

Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy

Volume 0 *National Center Proceedings 2018*

Article 34

April 2018

Research Panel: Faculty Unionization at Religiously-Affiliated Institutions

Michele Nelson

Iona College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba>

 Part of the [Collective Bargaining Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nelson, Michele (2018) "Research Panel: Faculty Unionization at Religiously-Affiliated Institutions," *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy*: Vol. 0 , Article 34.

Available at: <https://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba/vol0/iss13/34>

This Proceedings Material is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy by an authorized editor of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

SENIOR-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
AT CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Michele Lynn Nelson

BA, Wagner College, 2003
MSED, Fordham University, 2009

Mentor

Gerald M. Cattaro, EdD

Readers

Sheldon Marcus, EdD
Charles J. Russo, JD, EdD

DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK
2017

COPYRIGHT

© Michele Nelson, 2017, All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would be nowhere in life without my parents, Kip and Lee Sampson, whose commitment to my education, faith in my abilities, and unending love and encouragement have made this degree possible. I would also like to acknowledge my husband, Donny Nelson, for his support, love, and friendship throughout this massive undertaking. Next, I share sincere gratitude with my friends and extended family who have always cared for and believed in me.

My educational journey began at Wagner College, where my professor and the now president, Dr. Richard Guarasci, asked this first-generation college freshman what she was going to do for graduate school. I will forever be grateful to him for planting the seed and demonstrating faith in my ability to pursue a higher degree.

As a full-time administrator at Iona College while pursuing this degree, I was blessed with amazing colleagues and friends who always asked me about my progress and encouraged me along my way. I can never thank them enough for their kindness and investment in me. I specifically want to share my deepest gratitude with President Joseph E. Nyre, whose continued encouragement and assistance made this study possible.

My Fordham University CLP cohort-mates helped me get through the coursework and encouraged me through my study and the many long hours of writing and rewriting. Thank you! And I would be remiss if I did not sincerely thank the Graduate School of Education faculty and specifically, my dissertation mentor, Dr. Gerald Cattaro, as well as my readers, Dr. Sheldon Marcus and Dr. Charles Russo (University of Dayton), for their expert advice, edits, and motivation! You helped me achieve a dream! I am truly blessed!

Finally, I offer my sincere appreciation to the senior leaders who participated in this study around this important topic.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
NOTICE OF COPYRIGHT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
ABSTRACT	1
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	2
Problem Statement	2
Purpose of Study	4
Significance of the Study	5
Overview of Study and Limitations	13
Definition of Terms	14
Outline	16
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	18
Introduction	18
Development of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education	18
Union Development	18
Union Pros and Cons	21
Politics and Government Influence	23
Collective Bargaining at Faith-Based Colleges and Universities	27
Catholic Social Teaching	31
Introduction to Catholic Social Teaching	31
Rerum Novarum	33
Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction	38

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Quadragesimo Anno	39
Nova Impendet	42
Mater et Magistra	42
Pacem in Terris	45
Gaudium et Spes	46
Populorum Progressio	48
Octogesima Adveniens	49
Justice in the World	51
Laborem Exercens	53
Sollicitudo Rei Socialis	55
Centesimus Annus	56
Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy	57
Evangelii Gaudium	58
Catholic Social Teaching and Collective Bargaining Today	60
Communities of Faith	63
Review of Related Research	68
Primary and Secondary School Research	68
College and University Related Research	79
Conclusion	84
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	85
Research Proposal	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Research Methodology	86
Transcendental Phenomenological Approach	86
Researcher Role	88
Participants and Access	88
Study Design and Procedures	89
Interview Protocol and Questions	91
Data Analysis	93
Conclusion	95
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS	97
Introduction	97
Interview Process and Participants	97
Data Analysis	99
Research Questions	100
Primary Research Question Findings	100
Introduction to Primary Research Question Findings	100
Historical/Personal Benefit of Unions	101
Direct Relationship with Campus Educational Community	102
No (More) Unions	104
Preventing Union Growth	104
Summary of Primary Research Question Findings	107
Related Question One	108
Introduction to Related Question One Findings	108

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
Internal Factors	109
External Factors	128
Summary of Findings	135
Related Question Two	136
Related Question Three	140
Conclusion	143
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND FUTURE RESEARCH	144
Introduction	144
Statement of the Problem	144
Review of Methodology	145
Summary of Findings	146
Discussion: Implications of Findings	147
Findings and Previous Research	147
Findings and Catholic Social Teachings	152
Recommendations for Catholic Campus Leadership	155
Limitations	156
Suggestions for Future Research	157
Conclusion	159
REFERENCES	161
APPENDECIES	
APPENDIX A: PARTICIPANT INVITATION LETTER	169
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	172

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT FORM	174
APPENDIX D: IRB APPROVAL	178

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participating Institution Union Experience	98
2. Primary Research Question Findings	101
3. Internal and External Factors Affecting Senior-Level Administrator Perceptions of Collective Bargaining at Catholic Colleges and Universities	109

Abstract

SENIOR-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
AT CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Michele Lynn Nelson

Fordham University, New York, 2017

Mentor:

Gerald M. Cattaro, EdD

The economic, political, social, and other factors that spurred union growth in higher education during the 1960s and 1970s parallel some of the circumstances affecting union growth in higher education today. From 2012 to 2016 there was significant growth in collective bargaining efforts at colleges and universities with the most significant growth at private institutions. Catholic colleges, grounded in Catholic Social Teachings, have responded to collective bargaining efforts in different ways: some remaining neutral and some challenging the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board over their institutions. This transcendental phenomenological qualitative study attempts to learn the perceptions of senior-level Catholic college administrators about collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities.

The findings indicate that participating senior leaders at these institutions were generally supportive of collective bargaining, but they did not want union growth on their campuses. They preferred collegial, direct relationships with their staffs. Participants also disagreed about which constituents had the right to unionize. Further, Catholic Social Teachings about worker rights generally influenced their perception of collective bargain. Other significant factors contributing to participants' perceptions included their leadership style and professional experience with unions, fiscal pressures, and concerns about increased government regulation and interference, both as it relates to National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction and more broadly to other aspects of federal, state, and local government.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

“Unionization is the reality produced by labor and management, the product of conflict and accommodation as competing ideas of a union are brought together on a crowded organizational stage” (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988, p. 3).

As early as 1976 in his article, “Will the Academy Survive Unionization?” Fred Crossland predicted significant union growth in higher education for both faculty and non-faculty groups by 2000. He attributed union growth in the 1970s to a number of factors including inflation, the success of unions in other industries, declining student enrollment, layoffs, increased competition for students, and government influence. As of 2016, Crossland’s predictions have come true. Increased numbers of full and part-time faculty, graduate assistants, resident assistants, and even student athletes have sought collective bargaining with this biggest growth coming at private, non-profit colleges and universities from 2012 to 2016 (DeCew, 2003; Flaherty, 2016c; Green, 2015; Herbert, 2016). In *Unionization and the Academy* (2003), DeCew argued that something significant had to happen for faculty to consider breaking with the independent nature of faculty culture and consider working collectively for a greater purpose. DeCew then highlighted contextual realities present in the 1970s with those present today, which have contributed to increased interest in unionization at colleges and universities.

National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) v. Pacific Lutheran University (Pacific Lutheran; 2014) also contributed to increased interest in collective bargaining at private and religiously affiliated institutions. The NLRB’s order opened the door to collective bargaining when it asserted federal jurisdiction over private and religiously affiliated colleges and universities that had been protected from federal jurisdiction after two precedent-setting court cases: *NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago* (1979) and *NLRB v. Yeshiva University* (1980).

So far, more than 35 of the almost 250 Catholic colleges, universities, and seminaries in the United States have some form of collective bargaining on their campus including nine cases currently under review by the NLRB (Herbert, 2016). Most of the NLRB orders since *Pacific Lutheran* have upheld the precedent set by the Pacific Lutheran case and applied federal jurisdiction over private, religiously affiliated schools, affirming their employees' right to organize. *Pacific Lutheran* could ultimately affect as many as 68,000 faculty at Catholic colleges and universities and 90,000 faculty at other religiously affiliated colleges and universities (Parker & Park, 2015).

Senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities must now decide how to respond to increased interest in unions at their faith-based institutions. Institutions such as Chicago University of Loyola, Saint Xavier University, DePaul University, and Seattle University have challenged NLRB jurisdiction over their faith-based institutions. Others such as Georgetown University (DC), St. Mary's College (CA), and St. Michael's College (VT) have remained neutral and let workers choose how they want to be represented.

Workers at Catholic institutions have frequently used the Church's own teachings to justify their right to organize. The foundation for these teachings come from Catholic Social Thought, and specifically, from Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (1891). In *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo responded to the rise of the Industrial Revolution and the developing two-class system. The Pope was very concerned about the conditions of the working poor and felt it was the Church's responsibility to help lead social change.

Institutions such as Georgetown University have embraced Catholic Social Teaching and acknowledged the rights of the worker in its Just Employment Policy. This policy was cited as a major influencing factor in the institution's decision to remain neutral during numerous

collective bargaining process on its campus (Kalmanovitz Initiative, 2015). However, many other Catholic colleges and universities such as Saint Xavier University and Duquesne University have chosen to fight collective bargaining efforts. It remains to be seen what factors and experiences influence these actions. Faced with a new NLRB precedent allowing federal jurisdiction over faith-based schools and Church teachings supporting the rights of the worker, senior-level college and university administrators must decide how to respond to these and other internal and external pressures influencing their public and private response to collective bargaining efforts.

Purpose of the Study

A variety of scholars have investigated factors influencing faculty and administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at primary and secondary Catholic schools (Olsen, 1971; Russo, 1990). Yet, to date, no researchers have tried to understand how senior-level administrators perceive of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities and the factors and experiences that influence their decisions. The purpose of this research, then, is to study how senior-level administrators perceive collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities and to describe in greater detail how these administrators view the processes and factors that affect this perception. In achieving this purpose, the research adds to the body of knowledge propagated in this area of collective bargaining practice.

This study examines whether college leaders in Catholic institutions of higher education think unions pose a threat to academia. It also considers these leaders' views as to whether and in what ways union activity conflicts with academic values of shared governance and academic freedom or creates adversarial relationships between faculty, staff and administration (DeCew, 2003). Further questions address whether unions create financial hardship for institutions already

challenged by decreasing enrollment and increasing costs and/or whether unions threaten religious identities, religious freedom, and/or communities of faith. While struggling with these questions, senior campus leaders must also decide if or how Catholic Social Teachings apply to collective bargaining efforts on their campuses.

This research takes the form of a transcendental phenomenological study to answer the following research question, “How do senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities perceive collective bargaining?” Additional related research questions include: “What internal and external factors and experiences affect these perceptions?” “How does Catholic Social Teaching affect these perceptions?” “Do these perceptions change with regard to full-time faculty unions? Part-time or contingent faculty unions? Staff unions?”

Significance of the Study

This study is particularly important because the factors that led to increased unionization in the 1960s and 1970s continue to influence colleges and universities today. For example, in the 1970s fewer students entered higher education, which meant smaller enrollments diminished need for faculty (DeCew, 2003). Today, parts of the United States, especially the Northeast, have experienced particularly significant declines in the number of high school graduates, which influences the number of traditionally aged students entering higher education (National Center, 2016). Fewer students translates to less tuition revenue and cost-saving measures. Government at all levels have reduced funding to colleges and universities, leaving them more dependent on tuition revenue (Wieder, 2013) and more desperate to cut costs (Kalmanovitz Initiative, 2015).

One popular cost-cutting measure is the growing reliance on adjunct or contingent faculty who are compensated at a fraction of full-time faculty members’ salaries, have little to no job security, are hired from semester to semester, are easily not rehired, and often do not receive

benefits (Hendershott, 2015; Russo, 2014). Researchers have found that between 1969 and 1970, adjunct faculty made up about 18.5 to 22 percent of instructional appointments in higher education (Kalmanovitz Initiative, 2015; Kezar & Maxey, 2013). In contrast, in 2015, contingent faculty are the “new faculty majority,” constituting 75.5% of instructional staff, including part-time faculty, full-time non-tenure track faculty, and graduate assistants (Kalmanovitz Initiative, 2015).

This means that as that as a result of growth in part-time faculty, more than 1.3 million of the total 1.8 million faculty members at colleges and universities in 2015 are “contingent” faculty. At least 650,000 of these contingent faculty serve as part-time adjuncts (Clarke, 2016). The increase of part-time faculty is especially prevalent at community colleges for reasons beyond the scope of this study (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). However, a study by the Faculty Forward Network (2015) noted that similar trends exist in Jesuit colleges and universities. While many Jesuit college leaders challenge the methodology of the Faculty Forward study, the data on faculty composition are still consistent with national trends (Clarke, 2016).

The institutional cost savings from employing contingent faculty remains significant. In 2004, researchers found that part-time adjunct faculty made 60% less than full-time, tenure-track faculty if they were compared on an hourly basis. In 2015, the for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University reported that, on average, colleges universities paid part-time adjunct faculty members about \$2,700 per course and offered healthcare benefits to only about 51% of part-time adjunct faculty. Moreover, institutions have capped the number of courses that a part-time faculty member can teach to avoid the healthcare requirements under the Affordable Care Act (Kezar & Maxey, 2013). Notwithstanding the second-class status of adjunct faculty, the increased reliance on them by colleges and universities has reduced the power and influence of

tenure-track faculty and led these faculty to a state of concern about their own job security (Jaschik, 2015). The Faculty Forward Network reported that almost 25% of all tenured and non-tenure track faculty reported feeling insecure in their jobs, providing more reasons for faculty interest in collective bargaining (2015).

Amid changes in faculty composition, the nature of adjunct faculty has shifted. Adjuncts are no longer working professionals who earn a stipend in their free time for teaching a class or two based on their professional expertise (Sinyai, 2015). Only 8% of respondents in the Faculty Forward Network (2015) study of Jesuit colleges and universities reported being “traditional” adjuncts whose primary career is outside of academia. Fewer tenure-track lines has resulted in individuals with newly earned doctoral degrees entering the workforce unable to find full-time, tenure-track jobs. These adjuncts piece together courses at different universities and barely make enough to survive. As a result, they often travel between campuses trying to teach four or five courses per semester to make a living wage. Faculty frustrated with both their wages and quality of life are more inclined to support collective bargaining efforts (Russo, 2014).

Another significant adjunct-related incident has fueled collective bargaining efforts. Margaret Mary Vojtko, 83, was a 25-year contingent faculty member who taught French at Duquesne University, a Catholic university in Pennsylvania. Vojtko made about \$10,000/year as a part-time adjunct with no health insurance. Shortly after the university did not renew her teaching contract, Vojtko was diagnosed with cancer. She died in September 2013. Nearly homeless at that time, Vojtko became the poster child for the adjunct labor movement (Sanchez, 2013).

In addition to the increased use of contingent faculty, government overreach and increased regulation have resulted in increased faculty interest in unions. Faculty feel the

demands for improved student learning outcomes, assessment, and accountability (Jaschik, 2015). For much of his presidency, the Obama administration actively worked to tie federal funding programs to institutions' educational and economic outcomes. President Obama's goal was to tie college affordability, performance, and value to federal aid (U.S. Department of Education [USDE], n.d.). Some states have already done so.

Under President Obama's leadership, the Education Department successfully developed the College Scorecard to rate colleges based on educational "cost, value, and quality" (Duncan, 2013, para. 4). The data from the Scorecard have two main functions: "increasing accountability for the federal investment in higher education and making better information available to consumers" (Studley, 2014, para. 2). As a result, colleges and universities must become more affordable while producing better outcomes. Faculty often feel this pressure from their administrations and from the public and have responded negatively to the increased bureaucratization in their jobs.

All of these influences have reduced the power and influence of faculty since *Yeshiva* (Jaschik, 2015). Yet, the Faculty Forward Network survey (2015) reported that only 18% of Jesuit school faculty respondents felt they had a say in decision making at their institutions, only 33% agreed they had input on curriculum, only 20% said administration consulted with them about faculty concerns and needs, and only 24% said their governance structure allowed for faculty to have an appropriate say in decision making. Therefore, faculty seeking a true say in institutional decision making may be more inclined to seek and support collective bargaining.

The most significant development leading to the importance of this proposed study is *Pacific Lutheran* (2014), the NLRB's most relevant case that has significantly opened the doors for unionization at religiously affiliated institutions. The NLRB ruled that adjunct faculty

members at Pacific Lutheran University (PLU) have the right to unionize for two main reasons: the adjunct faculty do not qualify as managers, which would exempt them from the NLRB's jurisdiction, and the institution is not religious enough to qualify for the exemption (Jaschik, 2015). To date, the PLU adjuncts have pulled their petition and decided not to count their union votes while in negotiation with their administration over their concerns (Flaherty, 2015). However, the precedent has been set for new cases. Since 2013, over 11,000 contingent faculty have organized (Parker & Park, 2015).

Pacific Lutheran (2014) is significant because in it the NLRB created new tools making it likely that unionization will increase at private and religiously affiliated institutions. One set of new tools will help determine if faculty are managerial. For faculty to be managerial, they must “actually or effectually exercise control over decision making pertaining to central policies of the university such that they are aligned with management” (p. 14) in the following areas, “academic programs, enrollment management policies, finances, academic policies, and personnel policies and decisions, giving greater weight to the first three areas than the last two” (p. 14). The faculty must also play a significant role in governance.

Administrators must “almost always” follow faculty recommendations/decisions and minimally review these decisions, if at all, before implementing them. Which faculty are involved in decision making is also relevant. The Board is interested in whether contingent faculty have the same rights and power as full-time, tenure track faculty. Administrators must be able to demonstrate, not just in writing, how all faculty have control over decision making (*Pacific Lutheran*, 2014).

In a discussion about *Pacific Lutheran*, William Herbert, executive director of The National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education and the Professions,

Gary Rhodes, director of The Center for the Study of Higher Education, and Scott Jaschik, editor for *Inside Higher Ed*, agreed that the NLRB moved the burden of proof to administrators.

Jaschik argued that many faculty can already point to a number of public decisions from institutions where administrators cut programs and created new online programs making it difficult for those institutions to prove that faculty are managerial under the new standards and therefore make it easier for them to move toward collective bargaining (Green, 2015).

The NLRB also created another set of “tools” in *Pacific Lutheran* to determine if the NLRB has jurisdiction over schools identifying as religious. To remain outside of the NLRB’s jurisdiction, an institution must “hold itself out as providing a religious education environment” (NLRB, 2014, p. 6) and the school “holds out the petitioned-for faculty members as performing a religious function” (p. 6). The Board did not believe that the adjunct faculty at PLU perform a religious function. The Board has allowed previous cases to be reviewed in light of the new standards. Therefore, cases at Saint Xavier University, Duquesne University, and others will return to their regional boards for review (Flaherty, 2015).

So far, the NLRB has ruled that faculty at these institutions have the right to collectively bargain. Only most recently, in August 2016, the NLRB decided that part-time faculty in the Department of Theology and Religious Studies and in the School of Theology and Ministry at Seattle University and the Department of Religious Studies at St. Xavier University excluded from the bargaining units because these adjuncts are perceived as having a religious function (Flaherty, 2016b).

PLU, Duquesne University, DePaul University, Saint Xavier University, and others have chosen to challenge the NLRB’s jurisdiction over their religiously affiliated institutions and/or their faculties’ right to organize. However, other Catholic colleges and universities have chosen

to remain neutral in collective bargaining development on their campuses and waived their First Amendment rights to challenge it based on federal jurisdiction. As a result of both *Pacific Lutheran* and increasing numbers of religiously affiliated institutions that have chosen to remain “neutral,” Catholic colleges and universities are likely to see increased unionization on their campuses.

Finally, and even more recently, the Office of General Counsel, responsible for the overall supervision of the NLRB and investigations into unfair labor practices, issued a controversial memorandum (Griffin, 2017) to all Regional Directors on faculty and student rights. The memo offered a brief history of relevant cases covering the NLRB’s decisions about jurisdiction over religiously-affiliated colleges and universities, managerial employees, graduate students and other student assistants, medical interns, and student athletes. Griffin (2017) closed by asserting:

We merely determine here that the application of the statutory definition of employee and the common-law test lead to the conclusion that Division I FBS scholarship players are employees under NLRA, and that they therefore have the right to be protected from retaliation when they engage in concerted activities for mutual aid and protection. (p. 23)

Therefore, this memo emphasized that many college employees, including students, are covered and protected by the National Labor Relations Act and can seek redress if faced with unfair labor practices.

This research study is therefore practical and timely given how *Pacific Lutheran* and the 2017 General Counsel Memorandum opens the door for more private and religious college and university collective bargaining. The study assessed what factors and experiences affected senior campus leader perceptions of collective bargaining and if Catholic Social Teaching

influenced their perception of unionization. Through the lived experiences of presidents and/or senior-level administrators, this study should help readers better understand the experience of this phenomenon facing our senior Catholic campus leaders and perhaps how to better navigate it.

Catholic Social Teaching is the conceptual framework underlining this study. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB, 2005) identified seven themes of Catholic Social Teaching: life and human dignity; family, community, and participation; option for the poor; rights and responsibilities; dignity of the worker and worker rights; solidarity; and stewardship of God's creation. This research focuses on Catholic Social Teachings about the rights of the worker which may impact senior-level college and university administrators' experience when faced with collective bargaining on their campuses.

Since *Rerum Novarum*, numerous Papal and Bishop's conference publications, such as *Economic Justice for All* (1986), have supported workers' rights. They also encourage a fair relationship between "capitol and labor." Some of the principles from these teachings include: owners/managers should respect the dignity of the worker; workers have a right to a just wage; authorities have a responsibility to care for the poor and society; and those in control should respect freedom of religion and allow workers to obey their religious duties. Catholic Social Teachings also suggests that a greater social dimension of work exists that affects the common good. Finally, Catholic Social Teachings both respect the right to private property as well as the worker's right to organize.

Rerum Novarum (1891) lays the foundation for the right of the worker to organize. Pope Leo XIII wrote, "We may lay down as a general and lasting law that working men's association should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining

what is aimed at, that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost body, soul, and property” (para. 57). Full and part-time faculty as well as staff at colleges and universities have called upon leaders at Catholic colleges and universities to acknowledge their own Church’s teachings and recognize workers who wish to collectively bargain.

Overview of Study and Limitations

This qualitative transcendental phenomenological study sought to learn about the lived experience of at least six to eight senior-level administrators at different very small to mid-sized, four-year Catholic colleges and universities in the United States who see the increase in private and public collective bargaining efforts around the country and could be directly affected by the PLU decision. This researcher focused on the very small to mid-sized, 4-year Catholic colleges in the Northeast where leaders were more accessible and the number of high school graduates is on the decline. The researcher relied on snowball sampling with assistance from a current senior-level Catholic college administrator interested in this proposed study to identify and gain access to these regional leaders.

The researcher conducted 60 to 90-minute interviews with these senior-level administrators and offered the interview transcripts to these participants for member-checking. The researcher also analyzed public statements about collective bargaining efforts on participants’ campuses and statements issued by these Catholic campus leaders in the Northeast. Finally, the researcher analyzed any collective bargaining agreements, if they existed, at participants’ institutions, to see if any themes arose that add to our understanding of the senior leaders’ experience with collective bargaining.

The study had some limitations. First, the study focused on college and university presidents as chief decision makers, if possible, and other senior-level administrators, as needed.

In so far as presidents are busy, the researcher had limited access to these and other senior-level administrators at a limited number of Catholic colleges and universities. The researcher conducted interviews and used member-checking and document analysis to triangulate her data.

Another significant limitation to this study may have been participant's willingness to provide open and forthright answers about a controversial topic. The researcher worked to ensure the confidentiality of participants to try to encourage participants' honest responses. However, this is a likely concern. Finally, the sample size of six to eight participants was likely too small to draw generalizable conclusions about Catholic college and university leaders in general or to suggest any universal themes about what influences senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining. However, the results provided some insight into the lived experience of senior-level leaders responding to collective bargaining trends at faith-based colleges and universities.

Definition of Terms

Catholic College, University, or Seminary: The USCCB (2016a) identifies 247 degree-granting institutions of Catholic higher education within the United States. These are the institutions referred to as "Catholic" in this dissertation.

Catholic Social Teaching: The USCCB defined Catholic Social Teaching as "a rich treasure of wisdom about building a just society and living lives of holiness amidst the challenges of modern society" (2016b) as shared in various papal encyclicals and other Church documents, some of which are discussed in Chapter II.

Community of Faith: *To Teach as Jesus Did* (1972) by the USCCB defined the characteristics of an educational community of faith. The USCCB argued that an educational community served as a model for how to live in the greater world: "Community is central to

educational ministry both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal...” (p. 4, Section 13). Building a community of faith requires active involvement in any institutional structures that facilitate community relationship building.

Contingent Faculty: The Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor defined contingent faculty as, “part-time or adjunct faculty members, full-time non-tenure track faculty, or graduate assistants” (2015, p. 3). For the sake of this study, the researcher will include graduate assistants minimally and only when discussing major shifts in instruction staffing trends. The qualitative research will not specifically address graduate assistants.

Essences: The goal of transcendental phenomenological research is to understand the essences of an experience. Moustakas (1994) described essences as “universal, the condition or quality without which a thing would not be what it is” (p. 100) in a particular time and place from an individual.

Labor: In *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo XIII explained that “To labor is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the various purposes of life, and chief of all for self preservation” (1897, para. 44).

Senior-Level Administrators: For the purpose of this study, senior-level administrators were primarily college presidents, senior vice presidents, chief financial officers, and provosts. These senior leaders are likely most accountable to their Board of Trustees, are involved in making final decisions around campus budgets, and will be most likely accountable for establishing campus-wide decisions and responses to collective bargaining efforts.

Solidarity: Pope John Paul II thought the answer to many of the world’s most challenging problems could be found in solidarity, which he believed “helps us to see the ‘other’—whether a person, people or nation-not just as some kind of instrument, with a work

capacity and physical strength to be exploited at low cost and then discarded when no longer useful, but as our ‘neighbor,’ a ‘helper’ to be made a sharer, on a part with ourselves, in the banquet of life to which all are equally invited by God” (*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, 1987, para. 39).

Subsidiarity: As defined by Pope John Paul II in *Centesimus Annus* (1991), the Principle of Subsidiarity suggests that, “a community of a higher order should not interfere in the internal life of a community of a lower order, depriving the latter of its functions, but rather should support it in case of need and help to coordinate its activity with the activities of the rest of society, always with a view to the common good” (para. 48).

Very Small to Mid-Sized College or University: According to the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (2016), “very small” institutions enroll fewer than 1,000 bachelors or higher degree seeking full-time students. Small institutions have between 1,000 and 2,999 bachelors or higher degree seeking full-time students enrolled. Medium-sized schools include those with enrollments of 3,000-9,999 bachelors or higher degree seeking students. Universities with more than 10,000 students were excluded.

Outline

In Chapter II, the researcher reviews pertinent literature for this study including the literature about the development of collective bargaining in higher education. The researcher provides a significant review of Catholic Social Teaching and related Church documents that articulate teachings about worker rights to clearly outline the conceptual framework underlying this study. Finally, the researcher reviews relevant qualitative and quantitative research conducted on primary and secondary Catholic school administrator and teacher perceptions of collective bargaining. Additionally, the researcher shares the limited qualitative research about

conditions leading to collective bargaining at public colleges in New England and a private, Catholic college in California.

Chapter III includes a detailed methodology for this transcendental phenomenological study. The researcher conducted six semi-structured interviews with senior-administrators at Catholic colleges and universities in the Northeast. The researcher used snowball sampling to identify participants representing institutions with a variety of employment conditions including those with no unions, those with or developing staff unions, and/or those with or developing full or part-time faculty unions. When available, the researcher used document analysis to review public sentiments the institutions and/or their leaders have made about collective bargaining. The researcher also reviewed the collective bargaining agreements from participating institutions if applicable. The researcher conducted a thematic analysis to cluster and categorize themes in the phenomenological study, which are shared in Chapter IV. Chapter V summarizes the findings and offers recommendation for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Very little research has been conducted on collective bargaining at faith-based colleges and universities. Therefore, in Chapter II the researcher reviews pertinent literature about four main subject areas to inform her study: the development of collective bargaining in higher education; Catholic Social Teaching and related Church documents articulating teachings about worker rights, which serve as the conceptual framework for this study; characteristics of an educational community of faith as defined the USCCB in *To Teach as Jesus Did* (1972) and relevant qualitative and quantitative research about primary and secondary school administrator and teacher perceptions of collective bargaining as well as two qualitative studies about conditions leading to collective bargaining at public colleges in New England and at a private, Catholic college in California.

