standards of education; suitable teaching hours; small
school, etc.

Two other questions, in the form of opinions, completed this portion
of the questionnaire. Table IV-L, page 58, shows the opinions of the respond­
ents regarding state aid to alleviate the financial crisis facing Catholic
schools in the Archdiocese; and Table IV-M, the level of prestige at which the
religious teachers held the lay teachers, and how the lay teachers perceived
the level of prestige at which they were regarded by the religious teachers in
the schools in which they were teaching at the time.

There really has never been a Catholic position on the question of
public support for Catholic schools. Opinions among Catholic educators have
always varied just as on every other controversial issue. Yet, 58 (79.5%) of
the administrators, 124 (79.4%) of the religious teachers, and 110 (80.9%) of
the lay teachers felt that state aid would alleviate--not cure--the financial
crisis. All three groups, however, indicated that state aid would help par­
tially since the proposed plan in the state legislature would appropriate a
rather small sum of money to parents in the form of vouchers. Although state
aid does not propose a facile solution to complex financial problems in the
schools of the Archdiocese, administrators and teachers agree "it would not
TABLE IV

OPINIONS WITH RESPECT TO STATE AID AND PRESTIGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Religious Teachers</th>
<th>Lay Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L) State Aid Would Alleviate Financial Crisis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M) Level of Prestige of Lay Teachers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Religious Teachers</th>
<th>Lay Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hurt." Of those who answered in the negative, some were skeptical about accepting state aid since control usually followed the dollar. In 1968, the late Cardinal Spellman commented, "I would absolutely refuse the offer, for I cannot see... how they would grant it without wanting to control our schools." Others questioned the benefits to be derived from state aid if the lay teachers would absorb the money by requesting an increase in salaries equivalent to the amount of aid given.

There is little significant difference between what the religious teachers observe as the level of prestige enjoyed by the lay teachers in the school, and what the lay teachers consider as their level of prestige among the religious teachers of the same school. Accordingly, Table IV-M indicates that 141 (90.4%) of the religious teachers and 119 (87.5%) of the lay teachers agree that the level of prestige of the lay teachers can be found in the span from medium to high. This may be interpreted as an indication that good working relations exist between both groups of teachers, or that the professional status of the lay teacher is on an equal footing with that of the religious; or perhaps, that both of these conditions exist in the Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese. Although administrators were not asked this question, from the number of interviews conducted with the principals, it can be concluded that they also hold the lay teacher in as high a regard as do the religious teachers.

In summary, this chapter dispels a number of criticism which for the past few decades have been aimed at Catholic schools.

At one time there may have been grounds for the criticism that many religious teachers were placed in the classroom immediately after their
postulancy and novitiate training without adequate professional preparation equal to their counterparts in the public schools. From this chapter, it is quite obvious that the preparation of religious teachers today in the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese is a far cry from that of earlier years. The Notre Dame study shows that in 1962, 47 per cent of religious teachers held Bachelor's degrees and an additional 16 per cent held Master's degrees in the elementary and secondary schools. Today, in the secondary schools alone in the Archdiocese of Chicago, 32 per cent have a Bachelor's or a Bachelor's plus degree, while 65 per cent have a Master's or a Master's plus degree. In this, also, can be found a clearly discernible pattern of study which takes place throughout the lifetime of the religious teachers who retain the habit of continuing education. This is due in part to the efforts of the National Sister Formation Conference program inaugurated in 1954, which for several decades has advocated greater professionalism among the communities of religious.

It seems a safe conjecture to make that teaching in the Catholic schools is often better because of the more permanent nature of the religious teachers' commitment to teaching. In age and experience, the median for the religious was found to be between 40 and 49 years of age and from 16 to 20 years of experience.

Lay and religious teachers' salaries have improved greatly in the last ten years; and in the Archdiocese, up until the 1971 public school salary increase, a number of Catholic secondary schools achieved either near-parity or

5Neuwien, op. cit., p. 90.
came within 90 per cent of their neighboring-public-school salary scale so that only 21 per cent of the lay teachers surveyed found it necessary to implement their salaries with additional jobs.

One immediate advantage of better recompense is that the proportion of teachers with university degrees and state certification, embarrassingly low a few years ago, gets higher every year. Approximately 65 per cent of the teachers in the Archdiocese hold standard state certificates. The hiring of unqualified people to teach in the Archdiocesan secondary schools can no longer be applied as readily to the Catholic schools as was done formerly.

Catholics who attended the parochial school of the thirties or early forties, when the solitary lay teacher seemed an incongruity, find the situation toward giving lay people a professional status equal to that of the religious an inevitable trend. Figures in the survey show that the lay teachers are younger compared to the religious teachers, but they are just as strongly committed to the Catholic philosophy of education as their religious counterpart although not exactly in the same manner. The traditional tight, little world of Catholic schools operated purely and simply in the hands of clergy and religious as regards policy-making and administration is gradually being eliminated as competent lay people take over positions vacated by the decreasing number of religious vocations or as professionalism becomes the deciding factor for assignments or advancement. Positions of greatest prestige and authority are no longer reserved for priests and religious but are being awarded to "the best man for the job."
Prior to 1962, there was little opportunity for a teachers' union or association to form in the high schools of the Chicago Archdiocese. The number of lay teachers was insignificant. In 1962, there began a steady increase in the number of both lay and religious teachers; however, since 1967, there has been a notable decrease in religious teachers due to age, illness, and especially, leave-taking which has brought hundreds of lay teachers into the Catholic schools.

In the Fall of 1967, between thirty and thirty-five lay teachers formed a group and signed an application for a charter with the American Federation of Teachers in an attempt to organize their fellow lay teachers in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese. By October of that same year, fifteen teachers voted 13-2 in favor of affiliation. Thus a branch was opened called "The Archdiocesan Teachers Federation" Local 1700, American Federation of Teachers (AFL-CIO). Their purpose was to develop educational programs and professional competence in the Archdiocesan schools of Chicago. The attempts of the ATF to organize the schools, to develop bargaining programs in select schools in which they had teacher contacts, met with little success as newsletters sent from the ATF office never reached the teachers. The movement failed from lack of support and from the "close-mindedness" of some of the administrators and has recently gone "underground" so to speak. The movement, however,

1Hereinafter referred to as ATF.
alerted administrators and teachers to the importance and need for some type of organization in the schools to deal with the thorny topics of salary, tenure, teaching conditions, insurance, retirement, etc.—topics hitherto passively accepted by the teachers in whatever way or manner the administrators in Catholic schools chose to handle them.²

About five years ago, the Superintendent of the Archdiocesan schools, Bishop William McManus, realizing the need for an organization for teachers, was instrumental in organizing the Chicago Archdiocesan Teachers Association (CATA) which had close ties with the Archdiocesan School Office. This was not a desirable relationship; and after a few years, the Association evolved as an organization completely separated from the Archdiocesan School Office. A constitution and by-laws were drawn up, and on May 4, 1970, the professional, legal, non-profit organization of the religious and lay teachers of the Archdiocese of Chicago was chartered by the State of Illinois. Their purpose was to develop and promote the adoption of high standards of professional competence for teachers, to provide greater strength and unity among teachers of the Archdiocese, to enable members to speak with a common voice, and to secure for teachers, the adoption of personal policies (ex: Salaries, retirement, tenure, sick leave).³

This organization, however, concerned itself primarily with elementary and junior high school teachers; secondary school teachers never have been involved in any way with this Association.

²Interview with Bob Keeley, former Executive Secretary of the American Teachers Federation, Local 1700, and presently the Director of the same organization.

Both organizations, still in existence in the Archdiocese, seem to lack the dynamism and numbers necessary to achieve the interest and strength needed to unite all the teachers in the Archdiocese in such a way that the organization would be effective in negotiations with the Archdiocesan authorities on matters related to the welfare of the teachers and to educational issues.

On February 1, 1970, the Archdiocesan School Office issued the "Guidelines for Secondary Schools--Teachers Collective Bargaining." Originally, the guidelines were approved by the Archdiocesan School Board for use in all elementary schools and were presented to the high schools "as recommended guidelines for action." Three of the more important statements of the "Guidelines" are quoted here:

1. It is a policy of the Archdiocese that all parochial schools shall recognize and bargain in good faith with any labor organization which represents a majority of religious and lay teachers in a particular school and will be willing to incorporate into a signed contract whatever agreement is reached through collective bargaining.

4. It is recommended that only one collective bargaining representative will be recognized at any given school for its teachers and that recognition shall be granted only if a majority of the teachers at the school, both lay and religious, so vote in a secret ballot election.

5. Since there is no present federal or state statute setting forth standards of conduct in labor relations matters for parochial schools, the guidelines and procedures established by the National Labor Relations Board insofar as they apply to our situation will be followed except where they are in conflict with these Archdiocesan guidelines.

From these statements, it can be understood that the Archdiocesan School Board favored a teachers' organization which would include both religious and lay teachers in a single unit. Aside from these "Guidelines," very little
has been done to establish any uniformity of action regarding teachers' organizations. The entire situation can be summarized in the remarks passed by Bishop McManus during the time that a number of strikes were in progress in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese, "It was a matter for individual schools to settle rather than the Archdiocese, since the schools raise their own funds for operation."4

These statements indicate the viewpoint held by the Archdiocesan School Office regarding collective bargaining in the schools. The acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses in this study will, among other things, prove whether or not the above statements were accepted by the secondary schools in the Archdiocese.

The hypotheses and the items in the questionnaires which refer to them are listed in Table V, pages 66 and 67. After consulting the authorities and various educators, certain propositions were selected with relevance to the hypotheses to be tested. All other items and answers in the questionnaires were used to supply supportive data for the analyses and general background material with respect to the study. Interviews supplemented documentary research as administrators, teachers, and other authorities in the field of teachers' organizations, evaluated and elaborated upon facts obtained from written sources.

For the results of the completed questionnaires, see Appendixes I, II, and III.

---

**TABLE V - ITEMS IN QUESTIONNAIRES USED TO TEST HYPOTHESES I - VI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Lay and Religious Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis I:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, NO CLEAR AND UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTABLE PATTERN HAS DEVELOPED, NOR IS ONE LIKELY TO EMERGE IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE FOR COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS.</td>
<td>II - 1, IV - 8, 13, 21, 22</td>
<td>I - 6 Lay, 13 Religious, III - 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis II:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, THE FACTORS THAT LED TO THE FORMATION OF TEACHERS' UNIONS OR ASSOCIATIONS ARE BASICALLY THE SAME AS THOSE THAT HAVE LED TO THE FORMATION OF MILITANT TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY.</td>
<td>III - 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, IV - 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, V - 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57</td>
<td>III - 18, IV - 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, V - 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis III:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, A STRONG RELATIONSHIP EXISTS BETWEEN THE IMPROVEMENT IN THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION AND THE ORGANIZATION OF A TEACHERS' UNION OR ASSOCIATION.</td>
<td>II - 2, IV - 15, 16</td>
<td>IIB - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothesis IV:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, THE PRINCIPALS FEEL NO CONCERN THAT THE TEACHERS' ORGANIZATIONS WOULD PRESENT A REAL THREAT TO THEIR POSITION AS ADMINISTRATORS OR AS PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL LEADERS.</td>
<td>IV - 9, 10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24</td>
<td>IIA - 7, B - 12, 13, 14, III - 17, IV - 27, 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V - ITEMS IN QUESTIONNAIRES USED TO TEST HYPOTHESES I - VI
(cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis V:</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Lay and Religious Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, THE</strong></td>
<td>IV - 11, 13</td>
<td>IIA - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICIPATION OF RELIGIOUS TEACHING PERSONNEL IN A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION FOR COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS PRESENTS MANY DIFFICULTIES.</td>
<td></td>
<td>B - 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV - 28, 30, 34, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V - 52, 54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis VI:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis VI:</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Lay and Religious Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT IN COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS WHICH INVOLVES FINANCIAL ISSUES BE SEPARATED FROM THE DISCUSSION PROCESS ON PROFESSIONAL ISSUES.</strong></td>
<td>III - 7</td>
<td>IIA - 3, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V - 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 55, 56, 57, 58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data and Analysis

HYPOTHESIS I: IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, NO CLEAR AND UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTABLE PATTERN HAS DEVELOPED, NOR IS ONE LIKELY TO EMERGE IN THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE FOR COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS.

Proposition 1.1 -- In the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago, there are recognized teachers' organizations for collective negotiations for lay teachers only, for religious teachers only, or for both lay and religious teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lay Teachers Only</th>
<th>Religious Teachers Only</th>
<th>Lay and Religious Teachers Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 (8.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analyzing this proposition, it was found that 7 (8.6%) of the schools had a recognized teachers' organization as a sole bargaining agent for
lay teachers only. Of these, six were boys' schools; one was co-educational. Five (6.2%) of the schools had a recognized bargaining agent for both lay and religious teachers. Of these, three were boys' schools, one, co-educational, and one, girls'. None of the schools had a recognized bargaining agent for religious teachers only. Only two of the schools were affiliated with the ATF, a boys' school and a co-educational school. The rest of the schools had their own, unaffiliated, teachers' associations within the framework of the particular school.

None of the associations is related to each other, nor was there any known attempt made even to loosely unite them. They took on a variety of titles: "federation," "associations," "faculty senates," etc.; all of them were considered as "independent, unaffiliated unions." In looking over the agreements or contracts of employment drawn up by these teachers' groups, no two were alike in format although all of them dealt with similar items: recognition of sole bargaining agents, grievance procedures, salary, pension, retirement, insurance, terms and conditions of employment, and working conditions. Each of these items was given a different degree of importance in different schools; by that is meant that in some of the agreements, a number of pages were devoted to tenure policies, some a few paragraphs; some spelt out in detail grievance procedures, while others merely referred to their existence. All of these associations had one thing in common, however, and that was that they negotiated with the administrator of the school; none of them mentioned that negotiations were carried on with a local school board or with the Archdiocesan school authorities.
During the interview sessions with members of the various teachers' organizations, they were asked why their organization did not affiliate with a larger organization, such as, the AFT or the NEA. The consensus of opinion was that large group memberships would be a deterrent to reaching their common, local goals--"local issues need local solving." To them labor unions seemed to operate from an antagonistic philosophy: "truth established by gladiator system." Most of them felt no urgent need to join the larger organizations as their affairs could be and were settled satisfactorily through their local school associations without getting involved with labor unions which many still considered as unprofessional. Yet, when matters seemingly reached an impasse in the negotiations with the administration, the teachers' organizations did not hesitate to seek the help of the Illinois Federation of Teachers.

**Proposition 1.2** -- In the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago, there is a movement in the direction of a teachers' organization for collective negotiations for lay teachers only; for religious teachers only; for both lay and religious teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lay Teachers Only</th>
<th>Religious Teachers Only</th>
<th>Lay and Religious Teachers Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (9.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (13.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the respondents to this proposition, eight (9.9%) had some type of movement toward teachers' organization for collective negotiations for lay teachers only. Of these, five were boys' schools, three were co-educational. Again, there was no movement to form a teachers' organization for religious only. Eleven schools (13.6%) tended toward some type of teachers' organization for both lay and religious teachers. Of these, eight were girls' schools, two were boys', and one was co-educationl.
There was some question as to how "movement in the direction" was interpreted by the respondents. The questionnaire itself did not restrict the meaning of the phrase thus making broad interpretations possible. From the interviews, it was surmised that it meant different things to different staff members. Presenting salary scales and financial reports to the entire lay faculty constituted "movement" in one school. In other schools, "movement" was faculty gatherings to air grievances, or to offer suggestions for improvement of schedules, working conditions, or discipline. Still others stretched the interpretation to include departmental meetings during which textbooks and curriculum were discussed. In several schools, the administration and teachers recognized the need for a teachers' organization and made a conscious effort to structure some type of organization for lay teachers or for both lay and religious teachers. These schools had organized either a faculty senate or a governing board—functions of both were very similar—with lay and religious teachers serving as co-chairmen and faculty members serving on various committees, such as, public relations, student affairs, contracts, curriculum, grievances, social, etc. No sole bargaining agent was recognized in these organizations.

Proposition 1.3: -- In the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago, there has not been an organized and representative effort on the part of lay teachers and/or religious teachers to organize for the purpose of collective negotiations.

Administrators in 50 (61.7%) of the schools affirmed this proposition. Of these schools, thirty-three were girls' schools, nine were boys', and eight were co-educational. In commenting about this proposition, most of the teachers mentioned that the need for a teachers' organization had never arisen since
the administration and the faculty (lay) arrived at agreeable terms without many difficulties. Others mentioned that communications between the teachers and the administration were so very good that again, there was no felt need for an organized teachers' group since goals were just as easily attained without a recognized teachers' organization.

The impact of the male teacher on the organization of teachers' groups for collective action becomes quite obvious in the response to these propositions. Statistics in the Archdiocesan School Office reveal that the boys' schools tend to hire an overwhelming majority of men teachers in comparison to women teachers and vice versa. From this situation and from the results of the propositions, it can be concluded that teachers' organizations flourish in schools where men predominate as teachers. Since men have a firmer commitment to teaching as a lifetime career, there is a consistently lower turnover rate for men as against that for women who seem to resign just as soon as their romantic, psychological, or economic goals are reached. Men more so than women, then, are anxious to have a greater control over the conditions under which they work in order to obtain the stability and security which is found in formalized organization. This notion is supported by earlier research cited in this dissertation which indicated that militant collective action by teachers in public schools is also associated with the large number of male teachers who have entered the schools.

The results of the propositions can be summarized in the following table:
TABLE VI - EFFORTS OF THE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO TOWARD TEACHERS' ORGANIZATIONS FOR COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognized Teachers' Organizations</th>
<th>Movement Toward Teachers' Organizations</th>
<th>No Organized Effort Toward Teachers' Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Teachers Only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay and Religious Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Teachers' Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12 14.8</td>
<td>19 23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ 81 Schools = 100%.

From the statistics and analysis presented, it can be concluded that in the Catholic school system in the Archdiocese of Chicago, no clear and universally acceptable pattern has developed, nor is one likely to emerge in the immediate future for collective negotiations. The hypothesis, therefore, has been proven in the affirmative.

Administrators were asked in the questionnaire to evaluate statements which appeared to be the usual factors in the formation of the teachers' organization in their schools. In Hypothesis II, are found the responses of the administrators in the twelve schools have a teachers' union or association for collective bargaining.
HYPOTHESIS II: IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, THE FACTORS THAT LED TO THE FORMATION OF TEACHERS' UNIONS OR ASSOCIATIONS ARE BASICALLY THE SAME AS THOSE THAT HAVE LED TO THE FORMATION OF MILITANT TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY.

