1984

A Study of Collective Bargaining in Catholic High Schools in Illinois

Richard J. McGrath

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/2388

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1984 Richard J. McGrath
A STUDY OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
IN CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS IN ILLINOIS

by
Richard J. McGrath

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty
of the Graduate School of Loyola University
of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
November
1984
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank the members of the committee, Dr. Max Bailey, Dr. Philip Carlin, and especially Dr. Fred Lunenburg, the director of the dissertation, without whose help this paper could not have been written.

A special debt of gratitude is owed to Mrs. Nancy Dudgeon of Streamwood, Illinois, whose unfailing support and assistance brought this project to completion.
Richard J. McGrath was born in Chicago, Illinois on November 28, 1946.

He graduated from Mendel Catholic High School, Chicago, Illinois, in 1964. He attended Tolentine College, Olympia Fields, Illinois, and received a Bachelor of Arts in 1969. In 1973 he received a Master of Divinity from the Catholic Theological Union at Chicago. In 1975 he received a Master of Arts in English from DePaul University in Chicago. In 1977 he received a Master of Education in Administration and Supervision from Loyola University of Chicago.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ................................................................. ii
VITA ......................................................................................... iii
LIST OF TABLES .......................................................................... vi
CONTENTS OF APPENDICES ...................................................... xv

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION ................................................................. 1
   Statement of the Problem .................................................. 8
   Definition of Terms .......................................................... 10
   Limitations of the Study ................................................... 12
   Significance of the Study .................................................. 14

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ................................. 16
    Previous Studies ............................................................. 19
    A General Introduction to Collective Bargaining in Catholic Schools .......... 26
    Papal Teaching on Collective Bargaining ................................ 42
    Organized Labor in the United States .................................. 63
    Catholic School History .................................................... 69
    The Development of Catholic Teachers' Unions .................. 74
    Catholic Schools and the National Labor Relations Board ........ 86
    Catholic Teachers' Unions Now ......................................... 98
    The Third Party Agency ................................................... 109
    Religious Teachers and the Bargaining Unit ....................... 119
    Catholic School Contracts ............................................... 129
    Community of Faith Effects .............................................. 135
    Positive Approaches to Teacher Goals ............................... 144
    Summary ........................................................................... 156

III. SUBJECTS, MATERIALS, PROCEDURES ......................... 161
    Subjects ........................................................................... 161
    Characteristics of Respondents ........................................ 166
    Materials ........................................................................... 190
    Procedures ........................................................................ 192
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA................................. 195
  The Presence of Collective Bargaining...... 195
  The Usual Factors in the Formation of the Teachers' Organization.............. 201
  Principals Perceptions of the Effects of Collective Bargaining................ 206
  General Attitudes toward Collective Bargaining................................ 220
  Structures for Collective Bargaining........ 247
  General Policies Relating to Collective Bargaining................................. 264
  Items for Collective Bargaining................................. 288

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.... 317

BIBLIOGRAPHY..................................................... 333

APPENDICES....................................................... 345
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Summary of Possible Individual Responses by Principals, and Summary of Individual Responses to the Questionnaire</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Summary of Usable Returns According to Roles of Respondents</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Selected Characteristics of Respondents</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selected Characteristics of Respondents</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selected Characteristics of the Principals: Age and Type of School</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Selected Characteristics of the Principals: Number of Years as Principal, and Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Characteristics of Religious Teachers: Age, Type of School, and Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Characteristics of Religious Teachers: Highest Level of Education Attained, the Importance of State Aid, and Years Teaching in this School</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Characteristics of Religious Teachers: Certification, Signed Contract, Amount of Teaching in Major Field, and Prestige of Lay Teachers in the School</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Characteristics of Lay Teachers: Status, Age, and Type of School</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Characteristics of Lay Teachers: Years of Teaching Experience, and Highest Level of Education Attained</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Characteristics of Lay Teachers: Importance of State Aid, Years Teaching in this School, and Certification</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reasons for Seeking a Teaching Position in a Catholic High School</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Characteristics of Lay Teachers: Prestige, Intention to Remain in Education, and Leaving Catholic Education</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Principals Survey, Item: I.12a + 17a, Frequency Distribution; There is a recognized teachers' organization for collective bargaining for lay teachers only, for religious teachers only, for both lay teachers and religious teachers</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Principals Survey, Item: I.12b + 17b, Frequency Distribution; There is a movement in the direction of a teachers' organization for collective bargaining for lay teachers only, for religious teachers only, for both lay and religious teachers</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Principals Survey, Item: I.12c + 17c, Frequency Distribution; 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 bargaining</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Principals Survey; Factors important in the formation of the teachers' organization</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Principals Survey; Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining, Items 8, 9, and 10</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Principals Survey; Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining, Items 11, 12, and 13</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Principals Survey; Principals perception of the effects of collective bargaining, Items 14, 15, and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Principals Survey; Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining, Items 17, 18, and 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Principals Survey; Principals perception of the effects of collective bargaining, Items 20, 21, and 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Principals Survey; Principals perception of the effects of collective bargaining, Items 23 and 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 1. A person who enters the religious life should not engage in collective bargaining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 2. Religious teachers should be more occupied with spiritual matters in the schools, leaving to the lay teachers to take care of secular matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 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 bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 5. In important matters, such as those which come up in collective bargaining, a religious teacher should speak out and write even when he is in conflict with the will of his authorized superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 6. In important matters, such as those which come up in collective bargaining, a religious teacher should demonstrate or picket even when this conflicts with the will of his authorized superior............................................. 230

32. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 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................................. 232

33. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 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 bargaining................................. 234

34. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 9. The authorized religious superior should make decisions for the religious teachers in the school and thereby resolve such matters as those normally involved in collective bargaining.................................................. 235

35. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section A, Item 10. The individual religious teacher today should be authorized to manage his personal finances in such matters as dues for collective bargaining............................................. 237

36. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section B, Item 11. The Growth of collective bargaining will improve the professional quality of the schools.......................................................... 240

37. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section B, Item 12. The growth of collective bargaining will increase divisions between lay teachers and the administrators of these schools......... 241

38. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section B, Item 13. The growth of collective bargaining will increase divisions between religious teachers and the administrators of these schools............................................. 243
Table

39. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section B, Item 14. The growth of collective bargaining will increase divisions between the religious and lay teachers in these schools........ 245

40. Frequency Distribution of Part II, Section B, Item 15. Where religious and lay teachers would have equal voting rights in collective bargaining, the religious teachers will usually vote as a bloc.......................... 246

41. Frequency Distribution of Part III, Item 16. For collective bargaining, the principals and the assistant principals in the schools should have their own organization rather than hold membership in the teachers' organization.. 248

42. Frequency Distribution of Part III, Item 17. The Superintendents and Principals should take the initiative in organizing for collective bargaining in these schools................. 250

43. Frequency Distribution of Part III, Item 18. The National Catholic Education Association should move into the field of collective bargaining and become actively engaged in the bargaining process................................. 252

44. Frequency Distribution of Part III, Item 19. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective bargaining.......... 253

45. Frequency Distribution of Part III, Item 20. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective bargaining but religious teachers on a non-voting basis...... 255

46. Frequency Distribution of Part III, Item 21. Only lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in a teachers' organization for collective bargaining ....................... 256
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Frequency Distribution of Part III, Item 22.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious teachers should have their own organization, separate from that of lay teachers, for collective bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A professional association would be more desirable than a teachers' union for purposes of collective bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective bargaining than the professional association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level would be a more appropriate organization for collective bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Catholic Bishops of the United States should establish a national policy for all Catholic secondary schools regarding collective bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedure for handling the grievances of lay teachers should be established at the diocesan level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A lay teacher should be eligible for all administrative positions in a Catholic secondary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 30. In order to hold full membership in a teachers' organization for collective bargaining, a religious teacher should seek the permission of his authorized superior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 31. Authorized superiors should assign religious teachers to fill the classrooms of striking lay teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 32. All teacher contracts in Catholic secondary schools should include a &quot;no-strike&quot; clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 33. The penalty for participation of a lay teacher in a strike should be dismissal from the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 34. The penalty for participation by a religious teacher in a strike should be transfer from the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 35. Contracts with individual religious teachers should replace contracts between the diocese or parish and the religious congregation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 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.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 37. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, the bishop of the diocese should resolve the impasse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 38. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, the school board of the diocese should resolve the impasse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Frequency Distribution of Part IV, Item 39. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, a mediator should be sought who would be mutually acceptable to the teaching personnel and to the school authorities</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 41. Salaries for religious teachers</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 42. Leaves of absence. (Sabbaticals, personal etc.)</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 43. Teacher evaluation</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 44. Curriculum changes</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 45. Extra-curricular assignments and compensation</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 46. Student discipline policies</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 47. Class size and teaching load</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 48. Policy on substitution for absent teachers</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 49. Lunch period and study assignments</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 50. Pension and retirement benefits</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 51. Procedures for dismissal of teachers</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Transfer of religious teachers............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grievance procedures........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nomination of Principals..................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Textbook selection.........................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contents of faculty meetings...............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time allowances for professional meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Frequency Distribution of Part V, Item 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School calendar............................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX A</td>
<td>Cover Letter and the Survey for Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX B</td>
<td>A Questionnaire for Religious Teachers in Catholic High Schools on Collective Bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX C</td>
<td>A Questionnaire for Lay Teachers in Catholic High Schools on Collective Bargaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX D</td>
<td>Follow-up Letter to Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX E</td>
<td>Second Follow-up Letter to Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX F</td>
<td>Follow-up Letter to Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX G</td>
<td>Second Follow-up Letter to Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In April 1984 the National Catholic Education Association released the preliminary results of a study conducted the previous Winter among all Catholic high schools in the United States. 1480 schools were contacted by mail and asked to complete an extensive questionnaire about many phases of their operation. 910 schools responded to the questionnaire for a return of 61%. The information requested included items about the presence of collective bargaining in the schools. Respondents indicated that at 32% of the schools at least some of the teachers were represented during contract negotiations by a negotiating group. 1 68% reported that there was no representation by any negotiating group. Those respondents who acknowledged the presence of a negotiating group answered an additional item indicating that 31% of the teachers at those schools with a negotiating group were represented by the group. A third item asked the affiliation of the negotiating group, and the results indicated affilia-

tion to teachers' organizations in this manner. 14.4% were represented by a local single school bargaining unit. 13.5% were represented by a diocesan level unit. 7.8% were represented by the National Association of Catholic School Teachers (NACST). 3.3% were represented by the National Education Association (NEA). 2.3% were represented by some other national group. And 1.5% were represented by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). \(^2\) The exact number of teachers represented by a teachers' bargaining unit is not known, but the presence of bargaining units in 31% of the Catholic high schools in the nation indicates that collective bargaining is an important element in Catholic schools at the present time.

The movement toward unionization in Catholic schools depends directly on the growing proportion of lay teachers working in the schools. The 1983 edition of the Official Catholic Directory provided statistics on the relative numbers of lay teachers and religious teachers in Catholic schools in the United States. These were the most recent figures available, drawn from the cumulative report of all Catholic schools in the nation. The Directory reported that of 168,342 teachers in all Catholic schools, 127,308 or 75.6% were lay teach-

\(^2\) National Catholic Education Association, op. cit., p. 3.
ers, and 41,034 or 24.36% were non-lay teachers. These non-lay teachers were religious personnel: sisters, brothers, or priests. Fully three out of four teachers in all Catholic schools are now lay teachers.

The **Directory** information included all Catholic schools, both elementary and high schools. The NCEA study which was limited to high schools stated that 51% of the full time teachers were Catholic lay men or lay women. An additional 18% of the full time teachers were non-catholic lay persons. Catholic elementary schools tend to have more lay teachers than high schools, since they do not have the presence of religious orders of men who are often present in Catholic high schools. Seen from either side, Catholic schools as a whole are staffed by faculties who are 75% lay persons: Catholic high schools are staffed by faculties who are 69% lay teachers and 31% religious teachers.

The growing proportion of lay teachers in Catholic schools began in this century. Lay teachers amounted to 7.9% of the total teaching staff in 1920. By 1950 the number of lay teachers had grown to 12.6%. But then the shortage of religious teachers and the changing mood of the Catholic Church in America began to be felt. By 1960 lay teachers

---

4. NCEA, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
constituted 28.3% of the teaching staff; 38.9% in 1967; and 45% in 1969. 1970 was a landmark year, since it was reported that for the first time lay teachers outnumbered religious teachers, being 50.8% of the teaching staff. Lay teachers had climbed to 53% of the staff in 1971, and 66% by 1978. This type of change over the course of thirty years is nothing short of a revolution.

It is this dramatic influx of lay teachers into a field where religious teachers had dominated for so many years that is the cause of the growth of teacher militancy in Catholic schools. As the number of lay teachers has increased, the pressure they have exerted on the Catholic system has also increased.

Among these pressures is the growing feeling of militancy among teachers as they strive for better wages and working conditions just as workers in industry are doing. Since the trend toward collective bargaining in Catholic schools has spread more slowly than in public education, Catholic school administrators have had more time for formulating a just and proper manner of dealing with the need for collective bargaining.

The first reason for teachers' unions is the economic one. Catholic school teachers, who are more likely to be lay teachers than religious teachers, are often paid far below the scales provided to public school teachers. These people are aware of their needs and are looking for a way to obtain what they must have and still remain in Catholic education.

Economic conditions in recent years have affected us. Too many of our educators, especially the men, are leaving the Catholic elementary school because they cannot meet expenses to provide for their families. None of us expects to have our salaries match those of the public school. What we do justly anticipate is enough to provide for ourselves and our families.

Administrators will feel the pressure of teachers who want more in salaries and more influence in the operation of the school, but this growing militancy represents the same situation which existed in industry forty years ago. Since this is occurring in church-related institutions, it calls for the same sharing and participation that is experienced elsewhere in the Church.

Personal experience has indicated to me that when teachers are given a role with administrators in the decision-making process the entire school community benefits. Such shared participation results in job satisfaction, an important element in establishing a productive learning milieu in our schools.

The whole process of unionization and bargaining should be made democratic and responsive to the needs of the times. White collar unions have grown, and public employees have begun to unionize. Those who try to break or stall unions heighten the antagonisms and friction between labor and management. Not all of those in positions of leadership in Catholic schools are open or interested in the formation of unions at their schools.

The actions and comments of some diocesan, parochial, and private school administrators and Catholic school parents evidence a desire to return to the paternalism and authoritarianism of previous decades in our schools.9

Bargaining is usually done at the local level, and the trend is toward small bargaining units remaining independent. Since this concept of bargaining is relatively new to Church people in Catholic schools, it has taken some time for them to develop some familiarity and ease with it. Many are still quite fearful and see collective bargaining as a threat to themselves and to the school.

There is one major concern with the process of collective bargaining in Catholic schools. Will Catholic schools, which are already hard pressed financially, be able to sustain themselves in the face of the necessary financial concessions which are part of the bargaining agreement? This may be viewed rather as a challenge to the inventiveness of

9. Ibid.
Catholic people than as a life ending threat. Catholic schools must make every effort to become financially solvent if they wish to remain opened in the future. They must also become independent of the subsidies available to them in the past. They cannot hope to pass off their cost to Catholic people who are not interested in their survival. Neither should the local bishop be expected to support a school not making it on its own. Catholic schools must market themselves as worthy of support. In addition, those who use the schools have the chief obligation to pay the cost of them: the parents and students attending must carry the cost through tuition and necessary fund raising.

There is evidence that many Catholics can afford the full cost of their children's education, and they will have to come to the view that education is a commodity worth paying for.  

General support gained from the diocese and local parishes should be replaced by scholarships and grants, since direct gifts to needy students make it possible for them to attend. Small reductions of one or two hundred dollars for middle class students don't make a significant difference. While the financial burden of Catholic schools is real, collective bargaining may provide closer cooperation between teachers and administrators.

This study investigated the present status of collective bargaining in a state with a large Catholic population: Illinois. The Catholic schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago, comprising two of the most populous counties in the state, are the fifth largest school system in the United States including public education. This urban setting presented for study a typical Catholic population center in a city which has traditionally been strongly pro-union. In addition, the rural Illinois countryside included thirty-eight Catholic high schools in small towns and cities, serving the scattered Catholic population across the state in geographic regions not known for their union activity.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Since collective bargaining is a recent historical development in Catholic schools in the United States, it is necessary to determine to what extent it has spread and to chart how it has grown. To obtain factual data about it, research was conducted in Catholic high schools in Illinois. Male lay teachers seeking the higher salaries available in high schools are more likely to form bargaining units than elementary school teachers. The study reported in the following pages attempted to discover the presence or absence of collective bargaining in the ninety-two Catholic high schools in Illinois, and the attitudes of administrators, lay teach-
ers, and religious teachers toward collective bargaining in those schools.

The Catholic high schools of Illinois involved in the study included diocesan schools, parish schools and schools owned by a religious community. In some schools there was a recognized teachers' union, but not in others. The review of the literature and the data gathered in response to the questionnaire attempted to answer the following research questions.

1. What is the status of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in Illinois?

2. Are the factors which led to the formation of collective bargaining in Catholic schools the same as those which led to the formation of collective bargaining in public education?

3. What do principals in Catholic high schools in Illinois feel about teachers' organizations as they relate to their positions as administrators?

4. What is the teaching of the Catholic Church with regard to collective bargaining?

5. What factors have influenced the growth of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in the 1970's and 1980's and what effect have these factors had?

6. What is the place of religious teachers in a Catholic school collective bargaining unit?
7. Do lay teachers and religious teachers feel there is a possible conflict of interest if religious teachers participate in teachers' organizations?

8. What is the appropriate response of Catholic school officials when Catholic school teachers request collective bargaining?

9. What alternatives to collective bargaining are available to Catholic school officials and to Catholic school teachers to obtain legitimate teacher goals?

10. How can labor relations disputes in Catholic schools where collective bargaining is present best be solved?

11. What is the effect of collective bargaining on the familial atmosphere called "community of faith" in a Catholic school?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Church-related school: for the purpose of this study a church-related school is a school operated with the philosophy and goals of the Catholic Church. These schools vary in the type of administrative control used to direct them.

Collective bargaining: a method of determining conditions of employment by means of negotiations between representatives of the employer and representatives of the employee.

Community of faith: the atmosphere of warmth and concern, springing from a common religious faith, which is often pres-
ent among those involved in a Catholic school.

Community-owned high school: a Catholic secondary school which is owned and operated by the religious order or con­gregation which staffs it. It operates with the permission of the local bishop.

Diocese: a geographic district under the jurisdiction of a Roman Catholic bishop. In Illinois there are six dioceses of the Catholic Church.

Diocesan high school: a Catholic secondary school which is the property of the Catholic bishop of the diocese and may be operated by people directly under his jurisdiction.

Encyclical: a letter written by the Pope to the bishops of the Church for the guidance of the faithful under their jur­isdiction.

Grievance: a complaint for a perceived wrong made by a mem­ber of the bargaining unit against management.

Lay teacher: a male or female adult who teaches in a Catho­lic school who is not a member of a religious order or of the clergy in any way.

National Catholic Education Association: a voluntary nation­al organization composed of those interested in the work of Catholic schools, intended to promote the goals of Catholic education.

Parish school: a Catholic secondary school owned by the bi­shop but operated under the direct supervision of the local
Religious teacher: a male or female adult who teaches in a Catholic school who is a member of a Roman Catholic religious order or congregation or a member of the recognized clergy. These people are ordinarily characterized by their living in a convent, rectory, or with other religious persons, and by their commitment to the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience.

School administrator: a person officially designated to conduct and direct the activities of the school.

United States Catholic Conference: the national organization of Catholic bishops which coordinates the bishops' activities and acts as a spokesperson for the bishops on national issues.

Union: a formally recognized unit for collective bargaining which enters into negotiations with representatives of management for the purpose of making a contract.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited with respect to sample, procedure and instrument.

The sample for this study was limited to school administrators, religious teachers, and lay teachers in the ninety-two Catholic high schools in Illinois. The Catholic schools were selected from the listing of all Catholic high schools in Illinois according to the Official Catholic Directory,
published by J. P. Kenedy Co., New York, New York, 1983. All principals of Catholic high schools in Illinois were sent the principal's questionnaire. They were also asked to return the questionnaire with a faculty list including all members of their religious and lay faculties. Lay teachers and religious teachers were selected for the study using random numbers applied to the faculty list. The attitudes revealed in the questionnaire are those of the administrators, religious teachers, and lay teachers who completed the questionnaires in these schools. Since all principals were included, the responses are presumed to represent a normative distribution. Since the lay and religious teachers were selected by a random process, their responses are presumed to reflect a normative distribution.

The study was limited with respect to procedure. The initial questionnaire was mailed to the principals. The teachers' questionnaires were mailed subsequently to the schools which responded to the initial questionnaire. The limitations of using a mailed instrument are the lack of responses from a portion of the sample and the inability to check the responses given. Two follow-up letters which included an additional questionnaire were used to improve the percentage of returns.

The study was limited with respect to the instrument. Martinkus (1971) used substantially the same instrument in
studying the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago. She obtained 365 usable responses from her survey of the Catholic high schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago. Olsen (1971) used a survey very similar to that of Martinkus and tested the reliability using the test-retest method. Olsen obtained 975 responses from his survey of the Catholic high schools of the large dioceses of the United States. The instrument used in this study was reviewed by six experts in Catholic schools and collective bargaining. Three were experienced administrators in Catholic education, and three were experienced union officers who had been involved in bargaining for many years.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Early studies of Catholic schools discovered that the topic of collective bargaining was growing in practice and influence in the Catholic schools of America. They indicated there were both fears and hopes attendant on the spread of this phenomenon which was new in the late 1960's. They predicted the rapid growth of bargaining across the country and benefits to the school systems because of it.

Collective bargaining in Catholic schools is a field about which a reasonable amount of literature has been created. Formal collective bargaining has taken place in several locations with varying degrees of success. Growth and change
have taken place. Several papal and national commentators have further clarified the Catholic Church's teaching on collective bargaining in recent years; the Supreme Court has ruled that Catholic schools are not under NLRB jurisdiction; and a serious recession has beset the United States. In the aftermath of these events the present study discussed whether collective bargaining is a growing or declining phenomenon in Catholic high schools. Current information was gathered about the status of collective bargaining through the literature and the questionnaire.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature provided a discussion of ideas which have emerged in the field of collective bargaining in Catholic schools. It also attempted to answer some of the research questions posed in the last chapter by presenting the findings of those experienced in the field and the results of other research. From 1967 until the present, articles and studies have focused on areas which are seen as important issues in collective bargaining in Catholic schools. This review was limited to those ideas relating to the topic which appeared in the literature.

The review was composed of several sections: each of these sections fulfilled a particular function:

Previous Studies: This section discussed previous doctoral dissertations having to do with collective bargaining and Catholic schools.

A General Introduction to Collective Bargaining in Catholic Schools: This section provided information on the topic in several ways. It commented on the principles of collective bargaining; the right to bargain; issues in bargaining; and the process of bargaining in Catholic schools.
Papal Teaching on Collective Bargaining: This section summarized the major documents issued by the Catholic Church in the past ninety-three years having collective bargaining as their major theme, thereby explicating the Church's teaching.

Organized Labor in the United States: This section summarized the development of labor unions in the United States revealing the reasons for their formation in the industrial sector of the nation.

Catholic School History: This section provided insight into the evolution of Catholic schools from their beginning in missionary communities to their prominence as private educational strongholds.

The Development of Catholic Teachers' Unions: This section documented the growth of Catholic teachers' unions from their inception to the 1979 NLRB decision.

Catholic Schools and the National Labor Relations Board: This section analyzed the impact of the NLRB on Catholic school collective bargaining during its period of jurisdiction over those schools and the result of the 1979 Supreme Court decision.

Catholic Teachers' Unions Now: This section reviewed the circumstances and events which have influenced Catholic teachers' unions since the first quarter of 1979.

The Third Party Agency: This section presented a dis-
Discussion on the need for an impartial agency for the resolution of labor disputes in Catholic schools.

Religious Teachers and the Bargaining Unit: This section examined the issue of the participation of members of Roman Catholic religious orders in collective bargaining units in local schools.

Catholic School Contracts: This section reviewed contract provisions commonly found in Catholic school collective bargaining agreements to discover those needs which teachers in Catholic schools seek to meet through collective bargaining.

Community of Faith Effects: This section dealt with the effect of collective bargaining on the interpersonal relationships between administrators, lay teachers, and religious teachers in Catholic schools.

Positive Approaches to Teacher Goals: This section proposed a plan of action for administrators and teachers to obtain the goals of teachers' collective action with or without the presence of a collective bargaining unit.

Summary: This section compiled the information provided in the previous sections and indicated possible deductions to be drawn from them.
PREVIOUS STUDIES

The topic of collective bargaining in Catholic schools is of recent origin. Teachers began to effectively organize in public education in the 1960's and this interest in organizing spread to Catholic schools by the end of the decade. About twelve studies have been done in the general area of collective bargaining in relation to the Catholic Church. Seven in particular have some connection to the present study.

Martinkus\(^1\) studied the status of collective bargaining in the Catholic high schools of the Archdiocese of Chicago. The topic was relatively new at the time, and her study was one of the first. She sought to determine the extent and nature of collective bargaining by a questionnaire which was sent to the eighty-four Catholic high schools in Cook and Lake Counties in Illinois. A review of the literature outlined the history of the labor movement in the United States and the papal documents describing the Catholic Church's position on labor unions. She conducted twenty-seven structured and unstructured interviews to examine four Catholic

---

high schools which had experienced teachers' strikes in the previous two years and documented the causes of these strikes. The study gathered data in the Catholic school system about the administrators and the teachers, the dichotomy between lay and religious teachers, the attitudes of the teaching staff toward teachers' unions, the reasons for union formation, the effects unions had up to that point, and the future of collective bargaining in the Catholic school system. The questionnaire was sent to principals, lay teachers and religious teachers to determine attitudes toward collective bargaining. The study found that the decentralized nature of the archdiocesan school system caused problems for the system when it faced attempts at unionization. It found that lay teachers used the same methods as their public school counterparts to obtain the benefits of a negotiated contract. Religious teachers expressed a strong need to be actively involved in matters which concerned their professional development and therefore were strongly in favor of active participation.

Olsen² investigated the attitudes toward collective bargaining held by the faculty members and administrators of Catholic secondary schools of large dioceses in the United States.

---

thirty-one of the largest dioceses in the United States. Each of these dioceses had twenty or more high schools, and included the dioceses of Chicago, New York, Brooklyn, Boston, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and others. The data was obtained through responses to a questionnaire dealing with general attitudes toward collective bargaining and with the issues that should be the subject of bargaining. The selected schools included community-owned schools, parish schools and diocesan schools. In some schools there was a recognized teachers' organization and in others there was not. The study found that many religious teachers had a strong desire to be fully involved in collective bargaining in their schools, and predicted favorable outcomes from collective bargaining in Catholic secondary schools. The majority of non-religious respondents favored the involvement of religious teachers in collective bargaining. The respondents expressed a belief in generally favorable outcomes from the growth of collective bargaining in Catholic schools. Results tended to favor a structure representing full membership rights for religious teachers as equals to lay teachers in a single teachers' organization in Catholic high schools. Lay teachers and administrators agreed that lay teachers should be eligible for chief administrative posts.
Yamada\(^3\) studied the perceptions held by teachers and principals of the leadership role of Catholic elementary principals in schools with and without a negotiated teacher contract. He attempted to determine whether or not differences between perceptions were related to the presence or absence of a negotiated contract. He polled one hundred randomly selected principals, one hundred randomly selected lay teachers and one hundred randomly selected religious teachers in a diocese with a negotiated contract and the same number in a diocese without a negotiated contract. He found that a majority of respondents agreed with the description provided of the principal's leadership-role abilities, and that the presence or absence of a contract did not create a significant difference. Principals showed more difference in perception of their position in the areas of concern for people and goals than the religious teachers and the lay teachers did. Two leadership dimensions - "concern for people" and "concern for goals" - were found present in the principals of Catholic elementary schools. It was also found that the presence of a negotiated contract did not inhibit or provide

---

an incentive for the principals in exercising their leadership roles. It was also found that principals perceived they could exercise their administrative leadership roles more freely than teachers perceived - whether or not there was a negotiated contract.

Huffman\(^4\) studied the union movement among lay teachers and discovered that lay persons have not exercised many rights within the authority structure of the Church and particularly within Catholic schools. The Church has supported the movement of workers toward unionism in every sector except in the area of unionization of workers in Church-run institutions. The study, which was an historical analysis, found that Catholic education will survive, but the survival of Catholic school teachers' organizations depends on the structure of Catholic schools and the protection given by the government to Catholic school teachers' unions. Religion, education and unionism are uniquely combined in Catholic schools.

Nami\(^5\) studied the effect of teachers' strikes in Cath-

---

olic schools on particular behaviors of the lay teachers in those strikes. He looked at the factors of union association, social support, social pressure, fear of sanctions, commitment to Catholic schools and commitment to the Catholic faith, and he compared these factors to the strike behaviors of supporting or opposing the decision to strike, picketing or not picketing, and reporting or not reporting for classroom duties. He found that while teachers of both sexes and all ages supported the decision to strike, male teachers who were comparatively younger and less experienced tended to be more active in the strike-associated behaviors. These young male teachers were more concerned about the reaction of their fellow teachers to their support of the union and were more fearful of not supporting the union. Both those who supported and did not support the strike had a deep commitment to the Catholic faith.

Boyle studied the relationship between faith community and teachers' unions in Catholic schools. Faith community was defined as a group of people united by common beliefs, bound by their mutual faith or common religion, with mutual support for the goals of the school. The purpose of the study was to determine whether or not the uniqueness of

Catholic schools lies in their being faith communities and to examine the attitudes of Catholic school administrators toward unionization. The literature identified common elements relative to faith community, the nature of teachers' unions in Catholic schools, and the position of the Church on unions. A questionnaire was sent to the chief administrators of each Catholic school system in the United States; it sought information on the existence and status of teachers' unions and on the attitudes of chief administrators toward them. The study revealed that Catholic schools can exist while admitting unions in their midst. There was some conflict in the data as to whether unions impaired faith community. There was general agreement that faith community was the basis for the uniqueness of Catholic schools.

Palestini\textsuperscript{7} studied the effect of collective bargaining on the religious goals of Catholic high schools in Philadelphia. He was concerned about its effect on community of faith concept - the atmosphere of trust and warmth in the Catholic high school, which characterizes many of them. He also examined the effect of collective bargaining on voluntary service, good example set by administrators and teachers, 

\begin{footnote}
\end{footnote}
and its effect on the form of worship practiced. While the majority of respondents indicated that collective bargaining had no negative effect on the community of faith concept in the Catholic high schools, the grouping of religious teachers and administrators perceived that collective bargaining had a more negative effect on community of faith than did the lay teachers. A significant number of administrators and religious felt that collective bargaining had reduced the level of respect between teachers and administrators, lessened the sense of trust and partnership, curbed the sense of voluntarism and lowered the overall morale of the school. Overall the study revealed no perception of negative effects on community, service, example or worship in the Catholic high schools studied.

A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

There was no dispute in the literature that Catholic school teachers have the right to organize and bargain if they chose to do so. Authors repeated similar statements on the rights of workers and their right to organize for bargaining. Those opposed to the organization of teachers' unions usually confine themselves to the problems and negative effects of collective bargaining on the school and the community served by the school. None of those opposed to
unionization stated that teachers have no right to bargain for better wages and conditions in Catholic schools. The evidence in written documents and statements of the Church is so overwhelming that a position against bargaining cannot be seriously maintained by a rational spokesman. This does not mean that all welcome the desire of teachers to unite. To the contrary, responsible commentators, in pointing out the rights of workers, also mentioned the negative effects of the bargaining process when it closely followed the traditional labor-management model of bargaining so familiar in the United States, especially in the industrial Northeast.

Commentators made the point that while workers have the right to bargain, they are most inclined to resort to it when they feel squeezed by arbitrary and capricious administrators who run some schools. When there is a positive feeling about the way the school is directed, and the absence of an atmosphere threatening to their job security, teachers are usually less inclined to seek relief in bargaining.

Meyers believed there are some working assumptions which underlie the process of collective bargaining:

1. The worker has a right to a just living family saving

wage, and good working conditions.

2. The workers have a right to organize, bargain collectively, and (note this) participate meaningfully in decisions which affect the enterprise.

3. Social justice requires the establishment of a structure or set of structures that assures justice will be provided. Paternalistic relationships are not enough.

4. The Catholic Church, while it may be described as an institution, is more adequately described as Sacrament Community, or the People of God.

5. Some Church enterprises are more closely related to the central sacramental mission of the Church than are others.

6. The Catholic school is best defined as a Christian Educational Community, and as such, it is more closely related to the central sacramental mission.

7. The government must avoid excessive entanglement in the religious affairs of the Church.

8. Parents have the right to participate, usually through elected representatives, in policy decisions affecting the education of their children. This includes decisions concerning tuition and salaries.