Development of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education

Union Development

Higher education unions began to develop as early as the 1960s and 1970s from a number of social, economic, and political contexts including the Civil Rights movement, a poor economic climate, shrinking enrollments, political influences, decreased federal funding, fewer research grants, attacks on tenure, increased reliance on adjuncts, increased faculty workloads, and legislation that supported unions (Crossland, 1976; DeCew, 2003). To that point faculty had been and remained somewhat resistant to the need for collective bargaining.

Faculty culture was somewhat isolationist as faculty members had a deep loyalty to their disciplines as opposed to their institutions, which inhibited their likelihood of banding together in a collective bargaining unit. Also, tenure traditionally ensured job security so faculty felt little

need for unions. Many institutions also had some kind of shared governance model to resolve conflict or give voice to faculty and other staff people. Therefore, for most of their history, faculty perceived little need for unions. Faculty also thought their profession as “professor” in the academy was very different from blue collar workers who relied on unions for job security, wages, and working conditions.

Faculty who once ran colleges and universities did not think they needed unions. However, increased college size, complexity, and regulation led to the development of full-time administrator positions, which reduced faculty power. Faculty members eventually lost control over institutional budgets. Even uprisings by students who saw themselves as consumers of academics and were focused on customer satisfaction in the 1960s took away faculty power (Crossland, 1976). Faculty became increasingly concerned with a number of issues as a result of their power loss such as compensation, working conditions, job security, tenure, academic freedom, and grievance procedures. Few saw unions as a tool to regain power and help address their concerns (Crossland, 1976; DeCew, 2003).

While state and federal legislation played an important role in union development, the first post-secondary union formed before this supportive legislation at the two-year college, Milwaukee Technical Institute, in 1966. The first union at a four-year institution also formed in 1966 at the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (Crossland, 1976; Hutcheson, 2000). By the 1970s, about a quarter of faculty were unionized including about five-sixths of public schools and two-thirds of two-year schools (Crossland, 1976). By 1994, 1,057 campuses had unions, which included 44 percent of all faculty and 29 percent of all campuses. Unions were and remain least popular at elite institutions where faculty retain more power (DeCew, 2003).

While many national and local unions have competed for the right to represent faculty groups, three unions were particularly popular with faculty early in campus collective bargaining development. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was and is a well-respected organization that wanted to be the bridge between faculty and administration to help reduce tensions. The AAUP also wanted to serve as the “custodians of the interests of higher education” (as cited in DeCew, 2003, p. 19). The AAUP did not see a conflict between shared governance and collective bargaining, though the organization did not begin focused on unionization, and its move to involvement with collective bargaining was incremental.

The AAUP formed in 1914, modeled after the American Medical Association and the Bar “to maintain and advance the standards and ideals of the profession” (Hutcheson, 2000, p. 2). In 1957, the organization changed its mission “to advance the standards, ideals, and welfare of the profession” (Hutcheson, 2000, p.2). In the 1970s, after leadership changes, the AAUP finally took a clear stand in support of unionization and aided in collective bargaining negotiations (Hutcheson, 2000).

Two additional popular faculty unions were the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The NEA developed in 1870 and expanded again in 1943. Its goal was to improve the quality of education and teacher influence. The NEA started with primary and secondary schools and joined with colleges in the 1960s when faculty senates were especially weak. By 1962, the NEA had many members and significant financial resources to help faculty in their collective bargaining efforts. Similarly, the American Federation of Teachers, part of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), formed in 1916. By 1966 the AFT hosted a national meeting to discuss faculty unionization. The AFT focused on salaries, academic freedom, and governance

(Hutcheson, 2000). All three groups continue to support unions and unionization efforts on campuses across the country.

Union pros and cons. The AAUP, NEA, and AFT, along with other organizations, worked to increase faculty unionization. They had to convince faculty that unions were valuable and could help them regain power from administration. Union leaders had to challenge faculty to break with their solitary culture focused primarily on their discipline and research and recognize the benefits of collective bargaining. Union supporters faced many critics. Anti-union faculty and administrators believed that unions would replace collegiality with adversarial relationships between faculty and administrators. Many faculty felt they already had a voice in administration through shared governance and faculty senates. These faculty believed unions would negatively affect shared governance because unions took power away from these groups and forced negotiations through union representatives, “By its very nature, the union sets up a situation where we would be bargaining with the faculty over every term and condition of employment, when we could be cooperating in decision making through faculty senates and committees,” (Popper as quoted in Blum, 1990, para. 26).

Other critics feared unions would hurt colleges or universities’ reputations, diminish the professional status of faculty, and make it harder to recruit top faculty. Some also argued that faculty who joined unions were disloyal, helping national union interests at the expense of the local college or university interest. Some critics feared unions would reduce administrators’ ability to act when needed and limit their creativity and flexibility when addressing problems (Blum, 1990; Crossland, 1976; DeCew, 2003). Finally, others feared the cost of collective bargaining would have serious negative financial consequences for institutions that were already trying to limit costs while minimizing tuition increases. Following the August 2016 NLRB vote

allowing graduate student workers to unionize at private universities, Moody's confirmed this fear by indicating that the NLRB ruling gave unionization a "credit negative," which indicated it was another factor the rating agency would review when determining credit ratings (Seltzer, 2016).

On the other hand, pro-union faculty saw the many benefits of unionization. First, unions have traditionally benefitted junior faculty and increased egalitarianism. A 2000 study of faculty highlighted their top reasons for supporting unionization, which included:

...salaries, job security and tenure, advancement, respect, academic freedom allowing independence in the classroom and freedom with respect to research activities, faculty governance roles, and working conditions including teaching load and other university expectations about their time spent on campus and time for creative work. (DeCew, 2003, p. 16)

A 1985 study assessed which faculty were most amenable to unions. The study found that the faculty who were lowest paid, worried about fairness from administration, most concerned about job security, and women were most likely to support unionization (DeCew, 2003). Studies have also demonstrated that unions often resulted in increased compensation at unionized campuses and at non-unionized campuses because of increased competition for talent. Finally, union advocates believed that collective bargaining agreements could be flexible and support shared governance (Blum, 1990; Crossland, 1976; DeCew, 2003).

Current collective bargaining efforts are fueled by faculty perceptions that tenure is under attack by the public and political leaders who understand neither lifetime appointments nor the value of academic freedom. Colleges and universities are also criticized for ever-increasing tuition costs. Private and public institutions face competition from for-profit institutions. Faculty

are often frustrated that committee recommendations and shared governance decisions are ignored or that these groups are perceived as rubber stamps by administration. Faculty dislike that salaries of senior college administrators soar while their incomes are stagnant and tenure-track lines decrease (Chaykin, 2015). The current challenges facing the academy, in general, and tenure specifically, make the benefits of collective bargaining seem all the more appealing.

Politics and government influence. Laws and political actions have greatly affected unionization at colleges and universities. The National Labor Relations Act (Wagner Act) of 1935 paved the way for collective bargaining in industry with the hope of channeling constructive dialogue for improved worker experiences (Malamud, 1998; Parker & Park, 2015). In 1958, New York City employees were allowed to unionize. In 1959, Wisconsin allowed municipal employees to unionize. In 1962, President Kennedy's executive order allowed federal employees to collectively bargain (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988).

The 1967 New York Public Employees' Fair Employment Act (the Taylor Law) led to a flood of collective bargaining at the City University of New York, the State University of New York, and community colleges throughout the state (Chaykin, 2015). Also in 1967, dioceses in major metropolitan cities including New York, Philadelphia and Chicago started to unionize (Russo, 1990). In 1970, the private sector earned the right to collectively bargain (McDermott, 1976). By 1977 the National Association of Catholic School Teachers had formed (Russo, 1990).

In addition to federal, state, and local laws, two major NLRB cases significantly shaped unionization at private and religiously affiliated colleges and universities. These cases specifically affected jurisdiction over religiously affiliated institutions and the role of professors on campuses. The first case was the *National Labor Relations Board v. Catholic Bishop of*

Chicago (1979). In this case, two groups of high school lay teachers wanted to unionize: one under the control of the Catholic Bishop of Chicago and the other under the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend. The NLRB originally ruled that these lay teachers could organize into a collective bargaining unit. Both groups voted in favor of unionization. However, the schools refused to recognize the unions. The unions filed a complaint with the NLRB for unfair labor practices (*NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago*, 1979).

The NLRB once again ruled in favor of the lay teacher unions. The schools then appealed to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court found in favor of the schools and expressed concern about how the NLRB distinguished between “completely religious” and “merely religiously associated” schools in its original decision, which allowed the teachers to organize. The court, worried about infringing on First Amendment rights, cited an earlier case to justify this concern: “At some point, factual inquiry by courts or agencies into such matters [separating secular from religious training] would almost necessarily raise First Amendment problems” (*Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602, as cited in *NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago*, 1979, p. 6). Justices therefore ruled in favor of the schools in a five-to-four vote.

Catholic Bishop affirmed that all teachers at religiously affiliated institutions play some role in maintaining the institution’s religious mission (Hendershott, 2015), while significantly slowing collective bargaining at religiously affiliated schools (Russo, 1990). Unlike K-12 Catholic education, some would argue that the primary role of Catholic colleges and universities is not to indoctrinate. Therefore, *Catholic Bishop* has been applied on a case by case basis in higher education (Parker & Park, 2015).

A second significant case affecting the unionization of private colleges and universities is *NLRB v. Yeshiva University* (1980). Though a religiously affiliated school, Yeshiva’s main

contribution to unionization was how the NLRB interpreted its faculty's role in decision making. Supervisors are not eligible for unionization because the NLRB believes that supervisors are aligned with management. Yeshiva University's administration tried to prove that its faculty had a significant say in decision making and governance (Leatherman, 1998), which made them supervisors or managers and therefore ineligible to unionize. However, Yeshiva's faculty was of the opinions that they were powerless employees.

The Supreme Court ultimately heard this case and agreed with Yeshiva's administration that claimed faculty were supervisors/managers and therefore unable to unionize. Frustrated, the Yeshiva faculty argued, "We can't have a union because we have too much voice, but if we had too much voice, why would we want a union?" (as quoted in Blum, 1990).

In the 10 years following *Yeshiva*, over 60 institutions cited it to avoid working with unions, and 20 unions were decertified. The most well-known case of decertification was Boston University (BU). The BU union had existed for nine years and represented over 800 faculty members. Public universities also challenged unionization as a result of *Yeshiva* (Blum, 1990). After this ruling only a few new unions were able to form, including those at Cooper Union, Long Island University in Brooklyn and C.W. Post, and Pratt. Most of the new unions were primarily for contingent faculty and support staff (Chaykin, 2015).

Contemporary NLRB members may disagree with *Yeshiva*. Since *Yeshiva* was decided by the Supreme Court, the NLRB lacks the authority to overturn it (Leatherman, 2000). Faculty at Manhattanville College and the College of St. Rose both tried to unsuccessfully challenge *Yeshiva* by arguing that, due to the shift of education to the business model, faculty were no longer managerial (Chaykin, 2015). Similarly, faculty at the University of Francis in Illinois and at Sacred Heart University were denied the right to unionize because the NLRB determined that

they were managerial (Smallwood, 2001; 2002). In these and other cases, faculty felt more like employees than managers. They wanted more respect, improved compensation, and a voice in decision making, especially related to academic matters.

Another significant case in the history of Catholic college unionization is *University of Great Falls* (a Catholic college in Montana) *v. NLRB* (2002). The NLRB first ruled that the faculty were not managers, as defined in *Yeshiva*, and were eligible to unionize. An appeals board decided not to address whether the Great Falls faculty were managers. Instead it determined that the regional NLRB lacked jurisdiction over the case because Great Falls was a religious institution (Smallwood, 2002). In the decision the appellate board provided a three-part test for future cases. They determined that a religious institution:

(a) holds itself out to students, faculty and the community as providing a religious educational environment; (b) is organized as a nonprofit; and (c) is affiliated with, or owned, operated, or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a recognized religious organization, or with an entity, membership of which is determined, at least in part, with reference to religion. (*University of Great Falls, 2002*, para. 16)

While establishing this new criteria for determining if an institution was religious, the appellate board intentionally tried to avoid questioning the effectiveness of the institution at its religious function.

Frustrated with the appellate board's decision, one faculty member at Great Falls argued, "The primary reason we decided to unionize was because over the last few years, we have lost the ability to communicate effectively with the administration" (Hughes-Briant as quoted in Leatherman, 1998). As a religious institution, the Great Falls faculty had no other means of

dealing with their depleting power. Great Falls and all of the cases discussed above significantly affected collective bargaining development at colleges and universities.

Collective bargaining at faith-based colleges and universities. St. John's University (NY) was the first private college in the country to form a union, creating an AFT chapter in 1963. In 1965, after receiving initial support from their Board of Trustees, the institution experienced turmoil when support shifted and 31 faculty union organizers were fired. St. Johns University's administration would not recognize the union until 1970 when it negotiated its first contract. The AAUP played an active role trying to first negotiate with and then fight St. John's administration (Hutcheson, 2000).

Manhattan College, a small Catholic college in New York City, has also struggled with collective bargaining efforts. The administration has been fighting faculty attempts to collectively bargain for over 15 years. Manhattan College's full-time faculty first tried to form a union in 1999 because they felt the administration had taken away their academic decision making power especially in hiring and granting tenure (Leatherman, 1998). The NLRB asserted jurisdiction over Manhattan College, pointing out that a declining number of religious taught on campus and that the LaSallian order played a minimal role in campus operations. The NLRB also found that the College "neither proselytized its students nor compelled professors to attend Mass" (Leatherman, 1999, para. 7). However, on campus, the union was ultimately voted down 76 to 47 (DeCew 2003).

In 2010, Manhattan's adjunct faculty wanted to collectively bargain, and the administration remained resistant. The NLRB ruled in favor of the adjunct faculty's right to unionize. Manhattan's administration challenged the decision based on the First Amendment, claiming that the NLRB did not have jurisdiction over the case because it was a Catholic college.

In 2011, the NLRB affirmed that Manhattan College was not religious enough because its primary function was educational, lacked a religious test for admission or hiring, received minimal funding from the founding order, did not require Catholicism courses, and does not have any compulsory religious activities among other issues. Therefore, the NLRB did have jurisdiction in the case. Still, the College continued to challenge the NLRB's action. In 2015, the courts ruled that adjunct faculty did not have a religious function and therefore could organize.

The DePaul University President, Rev. Dennis Holtschneider, has challenged adjunct collective bargaining efforts on his campus even though DePaul currently has union contracts with cafeteria, facilities, and construction workers (Holtschneider, 2016a). Like President O'Donnell, Fr. Holtschneider is most concerned about the NLRB's lack of understanding about what it means to be a Catholic college or university:

...the NLRB has begun asking questions such as whether individual faculty are required to convey religion within their course. Such questions misunderstand, of course, that universities permit faculty the academic freedom to shape their courses as they think best, and the Catholic universities include faculty of many faiths and none to join together in the larger religious mission of the institution. The more immediate issue, however, is that a government agency is attempting to determine – university-by-university – whether or not each institution is sufficiently religious to qualify for the exemption set out by the Supreme Court many years ago. This is a problem not limited to labor issues, but sets out a possible precedent where any government office could substitute and impose its own judgement for what constitutes religious activity, in this case dividing institutions and

educators into mutually exclusive secular and religious spheres. (Holtschneider, 2016b para. 2 and 3)

The NLRB also ruled that Saint Xavier University in Chicago, IL was not Catholic enough and therefore fell under its jurisdiction when Saint Xavier's adjuncts wanted to unionize. The NLRB justified its order for Saint Xavier by arguing that only a fraction of the Board of Trustee seats were reserved for members of the founding order, the budget did not include funds from a religious organization, and that faith was not considered in adjunct hiring (Jaschik, 2011).

In another significant 2009 case, the NLRB certified a faculty union at Carroll College, a Catholic college in Montana, seeking collective bargaining. The College challenged the NLRB's jurisdiction and a Washington D.C. Circuit Court agreed with the College under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, deciding that the NLRB did not have jurisdiction (Parker & Park, 2015). This decision was reviewed again in light of *Pacific Lutheran*. Carroll College was the first religiously affiliated institution since the pro-union Pacific Lutheran adjudication to receive a negative bid from a regional NLRB office, denying the formation of a tenure-track faculty union at the institution. Carroll College challenged the bid claiming that, because it was a faith-based institution, it was outside of the jurisdiction of the NLRB. The NLRB's action determined that Carroll College met its burden to prove that its faculty qualify as managers over academic programs, policies, and personnel at the institution. The NLRB also decided that the institution was sufficiently faith-based because it had dismissed faculty for violating its Catholic character or mission. Both of these factors led the NLRB regional board to deny the union bid (Flaherty, 2016f).

While many private and religiously affiliated institutions, including those discussed above, have tried to stop their faculty from unionizing, some institutions have decided to respect

their faculty's right to organize. These examples are also significant (Schneider, 1998). Georgetown created a *Just Employment Policy* in 2005 and has led a Jesuit Just Employment Initiative for 21 of the 28 Jesuit colleges and universities. In spring 2013 Georgetown University remained neutral as its adjunct faculty voted to unionize and join the Service Employees International Union (Russo, 2014; Sinyai, 2015).

SEIU Local 32BJ already represents 1,500 staff including custodial workers, cafeteria workers, and security guards at Catholic colleges and universities including Boston College, St. John's University (NY), Fordham University, Duquesne University, Villanova University, and Catholic University of America (Parker & Park, 2015). Advocates for collective bargaining at faith-based schools argued that the practice does not have to affect religious beliefs at all and primarily centers around topics including "wages, benefits, hours of work, just cause protection, layoff and recall rights, grievance and arbitration systems, and seniority" (Parker & Park, 2015, p. 13) as well as "staff development, scheduling and hours, health and safety, and labor-management committees" (Parker & Park, 2015, p. 14). These advocates also trust that the NLRB structure will work effectively and avoid religious entanglement.

While some institutions claim to be neutral, others criticize these institutions for posting anti-union information on websites emphasizing the negative aspects of collective bargaining. Pro-union advocates criticized Yale, Columbia, Harvard, and Princeton, for example, who added Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) pages to their websites following the NLRB decision giving graduate student workers the right to collectively bargain on their campuses. Common arguments against unions even by so-called neutral institutions come in the form of managerial information campaigns highlighting the cost of union dues and what happens in the event of a strike. (Flaherty, 2016a). Early in the most recent Manhattan College's adjunct union bid, the

College's Provost issued a similar message, though this memo clearly stated the College's position opposing the adjunct union (Clyde & Fabé, 2011).

Adding another layer to the complicated development of unions at faith-based colleges, California's Notre Dame de Namur University voluntarily recognized its tenure and tenure-track faculty in June 2016 (Flaherty, 2016d; 2016e). However, in making this recommendation to the Board of Trustees, the university's president took away the faculty's managerial authority and said that when they voted to unionize, faculty chose "to obtain 'status as labor'" (as quoted in Flaherty, 2016d) and therefore lost some say in decision making. The president and board then made significant program cuts that went beyond the faculty's recommendations and notified them about one week before classes started. The president also indicated that the faculty's new status as labor would result in changes to the college's governance process and faculty voting rights (Flaherty, 2016d).

Like Notre Dame de Namur, more and more faith-based colleges and universities are in the news as collective bargaining efforts develop on their campuses. In some cases, the institutions vow to remain neutral. In other cases, the institutions continue to challenge the NLRB. The history of collective bargaining at colleges and universities in the United States continues to be written.

Catholic Social Teaching

Introduction to Catholic Social Teaching

The foundations for Catholic Social Teaching came from Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (Rights and Duties of Capital and Labor) (1891) which attempted to address the rise of capital and the labor class while establishing morals in the Church's social teachings. Jesus served as the example, teaching that we should respect the dignity and worth of every human

being because we are all created in the likeness of God. Herein lies the most basic principle of the Church's social teaching. In "Foundations of Catholic Social Teaching," Novello (2014) argued that "The aim of Catholic social teaching is to 'guide' intellectual thought and moral behavior in pathways that advance the truth about the human person and its high vocation" (p. 23).

Catholic Social Teachings are further developed in a variety of Papal documents including Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), *Nova Impendet* (1931), Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes* (1965), Paul VI's *Octogesima Adveniens* (1971), John Paul II's *Centesimus Annus* (1991), and Pope Francis's Apostolic Exhortation *Evangelii Gaudium* (2013). Other important contribution to the Church's social teachings include: the *Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction: A General Review of the Problems and Survey of Remedies* (Ryan, 1919), which recognized the role of labor unions and the Vatican's 1971 Synod *Statement on Justice* which called on the Church to model the way for those working in church organizations by providing fair wages to priests and developing systems of promotion. Many Catholic healthcare systems and primary and secondary schools have found ways to both recognize unionized workers and maintain their religious freedom, though not without some growing pains (Russo, 2014).

Another important principle of Catholic Social Teaching aims to promote the common good. Vatican II's *Gaudium et Spes*, or *Joy and Hope: the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, defined the common good as, "the sum total of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfillment" (Paul VI, 1965, para. 26). Catholic Social Teaching is therefore about more than just getting into heaven, it is about improving the condition of society (Novello, 2014).

Pope Leo XIII's Catholic Social Thought was directly impacted by industrialization and the rise of a two-class system. The Church acknowledged the need to speak out against injustice and to care for the poor, the marginalized, and the oppressed. The Church saw significant industrial changes resulting in massive wealth growth among the few and massive poverty growth among the masses. The unemployed and the working poor were of special concern, and he felt that the virtual enslavement of a whole class of people required the Church to speak out. While Leo was also concerned about the rising popularity of socialism as an alternative to capitalism, his response may have been too little, too late to offer a real alternative to Catholics and others.

As a result, the Catholic Church tried to help improve the common good through teaching essential principles including: a fair and just relationship between capital and labor, the dignity of the worker, a greater social dimension of work as it relates to the common good, the right to a just wage, a responsibility for authorities to care for the poor, freedom of religion and religious duty, the right to private property, and the right to unionize (Novello, 2014). These ideals are all touched on in the review of Catholic Social Teaching documents that follows.

Rerum Novarum

As noted, Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* (1891) is the seminal work on Catholic Social Teachings. In this encyclical Pope Leo also acknowledged the essential value of hard work and advocated for the right of the workers to labor and meet their family needs. Pope Leo also respected the right of the worker to spend their own wages and to care for their families. He recognized each individual's differing gifts and talents, and admitted that unequal gifts lead to "unequal condition" (para. 17). Pope Leo taught that all gifts and talents were to be used for the glory of God and for the good of others.

Therefore, Pope Leo encouraged readers to care for others and always be attentive to the common good. Those with means were responsible to use their wealth and property in service to others. Owners and workers were to work together to meet each other's needs. By doing this, the distance between the two classes would diminish. Leo believed that the Church had a role in bringing the two classes together to understand their mutual roles in obtaining justice and to benefit from relationship building. Pope Leo hoped that Church institutions would therefore help "renovate" civil society (1891, para. 27).

Pope Leo also wrote for employers. He taught them to "respect in every man his dignity as a person ennobled by Christian character" (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 20). Workers needed time to tend to their religious needs and to their families as well as time to allow their bodies to heal from challenging work. He warned employers not to misuse workers for their own gain and not to "gather one's profit out of the need of another" (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 20). The Pope realized the "unprotected" nature of the working class and expected employers to be honorable and honest, acting with "strict justice – with that justice which is called distributive – toward each and every class alike" (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 33).

Rerum Novarum taught that workers also had a right to work as an essential component of their lives. Leo explained the explicit connection between working and earning what is needed to live. For Leo, "wages ought not to be insufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage-earner" (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 45). Workers were even encouraged to work toward ownership.

When employers failed to treat workers with dignity and respect, Pope Leo understood there to be grave consequences. Strikes were often the result of maltreatment of employees and were "extremely injurious to trade and to the general interests of the public....on such occasions,

violence and disorder are generally not far distant, and thus it frequently happens that the public peace is imperiled” (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 39).

In addition to sharing expectations for owners and employers, Pope Leo set expectation and guidelines for workers to:

Fully and faithfully to perform the work which has been freely and equitably agreed upon; never to injure the property, nor to outrage the person, of an employer; never to resort to violence in defending their own cause, nor to engage in riot or disorder; and to have nothing to do with men of evil principles, who work upon the people with artful promises of great result. (1891, para. 20)

Workers thus had a responsibility to work for what they need to maintain themselves and their families while owners had a responsibility to care for and fairly treat their employees.

After witnessing frustration and anger from the masses about their condition, Pope Leo XIII also needed to explain the importance of liberty and the right to private property in support of owners and employers. In no uncertain terms, Pope Leo XIII railed against the socialist movement and public ownership of private goods.

Pope Leo therefore identified the role of the State in capital/labor relations, which he argued was basically to protect the common good. According to Leo, both workers and employers needed the protection of law, which would be invoked when worker or employer rights were not met. For example, Leo argued that the law should protect employers when workers rioted and damaged their property. Leo also thought that laws should protect workers when greedy owners forced employees to work excessively to the detriment of their bodies or minds. These laws should also protect workers when wages were insufficient for maintaining

one's basic needs. However, Leo argued that the State should intervene only in extreme cases. The poor ultimately relied on the State to protect their rights when no one else will do so.

Finally, *Rerum Novarum* established important rules about union formation and worker associations that are essential to this proposed study. Pope Leo advocated for workers to establish societies as communities of mutual support. He wrote:

History attests what excellent results were brought about by the artificers' guilds of olden times. They were the means of affording not only many advantages to the workmen, but...of promoting the advancement of art....Such unions should be suited to the requirements of this our age - an age of wider education, of different habits, and of far more numerous requirements in daily life. It is gratifying to know that there are actually in existence not a few associations of this nature, consisting either of workmen alone, or of workmen and employers together, but it were greatly to be desired that they should become more numerous and more efficient....it will be well to explain here how notably they are needed, to show that they exist of their own right, and what should be their organization and their mode of action. (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 49)

These societies helped both protected worker rights and lifted members up who needed support. Leo argued that these societies should even be protected by the State:

Private societies, then, although they exist within the body politic, and are severally part of the commonwealth, cannot nevertheless be absolutely, and as such, prohibited by public authority. For, to enter into a 'society' of this kind is the natural right of man; and the State has for its office to protect natural rights, not to destroy them; and, if it forbid its citizens to form associations, it contradicts the very principle of its own existence... (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 51)

To Leo, these associations helped “establish harmony among the divergent interests and the various classes which compose the body politic” (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 55). At the same time, Pope Leo offered suggestions about how these associations should be organized to ensure their benefit and ability to meet the goals of the organizations. Here he suggested minimal guidelines and maximized each group’s freedom:

In order that an association may be carried on with unity of purpose and harmony of action, its administration and government should be firm and wise. All such societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such rules and organization as may best conduce to the attainment of their respective objects. We do not judge it possible to enter into minute particulars touching the subject of organization; this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and aim of the work to be done, on the scope of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time - all of which should be carefully considered. (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 56)

Throughout history union organizers can turn to the Pope’s own words for support in their unionization efforts. He continued:

We may lay it down as a general and lasting law that working men’s associations should be so organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at, that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost of body, soul, and property. (Pope Leo, 1891, para. 57)

Pope Leo XIII advocated so clearly for worker associations and maximum freedom in selecting these associations and their governing rules. Yes, many administrators at Church-related institutions have tried to stop union development or have challenged the nature of the unions that employees have chosen to represent them. At colleges and universities, some even

question if faculty, staff, or other administrators should be considered working class and therefore able to collectively bargain. A liberal reading of Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* suggests that these workers do have a right to bargain collectively.

Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction

In 1919, another important Church document contributed to Catholic Social Teaching. The *Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction* responded to circumstances in the post-World War I era both locally and globally. Soldiers returned home looking for jobs while women were displaced from their wartime jobs. In *Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction*, the Monseigneur Ryan carefully highlighted suggestions from leaders in management, labor, and religion about industry and Reconstruction. The National Catholic Welfare Council (NCWC) then offered practical suggestions for how to manage the challenges facing the United States in light of Catholic values and teachings.

In general, the NCWC advocated for the rights of workers, while urging the US government to do the same by encouraging employment opportunities, fair wages, needed support for the working class and the like. The NCWC supported the rights of the worker to organize, to maintain living wages, and to have voices in decisions increasing safety, improving efficiency, and raising productivity. The NCWC also supported technical/vocational education while cautiously ensuring that this education would not increase class divides.