Proposition 2.1 -- Lay teachers recognized the success of the American Federation of Teachers in securing improved salaries and working conditions in the public schools; this caused them to seek collective action to secure similar improvements in the Archdiocese of Chicago schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Relatively Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (16.6%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The success of the Chicago Teachers' Union in bargaining for the public school teachers of Chicago provided the impetus for the lay teachers in Catholic schools of the Archdiocese to use John E. Desmond's, President Chicago Teachers Union, hard-nosed bargaining model and to follow in the footsteps of their public school counterparts. In the introductory remarks of the 1968 Agreement between the Chicago Teachers Union and the Chicago Board of Education can be found the incentives for lay teachers in Catholic secondary schools to seek organization for collective action:

Collective bargaining is time consuming, but it is the most effective, democratic method of resolving problems of mutual concern to both employer and employee, . . . the Union has been successful in raising beginning salaries of teachers to the second highest in the nation, in attaining many fringe benefits, in making a real breakthrough in the area of certification, and in attaining significant improvements in Chicago's educational system.5

There is no doubt in the minds of the administrators that the success of the teachers in Chicago in their collective efforts was a primary factor in

5 AGREEMENT Between the Board of Education of the City of Chicago and the Chicago Teachers Union, June 26, 1968, p. 3. The booklet is published by the Chicago Teachers Union in which are listed all items agreed upon by both parties.
motivating the lay teachers of Chicago's Catholic secondary schools to do likewise. This is the age of dissent, dissatisfaction, and vigorous reaction, and teachers in all schools now realize that the loud voice and the collective roar are their best weapons in establishing their rights. Many of the Catholic high schools having a recognized teachers union have patterned their agreements or contracts on that of the Chicago Teachers Union. Teachers in these schools—and this information was obtained from interviews with officials or members of the teachers' unions in the schools—received help in their training programs for newly appointed or elected leaders of the union from the AFT. During times of impasse or strikes, they were also provided with legal advice from this same organization.

The principals were asked to evaluate this proposition as it appeared to have been a factor in the formation of the teachers' union in their school. They were to use the scale: Most Important, Important, Relatively Unimportant, or Not Applicable. Eight (66.6%) of the principals having a recognized teachers' union considered this proposition most important or important in the formation of their teachers' union, while four (33.3%) considered it not applicable to their school. The majority of the principals affirmed this proposition.

**Proposition 2.2** -- Lay teachers had not representation at the local level and were dependent for improvements in salaries and working conditions on the unilateral action of the Archdiocesan authorities or administrators in individual schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Relatively Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The reasoning behind this proposition can be simply stated that it presents another aspect of the uniqueness of Catholic education which adds another dimension to its complexity.

The situation in the Archdiocesan schools has been one in which the superintendent or administrator sat down quietly in an informal setting with an individual teacher and discussed salaries and fringe benefits the teacher would like to receive (whether or not he got what he asked for is beside the point). The origins of this prevalent practice stem back to the early history of Catholic education in this country. Usually, the bishop invited a religious congregation to teach in his diocese, signed the contract with the hierarchy of the religious community, and left all details to be worked out by the community heads. In most cases, the school became the property of the religious community as they assumed the responsibility for funding its operations. Principals were appointed by the superiors of this community and not by the superintendent of the diocesan schools. Especially on the high school level, the principals were very autonomous, and their independence was evident in their freedom to make all decisions on school policy covering the broad spectrum of salaries, hiring and dismissal of teachers, class size and assignments, working conditions, etc. They were both policy-makers and chief executives.

The lay teachers knew that a policy imposed or a concession granted unilaterally could be unilaterally changed or withdrawn. Thus a great many teachers in the schools has seen gains won under one administrator, vanish under a new principal. They began to organize and to demand a bilateral formulation of school policies on a local level through local representation, for this was the
only way they could be reasonably assured they would obtain necessary changes in the system; it had to be done on the local level. The representatives, they reasoned through formal negotiations, seated as equals across the table from the administrator would demand that teachers' rights be granted.

Teachers were also aware that with recognized legal representatives in school, the administrator could no longer deal with the teachers on an individual basis, nor could the teachers negotiate with the administrator except through the representatives. They were willing to give up their individual rights to attain security and stability bearing on their income and working conditions obtained through representation on the local level.

The administrators' responses to the proposition as a factor in the formation of teachers' unions in Catholic schools of the Archdiocese were distributed across the scale. One (8.3%) principal felt it was most important, five (41.7%) considered it important, three (25%), relatively unimportant, and three (25%), it did not apply to their particular school.

Although they admitted that the situation described above still remained typical in many of the schools in the Archdiocese and that changes were needed, their loyalty to their communities' sacrifices and money which kept the schools in operation, coupled with the fear that lay teachers would undo all the good accomplished, made them reluctant to relinquish any of their former independence.

Proposition 2.3 -- Lay teachers have always been regarded only as auxiliaries by religious teachers in the Catholic school system. The recent increase of lay teachers has encouraged them to seek through collective action full recognition in the system.
Until recently, in the tight little world of the Catholic schools, lay persons were rarely given a voice in the formulation of policies, seldom have exercised administrative responsibilities, and were commonly regarded as substitutes for religious teachers, to be replaced when these latter became sufficiently numerous. The professional status of Catholic lay teachers, with a few exceptions, suffered in comparison with that of teachers in other types of schools. The picture, however, is being reversed as the religious teachers are coming closer to being considered a minority group on the faculties of many Catholic elementary and secondary schools. Although the mainstay of the Catholic secondary schools remains the teaching nun, brother, or priest, each year sees an increasing share of the burden borne by lay teachers.

In the Archdiocese of Chicago, a study of the increase in lay teachers in the last ten years reveals that in 1960-61 there were 1894 (71.9%) religious teachers and 739 (28.1%) lay teachers in the secondary schools. Today, 1970-71, ten years later, there are 1969 (59.9%) religious teachers and 1901 (49.1%) lay teachers. The religious have increased by 3.8 per cent, while the increase in lay teachers is 61 per cent. All present indicators suggest that the proportion of lay people in Catholic education will continue to rise for the foreseeable future while that of the religious teacher is questionable.

The growing numerical preponderance of laymen and the decline in priestly and religious vocations have placed the lay person in a different perspective. He is beginning to receive professional recognition and authority
in the Catholic schools; his professional preparation and classroom competence give him more leadership in the frontline of Catholic educational endeavors; and the religious influence itself is as much the possession of the layman and the laywoman as of priests and religious. Today, it is not so easy to understand as it formerly was how a Catholic husband or wife who are teachers in Catholic schools are radically different from a Christian teaching brother or sister.

Simultaneously with the increase of lay teachers, there has been a noticeable increase in the number of teachers' collective activities of various kinds. There was no doubt on the part of the administrators that the increased number of lay teachers gave them the strength and encouragement to organize in order to gain equal professional status and full recognition as teachers in a Catholic school system. In agreement with these ideas, there were seven (58.3%) of the responding administrators who affirmed the proposition, two (16.6%) who found it relatively unimportant, and three (25%) not applicable to their situation.

In summary, it can be asserted that the lay teachers in Catholic schools witnessing the success of their colleagues in the public schools in receiving full recognition as professional teachers, improved salary and working conditions sought to obtain similar benefits in the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese. By resorting to the same procedures and tactics used by their counterparts in the public schools, they were able to bring about the desired changes in twelve high schools of the Archdiocese. By organizing teachers' unions on a local level with a recognized representation, they were able to
make these demands at formal negotiations with the administrators. They were greatly aided in their endeavors mainly by the increased number of lay teachers who today are equal in number to that of the religious teachers.

Hypothesis II, therefore, is affirmed positively and accepted as stated that in the Catholic school system of the Archdiocese of Chicago, the factors that led to the formation of teachers' unions are basically the same as those that have led to the formation of militant teachers' organizations throughout the country.

With reference to their present attitude or opinions on the subject of collective negotiations, all seventy-three administrators and two hundred ninety-two teachers responding to the questionnaires were asked in the following Hypotheses III, IV, V, and VI to note their degree of agreement or disagreement on a Likert scale presented with each proposition.

HYPOTHESIS III: IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, A STRONG RELATIONSHIP EXISTS BETWEEN THE IMPROVEMENT IN THE QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION AND THE ORGANIZATION OF A TEACHERS' UNION OR ASSOCIATION.

Proposition 3.1 -- Lay teachers through collective negotiations will become more professional as teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administrators were divided in their opinions regarding this proposition. The thirty-five (47.9%) who agreed with it, reasoned along the lines
that teachers' organizations in Catholic schools, or in any other type of
schools, have two basic objectives: better economic conditions for the teach­
ers and more control of the operations of the school by teachers' groups.
Professionalism was usually attained indirectly or as a result of having
achieved the basic objectives. Apart from low pay, perhaps the chief griev-
ance of teachers in the Catholic schools has been the load of nonteaching
chores they must assume. Taking attendance and collecting "milk money" re-
quire little training and have still less to do with teaching skills; but, as
any teacher so burdened can testify, they use up an inordinate amount of time
and energy. Collective action among teachers in the public schools of Chicago
has resulted in the elimination and redistribution of noninstructional func-
tions amongst teacher aides or paraprofessionals. Agreements or contracts of
teachers' unions specify the employment of teacher aides, duty-free lunch
periods, and duty-free periods to be used for "self-directed professional ac-
tivities which shall include conferences and the preparation of class work." 6

Administrators were asked to indicate on the questionnaires how they
would describe the teachers' organizations as they existed at present in their
schools, using the three types of teacher organizations as described by Lie-
berman and Moskow in their study of teacher collective action in public
schools: marketplace, professional, and problem-solving. 7 Two indicated that
their teacher organizations could be typed the "marketplace" as the teachers

---

6 Chicago Teachers Union - AGREEMENT, op. cit., p. 20, 44.

7 Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for
sold their services at a maximum rate while the school system was trying to buy these services at as low a cost as possible.

Three administrators saw their teachers' organization as professional. Although at times the teachers disagreed with their administrators on the salary they were to receive for professional services rendered, as professionals they would distinguish between the school's ability to pay for teachers' services and its unwillingness to pay for such services. When the reason was unwillingness, the organization saw the need to negotiate the conditions for their employment and would press for negotiations on curriculum, planning, and decision-making.

Seven of the administrators typed their teachers' organization as the "problem-solving" one. Emphasis was placed not on the prerogatives of either side but on the best manner of getting the job done. Short-range objectives, such as, salary increases or more comfortable schedules, could be sacrificed in order to achieve a more important long-range objective, such as, quality education.

The above descriptions of teachers' organizations were obtained from principals who had recognized teachers' groups in their schools. Yet, when they were interviewed, they gave the impression that their teachers' organizations were the "marketplace" type. The teachers, on the other hand, when interviewed felt that they were tending toward the "professional" type and ultimately would reach the "problem-solving" stage.

The twenty-seven (37%) administrators who disagreed with the proposition considered the professionalism of teachers from another source rather than teachers' organizations. The diminishing number of religious teachers in the
Catholic schools, they contended, contributed more to the professionalism of the teachers than did any teachers' organization. In order to attract a greater number of well-qualified lay teachers, salaries had to be competitive, as salary standards were rapidly rising in public schools due to teacher bargaining. At the same time, in an effort to be more respectable academically, most Catholic secondary schools had to seek lay teachers who were more extensively trained; otherwise, the replacement of religious teachers by lay teachers would result in diminishing quality, for religious teachers generally had more formal education behind them than did existing lay teachers in Catholic schools. The new, better-qualified lay teachers, who could easily obtain public school positions, had less reason to tolerate poor salaries or inequality in their assignments or advancement as did their predecessors.

The proposition cannot be simply stated as rejected or affirmed even though the administrators who agreed with the proposition are in the majority. Both sides presented sound reasons for their views, and both views contributed to the professionalism of the teachers.

**Proposition 3.2 --** With the growth of collective negotiations, the quality of instruction will become more excellent in the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
<td>26 (35.6%)</td>
<td>21 (28.8%)</td>
<td>18 (24.6%)</td>
<td>4 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>20 (12.8%)</td>
<td>63 (40.4%)</td>
<td>57 (36.5%)</td>
<td>11 (7.1%)</td>
<td>5 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>19 (14%)</td>
<td>60 (44.1%)</td>
<td>24 (17.6%)</td>
<td>22 (16.2%)</td>
<td>11 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documented occasions when the appearance of teachers' associations or unions in a school or school system have resulted in a more excellent education.
quality of instruction are rare; however, no one can question the generalized statement that satisfied, professional teachers are the most important element in the development of a learning atmosphere in school. Higher salaries, smaller class sizes, easier teacher schedules, less student supervision, fewer class preparations, and lifelong tenure are demands made by teachers’ organizations, for they claim these will insure excellence of instruction. These are popular indices of pedagogical excellence which teachers believe can be negotiated at the bargaining table by representatives of teachers’ organizations. Thus 30 (40.6%) of the administrators, 83 (53.2%) of the religious teachers, and 79 (58.1%) of the lay teachers agreed with the proposition that excellence of instruction is an outgrowth of collective negotiations.

Of the twenty-two (29.6%) administrators who disagreed with the proposition, the reasoning was that excellence of instruction was never the main purpose of establishing a teachers’ organization. As a long-range, indirect accomplishment of teachers’ organizations, it still remains to be developed. They see it in print and in action in the public schools that once established, teachers organizations have no other route to go but that followed by their fellow colleagues in the public schools--more and more for themselves, without concern about where the additional resources must be found or who must ultimately pay for them. This is so disconcerting to a professional administrator who, having come upon a small, new financial source for his school, finds it eaten up at the bargaining table by salary increases and new fringe benefits for the teachers. This perhaps accounts for the considerable number in all categories who disagreed or failed to indicate an opinion for this proposition. To these,
it seemed that money was of primary concern rather than the improved quality of excellence in instruction.

Although some debatable points have been raised by Catholic educators regarding the strong relationship between the improvement in the quality of instruction and the organization of teachers' unions in Catholic schools, most of the administrators and teachers agreed that economic gains make for satisfied teachers and this leads to improvement in the quality of instruction.

HYPOTHESIS IV: IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, THE PRINCIPALS FEEL NO CONCERN THAT THE TEACHERS' ORGANIZATIONS WOULD PRESENT A REAL THREAT TO THEIR POSITION AS ADMINISTRATORS OR AS PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL LEADERS.

Proposition 4.1 -- The principal will find it difficult to deal with the lay and religious staffs in the school as a unified faculty with the growth of collective negotiations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrators' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the principals in Catholic secondary schools, the development of teachers' organizations for collective action opens up some disconcerting possibilities. One of these is the problem of dealing effectively with the lay and religious staff as a unified faculty. Most principals of a particular secondary school are bona fide members of a religious community as are usually the religious teachers in the same school. This again presents the uniqueness of Catholic schools; for while the lay teachers frequently categorize principals as management, "the teachers' enemy," religious teachers through loyalty to their fellow religious, structure their relationship with the principal on a collegial or familial basis.
Despite the divergence in the perception of the administrator by the teachers, 48 (65.8%) of the administrators did not think collective negotiations would present difficulties in dealing with the lay and religious staffs in the school as a unified faculty. Of the 17 (23.2%) who disagreed, some felt that religious teachers would become antagonistic if the same benefits which possibly would be granted to the lay teachers would not also be granted to the religious teachers. This is a difficult situation which requires diplomacy in bringing about satisfactory results. It could be avoided if religious would have equal status with the lay teachers in proposing changes in the operation of the school educationally.

The teachers were asked to give a separate answer for each category:

Growth of collective negotiations would increase divisions between administrators and lay teachers, between administrators and religious teachers, and between religious and lay teachers in the schools.

**Teachers' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Between Lay Teachers and Administrators</td>
<td>6 (2.1%)</td>
<td>48 (16.4%)</td>
<td>59 (20.2%)</td>
<td>147 (50.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Between Administrators and Religious Teachers</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
<td>40 (13.7%)</td>
<td>64 (21.9%)</td>
<td>153 (52.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Between Religious and Lay Teachers</td>
<td>5 (1.7%)</td>
<td>27 (9%)</td>
<td>55 (18.8%)</td>
<td>162 (55.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the foregoing per cents, it can be interpreted that the teachers, lay and religious, rather strongly disagreed that collective negotiations would create divisions between administrators and teachers. Therefore, a conclusion
can be drawn that the proposition as stated was rejected by the majority of both administrators and teachers.

Proposition 4.2 -- The principal is participating in the determination of new working conditions being granted to the lay teachers through collective negotiations.

Administrators' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>13 (17.8%)</td>
<td>38 (52.1%)</td>
<td>17 (23.2%)</td>
<td>5 (6.9%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to the fate administrators in public schools have had to endure for some time, the administrators of Catholic secondary schools are not being by-passed in the decision-making process or in being considered only as "expert witnesses" at the negotiating table. The structure found in the hierarchy of the public schools where the principal is considered a subordinate administrator to the superintendent or middle management at the negotiating table is not the case in the schools of the Archdiocese whether they are community-owned, parish-owned, or archdiocesan-owned. The principal in each of these schools is more or less autonomous and appointed to the position by the superiors of whatever community of religious has been engaged to teach in the school. He occupies a unique position in the structure of the Catholic school system, for he is chief decision-maker and chief negotiator; and in many cases, he alone passes verdicts on new working conditions, new salary scales, new curriculum, etc.

It is precisely for these reasons that 51 (69.9%) of the administrators strongly agreed or agreed to the proposition. This was especially true in schools with a recognized teachers' union and in schools where some form of
teachers' group was in existence. Very few disagreed with the proposition, and of the five (6.9%) who did, three were in parish schools where the pastor determined all changes in working conditions granted to the lay teachers. In two other schools, the educational board of the particular congregation determined new policies and working conditions for all the schools staffed by the community.

Most principals felt that their staffs regard them as part of the archdiocesan administration team—not clearly structured, but existing. Principals reacted unfavorably to this attitude when it was mentioned in the interviews, for they felt an administrative team in the archdiocese was totally non-existent. The relationship between the principals and the superintendent of Catholic schools in the archdiocese is very tenuous. For one, the principals' status and authority does not depend on the superintendent but on their own communities. This is also the reason why principals feel more strongly attached to their religious communities than they do to the superintendent.

Secondly, some of the principals expressed that they could foresee a professional danger in becoming dependent on the superintendent, for on the Archdiocesan School Board, the superintendent is considered the agent of the Bishop or on the side of management. Even if the relationship between the principals and superintendents is threadlike, any amount of dependency on the superintendents would put the principals on the side of management which during negotiations would cause a division between them and the teachers.

In the survey, 54 (74%) of the principals were particularly strong in their feelings that the superintendent should consult with them before negotiating with the teachers if that ever became necessary. They felt almost as
strongly that the teachers should consult with them before starting to negotiate with the Archdiocese whenever necessary.