9. The nature of the structure provided to promote justice should be consonant with the nature of the institution and not antithetical to it. Consequently, it would not be immoral to be opposed to certain types of structures or organizations either of managers, administrators, or teachers.9

Meyers believed that those in Catholic education are looking for a structure which will meet these assumptions and guarantee social justice to those involved in the ministry of education for all lay and religious teachers, principals, pastors, parents, bishops and students.

He believed that the relationships in a Christian Educational Community should be characterized by cooperation and

---

not conflict, by service to others not service to self, by
harmony not hatred, by justice for all not justice for some,
and especially by growth in witness to faith in Jesus.10

Higgins said that teacher unions are here to stay and
that we had better begin to learn how to deal with them con-
structively.11 Higgins felt that ground had been lost in
the direction of labor union growth in the few years previous.
There was in his mind no question about the rights of teach-
ers to organize and bargain in Catholic institutions:

for unless we can agree without equivocation that teach-
ers have the right to organize and bargain collectively
and that school administrators have the duty to honor
this right in practice, we are heading for serious trou-
ble - the kind of trouble that could divide the Catholic
community for many years to come.12

According to Higgins there is a growing sense of human
dignity; people are more conscious than ever before of their
basic human rights. Higgins felt that while economic con-
cerns are important matters for teachers, even where there
is a just and adequate wage paid to the teachers, there is
still a need for teachers' unions. Forty odd years ago Amer-
ican business management made the mistake of not taking ser-
iously the determination of laborers to exert more influence
over their lives:

10. Ibid., p. 18.
11. George Higgins, "Theological Perspectives," Unionism in
Catholic Schools, Washington, D.C., National Catholic
12. Ibid., p. 2.
The time has come, I think, for our Catholic institutions to do what everybody else in the United States had to do forty years ago, and that is to begin to take seriously the right, or if you will, the obligation of people to organize into their own economic organizations—not to put our schools out of business but to enable them to carry on human relations in the economic field in the most sensible way that men have thus far been able to discover.13

Augenstein suggested that rather than being the last in the field to follow the inevitable, Catholic school administrators take the lead in establishing progressive labor-management relations in their particular profession. He affirmed the threefold right of organization, representation, and bargaining. Augenstein admitted that some people perceive negative effects from the implementation of bargaining rights. They fear financial collapse will result from it, and a loss of administrative control; faculty division may occur. Others fear interference from outside teachers' organizations if affiliation with a larger union comes about. Augenstein admitted these possible consequences, but thought they would be negated by leadership which is open, capable, understanding and self-confident on the part of teachers and administrators. This could be done if the administrators affirmed and implemented the principle of shared decision making. Written personnel policies jointly drafted and jointly reviewed can be

devised. Augenstein said teachers should participate in the setting of salaries and working conditions, and all interested parties should receive equal treatment. 14

On their part, teachers decide on their own whether or not to organize, but should see that they do not alienate fellow teachers who are members of religious orders or of the clergy but who have the same rights as other teachers. Teachers should be willing to compromise on issues which divide the two parties.

For Augenstein the issue in bargaining is the implementation of the Church's social teaching seeking justice for workers in the school's community of faith. The need for a common understanding of several points by both parties underlies the issue. These points include the mission of the Church in education, the roles of teachers and administrators and the teachers' organization. If these ideas are not understood at the beginning there will be great difficulty in reaching agreement.

While it is clear that teachers have the right to organize, it is not so clear that they should:

This decision should be left to the teachers. School administrators should not spy on union meetings, not hinder access to teachers by union members, nor fire a teacher for supporting a union, nor question workers about union activities, nor try to buy them off a grievance committee. They should listen in good faith; when

called on to do so, they should bargain in good faith. They should not allow the NLRB to manifest a stronger sense of justice to teachers than they do.15

Those who believe that teachers in Catholic schools should not organize into a union provide the strongest argument when they maintain that Catholic schools are different from public schools in that they function in a model known as the "faith community," which is at odds with the industrial model functioning in public education. The adversary nature of bargaining and the suspicion and deceit that characterize bargaining in the industrial model are not inclined to build trust and cooperation which is called for in Catholic schools. Critics propose to find a different model than the industrial one. But there is a weakness in this thought:

When new models are described, they often are very ineffectual associations with heavy paternalistic overtones, or... they call for the teacher to accept restrictions on pay and working conditions as their donation to the mission of the teaching Church.16

Among others, Liebrecht17 believed that teachers' organizations are the concern of the teachers themselves; they

16. Ibid., p. 63.
are in the best position to determine the parameters of their organizations without needing to consult any higher authority. The teachers themselves determine the criteria for membership, whether it is restricted or open, what structure it will take, whether it will involve one school or the whole diocese.

Most of the bargaining units in Catholic schools have evolved from professionally oriented teacher associations. Such groups, when elected to become agents bargaining for teachers, tend to become independent teacher unions or associations.18

This tendency to remain independent locally is more characteristic of Catholic teachers' unions than joining system wide organizations.

Liebrecht provided advice to administrators when confronted with the movement of teachers to organize:

1. Help the teachers' organization to be sensitive always to the expectation that, like Catholic school itself, the organization should be unique and willing to identify that uniqueness.
2. Work cooperatively with the organization in a spirit of mutual understanding and charity.
3. Attempt to minimize any adversarial relationships which might tend to appear on occasion.
4. Communicate, in a continuing dialogue, the hopes which administrators and board members and others have for the organization.

He suggested several principles related to Catholic teachers' organizations:

1. They have the need to identify the similarities and the differences between themselves and public school teachers' organizations. There are important differences.

2. Because they are based on the concept of faith community, they must be designed to be an integral part of that community of faith.

3. They must be very aware that the relationships between each public and each group of people is a vital concern.19

Teachers' unions are normally instituted through a process involving several steps. The following process applied to Catholic teacher unions until the 1979 National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) decision:

1. Teachers are asked to sign a union pledge card. If 30 percent of the teachers sign, then they may schedule an election under federal law. The NLRB may be called in to supervise and conduct the election, thereby protecting the rights of workers to organize.

2. All teachers in the school are included in a secret ballot, government regulated election, voting for or joining a union or voting to join an affiliated union or an independent one.

3. If the vote for the union does not have a majority of the voting teachers, then a new election cannot be held for one year.

4. Unions are required to accord everyone in the bargaining unit fair representation, even those who are not members.

5. Employers must bargain with the newly certified union and it has the exclusive right to represent all employees of the unit.

6. Teachers have the right to seek a decertification election to terminate agreements with a union.20

According to Burke the goal of collective bargaining is to reach a settlement; however, often the representatives of

19. Leibrecht, op. cit., p. 27.
the union and administration approach the process not equipped to formulate the initial contract. Special skills and expertise are needed to give birth to a reasonable settlement with a minimum of conflict.

The request for bargaining by the local teachers' association puts the pastor and or principal in a new situation. The intimate friendships which may have characterized the relationship between teachers and those directing the school may suffer as a result of different goals of the union and administration. The misunderstanding of the new relationship between teachers and employers in a Catholic school leads to much disillusionment on both sides of the table.

Teachers' associations at the diocesan level put much pressure on the superintendent who must carefully fulfill his complicated responsibilities in bargaining. The superintendent should immediately designate someone to act as the bargaining agent for the diocese, and that person needs to be a professional in the field. The issues of grievances, arbitration, and other tortuous interests require competent counsel. This person should be an experienced attorney, who must speak as the sole voice in negotiations. The superintendent must inform the negotiator of the parameters of the negotiations and the limits the diocese is willing to go to obtain labor peace, as well as those items which are non-negotiable on the part of the diocese. The many questions
to be answered require his close cooperation with the negotiator, and the full support of the bishop in advance. This responsibility as a communicator is most essential for the superintendent.21

Wise people approach the negotiations with the caution that they must assume nothing and analyze everything. The major areas of interest are money, working conditions, and the rights of union and employer. It is best that only one spokesman speak for each side and that this person be the most knowledgable in the areas concerned. In the first round of negotiations the employer retains the most initiative, since it is up to the employer to determine the terms and conditions of employment and the union must seek to alter them in its favor. The union submits proposals, and after a period of review and reflection, the employer responds to the proposals and offers counter proposals of his own.

There may be open discussion in a give and take manner, but it is also normal,

for the employer to listen to the unions' arguments in favor of a position, ask questions to clarify aspects of the proposal and then to adjourn to a separate room or caucus, to discuss the proposal in depth.22

In this private meeting all members of both committees freely exchange points of view, but when returning to the table, they revert to one spokesperson. If it is possible or reasonable to accept a proposal, then this proposal may become an element in further bargaining or a "chip" to be used to evoke a concession. If the proposal is unreasonable or puts an unreasonable burden on the employer, then it must be resisted. As time goes on the number of demands become focused on the most important priorities of the union and on the manageable commitments of the administration. If an impasse is reached, mediation may be sought to help both parties get a better perspective on the issues involved.

At this point anything can happen and the side that is best prepared to maintain its position will normally prevail in a majority of the basic issues.23

In most cases negotiations lead to a peaceful settlement, with the union gaining all it thinks it can at this time and setting the ground work for more gains in the future. Occasionally, the parties cannot reach agreement and the employer must be ready for a strike. If the employer is not prepared to resist the pressure which will come to bear after the strike has begun, he is better off making the necessary concessions to avoid the strike.

It is wise for both parties to reach a prior agreement that they will not discuss the negotiations with the press

until a settlement is reached, or a strike begins. Public controversy only aggravates a difficult situation and creates unnecessary obstacles in the way of agreement. After the process is completed, school administrators need to remember that the good will and support of the teachers is necessary if quality education is to be provided.

Problems With Collective Bargaining

Many good things have been accomplished through the union movement. But this does not mean that bargaining is always a positive experience for a Catholic school or those involved in it.

For many who have had some familiarity with the social encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI, there may be an initial impulse to feel that the best way to deal with teachers is through teachers' unions. For those who have had to deal with the raw display of militant teacher power, there has been a much closer look at the differences between the rights of teachers to organize unions which is indisputable, and the desirability of such unions in Catholic school.24

The literature reported that the effects of bargaining on the work relationships in a Catholic school is mixed. Some authors comment on the success of negotiations and a greater understanding of the position of both sides. There has been greater financial accountability and clearer personnel practices, but each particular institution has its

distinct character.

Inexperienced and uninformed principals, pastors and teachers may believe that just having a positive attitude and a Christian sense of sincerity and compassion will be sufficient preparation for success in the collective bargaining process. They fail to realize that collective bargaining is an adversary relationship in which both sides try to gain as many of their wants as possible, using whatever devices and strategies are available to them. They don't realize that compromise, often a little at a time, is the way to find an agreement. It is a mistake to believe that because they are adults and acting in good faith, they are equipped by personality or temperament to cope with the stress of bargaining. The complexity of the issues and misunderstandings on both sides leads to firings, walkouts, and strike behavior. It is this misunderstanding of the real nature of mature bargaining that is the cause of most disagreements which occur in Catholic schools involved in the process. 25

The appearance of teachers' unions has changed this traditional relationship between the administrators and the lay teachers in the unions. The principal becomes more a manager than instructional leader. The religious teacher is now considered a part of the management or as a professional

teacher who can be counted with other teachers.

Thus, the appearance of a teachers' union in the school leads to a division in a faculty where religious and lay teachers may once have worked together as a community of scholars. 26

Burke spoke from his own experience in the negotiating process including a teacher strike, which was detrimental to the morale of the school and the spirit of the institution. He maintained that the relationships between faculty and administration members often change from a warm and close working relationship to a distant and insulated professional one after collective bargaining begins. He blamed the bargaining process and those forces which led to its becoming necessary. Once the step is taken to collective bargaining, there is no turning back for the participants. Teachers who have asserted themselves by gaining a bargaining unit are not about to renounce it in favor of the old system of accepting the offerings of the administration.

It is perhaps possible that an overly zealous promotion of teachers' unionism, particularly of the trade union type, has distracted schools and school systems from providing an equally zealous concern that this growth consistently reflect the philosophical aims and objectives of the Christian school community. 27

According to Burke the bargaining process pits one side against the other and becomes essentially a struggle for greater control. The settlement, for the administration, is a temporary truce in the process of a long retreat from the power to direct the school. The ultimate goal of the union is to assert and maintain as much control over the school as possible, with little concern for the long-range effects on the school.

Negotiations in this process make great emotional demands of the participants, with acrimony raised on both sides. Contract settlements often include changes in tenure procedures advantageous to the faculty. Religious teachers are excluded by a lay-only union, and must go along with whatever the union gains for the lay members. Anything in the life of the school is potentially a negotiable item. When the financial position of the school is thoroughly investigated, the union moves on to other areas of school business and it becomes clear it seeks simply to maintain a powerful, but overbalanced influence on the administration of the school. Union incursions into the administrative areas of the school include working conditions such as class size, number of preparations, free time, and similar items. While working conditions become the subject of established grievance procedures, the top priority of unions apply to the area of teacher dismissals and terminations. The union presumes the dismissed teacher
has been treated wrongly by the administration. The atmosphere surrounding bargaining is no longer warm but a cold formal businesslike relationship.\(^{28}\)

Instead of dedication and mutual support that are anticipated to characterize a truly Christian school, there is increasing concern that collective bargaining under union auspices, will encourage a decline in the spirit of voluntarism, generosity, and mutual trust between faculties and school administration.\(^{29}\)

**PAPAL TEACHING ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING**

During the Middle Ages the guild system developed in Western Europe as a way in which craftsmanship might be protected and the just and orderly continuation of society effected. In this system, every one had his place and the stages of mastery provided the holder with status and position in the social structure. As events and circumstances brought guilds to an end, there was no teaching of the Catholic Church about these types of associations to which believers could turn for guidance. The onset of the Industrial Revolution created a new class; working people, who would have ordinarily spent their lives in rural settings, responded to the steady employment offered by the factories growing in the old and new urban settings. The workers at these machines were trained in their operation and therefore

\(^{29}\) *Ibid.*
became somewhat skilled. By the time the century ended, reasonable men, especially those who found themselves in the factories, realized that the exploitation occurring at the hands of the owners must be confronted and reduced. In the light of a growing yet infant labor movement the body of social teaching of the Catholic Church began.

The tradition of the Catholic Church has seen in the Pope its supreme teaching authority. Throughout history from the time of the early Church until the present day, the Pope has used this authority in the attempt to instruct the faithful in matters of faith and moral principle as the need arose. In the occasionally fortunate combination of events and personality, Leo XIII became Pope in 1878 and faced the issue of workers rights. It was a time when there was no harmony between the Papacy and the people of the Church.

During the funeral procession of his predecessor Pius IX a cursing, stone throwing mob followed the funeral cortage to the body's final resting place at San Lorenzo outside the walls and threatened to throw the dead Pope's body into the Tiber River.30

There was a strong tide of anticlericalism and unrest in society. Laborers were treated badly and employers tolerated no interference with the way business was conducted. Fearing that a revolutionary atmosphere would undermine the Church,

the Popes preceeding Leo XIII had resisted the changing times, but Leo XIII was different. As a child he became concerned with the plight of the neighborhood's poor, many of whom his mother fed and clothed. Although he was not healthy, he was ambitious and hard working. As a priest, bishop and cardinal, he worked for the underprivileged. He conducted schools to help the young in an industrial age. He established orphanages, free kitchens, grain reserves and even a savings bank. He was called to be Pope at sixty-seven and social reform remains his lasting monument.

On The Condition Of Workers. The first statement of Catholic social teaching was made to a worldwide audience by Pope Leo XIII, who issued the encyclical: *Rerum Novarum*, on May 15, 1891. An encyclical is a teaching letter used to explain doctrine or policy to the whole Church; it has moral authority and must be listened to. The title in English is usually rendered: *On The Condition Of Workers*. In it the Pope took note of the changing nature of the modern world and used much of the letter defending the right of private property, both for the owner and laborer. He attempted to counter the spread of Socialism and other revolutionary beliefs. He noted that the modern worker is easily victimized by the greed of his employers, who put a yoke of slavery on the

afflicted worker. The Pope warned against exploitation:

When the worker places his energy and his labor at the disposal of another, he does so for the purpose of getting the means necessary for livelihood. He seeks in return for the work done, accordingly, a true and full right not only to demand his wage but to dispose of it as he sees fit.\(^{32}\)

The worker has the ownership of his labor and may market it to his best advantage.\(^{33}\) The laborer is instructed to provide good labor conscientiously for his wage. He is duty bound in the eyes of God to perform what is reasonably expected. The rich too, have responsibilities toward those less fortunate than themselves.

Workers have the right to better themselves in society so that they may provide for their particular needs and help close the gap between the poor and the rich.

In our present age of greater culture, with its new customs and way of living, and with the increased number of things required by daily life, it is most clearly necessary that workers' associations be adapted to meet the present need. It is gratifying that societies of this kind and composed either of workers alone or of workers and employers together are being formed everywhere, and it is truly to be desired that they grow in number and in active vigor. Although We have spoken of them more than once, it seems well to show in this place that they are highly opportune and are formed by their own right, and, likewise to show how they should be organized and what they should do.\(^{34}\)

For late nineteenth century Europe in Catholic coun-

\(^{32}\) Op. cit., par. 9, p. 3.  
\(^{33}\) Op. cit., p. 3.  
\(^{34}\) Op. cit., par. 69, p. 25.
tries this was a powerful endorsement. Employers who had been maintaining that organizations of workers were sinful or the work of the devil lost the force of that argument.

No great change was immediately effected, but as the labor movement began to gain strength it claimed a powerful moral ally for its legitimacy in the teaching of the Pope. In countries where the Catholic worker population was or became significant, the clear approval of this statement allowed people of faith to pursue their claims with the confidence of a clear conscience. Neither could any employer or government maintain that workers were acting contrary to the teachings of Christ or the Church. As the twentieth century began and the labor movement gained strength both in Europe and in America the impact of this document grew and spread with the movement itself.

On Reconstructing The Social Order. By the time of the fortieth anniversary of On The Condition Of Workers it was recognized as a milestone in social thought. Therefore on the fifteenth of May, in 1931, forty years to the day it was issued, Pope Pius XI issued his own encyclical, Quadragesimo Anno, literally Forty Years (have passed, etc.) to praise and commemorate the original encyclical and to clarify its teaching. This letter called in English, On Reconstructing The Social Order, begins by acclaiming the significance of Leo's letter.
Forty years have passed since Leo XIII's peerless encyclical, *On The Condition Of Workers*, first saw the light, and the whole Catholic world, filled with grateful recollection, is undertaking to commemorate it with befitting solemnity.35

Pius explained that the new type of economic life which came into being at the end of the nineteenth century began to divide society into two classes, the smaller class enjoying the advantages of technology and the much larger class of those who provide the labor but did not share the benefits:

the huge multitude of working people, oppressed by wretched poverty, was vainly seeking escape from the straits wherein it stood.36

Pius warmly congratulates Leo for his effort saying the letter was "in advance of its time beyong all expectation."37 He explained the benefits which derived from it in so far as it had influenced the teaching of the Church and the actions of people worldwide. The effect of *On The Condition Of Workers* said Pius XI was to

lift up that class which on account of the modern expansion of industry had increased to enormous numbers but not yet had obtained his rightful place or rank in human society and was, for that reason, all but neglected and despised - the workers.

From that time on, fuller means of livelihood have been more securely obtained; for not only did works of beneficence and charity begin to multiply at the urgings of the Pontiff, but there have also been established every-

---

36. Ibid., par. 3, p. 6.
37. Ibid., par. 14, p. 8.
where new and continuously expanding organizations in which workers, craftsmen, farmers, and employees of every kind, with the counsel of the Church and frequently under the leadership of her priests, give and receive mutual help and support.38

This letter also encouraged Christian workers to found mutual associations according to their various occupations, taught them how to do so, and resolutely confirmed in the path of duty a goodly number of those to whom socialist organizations strongly attracted by claiming to be the sole defenders and champions of the lowly and oppressed.39

In summarizing his view of the importance of On The Condition of Workers, Pius compares it favorably with another memorable document:

On the basis of the long period of experience, it cannot be rash to say that Leo's Encyclical has proved itself the "Magna Charta" upon which all Christian activity in the social field ought to be based, as on a foundation.40

Pope Pius again affirmed the right of private property and devoted many pages to the concept of the just wage. He most clearly adds his approval to organized associations of workers near the end of this letter, written in the midst of the Great Depression, where he makes his own point and quotes his predecessor at the same time:

We consider it enough to emphasize one point: People are quite free not only to found such associations, which are a matter of private order and private right, but also in respect to them "freely to adopt the organization and

40. Ibid., par. 39, p. 16.
the rules which they judge most appropriate to achieve their purpose". The same freedom must be asserted for founding associations that go beyond the boundaries of individual callings. And may these free organizations, now flourishing and rejoicing in their salutary fruits, set before themselves the task of preparing the way, in conformity with the mind of Christian social teaching, for those larger and more important guilds, industries, and professions, which We mentioned before, and make every possible effort to bring them into realization.41

This statement is extremely clear: associations of workers are approved by the Church and its chief teacher as long as they are free and freely entered.

Mother and Teacher. On May 15th in 1961, the seventy­tieth anniversary of On The Condition Of Workers, another chapter was added to the Church's collection of Social Encyclicals. This one called Mater et Magistra or Mother and Teacher, was dedicated to the concept of Christianity and Social Progress. Seventy years had now passed since On The Condition Of Workers and the world was much different from the antibellum society of Leo XIII. Pope John XXIII saw labor relations from a twentieth century context.

Pope John XXIII re­emphasized this broader view of work relations; in Mater et Magistra, he reaffirmed what Pius XI had said namely; "that work agreements (should) be tempered in certain respects with partnership arrangements, so that workers and officials become participants in ownership, or management, or share in some manner in profits".

Pope John developed this theme more fully in the same encyclical: "Furthermore, as did our predecessors, We

41. Pope Pius XI, op. cit., par. 87, p. 32.
regard as justifiable the desire of employees to be partners in enterprises with which they are associated and wherein they work". He admits this will vary in each situation, but states emphatically: "We do not doubt that employees should have an active part in the affairs of the enterprise wherein they work, whether these be private or public. But it is of the most importance that productive enterprises assume the character of a true human fellowship whose spirit suffuses the dealing, activities and standing of all its members".42

Pope John XXIII said Catholic social teaching began with On The Condition Of Workers and in some ways all subsequent developments are commentaries on that letter. Leo XIII finds his lasting legacy in this document which is almost always quoted by his successors as setting the standard for the Church's expression of concern for the rights of the worker in modern society.

By far the most notable evidence of this social teaching and action, which the Church has set forth through the centuries undoubtedly is the very distinguished encyclical letter, Rerum Novarum, issued seventy years ago by our predecessor of immortal memory Leo XIII. Therein he put forward teachings whereby the question of the workers' condition would be resolved in conformity with Christian principles.43

Seldom have the admonitions of a Pontiff been received with such universal approbation, as was that Encyclical of Leo XIII, rivaled by few in the depth and scope of its reasoning and in the forcefulness of its expression. Indeed, the norms and recommendations contained therein were so momentous that their memory will never fall into oblivion. As a result, the action of the Catholic Church became more widely known. For its Supreme Pastor, making his own the problems of weak and harassed men, their com-

plaints and aspirations, had devoted himself especially
to the defense and restoration of their rights.\textsuperscript{44}

Pope John affirms that a just wage must be paid by all
employers:

In this connection, it is today advisable as our prede­
cessor clearly pointed out, that work agreements be tem­
pered in certain respects with partnership arrangements, so that "workers and officials become participants in
ownership, or management, or share in some manner in pro­
fits".\textsuperscript{45}

Although the Popes recognized the right of workers to
band together, they also stressed the hope that workers and
employers would put aside the adversary relationship which
characterizes negotiations and join in a useful partnership
between capital and the means of labor. Pope John maintained
that it is not his place or within his ability to determine
how and under what circumstances this should take place but:

We do not doubt that employees should have an active part
in the affairs of the enterprises wherein they work, whether these be private or public.\textsuperscript{46}

Labor unionism has many things in common with the Cath­
olic Church; it is most strong in Western culture, where the
Christian nations and those nations which are their descend­
ants through culture and language have grown. In \textit{Mother and Teacher}, the Pope endorsed collective bargaining between as­
associations of workers and the employer.\textsuperscript{47}

\begin{itemize}
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\item \textsuperscript{45} \textit{Ibid.}, par. 32, p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{46} \textit{Ibid.}, par. 91, p. 22.
\item \textsuperscript{47} Vincent P. Mainelli, Pope John XXIII, \textit{Mater et Magistra}, par. 100, p. 25.
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gaining gives workers an opportunity to exert influence outside the limits of their company and to extend that influence to other workers.

Pope John wished to provide encouragement to those who worked in the difficult field of labor relations and gave them his approval:

It is fitting, therefore, that our thoughts and paternal affection be directed toward the various professional groups and associations of workers which, in accord with principles of Christian teaching, carry on their activities on several continents. We are aware of the many difficulties experienced by these beloved sons of ours, as they effectively worked in the past and continue to strive both within their national boundaries and throughout the world, to vindicate the rights of working men and to improve their lot in life.48

The Church In The Modern World. A change took place at the Second Vatican Council. The Catholic Church, which for centuries and in its documents and actions had believed itself the hierachial leader of the world, began to perceive the mission of the Church in the modern world was as the servant to the people of God, and the guide of the progress of people in the area of social justice. The Church descended the throne of pontifical exhortation and moved more into the mainstream of social commentary. Pope John XXIII must take much of the credit for this adaptation into the new spirit of the time. His goal was to "open the windows of the Church" and let new light in, allowing for a freer exchange of ideas.

From Pope John XXIII onwards, previous teaching is certainly taken up and integrated, but the traditional pattern of problems nevertheless falls apart. The Church adopts a different attitude to the world: that of a "servant", it will soon be said, of the human community. An organized synthesis takes shape. It comprises a wider and more complex field than that of the earlier documents. And this approach brings up again in new form problems such as the right of association, wages and before long, that of natural resources.49

Pope John XXIII called the Second Vatican Council into session to effect a modernization of the Church, to bring the message of Christ more into the consciousness of men by having it address the concerns of people today in understandable terms. In one of the sixteen major documents issued by the Council, the Catholic bishops with the approval of the Pope set forth their position on the purpose of the Catholic Church in the modern world. This document called Gaudium et Spes or The Pastoral Constitution On The Church In The Modern World, issued December 7, 1965, dealt with many issues of concern to the bishops under general headings such as: "The Dignity of the Human Person"; "The Community of Mankind"; "Man's Activity Throughout the World"; and "The Role of the Church in the Modern World". After treating of these areas at length, the document turned to specific problems of special urgency, among them: "Fostering the Nobility of Marriage

and the Family"; "The Proper Development of Culture"; and "Socio-economic Life". Under this last heading the bishops provided their viewpoint on the Church's responsibility to comment on the active life of men:

Now in this area the Church maintains certain principles on justice and equity as they apply to individuals, societies, and international relations.50

In this same section of the overall document the bishops declared their position in a paragraph which is always quoted in modern times whenever the discussion turns to the right of labor unionism:

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.51

No new information was presented here which has not already been said elsewhere. It is a sharply clear statement in modern language about the right to organize which should not be taken for granted.

The next paragraph mentioned the right of workers to strike against the employer; a right not mentioned before this time in Papal documents:

Even in present-day circumstances, however, the strike can still be a necessary, though ultimate, means for the defense of the workers' own rights and the fulfillment

51. Ibid., p. 277.
of their just demands.\textsuperscript{52}

The remainder of the document concerns itself with the fostering of peace in the international community.

\textbf{A Call To Action.} On May 14, 1971, the eightieth anniversary of \textit{On The Condition Of Workers}, Pope Paul VI wrote a personal letter for publication which as been added to the canon of the papal documents on labor unions. It is named \textit{A Call To Action: Apostolic letter of Pope Paul VI to Cardinal Maurice Roy, President of the Council of the Laity and of the Pontifical Commission on Justice and Peace on the Occasion of the Eightieth Anniversary of the Encyclical \textit{Rerum Novarum}}. In speaking of the purpose of unions he says:

The important role of union organizations must be admitted: their object is the representation of the various categories of workers, their lawful collaboration in the economic advance of society, and the development of the sense of their responsibility for the realization of the common good.\ldots Here and there the temptation can arise of profiting from a position of force to impose, particularly by strikes--the right to which as a final means of defense remains certainly recognized--conditions which are too burdensome for the overall economy and for the social body, or to desire to obtain in this way demands of a directly political nature. When it is a question of public services, required for the life of an entire nation, it is necessary to be able to assess the limit beyond which the harm caused to society becomes inadmissible.\textsuperscript{53}

Part VI prohibited strikes in public services which would seriously disrupt society.

\begin{itemize}
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On Human Work. The most recent papal statement involving the rights of workers to unionize and explaining their responsibilities when doing so was an encyclical written by the present Pope, John Paul II, who on September 14, 1981, released his letter Laborem Exercens, translated as On Human Work. The Pope intended to release this letter on the ninetieth anniversary of On The Condition Of Workers, but his attempted assassination and recovery delayed its final revision until September of 1981. The Pope sought to use the anniversary to issue his own statement on the world of work:

I wish to devote this document to human work, and even more to man in the vast context of the reality of work.54

During the years that separate us from the publication of the encyclical, The Condition Of Workers, the social question has not ceased to engage the Church's attention.55 In references which almost seem coded to the then inflamed Polish labor situation, the Pope says:

From that time, worker solidarity, together with a clearer and more committed realization by others of workers' rights, has in many cases brought about profound changes.56

He used the word solidarity repeatedly to mean the unity of workers. The Pope discussed the tension between labor and capital and then the rights of workers within the broad con-

55. Ibid., p. 5.
56. Ibid., p. 18.
text of human rights. Perhaps because of his personal interest in the labor movement, especially in his own homeland, he devoted an entire section of nine paragraphs or some 1100 words to the importance of unions in modern society.

All these rights, together with the need for the workers themselves to secure them give rise to yet another right: the right of association, that is, to form associations for the purpose of defending the vital interests of those employed in the various professions. These associations are called labor or trade unions. The vital interest of the workers are to a certain extent common for all of them; at the same time, however, each type of work, each profession, has its own specific character which should find a particular reflection in these organizations.57

He went on to say that unions grew out of the struggle of the workers, especially industrial workers to protect their just rights. These unions are "an indispensable element of social life".58 He believed that in Catholic social teaching unions are a "mouthpiece for the struggle for social justice, for the just rights of working people in accordance with their individual professions".59 The goal of unions in their struggle is to provide unity for the human community and to find a working relationship between the different divisions of economic life. Union activity may enter the field of politics, but should refrain from becoming entangled with a particular political party. Unions function within their

57. Pope John Paul II, op. cit., p. 45.
58. Ibid., p. 46.
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competence when fostering the betterment of their members by education and social programs improving their lot in life.\textsuperscript{60} Unions may strike as an ultimatum to employers, under the proper conditions and with just limits; but essential community services may not be the subject of a strike which could paralyze the whole of socio-economic life.\textsuperscript{61} The Pope closed his letter by outlining elements for a spirituality of work.

Other Church Teaching. The Popes have spoken repeatedly over the last ninety-three years about the rights of workers. They are not the Church's only spokesmen in this matter.

The Catholic bishops of the world assembled together in conference or "Synod" may teach with authority. The 1971 Synod of Bishops, meeting in Rome, issued a statement called \textit{Justice in the World}, which called for the rights of Church employees. Examining the methods of Church action, the bishops said:

The Church is bound to give witness to justice, she recognizes that anyone who ventures to speak to people about justice must first be just in their eyes....Within the Church rights must be preserved. No one should be deprived of his ordinary rights because he is associated with the Church in one way or another.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{60} Pope John Paul II, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{61} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 48.
National groups of bishops may teach with authority and issue statements which apply to the areas under their jurisdiction. In America the organization of bishops is called the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) and the secular business agency of this group is called the United States Catholic Conference (USCC). A document issued by the American bishops in 1976, also called A Call To Action, pointed out that the Church in America did not lead the way in reflecting papal teaching in areas of social justice including granting collective bargaining to teachers.

It made this recommendation:

That in order to increase the credibility and integrity of its efforts in this area, the Catholic community recognizes and supports the rights of its employees, including documented and undocumented in the Church or church-related institutions, to form and/or join unions and other appropriate organizations of their own choosing to represent their collective interests and concerns.63

In the same year the bishops published a statement celebrating the Bicentennial called, On Liberty And Justice For All. In that document the bishops made the following resolutions:

1. That the social doctrine of Popes John XXIII, and Paul VI, Vatican II, the United States Bishops and the social teachings of the Church in their historic developments since 1891 be taught, respected and implemented.
2. That Catholics encourage and assist unemployed and unorganized workers...to join or form unions to represent their common interests and support legislation which

encourages such organization... We... urge Catholics in labor, management and government to support these organizing efforts.64

A subcommittee of the United States Catholic Conference issued a report to the membership as a whole on September 15, 1977, called Teacher Organizations in Catholic Schools. The subcommittee had been working for some time on this project and its findings, while not the last word on collective bargaining in Catholic schools, did make some very clear points. This report had only the force of a recommendation to the membership at large, which is the Catholic bishops. The subcommittee investigated many aspects of the Catholic school and the rights of workers. It made a statement specifically about the rights of Catholic school teachers.