Ryan discouraged socialism while acknowledging problems with the current industrial model which included "enormous inefficiency and waste in the production and distribution of commodities; insufficient incomes for the great majority of wage earners; and unnecessarily large incomes for a small minority of privileged capitalists" (1919, para. 35). The NCWC

believed that improving worker wages and increasing opportunities for worker ownership over production would reduce worker interest in socialism.

In summarizing the Christian principles that underlined their teachings, Ryan cautioned that human weakness could not handle the power that comes with the opportunity for oppression. He warned: “The employer has a right to get a reasonable living out of his business, but he has no right to interest on his investment until his employees have obtained at least living wages” (Ryan, 1919, para. 40). Overwhelmingly, Ryan supported increased wages of workers at the expense of employers, which was consistent with Catholic principles of solidarity, human dignity, and stewardship.

Catholic college and university employees seeking collective bargaining similarly seek fair wages and a voice in their institutions. As *Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction* explained, including employee voices in decision-making can result in improved efficiency and production as well as improved employer/employee relationships. Unlike private industry, though, private Catholic colleges and universities are not-for-profit, so these employers argue that they are already struggling to maintain their financial model. Many of these institutions strive to keep tuition competitive, serve the poor, and help prevent a tiered educational system that limits private education to the upper-class. From this perspective, collective bargaining would result in increased tuition costs that prevent these institutions from remaining financially viable.

Quadragesimo Anno

By 1931, another papal document, Pope Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno* (In the Fortieth Year), contributed to the growing body of literature on Catholic Social Teachings.

Quadragesimo Anno celebrated the 40th anniversary of *Rerum Novarum* and its impact on social

justice movements especially related to the rights of the worker. Even after 40 years and the positive impact of *Rerum*, the two-class system was still a problem. Pius wrote his encyclical to “lift up that class which on account of the modern expansion of industry had increased to enormous numbers but not yet had obtained its rightful place or rank in human society and was, for that reason, all but neglected and despised – the workers...” (Pope Pius, 1931, para. 23).

Like Leo, Pius supported collective bargaining. Moreover, he specifically supported and encouraged Christian worker organizations that were founded in Christian thought and helped ground worker associations in Catholic principles while cautioning workers against socialist movements:

They 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 whom socialist organizations strongly attracted by claiming to be the sole defenders and champions of the lowly and oppressed. (Pope Pius, 1931, para. 31)

Pius believed that these Christian worker organizations helped workers attain what they needed for their holistic development.

In fact, Pius believed that both clergy and lay leaders were responsible for helping to form these worker associations. When purely Catholic associations could not be formed, Pius wanted a parallel Catholic association to help inform the secular organizations. As unions have developed in Catholic schools, administrators have shared concerns about non-faith based unions. Administrators feared that these organizations would not best support their faith-communities. While Pope Leo XIII offered few regulations or direction for union management, Pius believed the Catholic worker associations needed to inform union development.

Like Leo, Pius XI commented on State involvement in worker rights. Pius XI argued for minimal State involvement, respecting the concept of subsidiarity, but acknowledging the role of the state to protect the weak and the poor. Today, many groups trying to form unions at Catholic institutions have turned to the State, in the form of the NLRB, to seek protection from perceived unfair labor practices. This raises the question whether these faculty, staff, and administrators can be considered the weak and poor these documents cover. Also, it remains to be seen if Catholic institutions struggle with State entanglement because of NLRB involvement and what local structures they can put in place to support subsidiarity and the right of the worker to bargain collectively without the State.

In his discussion of worker rights, Pius XI added practical commentary to the dialogue speaking to the concerns of employers. While he supported employment opportunities and their overall benefits, Pius warned against excessive wage increases or decreases that would lead to unemployment. Pius (1931) offered the following guidance on setting wages:

In determining the amount of the wage, the condition of a business and of the one carrying it on must also be taken into account; for it would be unjust to demand excessive wages which a business cannot stand without its ruin and consequent calamity to the workers...But if the business in question is not making enough money to pay the workers an equitable wage because it is being crushed by unjust burdens or forced to sell its product at less than a just price, those who are thus the cause of the injury are guilty of grave wrong, for they deprive workers of their just wage and force them under the pinch of necessity to accept a wage less than fair. (para. 72)

Similarly, administrators at Catholic colleges and universities realize the competitive nature of private education and the effect of shrinking enrollments, especially in certain sections

of the country. Therefore, senior-level administrators use caution when setting wages and tuition so as to not price themselves out of markets or risk the fiscal health of their institutions. Pius argued that employees and consumers should not place undue burden on institutions that would impact their ability to remain open and support many jobs. However, in the end, Pius argued that peace in society, and in this case-peace at institutions, would only come about with (wage) justice.

Nova Impendet

Later in 1931, Pope Pius XI further contributed to Catholic Social Teachings with *Nova Impendet* (On the Economics of Crisis), which drew attention to the effects of the Great Depression on the poor and unemployed. He specifically encouraged charity for children and other victims of the depression who were eager to work and contribute to society but could not get jobs. He also questioned significant military spending that diverted resources from helping the poor and marginalized. Pius XI called upon Catholics to influence the public good whenever and wherever possible in their spheres of influence, including leading by example.

Mater et Magistra

As social challenges persisted, Pope John XXIII wrote *Mater et Magistra* (On Christianity and Social Progress) in 1961 to further the dialogue around Catholic Social Teachings. John XXIII applied teachings from earlier encyclicals to modern times, specifically around developments in science, technology, and economic growth, positing that the State and individuals must work together to protect the common good. The Pope also reviewed and endorsed critical points in *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno* that affirmed the dignity of each person; advocated for the rights of the worker and fair wages based on justice, the needs

and conditions of workers, the financial state of business, and the potential impact on greater people; and supported the right to private ownership.

John XXIII also affirmed the rights of workers to form associations:

Such associations may consist either of workers alone or of workers and employers, and should be structured in a way best calculated to safeguard the workers' legitimate professional interest. And it is the natural right of the workers to work without hindrance, freely, and on their own initiative within these associations for the achievement of these ends. (para. 22)

John XXIII allowed for differences in worker associations, but viewed their ultimate purpose clear: to protect the worker. Yet, John XIII maintained that the relationships between employers and employees should be governed by solidarity and a commitment to the common good. Pope John XXIII offered the following challenges of worker association as well:

...this multiplication and daily extension of forms of association brings with it a multiplicity of restrictive laws and regulations in many departments of human life. As a consequence, it narrows the sphere of a person's freedom of action. This means often used, the methods followed, the atmosphere created, all conspire to make it difficult for a person to think independently of outside influences, to act on his own initiative, exercise his responsibility and express and fulfill his own personality. (para. 63)

He also cautioned associations to be "guided by moral principles and respect for the civil law" (para. 47).

John XXIII wanted workers to be "team players" as he thought their pleas for recognition and respect would be best heard if they were perceived as advocating for the common good.

Anti-union enthusiasts could read these cautionary words as potential problems with

associations. Instead, John XXIII offered a good goal for worker associations: collaboration. John XXIII believed that worker associations should form a “true human community, concerned about the needs, the activities and the standing of each of its members” (para. 91). In order to accomplish this goal, John XXIII suggested that managers and workers strive for mutual understanding and appreciation with active cooperation.

In fact, the Pope warned that employers should not treat “those employees who spend their days in service with the firm as though they were mere cogs in the machinery, denying them any opportunity of expressing their wishes or bringing their experience to bear on the work in hand, and keeping them entirely passive in regard to decisions that regulate their activity” (para. 92). Rather, for John XXIII, these workers should have a say in running their institutions and have seats at the tables.

Like Pius XI, John XXIII offered wisdom and insight about setting wages. He believed that wages should be based on justice and a holistic view of the labor environment:

...remuneration of work is not something that can be left to the laws of the marketplace; nor should it be a decision left to the will of the more powerful. It must be determined in accordance with justice and equity; which means that workers must be paid a wage which allows them to live a truly human life and to fulfill their family obligations in a worthy manner. Other factors too enter into the assessment of a just wage: namely, the effective contribution which each individual makes to the economic effort, the financial state of the company for which he works, the requirements of the general good of the particular country-having regard especially to the repercussions on the overall employment of the working force in the country as a whole-and finally the requirements of the common good of the universal family of nations of every kind, both large and small. (para. 71)

The employers and employees of Catholic institutions may read these words in a few ways. First, how will increasing faculty/staff wages affect the poor's ability to seek a Catholic education? If wages increase, will school enrollment decline and force closures which will result in lost jobs and educational opportunities. On the other hand, if institutions do well, wages should increase based on the collective efforts resulting in institutional success. John XXIII advocated for balance.

Finally, like Pius XI, John XXIII emphasized that the role of government should be to support subsidiarity. Therefore, for John, government action should only be necessary when working for the common good if other action for the common good was not present. John XXIII further believed that schools, parents, and Catholics in general had a responsibility to translate the theory of social teachings to practice through demonstrated action. Therefore, based on John's encyclical, many argue that Catholic institutions have a responsibility to model Catholic social teachings.

Pacem in Terris

Later in 1961, John XXIII reiterated many of the ideas he shared in *Mater et Magistra* but added some important points to *Pacem in Terris* (Peace on Earth). John XXIII focused largely on human rights and responsibilities and the importance of equitable and peace-filled relationships. First, John XXIII emphasized the right of the worker to work in an environment where he could thrive. He next discussed the right of workers to a just wage that supported a family and was based on the prevalence of work. John XXIII credited associations with many advancements in the labor force and advocated, "They have also the right to exercise their own initiative and act on their own responsibility within these associations for the attainment of the desired results" (para. 23).

Second, John XXIII emphasized a need for collaboration for the common good. He wrote specifically about relationships between individuals; between individuals and the State; and between States. The Pope believed we were all responsible for working collaboratively to advance the common good and protect human rights. John XXIII reminded readers about the principle of solidarity underlining the Christian foundation for all relationships.

When challenging the formation of worker associations in educational settings, many administrators and some anti-union advocates argue that unions actually negatively affect relationships and the faith-community by creating hostility and distrust between employers and employees. Others respond that unions create ground rules for successful relationship building. Regardless of one's beliefs, even John XXIII assented that relationships are more easily formed when justice exists.

Gaudium et Spes

In 1965, Pope Paul VI hoped to address issues in the modern world by applying Gospel lessons to contemporary problems stemming from inequality and imbalance in *Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the World in Modern Times), a constitution for the Second Vatican Council. In it Pope Paul VI affirmed the dignity of every human while emphasizing the nature of men and women as social beings who needed interpersonal relationships to reach their full potential. In building an international human community, he promoted a more just economically and socially balanced world where every individual had the opportunity to meet his or her full potential.

Pope Paul VI began by noting the responsibility of pastors to understand and model the Church's doctrine and teachings. He also believed everyone's voice needed to be included in local, national, and international decision making. Union advocates responded that these

sentiments support union development at Catholic colleges and universities and the value of staff voice in decision making.

Part II of *Gaudium et Spes*, Chapter III, “Economic and Social Life,” is most relevant for this proposed study. Pope Paul VI emphasized that everyone at all levels of organizations should be involved in decision making. He wrote, “...the active sharing of all in the administration and profits of these enterprises in ways to be properly determined is to be promoted” (para. 68). In other words, employees should have say in their working conditions and should be valued and supported for what they contribute to their communities. Pope Paul VI also believed that employee work should be adapted based on skill level, and that wages should be set “such that man may be furnished means to cultivate worthily his own material, social, cultural, and spiritual life and that of his dependents, in view of the function and productiveness of each one, the conditions of the factory or workshop, and the common good” (para. 67).

Pope Paul VI was the first to contribute a more radical element to the rights of the worker because he supported strikes as a means to improve labor ends:

When, however, socio-economic disputes arise, efforts must be made to come to a peaceful settlement. Although recourse must always be had first to a sincere dialogue between the parties, a strike, nevertheless, can remain even in present-day circumstances a necessary, though ultimate, aid for the defense of the workers’ own rights and fulfillment of their just desires (para. 68).

More traditionally, Pope Paul VI advocated for the right to private property but understood that ownership came with responsibility to help and care for others as what came from the earth belonged to all. He also advocated for public ownership primarily only when needed to protect the public good.

Populorum Progressio

In 1967, Pope Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio* (On the Development of Peoples) raised awareness about international injustices in human development, to provide global perspective on human realities, and to remind people that social progress, or lack thereof, affects everyone. Paul VI began *Populorum Progressio* by affirming all human dignity, recognizing our God-given gifts and potential, and reminding us of our responsibility to use our gifts and talents for the common good. Paul VI also reminded readers of the need to work to meet our human needs but not strive for material goods. Paul VI's significant contribution to Catholic Social Teachings was his emphasis that humans should live off of the gifts of the earth, but all should benefit equally from what the earth produced.

While previous popes more explicitly advocated for private ownership, Paul VI wrote "...the right to private property is not absolute and unconditional" (para. 23), warning that "No one may appropriate surplus goods solely for his own private use when others lack the bare necessities" (para. 23). Paul VI acknowledged materialism and greed as pitfalls of capitalism. He also specifically commented on the role of the worker; the worker should continue God's work with the gifts God gave to him or her. Labor allows people to join their efforts toward the same end, building relationships between the employer and employee. However, because work involves money, it can also bring out the worst in people. Understanding both the challenges and pitfalls of work, Paul VI encouraged employers and employees to partner together to increase production for the greater good. The rich therefore needed to make sacrifices for the benefit of the poor and disenfranchised.

Like earlier popes, Pope Paul VI supported professional organizations, viewing them as essential social structures. These associations provided training and educated members about the

role of work to help the common good. Paul VI thought that trade unions and professional organizations should therefore help ensure fair contracts that explicitly state worker rights and responsibilities. Paul VI called upon lay leaders to spread Catholic social teachings and explain how all social action is connected to doctrine.

Octogesima Adveniens

In *Octogesima Adveniens* (or “The Eightieth Anniversary;” 1971), Pope Paul VI commemorated the eightieth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum* and further worked to make the Gospel message relevant to the time, a time that was dealing with the challenges of industrialization and internationalism. Countries sought economic and political power which led to increased production, consumption, and wealth for some, and the dire consequences of exploitation and poverty for others. Paul VI wrote about “new social problems” facing the Church including the challenges of urbanization, challenges for youth, and challenges for women.

Octogesima Adveniens frequently addressed questions of power and responsibility. Paul VI cautioned those in power against discrimination, arguing that the Church had a responsibility to protect those at the margins who could be most adversely affected by change and suffer from the most abuse. Paul supported responsible participation and equality which he believed would lead to human dignity and freedom. Paul VI argued for justice, citing, “There is a need to establish a greater justice in the sharing of goods, both within national communities and on the international level” (para. 43).

Paul VI wrote broadly about political responsibility and the need to increase participation in decision-making. He specifically wrote about justice between nations, but his principles also applied to local attempts to unionize:

The passing to the political dimension also expressed demand made by the man of today: a greater sharing in responsibility and in decision-making. This legitimate aspiration becomes more evident as the cultural level rises, as the sense of freedom develops and as man becomes more aware of how, in a world facing an uncertain future, the choices of today already condition the life of tomorrow. (para. 47)

Workers similarly seek the freedom and responsibility that comes from decision making in the collective bargaining process.

Paul VI offered further commentary about the benefits and challenges of unions in this encyclical: “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” (para. 14). However, even as Paul VI supported strikes in *Gaudium et Spes*, he recognized the challenges of unions including their power to strike. He cautioned against this power and its potential negative impact.

In *Octogesima Adveniens* Pope Paul VI once again called upon Christian institutions to lead by example and help work for justice:

It is in this regard that Christian organizations, under their different forms, have a responsibility for collective action. Without putting themselves in the place of the institutions of civil society, they have to express, in their own way and rising above their particular nature, the concrete demands of the Christian faith for a just, and consequently necessary, transformation of society. (para. 51)

For Paul VI, the foundation of Christian hope comes from people working together for a more just world. If Catholic institutions, including colleges and universities, do not work for

justice, members of the Catholic faith-community may lose hope in the Church's greater message.

Justice in the World

In *Justice in the World* (1971), the Synod of Bishops added a global view of human dignity and articulated the expansiveness of the interconnectedness of life to the Catholic Social Teachings dialogue. This document advocated that developed nations should act responsibly and maintain and protect the basic necessities of life such as air, water, and the earth in a way people may not have understood before. In addition, the Synod taught that wealthy nations had a responsibility to care for developing nations. The technological developments of the day should have led to surplus resources and provided help for the poor and hungry. However, instead, the Synod wrote that these technological developments led to excess consumption and pollution. Therefore, the Synod clearly summarized that its focus was to seek justice through action, helping the marginalized and oppressed to understand their rights to work for justice as well.

Like John Paul II's *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* (or "The Concern for the Social Order"), Vatican II's 1971 Synod *Statement on Justice* and John XXIII's *Mater et Magistra*, the Synod of Bishops understood that the Church's credibility was at stake if it did not serve as a model for its own teachings on justice:

The mission of preaching the Gospel dictates at the present time that we should dedicate ourselves to the liberation of people even in their present existence in this world. For unless the Christian message of love and justice shows its effectiveness through action in the cause of justice in the world, it will only with difficulty gain credibility with the people of our times. (Section I, para. 35)

The Synod argued that the Church needed to serve as a model for justice in the world. Those seeking collective bargaining at Catholic schools could interpret this to mean that they too must model justice and serve as living examples of solidarity.

The Synod also advocated mobilizing the voiceless: "...from this basic self-determination can come attempts at putting together new political groupings allowing full development of these peoples" (Section I, para. 17). Therefore, according to the Synod, the poor and the marginalized needed to participate in their liberation process, a global message.

However, locally, in the Church setting, this means focusing on the Church workers, recognizing and encouraging their rights to be heard, providing them with due process, and increasing lay involvement Church operations and administration of church institutions. The Synod included daily education for justice and helping others understand the link between justice and Church practices/teachings in the liturgy and sacraments. Employees at Catholic institutions can interpret the Church's own words as support for collective bargaining or at least support for structures that allow increased participation in decision making.

At the same time, the Synod recognized the Church's responsibility to limit its resources and remain focused on serving the poor and marginalized. Catholic schools at all levels must remain affordable so as to serve the poor. School employees, religious and lay, have often had to limit their income to meet this need. Will the effect of unions on wages impact Catholic institutions' ability to remain focused on the poor and marginalized?

By way of conclusion, *Justice in the World* advocated that "through mutual cooperation, all peoples should be able to become the principal architects of their own economic and social development" (para. 71, b) and "every people, as active and responsible members of human society, should be able to cooperate for the attainment of the common good on an equal footing

with other peoples” (para. 71, c). Those seeking collective bargaining view these as supportive statements.

Laborem Exercens

In *Laborem Exercens* (Through Work) (1981), John Paul II argued that scripture dictates that work is a critically important part of each person’s life. Each person contributes to work as he or she is able, and derives dignity from one’s work: “through work man not only transforms nature, adapting it to his own needs, but he also achieves fulfillment as a human being and indeed, in a sense, becomes ‘more a human being’” (p. 16).

John Paul II also specified that all people have a responsibility to work and to take care of themselves and their families. All work should contribute to the greater good and utilize God-given natural resources for the benefit of all. John Paul II commented, “When man works, using all the means of production, he also wishes the fruit of this work to be used by himself and others, and he wishes to be able to take part in the very work process as a sharer in responsibility and creativity at the workbench to which he applies himself” (p. 28).

In *Laborem Exercens*, among other encyclicals, the Church recognized how advancements in technology resulted in changes to work. These changes would require retraining and even some temporary unemployment. However, these changes should ultimately increase employment and offer largescale improvements to global inequalities and injustices that will lead to greater peace. John Paul II acknowledged that worker movements had significantly contributed to this outcome by increasing solidarity among industrial laborers, especially, among those whose work had become depersonalized and valued only as a commodity.

The right to private ownership is another principle extolled in many Church teachings. Yet, like Paul VI, John Paull II contended that this right is not absolute. The right to ownership

was not intended to be an exclusive right. Instead, John Paul II extolled alternative structures that would allow workers to have joint ownership over the means of production. Without this, owners would continue to value capital over labor. He, however, prioritized labor over capital.

John Paul II offered a helpful analysis of direct and indirect employment that furthers this proposed study. Indirect employer influences include the external factors that affect direct employer contracts and the means of employee relations. These include state and international policies. John Paul II hoped for economic and social policies grounded in the rights of the worker. Just wages, fair social resources such as disability and medical insurance, unemployment support, training and adequate education for the workforce, pensions, safe working conditions, and work policies that promote personal and family development are all important worker benefits that improve justice. These are also issues often addressed in collective bargaining.

Laborem Exercens therefore offered a strong argument for worker associations. John Paul II strongly supported “the right of association, that is to form associations for the purpose of defending the vital interests of those employed in the various professions” (p. 36). These worker associations were open to all professions, not just industrial workers. John Paul acknowledged unions that sought worker education so workers could *be more* and not just have more. He hoped employers would not perceive union advocacy as opposition but rather as pushes toward justice. In fact, the Pope believed work should enhance solidarity. And, in the presence of extreme circumstances when worker needs were not met, John Paul II supported strikes as a means to an end. Yet, even this means had limits including first ensuring that the basic needs of the community first.

Sollicitudo Rei Socialis

In 1987, Pope John Paul II wrote *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* to honor the twentieth anniversary of *Populorum Progressio* and reaffirm the importance of the document while once again applying the Church's teachings to the contemporary world. John Paul II credited Paul VI with providing the first truly global evaluation of the challenges of the day and the ultimately for explaining the interconnectedness of individuals' challenges and decisions around the world. While John Paul II noted developments since the 1967 *Populorum Progressio*, he warned about ongoing and growing inequality gaps between the rich and the poor and between rich nations and poor nations.

In addition to growing economic poverty, John Paul II was concerned about another kind of poverty: the poverty that came from the denial of human rights, including the right to organize. For John Paul II, the denial of human rights was a bigger impoverishment than a lack of material goods. However, the gap between the rich and poor continued to grow between 1967 and 1987 which could be seen from symptoms such as the housing crisis, under- and unemployment, and increased indebtedness. Therefore, John Paul II argued that development was more inclusive than just economics. For John Paul authentic development included moral development, economic development, and social development requiring true international collaboration, sacrifice, and energy spent for the common good.

Without a moral guide, John Paul II believed that development in economics, science, and technology ultimately would not lead to happiness. He hoped to help people reach their true God-given vocation in pursuit of the greater good, which required collaboration and respect for the dignity of each human being. John Paul cautioned against sin, sinful acts, and evil structures. Ultimately, he understood human frailty but also had faith in human possibility.

Finally, as noted earlier, in *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, John Paul II wrote that the church should role model the behavior of Christ by being “agents of peace and justice” (para. 47). He believed that every individual had a role to play in the peace movement. Therefore, advocates of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities would argue that respecting the human right to organize would increase peace and that church leaders and leaders of church-affiliated institutions have an obligation to lead by example.

Centesimus Annus

Pope John Paul II’s *Centesimus Annus* (Hundredth Year; 1991) celebrated the 100th anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*. John Paul once again attempted to apply church teachings to the “new things” of his day. John Paul supported the social teachings of the Church, noted that the “worker question” had not yet been resolved, understood a global threat from injustice, called for a new evangelism to deal with the challenges of the day, and underlined the appropriate role of the State and international organizations in helping to bring peace to earth and right injustices leading to unrest.

John Paul II began with a healthy discussion of the challenges facing Pope Leo with the rise of a two class system, the rich and the poor, leaving the victims of industrialization poor and marginalized. This threat remained in 1991 and further developed on an international level. Like Leo, John Paul II vividly saw the threat of socialism, Marxism, totalitarianism, and other forms of oppression that failed to solve the justice problem. As such, he carefully outlined how the State could help support private economy and when it should intervene, evoking the spirit of subsidiarity to protect basic human rights of its people.

In *Centesimus Annus*, John Paul II once again declared that work was a basic right that helped both the individual and society meet its goals: “Work is work with others and work for

others” (para. 31). For John Paul, the role of business was more than profit; it was to create a “community of persons who in various ways are endeavoring to satisfy their basic needs, and who form a particular group at the service of the whole society” (para. 35). John Paul’s teachings also acknowledged “the legitimacy of worker’s efforts to obtain full respect for their dignity and to gain broader areas of participation in the life of industrial enterprises so that, while cooperating with others and under the direction of others, they can in a certain sense ‘work for themselves’ through the exercise of their intelligence and freedom” (para. 43).

Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy

In *Economic Justice for All: Pastoral Letter on Catholic Social Teaching and the U.S. Economy* (1986), the United States Council of Catholic Bishops evaluated economic policy in light of Catholic Social Teaching. In general, they argued that “Every perspective on economic life that is human, moral, and Christian must be shaped by three questions: What does the economy do for people? What does it do to people? And how do people participate in it?” (p. 1). As America is an experiment in democracy, collaboration and participation, the USCCB argued that the United States has the opportunity and responsibility to lead the world in shaping responsible economic policies at home and abroad.

The USCCB also called on Church institutions to lead by example with regard to economic policies: “All the moral principles that govern the just operation of any economic endeavor apply to the Church and its agencies and institutions; indeed the Church should be exemplary” (p. 86). Therefore, with regard to collective bargaining, “All church institutions must also fully recognize the rights of employees to organize and bargain collectively with the institution through whatever association or organization they freely choose” (p. 86). Any labor management agreements should also demonstrate communicative justice.

The USCCB called upon inclusion of workers in decision making, especially difficult decisions that have significant impact on them: “As a minimum, workers have a right to be informed in advance when such decisions are under consideration, a right to negotiate with management about possible alternatives, and a right to fair compensation and assistance with retraining and relocation expenses should these be necessary” (p. 74). Many colleges and universities are making difficult decisions that include layoffs and program closures.

In turn, USCCB also argued that unions have responsibilities:

Along with the rights of workers and unions go a number of important responsibilities, individual workers have obligations to their employers, and trade unions also have duties to society as a whole. Union management in particular carries a strong responsibility for the good name of the entire union movement. Workers must use their collective power to contribute to the well-being of the whole community and should avoid pressing demands whose fulfillment would damage the common good and the rights of more vulnerable members of society. (p. 24)

Unions also have a responsibility to provide training and support development to protect jobs. Some campus leaders may argue that this passage means campus unions should not put economic pressure on campuses with already tenuous economic situations and strained budgets.

Evangelii Gaudium

The current pontiff, Pope Francis, also offered important teachings about community and care for others. In 2013, Pope Francis wrote *Evangelii Gaudium* (or “The Joy of the Gospel”). While this text is primarily about evangelization, he made relevant points consistent with previous social teachings. First, he advocated for treating everyone with dignity. He also advocated for lovingly caring for our neighbors: “the rich must help, respect and promote the

poor” (para. 49). Pope Francis sensed rising anger and violence from inequality. He understood the growing gap between the rich and the poor, the idolization of money, obsession with consumption, corruption, and the “globalization of indifference” (para. 54). Pope Francis explained violence resulting from inequality and injustice could not be fixed by law enforcement alone, that the rich have to help the poor and everyone must address the systematic problems at the heart of the anger.

For Pope Francis, a community focused on spreading the good news was a loving community. He suggested limiting “rules” that prevent the Gospel from reaching everyone and avoiding processes and procedures that dehumanize people. Next, he reiterated that the Church will remain focused on serving the poor, the weak, and the marginalized.

In *Evangelii Gaudium*, Francis reviewed the problems from urbanization in developing cities. He worried that cities became mixes of subcultures where God was not present, centers of illegal and immoral activity. True Christian communities were self-giving places where people were reminded about joy and purpose from God, and he wrote, where people could search for meaning in their lives. The Pope further maintained that cities and states needed examples of others leading Christly lives.

Francis also argued that Christian communities stay together even when they are hurting, pointing out that the laity play a special role in Christian communities. Here he noted that people with many differences should find love and unity within Church communities. Community is part of a greater truth for Francis: “An authentic faith—which is never comfortable or completely personal—always involves a deep desire to change the world, to transmit values, to leave this earth somehow better than we found it” (para. 183). By living in community, by understanding solidarity, by prioritizing the whole over its parts, Francis advised that we are better able to serve

others in love and respond to the call for justice. Moreover, Francis viewed adequate wages, health care, education, opportunity for work, collaboration, giving voice to the voiceless, as ways we show our love for others and the sanctity of human dignity. For Francis, to solve inequity problems, we must break down the barrier between economy and the common good.

Francis's model offered wisdom to all, but especially to administrators and staff/faculty at faith-based schools struggling with conflict. He wrote, "In a culture which privileges dialogue as a form of encounter, it is time to devise a means for building consensus and agreement while seeking the goal of a just, responsive and inclusive society" (para. 180). Building consensus for the common good is for Francis a simple solution to many challenging problems.