There was also a strong feeling amongst lay and religious teachers that if a deadlock in collective negotiations would occur, neither the bishop nor the school board of the Archdiocese should be asked to resolve the impasse. Their opinion was that a mediator should be sought who would be mutually acceptable to the teaching personnel and to the school authorities.

**Proposition 4.3 --** With the growth of collective negotiations, supervision of instruction will remain a major function of the principal.

**Administrators' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 (22%)</td>
<td>33 (45%)</td>
<td>8 (11%)</td>
<td>15 (21%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to this proposition were found in the questionnaire submitted to the principals only; there was no corresponding response from the lay or religious teachers. The responses revealed a surprising 67 per cent agreement to the proposition, for the majority of principals when interviewed considered this function of the principal ideal theoretically, but honestly admitted they were unable to put it into practice. Many teachers in the different schools visited expressed their disappointment with the principals as they rarely visited classrooms during teaching periods and rarely communicated with them regarding instructional matters. Their communications were limited to requests for permissions to attend conferences or workshops or to obtain needed classroom instructional materials.
The 16 (22%) principals who disagreed were the ones drowned "in a sea of paperwork" and related "administrivia" such as, reports, building maintenance, parents, agents, etc., much of which was unrelated to the supervision of instruction. Unless additional personnel were hired for redistribution of the "trivia" tasks, they could not see how the major function of the principals could be supervision of instruction.

Another statement related to the proposition asked of the principals was whether they thought a professional, other than the principal, would assume the function of supervising instruction in the schools. Forty-five per cent of the principals disagreed with the statement; thirty-two per cent considered it a possibility since technological developments were opening wide the field to a number of companies who ventured in specializing in educational innovations.

Catholic school administrators are not so naive as to feel that the introduction of collective bargaining or teachers' associations will not lessen their administrative control or their role as professional educational leaders. But, they believe, the degree to which it will be lessened will not pose a real threat to their leadership roles. Collective bargaining is a process that operates between equals and this process does produce conflict and the loss of some autonomy for administrators, but this does not mean that all power in the school will be turned over to groups of teachers. It does mean that while administrators are the administrative and educational leaders, they must formally and effectively respect the competencies of the staff and share in the decision-making which affects both administrators and teachers. Whether the school is considered from the professional or from the administrative perspective, principals will be important and necessary.
From the foregoing propositions, it can be concluded that the development of teachers' organizations would not result in threats to the control of the principal as administrator or as educational leader, and it would not lead to unsolvable conflicts between principals and teachers and between lay and religious teachers; working with a unified faculty would be possible. The hypothesis thus is affirmed by the majority of administrators and teachers in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

HYPOTHESIS V: IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, THE PARTICIPATION OF RELIGIOUS TEACHING PERSONNEL IN A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION FOR COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS PRESENTS MANY DIFFICULTIES.

An unanswered question in most teachers' associations or union contracts is how to continue bargaining with lay teachers without ignoring the professional rights of religious teachers. Many of the lay faculty associations, especially in the large, eastern, urban dioceses, such as Buffalo, Cincinnati, and San Francisco exclude religious from membership. Some allow religious to take out an "associate" membership that would entitle them to obey all union laws, including the obligation to go on strike whenever the union so decreed, but which would refuse them a vote in any union matters. Still others consider religious as "membership-at-large." These are second-class citizenships unacceptable to religious as professional teachers. As non-regular members, religious would have no right to participate in the collective negotiations or to vote on the agreements made in the name of the association or union.

The reluctance to accept religious in teachers' organizations in Catholic schools stems from what is phrased as "conflict of interest" or "divided loyalties" which would result immediately if religious were on the labor side
of the bargaining table while being at the same time an integral part of the religious community—management which owns or operates the school. For the religious themselves, in some cases, it would result in a schizophrenic dilemma of serving two masters simultaneously: at one time a religious superior, at another an institutional administrator who in both circumstances may be the same person, thus still further complicating the matter.

What attitudes or opinions the administrators and teachers in the schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago have regarding this situation can be found in their responses to the following propositions.

**Proposition 5.1 --** Religious teachers should be more occupied with spiritual matters in the schools, leaving the lay teachers to take care of secular matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation of this proposition is that religious teachers should devote their full time and effort to works sponsored by the religious superiors and not get involved in such matters as collective negotiations. This was overwhelmingly rejected by 113 (83%) of the lay teachers and 144 (92.3%) of the religious teachers who felt it was important that religious participate with their confreres in matters other than spiritual in order to develop the communitarian spirit bringing about the togetherness and understanding so essential for peace and progress in any school.
In the past, many religious have been overworked, underpaid, and subjected to extreme frustration, all in the name of "sacrifice" thought to be intrinsic to religious life and the apostolate of teaching. Many of these "sacrifices" were impossible to attain and eventually destroyed those involved. Today's "new breed" of religious is very different from his or her former predecessors. Whatever hinders them from using effectively their talents and abilities in teaching—whether it is low pay, excessive work loads, uncongenial assignments, or lack of opportunity for professional advancement—is considered a disservice not only to the religious teacher but to the apostolate itself.

These mundane, secular matters are found in the constitutions and platforms of teachers' associations, and today involve professional religious teachers almost as deeply as they do the lay teachers.

Proposition 5.2 -- The authorized religious superior of a community which teaches in a particular secondary school should not at the same time be principal of that school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' Responses</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>29 (21%)</td>
<td>57 (42%)</td>
<td>30 (22%)</td>
<td>17 (13%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>52 (33%)</td>
<td>59 (38%)</td>
<td>28 (18%)</td>
<td>13 (8%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are some instances in the organization of Catholic schools where the relationship between administrators and teachers becomes quite complicated by the fact that religious teachers may have professional relationships with administrators who are also their local religious superiors. This dual function becomes confusing and at times provoking when the superior-principal con-
strues his interests or prejudices as coming under the vow of obedience. It is one of several reasons why 52 (33%) of the religious teachers strongly agreed and 59 (38%)--a total of 71%--agreed that these two functions be distinct and performed by separate individuals.

The lay teachers were aware of possible complications which could result from this type of dual authority vested in one person and of the possibility of subverting or weakening the position of teachers during collective negotiations. Eighty-six (63%) indicated their agreement that the duties of the superior and the principal should be performed by two different individuals. The small number of religious and lay teachers, about 13 per cent, who disagreed with the proposition is an indication of how strongly most of the teachers felt about abolishing this type of authoritarian pattern in the Catholic schools. Only a few high schools remain in the Archdiocese in which the superiors have not assigned these functions to different persons.

Proposition 5.3 -- In important matters, such as those which come up in collective negotiations, a religious teacher should speak out and write even when he is in conflict with the will of his authorized superior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between the religious teacher and his superior is not meant to rob the individual of his personal freedom or uniqueness. Leading authorities in this newly emerging field of collective negotiations in Catholic
schools, such as Reicher and Casey, feel that a religious teacher in these matters should be considered primarily as a teacher rather than as a member of a religious community. He should be free to join and free to vote and free to react to association business according to his own individual conscience. It is inconceivable that such personal expressions on the part of the religious should be in any way part of the superior's jurisdiction under the vow of obedience.

Freedom of the individual to make his own decisions was the most important factor to 96 (68%) of the religious who endorsed this proposition. Approximately the same per cent of lay teachers also agreed. The majority of the religious and lay teachers who strongly agreed with the proposition were in the age bracket of 29 and under or 30-39 years of age. Only 34 (22%) of the religious and 24 (17%) of the lay teachers disagreed with the proposition. For these the age group began at 29 or under with a few disagreeing and increased as the ages reached the 50-59 or 60 plus age group.

In another part of the questionnaire, teachers were asked whether in their opinion religious teachers should demonstrate or picket if these became necessary as a result of collective negotiations even when this conflicted with the will of authorized superiors. To "speak out and write" was considered a mild form of opposition compared to "demonstrate and picket." Thus, the responses were rather equally divided between those who agreed and those who disagreed. Thirty-three per cent of the lay teachers and 39 per cent of the religious teachers agreed to demonstrating and picketing, while 39 per cent of the lay and 48 per cent of the religious teachers disagreed. The disagreement did
not stem from the "will of his authorized superior," but from the individual's conscience which should be free to make its own judgments and decisions. A number of teachers, both lay and religious chose to withhold their opinions in this proposition, as demonstrations and picketing are still unacceptable to the majority of the religious as a vehicle for expressing dissatisfaction with existing conditions.

Again, it was in the younger age levels--lay teachers (29 years or under), religious (30-39 years)--that the strongest agreement or disagreement on demonstrating or picketing was expressed.

It is a matter of fact that religious, under certain circumstances, do join in demonstrations or picket lines as was recorded by the news media recently. In the Elizabeth Seton High School in 1968, religious staff members who sympathized with the lay teachers during the strike did join the picket lines and marched with placards in front of the school.8

The proposition affirms the freedom religious have in the exercise of choice of action if matters in which they chose to differ from the religious authority does not alter the essence of religious life nor attempt to negotiate those elements which are of an internal nature to the religious life, such as, transfer or assignment of personnel to a needed position or occupation. These are not elements that belong to labor-management situations; they are essentially something between the religious and his religious superior which cannot be altered.

---

It is an inevitable conclusion from these propositions, that both the uniqueness of Catholic education and the peculiar uniqueness of the religious life style are reflected in certain ways with respect to religious who become members of a teachers' union or association. In church-related schools, the lay-religious dichotomy is considered the most vexing problem with no ready solution available. As all questions do not have answers, so all problems do not have solutions; but as the process of legitimate and fair collective negotiations develop in the Catholic schools, satisfactory compromises should be achieved.

Thus, although the majority of teachers affirmed the hypothesis that the participation of religious teaching personnel in a teachers' organization for collective negotiations presents many difficulties, they did not feel that these difficulties were insurmountable nor that they would prevent the religious teachers from participating in the activities of these organizations.

HYPOTHESIS VI: IN THE CATHOLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT IN COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS THE NEGOTIATING PROCESS WHICH INVOLVES FINANCIAL ISSUES BE SEPARATED FROM THE DISCUSSION PROCESS ON PROFESSIONAL ISSUES.9

Proposition 6.1 -- Negotiations involving salaries for lay teachers should be negotiated by lay teachers only and salaries for religious should be negotiated by religious only.

Financial issues are restricted here to mean those items in the teachers' contract which have an income value to the individual teacher. These would include salaries, insurance benefits, etc.

Professional issues may also include items which can be estimated on a monetary scale, such as improved working conditions. There are definite costs to the school involved in establishing lower pupil-teacher ratios or a shorter teaching day. In this hypothesis, such costs, which do not accrue to teacher income, have been considered separate from the financial issues.
Teachers' Responses

a) Salaries for Lay Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable For Lay Teachers Only</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Negotiable For Religious Teachers Only</th>
<th>Negotiable For Both Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>87 (64%)</td>
<td>6 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
<td>87 (56%)</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49 (31%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Salaries for Religious Teachers

| Lay            | 5 (4%)                           | 14 (10%)   | 77 (57%)                               | 40 (29%)                    |
|                |                                  |            |                                        |                             |
| Religious      | 21 (13%)                         | 1 (1%)     | 16 (10%)                               | 75 (48%)                    |
|                |                                  |            |                                        | 43 (28%)                    |

From the foregoing per cents, it can be assumed that teachers' opinions regarding salaries are divided between negotiable for a particular group only and negotiable for both together. Sixty-four per cent of the lay teachers and 56 per cent of the religious teachers think that lay teachers' salaries should be negotiated by lay teachers only and about 30 per cent of each group think that lay teachers' salaries should be negotiated by both groups together. Religious teachers' salaries, according to 57 per cent of the lay teachers and 48 per cent of the religious, should be negotiable by the religious only, while about 29 per cent of both groups would like them negotiated by both groups together.

Only 13 per cent of the religious teachers indicated that salaries for religious should be non-negotiable. This is a decided change in attitude from a few decades ago when religious teachers traditionally exchanged their talents and energies "for a mere pittance" in the name of poverty or obedience.
Formerly, religious teachers rarely concerned themselves with items of economic concern, such as salaries, tenure, substitution and overtime, compensations, pensions or retirement, or working conditions. The burden for these concerns was assumed by legitimate superiors who arranged for these needs with the authorities of the Archdiocese.

It is for this reason that teachers' associations or unions specifically excluded religious from membership for they felt religious lacked motivation in bargaining for economic considerations as their financial well-being was secure and was not directly affected by the bargaining. Lay teachers, on the other hand, in most cases, must themselves fully assume the burden of their economic welfare.

Since Vatican II, however, there is a strong movement amongst Catholic educators and spokesmen of religious communities to recoup the value of the services of their religious teachers. More and more the religious school people, rightfully regarding themselves as professional persons are unwilling to continue to receive financial remuneration so low as to impede their professional growth. In addition, their inability to cover total costs of maintenance and teacher preparation out of the earnings from employment in the schools are causing them to demand full lay teachers' salaries. From this full salary, they freely consign a certain percentage to their religious orders which, in turn, may or may not assign it back in full or in part to the school system or to the archdiocese.

If religious teachers demand full lay salaries, it is logical that salaries will have to be scaled on the same basis as salaries for lay teachers.
In the questionnaire the teachers were asked to give their opinions on this subject. Approximately 54 per cent of the lay teachers and 71 per cent of the religious teachers agreed that the same salary scaling should be used by both groups of teachers. Twenty-nine per cent of the lay teachers withheld their opinions and 17 per cent disagreed. This indicates that lay people are divided about equating salaries for lay and religious and for reasons mentioned in the last proposition. If the same salary basis is used by lay and religious teachers, why the separate negotiations for each group? Perhaps, the only time the dual group model for salaries will disappear is when an equitable salary, plus benefits, will be paid to lay and religious teachers alike.

Taking all of these statements into consideration, it can be presumed that until such time as salaries are paid equally to lay and religious teachers alike, a discussion of salaries should be negotiated by lay and religious teachers separately. Stated in this manner, the proposition is affirmed by the majority of both groups of teachers in the archdiocesan schools.

Proposition 6.2 -- Negotiations involving economic benefits or compensation questions should be negotiated separately by lay teachers' groups and by religious teachers' groups.

Teachers' Responses

a) Attitudes on Pension and Retirement Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable For Lay Teachers Only</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Negotiable For Religious Teachers Only</th>
<th>Negotiable For Both Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
<td>31 (22.8%)</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>90 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>22 (14%)</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>118 (76%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Attitudes Toward Extra Curricular Assignments and Compensations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Negotiable</td>
<td>For Lay Teachers Only</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>For Religious Teachers Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
<td>12 (8%)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These responses lessen the psychological overtones that religious lack motivation in bargaining regarding matters of "income value," and as such should be excluded from negotiations. They are also an affirmation of the feelings expressed by administrators who claim: "It is about time to put lay and religious staffs together--same salaries and same benefits--STOP living off the NUNS!"

Not only nuns, but all religious in this day and age are deeply concerned with pensions and retirement since they are faced with an enduring financial crisis. Religious superiors spend frantic hours wondering how to stretch budgets to include the increased demands of professional in-service training and pension benefits for aging, retired religious.

The day has forever passed when sisters went their way docilely unaware of their wage-earning potential (which in a capitalistic economy is closely related to a person's self-concept and personal image). They know now that Church authorities have bound them into a community institution which furnishes low-cost personnel for multiple Catholic enterprises.

They are, therefore, demanding and obtaining equitable salaries plus other benefits comparable to those of the lay teachers.

10 Comment made by an administrator on "Principals' Opinionnaire."

The number of teachers who favored that pension and retirement benefits be negotiable for both teachers together were 90 (66%) lay teachers and 118 (76%) religious teachers. Twenty-three per cent of the lay teachers and 14 per cent of the religious teachers considered these matters as negotiable for lay teachers only. Opinions of these religious—and lay people shared the same opinions—felt no concern regarding pensions or retirement as these were matters to be settled and provided for by their authorized superiors and not at the bargaining table.

In regard to extra-curricular assignments and compensations, there was a more striking agreement among the teachers. Approximately 117 (86%) lay and 131 (84%) religious felt that these matters should be negotiable by both groups together. A very small per cent of each group considered these matters non-negotiable or negotiable for lay teachers only. Some of these still feel that any authority for making a decision "must rest with an individual in the local situation--THE PRINCIPAL."

It is not unusual to find in a Catholic school lay and religious teachers working side by side as coaches or moderators, as speech or drama teachers. Compensations of necessity would have to be agreed upon by both; and the amounts of equal value, considering, of course, also the training and experience of the individuals involved.

Teachers' opinions and attitudes did not affirm this proposition, but overwhelmingly the teachers felt that pensions, retirement, extra curricular assignments and compensations should be negotiable for both lay and religious teachers together.
Proposition 6.3 -- Negotiations involving discussion of professional issues should be negotiated by religious and lay teachers together.

Although the two teacher groups in Catholic schools may have different financial aspirations, they do have the same professional desires. Teachers' associations are also interested in many things beyond purely economic benefits. Details about class loads, curriculums, textbooks, school regulations, teaching hours, etc., are worked out in their constitutions or in contracts. Typically, religious teachers are more concerned with matters which improve professional status than with salaries and benefits.

Six areas involving professional issues were selected from the questionnaire to which the largest number of teachers responded that both lay and religious teachers should negotiate together. These areas are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Size and Teaching Load</th>
<th>Changes in Curriculum</th>
<th>Textbook Selection</th>
<th>Student Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>123 (90%)</td>
<td>121 (89%)</td>
<td>117 (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>137 (88%)</td>
<td>137 (88%)</td>
<td>140 (90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>Time Allowance for Professional Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay</td>
<td>118 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>125 (90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers indicate the very high per cent of teachers who strongly felt that professional matters were to be negotiable for lay and religious teachers together. From interviews with administrators, lay and religious faculty members, this same conclusion could be drawn. These same topics frequently
appeared on the agendas of faculty, advisory board, and departmental meetings which were composed of lay and religious groups of teachers.

The problem, however, in many teacher contracts is how to continue bargaining with lay teachers without ignoring the professional rights of religious teachers if the latter are not members of associations or unions. Catholic writers have offered a few suggestions. Some claim that religious need not become members of lay teachers' bargaining units if their professional rights are properly respected. Others suggest legislating professional questions and working conditions away from the bargaining table where the atmosphere is less heated and allows religious teachers to participate on an equal basis.

Regardless of what methods or means are employed, the opinions of 80-90 per cent of the teachers affirmed this proposition of including both lay and religious teachers together when negotiations involving discussion of professional issues take place in the school.

In summarizing the findings for this hypothesis, salaries were the only financial item to be considered as negotiable by lay and religious teachers separately; in all other items requiring financial considerations, the teachers felt they should be negotiated by both groups together. In the teachers' opinions, issues involving professional matters were definitely to be negotiated by both lay and religious teachers together.