The free exercise of these rights pertains to Catholic school teachers and other school employees in the same way it related to the employees of other Catholic institutions and secular organizations. We firmly believe that Catholic school teachers should not only study and understand these rights but should consider a responsibility toward their fellow teachers as they examine the possibility of even necessity of collective bargaining.65

Along with this right the statement mentioned the right of teachers to select their own organizations to represent them, the right to free elections, negotiations, arbitration

and conciliation. It said the membership of religious teachers in a bargaining unit is a question that requires further study.

This report then recommended five steps to assure procedural justice for Catholic school employees. Each diocese should develop written personnel policies in consultation with the teachers, and include the teachers in their development and implementation. It encouraged school officials to cooperate with teachers who wanted to form a bargaining unit, and to be guided by the community of faith concept in formulating the bargaining process. Finally they recommended the training for leaders who must be involved in the bargaining process.

In a statement released on August 27, 1979, Msgr. George Higgins, a leading Catholic spokesman for collective bargaining in Catholic schools, talked about the rights of workers within Church institutions to unionize, and the responsibility of Church authorities to see that workers are not denied these rights.

For the limited purposes of this annual Labor Day Statement, this means at the very least, that Church leaders and administrators of church-related institutions must unequivocally recognize the right of their employees to organize, if they so desire, for the purpose of collective bargaining. Any direct or indirect attempt to circumvent or to interfere with the free exercise of this right will predictably lead to serious trouble—the kind of trouble that could divide the Catholic community for many years to come and neutralize the effectiveness of
ongoing church-related programs for social justice both at home and abroad.66

On November 19, 1981, the United States Catholic Conference announced a pastoral letter, *Health and Health Care*, directed to the Health Care Industry. This statement said:

An important and indispensable responsibility of employers is the duty to deal justly with all employees. This involves not only just wages, fringe benefits and the like, but also the effective honoring of the desire of employees "to be treated as free and responsible men and women, able to participate in the decisions which affect their life and their future". This calls for the full recognition of the rights of employees to organize and bargain collectively.67

While it is clear the Church has taken leadership and extended it in the area of labor-management relations it should not be assumed that these principles are warmly accepted by all those with positions of authority and responsibility within the Church. There are those who feel there is no need for unions, while recognizing the theoretical right of their formation.

In the 1970's, Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia, Bishop Grutka of Gary, Indiana, Cardinal Manning of Los Angeles, the Archbishop of Baltimore, and Cardinal Cody of Chicago were among those who did not recognize teachers' organizations


seeking status as bargaining agents.

There have been problems in Catholic schools where unions have been successful in obtaining bargaining rights. Often this was the outcome of particular situations in difficult circumstances. Opposition has not stopped the growth of Catholic school teachers' organizations.

Lynch reported that in 1980 ten percent of Catholic school teachers were organized. Some of the other ninety percent want to organize, but have been denied the right by their employers. Some administrators are vigorously opposing unions and calling them hostile to the very nature of Catholic schools. The problems facing Catholic schools are important, but cannot be solved at the cost of denying the rights of workers. 68

The point has been made repeatedly; all workers, including Catholic school teachers, may organize to bargain collectively.

ORGANIZED LABOR IN THE UNITED STATES

The Industrial Revolution made great changes in western society. A whole new class of people who had, up to this time, depended on the land for their support now found them-

---

selves in factories in fast growing cities. It was the most significant social change in centuries. In the new industries which were emerging, the struggle of workers to gain leverage in the new social order was resisted for many years. 69

The labor movement in the United States did not begin until the nineteenth century. Before this time most workers were agricultural and those in the cities in particular crafts were not united in any formal or informal organization. Those unions which did exist aggressively promoted the interests of their membership and often insisted on a closed shop. They were met with hostility, violence, and court action for their trouble; the courts often supported the ownership against what was perceived as a conspiracy. Their court failures turned union people toward politics and the promotion of candidates who would work for their cause. They were able to effect several early reforms such as the elimination of prison for debt, the ten-hour work day for women and children, and free public education. 70

In the 1830's unions began growing in the major cities around trades and crafts, especially in New York, Newark,

Philadelphia, Boston and other large cities. As economic conditions improved at the end of the 1840's trade union activity revived and legal sanctions were won in courts, these sanctions permitted limited strike activity. The growth of the railroads in the 1850's provided stimulus for union growth as a unified economy came to be and the markets for products expanded. During the Civil War more unions were formed--plasterers, cigarmakers, bricklayers, and masons among them. The Knights of Labor was formed in 1869. It was the longest lived and most important of all the movements before the formation of the American Federation of Labor (AFL). It started as a secret society and therefore was off limits to Catholics who were forbidden to enter secret societies by the Church. It grew to 700,000 by 1886. Later on when workers in the skilled crafts felt neglected, they withdrew, weakening the Knights. 71

By 1886 Samuel Gompers formed the American Federation of Labor from the disgruntled Knights and other groups. This group was autonomous and exclusively covered the constituent unions. It was a federation of independent unions governed by its own officers under their own constitutions. There were at the same time independent unions; the most important of these were the Railroad Brotherhoods. Unions grew moder-
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ately until World War I, when they spurted in growth because of better economic conditions, as well as government recognition. Union membership declined after the war and continued declining until the Roosevelt New Deal policies began to reinvigorate the economy.

The first significant legislative gain for unions in this country was the passage of the Railway Labor Act of 1926. The Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 curtailed much of the anti-labor strength of the courts. The passage of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935 greatly strengthened the hand of union organizers and membership rose to a height at the end of World War II—almost 15 million by 1946. The NLRA made the work of unionization and collective bargaining a nationally approved policy. It dictated election procedures and safeguards, and it forbade interference by the employer in organization process or the election process.

These laws gave unions the support of public policy and therefore sanctioned collective bargaining. After this time unions had a legally protected status and the cover of the law when they negotiated for wages and working conditions.

In 1937 the Congress of Industrial Organizations was formed from those members of the AFL who felt that the parent organization was no longer adequate to meet the diverse needs of union people in the great variety of industries now available. Seeking a greater emphasis on industrial unions which
cut across the jurisdictional lines of the AFL, these people formed their own group which held its first convention in 1937.

Because of the benefits of the New Deal, labor memberships doubled from 1935 to 1938. Growth continued through World War II and in 1947 the Labor-Management Relations Act was passed which established a policy of government neutrality in labor disputes, and it listed unfair labor practices. In order to stop duplication and conserve resources, the AFL merged with the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) in 1955. This was more a marriage of convenience at the top level of these two institutions than a real joining of unions at the local level.

Membership in these giants has declined in recent years for several reasons: increased automation needs fewer workers; expansion in service industries has increased the number of white-collar workers; migration of industry to the Sun Belt has brought workers to traditionally non-union areas of the country; relative prosperity has made workers less eager to unionize; and government scrutiny of organized labor and its excesses has made unionization less appealing to the public. 72

---

In the 1960's and 1970's there was effort to organize strikes among police, firemen and other public employees. Unions have continued to grow but have not increased their percentage of the American work force. Some of the reasons for this are that: 1) most industries which are likely to unionize are already unionized; 2) the longer an employer remains non-union, the more likely it will remain non-union. Non-union employers have solidified their hold on employees and greater prosperity has reduced the level of dissatisfaction among workers. The economic job structure has shifted from the creation of blue-collar jobs to more white-collar jobs, particularly in new industries such as computers and electronic micro-processors.

Unions have had a significant effect on collective bargaining. In 1965 there were about 150,000 collective bargaining agreements which covered about 17 million workers nationwide, including 180 national unions and many local unions.

Nineteen states have laws which do not require all members of a particular business to be members of a recognized union. These "right to work" laws have retarded union membership. In the last few years the economic recession has been responsible for the retreat of the labor movement nationwide and the slowdown in union growth. American workers raised with the cultural myth of rugged individualism
have tended to favor collective bargaining rather than political action for social reform and individual improvement. They are job conscious rather than class conscious.

CATHOLIC SCHOOL HISTORY

Early Catholic schools were founded by Spanish and French missionary congregations of nuns and priests to convert the Indians to the Church. After the American Revolution, John Carroll, the first American Bishop, urged the establishment of Catholic schools. Schools began to educate Catholics in America so they could receive Catholic teaching without having to return to Europe. Without these schools poor Catholics had to send their children to public schools, which at the time, often taught Protestant religious beliefs and practices.

When free public education became a reality, Catholic schools lost the financial aid some had obtained from those states which up to that time had given aid to all private schools within their borders. In New York from 1805 until 1824 Catholic schools had received direct financial aid from the state. When this aid came to an end, many Catholics felt

---

they could not in conscience send their children to schools conducted by Protestant teachers, where Protestant religious practices were conducted. In these public schools, supported by taxes, non-sectarian Protestantism was the religion taught; students were required to study Protestant books, hymns, and prayers, as well as to read the King James Bible. Catholic parents were eager to avoid this religious indoctrination and promote the values of their own faith. When Catholic parents were unable to get Catholic students excused from participation in these activities and were denied their share of tax money for their own schools, they felt compelled to establish their own school system at their own expense.

In 1801 the first Catholic elementary school was established, but in the 1840's to the 1880's, when religious immigration greatly increased, the number of Catholic schools rapidly increased. At this time many elementary and high schools were opened.

Many European nuns, bringing their language and culture came to America to work with the ethnic people who had left the old land for the new. In their local neighborhoods they established what they felt most comfortable with in Europe—an ethnic Catholic parish with an ethnic Catholic school. The foreign language of the mother country was taught with the English of the Americans. Ethnic culture, cooking and
customs were safeguarded, and marriage outside the ethnic culture was frowned on or forbidden completely.

The First and Second Councils of Baltimore encouraged all Catholic parents to send their children to Catholic schools. The influential Third Council of Baltimore in 1884 decreed that every pastor must build a Catholic school and that parents must send their children to these schools. In the next eighty years thousands of Catholic schools were built in parishes all over America to fulfill the decrees of the Baltimore Council. Every Catholic child in a Catholic school was a dream that was not realized.

The diocesan school system was born to cope with the new and growing schools. Local examining committees were established and by 1882 all dioceses were expected to follow the same diocesan central plan. In Canon Law, the law system of the Catholic Church, the local pastor directed the parish, and remained the final authority in the local school within the limits of diocesan policy and practices. The pastor even now is responsible for the building, paying the teachers, and the overall operation of the parish including the school.

75. Burke, op. cit., p. 5.
The bishop of each diocese is responsible for all education in his jurisdiction. In most dioceses of the United States this authority is delegated to a Board of Catholic Education. The authority of the bishop is exercised by a diocesan school office and under the direction of a head of the office, traditionally called the superintendent of schools. In recent times the officer is often called the diocesan director, episcopal delegate, or some other title.

The parochial school system is the United States is a new and unusual phenomenon in world history. It is the largest private school system in the world. Its enrollment is drawn from all levels of the Catholic population, not merely from the wealthy. 76

There are three types of Catholic schools on the elementary and high school levels. Parish schools may be elementary schools and/or high schools, and they are administered locally, with the pastor as the ultimate authority. Diocesan schools are financed under the direction of the diocese. Private elementary and high schools are directed and financed by religious orders of men or women; these religious orders retain their independence; they function with the approval of but not under the direction of diocesan officials. 77 Ordinarily the bishop himself as the Corporation
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sole holds all titles to the property of the diocese, including the schools, and he has the right to install or replace the pastors within the limits of Canon Law.

Contrary to belief and common terminology, Catholic education is not a monolithic system. Rather, Catholic education in the United States is made up of 170 school systems, one in each of the 170 United States dioceses. These range in size from the Archdiocese of Chicago with a total enrollment of 189,213 students (in 1981) in elementary and secondary schools (making it the fourth largest school system in the United States) to the Diocese of Juneau, Alaska, with a total enrollment of 821 students. 78

Each of these school systems is operated in its own manner with greater or lesser autonomy given at the local level. In some places, teachers must be approved by the diocesan office before they can be hired; others allow individual schools to hire the teacher directly. Some dioceses set a uniform salary scale and others allow the salary to be set at the local school. There are two national associations which unite the schools in all dioceses. The United States Catholic Conference is the group of Catholic Bishops of America, and the National Catholic Education Association is a professional organization for teachers, administrators, pastors and all those involved in Catholic education.

The faculties of Catholic schools were, in the first 130 years, composed of religious sisters and brothers, as well

as by teaching priests from religious orders. When the voca-
tion shortage of the 1960's and the 1970's began to have its
effect on the schools, growing numbers of lay teachers were
needed to replace the absent religious teachers. The per-
centage of lay teachers increased as much as 400 percent from
1950 to 1960. More lay teachers than this entered the system
after 1960. By 1980 religious teachers were only one-third
of the teaching staff. 79

This shift in personnel put a great strain on the lim-
ited resources of Catholic parishes. The critical year for
Catholic teacher personnel was 1966 when the number of teach-
ing sisters dropped by 4,500, at the same time the number of
lay teachers increased by over 1,000. 80

THE DEVELOPMENT OF CATHOLIC TEACHERS' UNIONS

Although unions for teachers appeared much earlier, the
aspect of militancy among teachers in unions first seems
to have appeared in 1962 when the United Federation of
Teachers went on strike in New York. By the end of 1975,
about twenty-five percent of the public school districts
were conducting some form of collective bargaining for
teachers. 81

---

80. Ibid., p. 21.
    Schools," Unionism in Catholic Schools, National Catholic
President Kennedy in Executive Order 10988 (1962) established the principle of the right of white-collar workers in government to bargain and this example was followed by others.

In Catholic schools before 1967 there were associations of teachers and teaching guilds in different parts of the country. Clifford said the first formal unionization occurred in 1967 in Philadelphia with the founding of the Organization of Catholic Teachers. This group voted to affiliate with the National Federation of Teachers (NFT) as Local 1776. They went out on the first Catholic systemwide strike in the fall of the same year.

Most of the union activity in Catholic schools has taken place in the East and Far West of the country. Large metropolitan areas such as New York, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles and other large school systems have been the focus of organizing.

Motivating factors in the history of American trade unionism are nearly identical to those that ultimately brought lay teachers involved with Catholic education into roles practically synonymous with others in the labor force. Recently, the Executive Director of an association of lay educators in a Catholic diocese outlined the following needs: "adequate salaries, increased job security, improved working conditions, greater due process protec-

tion, viable grievance procedures, hospitalization and retirement benefits". 83

The increased teacher militancy was due to the larger proportion of lay teachers in the system and a greater percentage of men who were the main support for their family.

In 1960 the average starting salary for a beginning teacher with a bachelor's degree was $5,174. This average had risen by 1968 to $5,519 and 1971 was up to $7,061. 84

Bargaining in Catholic schools has shown similarly positive results in improving salaries and working conditions.

Since 1964 salaries for starting teachers in Philadelphia Archdiocesan schools rose from $4,200 to $7,400 in 1972. Important gains have also been made in Brooklyn. Teachers organize for the same things whether in public or Catholic schools: "It is the twin inducements of higher salaries and better working conditions which encourage teachers to organize themselves into bargaining units." 85

Before modern times, Catholic teachers did not feel at ease with this aggressive movement toward asserting their rights, but civil rights demonstrations and the success of militant public school teachers gaining their demands certainly encouraged them. The effect of Vatican II and its documents which amplified previous papal teaching on the rights of workers also gave substance to the drive for more and better. The Second Vatican Council stressed the rightful
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place of laymen; and the shift of teaching personnel from religious to lay coincided with this emphasis encouraging the growth of teacher militancy.

Since the early 1960's, the demand for Catholic schools outran the ability of religious teachers to staff schools, and increasing numbers of laymen and laywomen entered Catholic schools. Laymen were needed especially in big high schools run by religious orders of men, which did not have the personnel enjoyed by women religious orders.

From 1967 to 1974, the number of lay teachers increased from 58,829 to 90,306. In 1970, lay teachers for the first time exceeded religious teachers in Catholic schools and in the school year 1972-73 were 58.7 percent of all teachers in Catholic schools. 86

This trend has slowed in the present time but only after a tremendous shift in the favor of the lay teachers in Catholic schools. It is now rare to find a school dominated by religious teachers, even among those community-owned schools associated with urban population centers.

The militant teacher movement in public schools is associated with the growth of male teachers in public schools from 1955 to 1966. During this time the percentage of men teachers rose from 26 to 31 percent of the work force.

Among Catholic school teachers this growth in the number of laymen teachers and the high level of teacher preparation were equally evident. In 1973, 96 percent of Cath-

86. Peter Clifford, op. cit., p. 4.
olic lay teachers on the secondary level had bachelor's degrees and 26 percent had master's or higher degrees. For religious teachers, 65 percent had a master's or higher degrees and 98 percent had at least a bachelor's degree. In Catholic secondary schools in 1973-74, 58 percent of the lay teachers were male.87

The union movement in Catholic schools shows a connection between the growth of militancy among teachers and increased numbers of men teachers.

The fact that militancy in Catholic schools is similar to militancy in public systems also is derived from the bureaucratic nature of large school systems. Just as in public schools, in Catholic systems the growing professionalism of the teachers unites them against the remote power structure in the central city, which is removed from the scene and seems uncaring about the needs of the teacher.

Since there is less bureaucratic structure to cope with in local parish elementary schools and private Catholic high schools, organization by the teachers may be less likely to occur. It is also difficult for unions like the AFT to organize these situations into units for bargaining. Only in New York has there been much success in organizing them on the systemwide elementary level.

The Catholic schools themselves have encouraged the development of unions. At this point in time, the Catholic schools most susceptible to the formation of unions are

87. Peter Clifford, op. cit., p. 5.
systems of diocesan-owned secondary schools in large urban centers, where successful public school unions exist and where such systems have a large number of full time and well trained lay men teachers.88

It is also true that repeated experiences with arbitrary and unfair administrators led these people to seek the security offered by the labor movement. These organizations took a variety of forms and in private high schools often represented that school alone.

Catholic diocesan school systems responded differently to these situations; in a few but rare instances they allowed collective bargaining to begin unopposed. Other dioceses met with teacher representatives and reached agreements which were occasionally put into the contract and sometimes not entered in the contract. Some unions were ignored by their diocese.

In the 1970's, a few Catholic teachers' unions became affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), until differences caused their separation. Because of the need for a national organization, the National Association of Catholic School Teachers (NACST) was formed. As of 1981, there were about 100,000 lay teachers overall with about 8,000 having some labor representation.

Three issues asserted themselves in the period of the

88. Peter Clifford, _op. cit._, p. 7.
late 1960's and early 1970's. The first issue was: should religious teachers be included in the same bargaining unit as lay teachers? Religious teachers do not bargain for their salary, since it is set by the mutual consent of their superior and diocesan officials. But economic issues are not the only subject of negotiations. The second part of this issue is the relationship of the religious teacher with his superior; since he is obliged to obey the superior, he is, in the eyes of some, not free to bargain freely and in good faith.

A second issue to emerge in this period was the idea of federal or state aid to Catholic education. The pressures on finances grew very rapidly in the 1960's, leading many proponents of Catholic education to begin petitioning for aid by the government to Catholic schools.

The third issue was that of strikes by teachers. The first strike in Catholic schools occurred in Chicago on April 21, 1967, when three high school faculties all went out on the same day; one a parish school and two owned by religious orders. One year later a fourth strike occurred in South Holland, Illinois, a suburb of Chicago. This strike which occurred at Mother Seton High School led to a decision

89. Donna M. Krier, op. cit., p. 25.
by the National Labor Relation Board (NLRB) not to interfere. The lay teachers who were not making progres with the sisters administering the school petitioned the NLRB for a certification election. The petition was denied because the NLRB judged that the school was a non-profit organization operated with the sole purpose of education, and not a commercial endeavor.

In the following years the NLRB changed its position and repeatedly asserted jurisdiction in cases of church-related schools, ignoring this precedent, which it had set itself. There was and is now no agency of the Church to deal with labor disputes; when the NLRB began to assert jurisdiction over Catholic schools, the Church was forced to face this challenge to its traditional authority.90

An informal survey in 1970 showed that bargaining units were formed in twelve dioceses but it did not say that all had received recognition.91 The were all in urban areas of the North and East and one on the West coast.

In a 1970 questionnaire, Catholic school superintendents and others believed unions would grow rapidly.

Ninety percent of all dioceses will have teachers' associations that will bargain with the board for the diocese.

Seventy percent of the respondents estimated that this would more than likely occur between 1976 and 1980. But this prediction never materialized. The growth of Catholic school bargaining has been slow. By 1972 only sixteen diocesan school systems had bargaining. The 1984 NCEA survey mentioned above discovered that at 32 percent of the Catholic high schools in the United States at least some of the teachers were represented in negotiations. These schools which indicated representation for the teachers, indicated that 31 percent of their faculties were represented in the negotiations.

After the publication of To Teach As Jesus Did, in 1972, which canonized the phrase "a community of faith", administrators contended that it was not possible to have this "community of faith" in a school where the union was the bargaining unit. Unions denied they impeded the development of a "community of faith" and said "community of faith" was being used to block their legitimate needs and rights.

Several local and national associations have formed to represent Catholic teachers with varying success. The Association of Catholic Teachers (ACT) of Philadelphia is the largest of Catholic teacher unions. It was Local 1776 of the AFT, until the one thousand members voted to withdraw from the AFT over the issue of tuition tax credits for non-public

---

schools. The AFT does not support tuition tax credits, and so in January of 1978 the ACT withdrew its affiliation with the AFT. The Pittsburgh diocesan teachers withdrew their affiliation with the AFT in September of 1978 for the same reason.

The Chicago Archdiocesan Teachers Association was formed with the help of Msgr. McManus in 1964, to provide more professionalization for the teachers of Chicago. It had three divisions: primary, intermediate and junior high. The success of the association during this time was described as moderate. In 1970, Fr. Clark unified the three divisions into one and encouraged the participation of the teachers in planning and consultation about school matters including salary and fringe benefits. After 1977, frustration grew between teachers and diocesan officials because the diocese refused to bargain effectively with CATA; in recent times CATA felt it had been shut out of effective influence on policy and procedures in the Archdiocese. It has worked with the superintendent and makes recommendations to the Archdiocesan school board headed by the cardinal. CATA petitioned Cardinal Cody for recognition, but he refused in his lifetime. Cardinal Bernadin has not yet granted recognition to this group.93

In 1978, the National Association of Catholic School Teachers was formed at Philadelphia. The association helps Catholic school teachers nationwide to organize and bargain. It has held several conventions and drawn representatives from fifteen to twenty-five Catholic teachers' organizations. Following the pattern of union strength in urban areas these groups represented teachers in large and Catholic population centers of the Midwest, the North and most often the Northeast.

John Reilly, the president, reported opposition to the unionization of Catholic school teachers by those who presently run them:

There is a lot of opposition to teachers organizing, particularly in the Catholic Church. ...There is a great deal of resentment on the part of our employers, mostly religious, to lay teachers organizing. They seem to feel that they are going to lose some of their power and authority, which they are, and which they should, by the way.94

The association granted membership charters to associations in many parts of the country. The possibilities of continued growth seem good in many sections, even in the face of economic difficulties facing the country as a whole.

Writing in 1979, Askin95 maintained that the majority

of Catholic teachers remain unorganized. He said that no more than ten percent of the nation's 110,000 parochial school lay teachers belong to groups which have received formal recognition. Most of the unionized faculties are in diocesan high schools in major metropolitan areas or smaller heavily unionized cities. But even high school teachers have union contracts in less than half of the twenty biggest dioceses. The majority of the National Association of Catholic School Teachers' 2,000 members in 1979 were in Philadelphia with most of the rest scattered around Pennsylvania and neighboring states.

Another several thousand parochial school teachers are represented by the AFT, but the majority of them are in the union's New York metropolitan area locals, in the New York Archdiocese, and the nearby Brooklyn and Rockville Center Dioceses. Other AFT groups typically represent teachers of a single school. Independent associations are concentrated in labor strongholds such as St. Louis, Cleveland, Buffalo, New York and Scranton, Pennsylvania. The leadership seeks to transform this disperate group of people into a national union organization of 25,000 to 50,000 members which would give Catholic school teachers strength in the Catholic Church and the labor movement.

President Harold Isenberg, of the New York Archdiocese
Federation of Catholic Teachers, the largest Catholic AFT affiliate in 1979, told the National Catholic Reporter (NCR) he is convinced mass unionism will arrive in Catholic schools someday but probably not soon.

The National Association of Catholic School Teachers would like to help more unions around the country, but it is restricted by lack of money. The entire Catholic schools union movement has only three full-time officers at this time: Isenberg in New York, and Schwartz and Riley, who divide their time between the Philadelphia Association of Catholic Teachers and the National Association of Catholic School Teachers.

On August 29, 1980, Riley said the National Association of Catholic School Teachers had 2,700 members and felt that only ten percent of the Catholic school teachers were unionized.96

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AND THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

An unanticipated influence inserted itself into the movement toward collective bargaining in Catholic schools in the 1970's. In different locations over a period of years

teachers had sought the assistance of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to get recognition. At first the NLRB refused to engage itself in the process, but as time went by it became more and more involved, until the question of NLRB jurisdiction was settled finally by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1951, the NLRB asserted no jurisdiction in a Columbia University case, since Columbia was a nonprofit educational institution. In 1970, in dealing with Cornell University it exercised jurisdiction based on the involvement of the school in commerce. In 1971, it exerted jurisdiction over the Shattuck School, which is private, and in 1975, did the same over five parochial high schools in the Archdiocese of Baltimore.

From 1975 until the Supreme Court decision of 1979, the NLRB rendered a series of decisions extending its authority into the sector of private and church-related schools. In doing this it reversed itself after a twenty-five year period of declining jurisdiction in this area of American life. The


decision in the 1968 Seton High School strike petition was consistent with NLRB policy at that time and was reasserted as late as 1974. The board had a policy that church-related schools were primarily religious in character and non-commercial in purpose and essentially oriented to the promotion of their religious beliefs. Adding further weight to this policy was the 1971 Supreme Court decision in Lemon vs. Kurtzman denying funds to church-related schools because they involved substantial religious activity and purpose. The court enunciated the concept of "entanglement" in religious activities which the First Amendment forbids.

However, the National Labor Relations Act was amended in 1974 to remove the exemption of nonprofit hospitals. The NLRB assumed the intent of Congress to include church-related schools within its jurisdiction, even though there were other guidelines indicating the exclusion of the schools. The first case brought under this extension of the NLRB involved the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Baltimore, in 1975. The NLRB asserted jurisdiction saying that only schools which were "completely religious" were exempt from its jurisdiction. Since most church-related schools teach secular subjects such as English or science, all of them are within the juris-

diction of the NLRB. The Board reasserted and broadened its jurisdictional claim the following year against the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. It declared the Catholic schools of the diocese were not religious institutions closely involved with the Catholic Church. The Board stated it would exercise jurisdiction over church-related schools from then on. In the Los Angeles case the NLRB maintained that the Catholic schools were involved with commerce and that their assertion of jurisdiction did not interfere with religious beliefs. Their intrusion into religious conduct was minimal and necessary to protect labor relations. At this point the NLRB was fully committed to this stance. Several teachers' organizations brought their petitions to the Board and were challenged by the dioceses involved on the Constitutional issue of interference in the free exercise of religion. By this time Church officials no longer regarded the NLRB as an impartial third party to resolve disputes, but as an unwelcome intruder into the Church's business.

In the Archdiocese of Philadelphia case the NLRB ruled it had jurisdiction on the basis of three points. First, the Catholic school system had an operating budget greater than one million dollars. Secondly, the schools
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were involved in interstate commerce exceeding $50,000 per year. Third, the NLRB decided that the schools were religiously associated schools, but not completely religious, since secular subjects were taught and religious instruction amounted to less than fifteen percent of the total teaching curriculum. Up until the late summer of 1978 five cases of NLRB asserted jurisdiction are on record. Having declared and provided the criteria for jurisdiction, the NLRB specified that bargaining be conducted in accord with the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia tried to stop the representation election, but Supreme Court Justice Brennan allowed the election but impounded the ballots until the outcome of the Chicago case. The Church objected to the third criteria of the NLRB, namely that the schools are only religiously associated institutions. It held the NLRB violated First Amendment rights in asserting jurisdiction.

Two other cases were developed which brought the whole question into review at about the same time. One concerned the diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, Indiana, and five diocesan high school seminaries in the Archdiocese of Chicago. These cases were joined by the Supreme Court because of their similarity and resulted in the important decision of 1979 denying jurisdiction in church-related schools to the NLRB.

In Chicago, diocesan officials refused to bargain with
the duly elected unit at Quigley North and Quigley South Seminaries. The NLRB claimed the schools were not completely religious and ordered the diocese to bargain. The Archdiocese claimed the Board had no jurisdiction on First Amendment grounds.

In the diocese of Fort Wayne the issue was the same involving bargaining with five diocesan high schools. The Board again ordered bargaining by the diocese, and the Catholic schools, said the Board, had no constitutional right to commit unfair labor practices. At the same time the Board felt that to forbid collective bargaining to proceed would disrupt the free flow of commerce demonstrated by the fact that more than 100,000 lay teachers were employed in over 10,000 Catholic schools in 1979.

In the case NLRB vs. The Catholic Bishop of Chicago and the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, the United States Court of Appeals in the Seventh Circuit reversed the NLRB decision and ruled the NLRB did not have jurisdiction. In the words of Judge Wilbur Pell:

"the Board is cruelly whipsawing their schools by holding that institutions too religious to receive government assistance are not religious enough to be excluded from its jurisdiction."\(^{102}\)

The Court of Appeals found for the Church in both cases. It

\(^{102}\) Donna M. Krier, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
declared that the schools were religious schools and the Board jurisdiction would interfere with the authority of the local bishop to direct his schools. In questions of disputes involving the religion clauses the safeguard of law should be extended to the benefit of the religious rights.

For the Supreme Court presentation the NLRB had prepared a brief of their opinions, as did many others. The Board argued that its jurisdiction did not violate the First Amendment. It also charged that a religious institution is obliged to defend its position in a lawsuit over secular issues and not excused from doing so because of its claim to being solely religious in nature. 103

The Church maintained the First Amendment argument and also stated there was no intent of the Congress to extend the National Labor Relations Act to include church-related schools within the National Labor Relations Act powers. This point of view relied on the positions forwarded in the Lemon vs. Kurtzman case saying that Catholic schools were too religious to receive aid from the government. The decision was handed down on March 21, 1979, and was based on the lack of direct intent by the Congress to include church-related schools in the meaning of the NLRA. The decision recognized the First Amendment questions present, but did not depend on
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them primarily:

in the absence of a clear expression of Congress' intent to bring teachers in church-related schools within the jurisdiction of the Board, we decline to construe the Act in a manner that could, in turn, call upon the Court to resolve difficult and sensitive questions arising out of the guarantee of the First Amendment Religion clauses.\(^{104}\)

Although the decision arose from a close vote of the Court it seems likely to remain in force, since an Act of Congress would be needed to reverse it, and Congress is traditionally reluctant to involve itself in issues of religious controversy. The decision effectively ended the period in which teachers' associations would be able to turn to a government agency for their bargaining rights in church-related schools. It should be clearly noted that the Supreme Court decision stated the rights of the teachers to organize and bargain are not protected by the NLRB. There is no question about the rights of the teachers to exercise their bargaining rights in themselves.

The 1979 Supreme Court decisions occasioned commentary, much of it related to the need for a third party organization to fill the void now created by the absence of NLRB jurisdiction over Catholic schools.

Msgr. Higgins commented on this decision in his 1979

---

Labor Day statement. He said:

It is important to remember what the Court exactly did and did not say about this matter. It stated the NLRB had no jurisdiction over this situation. It did not say teachers could not negotiate or did not have the right; or that the Church had an ethical obligation rising from its public documents and teachings on bargaining. It merely ruled on a particular jurisdiction. The Church is still required to follow its own teaching in this matter, and too often its pastoral leaders do not do this. This right to organize is a fundamental human one and did not at this juncture need to be affirmed by the court.105

Serritella said that the decision recognized that NLRB jurisdiction would hinder the mission of the Church, and left to the schools themselves how they would deal with the desire of the teachers to bargain. There is not complete freedom however:

in developing their own models of negotiation based upon the religious beliefs of the schools, the Catholic schools must remember that even though they do not have to obey the NLRB rules, they still may be required to follow many federal and state statutes dealing with employee relations.106

Several federal and state statutes cover equal opportunity, discrimination, civil rights, health and welfare regulations. The primary limitation on actions by the school is the contract. Schools do not have to have written con-

tracts, but these are the norm and expected by most parties.