Catholic Social Teaching and Collective Bargaining Today

All of the Catholic Social Teachings outlined in these important Catholic texts are engaged as senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities face the realities of these principles lived out on their campuses. In an article discussing National Adjunct Walk-Out Day held on February 25, 2015, Schneider (2014) suggested, "The best way of affirming Catholic identity is surely to actually practice it-by letting faculty organize" (p. 3). Is it that simple?

Those worried about government entanglement and religious freedom can turn to Bishop Vincent Leonard of Pittsburgh (1979) who was similarly concerned about religious freedom. Though Bishop Leonard believed his schools were exempt from federal oversight, he worked with a diocesan counsel and created a collective bargaining plan founded on Catholic Social Teaching that used an independent arbitrator. Though the Bishop still had power, the rights of the workers were much more protected (Sinyai, 2015) under his leadership.

Given the ideals espoused by Catholic Social Teaching, does collective bargaining affect religious freedom at colleges and universities? Following *NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago*, the American Catholic Church was challenged to find a solution to help lay teachers. Yet, the Church did not respond even though Catholic Social Teaching affirm the rights of the worker (Russo, 1990). Those advocating for the First Amendment believed, “any inquiries into how religious a college is, or how religious are the duties performed by faculty members, would also infringe on religious freedom” (Jaschik, 2015, para. 18). Novello (2014) warned, “The error of detaching human freedom from the truth about humankind leads to devastating consequences...” (p. 23). Will this happen at our colleges and universities? Has it already?

The Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities President Michael Galligan-Stierle posited, “Catholic colleges and universities respect and support the moral rights of workers to organize and bargain collectively, but reject the jurisdiction of the NLRB,” (as quoted in Russo, 2014). If this is the case, one can ask why all institutions are not following the models of St. Mary’s College or Georgetown who chose to stay neutral. Sinyai (2015) challenged colleges and universities that refuse to recognize faculty unions:

Duquesne and other Catholic universities adopting the same position (including Seattle University, St. Xavier University and Manhattan College) are trying to occupy an almost inconceivably narrow conceptual space. They are at once claiming to be too religious to be subject to enforcement action by the NLRB yet not religious enough to honor their adjuncts’ right to organize out of simple fidelity to Catholic social teaching. (p. 6)

Sinyai thought that failing to model Catholic Social Teaching faithfully will cause Church followers to question the Church’s teachings and institutions.

Many religiously affiliated professional organizations and colleges/universities supported Pacific Lutheran University's administration as it challenged its contingent faculty's collective bargaining efforts. These groups including the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities, Congregation for Mercy Higher Education, Cardinal Newman Society, St. Leo's University, and Fairfield University. Similarly, some groups also supported the adjuncts at PLU including AFL-CIO, Catholic Scholars for Workers Justice, and other labor unions.

Russo (2014) noted that not only does the Church support labor unions, but that Church teachings actually call upon unions to be inclusive organizations that model solidarity and take on the burdens of all faculty: full-time and contingent. In fact, many religiously affiliated primary and secondary schools as well as healthcare facilities already have unions. In an assessment of the state of adjunct faculty Russo concluded, "Higher education represents the type of unjust system that Catholic Social Teaching wants to address" (p. 21). He thus encouraged Catholic colleges and universities to follow the lead of Georgetown and/or to work with unionized primary and secondary schools to find a successful model that respects the rights of the worker.

In general, administrators who fear unions argued that they are concerned that the NLRB might exercise control over their religious identities. Additionally, those who criticized Catholic colleges and universities argued they are "defying the church's own teachings by exploiting instructors who work off the tenure track and by opposing their unionization" (Schmidt, 2013). This study saw how Catholic Social Teaching has affected senior-level administrator thinking about collective bargaining and what experiences affect senior-level administrators' perceptions of collective bargaining.

Communities of Faith

To Teach as Jesus Did (USCCB, 1972) helped define the characteristics of educational communities of faith. The USCCB argued that educational communities served as models for how to live in the greater world: “Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and the building of community. Community is central to educational ministry both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal...” (p. 4, Section 13). Based on what students learn about community in schools, they will apply these principles to their other “communities” including their family and friend communities.

Building communities of faith requires active involvement in institutional structures facilitating community relationship building. Cusick and DeVries (2001) wrote that relationships should be mutually beneficial and intentional. People, students especially, define themselves and learn how to interact with others within community. Therefore, the quality of campus relationships affects the ability of colleges or universities to collaborate and work together as well as affect their students’ development within their communities.

Ideally, educational faith communities show concern for the relationships between administrators and faculty, promoting a sense of trust in the community. There should be partnerships between lay and religious community members as well. All campus community members should have a sense of volunteerism and overall positive morale (Palestini, 1980) insofar as Catholic education is responsible for sharing the Message and modeling some of the forms a call to service may take. Community members should also feel a sense of procedural justice, fairness, just wages/costs, and positive working/learning environments.

To Teach as Jesus Did (USCCB, 1972) reminds readers about four essential components of faith communities which serve as foundations for effective school communities. First, “Since the Gospel spirit is one of a peace, brotherhood, love, patience, and respect for others, a school rooted in these principles ought to explore ways to deepen its students’ concern for and skill in peacemaking and the achievement of justice” (pp. 30-31, Section 109). Catholic colleges and universities should therefore seek to model relationships based on peace, love, patience, and respect because students need to see the Message lived out and see how community is built (USCCB, 1997). Decision making structures should allow for decisions to be made peacefully.

A second ideal for effective faith-communities is that, the “Life of the Spirit unites its members in a unique fellowship” (USCCB, 1972, p. 7, Section 22). Catholic educational communities should be motivated by a common mission, common values, and a common desire to serve its students and develop values in them as they seek a Christ-centered life in community. Communities should feel like they are working toward something greater than themselves while fostering a sense of volunteerism and positive morale. As a result of communities united in their goals with common values, their members should feel welcomed and secure, which will best allow their members to develop (USCCB, 1997).

A third theme for building effective faith communities is, “In this community one person’s problem is everyone’s problem and one person’s victory is everyone’s victory” (p. 7, Section 22). Remembering our shared responsibility to each other and our respect for each other’s human dignity reduces adversarial relationships. Communication break downs or competition within Catholic college communities will take focus away from the greater mission and detract from collegial environments, leaving community members divided instead of united as they struggle to fight other external challenges already facing the faith community.

A fourth theme of participation is also critical to effective shared governance at Catholic colleges and universities: “All those involved in a Catholic school—parents, pastors, teachers, administrators, and the students—must earnestly desire to make it a community of faith which is indeed ‘living, conscious, and active.’ (USCCB, 1997, p. 30, Section 106). These participants are all noted as being essential components of the faith community. All parts are equally important even if all are not visible (Powell, 2001). When communities feel fair and just, it models an extended family as opposed to just a work place or any other school (McGrath, 1985).

While all members are important and equal, administrators have a crucial role to play in setting the tone and providing structures to help build faith communities in the form of shared governance. Faculty/teachers also have a special role to play in faith community formation and maintenance that should be respected and valued by school administrators: “Integration of religious truth and values with the rest of life is brought about in the Catholic school not only by its unique curriculum but, more important, by the presence of teachers who express an integrated approach to learning and living in their private and professional lives.” (USCCB, 1972, p. 29, Section 104).

Faculty are in classes with students each day. They provide mentoring relationships and demonstrate an important and lived experience of faith with reason. Therefore, administrators in shared governance models must give proper credence to the essential role faculty play in the lives of our students and the expertise they have as both mentors and seasoned professionals who understand and dialogue with students about the complexities of their lives daily.

In its call to all members of faith communities, *To Teach as Jesus Did* particularly recognized religious communities for their historic contributions to maintaining educational faith

communities. The USCCB also called upon ever increasing numbers of lay campus leaders to have a role in shaping the future of these communities:

They are full partners in the Catholic educational enterprise, and the dramatic increase of their numbers and influence in recent years is welcome and desirable in itself. As with religious, so with lay teachers and administrators, the Catholic community invites not only their continued service but also their increased participation in planning and decision making and their continued emergence in leadership roles. (p. 40, Section 147)

The USCCB called for broad representation in shared governance and a common commitment to meet the challenges facing educational faith communities in 1972 as well as today.

Faculty and administration therefore play critical roles in Catholic educational communities: “Adult learners assume the role of preparing and equipping all members of the body to minister to one another” (Powell, 2001, p. 201). Effective shared governance should facilitate trust building which is vital for community life, allow members to honestly and effectively share their pain and fears (USCCB, 1997) while preparing the educational communities with the tools needed for effective collaboration and decision making.

Shared governance should also provide the structure needed to facilitate collaboration and shared decision making in educational faith communities.

The concept of the Church as a community, and the school as a Christian Educational Community, has significant implications for the ordering of relationships between persons having roles in the secular arena labeled “employers” and “employees;” “management” and “labor.” In the Christian Educational Community, the relationship should be characterized by cooperation and not conflict; by service to others, not service

of self; by harmony not hatred; by justice for all, not justice for some; and especially by growth in and witness to faith in Jesus. (Palestini, 1980, p. 40)

The shared governance structure should therefore allow for and expect active participation, cooperation, harmony, and justice. But most importantly, the shared governance structure should facilitate relationship building.

Finding a shared governance model that can meet the needs of whole communities may be challenging (Powell, 2001). Communities formed from shared governance should provide a healthy network of belonging that respects individual member contributions and realities. They should be places where all members can make meaning and allow for some security so growth can happen. The structure should facilitate open dialogue and welcome those who have differences of opinions and different needs. School administrators are called to find a shared governance system to meet the unique educational needs and objectives of Catholic education because the ability to be community depends on the quality of our relationships and the way community members relate to each other (Parks, 2011).

Can educational faith communities exist in Catholic higher education? Are school professionals able to model care for each other? Can a successful professional educational community demonstrate God's care and grace? How can senior administrators ensure this happens for the benefit of the greater school community/students? Hopefully, opportunities for well-functioning shared governance will help build and maintain a model educational community in which all members will thrive and develop. Do senior-level administrators perceive unions as helpful to building caring, faith communities?

Review of Related Research

Some research has been conducted about administrator and teacher perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic primary and secondary schools. Some of these quantitative and qualitative studies assessed the perceived effect of collective bargaining on various aspects of faith-communities. Additionally, some qualitative research has been conducted on conditions leading to collective bargaining at public colleges in New England and a private, Catholic college in California. The researcher pulled from these studies when formulating her research questions and returned to them when analyzing the data from this study.

Primary and Secondary School Research

The first known related study on administrator perceptions of collective bargaining was conducted by Olsen (1971). Olsen actually sought teacher and administrative perceptions of collective bargaining at 620 randomly selected Roman Catholic secondary schools in the 31 largest diocese in the United States, about half of all secondary schools in 1969. He sent a 61 item questionnaire to one religious teacher, one lay teacher, and one administrator at each school. He received 975 usable responses from 393 schools. Of these, 385 were from administrators, 309 were completed by religious teachers, and 281 were from lay teachers. Responses came from three types of Catholic secondary schools: 167 private schools, 120 parish schools, and 106 diocesan schools.

Olsen then analyzed the data based on various factors including type of school, religious/lay faculty member role, age, gender, highest education achieved, and data on teacher/administrator experience. He assessed the respondents' overall attitudes about collective bargaining, the role of religious in collective bargaining, thoughts about the structure for

collective bargaining, policies related to collective bargaining, and the items negotiated in collective bargaining.

As a result of his research, Olsen learned five important findings. First, most respondents felt that a professional association was preferable to a union. This was particularly true for female lay respondents. Second, a faculty senate structure was not necessarily preferred over a professional association or a union, which speaks to concerns about their effectiveness. Next, over 67% of respondents thought that collective negotiations would improve the professional quality of their institutions. Fourth, almost 70% of respondents did not think that collective bargaining would create a divide between lay teachers and administrators. Finally, almost 78% of respondents disagreed that collective negotiations would increase conflict between religious and lay faculty. Therefore, perceptions of collective bargaining were somewhat positive.

The majority of Olsen's respondents wanted Catholic bishops to establish policies for collective bargaining, but did not want the Church to play a formal role in disagreements between boards, administrators, and teachers. The majority of respondents also supported religious participation in bargaining units. However, they agreed that a religious superior should not serve as the school principal.

Respondents supported wide inclusion of topics open to collective bargaining including leave of absences, teacher qualifications, teacher evaluations, curriculum, co-curricular assignments, teacher load, class size, and dismissal procedures. Religious faculty wanted to be fully involved in collective bargaining efforts, however male religious and male administrators had more moderate views of collective bargaining than male lay faculty or female respondents. Administrators, in general, felt fewer items should be eligible for collective negotiations.

Overall, Olsen's study found that faculty and administrators at secondary Catholic schools had a generally favorable attitude about collective negotiations and about outcomes they anticipated from collective negotiations. However, there were differences between responses of administrators, religious teachers and lay teachers, as well as differences based on the type of school and if the schools already had a recognized collective bargaining unit. Finally, religious faculty wanted to be active and full participants in collective negotiations.

The Olsen study did not account for response differences between lay and religious administrators, likely because more respondents were religious administrators at the time. Still, respondents overwhelmingly agreed that lay people should be eligible for leadership roles within the schools. While Olsen's study showed that administrators may have been more resistant to negotiating, they were not necessarily against unions.

In a subsequent study, Yamada (1973) researched teacher and principal perceptions of the principal's leadership role in Catholic parochial elementary schools. He randomly surveyed 100 elementary principals, religious teachers, and lay teachers from 207 schools in the New York Archdiocese who had a negotiated contract. He used the Principal's Leadership role Opinionnaire (PLRO) as his research tool. He compared these results with those of 100 randomly sampled principals, religious teachers and lay teachers in 217 Newark parochial schools who were without a negotiated contract.

Yamada's findings argued principals felt their working relationships were less cooperative after collective bargaining negotiations, created less desirable working conditions, lacked warmth, were more formal and created relationships that were less open with teachers. He summarized that the role of principal became to, "surmount turmoil and conflict" and "to tolerate frustration" (1973, p. 45).

Yamada also had some positive findings that supported collective bargaining, including that it developed formal procedures for participation and two-way communication, that staff better understood the implications of decisions, that bargaining increased principals' care for their staff and closer bonds with teachers, and that it increased agreement in decision making. The collective bargaining supporters in his study also argued that collective bargaining changed the role of principal to: "the implementer and coordinator of policies and procedures emanating from local committees" (1973, p. 44), which was more inclusive. Yamada also found that collective bargaining shifted the role of principal to one of a true leader who effectively engaged others in decision making and led change as opposed to managing the status quo or implemented contracts.

In general, Yamada affirmed that "concern for people" and "concern for goals" were two primary functions of Catholic elementary principals. He concluded that having a negotiated contract had no "inhibitive factor nor incentive factor" for principals in exercising their leadership (1973, p. 96).

In a 1976 historical analysis of the role of laity within the Church, Huffman argued strongly for a lay union movement and cited Catholic Social Teaching as a justification for increasing the power and influence of lay people in Church leadership and in Church schools. Huffman acknowledged the instability of the church schools' fiscal model but still strongly believed that lay teachers needed increased academic freedom and had a right to basic financial survival. She understood the lay movement's desire to reassert its power and challenge the Church (Perrotta, 1993). Current collective bargaining efforts at Catholic colleges and universities include movements for a just wage and voice within the institution, though not necessarily for a voice within the Church.

Nami (1979) researched teacher strike behaviors in three U.S. Catholic Dioceses where strikes had taken place in recent years. He randomly distributed 600 surveys in three dioceses to postsecondary school teachers, receiving 186 responses. Nami assessed strike behavior based on a number of personal factors including teachers' commitment to the Catholic school system and to Catholic morals and values. He found that men, younger teachers, families with lower salaries, and teachers with less time at Catholic schools were more likely to support strike behaviors, though almost all respondents supported the strike in some way. Also, he discovered that the more diocesan pressure asserted, the more likely teachers were to support the strike. In this study, those who were more service-oriented to their schools and those who were more faithful tended to demonstrate more militant strike behavior. While this study solely reviewed teacher perspectives, it should be useful to help senior-administrators understand factors that influence strike participation moving forward.

Palestini (1980) studied administrator and teacher perceptions of the effects of collective bargaining at 30 secondary schools in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. Palestini's work is especially relevant to this proposed study because of his focus and findings on administrator perceptions. In general, respondents in this study reported that collective bargaining had a positive effect on a community of faith as measured by four identified factors including: community, service, witness, and worship. However, responding administrators perceived collective bargaining as having a negative impact on these factors.

Palestini specifically noted that administrators perceived collective bargaining as having a negative impact on "respect, trust and partnership between lay and religious teachers, and between teachers and administrators" (p. 147) as well as morale and volunteerism. However, he found that collective bargaining had a perceived effect on "support and collaboration among

teachers, the teachers' treatment of students, and teacher assignment and improvement" (p. 147). Palestini also discovered that administrators perceived a positive effect on "teacher public commitment to the Catholic school, their support for each other, the promotion of justice among teachers and administrators, and the interaction among faculty, parents, administrators and students." (pp. 147-148).

Palestini's study found that administrators were concerned about the impact of collective bargaining at faith-based schools because of their perceived impact on communities of faith. This concern is also commonly used as justification why public unions should not have jurisdiction over faith-based collective bargaining and is therefore discussed in other studies and texts as well (Cicco, 1976; Cresswell, 1976; Huber, 2004; Leibrecht, 1976; McGrath, 1985; Perrotta, 1993).

Boyle (1980) continued the discussion about the impact of unions on faith-based schools by sending a questionnaire to chief administrative officers in all 160 Catholic School systems in the United States, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam. Almost 90% of administrators responded. Most respondents were administrators of parish schools. Yet, only about 16% of respondents had unions and most of these were diocesan, secondary schools. Almost half of respondents wanted a new union model because they felt the public school model did not work. Only about 25% of administrator respondents supported unions. About 42% of respondents disagreed with unions on philosophical grounds, about 33% on economic grounds, and 1% wanted another structure in their dioceses. Interestingly, of those administrators who already had unions, about 75% supported them. Of those without unions, more than half felt unions were detrimental to their faith communities. This contrast highlights the perception versus the reality of unions. Finances were also a concern for administrators worried about unions. Boyle

acknowledged a larger fiscal crisis for Catholic schools and the pressure they put on local religious leaders and parishes.

Scatena (1984) researched the historical development of unions in Pennsylvania Catholic secondary schools affiliated with the National Association of Catholic School Teachers (NACST) in the dioceses of Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, and Youngstown from 1960-1982. He found that there was no persistent resistance to the lay teacher organization movement in Pennsylvania and that church teachings emphasizing the rights of the worker were important in the movement. The collective bargaining agreements under study provided an established means of communication and guidelines for working together. Further, these agreements also resulted in improved working conditions and salary/benefits. These dioceses were able to reach collective bargaining agreements without NLRB involvement.

Building on Olsen's research, McGrath (1985), sent Olsen's survey to principals and (lay and religious) teachers at 92 Catholic high schools in Illinois. McGrath's essential quantitative research questions and findings are essential to the current proposed study. He sought to learn what led to collective bargaining, how principals felt about collective bargaining, what the Church taught about collective bargaining, how lay and religious teachers felt about collective bargaining, how administrators should respond to collective bargaining efforts, available alternatives to collective bargaining, how to solve labor relations disputes, and how collective bargaining affected the culture of Catholic schools.

McGrath found that the same factors leading to public school union growth contributed to Catholic school union growth and that the Church teachings on unions were clear. More than half of the principal respondents said that there was no movement toward collective bargaining at their schools. Those who reported movement described the primary reasons for collective

bargaining efforts were staff seeking improved salary and better working conditions; teachers also wanted to participate in planning. About two thirds of responding principals did not report concern about dealing with unionized faculties and many believed that the role of the principal would still be important. More than half of the responses were not worried about losing authority, but a significant amount of the respondents were concerned.

Based on their studies of over 100 school districts in California and Illinois during four field research projects, Kerchner and Mitchell (1988) proposed that collective bargaining in education spurred from industrial unionization with an initial focus on legislation, training, and benefits. They argued it has occurred in a three phases, or generations. The First-Generation of union organizers preferred a “meet-and-confer” model and assumed a family-like school atmosphere where teachers and school leaders both had their best interests at heart. The ‘Good Faith Bargaining’ Generation was more typical of collective bargaining through the 1980s with traditional union contracts that clearly defined due process and worker rights. In the “Negotiated Policy” generation, the model these authors argued we are moving to, understands teachers’ impact on educational issues, outcomes, policy. Conflict between these “generations” led to the iteration of collective bargaining in the next generation.

Kerchner and Mitchell (1988) had a number of significant findings including that unionism occurred after a critical event which could include policy changes, personnel changes, or legal changes. As a result, those who decided to organize lacked trust in administrators and perceived unionism as the ideal. On the other hand, school leaders were shocked when teachers wanted to organize and perceived labor organizers as outsiders who wanted to stir up conflict within schools. They also found that unions began when teachers believed, “that they were being treated unfairly by those who were responsible for managing the schools and that they had

to gain power in order to protect themselves” (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988, p. 33). How leaders handled these challenges was also significant. Amateurism on the part of leaders and union organizers negatively affected participants’ perceptions of collective bargaining.

Kerchner and Mitchell (1988) found that when moving from the first generation collective bargaining to the second generation, teachers had to define their own self-interest, advocate for their own dignity and protection, and change the perception that they were harming educational institutions or their students through their desire to collectively bargain. Once in the second generation, trust developed slowly but became essential for successful labor/management relations and traditional collective bargaining. At the same time, managers fought for sweeping control over management rights as they feared unions would take away their ability to manage problems locally and quickly as well as de-professionalize the faculty.

In assessing the need for unions in the future, Kerchner and Mitchell argued that teacher unions needed to move away from industrial unions to a new model that would professionalize teachers and hold them accountable for educational outcomes. They wrote, “As we envision it, professional unionism follows the pragmatic tradition of the American labor movement: solving the pressing “problems of today,” rather than building a utopian but unrealizable mode for a future that never arrives” (Kerchner & Mitchell, 1988, p. 243). They preferred a model that focusses on public accountability, job definitions, contributes to educational outcomes, and supports a healthy organizational culture.

In 1989, Russo conducted an additional study that built on Olsen and McGrath’s findings. Using a copy of Olsen’s questionnaire that he modified with permission, he researched 146 Catholic secondary schools in New York State seeking to learn the factors that affected principal

and teacher perceptions of collective bargaining. Russo (1989) noted the importance of his study:

Any significant differences that emerge between the attitudes of administrators and teachers must be viewed as potential areas of conflict where efforts will have to be made to resolve differences before they can mushroom and disrupt the educational atmosphere present in the schools. Conversely, areas where no significant differences emerge may provide a strong basis for continuing cooperation and a strengthening of the schools. (p. 16)

Russo found that religious respondents were more open to finding alternatives to collective bargaining while lay teachers wanted different units for lay and religious in collective bargaining units. He noted that lay teachers were more favorable to the National Catholic Educational Association's (NCEA) involvement in collective bargaining. All respondents were somewhat positive about collective bargaining development, but only 29% of responding schools had collective bargaining units. In general, Russo discussed that more differences existed between lay and religious responses than between administrator and teacher responses.

Perrotta (1993) studied the factors affecting administrator and teacher perceptions of collective bargaining at Jesuit secondary schools in the United States by using a modified version of the Olsen-Russo questionnaire with over 93% of schools responding. Perrotta noted that over 68% of responding administrators were religious, but lay leadership was growing. Respondents worried about divisiveness resulting from collective bargaining, but administrators worried more than teachers. Respondents also believed administrators should help reduce the tension. Respondents wanted Jesuits to develop a national policy for collective bargaining. Administrators and religious teachers opposed strikes more than lay teachers. Administrators

and religious also preferred a faculty committee structure that ensured collaboration as opposed to a union. A similarly common argument against collective bargaining on the collegiate level is that shared governance (faculty senates) already exist to give faculty voice in campus decision making.

Kresse (2004) examined the major models for labor relations in Catholic schools and the impact they have on teacher attrition. Kresse began with a simple survey asking 101 Catholic high schools in New York State plus an additional 20 high schools with primary grades to identify their labor relations model as one of three simplified models: “Union/Collective Bargaining Model,” “Meet and Confer Model” for example, having a faculty senate or advisor board), and the “Notification Model” with a top down administration.

Kresse (2004) then chose one school from each model and conducted extended, structured interviews with three current teachers, three teachers who left in past two years, and key administrators. Kresse inquired about issues teachers were upset about, how teachers were able to voice their dissatisfaction, how school administration reacted to teacher voice, and what led teachers to leave their institutions. Kresse found that the primary reason for teacher attrition in all models was dissatisfaction with salary, benefits, and working conditions. Kresse discussed that with each model the expectation for having a voice increased (i.e. teachers with a union expected to have a larger say than those in notification model). When their voice was not heard, he learned that those in the union model were more likely to leave. Also, the results demonstrated that diocesan schools were more likely to be unionized. Notification schools were more likely to be run by religious orders.

These primary and secondary Catholic school studies focus on a range of topics including: why teachers seek collective bargaining, why teachers strike, administrator

perceptions of collective bargaining, perceptions of collective bargaining on the educational faith community, differences between lay and religious respondents and involvement, etc. The findings will be relevant in understanding the findings from this study as so little research exists on senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic college and universities.

College and University Related Research

The researcher could only find two qualitative studies on administrative perceptions of collective bargaining in higher education. The first was published by Arnold (2000) in *The Politics of Faculty Unionization: The Experience of Three New England Universities* in which he studied the circumstances leading to collective bargaining at three public universities. The second is was by Hudec (1999) who studied the issues that caused faculty to adopt a union model at a private, medium-sized church-related Jesuit institution in California.

To begin, Arnold (2000) wanted to understand why the faculty on three public campuses in New England formed collective bargaining units. He specifically focused on the University of Connecticut, the University of Massachusetts, and the University of Rhode Island, all of which unionized between 1971 and 1976; these institutions had strong alumni following who were located in relatively close proximity to these institutions. Arnold focused on public universities because he argued the public, politicians, and media were more interested in and concerned about public funds than at private institutions.

Arnold (2000) understood that something significant had to change for faculty to see unions as a viable option for their profession. Arnold acknowledged that higher education moved from its golden years in the 1960s to much more challenging times in the 1970s, including cuts in government spending on education, also noting that the United State was on the

verge of war with Vietnam. In these challenging times, Arnold (2000) saw that a greater “crisis of confidence in existing social institutions led to widespread re-examination of many aspects of social and economic life in the United States” (p. 3).

At the same time, Arnold (2000) described a move to collective bargaining as part of a larger power struggle between faculty and administration. He argued that collective bargaining was most likely to occur when administration and faculty were adversaries and could not be collegial or when administration and faculty already had strong governance structures and good working relationships, but they started to lose some strength around money and public sentiment. At each of these three institutions Arnold found developing adversarial relationships between faculty, administration, politically appointed boards, and/or state governments. He also saw a shift from academic to business cultures on these campuses.

Arnold found budgetary restrictions and salary conflicts to be a strong precursor of collective bargaining at these institutions. He also realized that faculty were tired of shifts in political support that relied on the whims of governors and state legislators; these changes to state collective bargaining laws and politically active public unions added fuel to an already burning fire. According to Arnold’s research, challenges to tenure and academic freedom and a diminishing role in campus decision making were potentially the breaking points for the faculty at these state universities.

Arnold’s research uncovered common themes contributing to collective bargaining at these universities and at other primary, secondary, and post-secondary schools. Arnold also found that the role of key campus leaders, usually the presidents, played important roles in the collective bargaining movements either as adversaries of the faculty or to state governments.

In a qualitative case study dissertation, Hudec (1999) conducted historical research to learn what issues caused faculty to adopt a union model at a private, medium-sized, church-related Jesuit institution. Hudec utilized direct observation and hosted 15 interviews, in person and on the phone, with those present in the mid-1980s. He also reviewed published materials, internet and written responses, University archives, and department/personnel files. He sought chronological facts, tried to learn perceptions and intentions at the time, and recreated a narrative of the union formation. Hudec's research questions included:

What led the faculty to seek unionization? What led the faculty to choose the corporate-industrial model instead of the collaborative-cooperation union model? What were the specific characteristics of the management style of the administration and faculty union leaders? Were the church documents, specifically those concerning social teaching, a significant factor in the position of statements of either the administration or the faculty union, why or why not? (Hudec, 1999, p. 8)

Hudec (1999) concluded that a number of external developments in the 1960s affected union development in his study. These included the assassinations of Martin Luther King and John F. Kennedy as well as the race into space which resulted in large investments in technology and education. Hudec also determined that international student perceptions about that U.S. wealth contributed to union formation at this California institution.