As long as religious teachers remain economically on a different footing from lay teachers, salaries will always present a problem in any association or union whose membership is opened to both lay and religious teachers. Although it may not be necessary or important to separate the negotiating process which involves financial issues from the discussion process on profes-
sional issues, for the present, it would be better to separate them. Until such time as a single teachers' organization in the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese includes lay and religious teachers, financially and professionally, on an equal basis, a separate negotiating process on these issues would help to avoid many problems which are bound to arise under existing conditions.

As stated, Hypothesis VI was rejected by the majority of lay and religious teachers.
Aided greatly by the social and political unrest that bound the nation, 1967-68 will go down in history as the year of strikes in Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago. The shrinking blue-collar base for labor unions, country-wide organizational interest of unions in school systems, the lessened opposition to the exclusion of such organizations from the NLRB, and the general goals of the labor movement accelerated increased organizational attempts to involve church-related institutions.

Schools throughout the nation, including Catholic schools, were caught in expanding teacher aspirations; the job market for teachers was unusually great. In Catholic schools, an increasing number of men were finding satisfying and rewarding teaching careers. Like their counterparts in the public schools, these people wanted to be professional and remain in the teaching profession. To secure these goals, they organized associations or unions to represent them. When their efforts to achieve what they considered their rights were thwarted, they resorted to strikes. The successful strikes of the teachers in the public schools of the city, gave them confidence and courage to do likewise in church-related schools.

The lay teachers in three large Catholic high schools with all-male enrollments--Leo, Mendel, and St. Patrick--went out on strike Friday, April 12, 1967. Although the strikes were simultaneous, they apparently were unrelated since the lay teachers in these schools were represented by three different organizations. On that day, the teachers in all three schools became aware of
each others' plight through news reports via radio and television. At a joint press conference held the following day at the Drake Hotel, representatives of the lay teachers at the three schools emphasized that the three teachers' groups were striking separately. However, they issued a joint statement citing "the need for stabilized salary schedules, recognizing of the respective organizations as sole bargaining agents, lifting of ceilings imposed upon the salary schedules, instituting of determination of master's degree credit, and recognizing of tenure."¹ In addition, the spokesmen agreed that the rate of teacher turnover in the schools was about 50 per cent and that measures had to be taken to stop this turnover to insure a good education for Catholic students.

These were the first walkouts at Roman Catholic schools in Chicago and the first in the nation. A year later on March 22, 1968, a fourth strike occurred at Mother Seton High School, an all-girl school in the suburbs of South Holland. The strikes were so different in each of the schools that it was necessary to consider each of the striking schools separately.

Each of the striking schools was visited and extensive, structured interviews with twenty-six administrators, teachers, and mediators who had participated in the strikes were taped. An intensive study of the files in the Archdiocese School Office were also read. Newspaper articles from the city's major papers and a number of magazine articles treating of the strikes have been examined for comments of those closely concerned with the strike. Numbers of documented correspondence and reports from various individuals involved with

the strike were checked in an attempt to present as objectively as possible a case study for each of the striking schools.

LEO HIGH SCHOOL

Leo High School, located on the south side of Chicago, had at the time of the strike an enrollment of 970 boys. The school, conducted by the Christian Brothers of Ireland, was a parish school which at one time was able to meet its financial obligations without burdening the parish. Changes over a period of years, and in particular, the changing racial pattern in the neighborhood caused the enrollment to decline, and the school's financial problems began to tax the parish.

As a consequence, in 1966, St. Leo Parish abrogated all interest in the high school more by default than by anything else. To ease the financial stress, the Archdiocesan School Board assumed the financial obligations of the school while the Brothers continued to operate it. The plan of the Archdiocese was to renovate the school and eventually give it to the Brothers. The school became the recipient of much Archdiocesan money which was used for badly needed repairs and improvements around the school. The internal control of the school, the real governing force, however, shifted from the Christian Brothers to the Archdiocesan School Board.

Rumors soon began to circulate that the Brothers were planning to terminate their association with the school. During this particular interim, the school did not belong to the parish nor to the Christian Brothers. The latter would not accept the title to the building for a period of three years
during which time a final decision would be reached on whether or not the Brothers wished to accept the school. If a decision to accept the school was reached, they wanted a guarantee that the Brothers would remain there unconditionally.

In the face of such uncertainty, it became apparent to the lay teachers that regardless of the decision, their positions were most precarious. The predicament in which they found themselves led them to undertake serious consideration of an idea they had earlier entertained—that of organizing a teachers' union.

In September of 1966, the teachers took the first steps toward unionization. A proposed constitution and contract were formulated and approved by the lay faculty. By December of the same year, a formal petition was drawn up and signed by the lay faculty, announcing their intention to organize a union and to hold an election to determine a collective bargaining agent. The election was held, the agent was determined, and the Catholic Lay Teachers Association (CLTA) came into existence and was designated as the agent for the Leo lay teachers. It was the first organization of its kind in a Catholic high school in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

The following January, 1967, the CLTA presented the administrator of the school, Brother R. J. Lasik, the proposed contract. He accepted the contract and informed the teachers that under the present situation at Leo he would have to refer the matter to his superiors at the Catholic School Board for a final approval. The School Board efficiently and properly pigeonholed that contract. After a lengthy period of waiting, the teachers notified
superintendent Monsignor William McManus and Brother Lasik that if good faith negotiations were not initiated by a certain date, the teachers would call a strike. Two days before the deadline, Msgr. McManus met with the teachers' representatives and appointed Brother Lasik to negotiate for the School Board. He offered the lay teachers a wage package that would raise starting salaries from $5,100 to $5,500 and the top salary level from $7,500 to $8,500 for the next school year. James Walsh, spokesman for the Leo teachers, sought a basic annual salary of $5,900, the institution of a pension plan, payment of hospitalization and life insurance benefits, and "working conditions which would encourage a more professional atmosphere." Progress was being made along these lines between the administration and the lay teachers, and perhaps a settlement would have been reached had not the introduction of a third party taken place.

After two weeks of negotiating with Brother Lasik, lawyers from the law firm of Kirkland and Ellis were introduced as members of the School Board's negotiating team; and they took over the meetings with the teachers. The lawyers questioned the legality of the CLTA and suggested that the union was not a proper bargaining agent for the teachers. They wanted a new union election. Bit by bit, the teachers saw their gains in negotiations with Brother Lasik disappear. They became disturbed over the way matters were progressing and tried to negotiate with the lawyers, hoping to retain, at least, the basic minimum things agreed upon previously with Brother Lasik. Their demands were refused, and the strike broke out on April 21, 1967.

Twenty out of twenty-two lay teachers picketed outside of Leo High School. Msgr. McManus' immediate comment was that
The teachers now absent from their classes are violating the contracts they signed at the beginning of this year. Labor leaders would call this a wildcat walkout, rather than a strike.

The people who are being hurt are the students who need their teachers.

My personal comment is that the Catholic school system depends upon the generosity of many people for its financial support. We have no Legislature to turn to for emergency funds, no sales tax to increase for the support of our schools, no source of money other than the tuition fees and contributions of the Catholic people.2

On the same day that the strike broke out, the parents received a letter from the principal in which he explained that the school could not meet all of the lay teachers' demands with the financial resources available to the school "unless we made an extremely steep increase in tuition." He further commented that the teachers were offered a substantial salary increase for the coming school year "in addition to the health, life, and accident insurance plan." Despite these efforts, the teachers broke their contracts with the school, a decision that "was tragic and ill-advised," but that he "could not prevent it without an unreasonable increase in the cost of educating your sons." The school was prepared to make every effort to resolve their differences with the lay teachers through negotiation, and "until this effort is fruitful we will adopt a revised class schedule, commencing Tuesday morning, that should enable us to continue performing the essential educational services of the school."3

A few days later, a flyer was sent to the parents by the striking teachers requesting them to attend a meeting at a local restaurant so that the

---


3 Letter to parents from Brother R. J. Lasik, principal, April 21, 1967.
questions concerning the strike could be answered. About a hundred parents attended the meeting and were told that the tuition increase referred to in Brother Lasik's letter would not be the result of a successful strike, but the $30.00 increase had already been decided upon several months ago by Msgr. McManus.  

The attempt of the lay teachers to interest the parents met with negligible success. As one teacher put it,

The one thing we were most upset about after the strike started was the indifference of the parents. We tried to get the message across to them that if we won it would mean as much to their children as it would to us. However, most just didn't care, they sat on their duffs and let us sail our own boat.  

The students were divided over whether teachers were justified in striking. Some were concerned with what this would mean in view of having only twenty-five school days left; others were in favor of the strike and felt the teachers were justified. One of the senior boys who belonged to a union in his after-school job refused, as a loyal union man, to cross the picket line despite the warning by the Assistant Principal that in so doing he would take the chance of losing his diploma. Striking teachers did not permit any students to join the picket line. Mr. James Keane, a spokesman for the striking teachers, felt that this is one thing he would do differently if he were in the

4Letter to parents from the Catholic Lay Teachers Association, April 26, 1967.  

5Daniel Carroll, "The Leo Teachers' Strike." Paper prepared for an Economics course at some local university. Undated, it was obtained from the Leo Teachers' Union file in care of Mr. George Cummins, president of the Leo Teachers' Union.
strike situation again: He would involve more students in the strike by encouraging them to remain at home or to join the picket line.\(^6\)

Some of the Brothers were very sympathetic with the goals of the striking teachers and made their feelings known at various public meetings; however, for every sympathetic religious, there were those who were bitterly opposed to the strike, who felt they were being "stabbed in the back," or "spit in the face." They took it as a personal affront and were then and still are now opposed to any union activities. The Leo lay teachers' union decided not to allow the Brothers to join the union as they felt that the Brothers would not go on strike if it became necessary. After the strike was settled, the teachers' union invited the Brothers to join, but none accepted the invitation.\(^7\)

Classes continued throughout the strike as twenty members of the Christian Brothers and one non-striking lay teacher doubled up on classes.

Strangely enough, the mutual desire of each side in this dispute to reach accord was brought about by a television show. James Walsh and Brother Lasik were invited to discuss the strike on the Jim Conway Morning Show. Brother Lasik found himself unable to appear because of pressing matters at the school, and in his letter of apology to Jim Conway, he extended an open invitation to the teachers to reopen talks. He stated that his door was always open to any contact from the union. When confronted on the air by this statement, Mr. Walsh agreed that the teachers also maintained an open door. Jim Conway

\(^6\)Interview with Mr. James Keane, July 3, 1971.

\(^7\)Ibid.
became the third party. Through his intervention, a series of phone calls were made, conditions were arranged, and the time and place for reopening negotiations were set. 

Four days after the negotiations were reopened, the final contract was completed and sent to both sides for ratification. The agreement was accepted immediately by the teachers and on Sunday afternoon by the administration. Ten days after the strike began, it ended on April 29, 1967.

The administration and the Catholic Lay Teachers Association issued a joint statement Monday on the agreement that said in part:

- The agreement recognizes the association as collective bargaining representative for lay teachers at Leo High School.
- It provides a new salary scale with substantial increases for all teachers currently employed. It also provides for an insurance program and a pension plan, tenure for all teachers with more than three years of service, and a grievance procedure with arbitration.
- The agreement contains a no-strike guarantee extending through March 31, 1969.

After ten days of striking, the lay teachers were back at work on Monday morning, May 1, 1967, and normal classroom schedules were resumed on Tuesday.

The Archdiocesan School Board played a strange role in the Leo strike that should be mentioned. The striking teachers union was in reality negotiating with the Archdiocese, although this was not publicly acknowledged by the Archdiocese. Mr. James Walsh, the spokesman for the striking teachers, knew it.

---

8Carroll, op. cit. Also confirmed in an interview with Mr. George Cummins, March 30, 1971.

was not the Christian Brothers, but the Archdiocese with whom he was negotiat-
ing. The Archdiocese disclaimed publicly any involvement in the negotiations,
but their behind-the-scenes operations were quite evident to the local adminis-
tration and to the representatives of the striking teachers sitting at the bar-
gaining table.

In an interview with Father Thaddeus O'Brien, assistant superintendent
of the Archdiocesan secondary schools, he stated that the reason for the public
denial of the involvement with the negotiators was that they did not want to
pick up the tab "if a high settlement were negotiated" for fear it would set a
precedent for other Catholic secondary schools to follow.\(^{10}\) The Leo striking
teachers made it known that the strike was not against the Christian Brothers
but against the School Board for whom the Brothers acted as representatives.

A few weeks after the settlement of the strike, the teachers at Leo
High School, under the direction of Mr. James Keane, initiated the procedures to
affiliate themselves with the AFL-CIO sponsored American Federation of Teachers
and its local affiliate, the Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT). The forma-
tion of the new Chicago local to represent Catholic lay teachers became Local
1700 of the AFT with the official title of the Archdiocesan Teachers Federation
(ATF). The goal of this organization was to unionize all Catholic teachers in-
cluding religious under the jurisdiction of the Catholic School Board. Many of
religious were dissatisfied with the old system of school control on the parish
level. These professional educators felt that the job of operating the school

\(^{10}\)Interview with Father Thaddeus O'Brien, June 24, 1971.
should rest solely within their jurisdiction and not as another duty of the local Pastor.

MENDEL HIGH SCHOOL

Mendel High School is located in a racially changing neighborhood about four miles south and two miles east of Leo High School. It is a private, community-owned school operated by the religious order of Augustinian Fathers. At the time of the strike, it had an enrollment of 1,400 boys with thirty-four lay teachers. The financial resources were derived solely from tuition and some fund-raising. Any deficits incurred from the operation of the school were the sole responsibility of the Augustinian order; at no time were subsidies received from the Archdiocesan School Board.

Although the strike was coincidental with that of Leo's and St. Patrick's and lasted only one day, its roots extended back to months of restlessness and communication difficulties with the administration regarding a single salary schedule. The former principal, Father McNabb, had set up an acceptable, uniform salary schedule from which the incumbent principal, Father Daniel Hartigan, had deviated. Father Hartigan was signing contracts with the teachers on an individual basis, using what was basically a merit system. A teacher's salary depended upon the administrator's evaluation of the value or service the teacher rendered to the school.11 Some teachers felt it was based more on "personal relationships" which a selected group of teachers enjoyed.

11Father Daniel Hartigan's definition of "merit system" as given in an interview on May 12, 1971.
with the administration. The discrimination in salary between the teachers in the athletic department and those in the academic fields was especially noted. The latter received lower salaries than the former. The inconsistencies and preferential treatment of certain faculty members by the administration alienated most of the faculty who felt left out of the "good relationship" with the administration.

As the teachers left the administrator's office with the signed "Sweetheart Contracts" as the teachers labelled them, they revealed the inequities to other teachers and related to them the request by the administrator not to repeat any of the negotiations that took place in the principal's office. Obviously, many were reticent to tell what transpired, but it was not long before these inequities became public knowledge and resentment began to build up. To the lay teachers, this became a moral issue.

Prior to the strike, if a teacher wanted to get a raise, to get better classes, or to get some necessary instructional equipment, he had to do this on an individual basis. The teachers had no share in decision-making regarding school matters or wages. It was a matter of supply and demand; if a teacher was not wanted, he was eliminated from the roster and someone else replaced him. As a consequence, there was a great turnover of teachers from year to year. With no assurance of tenure, there was no stability nor security amongst the teachers. A pension plan in the form of an insurance policy was used, but very few of the personnel participated in the plan. Since many of the inequi-

---

12Interview with Ray Janulis, currently teaching at Mendel High School and former Vice-President of the Mendel Federation of Teachers, March 22, 1971.
ties and inconsistencies were on an individual basis, there was almost nothing the individual teachers could do about them. On several occasions these grievances had been presented, vocally and in writing, to the administration, but no action had been taken to correct them. An organization of the teachers became inevitable.

The lay teachers formed an ad hoc committee which they knew would be opposed by Father Hartigan, so they contacted the IFT who sent the regional director and a lawyer to help the teachers set up a program which the teachers felt should be incorporated in the contract. Both men were very knowledgeable with considerable experience in labor-management matters. Meetings, discussions, agitations followed. At the very outset, focus was placed on drawing up a contract with a single salary schedule which would eliminate preferential treatment.

Very little progress was made. On Friday morning, April 21, 1967, in the faculty lounge, the teachers read in the papers about the strikes at Leo and St. Patrick's. This was a golden opportunity to present their demands to the administration; and if refused, to join the other two schools in a strike. The committee approached the administrator and orally requested the recognition of the association of lay teachers at Mendel as the sole bargaining agent to negotiate for a unit salary schedule for the entire faculty. Father Hartigan claimed he did not know his legal position and needed legal advice before he could make any commitment to the teachers. "An immediate answer to something they had so well thought out would be imprudent," thought Father Hartigan. The teachers considered it a delay tactic and informed Father Hartigan
that if an answer was not received by a quarter to nine, the teachers would strike. No answer was given, and the teachers walked out to picket the school. About 88 per cent, or 30 out of the 34 lay teachers went out on strike. Those remaining with the school were all members of the athletic department.

By 6:00 o'clock of the same day, Mr. James Duggan, a graduate of Georgetown University in Washington, D. C., had been engaged as legal representative for the school. He had a great deal of success representing management at labor negotiations. Bob Keeley, executive secretary of the ATF, considered Duggan, in the course of the negotiations, as an "obstructionist" whose "basic purpose was to get the ATF out..."13 Duggan, however, proved to be an expert in the area of labor-management relations and wasted no time in getting negotiations underway. The following year he was hired by Sister Thomas Miriam for the Seton strike. Here, too, he did a commendable job.

His first step was to get a "return-to-work" agreement in motion. By Sunday afternoon, April 23, 1967, the "return-to-work" sessions began with four lay teachers, their lawyer and ATF representative, Father Hartigan and Mr. James Duggan. Until the early hours of the morning, they hammered out points which constituted the "return-to-work" agreement. One of the points was that there would be no action taken against the organizers of the strike. The institution's administration conditionally

Recognized Mendel Teachers Federation, referred to as the union as sole bargaining agent for all lay members of the teaching faculty, including classroom teachers, counselors, librarians and athletic

13Interview with Bob Keeley, December 2, 1970.
coaches. Agreed to meet Wednesday, April 26, for the purpose of reaching an agreement covering terms and conditions of employment for all members of the bargaining unit for the school year 1967-68.\textsuperscript{14}

By May of that year, bargaining was completed and a contract was drawn up which is still in effect today. The teachers organization became known as "The Mendel Teachers Federation" (an independent, unaffiliated Mendel Lay-Teachers-only Union). It excluded religious. According to Father Hartigan, much of the wording in the contract is irrelevant to priests since they are not salaried. The professional areas did not come under serious consideration at that time and so were omitted from the contract. In addition, the Provincial Superior of the Augustinian Fathers at Mendel forbade the religious to join the union.\textsuperscript{15}

Before and during the negotiations to settle the strike, Father Hartigan encountered trouble in an unexpected area--the Augustinian monastery which "was a house divided against itself." Anything that was discussed in the monastery regarding the negotiations was immediately reported by some members of the community to the lay faculty on strike. This became apparent to Mr. Duggan one day as the legal representative for the striking teachers informed him that the lay teachers had "a direct pipeline from the monastery to the faculty lounge. We know every anticipated move before you even make it."\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{14}Taken from the Archdiocesan School Board Files on Negotiations.