Castelli reported on the decision shortly after it was handed down:

It is inconsistent to hold that Catholic schools are too religious to receive most forms of government educational aid but not too religious to be under the jurisdiction of a government agency like the NLRB. The Court seemed to follow the trend of many past school aid decisions holding that any kind of government entanglement with the church-run school would be a violation of the constitutional separation of church and state.¹⁰⁷

Castelli was afraid that sometime this decision may be used to strike down any participation by church-related schools and such acts as the Elementary and Secondary Educational Act or the use of any federal funds to hire public service workers in church-run schools. Many church figures see this decision as a victory against the encroachment by the federal government. At the same time it may be taken more than one way. Castelli related that Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) has called for legislation to extend the NLRB jurisdiction to church-run schools. Castelli was concerned that this may be a hollow victory for the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in that it may close the door to any kind of federal aid to Catholic schools.

¹⁰⁷. James Castelli, National Catholic Reporter, August 6, 1979, p. 6.
An editorial\(^{108}\) on the same date said the Catholic Church must handle its affairs honestly and correctly. It must allow for the kind of resolution of disputes which is in the democratic way in which most Americans are familiar with handling things. It also stated that the method of deciding things by the Bishop's decision alone is no longer practical or believable. It amounts to hypocrisy especially if the Church pretends to stand for social justice issues such as farm workers rights to organize but will not extend the same rights to its own employees in church-related schools.

A few months later Isenberg stated the effect of the decision on Catholic teachers: "Catholic school teachers have never been so alone or vulnerable as now."\(^{109}\) Stripped of the protection of the NLRB, they must struggle to preserve their rights to collective bargaining against an employer who is unsympathetic at best. Isenberg was concerned that there must be some kind of organization in which the Catholic teachers and diocesan or school officials may work together in order to solve union problems and difficult situations involving labor relations and economic conditions.

---


\(^{109}\) Harold J. T. Isenberg, National Catholic Reporter, Editorial-"In My Opinion," President of the Federation of Catholic Teachers, October 26, 1979, p. 17.
He suggested using the existing agencies to provide an orderly transition from the present situation of chaos to one in which the rights of both sides were safeguarded.

After the Supreme Court decision, the Fort Wayne bishop, William McManis, responded with a swift promise that he would recognize a union supported by the teachers.

The Court decision effectively ended the authority of the NLRB over Catholic schools. From March of 1979 to the end of 1983 the movement toward collective bargaining in Catholic schools seems to have slowed and lost the national momentum it possessed from 1967 to 1979. Undoubtedly the Supreme Court decision had much to do with this loss of momentum. There are some indications of renewed interest in collective bargaining in Catholic schools, but it is fragmentary as of this date.

The issue of recognition returned to the local diocese for resolution. This has lead to a new stage in Church-teacher relations - the search for a workable model of labor relations which will satisfy the needs of both sides and still be on a voluntary basis. Some discussion of this issue took place before the court decision, but became more relevant after the Supreme Court decision.
CATHOLIC TEACHERS' UNIONS NOW

The evidence suggests that collective bargaining is not growing as fast or having as much effect on Catholic education as was predicted fourteen years ago. Several factors have worked to slow its development nationwide.

Support for unions in Catholic schools seems to have lessened through the decade of the seventies and into the 1980's, although universal agreement is given to the principles of the workers rights to unionize and bargain collectively. A telephone interview with John Reilly (November, 1983), the President of the National Association of Catholic School Teachers, revealed that in his words: "There is not much going on," in the field of Catholic school bargaining at the present time. Those schools where collective bargaining became an important issue in the 1960's still have their bargaining units, but the pressure for rapid expansion of collective bargaining in Catholic schools seems to be absent. The economic recessions of the late 1970's and early 1980's slowed the growth of unionism nationwide.

Articles in the national press testify to the difficulties faced by the labor movement. The year following the Supreme Court decision on the NLRB was no better for national labor unions than for Catholic teacher unions. Time

declared that the labor movement in the United States is faced with eroding membership and fading public support. Unemployment had withered union ranks causing membership to drop dramatically. The chief cause of unemployment was the two-year-long depression of 1979 to 1981.

Anti-union feelings seemed to be nationwide, not just among the white collar workers in the suburbs. Unions also lost support among workers themselves. In the past ten years the labor force has grown from 86 million to 107 million, but enrollment in unions remained essentially the same at 22 million. Workers frequently voted down unions, with organized labor winning only forty-eight percent of certification elections in 1980. Stiff competition from Japan also weakened unions.

1984 does not seem to be very promising for organized labor either. English wrote that big labor was in trouble and normal signs of union strength were not present. Big labor faced hard times and must make gains in 1984 to remain a strong force in American economics. The fifteen-month recession and a poor labor climate took their toll on the national labor movement. Negotiations would be difficult this year, and the auto industry faced difficult times

negotiating its new successes with workers who took cut backs to keep jobs three years ago. Repeated defeats suffered by labor make this the worst climate for labor relations in decades.

A week later English said:

Statistics show that the number of strikes in industry involving more than 1,000 workers has dropped significantly from 1973 to 1983. In 1973, there were 317 such strikes nationwide, while in 1983, there were only 81 such strikes. A new attitude has become more common in bargaining. There is less of an adversarial relationship in some industries, and a more cooperative approach present. Pressure from the recession, and foreign competition in home markets are listed as the main causes for the shift in strategy.112

The last five years have been no more successful for Catholic school unions than for unions in industry. Commenting on the state of Catholic schools in 1982, Askin related that Catholic schools were out of the woods as far as the financial crisis was concerned, but still faced problems.

The fiscal crisis of Catholic education has ended. Today, Catholic schools survive while public schools close. Will parochial schools thrive, not will they survive, is now the question.

The schools survived for one reason: parents increasingly value Catholic education. How well they will survive depends on many factors. But the most obvious - the fate of tuition tax credit legislation - is no longer most important.

Labor organizing, which once looked as if it would have a major impact on Catholic school finances, instead re-

mained a minor factor. Fifteen years after unionism exploded onto the Catholic education scene with a 1967 Philadelphia high schools strike, union contracts probably cover less than ten percent of the Catholic school teaching force. Union growth has been insignificant since 1979, when the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that the National Labor Relations Board has no jurisdiction in parochial schools.

For the most part, unions remain limited to diocesan high school systems in the industrial Northeast and Midwest. At their 1979 founding meeting, some National Association of Catholic School Teachers (NACST) leaders spoke of their hope for an organization of 25,000 to 50,000 members. Today, conceded one official, "We're still in the infant stage; 6,000 in five years would be optimistic."113

Eighteen months later Askin reported some stirrings in the Catholic-union movement which may lead to union growth.

After half a decade of stagnation, unions appear to be growing again. Elementary school organizing campaigns are under way in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Cleveland, where high school teachers have well-established unions.

Changes in the Church have helped the unions regroup, said NACST secretary-treasurer, Rita Schwartz. "It's difficult, after the Pope's encyclical on labor, for bishops to be adamant against unions," she explained. "That's not to say that dioceses won't give teachers a run for their money. But there seems to be no valid way to say, 'You can't form a union.'"114

At this writing it is not possible to determine whether or not Catholic-teachers' unions will enter a growth period.

Other causes have contributed to the decline in the union movement in the late 1970's and early 1980's. The

continued migration of northern Americans to the Sun Belt, where unions are not as common, has slowed their growth. The National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) symposium of 1976 showed that caution, distrust and suspicion existed among some of the participants toward collective bargaining based on the difficulties they have experienced with it. At this symposium speakers revealed their perception that collective bargaining had led to a painful adversary relationship between administration and faculty in several Catholic schools. 115

Snelling analyzed the contemporary position of unions in the private sector of education. He maintained that twelve years ago there was widespread concern among the heads and directors of private schools about the spread of union organization efforts in the private sector. The NCA and the AFT had exerted increasing pressure on the Catholic-school system with some success; college and university faculties were unionizing, and some private-independent schools were operating with unions present. However, after several years of observation and of monitoring the professional literature in the field, he concluded that fears of a large-scale teachers' union movement gaining ground in private schools were unfounded.
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There are several reasons substantiating his conclusion that unionization in private education has slowed.

First, there is considerable cost in the establishment and maintenance of a union; most unions feel that a local chapter with less than one hundred members is not worth recruiting.

Second, the Supreme Court decision in the case of the Catholic Bishop of Chicago handed down in March of 1979 removed church-related schools from NLRB jurisdiction. The decision removed church-related schools from further government consideration and has greatly reduced the power of union organizers who were aiming at the large Catholic systems. Most of all, it has created a murky atmosphere for unions within the dominant portion of the private sector.\footnote{116. W. Rodman Snelling, "The Status of Unionization," Ideas and Perspectives for Independent School Management, Vol. 6, No. 4, September 22, 1980, p. 1.}

Third, many schools and school districts have had to concern themselves with retrenchment because of declining enrollment and a lessening of support from the public.

Fourth, union organizers, who have been successful in the public sector of education, are not very familiar with the different nature of the private and parochial school.

Fifth, since private schools often include on their faculties teachers who are very dedicated to students and
who often put in extra time and effort without compensation, the faculty tends to be vested in the institution itself and therefore less likely to take actions which would imperil the school. Often monetary considerations are less important than other personal reasons for their commitment to the school.

Sixth, according to Snelling, there has been no significant growth of unions outside Catholic diocese since 1976. Union development in Catholic schools has fallen off significantly since the Supreme Court decision.

Spouting the thesis supported by these observations, I sought reactions from heads of schools with unions, and from other closely-aligned professionals. Virtually all endorsed the analysis. The heads reported fewer contacts from fellow administrators asking for advice in anticipation of union activity, and several felt that operations within their own institutions had grown more harmonious. 117

He mentioned that the ultimate cause of unionization can easily be found:

Yet, despite the economic stress, the final stimulus for collective action is usually an administrative or board decision perceived as callous by faculty. Enlightened personnel policies are key to forestalling unions of all sorts. 118

Treating teachers with concern is an excellent aid in reducing the pressure that may make faculty members feel a union is needed to protect them from the administration.
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I believe that school leaders can significantly lessen the likelihood of any form of collective action by initiating needed salary improvements and by operating in an open and caring manner. But once associations have materialized there are built-in pressures to escalate. Elected leadership provides a power base that, once attained, few are willing to give up.\textsuperscript{119}

In 1979, Augenstein conducted a nationwide survey asking the diocesan directors of education in all 162 Catholic dioceses in the United States about the status of collective bargaining in Catholic schools. Sixty-nine percent of the surveys were returned; seventy-nine percent of the superintendents responded and thirty-three percent of the heads of teachers' organizations responded. The size of the diocese and the region of the United States it belonged to were used to differentiate the information gained. At that time twenty-seven dioceses or twenty-four percent of the respondents indicated that teachers' bargaining organizations were present in the diocese, and the overwhelming majority of these were found in the medium and large dioceses in the middle Atlantic states.\textsuperscript{120}

Seventy-eight percent of these organizations limited membership to lay teachers only; the rest allowed religious teachers to join lay teachers in the unit. The majority of
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organized teachers were found in Catholic high schools - rather than elementary schools. Sixty-seven percent of the superintendents responded that the rights and duties of the teachers were spelled out in these contracts. A conclusion drawn from this survey was that the number of teachers' organizations is growing slowly but steadily; slightly more than half of the groups in the 1979 survey have been in existence for more than five years. A majority of the superintendents responding indicated the need for a third-party service to help with the settling of collective bargaining disputes. The hoped for third-party leadership should, according to the superintendents, come from the local diocese, the State Catholic Conference, and the NCEA, in that order of preference.

With regard to salaries and benefits the survey showed that these are usually settled at the local instead of diocesan level; more teachers are directly involved in setting salary than might be expected, and methods for determining teachers' salaries should be made available across the country.121

Two years later, in 1981, Augensteim investigated the effect of teachers' organizations in Catholic schools. He sent an open-ended survey to fourteen superintendents and thirty-eight union presidents. Eight superintendents and
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twenty-one presidents returned the survey which yielded information mostly in the area of administration.

The superintendents felt that the presence of a union for collective bargaining made them more sensitive to teachers' rights and responsibilities, and made them provide documentation for retention or firing. It also tended to polarize the faculty and administration and provide greater distance between these groups: legal procedures became more common. The union presidents felt they had gained greater cooperation and more respect: the administration became more accountable to the teachers and there was some limitation on administrative powers. Presidents felt that dollar figures reported by the school administration have become more reliable.

Both superintendents and presidents agreed that in personnel relations collective bargaining spells out the rights of teachers more clearly and pressures teachers to become more professional. In the area of finances, superintendents and principals agreed that operating costs are rising in part because of the considerations won by the union, but there is a tendency to become more cost effective on the part of the administration.

Superintendents felt that models must be developed in the next few years for the collective bargaining process which have more in common with the ideal of community of
faith. The limited resources of Catholic schools must be augmented by finding some financial stability for the schools. Union leaders felt that in the next few years development needs to take place in the area of shared ministry among administrators and teachers, coupled with better financial planning, and new sources of income. They felt there will be more teacher organizing and that collective bargaining will take place on a systemwide basis.

Augenstein concluded that there is a need for clear personnel practices developed mutually by teachers and administrators, including the important step of documentation for purposes of retention and dismissal. There will continue to be a loss of administrative power, a low level of trust between contracting parties, and the persistence of an adversary relationship. Concern will continue over rising operating costs, with the need for a fuller partnership with parents in the operation of the school. Teachers will continue to become equal partners with administrators and both will work toward a greater shared ministry. 122

---

THE THIRD-PARTY AGENCY

After the Supreme Court decision of 1979 which removed church-related schools from National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) jurisdiction, it became clear that the discussion started many years before about a neutral third-party for resolving these labor disputes in Catholic schools was to have new life.

A nationwide survey of diocesan school superintendents and teachers' organization heads was conducted during July of 1979. The majority of diocesan superintendents indicated a need for a third-party to help the diocese and the local schools in resolving labor disputes. The superintendents favored using three sources for the third-party agency: a local diocesan authority, the State Catholic Conference and the National Catholic Education Association in that order of preference.

Different models have been proposed by those interested in the resolution of these disputes.

Catholic Labor Relations Board

The idea of a Catholic Labor Relations Board at the national, regional or local level has been discussed by

124. Ibid., p. 57.
several commentators.

This concept was proposed by Elford in 1976. It is a form of compulsory arbitration, since schools and teachers would be bound to accept its decisions.

Krier addressed the concept but was aware of the problems. Kealy added to the discussion and included a strong concern about the enforceability. Higgins supported a voluntary replacement for the NLRB, since it no longer had jurisdiction. This agency, if constituted, would fulfill the following functions:

1. Set policy.
2. Protect the right of workers to freely choose to organize or not to organize for purposes of collective bargaining.
3. Determine appropriate bargaining units.
4. Supervise elections and recognize representative bodies; be they termed unions, associations, or whatever.
5. Determine unfair labor practices.
6. Arrange for mediation and arbitration of disputes.

This agency would have several responsibilities including publishing its operating rules and setting guidelines and standards for fair and unfair labor practices. A full

board would delegate issues to a smaller committee. It could also supervise elections. Local diocesan officials and structures would be the first line of resort in labor-management relations, but the agency would be a source of appeal. Local and regional offices would have to be established where there were none. The board would utilize agencies like the American Arbitration Association wherever possible.

This agency could be organized in a variety of ways: on the national level, the regional level, or the diocesan level. The agency would operate and fulfill the above-mentioned functions; it would be a policy-setting board rendering decisions and policy to meet specific needs.

The same two objections arise in any discussion of this concept: namely, the voluntary nature of submitting these disputes to this agency because of the structure of the Church, and the financial expenses of such an agency. Each diocese in the United States is independently run and under the direction of the local bishop, called the ordinary, since he exercises ordinary authority. He must of course, obey the general laws of the Church and Canon Law, but besides these norms, he has much individual discretion at his command and a great deal of power. The bishop may approve and implement a plan for solving disputes in his diocese, but it would be binding only in that diocese.
The management of these schools, therefore, rests within the power of each bishop. ...In this work he is generally assisted by a diocesan school board composed of several priests. This board administers the affairs of the diocesan schools in the name of the ordinary and in conformity with local conditions. ...The power of this school board depends entirely on the degree of jurisdiction delegated to it by the local ordinary.130

The authority of the bishop over local schools is unquestionable. The individual bishops would have to publicly commit themselves to support this board in advance. It seems unlikely that the bishops would be able to accept this limitation on their authority.

Another large problem facing a third-party agency is that there is no avenue in Church law for enforcing decisions reached by any other authority than the bishop in his diocese. No one can put any labor decision into effect unless the local bishop allows it. Realistically some solutions must arise to meet these needs, compatible with the structure of the Church and able to function within these limits.

The raison d'être of Catholic schools is to provide an environment in which the faith can be experienced, understood, and embraced. Everything is secondary to that purpose.131

Creating a Catholic Labor Relations Board would take much time and effort. Isenberg and Greely did not think it

would ever happen. The cost of such an agency would be great and is estimated at over two million dollars annually for a fully developed national agency.

Further strain would be placed on the limited resources of the Church to support this type of agency in addition to the many existing agencies and services provided by the Church already.

Consensus Models

A second model mentioned repeatedly is the consensus model. It is actually a group of models which include the cooperation of all interested parties as equals and also recognizes the union as the sole bargaining agent for the teachers.

It acknowledges the goals of labor peace and just wages and conditions for the workers. It includes all interested groups in a process in which they simple agree to negotiate and work together until an agreement is reached. Impasses can be resolved through the use of a neutral third party or binding arbitration. Elections could be supervised by a neutral party. The existing conciliation and arbitration services could be utilized when needed. Both parties must agree in advance to negotiate and settle in such a way that
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the best interest of all would be available to each. Enforceability would depend on contract provisions and the consent of the parties to be bound. This concept has the beauty of being effected at the lowest level, with those directly involved intimately linked to its success. Here agreement is much more likely to be reached.

A particular example of this model which has been implemented and developed for use in Catholic schools was advanced by John Augenstein, the Superintendent of Catholic Schools in Youngstown, Ohio. It has been discussed elsewhere.

One particular expression of a consensus model proposed during the period of NLRB jurisdiction was the expanded school board concept of Fr. Meyers voiced in 1977. The expanded school board would, according to Krier, include representatives from all parties, and present the teachers' point of view on all school issues. This would ensure that no salary decisions were made without the input of the teachers. She believed that with some alterations this model could be put into place on the diocesan level as well as the local level. This model is connected to the understanding of the Catholic school as the "community of faith"; it would tend to remove the adversary relationship which exists in the traditional union-management roles...a spirit of common concern could be fostered so that both the board and the teachers see themselves as working
together for the same purpose.\textsuperscript{134}

Some fear this type of structure because of paternalism, but this could be avoided by including total faculty participation. This system allows for the participation of the parents in the discussion of financial needs: this is important because it is the support of the parents which pays the bills. The model of the expanded school board is much different from classical collective bargaining. This consensus model is not really bargaining at all, but a mutually arrived at decision among parties who realize they must cooperate so the school may continue.

A second expression of the consensus model is the Education Personnel Commission which is similar to a National Catholic Labor Board. It would be established at the regional level having authority over personnel matters in its region. This model would create Regional Personnel Commissions and would be consistent with the "community of faith" concept, but different from the trade union model. It would include all teachers and all segments of the educational community by an electoral process.

While this discussion may seem promising and the ideas beneficial, it is very questionable that teachers would be interested in most cases.

Teachers display more of a tendency toward the tra-
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ditional type of labor union than toward any cooperative agreement with the local school in a voluntary participatory manner. The models and discussion disavowing the traditional labor union model come from the administrators of Catholic schools and therefore probably do not present an even-handed gauge of the feelings of all those involved.

It is also true that teachers' organizations show great variety in their form and structure; it is the choice of many of the teachers to determine the nature of their organization and its constituents. Each teachers' organization would view the Catholic Labor Board from its own point of view and many would not choose to cooperate with an agency sponsored by the Church.

Consensus models have worked in different parts of the country but the literature showed they flourish where cordial relations already exist and administrators and authorities are open to the desire of workers to unionize.

Currently the services of the American Arbitration Association are in use by some school systems and teachers' organizations. Others have contacted professionals in colleges and universities with expertise in labor-management relations. This seems to occur when good-faith attempts are made on the part of the school authorities to meet the needs of teachers short of a recognized bargaining arrangement.
The literature showed that these types of recourse are used in grievance process questions only. They do not meet the situations where full bargaining recognition is requested. Problems with using an outside national agency include the concern that the outside experts are not familiar with the structure of the Church and the interrelationships present in any church institution. All areas of the labor-management relationship need to be included in the concept to make it workable. Some dioceses have established offices of Conciliation and Arbitration to deal with due process questions within the Church. These are of course, under the bishop's authority and not fully independent of the diocese. Strictly speaking the conciliator has no final authority to make the parties accept his decision except that given by the bishop. He attempts to bring the sides together and to get them to agree. Krier\textsuperscript{135} believed that these services worked well, since they are conducted by people familiar with the nature of Church institutions and are still neutral. These agencies do not have a final answer however, when faced with very militant teachers' unions determined to obtain recognition, since it is not their task to provide recognition.

Heads of teachers' organizations overwhelmingly sup-
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ported the establishment of a third-party agency in labor disputes. Among the available resources, there was a strong preference given to the American Arbitration Association since it is independent and not an arm of the Church.

What we want is a true neutrality, not some "in-house" remedy to equitably and fairly settle disputes. 136

Along with the American Arbitration Association there are two other national organizations in the field: the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and the National Academy of Arbitrators. The American Arbitration Association lists 1800 registered and trained arbitrators, has offices throughout the country, and is a private non-profit corporation. It functions through an established set of rules which can be waived at the consent of the involved parties or modified to fit their dispute. This agency seems like the type of neutral third-party which would best fit the needs of the Church and the unions. Already several lay teacher contracts call for AAA arbitration as the final step in settling disputes. It has the advantage of being a service that can be employed by both parties only when necessary, and therefore eliminates the need for a third-party agency set up and supported by the Church. Perhaps Church officials would be reluctant to use this option in some cases.

because it is "too" neutral. 137

RELIGIOUS TEACHERS AND THE BARGAINING UNIT

For the purpose of this study religious teachers have been defined as those persons who are members of Roman Catholic religious orders or congregations and who are also teachers in Catholic schools.

These people are both men and women who are distinguished by taking the religious vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. They most often live in groups called "communities" and receive a set salary, called a stipend, for their services as teachers. The stipend, often one-half the amount of the average lay teacher salary, is in many cases sent directly to the financial officer of the religious community. Because religious teachers often live in common and are committed to poverty, individuals may not be directly concerned with the day to day responsibilities of paying the bills and making ends meet. Their commitment to obedience means that individual religious teachers may be transferred from one school to another. This can be done with or without their approval, but in recent times most superiors at least consult with their personnel before transferring them. Lay teachers, who have no such vows or commitments, view the

issues in bargaining with much greater urgency than religious teachers. Catholic schools are unique in this aspect; that lay teachers and religious teachers work side by side, but may have wholly different personal goals by the nature of their life style.

Religious teachers take a professional attitude toward their work in the school. There are religious who feel that union movement threatens the traditional values present in a Catholic school and they therefore resent unions. Many religious teachers view the school as their private enclave; the union is seen as taking control of the school away from them. Traditionally schools owned or operated by religious orders have experienced this possessiveness by the religious staff. In 1981, while religious on staffs made up only thirty percent of the teachers, they retained ninety percent of the school principalships. 138

Religious often feel a school should charge the minimum tuition, so that children from the poorer families can afford to attend. The demand of the teachers for higher wages, which push tuition costs up, may be seen as selfishness and a threat to the continuation of the school. Religious teachers see themselves as unselfishly available for

service to the school. They transfer from school to school at the will of their superior; the desire of teachers for tenure and stability as well as the security which accompanies these requirements is therefore alien to the spirit of many religious teachers. It is also true that some religious teachers become entrenched in a particular school and remain there, reluctant to move, for many years. Some religious teachers because of their vows and dedication to the mission of the Church in education have become suspicious of the dedication of the lay teachers who seem to want too much from the school, which has not provided so much in the past. Lay demands, moderate and fair when initiated and when seen in the light of the pressures on maintaining a family, may seem exaggerated to religious teachers who do not have to worry about their financial needs. In the late 1960's and 1970's the large departure of religious teachers from school work and the attitude of possessiveness contributed to their defensive posture.

While it may be that religious are not directly concerned about the financial awards to lay teachers, they are very concerned about all the other issues which are the subject of bargaining. Issues such as working conditions, philosophy, and other items are handled in bargaining. In addition, the contract shapes the personnel policies and practice in the school and this affects both religious and
lay teachers equally.

Religious teachers are in many respects like their lay counterparts. Religious teachers are like lay teachers and religious administrators are like lay administrators. Some people think religious teachers should be completely equal to the lay teacher in compensation, authority and responsibilities.

The question of religious membership with lay persons in a Catholic-school collective bargaining unit first came up in the mid 1960's when the Archdiocese of Philadelphia recognized the Association of Catholic Teachers as the exclusive bargaining agent for all lay teachers in its secondary school system. Shortly thereafter ninety religious from seventeen different orders gathered in Allentown, Pennsylvania, to discuss religious participation in Catholic unions. They were unanimous in their agreement that religious should be represented in the bargaining unit.

To my mind the most vexing problem in church-related schools is the representation of priests, nuns, and brothers who teach.139

There is no simple way to ensure their representation, but the process of negotiation should solve the problem. Not all religious teachers are part of management. Reicher be-

lieved that in an atmosphere of mutual trust and confidence work can be done toward an ideal structure of bargaining.

Representation must be based on two important principles. Religious faculty members who are teachers must in some way be included in the bargaining unit. Second, members of the religious community cannot allow their connection with the order to impair the independence of the non-religious employees group.

Grey said a single union would further the unity and morale of the teaching staff. If religious were excluded, then up to half of the teachers in a school or diocese would be excluded. Since religious are teachers, they have the right to be in the union.

He did not believe that the commitment to poverty in religious life would be incompatable with union membership. Nor would a uniform pay scale for lay and religious be an argument against the usefulness of religious in the unions. It would rather build the morale of the religious by allowing them to see the value of their contributed services.  

Higgins agreed with Grey and was in favor of religious membership in Catholic teachers' unions. He seconded Reicher in wanting free and equal participation of non-administrative

religious faculty members with lay faculty members in the same organization.

Higgins encouraged concentration of constructive, forward-looking, nonlegalistic ways of making collective bargaining work in the best interests, not only of the teachers involved, but of the schools themselves and the pupils who attend them.  

Shea believed that religious teachers should have a vote as to whether or not a school staff should join a union, since the union will call the shots for the entire staff. He also felt that religious should have the right to decide individually whether or not they will join the union.  

Liebrecht affirmed the right of religious teachers in a bargaining unit.

Though not every concern is equally appropriate to religious and lay teachers on a staff, most concerns are shared. The long range benefits of belonging to the same organization seems to outweigh the immediate problems which joint membership may encounter. No civil or canonical legal barrier prevents lay and religious from being members of the same organization. From a positive viewpoint, joining together in one organization may benefit the atmosphere and effectiveness of the school.  

Lynn was against the inclusion of religious in teach-

ers' unions. He felt that religious by the nature of their commitment to religious life do not willingly become part of one camp or another in the adversarial relationship present in bargaining; rather they are by vocation inclined to serve and obey the legitimate requests of their superiors, and that the important commitment to religious life makes it a corporate state, not at all similar to labor unions. The generosity and other worldliness expected of religious is in opposition to the devisive nature of bargaining. But he believed that religious must have some voice to protect themselves from exploitation.  

When a bargaining unit is constituted, the question of religious teachers being included is usually not in dispute.

Case law and National Labor Relation Board (NLRB) decisions have excluded the membership of religious teachers from Catholic school teachers' bargaining units on the grounds that the vow of poverty and a conflict of interest prevent the religious teachers from being able to participate fully and bargain in good faith. Religious teachers have been angered by these decisions, feeling excluded from the process and unwanted by their fellow teachers.

The criteria used to determine membership of the unit is similar when it is adjudicated by the NLRB or the American Arbitration Association.
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To provide consistency in its rulings, the NLRB, while it exercised jurisdiction in the matter of Catholic teachers' unions, developed the criteria of "community of interest." In these cases the Board considered control of the school, the connection between religious order faculty and the administration, hiring practices, salary and fringe benefits, and services that religious teachers contribute to the school in making its decision. 145

Augenstein concluded that the diocese of Youngstown is either the only diocese or one of the very few which has religious teachers in the bargaining unit. This result was achieved by the design of Bishop Hughes who at that time was superintendent of schools for Youngstown. He gathered elected teachers from each of the six diocesan high schools and encouraged them to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining with the diocese. This unusual move was taken for the avowed purpose of creating a climate for positive labor relations. Since most unionization begins in the complaints of the workers against the management, Bishop Hughes reasoned that if the step to unionization were taken voluntarily, then the whole collective process would have a positive and progressive atmosphere surrounding it, and in

this case he was correct. The organizing began in 1970, and the bishop insisted that in the organizing group there would be a place for each member of the teaching community: clergy, religious, and lay. It was clear that there would be differences among that population, most especially in the area of salary needs, but that in all other educational matters there would be a strong common interest for the improvement of the system. So the Catholic Teachers' Organization of Youngstown came into being with the understanding that the issue of salaries for clergy and religious would be settled in a different manner than for the lay teachers, who would negotiate for it. The major superiors of sisters began meeting in 1968 with the representatives of the six bishops of Ohio to set a salary scale which was satisfactory to them. The priests who were not members of religious orders had their salaries set by the diocesan-level authorities for priests. All other matters which were common concern of all teachers were the subject of the negotiating process.

From the beginning the religious teachers were a part of the secondary teachers' organization. The places of the religious in the confederation was clearly stated in the basic contract which used these words in 1973:

The Diocesan Board of Education recognizes the Diocesan Confederation of Secondary Teachers as the sole collective bargaining representative of all certified personnel employed in the diocesan high schools for the purpose of negotiations on matters of mutual concern in-
cluding the base salary agreement for the duration of this agreement. The Confederation shall not be the bargaining agent for priests and religious in the diocesan high schools with regard to their base salary. Excluded from this agreement in its entirety are all administrators and supervisory personnel.146

In the fall of 1975 the high school teachers voted to affiliate with the AFT. It is still up to the individual religious or priest to become a member of the confederation. Augenstein admitted that when religious teachers become members of a bargaining unit there are certain unique problems. The initial product of the bargaining arrangement is the basic contract; this document speaks of salaries, fringe benefits, medical coverage, class size, number of preparations, extra-curriculars, etc. If this contract affects only the lay faculty, then the administrator must not only satisfy the needs of this contract group, but must also deal with the needs of a separate group namely, the religious and clerical teachers.147

Bargaining units are remarkably diverse and it is not likely that any uniformity will emerge as the prototype for collective bargaining in a church-related school; each situation develops its own parameters which is wholly in keeping with the nature of Catholic schools. Each is vastly
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similar to all others in a hundred ways, and at the same moment different from any other. With this in mind it is obvious that the problem of religious teachers' membership will be present in Catholic schools. 148

Ultimately the solution to this question may be resolved by the passage of time.

The total number of religious teachers has dramatically declined and continues to fall. The present situation is such that in most Catholic schools the religious teachers are in the minority and continue to be reduced in number. Lay teachers are becoming principals and administrators in these schools. Therefore the membership of religious teachers in many places is now no longer an important issue. 149

CATHOLIC SCHOOL CONTRACTS

Catholic school teachers seek in their bargaining the same goals as public school teachers. In the matter of contracts Catholic school teachers' unions have followed the lead of public school teachers' unions in their pursuit of those needs which the membership feels are important.

By the process of collective bargaining, the teacher has established his rights to discuss as an equal with his

employer his compensation and duties as an employee. Thus the process of writing the contract is the expression of the teacher asserting his rights. For the employer the process is one of preserving the rights of management from the pressures of an impersonal third party, the union. The finished document is the record of the power struggle between the employer who strives to preserve as many management rights and powers as possible and the teacher who seeks to expand his rights and privileges.150

A study of the contracts signed between unions and diocesan office revealed that there are many standard contract provisions which are found in most if not all public school contracts.

The most important elements are the pay scale and fringe benefits. As a general rule Catholic school salary schedules were within eighty to ninety percent of public school salary scales.151 Fringe benefits including pension, health insurance, life insurance, annuities and unemployment are included in this area.

Unions want the bargaining unit to be defined broadly, thus including as many workers of the system as possible. This gives them greater leverage, since they represent more people. Determining the bargaining unit is very important to both parties at the beginning of the negotiating process.