The institution was located on seaport city whose culture, behavior, and history with unions also contributed to collective bargaining development. Even the campus culture itself, which was open to protests, valued free speech and social action, contributed to union growth. The campus also had a labor management school that prided itself on connection to Catholic Social Teaching and had strong relationships to local labor and labor lawyers.

As early as 1965 this institution became co-educational and had good enrollment. It was building its capacity and benefited from G.I. Bill funding. However, the number of religious orders began to decline in the 1960s and 1970s. Teachers were not replaced with other religious order professors. Vatican II resulted in even more religious leaving the Church. The campus's student population was less than half Catholic, the curriculum changed. The campus had more business focused members and even fewer religious on the board of trustees.

Declining enrollments in the 1970s led to deficits and stagflation. Limited raises, limited spending, concerns about job security, increased numbers of lay staff/faculty who wanted "real world wages" (Hudec, 1999, p. 88), and a perception that administrators did not value the faculty, all led to increasing tensions on campus. Even as the number of administrator positions increased by one third in one year, the faculty senate remained collegial with the administration. That changed in the mid-1970s when the faculty felt that they were not respected and their opinions were not listened to.

First, Hudec reported the trades and law school faculty unionized. Unionized staff/faculty received a 6-8% salary increase, but non-union faculty earned only a 2.5% increase, as administration made it clear that they had no obligation to work with the non-union faculty. The Labor Management School advised the faculty to speak with a lawyer, and they did. The faculty did not think the AAUP or AFT would help them so they formed as a trade union.

The lawyer met with the campus's religious faculty who had mixed opinions about collective bargaining. Other faculty similarly had mixed opinions, but they moved to a pro-union stance as their treatment by the administration grew worse. Tensions increased when the administration publically blamed the faculty for its enrollment troubles. The Board, without

consulting the faculty, made major campus leadership appointments who were known anti-union entities. The College also laid off all non-tenured faculty members.

The faculty voted three to one to unionize. The administration sent staff to intimidate faculty at an organizing meeting. In 1981 the administration raised tuition 15% and in 1982 it froze the budget. When the faculty contract expired in 1986, the conflicts only become worse. The union actually sent multiple letters to parents threatening a strike. One of these letter cited Catholic Social Teachings about the workers' rights. In 1987, the institution hit a turning point. Bad behavior on both sides began to wane after the economy started to recover. Then the Academic Vice President (AVP) resigned. In 1988, a new AVP was hired who was more inclined to collaboration and began meeting regularly with faculty. Pressure from accrediting agencies enforced the need for improved collaboration. In 1988 the Faculty Association leader stepped down. Later, in 1988, a new president was hired who was both more collegial and a successful fundraiser, helping to ease financial pressures.

As a result of this study, Hudec (1999) concluded that the following factors influence collective bargaining development. First, unionizing usually occurs for significant reasons. In this case, unresolved issues resulted in increased tensions and militaristic behavior. Second, social, fiscal, religious and scientific developments locally and nationally have a serious impact on our campuses that in this case pushed the faculty to seek collective bargaining.

Arnold (2000) and Hudec's (1999) studies articulate that leadership, personnel, and personalities undoubtedly impact campus functioning. They find that leadership and campus culture that lacks respect and human dignity between faculty and administration is damaging. Campus leadership starts at the Board of Trustee level. The institution must strive to be fair and just. The media and one's public image also affects union development. Ultimately, the

institution had to become fed up with both sides of the debate and hire a good mediator in the right position to make a difference. The external pressure from the accrediting agency helped validate an urgent need for change. The institution had to build openness and trust founded in Catholic Social Teachings. Again, these two post-secondary qualitative studies will be relevant in understanding the findings from this proposed study as so little research exists on senior-level administrator experiences with and perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic college and universities.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the researcher reviewed the relevant literature affecting this study. Since little research has been conducted on senior-leader perceptions of collective bargaining at faith-based colleges and universities, the researcher reviewed pertinent literature about the development of collective bargaining in higher education; Catholic Social Teachings about worker rights; characteristics of an educational faith community; and relevant qualitative and quantitative research about primary and secondary school administrator and teacher perceptions of collective bargaining as well as two qualitative studies about conditions leading to collective bargaining in higher education.

CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY
Research Proposal

The purpose of this study was to examine senior-level administrators' perceptions of collective bargaining at selected Catholic colleges and universities. The researcher explored the participants' experiences that have influenced these perceptions including such matters as internal and external pressures such as financial challenges, board expectations, and stressed markets in hope that participants' stories may inform other senior-level administrators facing similar pressures. The researcher hoped to learn the extent to which Catholic Social Teaching also affects senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining. The researcher interviewed senior-level administrators, member-checked the interviews, and reviewed and analyzed relevant documents including public statements and collective bargaining agreements from participants' institutions to answer the following research questions:

1. How do senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities perceive collective bargaining?
2. What internal and external factors and experiences affect this perception?
3. How does Catholic Social Teaching affect this perception?
4. How does this perception change with regard to full-time faculty unions? Part-time or contingent faculty unions? Staff unions?

This chapter explains the study's rationale and design which will best capture the essence of the participants' lived experiences. These experiences may have affected senior leaders' perceptions of collective bargaining. This chapter also reviews procedures and protocols used in this methodology.

Research Methodology

Berg and Lune (2012) maintain that qualitative research captures the “what, how, when, where, and why of things-its essence and ambience” (p. 3). Insofar as this researcher hopes to gain deep insights into the lived experiences of senior-level administrators faced with a trend toward collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities, she conducted a qualitative study seeking the aforementioned “essence” of their experiences. Qualitative researchers seek “patterns among cases, but do not reduce these cases to their averages” (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 8). While quantitative research would provide statistical tests on aggregate data, this qualitative study seeks more depth in attempting to understand senior-level administrators’ “emotions, motivations, symbols and their meanings, empathy, and other subjective aspects associated with naturally evolving lives of individuals and groups” (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 15).

Transcendental Phenomenological Approach

Creswell (2013) wrote that a phenomenological study “describes the common meaning for several individuals of their lived experiences of a concept or phenomenon” (p. 76). He continued, “The basic purpose of phenomenology is to reduce individual experiences with a phenomenon to a description of the universal essence” (Creswell, 2013, p. 76). Seeking the “what” and the “how” of a phenomenon from those who have experienced it, a phenomenological researcher develops a description of the phenomenon, not an explanation of it. Phenomenology moves away from empirical data toward a philosophical approach that respects self-knowledge, experience, and intuition as true forms of knowledge (Moustakas, 1994).

In this study, the researcher sought to learn how senior-level administrators perceive collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities and what experiences affect this perception. Moustakas posited that phenomenological research should not assume or predict

relationships and that the research question should remain “alive” or open to modification throughout the studies as researchers seek to understand their phenomena. This researcher kept these principles in the forefront when preparing the research design and when conducting the study.

Moustakas’s (1994) work on transcendental phenomenology is founded in Husserl’s phenomenology that sought to establish a “disciplined methodology for derivation of knowledge” (p. 45) gleaned from observation and experience, not just empirical knowledge gained from experiments and science. For Moustakas, transcendental phenomenology was “a scientific study of the appearance of things, or phenomena just as we see them and as they appear to us in consciousness” (1994, p. 49). Phenomena like the ones being researched in this study become clear by thorough examination and reflection.

Transcendental phenomenology requires the researcher to look at a phenomenon with fresh eyes while seeking knowledge from participants whom Moustakas (1994) considered true research partners. By learning new layers of partial understandings from each participant’s experiences, the researcher can better understand the phenomenon. Therefore, phenomenological research is about more than discovering facts; it is about looking for common participant experiences. Moustakas argued that noema (the physical experience) and noesis (the perceived experience), collectively unify and shape the meaning of an experience for the researcher. Through phenomenological research, “Richer and more extended descriptions of an experience are realized” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 72). As a result of this study, this researcher hopes to provide a rich description of senior-level administrators’ experiences that influence their perception of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities.

Researcher Role

The primary role of the researcher in transcendental phenomenology is to develop a “knowledge of essences” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 51). The researcher seeks out participants’ wisdom and experience of a phenomenon and then attempts to describe the essence of the phenomenon. Moustakas further explained the role of the researcher in phenomenological research:

Phenomenology is rooted in questions that give a direction and focus to meaning, and in themes that sustain an inquiry, awaken further interest and concern, and account for our passionate involvement with whatever is being experienced. In a phenomenological investigation the researcher has a personal interest in whatever she or he seeks to know; the researchers is intimately connected with the phenomenon. (1994, p. 58)

In this case, this researcher works at a small Catholic college in the Northeast, is aware of the complicated and challenging higher education landscape, and hopes to assume increasing levels of administrative responsibility in her career. She is knowledgeable of Catholic Social Teaching and an advocate for justice. She has also served as an adjunct instructor for three semesters. The researcher, therefore, hopes to maintain her passion for the subject while instilling Moustakas’s principle of Epoche, which is a “process of renewal” and reflection (1994, p. 90) requiring the researcher to put her judgement and expectation aside to learn from the essence of the lived experiences of senior-level administrators in her study.

Participants and Access

The researcher first needed to gain access to the appropriate senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities in the Northeast. This is the most basic criterion for participants, or as Moustakas referred to them, co-researchers. She gained access to this

population with the help of a gatekeeper, which Glesne (2011) defined as, “the person or persons who must give their consent before you may enter a research setting, and with whom you must negotiate the conditions of access” (p. 57). A senior-level administrator the researcher knows who is committed to the research study assisted the researcher with introductions to possible study participants. She specifically used purposeful snowball sampling to select her participants. Glesne (2011) defined snowball, chain, or network sampling as “obtains knowledge of potential cases from people who knew people who meet research interests” (p. 45).

Berg and Lune (2012) described snowball sampling as especially useful when studying sensitive topics. Senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities is a very sensitive topic. As the information shared by participants is likely to be highly confidential due to the public nature of many collective bargaining efforts and National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) cases, the researcher maintained participant confidentiality to gain trust and minimize any limitations of the study.

Study Design and Procedures

This qualitative transcendental phenomenological study sought to learn about the lived experience of six to eight senior-level administrators at different Catholic colleges and universities. This number of participants allowed for adequate data collection in a phenomenological study (Creswell, 2014). Participants were from very small to mid-sized, four-year Catholic colleges in the Northeast where leaders were more accessible and the number of high school graduates is on the decline. These institutions may also be more tuition-reliant and therefore particularly sensitive to market pressures. The researcher tried to find a mix of participants who already have staff, faculty, and/or contingent faculty unions; may be

imminently facing collective bargaining efforts; and do not currently have any collective bargaining/bargaining efforts on their campuses.

The researcher conducted one 60 to 90-minute interview with each participant and record these interviews with a primary and back-up audio recorder. She transcribed these interviews and sent the transcript to each participant for review and comment. The researcher carefully and thoughtfully coded the transcripts based on emerging themes from participant experiences and document analysis.

The researcher also coded public statements about collective bargaining efforts on participants' campuses gathered from relevant news sources, campus websites, and/or the participants themselves. Finally, the researcher analyzed collective bargaining agreements, if they exist, from participants' institutions to see if any themes arose that help inform the data gained in the interview process or add to our understanding of the senior leaders' experience with or perceptions of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining agreements are sometimes publicly accessible on campus websites. When this is not the case, the researcher asked the participants to make the collective bargaining agreements available to her, which was clear in the invitation to participate and informed consent form.

The researcher stored the interview files, transcripts, documents, and data analysis on her password protected personal computer labeled by aliases and erased the audio files on the recording devices. A list of aliases was stored separately in a locked file cabinet at the researcher's home. The researcher followed Fordham's Internal Review Board guidelines which required her to store consent forms for 3 years following the conclusion of the research in a second, separate locked filing cabinet also at the researcher's home.

Interview Protocol and Questions

Moustakas (1994) argued, “Husserl’s transcendental science offers a carefully developed conceptual model that brings the person into focus as the necessary source for explicating experience and deriving knowledge” (p. 48). During the interview the researcher kept participants in focus and asked questions that were non-directive and open-ended, while seeking examples and full descriptions of experiences that helped the researcher derive knowledge. The participant could choose to stop the interview at any time, as is consistent with Fordham University’s IRB protocols. Moustakas offered the following interview questions to guide researchers:

1. What dimensions, incidents, and people intimately connected with the experience stand out for you?
2. How did the experience affect you? What changes do you associate with the experience?
3. How did the experience affect significant others in your life?
4. What feelings were generated by the experience?
5. What thoughts stood out for you?
6. What bodily changes or states were you aware of at this time?
7. Have you shared all that is significant with reference to the experience? (1994, p. 116).

Creswell (2013) also offered two important phenomenological interview questions: “What have you experienced in terms of the phenomenon? What contexts or situations have typically influenced or affected your experiences of the phenomenon?” (p. 81). In this study the

researcher sought to answer the following questions influenced by both Moustakas and Creswell while seeking the wisdom, knowledge, and experience of the participants:

1. Describe your perception of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities.
2. What have you experienced at your current institution that has affected your perception of collective bargaining?
3. What other experiences have affected your perception of collective bargaining?
4. What dimensions, incidents, and/or people connected with your experiences stand out for you?
5. How have these experiences affected you? What changes do you associate with these experiences?
6. How does your perception of collective bargaining differ, if at all, for staff, contingent faculty, or tenured/tenure-track faculty? Why?
7. How does your understanding of Catholic Social Teaching affect your perception of collective bargaining?
8. How do your personal and professional perceptions of collective bargaining align or differ?
9. How does your perception of collective bargaining affect your campus leadership and decision making?
10. Have you shared all that is significant with regard to you perception of collective bargaining?
11. Do you have any questions for me?

Data Analysis

Through the data collection and analysis process, the researcher sought to fulfill Moustakas's (1994) goal of transcendental phenomenological research: to ...describe in detail and fully the whole account of an issue, problem, situation, or experience, using qualities and properties from specific contexts or perspectives, so that the events or experiences take on vivid and essential meanings, a clear portrait of what is. We then reflect on these textural portraits to arrive at their essences, in terms of underlying conditions, precipitating factors, structural determinants. We combine the textural and structural meanings to arrive at the essence of an experience. (p. 60)

To meet this goal, the researcher followed the qualitative procedures summarized by Creswell (2013): define the phenomenon; understand the philosophical assumptions of phenomenology; bracket the self; collect data from those who have experienced the phenomena along with documents such as collective bargaining agreements and public statements; and analyze the data for significant statements that will lead to themes or "clusters of meaning" (p. 81). The researcher analyzed and combined the data into a summary description of the participants' perceptions of collective bargaining that is both textual (the *what* of the experience) and structural (the *how* of the experience). The reader and the researcher should then understand what it is like to experience the phenomenon.

When analyzing the data, the researcher incorporated Moustakas's process necessary for transcendental phenomenology which includes Epoche, Transcendental Phenomenological Reduction, Imaginative Variation, and Synthesis. Epoche required the researcher to suspend judgement and limit bias, seeing the phenomenon in a new way from an "original vantage point" (1994, p. 85). Moustakas wrote, "This way of perceiving life calls for looking, noticing,

becoming aware, without imposing our prejudgment on what we see, think, imagine, or feel” (1994, p. 86). Epoche, or reflection and meditation, helped the researcher bracket herself and was an essential part of phenomenological research that was incorporated throughout the research and data analysis processes.

Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction is the next part of the process. It involves trying to see the world and experiences purely and reflexively with the self as an important source for data and understanding. Moustakas (1994) wrote that the process is a, “prereflective description of things just as they appear and a reduction to what is horizontal and thematic” (p. 91). Researchers relate the world to themselves, brackets themselves out, horizontalize, or give each statement value, look for meaning, turn meaning into themes, and create descriptions of the phenomenon. Put simply, Transcendental-Phenomenological Reduction aims to describe the *what* of the experience of the phenomenon.

Next, Imaginative Variation seeks to describe the how of the phenomenon by forcing the researcher to ask “How did the experience of the phenomenon come to be what it is?” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 98). What structures must exist for the phenomenon to occur? The researcher must trust his or her intuition to help uncover and understand the essence of an experience and all the possible causes for it. Again, at this point in the data analysis process themes emerge that contextualize the phenomenon.

Moustakas argued that “the method of reflection that occurs throughout the phenomenological approach provides a logical, systematic, and coherent reference for carrying out the analysis and synthesis needed to arrive at essential description of experience” (p. 47). The final step in Moustakas’s process, synthesis, brings together the textural and structural descriptions of the participant experiences to provide a meaningful essence of the phenomenon

while acknowledging the limiting impact of time and place on developing any truly universal essence. Similarly, Creswell (2013) posits that the researcher should go from specific and significant to broad when answering the “what” and “how” questions, and then lead to a culminating paragraph that describes the essence of the experience dealing with the phenomenon.

Moustakas reminded us that transcendental phenomenology can describe, but never explain a phenomenon. He summarized transcendental phenomenological research as:

a way of interrelating subjective and objective factors and conditions, a way of utilizing description, reflection, and imagination in arriving at an understanding of what is, in seeing the conditions through which what is comes to be, and in utilizing a process that in its very application opens possibilities for awareness, knowledge, and action. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 175)

The researcher followed these research and analysis principles and procedures when engaging senior campus leaders in thoughtful interviews and seeking to answers this study’s research questions.

Conclusion

The researcher used a qualitative methodology with a transcendental phenomenological approach in this study to learn the *what* and *how* of the participants experience and to better understand the phenomena faced by senior campus leaders that shape their perception of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities. The researcher hoped to learn the extent to which Catholic Social Teaching affects senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining. The researcher interviewed senior-level administrators and reviewed

relevant publications including public statements and collective bargaining agreements from participants' institutions to answer her research questions.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative transcendental phenomenological study was to learn the perceptions of senior-level administrator about collective bargaining in Catholic colleges and universities as well as what factors influence their perspectives. The findings described in this chapter focus on the lived experience of senior administrative leaders at Catholic colleges and universities in the Northeast from November 2016 – January 2017. The goal of the study was also to understand the internal and external pressures facing the institutions at which the respondents worked and how these pressures affected leaders' perceptions of collective bargaining. Further, the researcher learned the extent to which, if any, the perceptions of senior-level administrators towards collective bargaining were shaped by Catholic Social Teaching.

Interview Process and Participants

The interview process consisted of six 60 – 90 minute in-person interviews on the participants' campuses. In advance of each interview the researcher reviewed all publically available information about each leader's professional experience in order to better understand their prior institutional experience and professional background, which they spoke about during the interviews. For example, one respondent, the president of a Catholic college who served on the Board of Trustees of another Catholic college in the Northeast, offered insights from both schools. Another participant had professional experience with collective bargaining from outside of higher education that informed this respondent's perceptions.

As noted, the interviews (Appendix B) were conducted with six senior Catholic college leaders: five presidents and one vice president for human resources (Participants A – F). Three leader-participants were members of religious communities and three were lay. As delineated by

their Carnegie classifications, all participants were from very small to mid-sized, four-year Catholic colleges and universities in the Northeast. Five of the participants positively responded to the request for an interview after being electronically introduced to the researcher through a gatekeeper, a senior-level administrator familiar with and supportive of the researcher and the research topic. One participant positively responded to a request for an interview because of a relationship with the researcher's dissertation mentor. Sixteen other invited participants either failed to respond or declined to participate.

The researcher spoke with participants who reflected on the variety of their experiences dealing with collective bargaining on their campuses (see Table 4.1). Three of the participants currently had some form of staff union involving facilities and/or safety and security workers at their institutions (Participants A, B, and C). One participant had a full-time faculty union (Participant E). Participants at two schools had their adjunct faculty members attempting to organize on their campuses (Participants B and D). One participant had no direct collective bargaining units on campus, but reported that four years earlier staff members were approached by other local workers about the idea of forming a union (Participant F); the employees chose not to proceed with forming a union. Also, it is important to note that institutions could have more than one type of bargaining unit on their campuses; (Participant B); for example faculty members could belong to one unit while maintenance staff belong to a different unit due to their different community interest.

Table 1

Participating Institution Union Experience

Institution	Staff Union	Contingent Faculty Union	Tenure-Track Faculty Union
Institution A	Yes	No	No

(table continues)

Institution B	Yes	Yes	No
Institution C	Yes	No	No
Institution D	No	Yes	No
Institution E	No	No	Yes
Institution F	No	No	No

Data Analysis

In order to analyze and triangulate the data gathered for this study, the researcher relied on participant interviews, member-checking and document analysis. Within one week of an interview, the researcher provided participants with encrypted electronic copies of their interview transcript for review, clarification, and additional comments. Two of the leaders responded (Participants A and C) but offered minimal comments. One clarified a specific word the researcher transcribed incorrectly. The other asked to leave out any specific numbers identifying the size of the campus's bargaining unit and a related stipend noted in the collective bargaining agreement that would make the participant's institution identifiable. The participants did not offer any other feedback, clarification or corrections.

The researcher also conducted document analysis. Three of the senior-leaders provided the researcher with copies of their collective bargaining agreements (Participant A, B, and E), two for staff unions and one for a tenure-track faculty union. Participant C was unwilling to share the staff collective bargaining agreement as that campus was about to undergo contract negotiations. However, that leader provided the researcher with an article recently submitted for publication that spoke to the leader's perceptions on topics related to the study. At the time of the research, the two participants facing adjunct collective bargaining on their campuses did not

have completed collective bargaining agreements for this population to share (Participants B and D). Even so, the researcher was able to find public statements the senior leaders and/or their institutions issued on the subject. Finally, one campus leader had no collective bargaining agreement to share and had not issued any public comments about the topic (Participant F).

The researcher reviewed each interview, collective bargaining agreement, public statement and publication for themes. She then coded them to better understand the lived experience of the Catholic campus leaders facing collective bargaining.

Research Questions

Primary Research Question Findings

Introduction to primary research question findings. The purpose of this study was to answer the primary research question: How do senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities perceive collective bargaining? In general, participants were receptive to the idea of collective bargaining on their Catholic college and university campuses (see Table 4.2), even though some had different opinions for faculty, staff, and adjuncts, matters discussed below.

Five participants acknowledged the historical benefits of labor unions. Even though generally supportive of the concept of unions, five of the participants explicitly preferred to work directly with employees as opposed to through a union, suggesting that working with a third-party union negatively affected relationships and campus collegiality. None of the participants wanted another collective bargaining unit on their campus, although most would not have challenged employee efforts to organize because of their understanding of Catholic Social Teaching, especially for staff or adjunct faculty members. In varying degrees, all of the

participants expressed concern about the level of government interference in the running of their institutions, at times, directly related to collective bargaining.

Table 2

Primary Research Question Findings

How do senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities perceive collective bargaining?

Participants had a genuine appreciation for the historical and personal benefit/need for collective bargaining to protect worker rights and support collective bargaining in some form on their campuses.

Participants preferred to work directly with employees instead of with (outside) union representatives to maintain these relationships and encourage a collegial educational campus community.

Participants did not want any (more) unions.

Participants were actively assessing their campuses for ways to improve the work environment and employee morale to prevent new or additional union activity.

Historical/personal benefit of unions. Five of the participants voluntarily acknowledged and emphasized their understanding of the historical importance of unions, for example, in the fight for fair wages, safer working conditions, improvements in industry, and job protection. Attempting to remember a quotation from former New York State Governor Mario Cuomo about the need for unions, Participant E recalled, “We may not always like what someone is saying in terms of advocating a particular position. But we also have to remember that in our country we have a history where when people weren’t advocating, there were gross aspects of exploitation.” Relatedly, when Participant E’s senior leadership team became frustrated with their campus union, he/she reminded them of the above implied purpose and value of unions and the historic need for advocacy.

Three of the participants experienced the benefits of labor unions first hand through family and community connections. Participants B, C, and D had family members in unions and/or came from blue collar hometowns where unions were popular. Participant C's grandmother was a child laborer in textile mills during the 1920s who became a union organizer as a result of unfair treatment and fear of factories moving south. Participant C's father was also a labor union attorney. Participant D's father and brother were union members in a blue collar city in the Northeast where the brother actually served in the union's leadership. Participant B was born and raised in a blue collar hometown with pro-union parents, which this person implied made this leader sympathetic to unions and labor.

Participant A did not share any personal family connections, but this campus leader had extensive and sustained experience with collective bargaining throughout his/her professional life and shared that his/her perception of collective bargaining had changed over time. In the past, this leader admitted to being much more adversarial with unions. Through this leader's self-identified maturation and growth, this respondent came to see (and needed to see) unions as partners when facing pressing economic and social changes affecting the way business needed to be done.

Direct relationship with campus educational community. Even though the participants generally supported collective bargaining on Catholic campuses, they preferred to work directly with their employees, perceiving unions as limiting their relationships, communication strategies, collaboration, and how much they could ultimately help their employees. The respondents also saw unions as negatively affecting relationships, often creating hostility between administration and employees. Moreover, participants perceived union leaders

as outsiders coming into their communities who failed to produce the healthy working relationships characteristic of educational, mission-driven communities.

The above sentiment emerged strong during the interviews. Although not having specific experience with unions, Participant F began the interview by saying, “I like to preserve the ability to talk with and negotiate freely with faculty and staff. And at times, I haven’t dealt with unions myself, but at times I’ve had friends who’ve had that experience and have picked up the feeling that sometimes they set parameters for what you can or can’t do.” This participant was genuinely committed to caring for staff members, but wanted to preserve flexibility in doing so. For this respondent, unions removed the leader’s flexibility in managing challenges and responding to needs.

Participant F asserted that not having a union, “helps create an environment where people can be honestly in conversation and live within their means, and be as generous as possible to the people who work there.” Through direct outreach and strong relationships with the campus’s faculty and staff, Participant F explained having the ability to engage in dialogue while maintaining a collegial campus community.

Like Participant F, Participant A wanted to preserve the right to work directly with employees instead of through a union. Further, participant E was not confident unions would improve circumstances better than creating collegial, direct relationships with administration.

Finally, Participants D and E wished that the unions currently forming on their campuses would have gone to the administration first to see what could have been done to help them as opposed to having outside unions interfere. Participant E also worried that collective bargaining movements by unions from outside of the academy would not understand the academy’s true needs or challenges. According to the respondents, the outside unions interfered with the

administration's relationship with its employees (Interview with Participant B). In fact, Participant B would much have preferred that the college's own employees spoke with the administration about the campus and constituents' needs as an internal community rather than with union officials.

No (more) unions. While they were generally supportive of collective bargaining efforts on Catholic college campuses, the participants' attitudes about additional unions at their institutions were best expressed by Participant C when answering a specific question about adjunct faculty even though the sentiment was consistent with the lived experiences shared by all participants: "Do I think they are legally eligible to unionize? Yes. Do I think that I want them to? No."

Participant A similarly said, "Where we have unions, they're our partners; where we don't have them, we don't want them." Participant A reported generally having a good relationship with the union leadership and members. However, this leader reiterated the same sentiment later in the interview: "I don't want another union here." For this leader, tensions were common and were the result of competing priorities for the union and administration.

Interestingly, Participant F was clear throughout the interview about preferring to work directly with employees as opposed to unions. Still, this leader remembered later in the interview about having worked with union leaders as a principal at a Catholic school. The leader recalled, "Now that I think of it, it wasn't really that intrusive." Even so, this leader still came down on the side that unions were not best for the respondent's campus.

Preventing union growth. All of the participants had made some effort on their campuses to prevent climates that would have spurred future union growth. Participant

responses varied a bit in terms of attitudes about wanting to prevent faculty, adjunct, and staff union activity.

Participant B reported having good relationships with staff unions and provided raises even when they were not contractually due. Yet, the collective bargaining agreements for this institution indicated that yearly raises were guaranteed during the last three years the contract covered. Participant B also reported that leaders limited adjunct use primarily for leave replacements or where flexibility was needed within the institution. Further, the institution offered an adjunct orientation, ensured access to technology, paid fairly in the market, allowed for access to governance meetings, and advocated for adjunct representation on governance groups.

Participant D's campus leaders had concerns about adjunct salaries and retention. This campus leader also reported that this institution did not rely heavily on adjuncts and limited the number of courses they could teach. This institution has had to be more thoughtful about how it welcomed adjuncts and the way in which it lived its mission as a relational community. Leaders there even had to rethink the hierarchy at the institution for simple issues such as email distribution lists and access to information for different employees.