\textsuperscript{15}Interview with Father Daniel Hartigan, May 12, 1971.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.
official family was divided; and the appeal for unity by Duggan, Hartigan, and the Provincial was ineffective.

The Mendel situation was left completely in the hands of the negotiators without any interference from the Superintendent or the Archdiocesan School Board. It was a private community-owned school under the jurisdiction of the Augustinian Fathers. The School Board was kept informed about the proceedings, but the Archdiocese was not permitted to enter in the negotiations. The reports to the Superintendent indicated that things were moving well, even if they were not.

The strike was too short to involve the students. There was very little reaction from them; they were not aware of the purpose or reason for the strike. Some were disturbed because they came to school and were told to return home; while others considered it a lark having a free day. The parents like the idea of a contract to stabilize the faculty at Mendel. Many sympathized with the teachers because they felt an injustice had been done with the inferior salaries. A few were displeased especially with the idea of increased tuition due to the teachers' request for a higher salary. The increase in tuition, it was noted by the teachers, did not parallel the increase in teachers' pay.

Mendel never affiliated with a major, national organization. Perhaps it was due to a comment made by one of the administrators who said they would "close the school and die first if the teachers affiliated with a national or state organization. The union at Mendel would be a company union and that is as far as it would go." If threatened to go further with membership, the
school would be closed.17

The contract as drawn up by Father Hartigan had a lot of "holes" in it, and by September, 1968, the teachers were again asking the AFT to help them rewrite the agreement. But the split by now at Mendel between the regular academic faculty and the priests who backed the faculty during the strike and who were joined by the athletic department was so severe that the membership in the AFT was out of question. The teachers seeking membership knew they could not muster up the majority votes necessary to affiliate with the AFT. To this day they do not have a grievance procedure in their contract.

On the other hand, the teachers felt no real need for an affiliation if they could work out their problems with the administration. Their concern, claimed Mr. Janulis, was with the school and not forming an organization for selfish motives. They were concerned with the local, school problems and not with organizing "a typical blue-collar union."18

ST. PATRICK HIGH SCHOOL

The third school on strike on April 21, 1967, was St. Patrick's boys high school with an enrollment of 1,750. The Christian Brothers of Ireland staffed the school and were of the same order as the Brothers at Leo High School. St. Patrick is located in a white, middle-class neighborhood on Chicago's northwest side. The faculty numbered twenty-three Christian Brothers

17 Interview with Mr. Ray Janulis, March 22, 1971.
18 Ibid.
and forty lay teachers. It was a private, community-owned school with its entire financial support obtained from tuition; neither the Archdiocese School Board nor the Community contributed to its maintenance.

For several months, the problem of lay teachers' salaries in all the Christian Brothers schools had been under study by the Directors and Principals of all the Brothers' schools in the Chicago area. At St. Patrick, a joint committee of administrators and duly elected lay faculty representatives further studied the problem in a series of meetings. A salary schedule acceptable to the lay faculty was proposed. The administrators worked on this proposal and suggested modifications of it in a tentative document submitted to the faculty on March 28, 1967. Final approval of the budget for 1967-68 by the Provincial Council of the Christian Brothers and approval, consequently, of the salary schedule itself came through on April 18, 1967.

The salary schedule included a pension plan, a tenure plan, and a hospitalization plan. A projected $25.00 increase in tuition enabled the school to offer the lay teachers a salary increase of $800.00. What proved to be the major obstacle in the salary proposal was the ceilings placed on the salaries. The new salary scale benefitted newcomers not those who had been at St. Patrick's a number of years. It would not hurt anyone who had been there for three years or less. Under the new contract, a teacher who had been at St. Patrick's four years or more could only receive a raise of $800.00 even if the lane he was in at the time entitled him to a salary increase of $1200.00.19

---

19Interview with Mr. Patrick Gill, teacher of business and general law at St. Patrick during the strike period, June 28, 1971.
The administrators of the school explained that the increase in salary was to be gradual; in other words, if a teacher did not get the full increase in salary one year, he would get it the next. This was the only means the school had "to finance the salary increase without going deeply into debt or keeping a balanced budget." The lay faculty was fully informed of all these developments and of the "Chicago Area Christian Brothers School Salary Schedule." The information, however, did not satisfy all the lay teachers.

A week before the strike, interviews were conducted by the principal, Brother Patrick O'Neill, for the coming school year. Not all of the teachers were offered contracts to return. During one of these interviews, a lay teacher showed the administrator a slip of paper on which the lay teachers had been asked to vote whether or not a union should be formed at St. Patrick. The administration was aware of restiveness among the lay teachers, but that the formation of a union or a possible strike was eminent, never crossed their minds. There had been no previous discussion nor was there ever a plan presented to the administration by the lay teachers regarding the organization of a union. It seemed to be something that came up all of a sudden.

On Thursday, April 20, 1967, at about 5:00 p.m., Brother Mark Wagner, the director of the school, received a statement from three lay teachers who gave notice that some twenty lay teachers were going to refuse their services beginning Friday morning, April 21, 1967, at 8:00 a.m. At this time also the

20 Interview with Brother Patrick O'Neill, principal of St. Patrick High School during the time of the strike, May 11, 1971.
21 Ibid.
striking teachers would present their demands in the school office. On the following morning, since no one was present in the school office to receive their demands, twenty-three out of forty lay teachers went out on strike. The administration never received the demands nor did they know the cause for the strike. The Brothers learned the reasons for the strike from the newspapers.

A spokesman for the St. Patrick teachers said the Christian Brothers teaching order, which runs the school, has refused to recognize the St. Patrick Chapter of the Association of Teachers of Catholic Secondary Schools as bargaining agent and has attempted to force a "Mickey Mouse" contract on the lay teachers.

St. Patrick teachers charge that in addition to the flat refusal to recognize a bargaining agent, the school administration has offered the teachers a salary contract which cannot be fully implemented...and that the new ceilings imposed on teachers' salaries are too low.22

There had been no previous meetings with the administration, no previous discussion by any of the parties involved, no previous warnings. It was a surprise walk-out by men under contract.

During one of the early meetings with the striking teachers, the administration made the following proposals: to return to classes and fulfill the contract and then discussions between the administration and walk-out group on the issue of collective bargaining would take place "in a free and open atmosphere." The walk-out teachers, after a vote, refused to return. No demands or grievances had been cited by the protesting group. A uniform salary scale, teacher tenure, a pension plan, a group medical and life insurance program paid for by the school had already been provided for.23


23Press release given to all the news media by the administration of St. Patrick High School, April 24, 1967.
Dr. Charles Enrod, the school's legal representative, advised the administrators to find out what the demands were before they agreed to recognize the walk-out teachers' representatives as the bargaining agent. A meeting with the representatives and Brother Wagner was arranged for the following Monday, April 24, at 9:15 a.m. Brother said he believed the talks would "result in a satisfactory solution." The meeting, however, adjourned without an agreement, for the teachers would not present their demands until they were recognized as the bargaining agents, and the administration would not recognize them until their demands were made known.

Meanwhile, fifteen lay teachers continued to teach their classes according to contract. Violation of signed contracts seemed to be the main reason for these teachers not joining the strikers. In addition to these teachers, twenty-five Brothers and two priests on the staff kept the school running. Although substitutes were considered, none was brought in from the outside to help with classes in order to avoid the accusation that the school was using strike-breaking tactics. Classes continued on modified schedules with juniors and seniors attending morning sessions, while freshmen and sophomores attended afternoon sessions. Wherever possible, closed circuit television was used with proctors in the rooms without teachers. Lunch and study periods were curtailed, but all credit classes were conducted without interruption. Approval for half day sessions was received from Lowell B. Fisher, State Chairman for North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools:

The case of your strike at St. Patrick High School is considered an emergency and your action to continue school is very
The Archdiocesan School Board was kept informed about the developments but did not intervene in any way. The administrators of the school were told to handle the situation as best they could. Msgr. McManus, then Archdiocesan Superintendent of schools, "expressed confidence in the administrations of the schools" and was "hopeful the disputes can be settled quickly."25

Parents were informed of the situation through letters sent home with the students. Letters received from the parents expressed agreement in some cases and disagreement in others with the stand the Brothers took. According to Brother Lawrence Hickey, assistant principal at the time of the strike, the letters ran 4 to 1 in favor of the administration, for the majority of the parents felt that their sons were being let down by the striking teachers.26 Mr. Gerald Murphy, a spokesman for the protestors, claimed that the "majority of parents approved the strike but have not given much support because of fears of retaliation."27

The students appeared to be very much on the side of the administration and the teachers who stayed with the school. This was pretty obvious from the number of students who heckled the teachers as they came to school each day and crossed the picket line. The cooperation given to the school by the students

---

26 Interview with Brother Lawrence Hickey, May 11, 1971.
was encouraging; for with a faculty of forty-five teachers and a student body of 1,700, the school could have been run into a shambles. With only six weeks to the end of the school year, chaos could have been daily fare and possibly forced the administration to close the school if the students had not cooperated. The boys were interviewed on television during the first days of the strike, and their general opinion was that they were caught in the middle of the situation and felt they were being let down by the striking teachers.

Although non-striking teachers were permitted to cross the picket line without harassment, it was made known to them by the striking teachers that if they received recognition, upon their return to the school, a closed shop union would be formed. They threatened the non-striking teachers that they would not be welcome in the union and that their teaching positions would be jeopardized. This attitude on the part of the striking teachers proved to be a delaying factor in settling the strike. It was a real "fear" on the part of the non-striking teachers that a closed shop union would be established if the protestors returned.

On Monday, May 1, a three-point proposal was made to the striking teachers by a labor relations expert brought in by the administration. The proposal called for

...the teachers to return to work without prior recognition of their organization, known as the St. Patrick Chapter of the Assn. of Teachers of Catholic Secondary Schools. It also required them to make a no-strike pledge for two months and promised that after a few weeks of open campaigning there would be a supervised election to determine if a collective bargaining unit should be established.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{28}Chicago Sun-Times, May 11, 1967.
The walk-out group was to indicate its decision within two or three days after the presentation of the proposal.

The proposal was never accepted. Gerald Murphy, president of the striking teachers' group, and Robert E. Fitzgerald, Jr., attorney for the teachers, said the three-point proposal was never presented as an official offer by the school administration.

We could not respond to a proposal when we did not have any assurance that it represented the position of the administration. The proposal had been made by Charles Enrod, a retired Loyola University professor of industrial relations, who was brought in by the administration without prior agreement with the striking group.\(^{29}\)

On Wednesday, May 10, the administration of St. Patrick High School acting through the director, Brother Mark Wagner, announced "that the services of 23 of the 26 teachers who had walked out on Friday, April 21, were formally terminated, effective as of that date." The reason given was that in refusing to teach since that day, the teachers had committed "a clear-cut breach of contract." Three of the striking teachers had already submitted their resignations.\(^{30}\) The administration had endeavored to follow diligently "the policy of reason, calmness and restraint" since the walk-out and now clearly indicated that formal termination of contracts was the only practical alternative left to them in order to safeguard the welfare of the students and the 35 faculty members who had remained on the job.\(^{31}\)

Registered letters were sent to each of the striking teachers telling them they were no longer associated with St. Patrick High School. The uncol-

\(^{29}\)Ibid.

\(^{30}\)Press release by the administration, May 10, 1967.

\(^{31}\)Ibid.
lected salary of the walk-out group was used to pay additional salaries to teachers who were working double shifts and performing other tasks of the absent teachers.

The reasoning behind this move "to fire" the teachers was that the administration had already made up their minds that under no circumstances would they hire any of the striking teachers for the coming year. It was only fair, then, for them to inform the teachers that their services would not be needed and that they should apply elsewhere for teaching positions. The intentions of the Christian Brothers perhaps were well-meant; but when the news was released, it resulted in the worst possible publicity for the Brothers and the school.

The "firings" made front-page headlines in the Chicago Tribune on Thursday, May 11, 1967: TEACHERS ON STRIKE FIRED. One of the first to respond to the firings was Msgr. McManus who said he had not been consulted about the decision and disagreed with it. He felt that dismissing men with many years of service in the school was "an extremely drastic action that should be taken only when every conceivable attempt at mediation and settlement had failed."

It was not a good practice to dismiss employees in the midst of a labor dispute and should be used only "in light of incontrovertible evidence that the school was absolutely in the right." He said he had asked Brother Mark Wagner to reconsider it. Brother Wagner, on the other hand, felt his decision was final.

32 Interviews with administrators, O'Neill and Hickey, May 11, 1971.

"It would take a great amount of contrary evidence to change my present convictions on this matter." Furthermore, he claimed that the superintendent had made it clear earlier in the dispute that "the local school is the authority in the matter."34

Until the firings, Msgr. McManus had stayed out of the controversy. The school was owned, operated, and supported by the Christian Brothers. It was a long-standing tradition in the Archdiocese that conflicts should be resolved at the local level with final decisions residing with the local administration. "But," remarked McManus, "I have an obligation to be interested since the matter has repercussions beyond the local school. I had stayed remote on an assurance that attorneys for both sides were trying to resolve the intricacies of the situation."35

The striking teachers hit back with a plan to seek a hearing before the National Labor Relations Board; and if this was not granted, they would have no recourse but to take the matter to the courts.

In 1944 the Supreme Court clearly stated that a majority of employees who chose some agency to represent themselves in collective bargaining are not legally obliged to honor any previous contracts entered into individually with employees.36

Gerald Murphy, speaking for the fired teachers said,

It's the law of the land as determined by U. S. Supreme Court decisions, that workers cannot be fired for union activities. We

36 Chicago New World, May 12, 1967, p. 5.
plan to take our case to the National Labor Relations Board. We will seek damages and back pay.\textsuperscript{37}

I don't understand it (firings). For 75 years the church has been teaching that it was proper to strike, and took the stand in its encyclicals. Now the church can't live up to its own teaching.\textsuperscript{38}

The striking teachers "appreciated" the efforts of Msgr. McManus and withheld threatened legal action until the results of his efforts were clear.

The administration, however, did not reconsider. Days passed without any settlements, and the school year came to an end without the re-hiring of any of the teachers on strike. Some time before the end of the school year, a teachers' organization was formed within the school with both lay and religious teachers forming the membership. Administration was excluded. Officers and various committees were organized, one of which was the faculty welfare dealing for the most part with salary increases.

The following year, the teachers did not vote for a union, but chose to retain the combined faculty organization. A constitution and contracts were drawn up and put into effect. The lifetime of the organization was short-lived. Interest in it dwindled; and at present, it is non-existent. A strong administrative team has been developed, headed by a superintendent who periodically keeps the faculty aware of the financial conditions of the school. There is a published salary scale, a published budget, but problems regarding salary increases and grievances are settled on an individual basis. From outward appearances, everything seems to be working satisfactorily and smoothly.


\textsuperscript{38}Chicago American, May 11, 1967, p. 3.
ELIZABETH SETON HIGH SCHOOL

The longest teacher strike in the history of Illinois took place at Elizabeth Seton High School, a private, community-owned, 1,000 student-all-girl school located in South Holland in a white, middle-class suburb south of Chicago. It started on March 22, 1968, with fourteen out of thirty-one lay teachers striking; and it came to an unofficial end seventy-two days later on June 2, 1968.

During the previous year, strikes of short duration had occurred at Leo, Mendel, and St. Patrick High Schools in the Archdiocese of Chicago; and as a result of these strikes, a group of lay and religious teachers in the Archdiocese formed a new union. On August 14, 1967, some forty Catholic high School teachers signed a charter founding "an independent teachers' union" with an official title of the Archdiocesan Teachers Federation (ATF). In October of that year, the union affiliated with the Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT) becoming local 1700 ATF of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO). The charter signers authorized the federation to represent them in collective bargaining with their schools.

None of the former strikes in Catholic schools of the Archdiocese generated as much emotionalism, nor did they attract public attention to the same degree as did the Seton strike. Emotionalism gave undue emphasis to fringe issues, obscuring the underlying basic ones. From all appearances, the basic issues centered around the role of the lay teacher in the administration of Catholic secondary schools; the role of the religious teacher in making deci-

\[39\] The New World (Chicago), August 18, 1967, p. 5.
sions to adopt or to reject collective bargaining and to choose the structure through which this bargaining would be accomplished; and the role of ecclesiastical authority and the Archdiocesan School Board in disputes between lay teachers and administrators of community-owned and operated high schools in the Archdiocese.

In the summer of 1967, Sister Thomas Miriam was appointed administrator at Elizabeth Seton High School by Mother Mary Omer, Mother General of the Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati. Sister Thomas Miriam came to Seton with eighteen years of service and previous experience as principal of schools in Michigan and New Mexico. She was a direct and forceful person in contrast to her predecessor who was a wonderful person, but lacking in administrative expertise. It soon became evident to the teachers that the "strong administrator" would function as a "one-man-operation." Circumstances leading to the strike began to build with the first few faculty meetings of the school term.

At one of these faculty meetings, all of the teachers received a policy statement from the principal concerning excessive absences incurred by the faculty:

The new policy stated that absent teachers would be responsible for providing a substitute and that the substitute would be paid by the absent teacher.40

The lay teachers indicated their concern with the new policy to the administration at the following faculty meeting held on October 13—which proved to be

the last for the entire faculty—and a committee was appointed by Sister Thomas Miriam to examine the absence policy. Any attempts on the part of the committee to meet with the administration proved futile; Sister was always "too busy" to discuss the matter.41

From then on communications between the administration and the lay faculty began to break down, and faculty meetings were suspended indefinitely. A series of incidents which the teachers felt curtailed their academic freedom began to build up and resulted in a strong alienation of the lay faculty and Sister Thomas Miriam. Some of the incidents involved teachers who were pressured into changing class grades because they were too high. There was unannounced visits to the classrooms by the principal who would then openly criticize teaching methods. A teacher was fired between classes in the hallway and in the presence of students going to and from classes. Both teachers and students were arbitrarily disciplined by the administration, and the intercom was used to spy on the teachers.42

After the Thanksgiving holidays, the lay teachers presented the list of grievances to Sister Thomas Miriam who promised to consider them. The lay teachers were not reassured by Sister's promises and decided to discuss the matter with the ATF representatives.