The union is very sensitive to the issue of job secur-
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ity and is eager to incorporate tenure into the contract. Tenure is the guarantee of a continuing contract for the services of the teacher from year to year. It is usually granted after three successful years of service, but does not give more rights to the teacher than a non-tenured teacher. Rather it guarantees that the teacher can be dismissed only for cause, which in most contracts includes incompetence, insubordination or immorality. When the management grants tenure, it is most concerned that the teachers does not lose his professional edge and become mediocre because of the guarantee of employment. Safeguards on tenure for the teacher vary from place to place, and may depend on favorable evaluations, increased credit hours or other such criteria.

In some situations the union tries to establish the right of transfer, so if a school is closed within the system the most senior teachers will be relocated at another school and retain their seniority in the system. Of necessity they will "bump" a less senior teacher; the least senior teachers will lose their position if there is a cutback in personnel.

In 1974 the teacher contract of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia provided for a well thought out process of transfer which attempted to better serve the needs of the teachers and the schools.
Grievance clauses rank close to tenure in the importance placed on them by teachers. Usually they provide three steps for those who feel their rights in the contract have been violated. First the teacher meets with the principal face to face to resolve the problem. If the result is not satisfactory, the teacher may appeal to the level of the superintendent. If satisfaction is not obtained here, often the teacher may appeal the issue to binding arbitration. Here the arbiter is an impartial third party who interprets the meaning of the contract in the specific situation in contention. This process can be costly for both sides.

The areas of grievance and due process have an added dimension in a church-related school such as a Catholic high school. When causes for dismissal of a tenured teacher are alleged to be on the basis of religious or moral charges, both the diocesan system and the unions are reluctant to rely on an outside arbiter for a binding decision. Several contracts, therefore, specify that such issues be settled by a diocesan committee on due process, if one exists, or if none exists, the contract will name a specific diocesan official, such as the Bishop or Chancellor, as the final arbiter.152

In procedures for termination or dismissal the crucial issue becomes the status of the teacher's file. Knowledgable administrators maintain a record of items which bear on the future employment relationship of the particular teacher. Incidents which are positive and those which are negative

should be entered into the file so that at the time of dis­
missal or granting tenure, the decision is made on the basis of evidence, which can be supported. This process may be commonplace in many public schools, but it is a relatively new concept in Catholic schools. Traditionally administra­tors had the power to act arbitrarily in the firing of teachers without accounting to any higher authority. In Catholic schools where a contract is negotiated, unions have insisted on protection for their members.

Working conditions become part of the bargaining proc­ess when negotiators try to include language controlling class size, free time, number or preparations, volunteer time, extra-curricular assignments, and substitutions.

Not all these things must be included in the contract itself, since the contract freezes all covered items and makes them obligatory for both parties. Rather, much can be accomplished by including these things in a comprehensive handbook, which serves as a guide for the day to day opera­tion of the contract. Since the handbook is a guideline, it is flexible enough to allow for exceptions.

Since the union is dependent on the contributions of its members to pay it's expenses it often asks for a provision calling for a 'dues deduction' or 'check off clause' meaning the school will retain part of the salary owed the employee and send it to the union.
From the management point of view the most important concession gained by the contract from the union is a no-strike clause for the duration of the contract; corresponding to no-strike is the no lock-out promise of the administration.

Most contracts included the rights of management, a criteria for hiring and rehiring, and a definition of the school year.  

Except for more of the language referring to the specifically Catholic nature of the school and activities peculiar to Catholic schools, the contracts used in Catholic schools are very much the same as those used in public schools.

The achievements of the union, as shown in the contract comparison, demonstrate a similarity of interest on the part of both public school teachers and Catholic school teachers in the process of negotiating a contract. Both want better salaries and improved working conditions. They seek job security and a stable relationship with those they work for. They want to know what is expected and what limitations are placed on their employment.

The strong similarity between those issues negotiated by public school teachers and those negotiated by Catholic
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school teachers shows that in the contract and through the formation of a union all teachers seek the same things. It can be concluded that Catholic school teachers form unions for the same reasons as public school teachers.

COMMUNITY OF FAITH EFFECTS

In taking a look at the institutions in which they serve, Catholic school people have sought to explain that intangible quality which differentiates Catholic schools from other schools. They believe there is a certain atmosphere in a Catholic school - an attitude of concern and personal interest which makes a Catholic school more like an extended family than an institution. The literature calls this very beneficial component a "community of faith."

The Catholic school is best described as a community of faith, formed by gospel values, whose purpose is service of others. To be a community of faith, whose members are united by the very Spirit of God into a unique fellowship, the school must be consciously and publically guided in all its actions by the teachings and the spirit of Jesus. Not only is this true of all individuals associated with the school in any way, it is also true of all groups and organizations related to the school.154

This idea has been seized upon by many and is seen as both a description and a part of Catholic education.

This concept has its origin in the communal nature of the Church. In the application of this concept, many schools and school systems are engaged in a self developmental process in which the characteristics of the community are defined by a collegial action of community. The activities, procedures, and policies which give expression to each characteristic, such as worship and service to others, are specified through the involvement and participation of the members.... Furthermore, concepts which have been basic to the survival of Catholic schools, such as contributed services, can be incorporated into the "community of faith" model without difficulty.155

This process allows for the blending of the various roles of teacher, administration and religious in a process of goal setting and implementation.

This concept, which proposes an ideal, has been taken seriously by those in Catholic schools. But can this idealistic view of the relationships between people work in harmony with the realism of collective bargaining or will bargaining wipe out this positive atmosphere and make Catholic schools similar to factories and industrial plants in their atmosphere?

Creswell believed that collective bargaining is compatible with a community of faith and may even be a necessary component. He made three points for thinking the way he does. First of all, his understanding of community of

faith includes the Church's concept of social justice, which is a way for making fair decisions about the distribution of benefits in the community. Secondly, collective bargaining appears to be the best way for establishing a just wage and good working conditions in many settings. Third, it does produce some dangers but these can be avoided or minimized with conscious effort. 156

Since collective bargaining is a matter of relative power of the two parties, it is best expressed not strictly in dollar terms but in the costs of agreeing rather than the cost of disagreeing. There is a price for each side to pay; where the cost to each side is high, there is likely to be more disagreement than in a situation where there is a small cost to each side. His second assumption was that conflict is not necessarily bad. It is an unavoidable and often necessary reality. Conflict allows both sides to learn that the other deeply feels and believes their point of view. Third, he said what is usually understood as the industrial model of bargaining does not really exist. Each unit and industry has its own methods and practices which vary widely from place to place.

Conflicts in school operations which lead to bargaining and may impede the formation of a community of faith derive first from the scarcity of resources. There is not enough financial support to satisfy everyone. The question becomes what portion of the resources go to salaries and what part to the other things besides salaries? If the total amount available is fixed within a certain range, what part of the other operating expenses are reduced to make room for an increase in salary? There is no standard anywhere in Church teaching or practice which directs how this mix is to be obtained. Another source of conflict in collective bargaining is the divergence of interest between the bargaining parties. In spite of modern theology which shifted emphasis from traditional forms to more open concepts, Church schools follow an institutional model. As such the goals of the administration differ from those of the teachers. Conflict also arises from the fact that administrators must evaluate teachers for retention and termination. When this takes place, reasonable people can expect teachers and administrators to disagree with the decision to terminate the employment of a teacher. There will be differences about criteria, methods of evaluation, and other issues in the retention area. A fourth point of conflict arises from administration which is arbitrary and capricious. This unfortunate occurrence is not typical, but in places where the administrator is not responsible to a higher authority for his decisions,
unfair teacher terminations have been made. A fifth cause of problems in the bargaining field is the question of a just wage itself.

Where do we find the standards which will provide resolution for these conflicts? The documents of the Church make clear what principles are to guide our actions, but they expect those involved to make the actual agreement setting the standards.

If there is no substantive standard, then there must be a procedural one. That's where the notion of due process comes from, which is fundamental to many of the other procedures of the Church. That is what bargaining is about. I propose simply that collective bargaining is the best available mechanism for procedural justice for labor conflict.157

Procedural justice can be found in the teaching documents of the Church; it can be justified from the process of wage determination itself. The teacher in a Catholic school should have some say in what he makes. He should have some say in how much he is expected to sacrifice for the good of the community of faith by taking a wage lower than offered in public education. Many critics raise the objection that unionism will bankrupt the Catholic schools. This question is political in nature: it involves a decision made by many people, parishioners, pastors, administrators, and even students. It is a question of how much expense the traffic will bear at this time and place. It does not seem

that unions must bankrupt schools, but it means that each part of the constituency will make its point of view known about grievances. "Parishioners vote with their Sunday envelopes in the same way they vote on taxes." If they have confidence in the school and its work, they are more likely to support its needs. Bargaining is not the only possible method for attaining these needed just results, but whatever method is used, it should be one freely chosen by both parties. If another method is agreeable, good; if bargaining is the method of choice, then it should be utilized. Looking at the history of organizations of teachers who have chosen a mechanism for determining wages and working conditions, it is obvious that they clearly prefer bargaining as equals. According to Creswell, problems in the process come from poor treatment of teachers by the management. Historically the demands of workers have come to be seen as just and reasonable.

The point of negotiations is to reach an agreement that both sides can live with. It means mutual accommodation and working out differences that both sides can live with.

...Sacrifice, rational choice, and obedience are not enough. A method, a procedurally just method, is needed to determine many questions of labor policy which can arise in a Faith Community. A mechanism of procedural justice is necessary to that Community itself. Collec-

---
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tive bargaining for workers in Catholic schools seems to be the best candidate for that: achieving social justice in labor relations.159

The United States Catholic Conference Report of 1977 agreed with this point of view saying:

In this community, it is fitting, and, indeed, necessary that the question of teacher organizations be approached, not in a negative or adversarial way, but in an atmosphere of trust and understanding. There is not intrinsic reason to fear the consequences of a teacher organization established according to the wishes of the teacher employees. The very fact that a Catholic school is called to be a Community of Faith should persuade the administration to accept and welcome employee initiative in this regard.160

Boyle (1980) studied the relationship between faith community and teachers' unions as mentioned above. She said the community of faith concept grew out of the Pastoral Letter, "To Teach As Jesus Did" of 1972. In her study the supported the compatibility of community of faith and collective bargaining, but the results of her survey pointed to a conflict between these two concepts. Data was obtained from administrators alone, which may have influenced its outcome. There was not enough evidence to conclude that unionization was harmful to community of faith.161
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Dunne believed community of faith would suffer stress with collective bargaining, and Cicco pointed out the divergence of interest between them.

Cicco insisted on ready access to Catholic schools: therefore, tuition must be kept as low as possible. Otherwise we are creating a system in which only the affluent and upper middle class will be able to afford them. Sacrifice is therefore necessary on the part of all those involved with the process of Catholic education, and part of this sacrifice must be in monetary terms - the money available to the teachers in the form of salaries. Unions were formed for the improvement of working conditions and better wages. The demand for these improvements depends on the profit margin of the business involved. Since there is no profit in a Catholic school, the increases won for higher wages must be paid for by increases in tuition. This higher tuition denies many children the opportunity to attend Catholic schools. The secular values which the union promotes are opposed to the values of the community of faith. Since the Church operates on the local level, said Cicco, we must understand that each parish is a self contained unit of the Church and that diocesan salary scales do not mean that every parish in the dio-

cese can afford the same salary scale since all have different levels of economic strength. Labor unions often fail to understand this.163

Cicco did not believe that people whose object is the promotion of the community of faith in a Catholic school can be comfortable in the same organization as those who have directly opposed any aid to non-public schools such as the AFT and NEA. Because of these variations in objectives and philosophy Cicco didn't think that labor unions in general are consistent with a community of faith as he understood it. Two results may be the product of recruitment of labor unions in Catholic schools: the closing of schools which cannot meet the financial demands, and the elite nature of those remaining open for the same reasons.

At the same time each school may have a local teacher organization whose goals and objectives are consistent with the community of faith idea. Cicco believed that only those teachers who have limited financial responsibilities can afford to work in Catholic schools. Heads of families should not be expected to work in our schools since it would be unfair to them to do so.

The resolution of this question seems unclear at

this time. It is clear that the attitude of those involved both as labor and management is the most crucial element in sustaining the community of faith in a Catholic school.

If school officials work with teachers and address their needs voluntarily, including them in decisions which affect them, the community of faith will be nurtured and blossom.

If teachers are forced to turn to the unions to safeguard themselves and their jobs and must continually rely on union strength for security from threats, it is unlikely that any mood fostering a community of faith will be created.

POSITIVE APPROACHES TO TEACHER GOALS

Many discussions of collective bargaining in Church institutions begin with the assertion that workers have the right to bargain, that the Church has consistently taught this, and that bargaining as a union unit may be a good or bad way to do the work of the Church and fulfill the just needs of the employees.

More importantly it is the underlying attitude within the school and the system which brings the issue of unions to the surface in the first place. Consider two extremes. In one school teachers and administrators work in perfect harmony and always fulfill the demands of their philosophy.
In another school the pastor and principal are tyrants, and all teachers actively undermine their respect and authority at every chance. Just as these two extremes may encompass an unlimited number of different situations between them, the desire for unionization or the lack of desire for it present an unlimited variety of situations for administrators and teachers to deal with. In a discussion of positive approaches to teacher goals we may speak of how to avoid the desire to organize on the part of teachers as one end of the issue, and how to deal with an existing and determined union at the other end of the issue.

Collective bargaining in Catholic schools is not inevitable, but may become a part of administrative life. Teachers who have felt the need to join together for their protection, will certainly not ever forget that lesson, and will not willingly cease what they have begun. Teachers who believe they have a partnership arrangement with the school will not feel the need to unionize to gain by pressure what they may be persuasion.

School administrators should be able to foresee the movement of teachers in the direction of bargaining and be prepared not to block the movement or to forbid it, but rather to make the resort to negotiations unnecessary.164

Burke felt that the usually enunciated position in defense of the Church's encyclicals is only part of the total labor picture, and that a different point of view may be drawn from the Church's teachings. He believed that the basic responsibility of the Church employer is to provide the best possible working conditions so as to remove the need for employees to seek outside assistance from a union to achieve them, while still recognizing the right to bargain.

He recognized that economic considerations are a primary, but not the only areas of concern for Catholic teachers; in those places where a faculty member knows that everything possible is being done to raise his salary and benefits, teachers will be more likely to accept what is offered, even though it may not be as much as they would like. However, if the employees feel abused and unappreciated and have too limited a say so in matters important to the school and their working conditions, they will seek active voice through a union if necessary. Therefore, when the teachers in a school are in any way abused, their memory will certainly be a part of the decision to seek protection through a union. Burke encouraged administrators to work so that situations in which unions might emerge do not occur in

their school. He did not oppose the right of people to unionize, but believed that the problems attendant to unionization outweigh the benefits. No Church teaching says that anyone should organize, only that they may organize if they choose to do so. Faced with the fact of a union organization drive developing in the school, the administrator should make a strong effort to fully inform the faculty of his viewpoint on the union. Unless the administrator speaks, the faculty will not know his feelings and will assume he favors the union. In addition, the employer should realize that the union representative will present only one side of the picture, intending to make the union appear as the only salvation for the present situation. The employer has the obligation to speak out on the drawbacks of unionization. Most faculty members will not know the pluses and minuses of unionization unless these are pointed out. Do teachers know, for example, that once the union is voted in, only the union may speak for the members and no individual agreements may be made? The rights of the members are restricted by a union agreement; the union may discipline its members so as to maintain its strength and status. Because of the complexity of the questions involved in the unionization process, Burke strongly advised consultation with a qualified labor attorney before the question of a union comes to a head.
Meyer proposed three models to help facilitate greater participation for all and promote social justice in the school without recognizing a union. The first model restructured the school board to include a meaningful representation of the teachers so that all constituencies may be fairly included and share in decisions. His second model was the creation of an Educational Personnel Commission at the local or diocesan level with the authority to settle disputes - essentially a board of binding arbitration. The third model is a combination of one and two: a modified Board of Education and an Educational Personnel Commission. 166

Alternatives to the bargaining process as a union function revolve around a coming together of concerned personnel from each interest group and having them meet as equals to forward the best interest of the school. These models are cooperative and problem solving rather than demanding and adversary. They include participative and effective decision making.

In schools where the teachers have influence on the terms and conditions of their employment and a voice in assessing the needs of the school and determining policy, they are

very likely to feel quite comfortable in the educational setting. The method of dealing with the teachers is the key to the smooth operation of the school.

The wise administrator of the Catholic school should become immediately aware of the need to include the teaching staff in an effective and meaningful manner in those decisions which affect the teachers' position in the school. He also needs the foresight to head off pressure for negotiations by removing from contention the problems teachers are likely to want bargained. This is not deceitful, only far-sighted. By heading off problems, the administrator makes it easier to direct and promote the best interest of the school. In taking away the need to bargain, the administrator is fulfilling the mission of the Church helping teachers in their professional careers.

In such a situation, which has been characterized by a relaxed atmosphere and mutual cooperation, commentators mentioned the need to develop alternatives to the industrial model.

Augenstein's monograph provided a well-though-out attempt to concretize this concept in a model for action he called "a collaborative approach". 167

Augenstein believed collective bargaining originated with the market-place approach which begins and ends in confrontation. Catholic schools should move away from this approach through the professional and problem solving approach to a collaborative approach. Because he felt that Catholic schools and teachers proceed from a common vision and a common goal, Augenstein wanted to incorporate two ideas which have been seen as opposites, namely, community of faith and justice for workers. He believed both could be gained at the same time. He mentioned three of Creswell's points as necessary in any model:

1. A Community of Faith requires some mechanism for procedural justice, that is a way to make fair decisions about the distribution of benefits in the community.
2. There must be a procedural standard with which to make decisions.
3. A procedurally just method is needed to determine many questions of labor policy which can arise in a Faith Community.168

In deciding how to go about this process Augenstein realized that all parties involved in the process must be represented. These include the pastor, the parents, the parishioners, the administrators and the teachers. So that they may all move in the same direction, he posited the need for common foundation agreements. These are statements of

vision, mission, outlook and philosophy which all participants hold in common. Time and meetings must be devoted to the development of this shared vision for the school. By their activity in these sessions the participants make themselves and each other aware of the nature and purpose of their particular school and discover the goals they share. Of equal importance is the acknowledgement of the rights and responsibilities of each party. Goals, purpose, tone, participants, leadership and format must be decided.

The issues faced in the process are not mysterious; they include the overall mission of the Church, the educational mission of the Church, the role of teachers in the Catholic school, and the role of teachers' associations in Catholic schools. Documents exist to help guide discussion, particularly two which are often cited: To Teach As Jesus Did, issued by the Catholic Bishops of America in 1972, and The Catholic School, issued by The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education in 1978. The rights of teachers, administrators and parents must be recognized. Concerns that all parties want studied and resolved must be brought into the discussion process. These most commonly include:

personal and family needs, methods of addressing apparent or actual injustices, terms and conditions of employment, and cooperative planning of the school's direction.169

The process itself involves from five to ten sessions, of two hours' duration, where the elements mentioned above are discussed in an organized manner. The panel composed of representatives of each party meet and select two leaders for discussion. One leader is for the stewards, who are defined as those who traditionally control and direct the school. The other is for the collaborators, who are defined as the teachers. Leaders should be those good at leading people and conducting meetings. Participants must commit themselves to attend all meetings and prepare for them. All participate fully in the discussion and are prepared to compromise and adjust to the need for finding a workable solution. Each session of the process follows a definite plan elaborated by Augenstein. They move along with preset goals for each session. Because all concerned parties are present in all discussions, it is reasonable that this consensus model would work in Catholic institutions where good will and trust are present. In places where trust has disappeared and hostility has replaced harmony, it may not be possible to use this model.

Is it possible that teachers who are interested in unionization may decide not to?

In Syracuse, New York, Catholic school teachers overwhelmingly defeated the proposed union in a certification election on June 3, 1981. The diocese did not resist or-
zation efforts and cooperated with the election process. It was the first time Catholic teachers rejected a union after exercising the right to vote.

The diocese granted all the requests of the teachers' group.

While the teachers were granted the elections and the schools were closed for a half day to ensure the largest turnout, the diocese openly campaigned against the union. Father James O'Brien, the superintendent of schools, was given the power by Bishop Frank Harrison to deal with the union to propose a covenant of teachers, clergy, parents, and administrators as an alternative to the forming of a bargaining unit. Positions were spelled out in the local diocesan newspaper, The Catholic Sun.

O'Brien listed the advantages of the covenant over the union but even these were prefaced with a statement acknowledging the teacher's right to organize as a long standing one in the teachings of the Catholic Church and one that the Diocese of Syracuse in no way denies or wishes to challenge.

The Bishop was very outspoken and obvious about cooperating with the processes and should be congratulated for it no matter how the election turned out.170

This outcome may reflect the weakened position of unions in this period of history, but it may also show that the attitude of administrators and bishops and their method of dealing with teachers is a crucial element in the formation of Catholic teachers' unions. Even where there is a fully recognized union present at the bargaining table it is possible to avoid the adversary style of bargaining.

Teachers and parents in the Fort Wayne/South Bend Diocese after nearly a year have taught each other how to negotiate a union contract. Inexperience on both sides slowed completion of the Diocese's first collective bargaining agreement with teachers. But the tough days were worth it according to Bishop William McMannus because "we learned how to put our goals for Catholic schools in writing." The two sides agreed from the start to negotiate without lawyers at the bargaining table. Four teachers from Community Alliance for Teachers of Catholic High Schools (CATCH) met with five parents, one representing each of the Diocese's high schools. The contract signing climaxed a process begun in 1975 when a CATCH victory in the National Labor Relations Board election was challenged in court by Bishop Andrew Gruptka, McMannus' predecessor, who argued the Federal Government had no right to impose collective bargaining on a parochial school. Soon after a March, 1979 Supreme Court ruling upheld the Diocese's position, McMannus made good the pledge and recognized CATCH. McMannus recognized the union even though he won the law suit. Though federal law no longer controls parochial school collective bargaining, McMannus contends that: "Church law does require good faith negotiations with employees." McMannus' attitude is rare. NCR reports that at contract time each spring, it is flooded with anguish reports from teachers who are denied reappointment after trying to take collective action on wages, benefits, or job security.171

It is possible to work harmoniously with a teachers' union, although such experiences may not be typical:

Mutual respect and a deep commitment to participatory decision making made collective bargaining work in the Columbus Diocese of Catholic schools. Together teachers, administrators, and Church members in Ohio's third largest city have proved, in the words of Catholic school superintendent Daniel Brent, that unionization can help all parties "become partners in improving an educational enterprise for which we share a common concern."

Through the union, teachers have a say in the school

system policies. The union is represented on the Columbus elementary and secondary Catholic School Boards. The union has never struck. Its members are some of the nation's highest paid parochial teachers. The 1980-82 contract raises salaries 30 percent during two years, and sets pay raises at 87 percent of local public school levels.

From the association's founding in 1970, both sides set the stage for amicable relations. Columbus recognized the association easily and began collective bargaining as soon as it obtained majority teacher support. Personal respect helps cement the relationship. The superintendent always has been exceptionally open to teachers. The two sides maintain good ties not by avoiding conflict but by regulating it. Negotiating guidelines adopted before talks began kept them orderly and peaceful. Under those rules, the association retains recognition as long as it has the majority teacher support.

If adopted elsewhere the Columbus guidelines might eliminate problems that plague other Catholic school systems. The simple recognition procedure avoids battles about teacher's rights to unionize. Early talks mean wage rates are established before the school board adopts a budget. Arbitration makes strikes unlikely.172

There is no reason to believe that one particular type of model will dominate Catholic bargaining processes. The traditional individuality of Catholic schools seem to indicate that each institution will develop a position which suits its needs.

The information presented in the review of the literature supported collective bargaining in Catholic schools. The social context of workers' rights in the United States was discussed and applied to teachers in Catholic schools. The economic advancement of Catholic school teachers through improved wages and working conditions are concrete expressions of the quest for justice. It maintained that the difficulties of collective bargaining can be overcome and that teachers may take a more active part in the decision-making process of the school. Collective bargaining is a process that often requires professional help so that the interests of all participants are protected.

The history of papal and other official Catholic Church teaching on collective bargaining was discussed; the right of workers to organize and bargain, including teachers in Catholic schools, was clearly established. It is the prerogative of the teachers to decide whether or not to bargain, the nature of the unit, and its rules. The official spokesmen of the Church have taken a strong position in favor of collective bargaining.

The genesis of collective bargaining for Catholic teachers is a part of the historical development of organized labor.
American workers chose unionization as their method to exercise political power without identifying with a particular political party.

Historically Catholic schools were found to train young people in the Catholic religion and tradition, and to provide a place for social and cultural interaction. When Catholic schools became more and more the haven of lay teachers, as the numbers of religious teachers available decreased, these lay teachers became increasingly concerned about their wages and working conditions. Wages have always been less in Catholic schools than public schools, because of their private nature and lack of public funding.

Unions in Catholic schools experienced success in the 1960's and 1970's following the success of public school teachers' unions. Catholic teachers' unions were formed and grew for the same reasons as public school teachers' unions, namely: salaries, job security, working conditions, and increased participation in the decision making process of the school. The prospect was for continued growth in Catholic school teachers' unions until the 1979 Supreme Court decision. This case set the precedent, still in effect, that the Federal Government cannot interfere in the internal operation of Catholic schools. From then on Catholic teachers' unions were forced to rely on other avenues than the government for assistance as they pressed their claims for
collective bargaining.

In the past few years Catholic school teachers' unions have not grown as quickly or spread as fast as they did in the 1970's. Among the reasons presented for this fact are the court decision, the economic recession of 1979 to 1981 with its slow recovery period, the overall weakening of organized labor nationally, the decline in enrollment in Catholic schools and accompanying retrenchment, and a lessening of interest on the part of private school teachers in the union movement.

Discussion focused on the need for a suitable agency to resolve labor disputes, but it was also made clear that only the willingness of the local bishop to agree to an arbitration process would make this type of solution possible. It was recommended that disputes be negotiated by the American Arbitration Association, which would require the voluntary agreement of both parties.

The place of religious teachers in the bargaining unit was discussed. The concern was expressed that all teachers be included in the bargaining process in an appropriate manner, recognizing the contribution of each teacher. The continuing decline in the number of religious teachers will lessen their impact on Catholic school collective bargaining; but religious teachers can be successfully included in the bargaining unit.
Concern was expressed in the literature that the atmosphere of warmth and concern present in Catholic schools would be affected by the presence of collective bargaining. This "community of faith" effect, may according to some commentators be maintained where collective bargaining is present, if procedural justice and a spirit of accommodation are present among teachers and administrators. This "community of faith" may be lost where issues polarize the school community.

The literature suggested a positive approach to the question of legitimate teacher goals in Catholic schools. It suggested that administrators work to avoid the necessity of collective bargaining in Catholic schools by encouraging legitimate teacher goals and working with teachers for improved salary, better working conditions and a greater participation in decision making. These goals may be reached without the presence of formal collective bargaining. This stance assumes a cooperative spirit and attitude of accommodation by both teachers and administrators making collective bargaining unnecessary. In situations where formal bargaining is already present, the discussion suggested the use of a consensus model which includes the full participation of bargaining unit representatives in all discussions of the contract. This suggestion also requires the cooperation and trust of all parties. In circumstances where teachers feel
compelled to form a bargaining unit and will not be satisfied without it, the discussion suggested the recognition of the bargaining unit and an honest and professional approach to bargaining with the goal of making a just and equitable settlement.
CHAPTER III

SUBJECTS, MATERIALS, PROCEDURES

SUBJECTS

The population sampled in this study was the principals, and a sample of the lay teachers and religious teachers of the Catholic high schools of Illinois. Illinois provides specific advantages to the researcher in the area of collective bargaining. It is a large northern industrial state: since union activity and its effects are most likely to occur in such a state, Illinois presents an appealing field for study. In addition, Illinois has a large Catholic population, which indicates a significant number of Catholic schools.

Another distinct advantage to Illinois is that it contains two divergent types of American life in a fairly even proportion for the purpose of the study. The Archdiocese of Chicago has the largest Catholic school system in the country; it is the fifth largest school system overall in the nation. Only the public school systems of New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Philadelphia have larger school systems. In the Archdiocese of Chicago there are 366 elementary schools, and fifty-four Catholic high schools. In the remainder of the
state there are thirty-eight Catholic high schools. Since the literature and experience have shown that most collective bargaining in Catholic schools is on a diocesan system-wide basis or on an individual high school basis, it was decided to conduct the study based on the ninety-two Catholic high schools in Illinois. Research and literature had shown that no diocese in Illinois was bargaining on a system-wide basis. Since the state contains a large metropolitan area and an important rural area, Illinois provides an interesting, yet balanced field for study. Previous research included Chicago, but is dated and a fresh assessment seemed pertinent.

The primary source for information on Catholic institutions in the United States is the Official Catholic Directory, published by the J. P. Kenedy Co., New York. The sample, which was the ninety-two Catholic high schools of the state, was listed with their addresses and the names of the administrators in the 1983 edition of the Directory, and was used for the research. In this study responses were sought from each of these schools. The population included principals, lay teachers, and religious teachers from each of these schools. Each principal was asked to respond to the survey, and to enclose a list of the names of the teaching staff with the completed survey. From the teacher lists, three lay teachers and three religious teachers were selected at random and mailed a questionnaire.
In the case that every respondent cooperated with the study, there would be 644 possible returns of the survey instrument. However, the actual return was less than ideal. To the initial questionnaire for principals, seventy-seven of the ninety-two principals responded for a return of 83.69%. Of these seventy-seven principals, seven (7.60%) returned the questionnaire unanswered or enclosed a note saying that they would not cooperate with the study. Two (2.17%) of the principals returned the survey but did not enclose a teachers' list, although two follow-up letters were sent requesting it. Fifteen principals (16.30%) did not respond at all, although two follow-up letters were sent with an additional survey enclosed with each one. Table 1 summarizes the possible individual responses by principals. Sixty-eight (73.91%) of the principals returned a teachers' list with the survey. The teachers' lists were labeled indicating the status of the faculty member: Father, Sister, Brother, if they were religious; Mr., Mrs., Ms., or no prefix if they were lay teachers. Table 1 also summarizes the individual responses to the questionnaire. From these lists three religious teachers were selected at random and they were sent the questionnaire for religious. Three lay teachers were selected at random and they were sent the questionnaire for lay teachers. In this way a sub-sample of 204 religious teachers and 204 lay teachers was created. Two
### TABLE 1

**SUMMARY OF POSSIBLE INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES BY PRINCIPALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illinois Catholic high school principals: N = 92</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possible responses</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to initial survey</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-cooperative response</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaire and included teachers' list</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed questionnaire; did not include teachers' list</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUMMARY OF INDIVIDUAL RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70*</td>
<td>76.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious teachers</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>67.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay teachers</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>61.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>66.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of the principals responding seven would not cooperate with the study. The number of usable principal's responses was seventy (76.08%).
follow-up letters were sent to each religious teacher and lay teacher who did not respond to the initial questionnaire. The adjusted total possible responses for teachers was 408; added to a possible 92 principals the total possible responses for the study was 500. Of this 500, a total of 333 (66.66%) were returned and comprise the data of this study.

The total of 333 usable responses included sixty-eight (73.91%) of the principals, 138 (67.64%) of the religious teachers, and 125 (61.27%) of the lay teachers.

**TABLE 2**

**SUMMARY OF USABLE RETURNS ACCORDING TO ROLES OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles of Respondents</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious teachers</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>41.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>37.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the principals indicated by mail that they would not cooperate. Four responded that they were not interested in completing the questionnaire; one said he would
not respond because of the topic. One said the questionnaire did not apply because there is no union at their school. Another said he had a fine relationship with his faculty and was not interested in responding, and one wrote a letter stating that she did not have enough time to complete the questionnaire.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

The respondents to the questionnaire included principals, religious teachers and lay teachers. Of the 333 usable responses seventy (21.03%) were from principals, and 263 (78.97%) were from teachers. Classified according to their status in the school, 138 (41.44%) of the respondents were religious teachers, and 125 (21.03%) were lay teachers. Classified according to sex, 127 (48.28%) of the teachers were male lay and religious, and 136 (51.72%) were female lay and religious.

The survey asked all respondents to check what type of school they were working in; whether it was a community-owned school, an archdiocesan or diocesan school, or a parish school. 185 (58.35%) of the respondents stated they worked in a community-owned school. 105 (33.12%) stated they worked in an archdiocesan or diocesan school, and twenty-seven (8.53%) stated they worked in a parish school.

The survey asked all respondents to indicate their age;
fifteen categories were provided for checking this item. Twenty-eight (8.52%) indicated they were twenty-nine years old or younger, 116 (35.25%) indicated they were between the ages of thirty and thirty-nine, ninety-two (27.96%) indicated they were between the ages of forty and forty-nine, fifty-seven (17.33%) indicated they were between the ages of fifty and fifty-nine, and thirty-six (10.94%) indicated they were sixty years of age or older.