Participant C offered fewer specific actions to address potential moves toward collective bargaining. This leader acknowledged that adjuncts were exploited and said that officials did what they could to be fair in light of an unjust system. These officials, working with the respondent, limited the number of sections an adjunct faculty member could teach and had done this long before the implementation of the Affordable Care Act spurred other institutions to do the same as a cost savings measure. In general, though, Participant C believed, "You just try to treat people as well and fairly and honestly as possible, and not to give up anything that you

think is actually in the college's long term interests...to address their grievances. And every instance you try to make sure that you are, if you're erring, you're erring on the side of generosity.”

Participant F, who worked at an institution without unions, believed the absence of unions or union murmurings resulted from curbing layoffs during the 2008 economic downturn, ensuring some kind of raise every year, being transparent about the economic realities of the institution, and having good relationships with the faculty and staff who perceived this leader as advocating for them.

At Participant F's institution, leaders made a commitment to increase adjunct raises every year at the same rate as the rest of the academic community. This may have been influenced by the fact that one of the institution's board members had a spouse working as an adjunct there. The board member had great sympathy for adjuncts and said, “Do you know how many places an adjunct has to teach and what they have to do to try to make a decent salary?” Adjunct faculty were also encouraged to participate in department meetings and planning events. They could teach no more than three classes per semester.

Officials on Participant A's campus worked to address issues impacting the whole campus community. Issues affecting morale could be detected in work climate surveys or employee engagement models. Often these issues centered on the quality of the supervisor. Therefore, in this leader's experience, there was no need to worry about unions, but rather officials should do what was best for all employees. Often, this both improved moral and reduced the likelihood of union interest.

Participant A's campus had also reviewed its relationship with adjuncts. This leader shared that faculty were welcoming and understood the need for adjuncts. The President hosted

a reception for them, the institution paid the best in the area, and the leader was open to doing more for adjuncts.

Like Participant A, Participant E recognized that “The ultimate reason people tend to organize at times is because they’re frustrated with their work environment.” Therefore, Participant E wanted to create a work environment that made people want to come to work...that created an environment where people thrived:

So, obviously, where people can actualize their potential, where they feel stimulated, that they’re making a contribution and having impact, but that they’re....one of the things that’s an opportunity for Catholic colleges and universities is really to try to create that community where people, it’s not just a job and it’s not just work, but where people feel, you know, the critical elements of a community, and particularly a community formed by faith, which is care for people and their development, personally, professionally, spiritually.

Participant E tied these sentiments directly to Catholic Social Teaching and the rights of the worker in describing this as a “compelling rationale” for treating workers well.

While officials at Participant E’s institution had not yet raised adjunct salaries, they were investigating doing so. Institutional officials recognized adjuncts once each semester, knew who they were and where they taught, offered health benefits, limited the number of sections adjuncts taught to avoid taking advantage of them, and did what it could to improve their experiences teaching there.

Summary of primary research question findings. The participants’ general perception of collective bargaining was that unions had been historically important, generally align with Catholic Social Teaching and should be allowed at Catholic colleges and universities. However,

these leaders also believed unions negatively impacted their ability to build and maintain relationships on their campuses, preferred to work directly with employees to increase collegiality and flexibility, and did not want any (additional) unions on their campuses. They had all consciously thought about what they could do to prevent the circumstances that would lead to increased interest in union growth. Though to varying degrees, most participants also expressed concern about the level of government interference in their institutions' functioning. A detailed discussion of participant's perception of government interference can be found in Related Question One.

Related Question One

A very important question related to the main research question is: What internal and external factors and experiences affect senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities?

Introduction to related question one findings. According to the lived-experiences of these participants, a variety of internal and external factors affected their perception of collective bargaining. For the purpose of this study, the internal factors found to be significant included: the leader's personal experience with collective bargaining, the leader's style and professional experience with collective bargaining, the leader's relationship with or perception of his or her staff/faculty, the leader's perception of the purpose of unions and tactics used by a union, the leader's perception of current governance structures at the institution, Board of Trustee influence, and the leader's understanding and experience with the business model in higher education. For the purpose of this study, external factors found to be significant included the leader's experience with external unions either on campus through private vendors or in the

region, significant labor questions affecting the country at the time of the study, and the leader's perception of the role/influence of federal, state, and local government.

Table 3

Internal and External Factors Affecting Senior-Level Administrator Perceptions of Collective Bargaining at Catholic Colleges and Universities

What internal and external factors and experiences affect senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities?

Internal Factors	External Factors
Personal Experience	External Union Influence
Leader's Style and Professional Experience	National Labor Issues
Relationship with Faculty/Staff	Role/Influence of Government
Perception of Union Motivation and Tactics	
Governance Structures/Voice	
Board of Trustees	
Business Model of Higher Education	

Internal Factors

Personal experience. As discussed above, three of the participants experienced the benefits of labor unions first hand through family connections. Participants B, C, and D had family members in unions and/or came from blue collar hometowns where unions were popular. Participant C's grandmother was a child laborer and union organizer in textile mills during the 1920s. Participant C's father was also a lawyer for local municipal labor unions. Participant D's father and brother were union members from a blue collar city in the Northeast. Participant B was born and raised in a pro-union hometown that was consistently sympathetic to labor issues.

From the discussion with these leaders, their personal connections were a factor making them sympathetic to labor and unions, but it was just one small factor affecting their perceptions.

Leadership style and experience. A much more significant factor affecting the participants' perception of collective bargaining were the leaders: both the leadership style and the leaders' professional experiences with unions. The leaders' perception of their employees, primarily faculty, was an important related factor and it was therefore included in this discussion when relevant.

Participant A's institution had no experience with collective bargaining when the leader was hired. This leader even described "a level of immaturity with the leadership" resulting in hurt feelings, bruised egos, adversarial relationships, and the need for real healing. This leader brought extensive knowledge and experience in labor relations and contract development to the role.

Participant A shared the experience of having spent a great deal of time building relationships with members of the bargaining unit and the union's leadership:

So, a great deal of my attention was put into rebuilding the relationship with the union, spending time, walking around, spending time with our members as they're going about their business either in grounds keeping or painting, stopping to talk to them, calling my counterpart regularly, and frankly, to almost be somewhat of a servant to the union as we're repairing this relationship.

In order to be successful, Participant A knew that the institution and the union leadership needed to bridge the damage that had been done and show good faith. This leader actively demonstrated "tact and diplomacy." Participant A credited the union's leadership for being a good partner and helping to build the trusting relationship they currently had. Participant A and

the union leadership actually worked together to handle challenges from the national union that did not align with the needs of the local branch or institution.

In negotiations, Participant A tried to work transparently, recognizing the basic needs of the union, and providing data for bargaining unit members that influenced the institution's decision making. This leader also expressed a real sympathy for the needs of workers on this campus and for what union members wanted, namely job security, policies and procedures that treated them fairly, and the ability to build a future for themselves, with retirement benefits and/or by learning new skills.

Participant A then listened and shared worker stories with other senior leaders. At the end of the interview, Participant A reluctantly relayed a compliment from a member of the staff union who expressed genuine pleasure in having this campus leader at the institution. Participant A's leadership seemed to help turn the corner on this institution's relationship with its union.

It is important to note that while Participant A's institution had no experience with unions prior to the staff union, the administration had experience negotiated with its faculty even though the faculty was not unionized. Participant A was notably more sympathetic to staff workers than to the faculty who this leader perceived as having a sense of "arrogance." "It's just that they believe they're the most important thing on earth, and if you didn't have faculty, you wouldn't have a business." Participant A continued, "With faculty, it's all about power. It's like the faculty just want to gain one more little inch, squeeze one more little drop out of the towel. And it doesn't have to be money." This leader was frustrated by faculty who freely told the administration how to do its job, while staff workers just wanted to have a say on the operational side, not the strategy side.

Like Participant A, Participant E had extensive experience with collective bargaining before beginning at his/her current institution. One big difference, though, was that Institution E had an established union and bargaining process. Participant E credited his/her positive experience with collective bargaining with prior leaders who set a positive tone and a common goal that encouraged both sides to see the other's perspective.

Participant E chose not to serve directly on the institution's negotiating team but rather entrusted this important responsibility to the institution's top leaders and received reports regularly. These leaders were guided by a focus on improving the experience of faculty and students. It is worth noting that this leader repeatedly emphasized the importance of the academic leadership in maintaining a positive work environment and a good relationship with the union. The deans, department chairs, and Provost all had a responsibility to advocate for the faculty.

As a leadership style, Participant E believed in listening and dialogue, especially with union leadership. This senior leader met regularly with the union head who he/she seemed to have great respect for and who, like much of the union, proved to be mature and responsible. Participant E also made sure employees had a strong foundation in the reality of the economic challenges facing the institution and never lost sight of the ultimate fiduciary responsibility to the institution while seeking consensus with the union.

Most striking from this interview was the real regard Participant E had for the institution's faculty who were the "heart of the [college or university]":

I always find here I learn a lot from the faculty, and I learn a lot from their perspective because, you know, they're really smart people. Our faculty, by and large, are very engaged with the students, you know, and obviously in any area there's always

exceptions, but I find, by and large, my predecessor and the academic leadership did a very good job of hiring, because they really do believe in teaching as well as being scholars. And with that comes the willingness to be accessible to students. So I really perk up when they speak because I think they have a really good perspective being in the classroom, and the amount of time they're spending with students and what they're seeing and what they're encountering.

Therefore, Participant E viewed faculty as partners with expert input in campus decision making. Participant E's expectations for faculty engagement was documented in the institution's collective bargaining agreement, which emphasized shared governance and faculty as campus partners as well as had a strong emphasis on being a teaching institution. Teaching was evaluated and prioritized in tenure and promotion.

According to Participant E, the process of collective bargaining itself was a means to create a good work environment, a community that brought meaning and value to peoples' work. Participant E said, "I think that we all want the faculty to be happy in the environment that they're in, and collective bargaining is one means, one direct means, to be able to impact that very positively. It's really rather seeing how do we live out the collective bargaining agreement as the way in which we can really help the faculty and the university community to move forward." Though Participant E focused on faculty, this leader also spoke with regard for staff who were part of one campus community...all accountable for the institution's progress.

Like Participant E, Participant C also did not sit on the institution's negotiating team, but met regularly with its members to prepare for the upcoming negotiation:

I had a series of meetings with those people who are responsible to say that I did not want this approached as a traditional negotiation...I wanted it to be approached as though we

were both, both the union and we, were sitting on the same side of the table, and how do we reach the best possible agreement in light of our managerial needs and their legitimate concerns...what's it possible for us to bring to them and completely open book process...that getting to "yes" stuff. There are no secrets.

This leader had a longer tenure and acknowledged that on arriving, the administration's relationship with the union was not good. Participant C had to earn the union's trust, which was a long, slow process that started by demonstrating good will. This leader was therefore committed to avoiding the same kind of adversarial relationship.

As a leader, Participant C believed trust was key to building the healthy relationship that now exists between the union and the administration: "You have to be really candid and tell people the truth even when it's unpleasant because they can be really angry, but they learn to believe you. And they trust that. And, so to, you have to be thinking they're telling you the truth. Because if you're not responding to their best selves, why will they bring their best selves forward?"

This senior leader's relationship with the staff and faculty went well beyond trust. Participant C truly adored the institution and the people who worked there: "I've come to love it with...idiotic intensity...and the people who work here who I think are unimaginably lovely and to an amazing degree, hardworking and dedicated to the quality of what happens here." In addition, this leader wanted to create a community people were proud to work in and for employees to be proud of the institution.

As a negotiating philosophy, Participant C tried "to treat people as well and fairly and honestly as possible, and not to give up anything that you think is actually in the college's long term interests...to address their grievances. And every instance you try to make sure that you

are, if you're erring, you're erring on the side of generosity." As a result, the leader believed the administration was well-liked by the union.

Participant F's institution did not have a union. Even so, this campus leader believed that being present and building relationships with the staff and faculty were at least partially why one was not needed and had not been actively pursued. The relative size of the institution and this leader's longevity were also an asset according to Participant F. Throughout this leader's tenure, Participant F tried "to work with people, talk out issues, try to get consensus, and try to be as transparent as possible in terms of these are our resources. These are the expectations of what we have to meet. So, to date, that has worked for me, and probably, it's my preferred way of acting."

Participant F and other campus leaders were responsive to faculty requests for more representation of various campus committees, had an open door policy and was therefore willing to meet with anyone who requested the opportunity to do so, did not have any layoffs during the 2008 economic downturn or in the subsequent years and still provided some kind of raise and believed in good information sharing. "I think good information sharing is important too. People have to believe what they hear...that there isn't one thing happening when you're giving a report and something back behind closed doors, and that's not the case here. And that's more about trust and how an institution operates."

Like Participants C and E, Participant F was passionate about people: "I've spoken, in particular, to an institution here who said as its priority, our people are number one. We don't want to make progress on their backs, and we've been able to do that." This leader was committed to compensating employees at least in the mid-range of their identified peers: "We try to collect as much data as possible from AAUP and from CUPA, College and University

Personnel, so that we're constantly trying to at least stay in the middle of our peers and checking out all these other resources so that here in the little world we have some influence over, we can try to see that people are treated fairly."

Finally, Participant F revealed a vignette from a recent lunch with a retired faculty member who said, "You have no idea of how, in the hardest of times, when people would get an increase in their salary, they knew that the college was there for them." Participant F was actually surprised and had not realized how pushing for a raise at a budget committee meeting, for example, would have had such a positive outcome: "I never expected that. Gee, that's going to have a positive effect on spirit and morale, but perhaps it does, you know? People take note."

More contentious campus communities existed on Participant B and D's campuses, both of which were in the midst of organizing efforts. Participant B's predecessor was strongly anti-union and left some residual tension with the faculty, a matter beyond this leader's control. The leader actually felt tested early in his/her tenure to see how aligned Participant B would be with the predecessor's ideals. Although every leader had challenges, Participant B regretted that conflict with the collective bargaining unit had negatively affected this leader's relationship with faculty. As an important note, when asked about experiences with people that had affected this leader's lived experience with collective bargaining on this campus, Participant B spoke about the numerous attorneys who had been most influential.

Similarly, Participant D's lawyer and, as needed, outside counsel, had been this respondent's primary advisors. The college's counsel served as the collective bargaining point person for the institution. That was not the case for Participant E, whose legal counsel was only mentioned as the primary point person for dealing with the union's lawyer. Also relevant,

Participant D had limited exposure to and experience with collective bargaining and was unaware of any organizing efforts when he/she arrived.

The organizing process on Participant D's campus had led to some real tension between the administration and faculty who supported contingent faculty bargaining but who the senior leader saw as lacking any real understanding of the business model for higher education or the stress on that institution's market. Participant D was disappointed that the faculty also helped paint a picture that the administration was opposed to the union and/or tried to stop it from organizing, resulting in a faculty "paranoia" about secret meetings and fear the administration was reviewing faculty email accounts.

During the interview, Participant D seemed particularly frustrated with the faculty and offered examples of difficult scenarios when faculty had challenged or critiqued the administration, demonstrated a lack of knowledge about the realities of the costs associated with running the institution, were resistant to change (even those mandated by its accrediting agency), and were resistant to the administration's agenda in general. Participant D viewed some of this resistance as fear of change and fear of job loss. For example, through various interactions and discussions with faculty, Participant D believed that faculty concerns about attacks on tenure were primarily about avoiding faculty cuts.

As a result of these challenges, Participant D actively educated the whole campus community about the economic realities of the market, the needed changes at the institution, and the likely impact of the new collective bargaining unit on the greater campus community. Moreover, Participant D acted intentionally in being inclusive by bringing faculty into a dialogue with other staff and administrators to educate them about the realities of all employees'

experiences at the institution. As a result, full-time faculty began to fear the impact of the collective bargaining unit on them.

These six senior administrators had different leadership styles, different lengths of tenure at their institutions, different experience with unions, different relationships with their faculty, and were at different points in the bargaining process. These difference likely affected their perception of collective bargaining on their campuses.

Union purpose, motivation, and tactics. The senior leaders' beliefs about the primary purpose and motivation of unions also affected their perceptions of unions on their campuses. Some of the participants believed that unions were a business with a fiscal model requiring increasing membership and retaining jobs. These participants reasoned that unions actually do little good for employees. Other participants believed unions formed when employees were treated poorly and were motivated by justice for workers.

Participant A believed that unions were solely motivated by membership recruitment to sustain their business: "They are fundamentally a business, and we shouldn't seduce ourselves into believing that, when a union comes into an institution, that they have the best interest of the workers in mind." For this respondent, unions needed to increase membership to fund operations including salaries, health insurance, and pensions.

Participant A made it clear that unions were promulgated by workers seeking job security, fair policies, and safety. Participant A contended that a secondary benefit to a union might be safety, "So to the extent that working conditions aren't what they should be, a union that operates in multiple locations will be able to bring that best practice or a perspective that's broader." However, in general, Participant A disagreed that there was a contemporary reason for unions since real abuses, such as child labor, no longer existed (at least in the United States).

Participant A's bottom line was that unions were a business and that helping workers was a secondary consequence to making money.

As mentioned above, Participant D also believed that job security was a significant motivating factor for unions. In academia, the job market for many new doctoral graduates was weak, particularly in the humanities. Participant D received hundreds of applications for one open position in a humanities field; this spoke to concerns about supply and demand for faculty in highly competitive markets.

Participant E made a parallel argument for Liberal Arts faculty who felt threatened as enrollments declined and students chose majors with clear career outcomes. Participant B also understood why core humanities adjuncts wanted to unionize as they were perhaps the most exploited of the contingent faculty. Finally, Participant E saw increased interest in collective bargaining as linked to attacks on tenure and changes in educational methods such as online education that left faculty feeling replaceable.

On the other hand, Participants C, E, and F believed that union motivation was the result of unfair labor practices. Participant C claimed, "I've never known of a union coming some place where people were being treated as fairly as the place could treat them...including here when our maintenance workers unionized. And I understand why they did that, and they were right." The respondent continued, "Working people know when they're being well, fairly treated. Real human respect demands it."

Participant E shared that the history of its union was also a result of "unrest" and "strife" that led to "contentiousness and adversarial relationships and hard feelings." Not having a union, Participant F believed that an absence of these kinds of feelings and circumstances had contributed to why no organizing activity existed on that campus as discussed above. However,

this senior leader understood that the circumstances could change tomorrow given shifts in any of the factors shared in these findings.

Even with a firm understanding and perhaps some sympathy for union motivation, Participants A, B, and D had concerns about their experience with the unions' tactics on their campus. Primarily, they thought that unions promised to make sweeping changes but could not possibly follow through on all of the promises, which contributed to the adversarial relationship left once the bargaining units were in place and some demands left unfulfilled. Similarly, the participants were all working with non-academic, public unions. Participants B and D asserted that an outside union came to their employees, encouraged them to form unions, and "interpose(d) itself" (Interview with Participant B) between the employees and the administration. It was not their employees who sought a union (Interview with Participant B).

Participant B also questioned the nature of public unions representing private college and university employees. Ultimately, for Participant B, employee dues supported national union lobbying efforts to curtail private education resources in favor of public education needs. This leader's strong concerns about outside unions were noted in public statements issued by the institution.

Participant D was most disturbed by the union's organizing tactics. In this case, the union put pressure on Church leader(s) and local politicians to shape the institution's response the bargaining effort. The respondent continued:

I have a real question about the union and the union tactics. I think if I did anything like that, I would be very much challenged. We did have some union representatives who went into classrooms, were very rude to people in terms of 'sign up for the union' kind of thing. People were just finishing class, erasing blackboards...things like that...getting

these things pushed in their faces. People weren't prepared for union people appearing at their houses, pushing that. Even during the count of the ballots, and what not, the results of the ballots were tweeted out before the meeting was over. So, that information was already at the [local newspaper] downtown before the meeting was even concluded.

Whether skeptical of a union's motivation or frustrated by a union's tactics, the senior leaders' perceptions of collective bargaining were shaped by these perceptions.

Campus governance and opportunities for voice. Five of the six the participants spoke to the role of shared governance on their campuses. They viewed faculty members as the primary constituents represented in shared governance at their institutions, all of which were seeking and responding to demands for increased transparency and communication with administration.

Participant F had an elected faculty group that made recommendations to administration. For example, this group made a recommendation to have a faculty member attend Academic Committee meetings of the Board of Trustees. Participant F was amenable to this request and others that increased faculty participation in committees and decision making.

This institution also had faculty on various committees including budget and planning committees. Participant F said, "So, when people have asked for different things, we've certainly considered it. We didn't always have faculty at our budget meeting. We didn't always have faculty chosen by faculty at the planning meetings. But, when people have asked for that, we said, 'Why not?'" The dean(s) also invited adjunct faculty to planning meetings for departmental initiatives. However, no formal governance structure for staff participation existed at Participant F's institution.

Participant B had a faculty senate body, the meetings of which were open to adjuncts. Yet, no adjuncts currently held a seat in the governance structure. A parallel structure did not exist for staff on Participant B's campus. Participant B said that this institution had been working to improve communication and streamline governance to make it more effective since the start of his/her tenure. While shared governance remained a priority, and Participant B believed the institution had made progress, this respondent admitted that transparency and effective governance was a challenge for most senior-leaders.

Participant A's faculty governance model served at times like a negotiating team for compensation and benefits. Members of the faculty and staff also served on many campus committees to offer feedback and advise policy. These representatives often sat on committees because they were somehow related to their roles within the college or university. The staff had no formal governance structure, but the staff in the collective bargaining unit(s) had negotiated the opportunity to more regularly meet with the administration around issues of most concern to them.

Participant D reported having an active faculty that seemed to offer a great deal of direct feedback to the administration. Participant D pushed back on some of the faculty's demands for special faculty meetings and acknowledged that faculty, staff, and administrators were all part of one community. This campus leader made hosting a series of campus meetings a priority in his/her administration to share information and gain perspective from all campus constituents as well as to spur inter-constituent dialogue.

Finally, Participant E discussed the governance model at this institution. Admittedly, this institution's faculty governance group needed some work and was currently reviewing the shared governance model as advised by its accrediting body. The institution was also streamlining the

relationship between its governance body and its union to clarify areas of responsibility. It is worth noting that Participant E's collective bargaining agreement had references to shared governance, clear communication, transparency, faculty leadership, and strategies for including faculty voice in decision making, primarily through committees. Participant E had also recently responded to requests from the collective bargaining unit to meet more regularly with senior administration.

Therefore, even though five of the six institutions had structures for faculty input in decision making already established, all participants experienced a desire for increased voice and contact with senior leaders.

Board of trustees. The influence of participants' boards on their perception and lived-experience of collective bargaining varied slightly. Participant C had the least to say about the board's impact. This leader provided points of information updates at board meetings during negotiations and was otherwise unconcerned and intentionally uninvolved in discussion about the staff union because the senior leader did not want the board to be distracted by the topic.

Somewhat similarly, Participant E spoke only about the board's ultimate fiduciary responsibility for the health and well-being of the institution during contract negotiations.

Participant D admitted to educating the board about Catholic social teaching when the adjunct staff on this campus decided to organize. Participant B also admitted to having at least a few board members who were anti-union. While asserting at the beginning of the interview that Participant B's board was not squarely anti-union, this campus leader later disclosed that, due to the nature of the academic programs offered at the institution and the professions of the alumni board members, it was likely that this board was less union friendly than a random sampling of

local residents. Participant B's board was also sharply focused on affordability, although this leader emphasized that its stance on bargaining was not fiscally motivated.

Participant F's board was perhaps the most sympathetic to unions given that one member's spouse was an adjunct at the institution. Moreover, this board had connections to the construction industry, which had helped support union-only construction projects on campus. Interestingly, Participant F was a board member at another Catholic institution of higher learning in the Northeast which never engaged in discussions about collective bargaining.

Finally, Participant E, whose board had the most experience with unions, was fully accepting of the union. Discussion about the union typically only occurred during contract negotiations. While this board remained sharply focused on its fiduciary responsibility, Participant E reported that the board wanted the faculty and staff to be "happy, to be paid well, and treated with respect." Participant E and the Board held everyone in the community accountable for the institution's outcomes. Participant E joked that occasionally he/she needed to explain tenure to some of the more business-minded members of the Board.

Business model. The participants offered some of the most significant findings about the factors that influenced their perception of collective bargaining in discussion about the fiscal pressures they faced. Participant A argued that the higher education model had changed dramatically. It was no longer a "cost-plus model," noting that institutions could no longer just raise tuition to cover costs. Participant B agreed that there was pressure from boards and others to keep tuition low. Participant A believed that many institutions were reaching their limit on the number of students they could enroll, so these institutions had to save money by doing business at lower costs and more quickly. Institutions were also pressured to produce an annual margin (Interview with Participant A and Interview with Participant F).

Participant C concluded that labor was the major cost in higher education, and unlike textile mills, colleges and universities could not pick move to other countries where labor costs were lower. Participant B expressed concern that unions made it harder to respond to the demands of the market. Therefore, during negotiations and in campus presentations and discussions, participants were actively sharing the reality of their financial situations and painting a clear picture of the changing market.

Participant F knew that insofar as the employees saw layoffs at other similar institutions during and after the 2008 economic down turn, they understood the financial pressures of the market while realizing that the institution lacked the cushion of a large endowment. Participant F freely shared that if the institution failed to meet enrollment goals, the community would need to come together to make cuts.

Participant B asserted that concerns about collective bargaining on campus were not financial. Even so, this leader affirmed later in the interview that union labor was more expensive, especially for institutions that needed to “pinch every penny.” Realistically, Participant B would have liked to do more for contingent faculty, but he/she was not sure how much more the institution could afford. Multiple participants believed they could only do more for employees if they were fortunate enough to have had large endowments or more revenue like Georgetown University, a comparison that came up multiple times (Interview with Participant A; Interview with Participant B; Interview with Participant D; Interview with Participant F).

Participant D was aggressively trying to educate his/her campus about the fiscal realities of the market and described his/her campus as “an endangered species.” This campus leader believed, “The whole environment and context and the operating model of higher education is really coming at a crossroads at this point.” Participant D encouraged faculty and staff to assess

the feasibility and sustainability of small, private colleges, to learn what it really costs to run the campus and its programs, to review comparative data, to understand the cost of small class sizes, to recognize the impact of salary compression and competition for talent at all levels of the institution, to think about alternative models for compensation, and to realize the cost savings with adjunct staff while acknowledging the increased costs associated with a unionized contingent faculty.

Participant D made the argument for new academic programs and more flexible systems, which were critical to meet the demands of the market. With a similar evaluation of the market, Participant A concluded:

So, one way of looking at it is no money, no mission, right? I mean labor is a derived demand, right? So, if there's money, there's a mission; if there's a mission, there's a need for people. But the bottom line is, if we don't have an endowment, if we don't have tuition paying students, if our costs get way out of whack, we don't have a business.

All participants in the study had the fiscal realities of the higher education market in the Northeast weighing heavily on their minds and saw a direct connection between the cost of unions and their ability to survive and/or thrive in their markets.

Fiduciary responsibility. Tied directly to their experience with the fiscal model of higher education in the Northeast, the participants noted their role in maintaining the institution's financial sustainability. Participant E made it clear that the president and the board have the ultimate fiduciary responsibility for the well-being of the institution, which remained in the forefront during contract negotiations. Participant A affirmed this sentiment,

We can't lose sight of what is in the best interest of the institution, what will sustain the institution. If you can veer off 4 or 5 degrees in one direction and still hit your goals, I

think you have to understand how you can do that, if it will somehow bring the other partner along. But at times there will be the ability to not compromise, and at that point you have to have your allegiance to the Board of Trustees, and the institution, and the students who go here.

The weight of their fiscal responsibility was palpable with most participants.

Adjuncts as cost savings measure. Participant C most explicitly shared concern about higher education's business model that relied heavily on adjunct labor:

The problems with adjunct labor...we're overly dependent. [College name] is overly dependent. Almost every institution that does not have a huge endowment is overly dependent. And it's a very serious issue for our colleges. It's the only way we have found to substantially reduce costs...we've done a lot of things...but it's the biggest, and it's a problem.

Participant B also admitted that using adjunct labor to save money was a problem, but continued that cost savings was not the primary reason for adjunct use on that campus.

Participant B believed that many adjunct faculty members taught for enjoyment and did not need the money. However, a small group of Arts and Science adjuncts at Participant B's institutions who taught core courses were exploited. Participant B also agreed that the higher education business model exploited per course labor.

Participant D, preparing for a contingent faculty bargaining unit on campus, argued that a contingent faculty union would have a direct effect on what could be done for other faculty and staff and on the ratio of full-time to contingent faculty. Even though the senior-leader perceived the union's requests as "not onerous," the changes would still cost money, adding that adjunct

labor costs were less than full-time labor. And even though this campus had not relied heavily on adjuncts in the past, Participant D would be hiring more.