In December, the union representatives obtained permission to conduct a meeting at Seton to which all teachers were invited. The meeting was attended

41Ibid., p. 9. Quoting Mr. Ronald Sipowich, spokesman for the lay teachers during the Seton strike.

by the lay teachers and one religious, a representative of the principal who was not a member of the faculty but was in charge of finances. An Elizabeth Seton Council of the ATF was formed; and at the next meeting of the Council, twenty-two of the thirty-one lay teachers signed a collective bargaining authorization petition. During December and January, a number of Council meetings were held in which school policy, tenure, pensions, and grievance procedures were considered. Officers were elected and the contents of the contract were determined.

On January 12, 1968, Mr. Ronald Sipowich, president of the Seton Council, handed Sister Thomas Miriam a letter asking the administration to accept the Seton Council as the sole bargaining agent for the lay teachers in matters of salary and other conditions of employment. He further requested that the administration "authorize immediate negotiations with (the union) culminating in a collective bargaining agreement covering the next school year, 1968-1969." Sister Thomas Miriam refused to discuss the matter, insisting that she had no authority to take any action. "Seton," she said, "is run by a papal order, subject to no authority in the Archdiocese whatever but only subject to my superior in Cincinnati."44

The Council mailed a letter to the Mother General in which they defined the Council's position and requested her to approve it as the bargaining agent. By way of reply, Mother Mary Omer sent her representative, Sister Rose Helene,

43Snyder, op. cit., p. 16.
to speak to the faculty. She stated that Mother Omer found the "recognition of a union, an affiliated union, was unacceptable to her community,"\(^4^{5}\) and that the Community was within its legal rights to refuse recognition. She introduced Mr. James Duggan, a lawyer retained by the school, who then informed the lay teachers of the legality of the position of the school and the Mother General. Duggan had served as legal counsel for several Catholic schools during their strikes the previous year and had been instrumental in helping the administrators of these schools thwart the establishment of a nationally related union group.

Mother Omer had written to Cardinal John Cody, according to Father Thaddeus O'Brien, and had voiced her opposition to the union. Through Sister Rose Helene she told Bishop McManus that "the high school would be closed before she would permit an AFL-CIO union to become a bargaining agent in the school."\(^4^{6}\) Collective bargaining was not the issue, but the fact that an AFL-CIO union was being forced upon the high school which was "a privately owned and operated institution, and she could not agree with it." She did, however, believe in collective bargaining and gave support to the papal encyclicals on labor relations.

Since June, 1967, the High School Policy Commission, appointed by Cardinal Cody and composed of Archdiocesan high school principals, had been working to develop statements on personnel policies to be followed in working with

\(^{45}\)Interview with Father Robert A. Reicher, May 19, 1971.

\(^{46}\)Snyder, op. cit., p. 20.
teachers in the Archdiocesan schools. At a meeting of the principals held on January 31, 1968, the statements on personnel policy were considered. Upon approval they were given to Cardinal Cody for his endorsement. The statements in the teacher personnel policies with respect to collective bargaining read:

4112.11 STRIKES, WALK OUTS, AND WORK STOPPAGES ARE NOT PERMITTED AS SPECIFIED IN EITHER THE INDIVIDUAL OR COLLECTIVE CONTRACT.

4112.12 THE RIGHT OF TEACHING PERSONNEL IN THE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS OF THE ARCHDIOCESE TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IS RECognIZED.

4112.13 THE ENTIRE TEACHING STAFF, LAY AND RELIGIOUS, HAS A RIGHT TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY DECISION TO ADOPT OR REJECT COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, AND IF ADOPTED, TO CHOOSE THE STRUCTURE THROUGH WHICH THIS BARGAINING WILL BE CARRIED OUT.

4112.14 COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN A COLLECTIVE BARGAINING UNIT IS NOT TO BE REQUIRED AS A CONDITION FOR TEACHING IN A PARTICULAR SCHOOL UNLESS AGREED UPON BY BOTH ADMINISTRATION AND TEACHERS.47

The question of whether the religious were free to vote became one of the strongest factors of contention in the strike. According to Father Reicher, the Mother General of that Community circumscribed the freedom of the members of her religious community when she said the recognition of a union, an affiliated union, was unacceptable to her community.

There was undue influence on the part of the administration using the religious authority to get the support of the nuns against the union rather than facing the facts of the issues as they were . . . . In this particular instance, I do not think the nuns there were operating freely.48


48 Interview with Father Robert A. Reicher, May 19, 1971.
At Seton there were twenty-two religious and nine non-union lay faculty members which meant that the union group of twenty-two could be out-voted as the religious were bound by their vows to follow the dictates of their principal. Sister Thomas Miriam contended that the religious were free to vote as their consciences would dictate.

In a meeting between the administration and the Seton Council in February, the administration agreed to allow a vote on whether or not to recognize the union on condition that religious be permitted to vote. The Council argued that the religious were "management" in that they owned and operated the school; they could not also vote as members of the "labor" group. This became a very significant issue, one that served to widen and deepen the division. The meeting ended without compromise or solution.

Basically, the point at issue was the composition of the bargaining unit. The union's position on the make-up of the bargaining unit was ambiguous. The ATF provided for membership of religious teachers in their organization; therefore, it was difficult to understand how it was possible for the Seton Council to maintain that the religious were to be excluded from the decision to collectively bargain. The union never satisfactorily came to grips with this discrepancy between their posture at Seton and their encouragement of religious membership in their organization.

On March 7, Sister Thomas Miriam began to issue contracts for the coming year. A starting salary of $6,350 was named and the contracts specified that teachers would have to work toward obtaining a Master's degree. The contract also contained a section on grievance procedures which was unacceptable.
to the Seton Council because the administration's position was clearly favored on settling grievance questions. At their meeting that day, members of the Seton Council took a strike vote among the lay teachers which was defeated 6-11. About a week later, seven lay teachers were handed dismissal letters in which they were told their services would no longer be needed as of June. Four of the dismissed teachers were elected officers of the Seton Council teachers' union; the other three had worked very closely with the officers.

In mid-March, a fact-finding team was appointed by Bishop McManus with the approval of the Cardinal to investigate charges leveled against the administration and to attempt a solution to the problem. The team was headed by Father Robert Reicher, a priest well-known for his work in labor relations. He and his team met with the teachers and administration several days before the strike began. It was their judgment that there was fault on both sides and, therefore, compromise was the only way to a just settlement. But the "compromise" for "just settlement" was difficult to attain.

The Fact-Finding Committee held a number of "mediation" meetings with the administration, the Seton Council, and the representatives of the ATF Local 1700, separately and combined sessions. Father Reicher's relationship was unusual in that he was the chairman of the Fact-Finding Committee and also served as the mediator in the dispute. Despite earnest efforts, seemingly on everyone's part to reach a settlement regarding an agreement, negotiations

An interesting observation to be made is that none of the grievances had to do with salary or benefits, and at no time did this become an issue in the Elizabeth Seton strike.
broke down completely and the Seton Council called a strike on March 22, 1968, when recognition was again refused by the administration.

Parents and students were strongly divided on the matter due to pressures of various kinds. During the course of the disputes, several open meetings were called by the administration and by the striking teachers to explain to the parents their individual positions in the entire situation. Some parents supported the union, while others backed the school; but for the most part parents did not become too involved until chaotic conditions developed in the school which indicated that violence might erupt. Students who were taught by the striking teachers became openly defiant of the school's administration in sympathy with the striking teachers. Fifty-two of them walked in the picket line with the striking teachers in defiance of orders to either come to class or to leave the premises. They were dismissed from school and had to ask for reinstatement in the presence of their parents and the administration. This did not deter the students from participating in the strike; for throughout the day, March 26, rumors of a demonstration were persistent. A fire alarm was sounded during the lunch period, "and the students went running and screaming out of the school. They were hugging and congratulating the picketing teachers." The bus owner reported that there was so much agitation on the buses that the bus drivers were unnerved. From then on, classes were held on a day-to-day basis.

---

50 Interview with Sister Thomas Miriam, April 23, 1971.

When regular classes were resumed on April 1, the administration had transported Sisters from other schools to fill the vacancies created by the striking teachers. This move was strongly criticized in an article by Sister Myra Stratton, vice-president of the ATF, who referred to them as "Sister Scabs." 52

In the meantime, a group of non-striking lay and religious teachers had been working behind the scenes developing a plan of organizing a faculty senate. The idea of the faculty senate had been proposed early in the negotiations by Mr. James Duggan who felt it would provide an effective, legal bargaining agent that would satisfy all concerned. 53 When the organization procedures were completed, a copy was sent to Father Reicher to present to the union representatives and the Seton Council. It was bitterly opposed and rejected by the Council. Efforts to clarify the position of the union with respect to the religious teachers and to offer a compromise to the non-union lay teachers by the Council were to no avail. Father Reicher considered the faculty senate "a tactic used to break the strike" and an outgrowth of the feeling on the part of the administration that they "held all of the cards in the disagreement." 54

Up until this point, the position of the ecclesial authority and the Archdiocesan School Board had been plainly stated by Father O'Brien. In a

---


53 Robert Tracy, "Faculty Senate' Accepted by Seton, Rejected by Union', The New World (Chicago), April 26, 1968, p. 16.

54 Snyder, op. cit., p. 45.
report to the Association of Chicago Priests on April 22, 1968, he said:

It is the position of the Catholic School Office that this matter is a dispute between two private parties. The intervention of the school board must respect this freedom. The Office is in a position to recommend and to assist the disputing parties; it is not in a position to insist that its recommendation be followed.\(^5\)

In his "Chronology" Father O'Brien writes that teachers on strike are employees of a private institution and not of the Archdiocese of Chicago. Elizabeth Seton High School is under Archdiocesan control to the extent that it must abide by policies developed by the High School Policy Commission of principals and ratified by the Cardinal and the Archdiocesan School Board. "Excepting cases in which there is a conflict with approved policies, the school office respects the freedom and autonomy of private schools in the Archdiocese."\(^6\)

In a letter to Mr. John E. Desmond, President Chicago Teachers Union, he comments on the Archdiocesan School Board position:

Archdiocesan jurisdiction over this private school is limited by this fact. The Catholic School Office can exert moral pressure on the parties but it cannot dictate a solution to their problem.\(^7\)

Early in April, Father O'Brien informed Mr. Ronald Sipowich that, according to Father Reicher, an impasse had been reached and the matter had deteriorated to such an extent that the intervention of the Archdiocesan office was necessary. He suggested that both parties submit their differences to


\(^{6}\) O'Brien, "Chronology. . .," March 27, 1968.

\(^{7}\) Letter to Mr. John E. Desmond, President Chicago Teachers' Union, from Father O'Brien, May 8, 1968.
"binding arbitration."58 By this time, the basic posture of the union was that they had lost and should settle for anything they could get and try again later. So the Seton Council accepted O'Brien's request for participation in binding arbitration immediately. Although Father O'Brien sent both parties special delivery, registered letters, no response was received from the administration until the end of April.

Sister Rose Helene sent the response to Father O'Brien informing him that his "suggestion to submit differences to binding arbitration is unacceptable."59 Furthermore, a majority of all teachers at Seton High School had elected the Faculty Senate to represent them. Sister Thomas Miriam had recognized the Elizabeth Seton Faculty Senate on April 18, 1968, "as exclusive bargaining agent for all faculty members."60 She ended her letter with the statement that the striking teachers would be welcomed back if they wished to return to their classrooms.

In May, it became quite apparent that the union at Seton could expect no help from any source. The administration of the school would not discuss the issues; the Archdiocesan School Board had limited power; and the Cardinal would not enter into the dispute, despite overtures from a number of prominent labor organizations. The Local Chapter therefore, had no other alternative but to take the case to the National Labor Relations Board, charging the

59 Letter from Sister Rose Helene to Father O'Brien, April 24, 1968.
60 Letter to Elizabeth Seton Faculty Senate from Sister Thomas Miriam, April 18, 1968.
Seton administrators with unfair labor practices and asking the Board to come in to hold a supervised election among the lay teachers at the school. The religious were to be excluded since they were considered by the union members as coming under the jurisdiction of the administration.

Even before the verdict in the case was handed down, there were grave doubts about the NLRB accepting jurisdiction in the case. Martin Schneid, assistant regional director of the NLRB stated that the statute known as the Taft-Hartly legislation did not give them jurisdiction over schools, colleges or universities unless they operated commercial enterprises and that these would have to meet certain monetary standards determined by the board. In Mr. Duggan's legal opinion, Elizabeth Seton conducted educational activities only and would not be subject to the jurisdiction of the board.61

In refusing a permit for a collective bargaining election, the NLRB's regional director, Mr. Ross M. Madden, stated that a careful investigation and consideration of the petition had been made, and

As a result of the investigation, it appears that the Employer is a non-profit, education institution engaged solely in non-commercial activities. I am, therefore, dismissing the petition in this matter.62

In a last desperate gesture, Mr. Ronald Sipowich wrote a letter to Pope Paul VI asking him to intercede for the striking lay teachers in the


62 National Labor Relations Board reply to Elizabeth Seton High School, Case No. 13-RC-11566.
matter of collective bargaining, but whether or not a response was received is unknown.

Thus the labor-management impasse continued and the striking lay teachers marched until they "returned to the nether lands of ambiguity from which it emerged on March 22." Reverend Robert Reicher, who headed the unsuccessful mediating team said: "The administration broke the strike--that's it, pure and simple."63

Never resolved was the issue of whether or not the religious were free to vote. The role of the Archdiocesan School Board was never clarified, and a more basic issue, the role of the lay teacher in the administration of the Catholic school enterprise was never faced--at least in this strike.

During the summer, following the strike at Elizabeth Seton High School, Cardinal Cody wrote to Mother Mary Omer stating that he deemed it imperative that the Senate, which now represents about two-thirds of the total faculty, be allowed and even be encouraged to function as a bona fide collective bargaining agency. This might put to rest the frequently heard allegation that the school administration has a basic reluctance to engage in collective bargaining according to accepted procedures and requirements of social justice.64

Several interesting observations can be made from the four case studies of the schools which had a strike as presented in this chapter.

A contributing factor to the strike situation in the Archdiocese of Chicago can be attributed in part to the highly decentralized organization of

---


64 Letter from Cardinal Cody to Mother Mary Omer, August 2, 1968.
the Catholic secondary schools. They are private institutions, owned, operated, and funded by religious communities. This fact explains the autonomous performance of administrators in all matters pertaining to the functioning of the school. In matters of decisions, conflicts, or confrontations, they are accountable primarily to their immediate religious superiors rather than to archdiocesan church authorities or to the superintendent of the archdiocesan schools. Thus, contrary to the position of the principal in the public schools during the negotiation procedures, the principal in the Catholic schools during the bargaining sessions is usually the chief negotiator and, in a certain sense, the chief mediator. Although union representatives would have preferred to negotiate with the Archdiocesan school officials, the school administrators remained strong in their positions as chief executives of the school and as the only person through whom compromise or agreement could be reached.

Secondly, the Archdiocesan School Board had no standardized personnel policies on the secondary level at the time of the strikes. These came after the strikes were over. The revised and approved policies were sent to the high schools as recommended guidelines for action in February, 1970. Therefore, during the strikes, the personnel had no guidelines to follow and handled matters according to their own "know-how" and discretion.

Lack of communication was evident in the studies of the strikes. Both teachers and administrators, in most cases, agreed that the strikes could have been avoided, but failure to communicate or an unwillingness to compromise by both parties involved made the strikes inevitable.

Administrators wholeheartedly agreed that some type of collective
organization for teachers was essential, but most of them steered their faculties to "company unions" in an effort to avoid affiliation with outside organizations. To the administrators, nothing more could be accomplished with an outside union that could not be accomplished through an ordinary school association. In only one school, Leo High School, the union succeeded in winning recognition and it became affiliated with the AFT.

The dedication and commitment of the union-oriented lay teachers was deep and sincere. They had in many instances the good of the school at heart, especially in their desire to stabilize the teacher turnover which they based at about 50 per cent annually throughout the Archdiocesan schools. Stability of teachers, they sincerely felt, could be brought about only by organizing the teachers into recognized bargaining units. Their efforts were costly in personal sacrifice with little else to show in return for their efforts.

Paradoxically, what the teachers failed to accomplish through the strikes, was accomplished as a result of the strikes. Although the strikes were unsuccessful in three out of four striking schools, a number of changes--especially of benefit to the lay teachers--were immediately initiated in all of the Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese. Teacher organizations, contracts, published salary scales with substantial salary increases, tenure, pension plans, grievance procedures, and improved working conditions were put into practice.

Issues and outcomes which affected students were incidental to the goals sought by teachers when they called a strike. Teachers' salaries and improved working conditions were a principal issue in most of the schools which
had strikes. Frequently, the good of the students or the needs of education were discussed by the strike leaders, but the major issues did not include student welfare or the improvement of education.

Finally, Catholic secondary school administrators were not ready for the strikes. Time was needed to change the mentality of the administrators from autonomous decision and policy makers to those who shared this power with their faculty members, lay and religious. This could not have been accomplished so readily without a few strikes. Strikes came quickly not only to the Catholic schools, but to schools throughout the nation. It was the year of strikes for teachers; the following year, it was strikes for students on the nation's campuses. From many indications, it appears that strikes for administrators are next.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, TRENDS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this research was to study the status of collective negotiations as it exists in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago as to the nature of the administrators and of the teachers, the dichotomy of lay and religious teachers, the attitudes of the entire teaching staff toward teacher organizations, the reasons for the existence of the teachers' organizations, the effects they have had thus far on teacher-administrator relationships, and the future of the collective activism in the system.

From the readings in current professional literature and from opinions of men who had written or worked in the field of collective bargaining, it was hypothesized that in the Catholic school system,

I. ...no clear and universally acceptable pattern has developed, nor is one likely to emerge in the immediate future for collective negotiations.

II. ...the factors that led to the formation of teachers' unions or associations are basically the same as those that have led to the formation of militant teacher organizations throughout the country.

III. ...a strong relationship exists between the improvement in the quality of instruction and the organization of teachers' unions or associations.

IV. ...the principals feel no concern that the recognized teachers' union or association would present a real threat to their position as administrators or as professional educational leaders.

V. ...the participation of religious teaching personnel in collective negotiations presents many practical difficulties.

VI. ...it is important that in collective negotiations the negotiating process which involves financial issues be separated from the discussion process on professional issues.
To achieve the purpose of this study, an analysis was made of a specially constructed 28-item opinionnaire for principals, dealing with reasons for the formation of teachers' organizations in Catholic schools, and the effect of teachers' activities as a result of involvement in collective negotiations. A second 58-item questionnaire was used for teachers dealing with general attitudes toward collective negotiations, structures for collective negotiations, general policies related to collective negotiations, and items for collective negotiations in Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese.