Respondents were asked to indicate the highest level of educational achievement. Six categories were provided for checking. Two (.60%) of the respondents indicated they had no college degree; thirty-one (9.43%) indicated they had a Bachelor's degree. Fifty-two (15.80%) indicated they had a Bachelor's degree plus additional credit hours and sixty-one (18.55%) indicated they possessed a Master's degree. Responses indicated that 177 (53.79%) possessed a Master's degree plus additional credit hours and six (1.82%) of the respondents indicated that they possessed a Doctor's degree. Tables 3 and 4 summarize selected characteristics of the respondents.

Characteristics of the Principals. The principals of the Catholic high schools in Illinois were asked to complete a questionnaire on their attitudes toward collective bargaining. General information was solicited from them at the beginning of the survey. To the question of the age of the
### TABLE 3
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>78.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious teachers</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>41.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay teachers</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>37.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>333</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Teachers</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>48.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>51.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community owned</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>55.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocesan or diocesan</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>95.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 16 (4.80%) no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 years old or younger</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>35.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 years old or older</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>98.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 4 (1.20%) no response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Highest level of education attained by respondent: |      |      |
| No degree                                    | 2    | .60  |
| Bachelor's degree                            | 31   | 9.30 |
| Bachelor's degree plus credit hours           | 52   | 15.61|
| Master's degree                              | 61   | 18.31|
| Master's degree plus credit hours             | 177  | 53.51|
| Doctor's degree                              | 6    | 1.80 |
| Total                                        | 329  | 98.77*|

* 4 (4.80%) no response
respondent no principal was found under the age of twenty-nine, seventeen (25.00%) were between the ages of thirty and thirty-nine, thirty-two (47.06%) were between the ages of forty and forty-nine, fifteen (22.06%) were between the ages of fifty and fifty-nine, and four (5.88%) were sixty years of age or older. The mean age of the principals was 46.3 years and the standard deviation was 8.36 years.

In indicating the type of school they directed, thirty-seven (54.42%) were from community-owned schools, twenty-one (30.88%) were from archdiocesan or diocesan schools, and eight (11.76%) were from parish schools.

The principals were asked to indicate the number of years they had served as principal of their school, and answers ranged from one to twenty years. Forty-three (63.23%) were principal from one to five years, twenty-one (30.88%) were principal from six to ten years, and two (2.94%) were principal more than fifteen years. The mean length of service as principal was 4.91 years and the standard deviation was 3.88 years.

Principals indicated their years of teaching experience. One (1.47%) had five years or less teaching experience. Twelve (17.46%) had six to ten years teaching experience, thirteen (19.11%) had eleven to fifteen years teaching experience, fifteen (22.05%) had sixteen to twenty years teaching experience, nine (13.23%) had twenty-one to twenty-five
years teaching experience, nine (13.23%) had twenty-six to thirty years teaching experience, and five (7.35%) had thirty-one or more years teaching experience. The mean length of teaching experience for principals was 18.34 years and the standard deviation was 8.15 years.

The respondents tended to be well educated. None had less than a bachelor's degree, and only one (1.47%) had a bachelor's degree plus credit hours. Thirteen (19.12%) had a master's degree, forty-nine (72.05%) had a master's degree plus credit hours, and five (7.35%) had a doctor's degree.

To the question: "Do you think state aid to Catholic schools will alleviate the financial crisis?", thirty-three (48.52%) said yes, and twenty-nine (42.64%) answered no.

Tables 5 and 6 summarize selected characteristics of the principals.

Characteristics of the Religious Teachers. Tables 7, 8, and 9 contain the data concerning the religious teachers who returned the questionnaire. Of the 138 religious teachers sixty-five (47.10%) were male and seventy-three (52.89%) were female. The average age of the religious teachers was 41.9 years for males with a standard deviation of 9.75 and 54.0 years for females with a standard deviation of 10.49. The item asking the type of school they were working in showed that a majority of both male (29.71%) and female (39.85%) worked in community-owned schools. While male religious were
TABLE 5

SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 or under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean age of 46.3 years
Standard deviation 8.36

Type of School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community owned</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocesan or diocesan Parish</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                            | 66 | 97.06*|

* 2 (2.94%) no response
### TABLE 6
SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years as principal:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean years as principal: 4.9
Standard deviation: 3.88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching experience in years:</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>94.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*4 (5.88%) no response
Mean teaching experience: 18.34 years
Standard deviation: 8.15
as likely to work in a diocesan or parish school as female religious (14.49% versus 14.47%), both were twice as likely to be working in a community-owned high school. The data on years of teaching experience revealed that the average length of teaching experience for male religious was 14.0 years with a standard deviation of 11.36, and was 28.24 years for female religious with a standard deviation of 12.16. Coupled with the data about average age, it seems that female religious teachers in Illinois Catholic high schools are likely to be older and have more teaching experience than male religious. The item asking the highest level of education attained yielded data that both male and female religious are well educated, with a strong majority of both, (male 31.88%, female 38.4%) possessing a master's degree plus additional credit hours.

Male and female religious were fairly evenly divided in stating that state aid to private schools may or may not be helpful in overcoming the financial crisis. A majority of both male (34.05%) and female religious (30.42%) worked at their present school for ten years or less, and therefore demonstrate the tendency of religious personnel to be reassigned periodically. Both male and female religious tended to have state certification in their teaching field, although female religious (36.95%) clearly were more likely to be certified than male religious (16.66%).
## TABLE 7
CHARACTERISTICS OF RELIGIOUS TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or under</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean age of male religious: 41.90
standard deviation: 9.75

Mean age of female religious: 54.00
standard deviation: 10.49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community owned</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocesan or diocesan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of Teaching Experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean teaching experience for male religious: 14.07 years
standard deviation: 11.36

Mean teaching experience for female religious: 28.24 years
standard deviation: 12.16
### TABLE 8
CHARACTERISTICS OF RELIGIOUS TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education attained:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's plus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's plus</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.88%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State aid to school will help alleviate the financial crisis:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.53%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years teaching in this school:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 9**  
CHARACTERISTICS OF RELIGIOUS TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification in field of preparation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract signed between teacher and administrator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assignments in teacher's major field:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one half</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One half</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one half</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of prestige of lay teachers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before lay teachers became an important component in the staffs of Catholic schools, the religious teachers who made up the staff were assigned to their school by their religious superior. It was unheard of in those times for the religious teacher to sign a contract with that superior or with the administrator of the school. Often the superior and the principal were the same person. Signing a contract was not necessary due to the commitment of religious obedience which all religious teachers shared. After the Second Vatican Council when the number of religious teachers declined and the number of lay teachers increased, it became more common for the religious teacher to seek a position with the permission of the superior at a variety of religious institutions including schools. The item asking religious teachers whether or not they had signed a contract with the administrator of their school disclosed that seventeen (12.31%) of the male religious and forty-nine (35.50%) of the female religious had signed a contract. Female religious were almost three times as likely to have signed a contract as male religious. This seems to be the outcome of the movement of congregations of sisters toward open placement for their members. Through open placement, each sister must find herself a position within or outside of the institutions the congregation has traditionally staffed. Forty-six (33.33%) male religious teachers did not sign a contract - a majority of them - while a minority of the female religious, twenty-three
(16.66%) did not.

The item asking what proportion of their teaching time was spent in the area of their major field of study revealed that a large majority of both male religious, fifty (36.23%), and female religious, fifty-three (38.40%), taught more than one half of their teaching time in their major field. A small portion of each, two (1.44%), taught one half time in their major field, and a minority of both, thirteen (9.42%) male religious, and eleven (7.97%) female religious, taught less than one half time in their major field.

Religious teachers were asked to rate the level of prestige of lay teachers in their school. Thirty-eight (27.53%) male religious and fifty-six (40.57%) female religious rated the prestige of lay teachers as high. A significant number of male religious, twenty-two (15.94%), and female religious, thirteen (9.42%), rated the prestige of lay teachers as medium, while a small portion rated the prestige of lay teachers as low or uncertain (Table 9).

Characteristics of the Lay Teachers. Tables 10, 11 and 12 contain the data concerning the lay teachers who returned the questionnaire. Of the 125 lay teachers sixty-two (49.60%) were male and sixty-three (50.40%) were female. The same proportion of male and female lay teachers were married (31.20%), and slightly more of the female teachers (20.00%) were single than the male teachers (18.40%). The average age
of the male teachers was 36.04 years with a standard deviation of 8.90, and the average age of the female teachers was 37.30 years with a standard deviation of 9.04. The item asking the type of school in which they were employed revealed that somewhat more male teachers were employed in archdiocesan or diocesan schools (26.40%) than were employed in community-owned high schools (16.80%). By contrast female teachers were more likely to be employed in community-owned high schools (24.80%) than were employed in archdiocesan or diocesan high schools (16.00%). Of the lay teachers, only female teachers were found in parish schools (8.00%). The average length of teaching experience for male lay teachers was 12.25 years with a standard deviation of 13.87, and was 9.83 years for female lay teachers with a standard deviation of 6.11; however, only forty-nine (77.77%) of the female lay teachers considered in this study responded to this item.

The item asking the highest level of education attained showed that male lay teachers are more likely to possess at least a master's degree (28.8%) than are female lay teachers (17.60%). Both male (24.80%) and female (29.60%) lay teachers agreed in the majority that state aid would help alleviate the private school financial crisis. The average length of time teaching in their present school was 9.22 years for male lay teachers and 4.58 years for female lay teachers; however, only thirty-one (49.20%) of the female lay
### TABLE 10
CHARACTERISTICS OF LAY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or under</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean age of male lay teachers: 36.04
Mean age of female lay teachers: 37.30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community owned</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocesan or diocesan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11
CHARACTERISTICS OF LAY TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of teaching experience:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>*48.00</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>*39.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean teaching experience of male lay teachers: 12.25 years
Mean teaching experience of female lay teachers: 9.83 years

However, 49 (77.77%) of lay female teachers responded to this item.

Highest level of education attained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest level of education attained:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree plus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree plus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>*48.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>*50.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* % of the total lay teachers both male and female.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State aid to private schools will alleviate the financial crisis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching in this school:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>*45.60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>*24.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean teaching experience males: 9.22
Mean teaching experience females: 4.58, however 31 (49.20%) of lay females responded to this item.

* % of the total lay teachers both male and female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification in field of preparation:</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
teachers responded to this item. Both male (29.60%) and female (42.40%) lay teachers tended to possess a state certificate in their field of preparation.

An additional item was included in the questionnaire sent to lay teachers which was not included in the questionnaire sent to religious teachers. This item concerned the lay teachers' reasons for working in a Catholic high school. Item number nine in the first section of the questionnaire entitled "General Information" asked respondents to rank in order of importance their reasons for working in a Catholic high school. Eight options were supplied with a ninth designated "other". A copy of the instrument is in Appendix 3.

Table 13 summarizes the responses to this item by male and female lay teachers. The first column shows the number of times the response was used by male lay teachers (frequency), the second column shows the sum of the weighted responses, and the third column shows the mean score earned by each option. The process is repeated in columns four, five and six for female lay teachers. Since the item requests responses in order of importance, lower mean scores indicate a higher level of importance for the response in question. Both male (1.41) and female (1.61) lay teachers indicated that the Catholic philosophy present in a Catholic school was the most important reason for their seeking a position in that school. Second in importance for both was the availability of a po-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Male Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>Female Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Lay teacher replacing a religious teacher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Prefer Catholic philosophy of education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Fewer disciplinary problems in Catholic school</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Fewer demands on teachers in Catholic school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. More opportunity for advancement to administration</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Position available, not in public school</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Did not meet public school requirements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. My child enrolled here</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Other (not specified)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sition in a Catholic school, while a position was not available in a public school: male (2.00); female (1.85). In third place was the belief that Catholic schools had fewer disciplinary problems than public schools: male (2.24); female (2.26). Fewer demands on teachers was the least important reason for both male (4.85) and female (4.80) lay teachers to seek a position in a Catholic school. Option a., "Lay teacher replacing a religious teacher", is not a reason for seeking a position in a Catholic school, but does help explain the circumstances of the hiring.

Lay teachers were asked whether they had signed a contract with the principal or another school administrator. Fifty-eight (46.40%) male lay teachers and sixty-one (48.80%) female lay teachers had signed a contract. Only two male teachers had not signed a contract.

The item asking the portion of the teacher's assignments in their major field revealed that forty-seven (37.60%) male lay teachers and forty-seven (37.60%) female lay teachers had more than one half of their teaching assignments in their major field. A minority of both, ten (8.00%) male lay teachers and seven (5.60%) female lay teachers had less than half of their teaching assignments in their major field, and a small number, three (2.40%), had one half of their teaching assignments in their major field (Table 14).

Item thirteen asked lay teachers to state whether or not they held another job during the school year to supple-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract signed between teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and administrator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assignments in teacher's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major field:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than one half</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One half</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one half</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary to hold another job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to supplement income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ment their income. Results were fairly evenly divided between yes and no for both male and female lay teachers. Thirty-six (28.80%) male lay teachers and twenty-six (20.80%) female lay teachers responded that they had additional jobs, thirty (24.00%) male lay teachers and thirty-seven (29.60%) female lay teachers responded they did not have additional jobs.

Lay teachers were asked to check the level of prestige they felt they enjoyed at their school among their colleagues. A minority of male and female lay teachers felt they were held in high prestige: ten (8.00%) male and sixteen (12.80%) female. In the majority, thirty-eight (30.40%) male and thirty-one (24.80%) female lay teachers felt they were held in medium esteem, and a small portion felt their prestige was low or uncertain. Lay teachers were asked to state whether or not they intended to remain in Catholic education, and thirty-five (28.00%) male lay teachers and forty-two (33.60%) female lay teachers indicated they intended to remain in Catholic education. A minority of both male and female lay teachers indicated they would leave Catholic education; thirteen (10.40%) male and ten (8.00%) female lay teachers. Of those who indicated they would leave Catholic education eleven (8.80%) male and seven (5.60%) female lay teachers indicated they would remain in education. Five others (4.00%) stated they would not remain in education (Table 15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of prestige of lay teachers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lay teacher intention to remain in Catholic education:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lay teachers leaving Catholic education, but remain in teaching:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATERIALS

The study dealt with the attitudes of a selected population on the place of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools. The instrument was developed from materials present in the literature. A similar questionnaire was used by Martinkus in a 1970 study of the Archdiocese of Chicago. It was reviewed by the faculty of the Department of Administration and Supervision of Loyola University of Chicago in 1969. The instrument used in this study is based on the questionnaire used by Martinkus. It was reviewed and updated by a panel of six experts in the field; three were officials in Catholic education at the time of the study, and three were former or present presidents of Catholic high school teachers' unions. Their suggestions were incorporated into the questionnaire which is included in Appendixes 1, 2 and 3.

The questionnaire for administrators was printed on white paper, for lay teachers on light blue paper, and for religious teachers on tan paper. The different-colored paper was chosen to more easily distinguish between respondents when tabulating data. The first part of the questionnaire asked for general information about the respondent: position, marital status, age, type of school, years of teaching experience, level of education, certification, reasons for serving in a Catholic school, the presence or absence of a contract, and the presence or absence of a recognized teachers' organ-
ization for the purpose of collective bargaining.

Section II on the second page of the questionnaire dealt with general attitudes toward collective bargaining and had two subdivisions: ten items were included on the place of religious teachers in the bargaining unit, and five items were included on the outcomes to be expected from collective bargaining as it affected the interpersonal relations between religious and lay faculty members. The respondents expressed their degree of agreement or disagreement with the items in this and subsequent sections.

The third page contained two sections. In section III ten items dealt with the structures for collective bargaining, who should be involved and how they should be involved. Section IV contained fourteen items dealing with general policies related to collective bargaining.

These thirty-nine items in sections II, III, and IV used a scale showing the degree of agreement or disagreement of the respondents with the statement. Respondents checked or x-ed the appropriate box showing whether they strongly agreed, agreed, had no opinion, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with the statement preceeding the boxes.

In section V on page 4 of the instrument items numbered forty to fifty-eight listed eighteen items as the subject for collective bargaining and asked respondents to determine whether those items should be negotiable for religious teach-
ers, negotiable for lay teachers, negotiable for both, non-negotiable or whether the respondents had no opinion.

PROCEDURES

After the proposal of the study had been approved, a listing of all Catholic high schools in Illinois was compiled using the Official Catholic Directory. In some cases a new principal was selected at the beginning of the academic year, so the names of the principals were checked by calling each school. In Illinois there are six dioceses of the Catholic Church and each of them had one or more Catholic high schools. The archdiocese of Chicago had fifty-four such schools at the beginning of the 1983-1984 school year; the diocese of Rockford had eight; the diocese of Joliet had nine; the diocese of Belleville had four; the diocese of Springfield had nine; and the diocese of Peoria had eight, for a total of ninety-two Catholic high schools in Illinois. These schools formed the sample for the study.

On March 15, 1984, questionnaires were sent to each principal in these schools asking them to do two things. They were asked to complete the questionnaire, and they were also asked to return a complete faculty list with the questionnaire. The cover letter (Appendix 1) explained that the faculty list would be used to select teachers at random for the purpose of completing the teachers' copy of the questionnaire. An en-
closed addressed and stamped envelope was included with the questionnaire. Many of the principals responded within three weeks, but the return was not deemed sufficient, so a follow-up letter (Appendix 4) was sent on April 5, 1984, using a form suggested by the director of the study with a second questionnaire and an additional return envelope. On May 1, 1984, a third letter (Appendix 5) of request was sent to those principals who had not as yet responded to the first two letters.

In the meantime, another mailer was prepared for the lay teachers and religious teachers from the faculty lists which had been returned by the principals. Three lay teachers and three religious teachers were selected at random from the faculty lists returned by the cooperating principals. The questionnaires were coded in the lower left hand corner, so that a follow-up of the non-respondents could be done. The teachers' questionnaires were prepared similarly to the principals. Each teacher received a brief letter of explanation at the top of the questionnaire and was asked to complete it and return it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope (Appendixes 2 and 3). The teachers' questionnaires were sent on April 15, 1984. A second mailing was sent to the teachers who had not responded on May 5, 1984, with a cover letter (Appendix 6) and an additional copy of the questionnaire and envelope. A third request to non-responding
teachers was mailed on May 24, 1984, with a cover letter (Appendix 7) and an additional copy of the questionnaire and envelope. As returns to all requests for information were received, the name and number of the respondent was checked against the master list of the sample. Second and third mailings were prepared from the master list noting those members of the sample who had responded.

By June 15, 1984, the date used for the deadline, seventy-seven (83.69%) of the principals had responded and 125 (61.27%) of the lay teachers and 138 (67.64%) of the religious teachers. There were 333 usable responses to the questionnaire which formed the data for the results of this study.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The study investigated the presence of collective bargaining in the Catholic high schools of Illinois, and the attitudes of principals, religious teachers, and lay teachers toward collective bargaining and the issues involved in collective bargaining. Questionnaires were sent to the principals of each of the ninety-two Catholic high schools in Illinois, and to three religious teachers and three lay teachers in each of the schools where the principal returned a list of the faculty members. This chapter discusses the findings of the questionnaires and formulates deductions based on the results of the questionnaires. 333 usable responses to the questionnaires were obtained from principals, religious teachers and lay teachers which form the data of the study.

The presence of collective bargaining. Section one of the questionnaires asked respondents to indicate the presence or absence of a "recognized teachers' organization for collective bargaining," and to check whether the organization was "for lay teachers only, for religious teachers only, for both lay teachers and religious teachers." To this item,
1. 12a + 17a, nine (12.85%) principals indicated the presence of an organization for lay teachers only, and six (8.5%) indicated an organization for both religious and lay teachers (Table 16). The sum of these responses for principals indicated that the study found fifteen organizations for collective bargaining operating in Illinois Catholic high schools. Since the survey included responses from seventy (76.08%) of the Catholic high schools in Illinois, this finding indicated that there are organizations for collective bargaining in at least 16.30% of the Catholic high schools. No conclusion can be drawn about those schools which did not cooperate or did not respond to the survey, but the experience of this study suggests that schools not having collective bargaining are less likely to cooperate with a survey about collective bargaining than those who do.

Twenty-eight (43.07%) of the male religious indicated the presence of an organization for lay teachers only and six (9.23%) indicated an organization for both lay and religious teachers. Six (8.21%) of the female religious teachers indicated an organization for lay teachers only and eight (10.95%) indicated an organization for both lay and religious teachers. A total of 52.30% of the male religious teachers indicated the presence of a collective bargaining organization, but only 19.16% of the female religious teachers indicated it. Fourteen (22.58%) of the male lay teachers indi-
TABLE 16

Item: I.12a + 17a. There is a recognized teachers' organization for collective bargaining for lay teachers only, for religious teachers only, for both lay teachers and religious teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lay Only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rel. Only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Both</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (70)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>15 organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>52.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>19.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>37.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>17.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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cated an organization for lay teachers only and eight (12.90%) indicated an organization for both lay and religious teachers. Four (6.34%) of the female lay teachers indicated an organization for lay teachers only and seven (11.11%) indicated an organization for both lay and religious teachers. A total of 35.48% of the male lay teachers indicated the presence of a collective bargaining organization, but only 17.45% of the female lay teachers did. The percentages indicate that collective bargaining is more likely to occur at schools where male teachers, whether religious or lay, are present, than at schools where female teachers are present. Since religious congregations of men operate many boys schools in Illinois and tend to hire male teachers, it seems that collective bargaining is more likely to take place in those schools than in schools operated by female religious who tend to hire female lay teachers. One (1.61%) respondent indicated a collective bargaining organization for religious only. Collective bargaining organizations clearly seem to be founded primarily for the use of lay teachers, with the possible but not necessary inclusion of religious teachers. Lay-only organizations are twice as likely to occur as organizations for both lay and religious teachers.

The next item, I. 12b + 17b, asking if there is "movement in the direction of a collective bargaining organization," yielded a much lower frequency of response (Table 17).
Item: I.12b + 17b. There is a movement in the direction of a teachers' organization for collective bargaining for lay teachers only, for religious teachers only, for both lay and religious teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lay Only</th>
<th>Rel. Only</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

4.27%  
10.76%  
8.19%  
8.05%  
4.76%
Three principals (4.2%) indicated such movement; one for religious teachers only and two for both lay and religious teachers. Five (7.69%) male religious indicated movement toward an organization for lay teachers only, and two (3.07%) indicated movement toward an organization for both lay and religious teachers. One (1.36%) female religious indicated movement toward a lay-only organization, three (4.10%) female religious indicated movement toward a religious-only organization, and two (2.73%) female religious indicated movement toward an organization for both lay and religious teachers. 10.76% of the male religious and 8.19% of the female religious indicated movement toward a collective bargaining organization. Three (4.83%) male lay teachers indicated movement toward a lay-only organization, one (1.61%) indicated movement toward a religious-only organization, and one (1.61%) indicated movement toward an organization for both. Three (4.76%) female lay teachers indicated movement toward an organization for both lay and religious teachers. 8.05% of the male lay teachers indicated movement toward a collective bargaining organization, but 4.76% of the female lay teachers indicated such movement. Religious teachers were more likely to indicate movement in the direction of a collective bargaining organization than lay teachers.

Item, I. 12c + 17c, asking respondents "if 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 bargaining," yielded high levels of response for each category of respondent (Table 18). Fifty (71.42%) principals, twenty-three (35.38%) male religious teachers, fifty-one (69.86%) female religious, thirty-one (50.00%) male lay teachers, and forty-five (71.42%) female lay teachers indicated there was no such effort present in their school. Since fifty principals equals 54.34% of the principals in Catholic high schools in Illinois, it can be concluded with some certainty that collective bargaining is not present or likely to be present soon in more than half of these schools. In the majority, the Catholic high schools in Illinois are functioning without the presence of organized collective bargaining for the faculty.

The usual factors in the formation of the teachers' organizations. Section III of the principals' questionnaire was a follow up to the previous section on the presence of collective bargaining organizations. This section asked the principals who indicated the presence of a collective bargaining organization at their school to rank the reasons for the formation of the organization in the order of their importance. Seven items numbered 1 to 7 were included in this section. The scale provided three options for this ranking: 1-most important; 2-important; 3-relatively unimportant; A fourth option: 4-not applicable, was also present. Table 19
TABLE 18

Item: I.12c + 17c. 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 bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
summarizes the results of this section in which the options for relative importance: 1, 2, or 3, formed the weighting component of the statement selected. The sum of the frequency of responses and the weighted value of the statement was divided by the total respondents (seventeen) to obtain the mean of the scores. The lower the whole number value of the mean, the greater the relative importance of the statement as a reason for the formation of the collective bargaining unit.

Statement number one: "Lay teachers did not have representation at the local level and were dependent for improvements in salaries and working conditions on the unilateral action of the diocesan authorities or administrators in local schools," emerged as the most important reason for the formation of collective bargaining organizations with a mean value of 1.29. The reason second in importance was statement number seven: "The lay teachers felt that if the Catholic high school had so much money to spend for new projects including new school facilities, the teachers were entitled to receive improved salary and fringe benefits," which had a mean value of 1.41. The third most important reason was statement number two: "Lay teachers had 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 Catholic schools," which had a mean value of 1.76. Two state-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement (abbreviated)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lay representation in salary and working conditions decisions</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The success of the AFT causes lay teachers to organize for improvements.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lay teachers regarded merely as auxiliaries by religious</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lay teachers are more professional and seek professional status</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complexity of Catholic Education inclines lay to seek participation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Catholic school salaries too low to attract good teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Expenditures on facilities encourage lay teachers to seek salary raises.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ments were tied for fourth place in importance with an identical mean of 1.94. They were statements number four: "Lay teachers who have entered the Catholic school system in recent years have been better trained and are more professional as teachers. Their need to establish their status as professionals had led them to organize," and statement number five: "Catholic high schools have become so complex in recent years that without collective action the lay teachers would have no real sense of participation in educational planning." The sixth most important reason was statement number three: "Lay teachers have always been regarded only as auxiliaries by religious teachers in the Catholic school system," which had a mean value of 2.00. Statement number six was the least important reason for the formation of a collective bargaining organization with a mean value of 2.11. It said: "The Catholic high school was not offering large enough salaries or fringe benefits to attract enough good teachers to apply to the system." The results of this section indicated that the issue of representation in salary and working conditions decisions was most important to teachers forming collective bargaining organizations. The results also indicated that improvements in school facilities, and the success of public school collective bargaining organizing efforts were also very important reasons in the mind of Catholic school teachers when they began considering the formation of
collective bargaining organizations.

Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining. Section IV of the principals' questionnaire asked the principals to provide in some detail their perception of the effect of collective bargaining on their position as principal. Seventeen items, numbered 8 to 24, were included in this section; principals were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements according to the following scale: whether they strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, strongly disagreed, or felt the item did not apply. The summary of this section appears in Tables 20 to 25.

Item 8. Forty-six (65.71%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that the religious staff would need a similar organization to balance the strength of the lay teachers. Eleven (15.71%) principals felt this item did not apply, indicating that the formation of a separate organization for religious teachers was unlikely in the principals' perceptions (Table 20).

Item 9. Thirty-nine (55.71%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that principals would find it difficult to deal with lay and religious staffs in the school as a unified faculty. Twenty-two (31.42%) principals agreed or strongly agreed that principals would have difficulty with a unified faculty, showing a divided opinion among the principals, with
Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>95.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a majority not perceiving a problem with faculty unity.

Item 10. Fifty-four (77.14%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that the principal would be by-passed in educational planning. Principals did not believe they would be forced out of educational planning.

Item 11. Thirty-three (47.14%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that the religious staff would want the same improvements in working conditions that are being granted to the lay teachers. Twenty-one (30.00%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that religious teachers would want the same improvements as lay teachers. Principals tended to see religious teachers wanting the same things as lay teachers in the area of working conditions (Table 21).

Item 12. Sixty-two (88.57%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that the principal will participate in the determination of new working conditions being granted to the lay teachers. Principals clearly felt they would continue to exercise influence under whatever new working conditions were agreed upon.

Item 13. Thirty (42.85%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that religious teachers should be allowed to join the teachers' organizations, and thirty-one (44.28%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that religious teachers should have this privilege. Principals were fairly evenly divided on the place of religious teachers in bargaining or-
Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>94.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>94.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>94.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 14. Thirty-seven (52.85%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that the principal would become less an authority figure and more a professional colleague of the teachers. Twenty-two (31.42%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that the principal would have less authority with collective bargaining. The principals tended to feel they would not lose authority, but a significant number were concerned that their authority would be lessened (Table 22).

Item 15. Forty-seven (67.14%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that the lay teachers will become more professional as teachers, while fourteen (20.00%) strongly agreed or agreed that bargaining would make lay teachers more professional. A majority of more than three to one felt that bargaining will not make lay teachers more professional.

Item 16. Forty-eight (68.57%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that the quality of instruction in the school will become more excellent as the result of bargaining. A minority of twelve (17.14%), less than one in three, felt instruction will improve with the presence of bargaining.

Item 17. Forty-five (64.28%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that the principal would be regarded as a part of the administrative team by the teachers, while eleven (15.71%) principals felt that the principal would still be regarded as a fellow teacher after bargaining. Principals
TABLE 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The principal will become less an authority figure and more a professional colleague of the teachers.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38.57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>The lay teachers will become more professional as teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>The quality of instruction in the school will become more excellent.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52.85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perceived by slightly more than four to one that bargaining would place them on the opposite side of the bargaining table from the teachers (Table 23).

Item 18. Twenty-eight (40.00%) principals felt that the statement, "the lay teachers will become more dependent on the superintendent and less dependent on the principal," did not apply as an outcome of bargaining. Twenty-six (37.14%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement and nine (12.85%) principals agreed with the statement. The level of support for the relevance of this statement was low. In the perception of many principals, dependence on the superintendent would not be an issue in bargaining.

Item 19. Fifty-five (78.57%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that supervision of instruction would remain a major function of the principal. Principals did not feel that collective bargaining will erode their administrative prerogatives in dealing with the faculty.

Item 20. Forty-three (61.42%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that another professional will take the place of the principal in the supervision of instruction. Sixteen (22.85%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that another professional would replace the principal in the supervision of instruction. The results of item twenty are similar to the results of item nineteen, affirming the desires
TABLE 23

Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>The principal will be regarded by the lay teachers as part of the administrative team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51.42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>The lay teachers will become more dependent on the superintendent and less dependent on the principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Supervision of instruction will remain a major function of the principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the majority of principals to remain responsible for the supervision of instruction (Table 24).

**Item 21.** Twenty-eight (40.00%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that principals need an organization to represent their views to the diocesan authorities on educational decision making. Twenty-four (34.28%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed with the need for such an organization for principals, while fifteen (21.42%) felt this did not apply. Principals were evenly divided on the need for such an organization.

**Item 22.** Forty-eight (68.57%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed that principals should become members of the teachers' organizations in the Catholic high school. Nine (12.85%) principals felt that principals should join teachers' organizations. Principals clearly felt that their place is not in the teachers' organizations.

**Item 23.** Thirty-seven (52.85%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that the superintendent should consult with the principals before bargaining with the teachers. Principals want to be consulted in matters which will affect their position (Table 25).

**Item 24.** Thirty-one (44.28%) principals strongly agreed or agreed that teachers should consult with the principals before bargaining with the diocese. Twenty-two (31.42%) principals felt this item did not apply, and twelve
Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Supervision of instruction will become the function of a professional other than the principal.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47.14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The principals need an organization to represent their views to the diocesan authorities on educational decision-making.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The principals should become members of the teachers' organizations in the Catholic high school.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 25

Principals perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The superintendent should consult with the principals before bargaining with the teachers, where this applies.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>The teachers should consult with the principals before bargaining with the diocese where this applies.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(17.14%) principals disagreed or strongly disagreed with the importance of consulting the principal before bargaining with the diocese. Principals tended to prefer consultation with teachers before bargaining began where this applied.

The results of this section indicated that principals perceived that collective bargaining would not diminish their authority or their administrative prerogatives in dealing with the faculty or in the administration of the school. In those items in which the place of the principal was the issue, principals generally sought to remain actively involved. They preferred to be involved in working for a unified staff, in educational planning, in the supervision of instruction, in determining working conditions, in functioning as a part of the administrative team, and in being consulted by teachers and superintendents in the course of the bargaining process. Principals felt they were a population separate from bargaining teachers, and generally did not want to be perceived as members of the bargaining unit, but rather as professionals in their own right. Respondent principals were ambiguous about issues which did not directly concern them. They tended to show strong preferences about those issues which directly affected them.

The next portion of the data will discuss the responses of lay and religious teachers to Sections II, III, and IV of the questionnaire for teachers. The items in these three
sections were numbered consecutively from one to thirty-nine. Respondents were asked to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each of the thirty-nine items under discussion. The three sections concerned themselves with **general attitudes toward collective bargaining** (Section II), **Structures for collective bargaining** (Section III), and **General policies related to collective bargaining** (Section IV).