External Factors

Other union activity. An important finding was the impact of other union activity both through privately contracted labor on-campus and other union activity in the geographic region. For example, five of the participants had unionized food services workers on campus through private companies: Participants A, B, C, E, and F. Two of the participants were directly impacted by union strife occurring within the private food service companies.

For Participant B, a newly negotiated food service contract resulted in beloved food service workers losing their jobs and disappointed members of the community who were already struggling with other union-related issues (Interview with Participant B). Participant A feared cross-union talk when the food service workers on his/her campus demanded a contract provision that would have been very difficult to implement if Participant A's workers had requested it too, noting that, "At least the theory's there right, that they might want to use things that are going on elsewhere to bring that in here and say 'we want that too.'"

Participant F experienced a hint of cross-union influence. Some maintenance employees working in partnership with two related institutions in close proximity began murmurings of collective bargaining about four years prior to this research. To date, nothing came of it.

The impact of private construction unions also helped shape the participants' perception of collective bargaining on two participant campuses. Participant F had board members tied to the construction industry, which had been generous to the campus. Therefore, when bidding jobs, Participant D always selected union-only jobs and always had a positive experience even though these jobs were more expensive.

On the flip side, Participant B frequently selected union-only construction bids. Yet, for one project, the administration made a different decision given the timeframe and projected cost of the project resulting in public displays of dissatisfaction from members of the campus community and local construction unions. Participant B ultimately rebid the job for union-only labor.

Finally, the proximity to external union activity was a significant contributor to Participant D's perception of collective bargaining. An active union in that campus's metropolitan region had very successfully recruited members on other campuses in the area. Participant D reported not having knowledge of adjunct interest in collective bargaining before the outside union made contact with employees and was surprised when members of his/her campus community decided to organize. However, this union also tried to recruit staff members and was unsuccessful.

Participant A summarized the participants' concerns about outside union influence: "So be aware of what influences you have outside of your home country or your university, and what's going on in the market place, and the fact that will seep into whatever you're doing in terms of your own collective bargaining or union relationships."

National labor questions. Three of the participants placed their interviews in a greater national context. Participants A and B noted the cost of healthcare and the pressure to provide healthcare for adjunct employees. Within a changing national healthcare system, Participant B thought it was unfair for colleges and universities to find answers in a broken system that generations of politicians had not been able to solve, stating:

The healthcare issue is a big one, but that has to do with the fact that it's a big price tag.

And I'm just not sure why it is that, if I have an employee that's teaching for me, [college

name], and [college name], why it is it that one of the three of us, as a part-time employee, why I have to take responsibility for that person's healthcare.

Similarly, Participant A did not feel responsible for providing healthcare to adjuncts, but did acknowledge that it was part of a greater problem affecting the collective bargaining movement.

Participant D connected the labor issues facing the campus with a greater labor question in the U.S. This leader asserted that unions must find a way to deal with unskilled labor that needed to be repurposed: "We have to figure out a different way to employ a whole lot of people that used to have some of these very basic jobs, that help them to survive and make a living, and whatnot, but in the automated technological age, those jobs are really being eliminated more and more."

Healthcare and labor issues were relevant on participants' campuses and affected their perception of collective bargaining, but they also fit into a larger national dialogue.

Government interference. One of the most significant findings of this study was participant concern about how government interference in college and university functioning, generally, and Catholic college and university functioning, specifically, affected senior-level administrators' perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic institutions of higher learning. Participants expressed a sincere fatigue from what they perceived as perhaps well-intended, but frequently misguided government decisions. This fatigue seeped through the participants' responses and highlighted general concern about over-regulation and influence, issues of funding, and the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board over Catholic college and universities.

Government regulation and influence. On the grandest scale, senior-level administrators' perceptions and lived-experience of collective bargaining was influenced by the federal government. The research for this study began under President Obama's administration, which was arguably pro-labor. During their interviews, three participants noted the impact of a Trump presidency on labor, which would likely lead to reduced regulations. Participant E assessed that the shift in philosophies from Obama to Trump would likely lead away from an administration that asserted labor rights. More generally, Participants B and F voiced their uncertainty about where the new administration would take campus leaders on labor and other issues (Interview with Participant B). Participant F was frustrated with reporting requirements, regulations and external demands that adversely affected staffing and the College's ability to build community and to do its job. One example of such regulation was the Clery Act. A small Safety and Security office spent too much time tabulating data for this report when officers should have been engaging proactively with the campus community.

Participant F added that often these regulations did not take into account the unique nature of each institution or its circumstances. The Federal Labor Standards Act, a regulation facing institutions in fall 2016, was another example of government interference that Participant F felt did not take into account the uniqueness of the institution, its personnel, their roles, or even their location in the country. For participant F, these regulations were just "over the top." As a result, even though this participant was supportive of labor rights, he/she was not in favor of the NLRB's jurisdiction over Catholic colleges because it would be one more area of government interference.

As an additional example of government interference, Participant E registered concern about the NLRB's movement toward classifying student athletes as employees after

Northwestern University's football team tried to organize. For this participant, athletes were not employees. Instead of allowing college and university officials to provide outreach and find reasonable solutions, government regulation led this group closer to organizing. Closer to home, Participant D was vexed by acts of politicians from all over the region who sent letters in support of the collective bargaining efforts on that campus without any understanding of the circumstances or the union tactics.

Funding. Perceived cuts to federal and state government educational spending and proposals for public college aid that could negatively impact these private institutional leaders were additional factors affecting senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining because they affected the business model of higher education. Participant C noted, "The defunding of higher education, which is true in public and independent sectors alike, is of course, the brunt of it is being born first by those who are most vulnerable. It shouldn't be a surprise, that's what vulnerability is." Therefore, adjuncts were responding to cost-saving measures by organizing.

Three other participants criticized the potential impact of proposals to provide "free" public post-secondary education, which would reduce college choice, likely drastically reduce enrollment at private colleges and universities, and limit these institutions' ability to gainfully employ its faculty and staff (Interview with Participant D; Interview with Participant E).

National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction. One of the primary reasons Catholic colleges and universities fought federal jurisdiction over collective bargaining on their campuses was to protect the Establishment Clause in the First Amendment. Participant B challenged the government's ability to determine how Catholic colleges live their Missions and what it means to be religious. Participant B did not want an institution's employees who were responsible for the

core Mission of the institution to seek redress with the federal government or for the government to be able to dictate what contribution to Mission looked like. For Participant B, the NLRB demonstrated a fundamental misunderstanding of what it meant to be a Catholic college or university: “If you are broad and inclusive, then you’re like everybody else, but what we’re saying is that we can be broad and inclusive in a Catholic way, and people don’t get that.”

Participant E shared the same sentiment of Participant B and was similarly concerned with the government’s involvement in collective bargaining:

I think with some of the unionization that they try to make an artificial distinction about religious instruction. And I think what [Catholic College Leader], and what ACCU, and so many others have argued is, you really can’t make, it’s not sliced into one area for Catholics or, you know, or religious instruction. It’s really integrated and woven into the whole institution. And that’s the more accurate understanding of what, you know, institutions of faith are really about.

Both leaders had real concern about the ability of unions from outside of the academy to dictate what leaders could do and feared these unions would cause more harm than good.

Participant E likened the NLRB’s involvement on campuses to similar concerns about the Affordable Care Act and the debate about artificial contraception. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) (2010) actually came up in multiple interviews, both as a regulation affecting the way colleges did business and as government interference in faith-based institutions. To begin, the ACA resulted in a number of institutions limiting the number of sections an adjunct could teach so that these employees would remain under the threshold for full-time employment and therefore under the requirement to provide healthcare. This was exactly what happened at Participant D’s school, which both limited adjuncts to two courses per semester and changed the

status of another faculty position that lead to other circumstances resulting in an agitated population who joined the collective bargaining movement on that campus.

Only one participant had a decidedly different opinion about the NLRB's jurisdiction over collective bargaining on Catholic college and university campuses. While Participant C did not want another union on campus, this leader had no concern about the NLRB's jurisdiction and did not see it as a First Amendment issue. Participant C emphasized, "I think that is intellectually preposterous, and I think it is dishonest, and I think it is an effort to manipulate our Catholic identity in ways that serve short-term interests and that we end up subverting rather than furthering our Catholic purposes through such tactics." Participant C viewed labor rights, Title IX, and the Affordable Care Act as earned rights that did not have the right of conscience:

For Participant C, the separation of Church and State is about the preservation of religious liberty:

If I'm a school, and I want not to conform to public policy about human equality or dignity, I want to be [name of college] and discriminate against interracial couples, I have that right. But it would be a violation of the Constitution for the Federal government to subsidize me in doing so. That, I could take. I'd support that policy.

Participant C continued:

So if Catholic colleges believe that their mission is so grounded in, for whatever rationale, in precluding the unionization of maintenance workers, adjunct faculty members, administrators, well, you can have that right. But you cannot have funding any more than my location parish can. And, I don't see any, I don't actually think this is that debatable.

This campus leader did not agree with Participant's B's assessment of the government's role in defining what constitutes as religious: "If there's no criteria as to what, if an institution is not defining itself as primarily religious, and therefore, exempt, it cannot claim the exemption. I mean, that's basically what's at stake. We can defer to the organization...we defer to the Klu Klux Klan, right? The Klu Klux Klan has the right to discriminate."

Participant C feared that the argument Catholic colleges and universities had made about federal jurisdiction as a First Amendment issue, would actually do more harm than good:

When ideas become....tools to be manipulated, like religious freedom, to justify an interest where you site what's divine, what's really important, what is overarching, and twist or turn any legitimate understanding of its meaning, to justify what is in fact a conception of self-interest, it really matters because we don't discredit our self-interest; we end up discrediting the idea. And I think that's the opposite of leadership.

Therefore, while all participants believed in Catholic Social Teaching and spoke to its commitment to the rights of the worker, Participant C was the only one who was able to envision a both/and relationship for Catholic college and university collective bargaining with government regulation even though most other participants had experienced it. Participant C provided the researcher with an unpublished essay he/she had written about First Amendment issues in Catholic higher education that strongly affirmed the sentiments expressed in the interview.

Summary of findings. All of the internal and external factors discussed above affected these participants' perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities. The most significant of these factors included: the senior leader's leadership style and professional experience with unions, the fiscal challenges associated with the unsustainable higher education

model, and government regulation and interference, both as it relates to NLRB jurisdiction and otherwise.

Related Question Two

The researcher was especially interested in answering this related question: How does Catholic Social Teaching affect senior-level administrators' perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities? Catholic Social Teachings, discussed extensively above, date back to Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* and offer guidance about worker rights. Senior Catholic college and university leaders wrestle with these teachings while facing the numerous other internal and external pressures also discussed above.

All of the participants in this study made some reference to Catholic Social Teaching, Catholic identity, and/or the institutional order identity as a motivation for their general support of the idea of collective bargaining. For Participant E, Catholic Social Teaching was a compelling reason to do the right things for one's campus community:

...if you look in the tradition of Catholic Social Teaching, it finds in the Acts of the Apostles the term *koinonia*, 'each according to their need.' And so the community really gathered around serving each other's needs and caring for those who are most disenfranchised sort of at the top of the list. And, you know, I think that's for me a much more compelling rationale.

This institution's religious founding order also focused on service to the poor. Therefore, for Participant E, "The Catholic mission, I think, part of it is, you know, to the extent that you can create an environment that promotes human dignity and a caring environment, you know, that can...are broader than Catholicism but are at the heart of Catholicism."

Participant E summarized expectations for the institution's faith-based heritage as it related to caring for workers and building a campus educational community:

Well, you know, I think that we see ourselves and we present ourselves, and we are, our identity is really [Founding Order] and Catholic and a University. So you really hold all those three things together, and so, I think part of it really begins with trying to model that, you know, the best of Catholic Social Teaching, and create an environment that is really formed around that and builds a culture around Catholicity in that way.

Participant E acknowledged that one could easily trample on worker rights and therefore actively kept that in mind when making decisions. Regardless of what internal or external factors impacted these decisions, Participant E emphasized, "What we should be bound by is our commitment in Catholic Social Teaching for peoples' rights, their labor rights, and the environment that you create in the workplace. That should not change." Please note that the institution's Mission and the bargained-for employee's voice in maintaining the Mission was referenced in the institution's collective bargaining agreement (Participant E Collective Bargaining Agreement).

Participant F agreed with Participant E's assessment and believed that Catholic Social Teaching supported worker rights:

Well, certainly I think Catholic Social Teaching is in favor of collective bargaining. They are in favor of all people being treated justly and fairly and without discrimination for any particular group. And so, when it's determined that things are happening or that there are needs not being met in those areas, I think, certainly, it's not opposed...it would be supported by Catholic Social Teaching.

While this campus leader would have preferred not to have had a union and work directly on campus, given injustice, this senior-leader was supportive of collective bargaining as a means to correct the injustice.

Early in Participant A's interview, this leader shared that the institution's founding order and Catholic heritage made the institution sensitive to labor needs and attune to the human dignity of each member of the community. This leader explained that he/she participated in spiritual exercises, which impacted the last round of contract negotiations at the institution. The leader shared a scenario the he/she believed resulted in a changed negotiation tactic to maintain the relationship with union leadership and demonstrate care for the employees.

Like Participant A, Participant C discussed personal faith in saying, "I think my faith is why I do what I do. I'm really really Catholic." The leader continued, "Catholic Social Teaching really really is a reflection of the fundamentals of the faith. And it really is about human equality and human dignity, and our obligations to each other." Participant C asserted that labor organized when "they feel like they're bearing a disproportionate burden of the stress of the market place." The institution's mission and founding order called for a commitment to human dignity, equality, and to serve each other. Clearly, Participants C and A were very supportive of worker rights, a perspective reflected in their support for the historical value of unions and their attempts to build and maintain trusting relationships with them.

When Participant D faced collective bargaining on campus, this leader received a call from a local retired Catholic leader of importance to the campus who reminded Participant D about the Church's teachings on collective bargaining. While outreaching to the faith-leader was a tactic to assert pressure from the union, the Church leader and campus leader both understood Catholic Social Teachings on worker rights. Still, Participant D struggled with the economic

reality of a union on campus, “It becomes a problem for us in terms of Catholic Social Teaching, in terms of, you know, wanting people to have an opportunity to have reasonable pay for the work they’re doing and things like that. So, I think that was an issue for us.”

Participant D then had to educate the institution’s board about worker rights and why the institution would remain neutral in light of collective bargaining efforts. When asked why this institution chose to remain neutral during bargaining efforts, the leader said, “Again, I think we just have to deal with the reality of the world we’re living in. I’m not sure that we’re going to be able to resist those kind of things productively.” The leader also emphasized that the institution wanted “fairness to workers and understanding that we’re looking for skilled people to do various kinds of things and compensate them appropriately” as well as to gainfully employ people. The researcher confirmed the institution’s stated neutrality in press releases she found in media coverage.

Participant D was skeptical of the campus’s understanding of Catholicity and Catholic Social Teachings. Although the campus community spoke about Catholic Social Teaching, the leader felt responsible to educate faculty, in particular, about what being Catholic really meant and about the root of what it meant to be in the tradition of the founding order. Participant D challenged employees to model a more inclusive campus community in the Catholic tradition when reimagining what it meant to welcome adjuncts to campus.

In like manner, Participant B noted that the collective bargaining efforts on campus led to a forced discussion about identity and mission that benefited the campus and led this leader to feel that his/her current institution was the most “Catholic” of the campuses this leader had worked at. Participant B, though, did not agree with other leaders who argued that Catholic Social Teaching required leaders to recognize unions. In addition, Participant B did not believe

that collective bargaining was good for all institutions or that all unions were “good.” Participant B quoted a friend who said, ““What other doctrines of Leo XIII are we all holding up, holding onto and beating each other with?””

For Participant B, the current union model, did not work for higher education and would not solve the problems associated with higher education’s current business model that had led to the exploitation of adjuncts. Instead, Participant B advocated for erring on the side of inclusion and just wages to do what is Catholic by following the lead of Georgetown’s Just Employment Policy, but without government regulation.

Participant leaders spoke about Catholic Social Teaching, Mission, Catholic identity, and/or religious order identity. However, these leaders did so with slight variations on a common theme of human dignity and worker rights that affected their perception of collective bargaining.

Related Question Three

Very little has been written regarding the final related question: Do senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities change with regard to full-time faculty unions? Part-time or contingent faculty unions? Or staff unions? All of the participants believed in some kind of collective bargaining on their campuses even if they did not want them (or more of them). Not all participants agreed on which constituents had the right to bargain collectively.

Participant C was fully supportive of staff and adjunct bargaining rights, but he/she strongly asserted the *Yeshiva v. NLRB*’s holding that faculty were managers and should not be allowed to collectively bargain when the faculty exercised these responsibilities: “I believe that those responsibilities are real, they should not be nominal, that the faculty share managerial

responsibilities, and that, I believe that is, that efforts to subvert the role of faculty in that way, rather than to successfully engage faculty in that way, do not serve our profession or our institutions well.” If faculty were not given full managerial rights, this leader’s perspective changed.

Participant B similarly believed that faculty should not be able to collectively bargain and that staff should. However, this leader had a very different justification for this. Participant B believed that all teaching faculty, full-time and part-time, had a role in upholding the institution’s Mission while staff, including custodial workers, maintenance workers, and security, did not: “I don’t think that we get into issues with regard to housekeeping that affect or could possibly affect our ability to carry forth the core Mission of the institution, which is teaching and learning in the context of our Catholic identity.” This leader had no concern if a staff person negotiated for “purely economic issues and workplace issues and things like that for somebody, which puts that person on equal footing if they worked at a state institution, a private non-Catholic, non-sectarian, non-religious institution, or if they worked at a Catholic institution.”

For this leader, faculty had a significant role in maintaining the Mission. Participant B said:

When it comes to the work with the faculty, what we say is that no matter what your discipline is, no matter what your own confessional position is, your own religious beliefs, you are participating in a collegium, in a group at a college, a collegium, a gathering of people who are of like mind enough to be able to offer direction in a particular way to students.

Unlike Participant B, Participant C believed that staff played a role in maintaining the mission, as “teachers,” but in a different way than faculty.

The negotiated issues in the staff collective bargaining agreement(s) at Participant B's institution this leader's claim that these employees were bargaining for economic and such workplace issues including salary, raises, equipment, sick and vacation time, and security. No mention was made of the institution's mission – not even a preamble statement addressing a greater mission or purpose. Unfortunately, given the pending negotiation status of Participant C's staff, the researcher did not receive a copy of that document for comparison.

Participant A's institution also had a staff union. Its collective bargaining agreement similarly focused solely on economic and workplace issues. Yet, this document also outlined a means for continued dialogue with administration to allow staff voice in the issues of most concern to its members. While the administration struggled with the union's formation, Participant A reported that the relationship had developed into one with trust and collaboration.

Participant D was receptive to collective bargaining for all employees, but added, "I think obviously the Church has been very focused on lower level workers that are not making \$80,000 - \$100,000." Therefore, Participant D questioned the need for unions at the full-time faculty level.

Finally, Participants E and F recognized collective bargaining as an option for all employees. For Participant F, the nature of the union was not an issue. This campus leader specified that any population that felt its members were not being treated justly had the right to be protected with the assistance of the union. Similarly, Participant E currently had a full-time faculty union and understood that the institution would "respect the process" if staff chose to follow suit. Participant E summarized his/her take on collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities broadly, which seemed to be true based on the participants' interviews:

My overall perception is that at Catholic colleges and universities there is a strong

underpinning of a commitment to labor rights, and so, while there may be varying degrees of that, I think by and large that my perception is that Catholic colleges and universities tend to take the process very very seriously.

Conclusion

Senior-level administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities were shaped by many internal and external factors including, most significantly: their own leadership style and professional experience with unions, their fiscal reality and understanding of the business model in higher education, and their experience with government regulation/interference. Additionally, Catholic Social Teaching influenced their perception. Though generally supportive of collective bargaining efforts, none of the leaders wanted more unions, the participants did not agree on who should have bargaining rights, and all preferred to work directly with their staffs as opposed to through a union.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction

This chapter reminds the reader about the purpose of the study, reviews its chosen methodology, discusses the implications of its findings, makes recommendations to senior Catholic college and university leaders, and offers suggestions for future research on this topic.

Statement of the Problem

The internal and external factors affecting the growth of collective bargaining on college campuses in the 1960s and 1970s seem to once again be spurring union growth. From 2012 to 2016 there was significant growth in collective bargaining efforts at colleges and universities with the most significant growth at private institutions, including at religiously affiliated colleges and universities. Other factors spurring union growth include a declining number of high school graduates in certain regions of the country, especially from Catholic primary and secondary schools, increasing governmental influence and regulation, challenges to the higher education fiscal model, changing perception of the value and purpose of a college degree, etc.

Catholic colleges and universities have faced unique challenges as a result of the growth of unions. A number of significant church documents, beginning with Pope Leo XIII's *Rerum Novarum* in 1891, lay the foundation for the principles of Catholic Social Teaching around the rights of the worker. However, when faced with the threat or reality of collective bargaining on their campuses, Catholic campus leaders have responded in different ways to these various pressures. This study sought to answer the following research question: How do senior-level administrators at Catholic colleges and universities perceive collective bargaining? Additional related research questions included: What internal and external factors and experiences affect these

perceptions? How does Catholic Social Teaching affect these perceptions? Do these perceptions change with regard to full-time faculty unions? Part-time or contingent faculty unions? Staff unions?

Review of Methodology

For this study, the researcher utilized a qualitative transcendental phenomenological approach, as outlined by Moustakas, seeking the essence of the participants' lived experience that shaped their perception of collective bargaining on Catholic college and university campuses. The researcher successfully included participants with a variety of collective bargaining exposure on their campuses: three who already had staff unions; one with a full-time faculty union, two imminently facing contingent faculty collective bargaining efforts, and one that did not have any collective bargaining on his/her campus.

Each participant was from a very small to mid-sized, four-year Catholic college or university in the Northeast. A senior Catholic college administrator familiar with the researcher's work served as a gatekeeper helping to gain access to the participants. The researcher conducted a 60 to 90-minute in-person interview with each senior-level administrators on his or her campus. Within one week of the interview each participant received an encrypted electronic copy of the interview transcript for member-checking. To triangulate the data, the researcher also analyzed public statements about collective bargaining efforts or first-amendment issues on participants' campuses and analyzed any available collective bargaining agreements, if they existed.

The transcripts, documents, and public statements were all coded based on emerging themes relevant to the research questions. The findings are a result of Moustakas's

transcendental phenomenological process: Epoche, Transcendental Phenomenological Reduction, Imagination Variation, and Synthesis.

Summary of Findings

In general, the senior Catholic college administrators who participated in this study were supportive of collective bargaining and understood the historical role of unions in improving laborers' working conditions and wages. Even so, these leaders also preferred to work directly with their staffs and viewed unions as a barrier to flexibility and to maintaining a collegial campus community. Participant receptivity to unions varied for some leaders based on the constituent group. All leaders were most receptive to staff collective bargaining. Yes, in no uncertain terms, these leaders did not want more unions on their campuses.

Participant perceptions of collective bargaining were affected by a variety of internal and external factors. The most significant of these factors included: the leader's personal leadership style and professional experience with collective bargaining, the pressures of the higher education fiscal model at this point in time in the Northeast, and a range of government regulations and interference from local, state, and federal governments that has left most of these leaders wary of any additional government oversight particularly by the NLRB.

Though the researcher is not aware of any other research on this topic, these findings are consistent with related study findings about primary and secondary Catholic school leader perceptions of collective bargaining and post-secondary qualitative studies about circumstances leading to collective bargaining on college campuses.

Discussion: Implications of Findings

In the following section the researcher will place the study's findings in conversation with findings from previous research and major themes from Catholic Social Teachings about worker rights.

Findings and Previous Research

Important findings from this study relate to similar findings from previous research in both primary and secondary Catholic schools and in two studies about circumstances leading to collective bargaining in higher education. Important emerging themes include enrollment and budget, voice in decision making, salaries and benefits, leadership and relationship with employees, the union model, educational faith communities, and collective bargaining unit members.

The internal and external conditions at participating Catholic colleges and universities affecting the lived-experience of their senior leaders were consistent with warning factors outlined by Crossland (1976) and DeCew (2003) that previously led to collective bargaining in higher education. Crossland and DeCew understood that declining enrollments could spur union growth and concerns about job security. Threats to tenure and academic freedom intensified union support (Arnold, 2000; DeCew, 2003; Huffman, 1976). For participants in this research project, the sustainability of the fiscal model was a significant theme, an anticipated finding and why the researcher focused on the Northeastern market. In their earlier investigations, Huffman (1976) and Boyle (1980) found that school unions gained employee support and lost administrative support during times of economic stress. In their higher education research, Hudec (1999) and Arnold (2000) confirmed these trends.

A seeming disconnect between the literature and this study was how these leaders perceived adjunct faculty. While the participant institutions capped the number of sections adjuncts could teach to prevent them from eligibility for healthcare benefits and viewed adjunct use as a cost-savings measure (Faculty Forward Network, 2015; Hendershott, 2015), they failed to recognize the changing nature of adjuncts. The Kalmanovitz Initiative (2015) claimed that 73.3% of contingent faculty viewed teaching as their primary profession. However, the participants in this study mostly asserted that the majority of their adjuncts were professionals who had full-time jobs and taught part-time.

Participant A described these instructors as “Professional adjuncts that have another job, who do this because they love it or because they want to impart their wisdom, they want to share their abilities with others” (p. 19, 352- 354). To illustrate the “professional adjunct,” participants cited principals, accountants, or mass communication professionals who taught on their campuses because they enjoyed it, not for the money. In comparison, for Participant A, full-time adjuncts were the people who could not get a full-time job as a professor and therefore accepted that they had to piece together a teaching career if they wanted one. All participants argued that full-time adjuncts were the minority on their campuses, which contradicted the literature (Sinyai, 2015).

While participants were able to acknowledge the exploitation of adjuncts as a problem within the fiscal model of higher education, failing to understand the true reality of adjunct use on their campuses may have left the participants lacking an urgency to address any injustices. Also, if full-time adjuncts were perceived as just candidates who were not good enough to get jobs, consciously or unconsciously, leaders may have felt less inclined to make changes needed to address their situations.

Consistent with another finding in this study, Crossland (1976), Kerchner and Mitchell (1988), Russo (1990), Hudec (2000), Chaykin (2015), and Jaschik (2015) all spoke to the power of government influence on collective bargaining trends. From regulation reporting that shifted power from faculty to administration to changed labor laws, the participants in this study all spoke to their concerns about government influence and increased regulations. The participants anticipated upcoming local, state, and federal changes that could further challenge their rights and business model and were left with apprehension and concern.

How decisions were made on campus and who had a say in decision-making was another finding consistent with the literature about factors spurring union efforts (Chaykin, 2015; Crossland, 1976; DeCew, 2003; Faculty Forward Network, 2015; Hudec, 1999). Olsen (1970) found that faculty senates were not always perceived as an effective way to offer input, even though Perrotta (1993) later reported that administrators preferred shared governance to unions. In this study, participants' campuses all sought increased input in shared governance, more opportunities to meet with the senior leader, or additional representation on campus committees.

Positively, participants did not necessarily see requests for more voice or influence on their campuses as a threat to administrators' power or authority. Further, Yamada (1973) and McGrath (1985) noted that most (but not all) participants were not worried about losing their authority or exercising their leadership as a result of collective bargaining. Instead, participants were more focused on maintaining flexibility and worried that unions would negatively impact their ability to respond to market pressures. Kerchner and Mitchell's (1988) also reported that managers feared losing the ability to handle issues locally because of union influence.

Prior studies indicated that dissatisfaction with salaries and benefits further contributed to collective bargaining efforts (Chaykin, 2015; DeCew, 2003). McGrath (1985) reported that

private school union growth paralleled public school union growth and similarly resulted from a desire for better salaries and benefits. More recently, Kresse (2004) found that teachers left positions at Catholic schools because of salary, benefits and working conditions. Participant F believed that regular salary increases, even during bad economic times, positively impacted campus culture and was likely why employees at this institution had not sought collective bargaining.

Participant F also concluded that if a particular group on campus felt it was being treated unjustly, it had the right to bargain. Kerchner and Mitchell (1988) analogously found that in their research. Groups organized when they felt they were being treated unfairly and needed to protect their rights. Participants C and E agreed that justice was a common motivating factor of collective bargaining.