The population sampled was composed of school building administrators, lay and religious teachers in all the secondary schools of the Archdiocese who responded to this survey. The schools included parish schools, Archdiocesan schools, and community-owned schools, both large and small. Some of the schools had recognized teachers' organizations, others did not. Of 555 possible individual responses from school personnel in 84 Archdiocesan secondary schools sampled, 365 usable returns from school personnel in 81 schools comprised the data of this study.

From the general information section of both questionnaires, the composition and characteristics of the respondents were obtained. This information was used as the basis for the analysis of the administrators, lay and religious teachers who staffed the Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese at the time of this study.

Contrary to the existing situation in the public secondary schools of the city, the Catholic secondary schools employed more female than male teachers. Figures in the surveys showed that the lay teachers were younger than
the religious teachers which accounted in part for the greater professional preparation and teaching experience of the religious educators. The age range for the religious was 40 to 49 years, with 16 to 20 years teaching experience, while that of the lay teachers was 29 years and under with 6 to 10 years of teaching experience. From the number of years of professional preparation and teaching experience and from the more permanent nature of the religious teachers' commitment to teaching, it can be expected that teaching in the Catholic secondary schools would be somewhat better than that in the neighboring public schools.

Teacher contracts were signed by 90 per cent of the lay teachers and 22 per cent of the religious teachers, with 65 per cent of all teachers holding state certificates. State-aid was considered by the majority of administrators and teachers as an important means of alleviating the financial crisis in the Catholic schools. Although the salaries of the lay teachers had improved considerably, they were still below those of the public school teachers; however, 89 per cent of the lay teachers did not find it necessary to supplement their incomes and chose to remain in teaching in Catholic schools, for they preferred to work in a school committed to a Catholic philosophy. With decreasing numbers of religious vocations, positions of greatest prestige and authority were no longer reserved for priests and religious but were also being awarded to qualified lay personnel.

From the data and analysis of the hypotheses, it was found that the existence of teachers' organizations in the Catholic secondary schools took on a variety of forms. Only twelve schools had a recognized teachers' organization, seven for lay teachers only and five for both lay and religious teachers.
Of these, only two were affiliated with the ATF. Nineteen schools had some type of organization, such as: association, faculty senate, governing board, etc. Fifty of the schools indicated no recognized teachers' organization but used a variety of means to provide for the teachers' needs; and for the present, the methods employed seemed satisfactory to the teachers. Aside from the "Guidelines . . ." published by the Archdiocesan School Office, very little has been done by this Office to establish any uniform action regarding teachers' organizations for collective negotiations.

There was no doubt in the minds of the majority of administrators having a recognized teachers' organization in their schools that the success of the teachers in the Chicago public schools and throughout the country in their collective efforts to receive full recognition as professional teachers and to improve salaries and working conditions motivated teachers in Catholic secondary schools to do likewise. Encouraged by the favorable results of collective negotiations and aided by the representatives of the AFT, teachers in the Catholic schools were able to bring about the desired changes in twelve high schools of the Archdiocese. In schools which did not have a recognized teachers' organization, the administrators, alerted by the trend of events, set about immediately to initiate significant and far-reaching improvements in teachers' salaries and other benefits.

Although some debatable points were raised by Catholic educators regarding the relationship between the improvement in the quality of instruction and the organization of teachers' unions in Catholic secondary schools, most of the administrators and teachers strongly agreed or agreed that economic
gains, equality of assignments, and advancement stabilized teacher turnover and made for satisfied, professional teachers which led to improvement in the quality of instruction. According to the educators, these items were readily negotiated at the bargaining table by representatives of teachers' organizations.

The governing structure found in the hierarchy of the public schools where the principal is considered a subordinate administrator is not the case in the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese. The principal is to a great extent autonomous, appointed to his position by the superiors of his religious community and accountable only to these superiors. He occupies a unique position in the system, for he is usually the chief decision-maker and chief negotiator and chief mediator; and in many cases, he alone passes judgment on new working conditions, new salary scales, new curriculums, etc. The Office of the Superintendent and its members remain in the background giving advice or suggestions but do not have the final say in matters pertaining to the individual schools. Under existing structures in the Catholic schools, principals feel no real threat to their leadership from either a professional or an administrative standpoint.

Nowhere is the uniqueness of Catholic education or the peculiar uniqueness of the religious life style so evident as it is when religious teachers become members of teachers' unions or associations. A number of perplexing problems present themselves from this lay-religious dichotomy in matters of finance, but teachers do not feel that these problems are insurmountable or that they prevent the religious teachers from participating actively in the teachers' organizations.
The majority of the respondents rejected the hypothesis that in collective negotiations, financial issues need to be separated from the discussion process on professional issues. Because of financial crisis experienced by a number of Catholic secondary schools, a single salary scale, plus benefits, is replacing the dual group model for salaries. Even though lay and religious teachers may have different intensities in financial aspirations, they do have the same strong professional desires. Formerly, the religious teachers were more concerned with matters which improved professional status rather than with financial issues. From the research conducted in this dissertation, both issues today are of equal concern to lay and religious educators alike.

The majority of the administrators and teachers affirmed hypothesis I through V, but rejected hypothesis VI. There was a predominantly favorable attitude toward the development of collective negotiations in Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese among the administrators, religious and lay teachers who participated in this study. However, they preferred collective negotiations be carried on by organizations within the framework of the individual schools and not as affiliates of large, national unions or associations. Religious administrators and teachers tended to express a strong need and desire to be active and involved in all matters such as those considered in collective negotiations as defined in this study.

In the final phase of this study, case studies were made of four Archdiocesan high schools in which teacher strikes paralyzed the schools' functions for a period of time. A 17-item structured interview (See Appendix IV) was formulated to elicit the reaction of people involved with teachers' organiza-
tions and strikes as these developed in their schools. Each of the four schools was visited and twenty-six interviews were taped; these included administrators, teachers, and anyone who in any way participated in the strikes. A few, because of distance and time element, were telephone interviews. The Archdiocesan School Office files provided primary source material in the form of reports, records, and correspondence of persons involved in the striking schools. Newspaper articles from the city's major papers and a number of magazine articles treating of the strikes were closely examined in order to obtain a complete picture of the strike situation so that an objective study of each school would be presented.

The case studies revealed that the highly decentralized organization of the Catholic secondary schools in the Archdiocese was a contributing factor in the strike situation. Seventy per cent of the secondary schools in the Archdiocese were privately owned, operated, and funded by religious communities. Thus in matters of decisions, conflicts, or confrontations, administrators were autonomous, and any representatives of the teachers had to deal with the principal who throughout the negotiations remained the only person with whom compromise or agreement could be reached.

Most of the administrators endorsed some type of collective organization for teachers within the framework of the school. Their attitude was that local problems could best be settled through an ordinary school association rather than through an outside organization.

Throughout the case studies, the dedication and commitment of the lay teachers was quite evident. Their strong desire to help the school through
stabilization of teacher turnover, which they based at about 50 per cent annually, could best be attained through recognized teachers' organizations. The strikes were unsuccessful in three out of four schools; nevertheless, the considerable number of administrators who immediately initiated changes for the improvement of salaries and working conditions for the teachers could be attributed to the efforts of the lay teachers in the striking schools.

The case studies confirmed the analysis of the hypotheses as presented in Chapter IV. Hypotheses I, II, IV, V, and VI were strongly affirmed by the development of issues in the striking schools. Only hypothesis III lacked affirmation, for issues which affected the quality of instruction were incidental to the goals sought by striking teachers. Although the good of the students for improvement in the quality of education were brought into the discussions by the administrators and the teachers' spokesmen, the principal issues and outcomes were definitely those which benefitted the teachers.

Conclusions

As a result of the evidence gathered in the six hypotheses and four case studies, the following conclusions can be reached:

1. The highly decentralized character of the Archdiocesan secondary school system which is hardly even a "system" but rather a loose grouping of isolated, autonomous institutions is responsible for a number of problems among Catholic educators in the Archdiocese. This autonomy is clearly evident in the diversity of teacher organizational patterns and personnel policies and combined with the reluctance of the administrators to relinquish any of their authority will prevent, in the foreseeable future, any unified action regarding
collective bargaining.

2. Lay teachers in the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese, influenced by the success of their public school colleagues in obtaining full recognition as competent, professional teachers, especially in matters of improved salary and working conditions, sought to obtain similar benefits in their schools through collective bargaining. By resorting to the same procedures and tactics used by their counterparts in the public schools, the lay teachers brought about either the desired changes or called strikes.

3. Evidence is not overwhelming that teachers' associations or unions result in improvement of instruction; nevertheless, satisfied, professional teachers are still the most important element in the development of a learning atmosphere in the school. The popular indices of pedagogical excellence, such as, economic gains, smaller classes, easier teaching schedules, fewer class preparations, etc. are frequently associated with the outcomes of negotiations at a bargaining table.

4. In the present governing structure of the Archdiocesan secondary schools, school building administrators occupy unique positions not enjoyed by their colleagues in the public school system. They have dual roles as chief decision-makers and as chief negotiators. Thus, although their authority may be lessened to some extent by the outcome of collective bargaining, their positions as administrators or professional leaders are not seriously threatened.

5. Religious teachers expressed a strong desire and a need to be actively involved in secular matters which concerned their professional development. As a consequence, they indicated that their role is that of individuals
who possess the freedom to join, to vote, and to react, according to their own consciences, in any association or union business.

6. Financial crisis and decreasing religious faculty members are impelling religious community superiors operating secondary schools in the Archdiocese to seriously rethink the present dual group models for financial compensations of the teachers and to replace it with a single, equitable model for both lay and religious teachers.

7. Theories and hypotheses presented on collective bargaining in this study of the Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese have been verified in practice as documented in the case studies of the four Catholic high schools which were involved in strikes.

8. Failure of the American Federation of Teachers to achieve recognition for the schools that had strikes has halted the movement toward affiliated or representative unionism in the Catholic secondary schools of the Archdiocese. Although the AFT is strong in specific diocese, such as, Brooklyn and Philadelphia, it has not made significant inroads in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Trends

Several things have happened in the last few years to turn the tide of teachers' movements toward collective action in the schools of the Archdiocese.

Many school administrators, moved by a sense of justice and concern for quality, improved substantially the benefits of teachers in the Catholic schools. They have established policies and procedures which come reasonably close to filling the demands of teachers. As the conditions of school employ-
ment improved, the impetus toward bargaining seemed to lessen.

In place of the well-publicized teacher shortage of a few years ago, there is now a teacher surplus. Traditionally, in times of labor surplus, organizational movements among employees have not been successful. The surplus of teachers and the uncertainties about the survival of Catholic schools has softened the strong movement toward collective bargaining seen several years ago.

More and more administrators of secondary schools are hiring religious teachers of different communities than their own, and the problem regarding the relationship of lay and religious in the same union, so severe a number of years ago, is beginning to work itself out as more religious teachers sign individual contracts. Under the circumstances, as the annual contract renewal time comes around, the religious will be caught up in the bargaining procedures because they will want to have a voice in all those things which affect their welfare. The entire complex situation associated with this lay-religious relationship will mend itself as in time it becomes a natural thing for the religious to participate actively in the bargaining unit.

Recommendations

This study of the status of collective action on the part of teachers in the Catholic high schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago has attempted to create a clearer understanding of the extent to which this contemporary problem has received attention in the system. Besides the information about this complex situation disclosed by this study, other problems associated with collective teacher action in the Archdiocese have been identified. Literally,
hundreds of topics on this subject await further investigation. A few of these potential topics can be recommended here for further research:

1. Throughout the United States, faculty senates, professional classroom teacher associations, and affiliated teacher unions have found their way into church-related schools. A study of the three types of contracts now in use in the Catholic school system can be made with regard to the role of religious in affiliated unions; the extent of the power of a religious administrator; the right of the religious superior to transfer religious teachers; and the expectations of union members when it becomes obvious that the school cannot meet its contracted financial obligations.

2. A survey can be made of teacher contracts in effect in other church-related schools, such as, the Lutheran or Hebrew day schools, and compare them with those in effect in the Catholic schools regarding financial and health benefits, working conditions, grievance procedures, tenure, retirement pensions, etc.

3. A radical rethinking of the control structure of Catholic schools is a pressing need for the Archdiocese of Chicago. Decision-making procedures in the Catholic school system acceptable a century ago are today unacceptable to a membership that is now predominately middle-class and increasingly college educated. Different control structures should be researched.

Along this line, a thorough study should be made throughout the Archdiocese of Chicago of the report submitted by Edward Marciniak, chairman of the School Study Commission to the Archdiocese of Chicago School Board. The Commission recently recommended that local Catholic school boards take over
much of the control of education and policy-making held by the Archdiocesan School Board or pastors and religious orders in the Chicago Archdiocese since the organization of Catholic schools 150 years ago.

In the Archdiocese, a study can be made as to the function of the Archdiocesan School Board: Is it purely advisory? Does it have jurisdictional power with decisions subjected to formal approval or veto by church authorities? Are School Board decisions automatically binding in the Archdiocesan school system? Should there be local Catholic school boards?

4. In general, teachers and school administrators lack understanding of the dynamics of teachers' organizations. A study should be made to determine how improved curricula of schools of educational administration and supervision, in-service courses, seminars and institutes for administrators and teachers can help to meet the challenges of the changing role of educational negotiations in Catholic schools.

5. The twentieth and twenty-first century will see the laity dominating Catholic schools. A study can be made of how to prepare the laity to continue the great tradition of "Catholic" schools. If the schools are to survive, the lay people will have to show that their educational program is distinctive from that in the public schools and for reasons other than those had by religious--their state of life or their religious garb. From all appearances, the ministry and the universities will have to carry the burden of educating the laity to assume this task.

6. Defective planning and budgeting procedures are inherent in decentralization which is characteristic of the Catholic secondary schools of the
Archdiocese. Research should be initiated regarding the possibilities of central financing and central purchasing, professionally administered, to alleviate, perhaps, some of the financial crisis currently experienced by a number of Catholic schools in the Archdiocese. Centralization of financing and purchasing could be attained without interfering with decentralized administration and control.

7. The superintendent of the Archdiocesan schools has been frequently the missing man in collective bargaining. A study should be undertaken of the superintendent's role in teacher negotiations. He must be given the authority as well as the responsibility which his position entails. Either he should be the decision-making power to deal with administrators and teachers in negotiations, or the ecclesiastical authority must accept a visible role as policy-maker in the Archdiocesan schools.
APPENDIX I

AN OPINIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS IN THE CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

NAME OF SCHOOL ________________________________

ADDRESS _______________________________________

NAME OF RESPONDENT
Father - 16 Dr. - 0
Brother - 7 Mr. - 4
Sister - 13 Miss - 1

I. General Information. In each section please place a check (✓) in the space following the description which most closely describes your situation.

1. Age (last birthday): 29 or under 30-39 40-49 50-59 60 or over

2. Type of School: Community-owned Archdiocesan Parish

3. How many years have you been administrator of this school?

4. How many years of teaching experience?

5. Highest level of education which you have attained:
   a. No degree (O) d. Master's Degree (II)
   b. Baccalaureate Degree (I) e. Master's Degree plus (52)
   c. Baccalaureate Degree plus (2) f. Doctor's Degree (3)

6. Do you think state aid to Catholic schools will alleviate the financial crisis? a. Yes ✓ b. No 3

For the purpose of this study, collective negotiations is defined as a method of determining conditions of employment by means of negotiations between representatives of the employer and representatives of the employee. The results of the bargaining are set forth in an agreement. The organization which represents the employees may be a professional association, a teachers' union, or a faculty senate or council.

II. 1. Please check the one statement which applies to your current school:
   a. There is a RECOGNIZED TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective negotiations for lay teachers only ✓ for religious teachers only O for both lay teachers and religious teachers O.
   b. There is a MOVEMENT IN THE DIRECTION OF A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective negotiations for lay teachers only ✓ for religious teachers only O for both lay and religious teachers O.
   c. There HAS NOT BEEN AN ORGANIZED AND REPRESENTATIVE EFFORT on the part of the lay teachers and/or religious teachers to organize for the purpose of collective negotiations O.
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2. If there is a teachers' organization in your school, which of the following descriptions would best fit the organization. (Check one).

(3) a. This is an organization which, while struggling to improve the conditions of employment for its members, distinguishes between the school system in its ability to pay for teachers' services and its unwillingness to pay for such services. When the reason is unwillingness, this organization sees the need to negotiate for improved conditions.

(3) b. This is an organization which struggles to allow the teacher to sell his services at a maximum rate to a school system which is trying to buy those services at as low a cost as possible.

(2) c. This is an organization which is not as anxious about establishing the prerogatives of either the teachers or the school system but on establishing the terms on which the teachers can most effectively render service. It is, therefore, willing to establish, modify or eliminate teacher prerogatives on the basis of getting the job done most effectively; at times, it may sacrifice short-range objectives in the interest of attaining long-range objectives that are mutually agreed on by both the school system and the teachers.

REMARKS OR COMMENTS:

IF YOU DO NOT HAVE A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION IN YOUR SCHOOL, PLEASE SKIP SECTION III AND COMPLETE SECTIONS IV AND V WITH REFERENCE TO YOUR PRESENT ATTITUDE ON THE SUBJECT OF COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS.

III. Evaluate the following as they appear to you to have been the usual factors in the formation of the teachers' organization. (Use the scale: 1 - most important; 2 - important; 3 - relatively unimportant; 4 - not applicable).

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1. Lay teachers had not representation at the local level and were dependent for improvements in salaries and working conditions on the unilateral action of the Archdiocesan authorities or administrators in individual schools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2. Lay teachers recognized the success of the American Federation of Teachers in securing improved salaries and working conditions in the public schools; this caused them to seek collective action to secure similar improvements in the Archdiocesan system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>3. Lay teachers have always been regarded only as auxiliaries by religious teachers in the Catholic school system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recent increase of lay teachers has encouraged them to seek through collective action full recognition in the system.

4. Lay teachers who have entered the Archdiocesan system in recent years have been better trained and are more professional as teachers. Their need to establish their status as professionals has led them to organize.

5. The Archdiocesan secondary system has become so large and complex in recent years that without collective action the lay teachers would have no real sense of participation in educational planning.

6. The Archdiocesan system was not offering large enough salaries or fringe benefits to attract enough good teachers to apply to the system.

7. The lay teachers felt that if the Archdiocese had so much money to spend for new projects including new school facilities, the teachers were entitled to receive improved salary and fringe benefits.

REMARKS OR COMMENTS:

IV. Do you think that the activities of the teachers through collective negotiations will affect the following? (Use the scale: 1 - agree strongly; 2 - agree; 3 - disagree strongly; 4 - disagree; 5 - not applicable).