Data gathered for this section are summarized in tables twenty-six to sixty-four. They show a frequency distribution of the responses and the percentage of the total religious teacher response or lay teacher response the frequency represents. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on all items in this section. Raw data was entered into a program on a Commodore 64 computer which computed the F ratio representing the variance. In conjunction with the Foundations Department of the School of Education at Loyola University of Chicago, it was determined that the data yielded by the survey contained three (3) degrees of freedom in the numerator and between two hundred and fifty and three hundred degrees of freedom in the denominator. Using the F distribution table in Minium\(^1\), a value for significant difference among the respondents was determined.

Computation of the variance was used because it allows the researcher to determine whether or not there are differences among the subgroups of respondents that are statistically significant. The values yielded by the computation of variance ranged from 0.0275 to 1.0475. The F distribution table indicates a value of 2.65 for data with the components of the frequency distributions of this study. Since all the values of variance fall well below the 2.65 level, there were no statistically significant differences among subgroups of respondents at the .05 level. Examination of the data may suggest the cause of this. The mean scale values for each subgroup were computed and are part of each table. Range of the mean scale values varied from .22 to .90, showing that the responses of the subgroups tended toward clustering about means with similar values; the subgroups were similar in their responses.

Since the data were reported in terms of a Likert scale, it was necessary to weight the values in each column to obtain the mean scale value. A weight of 1 was assigned to the "Strongly Agree" column, a weight of 2 was assigned to the "Agree" column, a weight of 3 was assigned to the "No Opinion" column, a weight of 4 was assigned to the "Disagree" column, and a weight of 5 was assigned to the "Strongly Disagree" column. The mean scale values are expressed in terms of numbers from 1 to 5; 1.00 being the value of the column
"Strongly Agree" on the left side of the table. Moving from left to right, the values increase as they approach a value of 5, which is the value of the column "Strongly Disagree". In item number one, for example, the mean scale value for male religious was 3.27. This indicated that as a group the responses of the male religious to this item tended to cluster near "No Opinion", which had a value of 3.

The F ratio indicating the value obtained by a one-way analysis of variance is included in the tables. Although an analysis of variance did not reveal statistically significant differences, the discussion of each section includes the tendencies of respondents, along with a summary of the data.

GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Section II of the questionnaire for both lay and religious teachers contained two parts. In part A., Role of religious teachers, respondents indicated their opinion on the place of religious teachers in connection with collective bargaining. Items one to ten were limited to this topic. In part B., Outcomes, respondents indicated their opinion on the effects of collective bargaining on the relationships between lay teachers and religious teachers in the school. Items eleven to fifteen concerned themselves with the discussion of outcomes.

Item 1. 161 teachers (61.21%) disagreed or strongly
disagreed that religious teachers should not engage in collective bargaining. 28.25% of male religious and 34.25% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 27.20% of male lay and 32.80% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 15.20% of male religious and 15.21% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 16.80% of male lay and 8.00% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Twenty-nine (22.05%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .0857 which was not significant at the .05 level.

Teachers felt that religious teachers should be allowed to participate in collective bargaining (Table 26).

**Item 2.** 223 teachers (84.79%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that religious teachers should be more occupied with spiritual matters in the schools, leaving to the lay teachers to take care of secular matters. 39.12% of the male religious and 49.99% of the female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 36.80% of the male lay and 43.20% of the female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 6.53% of the male religious, 2.89% of female religious, 8.80% of male lay and 4.00% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Ten (7.60%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2421
TABLE 26

II. GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
A. Role of Religious Teachers

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} \) = .32

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .0857 \)
which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers indicated that religious teachers should be concerned with secular matters (Table 27).

Item 3. 149 teachers (79.84%) agreed or strongly agreed that it would be possible for a religious teacher to use the money of the religious community for membership in a teachers' union and not be acting contrary to the religious profession of poverty. 26.80% of male religious and 60.85% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 29.60% of male lay and 22.40% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Sixty-one (23.19%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Sixty-eight (25.85%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 0.0969 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers indicated their preference by more than two to one to allow religious teachers to use community money for teachers' organization dues (Table 28).

Item 4. 177 teachers (67.30%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that 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 bargaining. 25.25% of male religious and 65.29% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 32.8% of male lay and 36.00% of female
TABLE 27

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .62$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2421$
TABLE 28

Item 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} \) = .41

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .0969 \)
lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Fifty-three (20.15%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Thirty-five (13.30%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2116 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers indicated that religious teachers have the freedom to become involved in collective bargaining if they desire (Table 29).

Item 5. 167 teachers (63.49%) agreed or strongly agreed that in important matters, such as those which come up in collective bargaining, a religious teacher should speak out and write even when he is in conflict with the will of his authorized superior. 34.77% of male religious and 25.35% of the female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 35.20% of male lay and 32.00% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Thirteen (9.41%) male religious and thirty-one (22.45%) female religious disagreed or strongly disagreed. Less than 5% of male lay teachers and less than 7% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Thirty-six (13.68%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .7738 which was not significant at the .05 level. Generally teachers indicated that religious teachers should speak out, but some religious teachers indicated that religious teachers should not publically disagree with their authorized superior (Table 30).
TABLE 29

Item 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 bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of X = .48

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2116$
TABLE 30

Item 5. In important matters, such as those which come up in collective bargaining, 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></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .79$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .7738$
Item 6. 107 teachers (40.68%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that in important matters, such as those which come up in collective bargaining, a religious teacher should demonstrate or picket even when this conflicts with the will of his authorized superior. 22.46% of male religious and 31.87% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 12.00% of male lay and 13.60% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Eighty-eight (33.46%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 13.75% of male religious and 10.85% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 21.60% of male lay and 21.60% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Sixty-six (25.09%) teachers had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .7168 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers tended not to favor such an active role for religious teachers. Religious teachers were against this active role for religious teachers more than lay teachers were (Table 31).

Item 7. 154 teachers (58.55%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that religious teachers should be considered as part of the management of the Catholic secondary school by reason of their status in the Catholic Church. 28.98% of male religious and 30.43% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 29.60% of
### TABLE 31

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} = .81 \)

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .7168 \)
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the male lay and 28.00% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Sixty-seven (25.47%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 19.56% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, forming the largest sub group, which included 12.80% of male lay teachers, 9.41% of male religious and 8.80% of female lay teachers. Forty-five (17.11%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1708 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers did not favor the idea of considering religious teachers as part of the management (Table 32).

**Item 8.** 165 teachers (62.73%) agreed or strongly agreed that religious teachers should be considered primarily as a teacher rather than as a member of a religious community in such matters as collective bargaining. 23.18% of male religious and 34.05% of female religious teachers strongly agreed or agreed with the statement. 30.40% of male lay and 38.40% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Sixty-five teachers (24.71%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 18.83% of male religious and 13.76% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Thirty-four (12.92%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .5162 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers favored recognition of religious as teacher first
Item 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = 0.43$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = 0.1708$
for collective bargaining, but a minority, especially of the male and female religious teachers, wanted to be considered as part of the community in matters such as collective bargaining (Table 33).

Item 9. 183 teachers (69.58%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that 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 bargaining. 34.78% of male religious and 39.12% of female religious disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Religious were most definite in rejecting the statement, while 28.00% of male lay and 36.80% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Thirty-nine (14.82%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Thirty-nine (14.82%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .0865 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers, especially the religious teachers in matters concerning the religious teachers, want to speak for themselves, taking an active part in collective bargaining matters (Table 34).

Item 10. 139 teachers (52.85%) agreed or strongly agreed that the individual religious teacher today should be authorized to manage his personal finances in such matters as dues for collective bargaining. 26.63% of male religious and 28.25% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly
Item 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 bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .70

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .5162$
Item 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 bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of $\bar{X}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way analysis of variance: $F =$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreed with the statement. 24.00% of male lay and 28.80% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Forty-seven (17.87%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 15.21% of female religious were in this minority. Seventy-five (28.52%) had no opinion. More teachers had no opinion about the statement than disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1057 which was not significant at the .05 level. Both lay and religious teachers agreed that religious teachers should take an active part in managing matters which personally concern them (Table 35).

Results of this part of Section II, Role of Religious Teachers, indicated that teachers believed in an active and participatory role for religious teachers in matters involving collective bargaining in Catholic high schools. Teachers indicated that religious teachers should be involved in collective bargaining and that the secular matters of the school were also their legitimate concern. They felt that religious teachers should speak out and write defending their position, and should make decisions for themselves, even if these positions and decisions are not in agreement with the will of the authorized superior. Teachers, especially religious teachers, did not support activities such as picketing or demonstrations by religious teachers on behalf of collective
Item 10. The individual religious teacher today should be authorized to manage his personal finances in such matters as dues for collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .31

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1057$
bargaining, which they indicated were not consistent with the proper role of religious teachers. Teachers felt that religious teachers should be considered as teachers first, not as part of management. They generally supported the idea that the religious teachers identify themselves as part of the teaching staff in relation to collective bargaining, rather than as part of the religious community. Teachers, especially the religious teachers, felt that religious teachers could make their own decisions and manage their own limited finances. The results indicated that religious teachers would take a very active part in school matters, including collective bargaining.

B. Outcomes. In this part of Section II five items, numbered eleven to fifteen, asked respondents to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with statements relating to the effect of collective bargaining on the interpersonal relationships among administrators, religious teachers, and lay teachers in the schools.

Item 11. 145 teachers (55.13%) agreed or strongly agreed that the growth of collective bargaining will improve the professional quality of the schools. 21.01% of male religious and 18.11% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 36.00% of male lay and 36.80% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Sixty-six (25.09%) teachers disagreed or
strongly disagreed with the statement, including 14.48% of male religious and 19.56% of female religious teachers. Forty-nine (18.63%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of 1.0475 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers felt that collective bargaining would improve the professional quality of the school, but some religious did not agree (Table 36).

Item 12. 138 teachers (52.47%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the growth of collective bargaining will increase the divisions between lay teachers and the administrators of these schools. 18.83% of male religious and 23.90% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 28.80% of male lay and 34.40% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Eighty-two (31.17%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including 18.84% of male religious, 16.65% of female religious, and 18.40% of male lay teachers. Forty-two (15.96%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2508 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers did not feel that collective bargaining would increase divisions between lay teachers and administrators (Table 37).

Item 13. 142 teachers (53.99%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the growth of collective bargaining will in-
B. Outcomes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .90

One-way analysis of variance: $F = 1.0475$
Item 12. The growth of collective bargaining will increase divisions between lay teachers and the administrators of these schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \(\bar{X}\) = .53

One-way analysis of variance: \(F = .2508\)
crease divisions between religious teachers and the administrators of these schools. 21.00% of male religious and 23.91% of female religious disagreed or strongly disagreed and 32.80% of male lay and 31.20% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Less than 11% of any sub-group agreed or strongly agreed with the statement and sixty-one (23.19%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1805 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers did not feel that collective bargaining would increase divisions between religious teachers and administrators of Catholic high schools (Table 38).

Item 14. 167 teachers (61.21%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the growth of collective bargaining will increase divisions between the religious and lay teachers in these schools. 26.07% of male religious and 25.34% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 37.60% of male lay and 34.40% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Sixty-seven (25.47%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including 18.84% of the male religious and 16.66% of the female religious teachers. Thirty-eight (14.44%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .5995 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers felt that collective bargaining would
Item 13. The growth of collective bargaining will increase divisions between religious teachers and the administrators of these schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} \) = .39

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .1805 \)
not increase divisions between religious teachers and lay teachers, although some religious teachers felt it would (Table 39).

Item 15. 176 teachers (66.92%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that where religious and lay teachers would have equal voting rights in collective bargaining, the religious teachers will usually vote as a bloc. 31.95% of male religious and 39.85% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 24.00% of male lay and 32.00% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Thirty-seven (14.06%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and forty-nine (18.63%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .4647 which was not significant at the .05 level. Religious teachers were more adamant than lay teachers in rejecting the idea that they would vote as a bloc (Table 40).

Results of this part of Section II, Outcomes, indicated that teachers agreed that collective bargaining would improve the professional quality of the schools, but would definitely not increase divisions among administrators, religious teachers and lay teachers. Teachers expected that collective bargaining would be a benefit to the school and not interfere with the interpersonal relationships already present among the staff of these schools.
Item 14. The growth of collective bargaining will increase divisions between the religious and lay teachers in these schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} \) = \( .69 \)

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .5995 \)
Item 15. Where religious and lay teachers would have equal voting rights in collective bargaining, the religious teachers will usually vote as a bloc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} \) = .75

One-way analysis of variance: F = .4647
Structures for Collective Bargaining. Section III of the questionnaire for religious teachers and lay teachers included ten items numbered sixteen to twenty-five. These items dealt with the nature and composition of the teachers' organizations and alternatives to formal collective bargaining.

**Item 16.** 120 teachers (45.62%) agreed or strongly agreed that for collective bargaining, the principals and the assistant principals in the schools should have their own organization rather than hold membership in the teachers' organization. 18.11% of male religious and 21.01% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed, and 28.80% of male lay and 24.00% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Seventy-five (28.51%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, including 15.93% of male religious, 18.10% of female religious, and 16.00% of male lay teachers. Sixty-two (23.57%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .4481 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers indicated by two to one that principals and assistant principals should have their own organization for collective bargaining (Table 41).

**Item 17.** 109 teachers (41.44%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that superintendents and principals should take the initiative in organizing for collective bargaining in
### III. STRUCTURES FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} = \) .65

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = \) .4481
these schools. 14.48% of male religious and 24.63% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 21.60% of male lay and 22.40% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Eighty-two (31.17%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including 15.20% of male religious, 13.03% of female religious, 19.20% of male lay and 15.20% of female lay teachers. Sixty-two (23.57%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1134 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers did not support the initiative of superintendents and principals in collective bargaining, but were more evenly divided on this item than on many others (Table 42).

Item 18. 118 teachers (44.86%) agreed or strongly agreed that the National Catholic Education Association should move into the field of collective bargaining and become actively engaged in the bargaining. 16.65% of male religious and 17.38% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 27.20% of male lay and 29.60% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. An important minority of teachers, seventy-five (28.51%), disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, including 12.31% of male religious, 22.46% of female religious, 10.40% of male lay and 11.20% of female lay teachers. Sixty-nine (26.23%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of
Item 17. The Superintendents and Principals should take the initiative in organizing for collective bargaining in these schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .34$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1134$
variance yielded an F ratio of .4760 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers favored the intervention of the NCEA into collective bargaining (Table 43).

**Item 19.** 189 teachers (71.86%) agreed or strongly agreed that both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective bargaining. 33.33% of male religious and 42.02% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 32.80% of male lay teachers and 35.20% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Thirty-eight (14.44%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, and twenty-four (9.12%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .0275 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly favored membership by both religious and lay teachers in the same teachers' organization (Table 44).

**Item 20.** 205 teachers (77.94%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective bargaining but religious teachers on a non-voting basis. 32.85% of male religious and 45.64% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed. 29.60% of male lay and 40.00% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Twenty-three (8.74%) teachers agreed with the statement and thirty-six (13.68%)
Item 18. The National Catholic Educational Association should move into the field of collective bargaining and become actively engaged in the bargaining process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .62$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .4760$


**TABLE 44**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .50$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .0275$
had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2216 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly indicated that religious teachers should be voting members of a teachers' collective bargaining organization (Table 45).

**Item 21.** 204 teachers (77.56%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that only lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in a teachers' organization for collective bargaining. 33.32% of male religious and 47.82% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 31.20% of male lay and 42.40% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Thirty (11.40%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement and thirty-two (12.16%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .3408 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly indicated their feeling that not only lay teachers should be in the teachers' organization. Presumably religious teachers should also be eligible for full membership (Table 46).

**Item 22.** 188 teachers (71.48%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that religious teachers should have their own organization, separate from that of lay teachers, for collective bargaining. 28.97% of male religious and 45.65% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed
TABLE 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .55

One-way analysis of variance: $F =$ .2216
Item 21. Only lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in a teachers' organization for collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \(\bar{X}\) = .65

One-way analysis of variance: \(F = .3408\)
with the statement. 28.80% of male lay and 39.20% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Twenty-nine (11.02%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement and thirty-nine (14.82%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2835 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly did not believe that religious teachers should have an organization separate from the lay teachers' organization for collective bargaining (Table 47).

Item 23. 150 teachers (57.03%) agreed or strongly agreed that a professional association would be more desirable than a teachers' union for purposes of collective bargaining. 26.07% of male religious and 29.70% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 25.60% of male lay and 32.80% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Fifty-four (20.53%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Less than 10% of any sub-group disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Fifty-eight (22.05%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .0831 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers indicated a preference for a professional association over a union. This supports the data in chapter two which stated that teachers' unions are growing slowly in Catholic schools because they are not supported by the teachers themselves.
Item 22. Religious teachers should have their own organization, separate from that of lay teachers, for collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.81</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .61$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2835$
"Professional association" seems to be more appealing than "teachers' union" to the teachers in Catholic high schools (Table 48).

**Item 24.** 105 teachers (39.92%) had no opinion to the statement that a faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective bargaining than the professional association. 23.18% of male religious, 21.01% of female religious, 16.80% of male lay, and 18.40% of female lay teachers shared this lack of opinion. Ninety-six (36.50%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including 18.11% of male religious, 21.00% of female religious, 12.80% of male lay and 20.80% of female lay teachers. Sixty (22.81%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2326 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers indicated that the difference between a faculty senate and a professional association, as they perceived them, were not significant enough for a majority to hold an opinion. This contrasts with the results of item number twenty-three, where a clear distinction was made between a teachers' union and a professional association (Table 49).

**Item 25.** 101 teachers (38.40%) had no opinion about the statement that a faculty senate, similar to the senate
Item 23. A professional association would be more desirable than a teachers' union for purposes of collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \overline{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \overline{X} = .29 \)

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .0831 \)
Item 24. A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective bargaining than the professional association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$\bar{X}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .45$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2326$
frequently found on the college or university level would be a more appropriate organization for collective bargaining. This group included 24.63% of male religious, 20.28% of female religious, 16.80% of male lay, and 14.40% of female lay teachers. Ninety-five (36.12%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including 16.66% of male religious, 23.91% of female religious, 11.20% of male lay and 20.00% of female lay teachers. Sixty-four (24.33%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .4213 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers indicated they did not feel there was an important difference in using a faculty senate for negotiating. Results of this item were the most evenly divided of any item in this section (Table 50).

Results of Section III, Structures for Collective Bargaining, indicated that respondents felt that principals and assistant principals should have their own separate organization for collective bargaining and should not be members of the teachers' organization. They indicated that superintendents and principals should not take initiative in organizing for collective bargaining, implying that initiatives should come from the teachers themselves. Teachers felt that the National Catholic Education Association should become involved with the process of collective bargaining. Respondents most clearly indicated that in the teachers' organization,
Item 25. A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level would be a more appropriate organization for collective bargaining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Range of } \bar{X} = .64 \]

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .4213 \)
both religious and lay teachers should be equal in membership eligibility and voting rights, and that separate organizations for each one were not necessary. Respondents indicated a preference for a professional association of teachers over a teachers' union, but were divided and showed no clear preference when comparing a professional association to a faculty senate or in preferring a faculty senate without comparison to another form of organization.

**General Policies Relating to Collective Bargaining.**

Section Iv of the questionnaire for religious teachers and lay teachers contained fourteen items numbered twenty-six to thirty-nine and asked respondents to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement to statements about local and national issues involved in collective bargaining, such as strike behavior and consequences, grievance procedures, and deadlock situations.

**Item 26.** 116 teachers (44.10%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Catholic bishops of the United States should establish a national policy for all Catholic secondary schools regarding collective bargaining. 20.28% of male religious and 24.63% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 20.00% of male lay and 43.20% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Ninety-five (36.12%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including
18.83% of male religious, 17.38% of female religious, 20.30% of male lay and 15.20% of female lay teachers. Forty-eight (18.25%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1329 which was not significant at the .05 level. By a small majority teachers did not favor the intervention of the American Catholic bishops into collective bargaining (Table 51).

**Item 27.** 154 teachers (89.73%) agreed or strongly agreed that the procedure for handling grievances of lay teachers should be established at the diocesan level. 26.08% of male religious and 38.40% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 26.40% of male lay and 25.60% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Eighty-two (31.17%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, including 13.03% of male religious, 9.41% of female religious, 19.20% of male lay and 21.60% of female lay teachers. Twenty-four (9.12%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .3851 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers favored setting the procedures of lay teacher grievances at the diocesan level, perhaps because this will avoid arbitrary rulings at the local level (Table 52).

**Item 28.** 165 teachers (62.73%) agreed or strongly agreed that the authorized religious superior of a community
TABLE 51

IV. GENERAL POLICIES RELATED TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} = .36 \)

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .1329 \)
Item 27. Procedure for handling the grievances of lay teachers should be established at the diocesan level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of X = .60

One-way analysis of variance: F = .3851
which teaches in a particular secondary school should not at the same time be principal of that school. 33.32% of male religious and 40.57% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 23.20% of male lay and 27.20% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Thirty (11.40%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, and sixty-four (24.33%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .4146 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly preferred that the local religious superior not be the principal of the school (Table 53).

Item 29. 224 teachers (85.17%) agreed or strongly agreed that a lay teacher should be eligible for all administrative positions in a Catholic school. 40.57% of male religious and 45.64% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 40.80% of male lay and 43.20% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Fourteen (5.32%) teachers had no opinion and twenty-one (7.98%) disagreed or strongly disagreed. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1515 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers overwhelmingly believe that lay teachers should be eligible for all administrative positions in the school (Table 54).

Item 30. 114 teachers (43.34%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that in order to hold full membership in a teach-
TABLE 53

Item 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .55

One-way analysis of variance: $F =$ .4146
TABLE 54

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} = .26 \)

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .1515 \)
ers' organization for collective bargaining, a religious teacher should seek the permission of his authorized superior. 28.98% of male religious and 20.99% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 24.00% of male lay and 28.00% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Sixty-six (25.09%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including 22.75% of male religious and 19.56% of female religious teachers. Sixty-five (24.71%) teachers had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1264 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers did not believe that a religious teacher needed the permission of his superior to join a teachers' organization, but a minority of religious teachers, nearly 20% of both male and female, felt permission was necessary for them to join (Table 55).

Item 31. 170 teachers (64.34%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that authorized superiors should assign religious teachers to fill the classrooms of striking lay teachers. 30.42% of male religious and 31.87% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 32.00% of male lay and 35.20% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Nineteen (7.22%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement and sixty-eight (25.85%) teachers had no opinion. A
Item 30. In order to hold full membership in a teachers' organization for collective bargaining, a religious teacher should seek the permission of his authorized superior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>̅X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of ̅X = .41

One-way analysis of variance: F = .1264
one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .0394 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers overwhelmingly rejected the idea that striking lay teachers should be replaced by religious teachers assigned by their superior (Table 56).

**Item 32.** 130 teachers (49.42%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that all teacher contracts in a Catholic secondary schools should include a "no-strike" clause. 14.48% of male religious and 19.55% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 32.00% of male lay and 34.40% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Seventy-three (27.75%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, including 13.03% of male religious, 22.46% of female religious, 10.40% of male lay, and 8.80% of female lay teachers. Fifty-five (20.91%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .8241. Teachers clearly rejected the idea that contracts should contain a "no-strike" clause, although lay teachers were more adamant in rejecting it than religious teachers, presumably because a strike would have a more direct economic effect on lay teachers than on religious teachers (Table 57).

**Item 33.** 182 teachers (69.20%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the penalty for participation of a lay teacher in a strike should be dismissal from the school. 34.78%
Item 31. Authorized superiors should assign religious teachers to fill the classrooms of striking lay teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .22

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .0394$
Item 32. All teacher contracts in Catholic secondary schools should include a "no-strike" clause.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .85

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .8241$
of the male religious and 23.90% of the female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 40.80% of male lay and 40.00% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Nineteen (7.22%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and fifty-two (19.77%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .6491 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly indicated that participation in a strike should not result in dismissal from the faculty. Lay teachers were more adamant in rejecting dismissal than religious teachers, probably because dismissal would have a more immediate economic effect on them than on religious teachers (Table 58).

**Item 34.** 182 teachers (69.20%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that the penalty for participation by a religious teacher in a strike should be a transfer from the school. 34.77% of male religious and 27.53% of female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 36.80% of male lay and 40.00% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Twenty (7.60%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement and fifty-four (20.53%) teachers had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .5318 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly rejected the idea that a religious teacher should be transferred from
TABLE 58

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X}$ = .88

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .6491$
the school as a penalty for participating in a strike (Table 59).

**Item 35.** 108 teachers (41.06%) agreed or strongly agreed that contracts with individual religious teachers should replace contracts between the diocese or parish and the religious congregation. 19.56% of male religious and 28.98% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 12.80% of male lay and 20.00% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Fifty-two (19.77%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, including 11.58% of male religious, 10.86% of female religious, and 11.20% of male lay teachers. Ninety-nine (37.64%) teachers had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2975 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers favored individual contracts for religious, especially female religious, perhaps because female religious have had more experience with this practice. A significant number of teachers had no opinion on this item (Table 60).

**Item 36.** 163 teachers (61.97%) agreed or strongly agreed that stipends (money) for religious faculty members should be scaled on the same basis as salaries for lay teachers. 32.60% of male religious and 38.39% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 25.60% of the male lay and 26.40% of the female lay teachers agreed
Item 34. The penalty for participation by a religious teacher in a strike should be a transfer from the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} \) = .84

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .5318 \)
Item 35. Contracts with individual religious teachers should replace contracts between the diocese or parish and the religious congregation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .54$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2975$
or strongly agreed with the statement. Forty-three (16.34%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement and fifty-five (20.91%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .2000 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers, especially religious teachers, favored a religious stipend scaled on the lay faculty salary, probably because this would demonstrate the economic equality of the religious teacher with the lay teacher (Table 61).

**Item 37.** 172 teachers (65.39%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that in a deadlock in collective bargaining, the bishop of the diocese should resolve the impasse. 32.60% of the male religious and 28.98% of the female religious teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 37.60% of male lay and 32.00% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Twenty-seven (10.26%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and sixty-two (23.57%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .1185 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers clearly did not want the bishop of the diocese to intervene in a deadlock (Table 62).

**Item 38.** 153 teachers (58.17%) disagreed or strongly disagreed that in a deadlock in collective bargaining, the school board of the diocese should resolve the impasse. 24.63% of male religious and 28.25% of female religious teach-
TABLE 61

Item 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.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .39$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2000$
Table 62

Item 37. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, the bishop of the diocese should resolve the impasse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>3.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of $\bar{X} = .40$

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1185$
ers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. 32.80% of male lay and 31.20% of female lay teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Forty-eight (18.25%) teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, and fifty-four (20.53%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .0598 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers rejected the idea of intervention by the diocesan school board in the case of an impasse (Table 63).

Item 39. 225 teachers (85.55%) agreed or strongly agreed that in a deadlock in collective bargaining, a mediator should be sought who would be mutually acceptable to the teaching personnel and to the school authorities. 39.84% of male religious and 38.40% of female religious teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. 48.00% of male lay and 45.60% of female lay teachers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Five (1.90%) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement and twenty (7.60%) had no opinion. A one-way analysis of variance yielded an F ratio of .5189 which was not significant at the .05 level. Teachers overwhelmingly approved the idea of a mutually agreeable mediator becoming involved in settling an impasse in collective bargaining (Table 64).

Results of Section IV, General Policies Related to Collective Bargaining, revealed the perceptions of respondents
TABLE 63

Item 38. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, the school board of the diocese should resolve the impasse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of \( \bar{X} = \) .27
One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .0598 \)
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TABLE 64

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>̅X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range of ̅X = .53
One-way analysis of variance: F = .5189
to several issues in collective bargaining which may or may not be a part of particular school situations. Respondents indicated that the Catholic bishops of the United States should not attempt to establish a national policy on collective bargaining for secondary schools, and they strongly felt that teachers' grievance policies should be established at the diocesan level. Teachers indicated that they were not in favor of the local religious superior also being the principal of the school at the same time, since this may lead to a conflict of interest. In regard to religious teachers, respondents believed that the local superior should not send religious teachers into the classroom to replace striking lay teachers. They indicated that the stipend for religious teachers should be based on the same salary scale as that of the lay teachers. Respondents indicated that individual contracts for religious teachers were preferable to contracts made between the congregation and the diocese. They also felt that religious teachers should not need to seek the permission of their superior before joining a teachers' organization, although a minority of religious teachers felt that permission was necessary. Respondents indicated that lay teachers should be eligible for all administrative positions in the school. In regard to strikes by teachers, respondents indicated that they did not believe that a "no-strike" clause should be a part of the contract. They also felt that lay
teachers should not be dismissed for participating in a strike and that religious teachers should not be transferred for participating in a strike. In cases of deadlock in negotiations, teachers rejected the intervention of the diocesan bishop and the diocesan school board, but overwhelmingly approved of arbitration by a mutually acceptable mediator to settle the impasse.

**Items for Collective Bargaining.** Section V of the questionnaire for religious teachers and lay teachers contained nineteen items numbered forty to fifty-eight and asked respondents to check whether they considered the item a suitable subject for collective bargaining and on whose behalf the item should be negotiable. Five options were available for respondents to indicate whether the item was non-negotiable, negotiable for lay teachers, negotiable for religious teachers, negotiable for both, or whether the respondent had no opinion. "Negotiable for both" signified that both lay teachers and religious teachers would be involved in the negotiations. The choices were exclusive of each other, in that the respondent could choose only one of the five options. A response of 7% or more by either lay teachers or religious teachers to a particular option was considered noteworthy.

Data gathered for this section are summarized in tables sixty-five to eighty-three. They show a frequency distribution of the responses and the percentage of the total religi-
A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on all items in this section. Raw data was entered into a program on a Commodore 64 computer which computed the F ratio representing the variance. The data yielded by the survey contained three (3) degrees of freedom in the numerator and between two hundred and fifty and three hundred degrees of freedom in the denominator. The F value of significant difference among the respondents was 2.65. The values yielded by the computation of variance ranged from 0.0225 to 0.4251. Since all the values of variance fall well below the 2.65 level, there were no statistically significant differences among sub-groups of respondents at the .05 level. Comparison of the variance values of this section of the survey with the results of sections II, III, and IV show that the variance values of this section, Section V, are even lower than those present in the previous sections. Indeed, in this section the respondents were very similar in their responses to the issues of which items in the area of collective bargaining should be the subject of negotiations. Because the variance values were insignificant they are included in the tables, but not mentioned in the text. The discussion of the items included the areas of strong agreement along with a summary of the data.

Item 40. Salaries for lay teachers. Respondents were divided between indicating this item negotiable for lay teach-
ers or negotiable for both. 29.71% of male religious, 31.15% of female religious, 20.00% of male lay and 27.20% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for lay teachers. 15.90% of male religious, 15.94% of female religious, 14.40% of male lay and 21.60% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. The preference was for negotiable for lay teachers. Lay teachers were adamant in negotiating their own salaries, but some teachers favored making salaries for lay teachers negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 65).

**Item 41.** Salaries for religious teachers. Respondents were divided between indicating this item negotiable for religious teachers or negotiable for both. 28.98% of male religious, 27.53% of female religious, and 26.40% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for religious teachers. 13.04% of male religious, 14.49% of female religious, 12.80% of male lay and 17.60% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Religious teachers were more adamant about negotiating religious salaries than lay teachers (Table 66).

**Item 42.** Leaves of absence. Respondents indicated a strong preference on this item for negotiable for both. 41.30% of male religious, 44.20% of female religious, 29.60% of male lay and 42.40% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Respondents indicated that leaves of ab-
### Table 65

#### V. ITEMS FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Item 40. Salaries for lay teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>Neg-Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = \ .2086$
TABLE 66

Item 41. Salaries for religious teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1358$
sence should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 67).

**Item 43.** Teacher evaluation. Respondents were divided on this item, but a majority indicated a preference for negotiable for both. 36.95% of male religious, 39.85% of female religious, 27.20% of male lay and 44.80% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 7.97% of male religious and 10.86% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated that teacher evaluation should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 68).

**Item 44.** Curriculum changes. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 39.13% of male religious, 49.27% of female religious, 28.00% of male lay and 44.80% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 8.69% of male religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated that curriculum changes should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 69).

**Item 45.** Extra-curricular assignments and compensation. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 42.75% of male religious, 51.44% of female religious, 31.20% of male lay and 47.20% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Respondents indicated that extra-curricular assignments and compensation should be
### TABLE 67

**Item 42. Leaves of absence. (Sabbaticals, personal etc.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Religious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Religious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Lay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Lay</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .0977 \)
### TABLE 68

Item 43. Teacher evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2912$
TABLE 69

Item 44. Curriculum changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance:  $F = 0.1900$
negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 70).

Item 46. Student discipline policies. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 37.68% of male religious, 44.92% of female religious, 30.40% of male lay and 42.40% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 7.97% of male religious and 7.24% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated that student discipline policies should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 71).

Item 47. Class size and teaching load. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 39.13% of male religious, 44.92% of female religious, 31.20% of male lay and 46.40% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Respondents indicated that class size and teaching load should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 72).

Item 48. Policy on substitution for absent teachers. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 37.68% of male religious, 40.57% of female religious, 30.40% of male lay and 44.80% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 10.14% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents in-
TABLE 70

Item 45. Extra-curricular assignments and compensation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th></th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th></th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: F = .0866
TABLE 71

Item 46. Student discipline policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = .0225 \)
TABLE 72

Item 47. Class size and teaching load.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>Neg-Both</th>
<th>Male Religious</th>
<th>Female Religious</th>
<th>Male Lay</th>
<th>Female Lay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>44.92</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>31.20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = 0.1672$
icated that policy for substitution for absent teachers should be negotiable for both religious teachers and lay teachers (Table 73).

**Item 49.** Lunch period and study assignments. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 28.98% of male religious, 42.02% of female religious, 28.80% of male lay and 44.00% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 8.69% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated that lunch period and study assignments should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 74).

**Item 50.** Pension and retirement benefits. Respondents favored making this item negotiable for both, but there was support for having this item negotiable for lay teachers. 34.78% of male religious, 37.68% of female religious, 25.60% of male lay and 41.60% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 10.14% of male religious and 10.14% of male lay teachers indicated negotiable for lay teachers. 9.42% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated that pension and retirement benefits should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 75).

**Item 51.** Procedures for dismissal for teachers. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 34.05% of male religious, 36.95% of female
### TABLE 73


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1937$
TABLE 74

Item 49. Lunch period and study assignments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1363$
TABLE 75

Item 50. Pension and retirement benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1779$
religious, 29.60% of male lay and 43.20% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 11.59% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated the procedures for dismissal for teachers should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 76).

Item 52. Transfers of religious teachers. Respondents indicated that this item should be negotiable for religious teachers. 30.43% of male religious, 21.73% of female religious, 13.60% of male lay and 32.00% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for religious. Smaller percentages, 15.21% of female religious, 12.00% of male lay and 13.60% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 9.42% of female religious indicated non-negotiable. Respondents preferred that the transfer of religious teachers be negotiable for religious teachers (Table 77).

Item 53. Grievance procedures. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 39.13% of male religious, 37.68% of female religious, 27.20% of male lay and 41.60% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Respondents indicated that grievance procedures should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 78).

Item 54. Nominations for principals. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 37.68% of male religious, 31.15% of female religious,
### Table 76

**Item 51. Procedures for dismissal for teachers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .4251$
TABLE 77

Item 52. Transfer of religious teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .1405$
TABLE 78

Item 53. Grievance procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2424$
24.00% of male lay and 35.20% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 13.04% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated that the nomination of principals should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 79).

Item 55. Textbook selection. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 40.57% of male religious, 47.10% of female religious, 28.00% of male lay and 43.20% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Respondents indicated that textbook selection should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 80).

Item 56. Contents of faculty meetings. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 39.13% of male religious, 44.20% of female religious, 28.00% of male lay and 44.80% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Respondents indicated that the contents of faculty meetings should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 81).

Item 57. Time allowances for professional meetings. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 36.23% of male religious, 44.92% of female religious, 31.20% of male lay and 48.00% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. Respondents indicated that time allowances for professional meetings should be ne-
Item 54. Nomination of principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = .2973$
### Item 55. Textbook selection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance:  \( F = 0.0695 \)
TABLE 81

Item 56. Contents of faculty meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: \( F = 0.0657 \)
negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 82).

Item 58. School calendar. Respondents strongly indicated that this item should be negotiable for both. 36.95% of male religious, 42.02% of female religious, 28.80% of male lay and 40.00% of female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both. 7.24% of male religious and 9.42% of female religious teachers indicated non-negotiable. Respondents indicated that school calendar should be negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers (Table 83).

Results of Section V, Items for Collective Bargaining, indicated that respondents generally agreed that the items presented should be negotiable for all teachers. They agreed that both lay teachers and religious teachers should participate in negotiations about leaves of absence, teacher evaluation, curriculum changes, extra-curricular assignments, and compensation, student discipline policies, class size and teaching load, policy on substitution for absent teachers, lunch period and study assignments, pension and retirement benefits, procedures for dismissal for teachers, grievance procedures, nominations for principals, textbook selection, contents of faculty meetings, time allowances for professional meetings, and school calendar. On the item of salaries for lay teachers, a majority of teachers favored negotiations by lay teachers. On the item of salaries for religious teach-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg. Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = 0.1146$
### Item 58. School calendar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Neg.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Lay</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No Opin.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Rel.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Neg-Both</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Religious</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Religious</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Lay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Lay</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-way analysis of variance: $F = 0.0345$
ers, a majority of teachers indicated negotiations for religious teachers. These choices indicate respect for the positions of the group of teachers most intimately involved in the issue. On the item of transfers for religious teachers, many teachers indicated negotiations by religious teachers, but some male lay and female lay teachers indicated negotiable for both lay teachers and religious teachers. In the non-negotiable column a small but persistent percentage of female religious teachers indicated that many items were non-negotiable. A mean of 7.20% of female religious teachers indicated that any item was non-negotiable.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of administrators, religious teachers and lay teachers toward collective bargaining in the Catholic high schools in Illinois. Attitudes toward collective bargaining were obtained through responses to a questionnaire for each group dealing with several aspects of the collective bargaining process and the effects of collective bargaining on the interpersonal relations among principals, religious teachers, and lay teachers.

The study attempted to discover the presence or absence of collective bargaining in the ninety-two Catholic high schools of Illinois. Fifty-four of these schools were within the Archdiocese of Chicago and thirty-eight were located in smaller towns or rural areas outside the Chicago metropolitan area.

The Catholic schools which formed the sample for the study were listed in the Official Catholic Directory, published by the J.P. Kenedy Co., New York, New York, 1983 edition. All principals of the Catholic high schools in Illinois were sent the questionnaire for principals and were asked to return the completed questionnaire with a list of their faculty members. From these faculty lists three religious tea-
chers and three lay teachers were selected at random and sent the questionnaire for religious teachers and the questionnaire for lay teachers respectively. A stamped self-addressed return envelope was enclosed with each mailing. Two follow-up letters were sent to each subject to increase the number of responses.

The questionnaire attempted to determine the attitudes of the subjects toward collective bargaining, as well as their attitudes toward the structures for collective bargaining, general policies related to collective bargaining, and items negotiable for collective bargaining. 333 usable responses formed the data for the study.

Several questions were posed at the beginning of the study to guide the research and the analysis of the data.

These were:

1. What is the status of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in Illinois?

2. Are the factors which led to the formation of collective bargaining in Catholic schools the same as those which led to the formation of collective bargaining in public education?

3. What do principals in Catholic high schools in Illinois feel about teachers' organizations as they relate to their positions as administrators?

4. What is the teaching of the Catholic Church with regard to collective bargaining?
5. What factors have influenced the growth of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in the 1970's and 1980's and what effect have these factors had?

6. What is the place of religious teachers in a Catholic school collective bargaining unit?

7. Do lay teachers and religious teachers feel there is a possible conflict of interest if religious teachers participate in teachers' organizations?

8. What is the appropriate response of Catholic school officials when Catholic school teachers request collective bargaining?

9. What alternatives to collective bargaining are available to Catholic school officials and to Catholic school teachers to obtain legitimate teacher goals?

10. How can labor relations disputes in Catholic schools where collective bargaining is present best be solved?

11. What is the effect of collective bargaining on the familial atmosphere called "community of faith" in a Catholic school?

In answer to these specific questions, the responses of the subjects to fifty-eight items of the questionnaire were analyzed. Frequency distributions and percentages were computed for all items. In addition, a one-way analysis of variance was performed on the results of each item to determine if significant differences existed among the subgroups of respondents. In tables sixteen through eighty-three in
Chapter IV, the responses of the participating administrators, religious teachers and lay teachers to the fifty-eight items were summarized. These tables included the mean scale value for each subgroup as well as the variance ratio for significant difference.

In the review of the literature several topics pertaining to collective bargaining in Catholic schools were discussed. The development of collective bargaining in Catholic schools historically, as well as the process usually followed when teachers seek to bargain with the administration over salary and working conditions were discussed. The history of papal and other official Church teaching about collective bargaining was discussed. The rights of workers, including workers in Catholic schools, was clearly established. The growing proportion of lay teachers in Catholic schools was documented. The literature documented the growth of collective bargaining in Catholic schools during the 1960's and 1970's leading up to the Supreme Court case of 1979. From this time on the momentum for collective bargaining in Catholic schools declined. Weak economic conditions experienced since the late 1970's as well as the decline in enrollment in Catholic schools have also had a retarding effect on the momentum for Catholic school collective bargaining.

The literature indicated that where labor disputes arose, the local bishop retained final authority, and in virtue of the court decision, would have to voluntarily rel-
inquish this authority if an impartial third party agency were to mediate a dispute.

The literature indicated that religious teachers strongly desire to be included in all matters which affect the school. It was maintained that the "community of faith" atmosphere could be maintained at a school where collective bargaining was taking place if a spirit of justice and accommodation were present.

The literature suggested a positive approach to the question of teacher goals in Catholic schools. It suggested that teachers and administrators work together to reach a fair wage and reasonable working conditions. Such cooperation must be an ongoing process not limited to the time of contract negotiations, and which may or may not include formal collective bargaining. The literature suggested that an atmosphere of confidence and trust needs to be present to reach an equitable settlement.

A principal goal of the survey was to discover the presence of collective bargaining in the Catholic high schools of Illinois. The results of the survey indicated that there were fifteen schools which had a formally recognized organization for collective bargaining. All of these bargaining units included membership for lay teachers and six of the fifteen indicated membership was held by religious teachers as well as lay teachers. The results of the study indicated that collective bargaining was more likely to occur in high
schools where male teachers, both lay and religious, were strongly represented, than at high schools where female teachers were more strongly represented. The results indicated that lay-only organizations were more likely to occur than organizations which allowed membership for both lay and religious teachers. In those schools where collective bargaining was not present at the time of the study, religious teachers were more likely to indicate movement in the direction of the formation of a collective bargaining organization than were lay teachers.

In those schools where collective bargaining was not present, a great majority of all categories of respondents indicated that collective bargaining was not likely to be present in the near future. This finding agreed with the information in the review of the literature which pointed out that collective bargaining is growing very slowly, if at all, at the present time.

The study determined that the most important reason for the formation of a collective bargaining unit was the need for representation in decisions about salary and working conditions at the local level. In addition, money allocated for the improvement of school facilities and programs, as well as the success of the American Federation of Teachers, were also strong incentives for the formation of teachers' collective bargaining units. Teachers have become more professional in their own eyes, and the need for participation in
educational planning was also cited by the respondents as a reason for bargaining by the teachers. Results indicated that the issue of teacher representation in many areas of school life, especially salary and working conditions were prime motivators in teachers' bargaining efforts.

The role of the principal in collective bargaining was considered to be an important aspect of the study. Results indicated that principals did not feel threatened by collective bargaining; they felt it would not diminish their authority or their prerogatives in dealing with the faculty or in the administration of the school. Principals sought to remain actively involved in the process of collective bargaining in so far as it was their place, and to strive for a unified staff by building a Christian educational community. Principals clearly perceived that they were a group separate from the teaching staff and should be considered as part of the school administration in the matter of negotiations.

Results of the study indicated that teachers believed in an active and participatory role for religious teachers in all aspects of collective bargaining. Both lay and religious teachers indicated that religious teachers should be legitimately concerned with the secular matters of the school and that religious teachers were free to speak out and become actively involved in the process and practice of collective bargaining, just as lay teachers are free to do so. Teachers did not support the participation of religious
teachers in such activities as picketing or demonstrations, but felt that religious teachers should be considered as teachers first, not as part of the management with regard to collective bargaining. Respondents felt religious teachers were capable of making their own decisions with regard to their support of collective bargaining. Religious teachers clearly indicated that they could be counted on to take a very active part in all school matters, including collective bargaining.

Results of the study indicated that teachers agreed that collective bargaining would improve the professional quality of the schools, but would not damage the interpersonal relations among the administrators, religious teachers, and lay teachers.

The study yielded information about structures for collective bargaining. Respondents indicated that administrators should have a separate organization from that of the teachers in collective bargaining matters. Teachers clearly felt that the initiative for collective bargaining should come from them, and that the National Catholic Education Association should become involved in the process. Respondents felt that lay and religious teachers should be viewed as equal members in the collective bargaining unit, both participating in voting rights, and in the right to become officers of the unit.

In response to a group of diverse questions about coll-
ective bargaining, respondents indicated that the resolution of grievence disputes should be sought at the diocesan level and that the principal of the school should not be the local religious superior. Respondents indicated their preference for an equality of the lay teachers' salary with the religious teachers stipend and would expect the religious teachers to respect a picket line should the lay teachers go on strike. Respondents indicated that both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for all administrative posts in the school. Teachers also indicated their desire to have the freedom to participate in a strike without the threat of losing their jobs. Teachers overwhelmingly chose the arbitration of an impartial third party agency to settle impasse situations.

Results of the study revealed a large degree of agreement that most of the suggested items, as the subject of negotiations, were suitable to be negotiated by both lay teachers and religious teachers. Respondents agreed that all teachers should participate in negotiations about all items which affect both lay teachers and religious teachers equally; such as leaves of absence, teacher evaluation, curriculum changes, extra-curricular assignments, and other matters of concern to both groups. On the item of salaries for lay teachers, a majority of teachers favored making this negotiable for lay teachers. On the item of salaries for religious teachers, a majority of teachers favored making this item negotiable for religious teachers. These choices indicate respect
for the feelings of the group of teachers most intimately involved in the issue.

Conclusions

The study revealed pertinent information about collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in Illinois, as well as useful information on the status of collective bargaining in the Catholic schools nationally. Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions can be drawn.

1. The teaching of the Catholic Church is clear and consistent with regard to collective bargaining. In document after document for the last century, the Church has sided with workers and proclaimed their right to organize in a lawful and peaceful manner for the improvement of their place in life. The Church has recognized workers as partners with management in the necessary production of goods and services. The difficulty comes in getting local administrators to acknowledge these rights and to act in accord with Church teaching.

2. In Illinois there are a limited number of bargaining units in Catholic high schools. In those areas where formal collective bargaining is taking place, it is perceived as a successful means of dealing with the concerns of the teachers for greater participation in determining salary and working conditions. It requires that the administration be prepared for negotiations with a knowledge of finances and other
components present in the total school equation.

3. In those areas where formal collective bargaining is not taking place, the prospect is that it will not be initiated in the near future. The review of the literature indicates that economic conditions in Illinois, as well as the United States as a whole, do not favor the growth of organized labor. The data of the study supports the review of the literature.

4. The factors which led to the formation of collective bargaining in Catholic schools are the same as those which led to the formation of collective bargaining in public education. These include a greater participation in the decision-making process, especially with regard to the setting of salary and the determination of working conditions. Teachers, like workers in other businesses or professions, want an active part in setting the direction of the school. Both religious teachers and lay teachers are willing to become actively involved in collective bargaining in all matters which affect the school.

5. The success of the American Federation of Teachers and other teachers' organizations during the 1960's and 1970's was an important source of stimulus for Catholic school teachers to seek collective bargaining during those years. The review of the literature indicates that since the occasion of the 1979 Supreme Court decision, the momentum
which had been growing in Catholic school teachers' circles for collective bargaining has dropped off sharply. This fact, coupled with the poor economic conditions of the last five years and their effect on organized labor, has brought organizing efforts among Catholic school teachers to a near standstill.

6. Religious teachers have been strong to assert their desire to participate in all matters which affect the Catholic school, including participation in the collective bargaining unit as members who may vote and hold office. In practice, religious teachers are both included and excluded from membership in bargaining units. This is due to the circumstances present at the local site at the time when organizing began. Whether or not they are included in collective bargaining, religious teachers are very interested in what happens to the school and want to exert their proportionate amount of influence. Lay and religious teachers generally felt there was no conflict of interest if religious teachers were part of the bargaining unit. They also felt that collective bargaining, exercised with respect for the rights and privileges of each party, would not damage the interpersonal relations among administrators, religious teachers, and lay teachers.

7. For their part, principals felt that collective bargaining would not abridge their prerogatives as administ-
rators in Catholic schools, but they realized they must be sensitive to those areas of administration dealing with the teaching staff and with decisions involving the teaching staff. Principals who are unfamiliar with collective bargaining show the greatest reluctance to become involved in the process.

It may also be concluded that the issue of collective bargaining involves the gaining of improvements which are perceived as necessary by the teaching staff. Formal collective bargaining is the most commonly recognized way to obtain the goal of greater control over salary and working conditions in business and industry. Among public school teachers there is a strong impetus and precedent for formal bargaining. Many Catholic school teachers' efforts have been stymied by the Supreme Court decision. They must now rely on approaches which appeal to the conscience of the local and diocesan administrators to provide justice for teachers in the matters usually covered by the collective bargaining agreement. From a spirit of fairness, justice, and cooperation, local authorities may voluntarily include the teachers in the decisions which affect them. Such approaches may take many forms, but the goals of greater participation and shared responsibility for the institution will be accomplished. In unresolved disputes, voluntary recourse to an agency such as the American Arbitration Association may provide the solution.
Recommendations

In response to the information and data yielded by this study, some recommendations are offered which may advance the understanding of collective bargaining in Catholic schools.

Effort should be made to publish a comprehensive treatment of Catholic Church teaching with regard to collective bargaining, and collective bargaining for Catholic school teachers.

Catholic school teachers should be alert to the fact that recognition of the bargaining unit must depend on their ability to exert pressure locally and follow through to the bargaining agreement in an effective manner. The fact that school authorities cannot be legally mandated to recognize collective bargaining in Catholic schools does not mean that collective bargaining must become a dead issue.

Catholic school administrators at every level should realize that it is their obligation to preserve the school and meet the legitimate needs of their Catholic school teachers at the same time. They may achieve these goals through a sincere and firm effort to involve all parties in the decisions which shape and affect the school. By voluntarily sharing the burden of the school with those others interested in its future, Catholic school administrators will eliminate the pressure from teachers to seek formal collective
bargaining. By including teachers and parents in the administrative structure, teachers, parents, and administrators may all obtain what each desires for the future of the school. A stable, productive, Christ-centered school will be the outcome.

The continued decline in the number of religious teachers present in Catholic schools nationwide has led to the development of modes of operation at local schools which reflect the changing times. Catholic school people must recognize this religious teacher attrition for what it is—a continuing phenomenon. Catholic schools in which only a handful of religious teachers are present are becoming much more common. Some religious communities have accepted the model that a "religious presence" is their goal, meaning that some religious teachers work in the school in visible capacities. Others have accepted the model of "staffing" a particular school, meaning the religious teachers occupy key positions on the administration or staff as a visible sign of the religious orientation of the school. Many fine Catholic schools exist without the presence of religious teachers or clergy on a regular basis.

Local and diocesan personnel policies and grievance procedures need to be formulated fairly, put in writing, and administered fairly. When teachers and staff members perceive that the administration is firm but fair, the number of problems in the administration of the school declines.
The fact must be faced that these are bad times for organized labor movements of all types in the United States. Those seeking recognition and greater participation in the administration of the institution must balance their desires with knowledge that jobs are not plentiful, which gives the management greater leverage in matters of salary and working conditions.

For the future, the National Catholic Education Association will publish further results of a study of Catholic high schools in the Fall of 1984. This study will include data on collective bargaining nation wide. The progress or lack of progress in this field should be monitored in the next twenty-five years.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

1. Research should be done into the continuing decline in the number of professional religious who will be present in Catholic schools in the future. This will allow for more effective planning.

2. Research should be done into the nature of the key elements of Catholic schools, so that schools which are operated solely by lay persons may continue their Catholic mission.

3. Research should focus on identifying those means of obtaining legitimate teacher goals without the use of formal collective bargaining. In this way the needs of teachers may be addressed even though collective bargaining may not be available to them.
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Dear Principal:

Will you take just a few minutes from your many responsibilities to help both of us learn more about Catholic high schools in Illinois? As the former Principal of St. Edward High School, Elgin, Illinois, I am trying to complete a doctoral program in Administration, and I need your help.

As a principal of one of the ninety-two Catholic high schools in Illinois you are being asked to participate in this project. It is part of a study approved by Loyola University of Chicago to investigate the status of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in Illinois.

In order to obtain a complete picture of collective bargaining in the Catholic high schools in Illinois, it is important that all Catholic schools participate. Will you please complete this questionnaire and return it to me in the attached stamped, self-addressed envelope.

May I ask another favor? Would you please send me a list of the names of the teaching staff at your school with your survey. This list will be used to select two Religious Teachers and two Lay Teachers at random. They will be sent a survey similar to the one you have and will be asked to return it by mail. Home addresses are not necessary, since the survey will be sent to them at school. I realize this is an imposition, but it is an essential part of the randomization procedure necessary to this project. The selected teachers will be assured that their principal does not know who was asked to participate.

All responses will remain anonymous and no individual or school will be named in any report of the research. If you have any questions concerning this project, please call me at (312) 925-6600.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Rev. Richard J. McGrath, OSA
6310 S. Claremont Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60636
A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS IN CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

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): 20 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 ______
   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? Yes ______ No ______

   For the purpose of this study, collective bargaining 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 bargaining for lay teachers only ______ for religious teachers only ______ for both lay teachers and religious teachers ______.
   b. There is a MOVEMENT IN THE DIRECTION OF A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective bargaining for lay teachers only ______ for religious teachers only ______ for both lay and religious teachers ______.
   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 bargaining ______.

2. If there is a teachers' organization in your school, which of the following descriptions would best fit the organization. (Check one)
   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.
   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.
   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 achieving long-range objectives that are mutually agreed on by both the school system and the teachers.

REMARKS OR COMMENTS:
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.)

1. Lay teachers did not have representation at the local level and were dependent for improvements in salaries and working conditions on the unilateral action of the diocesan authorities or administrators in local schools.

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 Catholic schools.

3. Lay teachers have always been regarded only as auxiliaries by religious teachers in the Catholic school system.

4. Lay teachers who have entered the Catholic school 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. Catholic high schools have become so complex in recent years that without collective action the lay teachers would have no real sense of participation in educational planning.

6. The Catholic high school 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 Catholic high school 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 bargaining will affect the following? (Use the scale: 1—agree strongly; 2—agree; 3—disagree; 4—disagree strongly; 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 will be by-passed in educational planning.

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

12. The principal will participate 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 will become more excellent.

17. The principal will be regarded by the lay teachers as part of the administrative team.
18. The lay teachers will 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 diocesan authorities on educational decision-making.

22. The principals should become members of the teachers' organizations in the Catholic high school.

23. The superintendent should consult with the principals before bargaining with the teachers, where this applies.

24. The teachers should consult with the principals before bargaining with the diocese where this applies.

REMARKS OR COMMENTS:

V. 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 questionnaire.

Please include your faculty list with this survey.
APPENDIX B
A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS
IN CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Dear Religious Teacher:

Those of us dedicated to Catholic education in Catholic high schools are interested in learning more about the unique contribution we make to the teaching mission of the Church. With your help we can learn about the status of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in Illinois in 1984, and the attitudes of teachers like yourself toward it. This study was approved by Loyola University of Chicago. The sample includes Principals, Religious Teachers, and Lay Teachers from every Catholic high school in Illinois.

You were selected at random from a list of all the members of the teaching staff of your school. Your principal does not know you were selected.

Will you please complete this survey and return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope attached. All responses will remain anonymous and no individual or school will be named in any report of the research. Responses should be made with your school or school system in mind. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Father Richard McGrath

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 ___ Female ___

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

3. Type of school: Community-owned ___ Archdiocesan ___ Parish ___

4. Years of teaching experience: _______

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?
   Yes ___ No ___

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

8. Do you hold state certification in one or more fields of preparation? Yes ___ No ___

9. Was a contract signed between you and your principal, or another school administrator?
   Yes ___ No ___

10. How many of your teaching assignments are in your major field?
    Less than one half ___ One half ___ More than one half ___

11. In your opinion, what is the level of prestige that lay teachers have in your school?
    High ___ Medium ___ Low ___ Not certain ___

12. Please check the one statement which applies to your current school:
    a. There is a RECOGNIZED TEACHERS’ ORGANIZATION for collective bargaining for lay teachers only ___ for religious teachers only ___ for both lay teachers and religious teachers ___
    b. There is a MOVEMENT IN THE DIRECTION OF A TEACHERS’ ORGANIZATION for collective bargaining for lay teachers only ___ for religious teachers only ___ for both lay and religious teachers ___
    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 bargaining ____.
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For the purpose of this study, collective bargaining 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 BARGAINING

A. Role of Religious Teachers

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

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 bargaining.

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

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 bargaining.

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

B. Outcomes

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

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

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

14. The growth of collective bargaining 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 bargaining, the religious teachers will usually vote as a bloc.

III. STRUCTURES FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

16. For collective bargaining, the principals and the assistant principals in the schools should have their own organization rather than hold membership in the teachers’ organization.
THE FIVE RESPONSES POSSIBLE FOR EACH STATEMENT ARE:
SA—Strongly Agree; A—Agree; N—No Opinion; D—Disagree; SD—Strongly Disagree

17. The Superintendents and Principals should take the initiative in organizing for collective bargaining in these schools.
18. The National Catholic Educational Association should move into the field of collective bargaining and become actively engaged in the bargaining process.
19. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective bargaining.
20. Both religious and lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in the same organization for collective bargaining but religious teachers on a non-voting basis.
21. Only lay teachers should be eligible for full membership in a teachers' organization for collective bargaining.
22. Religious teachers should have their own organization, separate from that of lay teachers, for collective bargaining.
23. A professional association would be more desirable than a teachers' union for purposes of collective bargaining.
24. A faculty senate, similar to the senate frequently found on the college or university level, would be a more appropriate organization for collective bargaining 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 bargaining.

IV. GENERAL POLICIES RELATED TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
26. The Catholic Bishops of the United States should establish a national policy for all Catholic secondary schools regarding collective bargaining.
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 bargaining, 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 of 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 diocese 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 bargaining, the bishop of the diocese should resolve the impasse.
38. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, the school board of the diocese should resolve the impasse.
39. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, a mediator should be sought who would be mutually acceptable to the teaching personnel and to the school authorities.
V. ITEMS FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Note by a check ✓ in the appropriate box 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>Non-Negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable for Lay Teachers</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Negotiable for Religious</th>
<th>Negotiable for Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Salaries for lay teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Salaries for religious teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Leaves of absence. (Sabbaticals, personal etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Teacher evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Curriculum changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Extra-curricular assignments and compensation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Student discipline policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Class size and teaching load.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Lunch period and study assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Pension and retirement benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Procedures for dismissal for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Transfer of religious teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Grievance procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Nomination of principals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Textbook selection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Contents of faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Time allowances for professional meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. School calendar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR LAY TEACHERS
IN CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS ON COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Dear Lay Teacher,

Those of us dedicated to Catholic education in Catholic high schools are interested in learning more about the unique contributions of lay teachers to the Catholic school in the United States. We also are interested in learning about the status of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in Illinois in 1984 and the attitudes of teachers like yourself toward it. This study was approved by Loyola University of Chicago. The sample includes Principals, Religious Teachers, and Lay Teachers from every Catholic high school in Illinois.

You were selected at random from a list of all the members of the teaching staff of your school. Your principal does not know you were selected.

Will you please complete this survey and return it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope attached? All responses will remain anonymous and no individual or school will be named in any report of the research. Responses should be made with your school or school system in mind. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Father Richard M. Geath

I. GENERAL INFORMATION: In each section please check (V) the space following the description which most closely describes your situation.

1. Status: Single ______ Married ______

2. Sex: Male ______ Female ______

3. Age (last birthday): 20 and under ____ 30-39 ____ 40-49 ____ 50-59 ____ 60 or over ______

4. Type of school: Community-owned ______ Archdiocesan ______ Parish ______

5. Years of teaching experience: ______

6. Highest level of education which you have attained:
   a. No degree ______
   b. Baccalaureate Degree ______
   c. Master's Degree plus ______
   d. Doctor's Degree ______

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

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

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 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) ______

10. Do you hold a state certification in one or more fields of preparation? Yes ______ No ______

11. Was a contract signed between you and your principal or another school administrator? Yes ______ No ______

12. How many of your teaching assignments are in your major field? Less than one half ______ One half ______ More than one half ______

13. Is it necessary for you to hold another job during the school year to supplement your income? Yes ______ No ______

14. In your opinion, what is the level of prestige that lay teachers have in your school? High ______ Medium ______ Low ______ Not certain ______

15. Do you intend to remain in Catholic education? Yes ______ No ______

Why or why not? _____

16. If your answer to question 15 is NO, do you intend to remain in the teaching profession? Yes ______ No ______

17. Please check the one statement which applies to your current school:
   a. There is a RECOGNIZED TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective bargaining for lay teachers only ______
   b. There is a MOVEMENT IN THE DIRECTION OF A TEACHERS' ORGANIZATION for collective bargaining for lay teachers only ______
   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 bargaining ______.
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

For the purpose of this study, collective bargaining is defined as a method of determining conditions of employment by means of negotiations between representatives of the employer and representatives of the employees. 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 BARGAINING

A. Role of Religious Teachers

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

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 bargaining.

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

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 bargaining.

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

B. Outcomes

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

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

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

14. The growth of collective bargaining 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 bargaining, the religious teachers will usually vote as a bloc.

III. STRUCTURES FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

16. For collective bargaining, the principals and the assistant principals in the schools should have their own organization rather than hold membership in the teachers' organization.
IV. GENERAL POLICIES RELATED TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

26. The Catholic Bishops of the United States should establish a national policy for all Catholic secondary schools regarding collective bargaining.  
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 bargaining, 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 of 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 diocese 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 bargaining, the bishop of the diocese should resolve the impasse.  
38. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, the school board of the diocese should resolve the impasse.  
39. In a deadlock in collective bargaining, a mediator should be sought who would be mutually acceptable to the teaching personnel and to the school authorities.
V. ITEMS FOR COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Note by a check ✓ in the appropriate box 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>Non-Negotiable</th>
<th>Negotiable for Lay Teachers</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Negotiable for Religious</th>
<th>Negotiable for Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Salaries for lay teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Salaries for religious teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Leaves of absence. (Sabbaticals, personal etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Teacher evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Curriculum changes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Extra-curricular assignments and compensation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Student discipline policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Class size and teaching load.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Lunch period and study assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Pension and retirement benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Procedures for dismissal for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Transfer of religious teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Grievance procedures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Nomination of principals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Textbook selection.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Contents of faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Time allowances for professional meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. School calendar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
April 5, 1984

Dear Principal,

About two weeks ago you were one of ninety-two Catholic high school principals in the state of Illinois who received a questionnaire-type instrument in connection with a research project approved by Loyola University of Chicago. This form does not take long to complete: the time required by most individuals varies from ten to fifteen minutes.

Another copy of the questionnaire has been enclosed for your convenience. May I ask you to please complete the questionnaire and return it with a copy of your faculty list? Your prompt attention and cooperation will be greatly appreciated as it is a prerequisite to the success of this research. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rev. Richard McGrath, OSA
April 30, 1984

Dear Principal:

About six weeks ago you were one of ninety-two Catholic high school principals in Illinois who received a questionnaire-type instrument in connection with a research project approved by Loyola University of Chicago. This form does not take long to complete; the time required is between ten and fifteen minutes.

Enclosed is another copy of the questionnaire for your convenience. Your responses will be strictly confidential; all replies are anonymous, and no individual or school will be named in any report of the research. May I ask you to please complete the questionnaire and return it with a copy of your faculty list?

Your prompt attention and cooperation will be greatly appreciated. If the person to whom this letter is addressed is no longer in the position, the new or acting administrator should respond to the questionnaire. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rev. Richard J McGrath, OSA
May 6, 1984

Dear Teacher:

About three weeks ago you were one of a few teachers in your school who received a questionnaire-type instrument in connection with a research project approved by Loyola University of Chicago. This form does not take long to complete: the time required by most individuals varies from five to ten minutes.

Another copy of the questionnaire has been enclosed for your convenience. May I ask you to please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope? Your prompt attention and cooperation will be greatly appreciated: it is a prerequisite to the completion of this research. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Fr. Richard McGrath, OSA
May 24, 1984

Dear Teacher:

About three weeks ago you were one of three teachers in your school who received a questionnaire-type instrument in connection with a research project approved by Loyola University of Chicago. This form does not take long to complete: the time required by most individuals varies from five to ten minutes.

Another copy of the questionnaire has been enclosed for your convenience. May I ask you to please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope? Your prompt attention and cooperation will be greatly appreciated: it is a prerequisite to the completion of this research. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Fr. Richard McGrath, OSA
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