8. The religious staff will need a similar organization to balance the growing strength of the lay teachers.

9. The principal will find it difficult to deal with the lay and religious staffs in the school as a unified faculty.

10. The principal is being by-passed in educational planning in the Archdiocese.

11. The religious staff will demand the same improvements in working conditions that are being granted to the lay teachers.

12. The principal is participating in the determination of the new working conditions being granted to the lay teachers.

13. The religious staff should be allowed to join the teachers' organizations.

14. The principal will become less an authority figure and more a professional colleague of the teachers.

15. The lay teachers will become more professional as teachers.

16. The quality of instruction in the school has become more excellent.
17. The principal is regarded by the lay teachers as part of the administrative team in the Archdiocesan system.

18. The lay teachers have become more dependent on the superintendent and less dependent on the principal.

19. Supervision of instruction will remain a major function of the principal.

20. Supervision of instruction will become the function of a professional, other than the principal.

21. The principals need an organization to represent their views to the Archdiocesan authorities on educational decision-making.

22. The principals should become members of the teachers' organizations in the Archdiocesan system.

23. The superintendent should consult with the principals before negotiating with the teachers.

24. The teachers should consult with the principals before negotiating with the Archdiocese.

REMARKS OR COMMENTS:

25. Collective action by teachers in other school systems have resulted in strikes and "school holidays." As the principal, what do you anticipate your role would be if such eventuality affected your school?

26. How do you anticipate your religious staff would react?

27. How do you anticipate your student body would react?

28. If your school has already developed guidelines for such eventuality, please append a copy to this opinionnaire.
APPENDIX II

A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LAY TEACHERS IN THE CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF CHICAGO

I. General Information. In each section please place a check ( ) in the space following the description which most closely describes your situation.

1. Status: Single Married
   - Single 85
   - Married 49

2. Sex: Male Female
   - Male 57
   - Female 70

3. Age (last birthday): 29 or under 30-39 40-49 50-59 60 or over
   - 29 or under 67
   - 30-39 28
   - 40-49 18
   - 50-59 18
   - 60 or over 6

4. Type of school: Community-owned Archdiocesan Parish
   - Community-owned 62
   - Archdiocesan 41
   - Parish 28

5. Years of teaching experience: Table 1-E

6. Highest level of education which you have attained:
   a. No degree
   b. Baccalaureate Degree
   c. Baccalaureate Degree plus
   d. Master's Degree
   e. Master's Degree plus
   f. Doctor's Degree
   - No degree (1)
   - Baccalaureate Degree (25)
   - Baccalaureate Degree plus (58)
   - Master's Degree (15)
   - Master's Degree plus (34)
   - Doctor's Degree (1)

7. Do you think state aid to Catholic schools will alleviate the financial crisis? Yes No
   - Yes 110
   - No 80

8. How many years have you been teaching full-time in this school? Table II-F

9. What led you to seek a teaching position in a Catholic secondary school? (Please select reasons which pertain to you and number them in the order of importance, 1, 2, 3, etc.).
   a. The lay teacher is needed to help fill positions formerly staffed by religious.
   b. I prefer to work in a school committed to a Catholic philosophy of education.
   c. There are fewer disciplinary problems in a Catholic secondary school.
   d. There are fewer demands made on teachers in Catholic secondary schools than in public schools.
   e. There is more opportunity for advancement to administrative and supervisory positions than in the public schools.
   f. There was a position available, not available in public schools at the time.
   g. I did not meet the requirements for a teaching position in a public school.
   h. My child was enrolled in the school.
   i. Other (please state) ____________________________
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10. Do you hold state certification in one or more fields of preparation?
   a. Yes 93
   b. No 40

11. If certification is not held, which requirements are you lacking? Please select one or more.
   ( ) a. Degree
   ( ) b. Required professional education courses
   ( ) c. Practice teaching or the equivalent
   ( ) d. Subject matter course requirements
   ( ) e. Age
   ( ) f. Never applied for it
   ( ) g. Other (please state)

12. Was a contract signed between you and your principal or another school administrator?
   a. Yes 122
   b. No 10

13. How many of your teaching assignments are in your major field?
   a. Less than one half 6
   b. One half 9
   c. More than one half

14. Is it necessary for you to hold another job during the school year to supplement your income?
   a. Yes 28
   b. No 105

15. In your opinion, what is the level of prestige that lay teachers have in your school?
   a. High 65
   b. Medium 54
   c. Low 9
   d. Not certain 6

16. Do you intend to remain in Catholic education?
   a. Yes 98
   b. No 27

17. Why or Why not?

18. If your answer to question 16 is No, do you intend to remain in the teaching profession?
   a. Yes 19
   b. No 6

19. Please check the one statement which applies to your current school:
   a. There is a RECOGNIZED TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective negotiations for lay teachers only 9.
   b. There is a MOVEMENT IN THE DIRECTION OF A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective negotiations for lay teachers only 5.
   c. There HAS NOT BEEN AN ORGANIZED AND REPRESENTATIVE EFFORT on the part of the lay teachers and/or religious teachers to organize for the purpose of collective negotiations 106.
COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS IN CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

For the purpose of this study, collective negotiations is defined as a method of determining conditions of employment by means of negotiations between representatives of the employer and representatives of the employee. The results of the bargaining are set forth in an agreement. The organization which represents the employees may be a professional association, a teachers' union, or a faculty senate or council.

Directions. With reference to your present attitude on this subject, please note your degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement by checking the space according to the code. THE FIVE RESPONSES POSSIBLE FOR EACH STATEMENT ARE:

SA-Strongly Agree A-Agree N-No Opinion D-Disagree SD-Strongly Disagree

II. General Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations

A. Role of Religious Teachers

1. A person who enters the religious life should not engage in collective negotiations.

2. Religious teachers should be more occupied with spiritual matters in the schools, leaving to the lay teachers to take care of secular matters.

3. It would be possible for a religious to use the money of the religious community for membership dues in a teachers' union and not be acting contrary to the religious profession of poverty.

4. Religious teachers should devote their full time and effort to those works which are sponsored by the religious superior and not get involved in such matters as collective negotiations.

5. In important matters, such as those which come up in collective negotiations, a religious teacher should speak out and write even when he is in conflict with the will of his authorized superior.

6. In important matters, such as those which come up in collective negotiations, a religious teacher should demonstrate or picket even when this conflicts with the will of his authorized superior.

7. Religious teachers should be considered as part of the management of the Catholic secondary school by reason of their status in the Catholic Church.
8. A religious teacher should be considered primarily as a teacher rather than as a member of a religious community in such matters as collective negotiations.

9. The authorized religious superior should make the decisions for the religious teachers in the school and thereby resolve such matters as those normally involved in collective negotiations.

10. The individual religious teacher today should be authorized to manage his personal finances in such matters as dues for collective negotiations.

B. Outcomes

11. The growth of collective negotiations will improve the professional quality of the schools.

12. The growth of collective negotiations will increase divisions between lay teachers and the administrators of these schools.

13. The growth of collective negotiations will increase divisions between religious teachers and the administrators of these schools.

14. The growth of collective negotiations will increase divisions between the religious and lay teachers in these schools.

15. Where religious and lay teachers would have equal voting rights in collective negotiations, the religious teachers will usually vote as a bloc.

III. Structures for Collective Negotiations

16. For collective negotiations, the principals and the assistant principals in the schools should have their own organization rather than hold membership in the teachers' organization.

17. The Superintendents and Principals should take the initiative in organizing for collective negotiations in these schools.

18. The National Catholic Educational Association should move into the field of collective negotiations and become actively engaged in the negotiations process.
19. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective negotiations.

20. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective negotiations but religious teachers on a non-voting basis.

21. Only lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in a teachers' organization for collective negotiations.

22. Religious teachers should have their own organization, separate from that of lay teachers, for collective negotiations.

23. A professional association would be more desirable than a teachers' union for purposes of collective negotiations.

24. A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective negotiations than the professional association.

25. A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective negotiations.

IV. General Policies Related to Collective Negotiations

26. The Catholic Bishops of the United States should establish a national policy for all Catholic secondary schools regarding collective negotiations.

27. Procedure for handling the grievances of lay teachers should be established at the diocesan level.

28. The authorized religious superior of a community which teaches in a particular secondary school should not at the same time be principal of that school.

29. A lay teacher should be eligible for all administrative positions in a Catholic secondary school.

30. In order to hold full membership in a teachers' organization for collective negotiations, a religious teacher should seek the permission of his authorized superior.

31. Authorized superiors should assign religious teachers to fill the classrooms of striking lay teachers.
32. All teacher contracts in Catholic secondary schools should include a "no-strike" clause.

33. The penalty for participation by a lay teacher in a strike should be dismissal from the school.

34. The penalty for participation by a religious teacher in a strike should be a transfer from the school.

35. Contracts with individual religious teachers should replace contracts between the archdiocese or parish and the religious congregation.

36. Stipends for religious faculty members should be scaled on the same basis as salaries for lay teachers. (A percentage of such a stipend would be contributed to the school.

37. In a deadlock in collective negotiations, the bishop of the archdiocese should resolve the impasse.

38. In a deadlock in collective negotiations, the school board of the archdiocese should resolve the impasse.

39. In a deadlock in collective negotiations, a mediator should be sought who would be mutually acceptable to the teaching personnel and to the school authorities.

V. Items for Collective Negotiations

Note by a check (✓) in the appropriate space whether, in your opinion, each of the following items should be non-negotiable, negotiable on the part of lay teachers only, negotiable on the part of religious teachers only, or negotiable on the part of both religious and lay teachers together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Negotiable</th>
<th>Non-negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable for Lay Teachers</th>
<th>Non-negotiable for Religious Teachers</th>
<th>Negotiable for Religious Teachers</th>
<th>Negotiable for Both Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Salaries for lay teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Salaries for religious teachers.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Leaves of absence. (Sabbaticals, personal, etc.)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Teacher evaluation.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Non-negotiable</td>
<td>Negotiable for lay teachers</td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>Negotiable for religious teachers</td>
<td>Negotiable for both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Curriculum changes.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Extra-curricular assignments and compensation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Student discipline policies.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Class size and teaching load.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Policy on substitution for absent teachers.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Lunch period and study assignments.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Pension and retirement benefits.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Procedures for dismissal of teachers.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Transfer of religious teachers.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Grievance procedures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Nomination of Principals.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Textbook Selection.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Contents of faculty meetings.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Time allowances for professional meetings.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. School calendar.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS IN THE CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO

I. General Information. In each section please place a check (✓) in the space following the description which most closely describes your situation.

1. Sex: Male 59  Female 102

2. Age (last birthday): 29 or under 27  30-39 37  40-49 37  50-59 31  60 or over 22

3. Type of school: Community-owned 102  Archdiocesan 26  Parish 27

4. Years of teaching experience: Table I - F

5. Highest level of education which you have attained:
   a. No degree  (✓)
   b. Baccalaureate Degree  (✓)
   c. Baccalaureate Degree plus  (✓)
   d. Master's Degree  (✓)
   e. Master's Degree plus  (✓)
   f. Doctor's Degree  (✓)

6. Do you think state aid to Catholic schools will alleviate the financial crisis?  a. Yes 124  b. No 25

7. How many years have you been teaching full-time in this school? Table II - F

8. Do you hold state certification in one or more fields of preparation?  a. Yes 95  b. No 59

9. If certification is not held, which requirements are you lacking? Please select one or more.
   (✓) a. Degree
   (✓) b. Required professional education courses
   (✓) c. Practice teaching or the equivalent
   (✓) d. Subject matter course requirements
   (✓) e. Age
   (✓) f. Never applied for it
   (✓) g. Other (please state)

10. Was a contract signed between you, your principal, or another school administrator?  a. Yes 34  b. No 16

11. How many of your teaching assignments are in your major field?  a. Less than one half 25  b. One half 11  c. More than one half 17

12. In your opinion, what is the level of prestige that lay teachers have in your school?  a. High 91  b. Medium 50  c. Low 5  d. Not certain 5
13. Please check the one statement which applies to your current school:
   a. There is a RECOGNIZED TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective negotiations for lay teachers only 7 for religious teachers only 3 for both lay teachers and religious teachers 2.
   b. There is a MOVEMENT IN THE DIRECTION OF A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective negotiations for lay teachers only 7 for religious teachers only 0 for both lay and religious teachers 6.
   c. There HAS NOT BEEN AN ORGANIZED AND REPRESENTATIVE EFFORT on the part of the lay teachers and/or religious teachers to organize for the purpose of collective negotiations 107.

COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS IN CATHOLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS

For the purpose of this study, collective negotiations is defined as a method of determining conditions of employment by means of negotiations between representatives of the employer and representatives of the employee. The results of the bargaining are set forth in an agreement. The organization which represents the employees may be a professional association, a teachers' union, or a faculty senate or council.

Directions. With reference to your present attitude on this subject, please note your degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement by checking the space according to the code. THE FIVE RESPONSES POSSIBLE FOR EACH STATEMENT ARE:

SA-Strongly Agree  A-Agree  N-No Opinion  D-Disagree  SD-Strongly Disagree

II. General Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations

A. Role of Religious Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. In important matters, such as those which come up in collective negotiations, a religious teacher should speak out and write even when he is in conflict with the will of his authorized superior.

6. In important matters, such as those which come up in collective negotiations, a religious teacher should demonstrate or picket even when this conflicts with the will of his authorized superior.

7. Religious teachers should be considered as part of the management of the Catholic secondary school by reason of their status in the Catholic Church.

8. A religious teacher should be considered primarily as a teacher rather than as a member of a religious community in such matters as collective negotiations.

9. The authorized religious superior should make the decisions for the religious teachers in the school and thereby resolve such matters as those normally involved in collective negotiations.

10. The individual religious teacher today should be authorized to manage his personal finances in such matters as dues for collective negotiations.

B. Outcomes

11. The growth of collective negotiations will improve the professional quality of the schools.

12. The growth of collective negotiations will increase divisions between lay teachers and the administrators of these schools.

13. The growth of collective negotiations will increase divisions between religious teachers and the administrators of these schools.

14. The growth of collective negotiations will increase divisions between the religious and lay teachers in these schools.

15. Where religious and lay teachers would have equal voting rights in collective negotiations, the religious teachers will usually vote as a bloc.
III. Structures for Collective Negotiations

16. For collective negotiations, the principals and the assistant principals in the schools should have their own organization rather than hold membership in the teachers' organization.

17. The Superintendents and Principals should take the initiative in organizing for collective negotiations in these schools.

18. The National Catholic Educational Association should move into the field of collective negotiations and become actively engaged in the negotiations process.

19. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective negotiations.

20. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective negotiations but religious teachers on a non-voting basis.

21. Only lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in a teachers' organization for collective negotiations.

22. Religious teachers should have their own organization, separate from that of lay teachers, for collective negotiations.

23. A professional association would be more desirable than a teachers' union for purposes of collective negotiations.

24. A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective negotiations than the professional association.

25. A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective negotiations.

IV. General Policies Related to Collective Negotiations

26. The Catholic Bishops of the United States should establish a national policy for all Catholic secondary schools regarding collective negotiations.

27. Procedure for handling the grievances of lay teachers should be established at the diocesan level.
28. The authorized religious superior of a community which teaches in a particular secondary school should not at the same time be principal of that school.

29. A lay teacher should be eligible for all administrative positions in a Catholic secondary school.

30. In order to hold full membership in a teachers' organization for collective negotiations, a religious teacher should seek the permission of his authorized superior.

31. Authorized superiors should assign religious teachers to fill the classrooms of striking lay teachers.

32. All teacher contracts in Catholic secondary schools should include a "no-strike" clause.

33. The penalty for participation by a lay teacher in a strike should be dismissal from the school.

34. The penalty for participation by a religious teacher in a strike should be a transfer from the school.

35. Contracts with individual religious teachers should replace contracts between the archdiocese or parish and the religious congregation.

36. Stipends for religious faculty members should be scaled on the same basis as salaries for lay teachers. (A percentage of such a stipend would be contributed to the school).

37. In a deadlock in collective negotiations, the bishop of the archdiocese should resolve the impasse.

38. In a deadlock in collective negotiations, the school board of the archdiocese should resolve the impasse.

39. In a deadlock in collective negotiations, a mediator should be sought who would be mutually acceptable to the teaching personnel and to the school authorities.

V. Items for Collective Negotiations

Note by a check (✓) in the appropriate space whether, in your opinion, each of the following items should be non-negotiable, negotiable on the part of lay teachers only, negotiable on the part of religious teachers only, or negotiable on the part of both religious and lay teachers together.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Negotiable for lay teachers</th>
<th>Non-negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable for religious</th>
<th>Negotiable for both</th>
<th>Opinio...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Salaries for lay teachers.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Salaries for religious teachers.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Leaves of absence. (Sabbaticals, personal, etc.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Teacher evaluation.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Curriculum changes.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Extra-curricular assignments and compensation.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Student discipline policies.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Class size and teach-load.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Policy on substitution for absent teachers.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Lunch period and study assignments.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Pension and retirement benefits.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Procedures for dismissal of teachers.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Transfer of religious teachers.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Grievance procedures.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Nomination of Principals.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. Textbook Selection.

56. Contents of faculty meetings.

57. Time allowances for professional meetings.

58. School calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negotiable</th>
<th>Non-negotiable for lay teachers</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Negotiable for religious</th>
<th>Negotiable for both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

FORMAT FOR STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

1. Is your school fiscally dependent upon the archdiocese, your community, or tuition funds only?

2. Were you in your present position at the time of the strike?

3. Did you have the "know-how" to handle the strike effectively? If not, did you seek help from the archdiocesan school board, lawyers, consultants, etc.?

4. What were the stated demands made by the striking teachers?

5. Besides the stated demands, were there other issues involved? If yes, what were they?

6. How were these demands presented? (By letter, at a board or faculty meeting, etc.).

7. Had any of these demands been made to the administration before? If yes, what action had been taken?

8. Besides the formal demands, do you believe that other issues were involved? If yes, what were they?

9. What do you believe was the key issue that set off the strike?

10. What were the immediate outcomes of the strike? To what extent was the religious and lay faculty involved? Student reaction? Parental reaction?

11. How were the demands settled?

12. Do you believe the same results could have been achieved without the strike? If yes, how?

13. What do you believe is the most significant result of the strike?

14. Do you believe that any of the outcomes had a significant bearing on the educational program of the school? If yes, how? If no, who did benefit?

15. What would you do differently today if a strike occurred in your school than you did at the time of the strike?
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16. Are your attitudes toward unions and associations for teachers different today than they were at the time of the strike?

17. Are minutes for the period of work stoppage available?
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