The role of leadership, both in unions and on campus, was significant in the current research and consistent with Hudec (1999) and Arnold's (2000) studies in post-secondary education. Leadership, in Hudec's case included leadership on the Board level which negatively affected administrator-faculty relationships and spurred union growth. Academic leadership changes first hurt and later helped relationships with faculty and their perception of how they were viewed and valued by senior leaders. Union leadership was also aggressive and problematic (Hudec, 1999). Kerchner and Mitchell (1988) reported similar union leadership issues that negatively influenced leader perceptions of collective bargaining. For Arnold (2000), campus and state leadership also affected the campus climate and administrator-union relationships.

Interestingly, the current study found that senior-leaders perceived that unions would negatively affect their relationships with employees and preferred to work directly with them.

Yamada (1973) and Perrotta (1993) found this perception to be true for primary and secondary school administrators as well. However, Yamada reported that unions offered more structured procedures for communication and resulted in more inclusive decision making, which was consistent with the experience that Participant A shared. Further, Scatena (1984) reported that collective bargaining agreements had a positive impact on both communication and working conditions.

Kerchner and Mitchell (1988) concluded that collective bargaining often resulted when employees lost trust in their leaders and vested hope in unions to make change. Administrators were then shocked when the labor organizers made progress on their campuses and felt these labor leaders were outsiders negatively affecting their campus communities. The described experience parallels the narratives of Participants B and D who described the unions as outsiders and were surprised by the adjunct movements on their campuses.

As early as 1980, Boyle found that administrators wanted a new model because they perceived that public unions did not work for faith-based schools. Palestini (1980) similarly observed that administrators were concerned about how a union would affect educational faith communities. Kerchner and Mitchell (1988)'s research suggested a new model for the future of collective bargaining that recognized teacher/faculty influence on policy but that also required public accountability for institutional outcomes. Participant E's faculty union had campus-wide accountability for progress toward institutional goals. Participant E and Participant B were unconvinced that public unions from outside the academy would best help meet institutional goals or union member goals.

Educational communities of faith were supposed to model relationship building, welcome and provide security for members, feel like a family, allow for shared governance, develop trust

between members, allow for employee growth, and demonstrate collaboration (USCCB, 1972). The institutions that most exemplified these qualities from the leader's perspective were Institutions C, E, and F. It is worth noting that two of these institutions had unions, and one did not. Therefore, maintaining a community of faith was possible for institutions with unions and without.

As noted, many of the findings in this study are consistent with prior research. However, the most notably absent finding, in comparison to the prior primary and secondary Catholic school studies, was that no leader discussed differences in their perception of collective bargaining for lay versus religious members of their communities, nor was there a distinction in any collective bargaining agreement. This difference was expected for two reasons: fewer religious exist on these campuses than when the primary and secondary school studies were conducted, and those religious who were currently working at the participating institutions would not likely have been in staff roles. Institution E, though, did have a faculty union, and no distinction was made for lay versus religious faculty in the collective bargaining agreement.

Findings and Catholic Social Teachings

All participants in the study spoke to how their understanding of Catholic Social Teachings about worker rights informed their perceptions of collective bargaining. The following themes from the Catholic Social Teaching documents discussed in Chapter II were pertinent to this discussion for senior Catholic college leaders.

Pacem in Terris (1961), *Laborem Exercens* (1981), and *Centesimus Annus* (1991) advocated for work environments where workers could thrive and meet their full potential. Participant E's description of the campus community would best be described by the ideal outlined in these important teachings. Participant F espoused this ideal as well. A work

environment that supported employee development included workers and managers attempting to meet each other's needs, build solidarity, ensured a say in decision making, and paid people fairly.

Rerum Novarum (1891), *Mater et Magistra* (1961), *Pacem in Terris* (1961) and *Evangelii Gaudium* (2013) called for solidarity between workers and managers by building relationships between classes. These relationships resulted in collaboration, cooperation, and a push toward consensus as modelled by an inclusive community. Communication, or having a say in decision making, was an important part of building a community, according to all of the respondents, which was evident on each of their campuses. Sentiments from *Mater et Magistra* (1961), *Gaudium et Spes* (1965), *Octogesima Adveniens* (1971), and *Economic Justice for All* (1986) encouraged employees to have meaningful contributions to improve their working conditions.

Salary and wages were also important themes from Catholic Social Teachings and this study. *Rerum Novarum* (1891) supported adequate wages for frugal laborers. *Nova Impendent*, (1931) sought a strong commitment to the poor and the marginalized. *Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction* (1919) generally warned against exploitation of workers. When offering feedback about which campus constituents had a right to collectively bargain, salary did not come up. Still, Participant D implied that faculty making almost \$100,000 per year were not the workers Catholic Social Teachings were trying to address or described as being exploited.

Mater et Magistra (1986) dictated that wages should take into account more than just the marketplace. Wages should account for both worker justice and an understanding the impact on the business. When establishing wages, *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) cautioned against setting wages that would put the institution out of business. *Economic Justice for All* (1986) added that unions had a responsibility to avoid pressing demands that would hurt the community. Senior

leaders implied these points throughout their interviews and worried about the additional expenses unions would add to their institutions.

A common theme among participants was genuine concern about government interference. Catholic Social Teachings in *Rerum Novarum* (1891), *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931), and *Centesimus Annus* (1991) advocated for subsidiarity whenever possible, but also that the government had a responsibility to protect worker and employer rights in extreme situations. Therefore, as participants struggled with various ways the government had interfered on their campuses, one could argue that NLRB jurisdiction and policies were in place for just this reason – to step in when institutions had failed to protect worker rights.

Another commonly held participant concern about collective bargaining on Catholic campuses was the type of union representing the workers. *Rerum Novarum* (1891) and *Economic Justice for All* (1986) supported workers' right to freely choose a group that met their unique needs. Further, *Quadragesimo Anno* (1931) wanted Christian worker associations or associations at least guided by Catholic thought. *Mater et Magistra* (1961) also cautioned workers against corrupt unions not guided by goodness. These documents, therefore, offer conflicting teachings for participants who felt that outside unions would not meet campus needs or understand Catholic missions.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, *Mater et Magistra* (1961), *Gaudium et Spes* (1965), *Octogesima Adveniens* (1971), *Justice in the World* (1971), and *Sollicitudo rei Socialis* (1987) all called on the Church (and Church organizations) to model worker justice. Failure to do so would look like hypocrisy and reflect negatively on all Church teachings. How participant institutions and other Catholic colleges and university responded to similar issues on their campuses should at least be influenced by the above teachings.

Recommendations for Catholic Campus Leadership

After learning about the lived experiences of the participants and immersing herself in the related literature, this researcher concluded that Catholic Social Teachings universally endorses worker rights and should be taken seriously. Workers should be able to bargain collectively. However, the fears of senior leaders from stressed markets are real. These leaders have a fiscal responsibility to their students, employees, and alumni to maintain the health of their institutions. These leaders should do everything in their power to maintain an inclusive educational faith community where workers are valued, treated with dignity, and have true input in decision making. Moreover, leaders also have a responsibility to educate their employees about the market with this knowledge. Then, workers have a responsibility to come together to support the institution.

Where unions are pursued, leaders may consider recognizing the union without NLRB jurisdiction as a compromise to keep more government regulation out of the institution while recognizing workers' right to organize. Leaders on both sides, the administration and the union, should then work collaboratively for mutual gains while minimizing the negative impact on the relationship.

Finally, Catholic leaders in higher education can take leadership roles to stop the exploitation of adjunct faculty members. Leaders should holistically assess the adjunct experience on their campuses and reshape campus culture to make these vital educators feel welcome, valued, and included. They may also consider forming a consortium of Catholic colleges that collectively supports and employs contingent faculty, sharing the resources and the costs of these staff based on campus need and use while helping them earn a living wage with needed benefits.

Limitations

This study had some limitations. First, the number of senior-level administrators at institutions within the parameters set by the researcher who were willing to participate was limited. All senior-leaders who agreed to participate did so either at the request of a gatekeeper, a senior-leader supportive of the study who helped make needed connections, or through a prior relationship the participant(s) had with the dissertation mentor. No participant who the researcher contacted without a prior relationship was willing to participate. Most did not respond at all, likely due to the nature of the subject.

Another limitation of the study was that all participants were senior-level college administrators who were very busy. Two came late to the scheduled interviews. One was rescheduled. Only two of the six interviews lasted more than 60 minutes though all offered to answer follow up questions as needed.

Next, the researcher was concerned about the participants' willingness to answer questions openly and honestly. This concern was affirmed but also minimized when two participants made comments during the interviews about being unsure whether to share a piece of information with the researcher but proceeded to do so. Three participants also reiterated the confidential nature of the comments and documents during and after the interviews. One participant would not share the collective bargaining agreement out of concern that the institution was about to enter contract negotiations. The researcher conducted the interviews in person and tried to build rapport as a way to gain participant trust. Still, this remains a reasonable limitation of the study.

Suggestions for Future Research

First, while the National Center for Collective Bargaining in Higher Education maintains the most comprehensive list of all college and university collective bargaining units, the latest data was from 2012, and it did not have information for institutions who failed to respond to the survey. The database also separated institutions by public and private status, but it did not denote faith-based or Catholic institutions. A comprehensive list of institutions with collective bargaining units for tenured and tenure track faculty, staff, and contingent faculty should be compiled to better understand and track trends in collective bargaining.

Next, speaking with the senior-leader participants was an enriching and educational experience. The researcher recommends that this study be conducted on a larger scale to incorporate more voices and to look for trends across the country but with a similar qualitative approach. Participant C recommended speaking with a colleague and “independent thinker” from another region of the country who might have interesting additions to the study. However, that participant’s experience was outside the parameters of the study.

The researcher also recommends that a tool be developed, similar to the instruments used in the primary and secondary school research highlighted in Chapter II, to help gather quantitative data that would either encourage or challenge the findings of the current study and allow for more generalizable data. The researcher recommends looking for trend data such as across genders, religious and lay campus leaders, and regions of the country.

Future researchers might also consider case studies of one of the participant institutions with a history of collective bargaining that seemed to manage relationships well. Two of the participants had exceptionally strong relationships between their senior leaders and collective bargaining units. It would be both valuable and interesting to learn what factors go into building

and maintaining their healthy relationships over time from the perspectives of the faculty, union representatives, and senior leaders. The researcher notes that it may be challenging to get participants for such a case study given her experience trying to get participants for this study.

The campus leadership, senior-level administrator, faculty/staff, and union leadership, significantly impacted the relationship between members of the participant campuses.

Therefore, additional researchers might study these campus leaders and leadership roles. The researcher suggests a study that considers the senior leaders' tenure, experience, and leadership style to provide insights into building and maintaining healthy campus cultures and collegial learning environments. Still, it is important to note that the researcher did not specifically include the tenure of this study's participants to limit their ability to be identified.

In Arnold's (2000) study of three public colleges and universities, he found that public perception played an important role in union development. In Hudec's (1999) study, faculty and administration engaged students and parents in the battle over collective bargaining. A future study could focus more specifically on how public perception of collective bargaining affects union development on Catholic college and university campuses. While this topic was on the margins of this study and came up minimally in the research, a focus on prospective student, current student, parent, alumni, or peer perceptions of collective bargaining efforts would add to the literature on this topic.

This study, like those conducted by Hudec (1999) and Arnold (2000) had other related findings worthy of further investigation. In Hudec's case study, union growth was influenced by a private union on campus. Participants A and B were impacted by private unions on their campus as well. In Hudec's case study, union development was also influenced by accrediting agencies, as were Participant B and Participant D. Local campus culture, city history and

culture, institutional educational offerings, and public perception/pressure all affected Hudec and/or Arnold's institutions and certainly fed into this study to varying degrees. These factors are worthy of additional investigation.

Finally, it is clear from this researcher's interviews that senior Catholic college and university administrators are very focused on the impact of political leaders and change on the national, state, and local levels. The study, begun during the Obama administration, may have different outcomes during or after the Trump administration. Similarly, proposals for free college education were introduced during the 2016 primary and election seasons and continued by some Northeast governors including Governor Cuomo in New York and Governor Raimondo in Rhode Island. Therefore, the impact of changes on the federal, state, or local level could alter senior-level administrators' perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities.

Conclusion

As one study participant reminded us, "The whole environment and context and the operating model of higher education is really coming at a crossroads" (Interview with Participant D). This study's findings suggest that senior-administrators, staff, and faculty sense the impending change, which has resulted in collective bargaining efforts on private, religiously-affiliated campuses much the way pressures in the 1960s and 1970s resulted in collective bargaining in higher education. Senior leaders want to preserve flexibility in managing the pressures they face which include budgetary concerns and government regulations, while workers seek financial stability and job security. These seemingly conflicting goals result in tensions.

In managing these tensions, college and university leaders at Catholic institutions must also be guided by Catholic Social Teachings, which for over 125 years have advocated for worker rights. Participants in this study were influenced by these important teachings. They acknowledged the historical importance of unions in securing worker rights. Most believed in Catholic Social Teachings as a framework for creating a work environment that respects the dignity of each employee and encourages their personal development as a contributing member of the community. However, other internal and external pressures also affect their perception of worker associations.

Therefore, while all participants in this study were generally receptive to collective bargaining, they did not want any union growth on their campuses. Those with unions wanted to proceed as partners with the union and its leadership, but they did not want additional unions. These leaders perceived unions as limiting their ability to work directly with their staffs and to meet the pressures facing the higher education industry.

This transcendental phenomenological qualitative study found many consistencies with prior research that investigated primary and secondary Catholic school administrators' perceptions of collective bargaining. However, this study further highlighted the lived-experience of these senior-leaders who were faced with many competing priorities even though they were at various stages in the bargaining process and had different union experiences on their campuses. This study also offered insights about Catholic college leader perceptions of collective bargaining for different campus constituents. As a result of this research, readers can hopefully better understand the pressures facing senior campus leaders as well as the circumstances leading to collective bargaining, to best manage institutional challenges, and to build and maintain educational, faith communities consistent with their missions.

References

- Arnold, G. B. (2000). *The politics of faculty unionization: The experience of three New England universities*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing.
- Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2012). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Blum, D. E. (1990). Merits of unionism still hotly debated 10 years after high court limited faculty bargaining. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Archives. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Merits-of-Academic-Unionism/68001/>
- Boyle, D. F. (1980). *The Relationship between faith community and teachers unions in Catholic schools: Implication for the future of Catholic schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Boston College, Boston, MA.
- Brennan, J. & Magness, P. (2016). Estimating the cost of justice for adjuncts: A case study in university business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*. doi:10.1007/s10551-016-3013-1
- Carnegie Classifications of Institutions of Higher Education (2016). Retrieved from http://carnegieclassifications.iu.edu/classification_descriptions/size_setting.php
- Chaykin, M. (2015). An analytical review of higher education unionism over the last 40 plus years as a union staff person. *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy*, 7 (6). Retrieved from <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba/vol7/iss1/6/>
- Cicco, J. T. (1976). Faith. Community Effects. *Unionism in Catholic schools: A Symposium*. National Catholic Education Association, 44-48.
- Clarke, K. (2016). A bad case of Jesuit adjunctivitis? *America: The National Catholic Review*. Retrieved from <http://americamagazine.org/issue/bad-case-jesuit-adjunctivitis>
- Clyde, W. & Fabé, B. (2011, February 8). Questions about adjunct election on unionization. Retrieved from <http://www-archive.manhattan.edu/sites/default/files/QUESTIONS%20ABOUT%20ADJUNCT%20ELECTION%20ON%20UNIONIZATION.pdf>
- Cresswell, A. M. (1976). Collective bargaining and the community of faith in Catholic schools. *Unionism in Catholic Schools: A Symposium*. National Catholic Education Association, 49-58.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

- Crossland, F. E. (1976). Will the academy survive unionization? *Change*, 8(1), 38-42. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/40162436?sid=21106026154333&uid=3739832&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&uid=2134&uid=3739256>
- Cusick, J. C., & DeVries, K. F. (2001). *The basic guide to young adult ministry*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- DeCew, J. W. (2003). *Unionization in the academy: Visions and realities*. London: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Duncan, A. (2013). Obama administration launches college scorecard. *U.S. Department of Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/02/13/obama-administration-launches-college-scorecard>
- Faculty Forward Network. (2015). *A faculty survey and call to reignite the Jesuit social mission on campus*. Retrieved from http://facultyforwardnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Jesuit-Faculty-Report_Survey-_FINAL_1222.pdf
- Flaherty, C. (2015). Pacific Lutheran adjuncts withdraw union petition. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2015/01/15/pacific-lutheran-adjuncts-withdraw-union-petition>
- Flaherty, C. (2016a). Crop of “anti-union” university websites sparks criticism from proponents of graduate assistant unions. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/08/30/crop-anti-union-university-websites-sparks-criticism-proponents-graduate-assistant>
- Flaherty, C. (2016b). NLRB: Adjuncts in religious studies may be excluded from religious college unions. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2016/08/24/nlr-adjuncts-religious-studies-may-be-excluded-religious-college-unions>
- Flaherty, C. (2016c). NLRB says graduate students at private universities may unionize. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/08/24/nlr-says-graduate-students-private-universities-may-unionize>
- Flaherty, C. (2016d). Notre Dame de Namur professors protest academic cuts flowing from program prioritization. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/08/26/notre-dame-de-namur-professors-protest-academic-cuts-flowing-program-prioritization>
- Flaherty, C. (2016e). Notre Dame de Namur recognizes tenured faculty union. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2016/06/01/notre-dame-de-namur-recognizes-tenured-faculty-union>

- Flaherty, C. (2016f). Proposed faculty union at Carroll College is the first to be rejected under new guidelines. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/01/21/proposed-faculty-union-carroll-college-first-be-rejected-under-new-guidelines>
- Francis. (2013). *Evangelii gaudium*. Retrieved from w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html
- Georgetown University. (2005). *Just employment policy for Georgetown University*. Retrieved from <https://publicaffairs.georgetown.edu/acbp/just-employment-policy.html>
- Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Green, C. (Moderator). (2015). Program 30: The NLRB's new ruling and the future of faculty unions. [Audio broadcast]. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/audio/2015/01/09/program-30-nlrbs-new-ruling-and-future-faculty-unions-jan-9-2015>
- Griffin, R. F. (2017). Memorandum GC 17-01. Office of the General Counsel. Retrieved from <https://apps.nlr.gov/link/document.aspx/09031d4582342bfc>
- Hendershott, A. (2015). NLRB makes inroad at Catholic colleges. *The Catholic World Reporter*. Retrieved from http://www.catholicworldreport.com/Item/3690/nlr_b_makes_inroads_at_catholic_colleges.aspx
- Herbert, W. A. (2016). The winds of changes shift: An analysis of recent growth in bargaining units and representation efforts in higher education. *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy*, 1(8). Retrieved from <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba/vol8/iss1/1/>
- Holtzman, D. H. (2016a). Referring religion? *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2016/01/28/new-nlr-standard-could-have-major-consequences-catholic-colleges-essay>
- Holtzman, D. H. (2016b). *Response to recent actions by the National Labor Relations Board*. Retrieved from <http://offices.depaul.edu/president/speeches-and-communications/2015-16/Pages/Response-to-recent-actions-by-the-National-Labor-Relations-Board-.aspx>
- Huber, S. A. (2004). *Catholic hospital resistance to federally regulated labor organization: A moral assessment in light of occupational structure* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.

- Hudec, P. A. (1999). *Faculty choice of a corporate industrial unionization model at a private, church-related university* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marquette University, Wisconsin.
- Hutcheson, P. A. (2000). *A professional professoriate: Unionization, bureaucratization, and the AAUP*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Jaschik, S. (2011). Adjuncts 2, Catholic colleges 0. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/06/02/nlrb_rules_that_adjuncts_may_vote_to_unionize_at_another_catholic_college
- Jaschik, S. (2015). Big union win. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/01/02/nlrb-ruling-shifts-legal-ground-faculty-unions-private-colleges>
- John XXIII. (1961). *Mater et magistra*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_15051961_mater.html
- John XXIII. (1961). *Pacem in terris*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-xxiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_j-xxiii_enc_11041963_pacem.html
- John Paul II. (1981). *Laborem exercens*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_14091981_laborem-exercens.html
- John Paul II. (1987). *Sollicitudo rei socialis*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_30121987_sollicitudo-rei-socialis.html
- John Paul II. (1991). *Centesimus annus*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_01051991_centesimus-annus.html
- Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor. (2015). *Just employment in action: Adjunct unionization and contract negotiation at Georgetown University*. Retrieved from <http://lwp.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/Just-Employment-in-Action.pdf>
- Kerchner, C. T., & Mitchell, D. E. (1988). *The changing idea of a teachers' union*. London, UK: The Falmer Press.
- Kezar, A., & Maxey, A. (2013). The changing academic workforce. *Trusteeship Magazine*, 21(3). Retrieved from <http://agb.org/trusteeship/2013/5/changing-academic-workforce>
- Kresse, W. A. (2004). *Working with the new lay teaching force: Labor relation model in Catholic schools and implications for exit and voice* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Cornell University, New York.
- Leibrecht, J. L. (1976). Teacher organizations in Catholic schools. *Unionism in Catholic Schools: A Symposium*. National Catholic Education Association, 23-28.

- Leatherman, C. (1998). NLRB ends its opposition to unions for private-college professors. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Archives. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/NLRB-May-End-Its-Opposition-to/98538/>
- Leatherman, C. (1999). NLRB officials say professors at Manhattan College, a private institution, can unionize. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A20. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/NLRB-Official-Says-Professors/31181/>
- Leatherman, C. (2000). NLRB lets stand a decision allowing professors at a private college to unionize. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A14. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/NLRB-Lets-Stand-Decision/106646/>
- Leo XIII. (1891). *Rerum novarum*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/leo_xiii/
- Malamud, D. C. (1998). Collective bargaining and the professoriate: What the law says. *Academe*, 6, 18-22.
- McDermott, E. J. (1976). A report on unions and Catholic schools. *Unionism in Catholic Schools: A Symposium*. National Catholic Education Association, 59-64.
- McGrath, R. J. (1985). *A study of collective bargaining in Catholic high schools in Illinois* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Loyola University of Chicago, Illinois.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. Retrieved from <http://srmo.sagepub.com.avoserv2.library.fordham.edu/view/phenomenological-research-methods/SAGE.xml>
- Nami, P. B. (1979). *Relationships between selected social environmental factors with Catholic secondary lay teachers' strike behaviors* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). State University of New York, Buffalo.
- National Center for Education Statistics, IHS Global. (2016). *Projections of education statistics to 2023 (NCES 2015-073)*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2015/2015073.pdf>
- National Labor Relations Board v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago*, 440 U.S. 490. (1979).
- National Labor Relations Board v. Pacific Lutheran University and Service Employees International Union, Local 925*. Case 19-RC-102521. 361 NLRB No. 157 (2014).
- National Labor Relations Board v. Yeshiva University*, 444 U.S. 672. (1980).
- Novello, H. L. (2014) Foundations of Catholic social teaching. *Compass* (10369686), 48(2), 22-27.

- Olsen, J. D. (1971). *Attitudes toward collective negotiations in Catholic secondary schools of large dioceses in the United States* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). St. John's University, New York.
- Palestini, R. H. (1980). *Administrators' and teachers perceptions toward the effect of collective bargaining on the religious goals of the Catholic secondary schools in the archdiocese of Philadelphia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Pennsylvania.
- Parker, M. & Park, S. (2015). The impact of Pacific Lutheran on collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities. *Journal of Collective Bargaining in the Academy*, 7(3). Retrieved from <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/jcba/vol7/iss1/3/>
- Parks, S.D. (2011). *Big questions worthy dreams: Mentoring emerging adults in their search for meaning, purpose, and faith*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. (2010). Pub. L. No. 111-148, 124 Stat.119 (codified as amended in scattered sections of 42 U.S.C.)
- Paul VI. (1965). *Gaudium et Spes*. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/i_i_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html
- Paul VI. (1967). *Populorum Progressio*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_26031967_populorum.html
- Paul VI. (1971). *Octogesima Adveniens*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/apost_letters/documents/hf_p-vi_apl_19710514_octogesima-adveniens.html
- Perrotta, R. A. (1993). *Attitudes toward collective bargaining in Jesuit secondary schools in the United States* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fordham University, New York.
- Pius XI. (1931). *Nova Impendet*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_02101931_nova-impendet.html
- Pius XI. (1931). *Quadragesimo Anno*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-anno.html
- Powell, K. E. (2001). Focusing youth ministry through community. In *Starting right*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Russo, C. J. (1989). *Attitudes towards collective bargaining in Roman Catholic secondary schools in New York State* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). St. John's University, New York.
- Russo, C. J. (1990). NLRB v. Catholic Bishop of Chicago: Collective bargaining in Roman Catholic secondary schools ten years later. *West's Education Law Reporter*, 57, 1113-1121. Retrieved from author.

- Russo, J. (2014). Catholic Social Teaching and adjunct faculty organizing. *Social Policy*, 44(2), 18-21. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.avoserv.library.fordham.edu/eds/detail/detail?vid=9&sid=02743341-2d54-4aab-9a17-7ce3ff0c7bbf%40sessionmgr111&hid=119&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmU%3d#db=sih&AN=97435391>
- Ryan, J. A. (1919). *Bishops' program of social reconstruction: A general review of the problems and survey of remedies*. Washington, D.C: National Catholic Welfare Conference.
- Sanchez, C. (2013). The sad death of an adjunct professor sparks a labor debate. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/2013/09/22/224946206/adjunct-professor-dies-destitute-then-sparks-debate>
- Scatena, M. A. (1984). *The development of collective bargaining in the Catholic secondary schools of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Schmidt, P. (2013). Adjuncts appeal to higher power in debate over unions at religious colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Adjuncts-Test-Faith-of/143493/>
- Schneider, A. (1998). Goddard College allows faculty to unionize. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A14. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Goddard-College-Allows-Faculty/23026/>
- Schneider, N. (2015). Faculty and students are walking out today for Catholic identity. *America: The National Catholic Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.americamagazine.org/content/all-things/faculty-and-students-are-walking-out-today-catholic-identity>
- Seltzer, R. (2016). Moody's: Grad student unionization "credit negative." *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2016/09/02/moodys-grad-student-unionization-credit-negative>
- Sinyai, C. (2015). Which side are we on? *America: The National Catholic Review*, January 19-26, 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.americamagazine.org/issue/which-side-are-we>
- Smallwood, S. (2001). Sacred Heart U. professors lose bid to unionize. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A12. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Sacred-Heart-U-Professors/34269/>
- Smallwood, S. (2002). Twin setbacks hit faculty-union drives at private colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A12. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Twin-Setbacks-Hit/115992/>

- Studley, J. (2014). *Making it easier to pick and pay for college through ratings*. [Web log comment]. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/blog/2014/05/making-it-easier-to-pick-and-pay-for-college-through-ratings>
- Synod of Bishops. (1971). *Justice in the world*. Retrieved from <http://www.shc.edu/theolibrary/resources/synodjw.htm>
- University of Great Falls v. National Labor Relations Board. Case 278-F.3d-1335. No. 00-1415 (2002).
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1972). *To teach as Jesus did: A pastoral message on Catholic education*. Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc.
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1986). *Economic justice for all: Pastoral letter on Catholic social teaching and the U.S. economy*. Retrieved from http://www.usccb.org/upload/economic_justice_for_all.pdf
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (1997). *Renewing the vision: A framework for Catholic youth ministry*. Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc.
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2005). *Seven themes of Catholic social teaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/seven-themes-of-catholic-social-teaching.cfm>
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2016a). *Catholic colleges and universities in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/how-we-teach/catholic-education/higher-education/catholic-colleges-and-universities-in-the-united-states.cfm>
- U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. (2016b). *Seven themes of Catholic social teaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/what-we-believe/catholic-social-teaching/seven-themes-of-catholic-social-teaching.cfm>
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *College ratings and paying for performance*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/college-affordability/college-ratings-and-paying-Performance>
- Wieder, B. (2013). College enrollment expected to slip over next decade. *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/16/college-enrollment-expect_n_2488151.html
- Yamada, P. S. (1973). *Teachers' and principals' perceptions of the leadership role of the Catholic parochial elementary school principal in schools with and without a negotiated contract* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Fordham University, New York.

APPENDIX A
PARTICIPANT INVITATION LETTER

Michele L. Nelson
Fordham University
Phone: (845) 548-4338 & Email: msampson@fordham.edu
November 8, 2016

Dear Senior Leader:

I am writing to request the opportunity to interview you for my doctoral dissertation research study, "Senior-level Administrator Perceptions of Collective Bargaining at Catholic Colleges and Universities."

Many factors contributing to union growth in the 1970s including declining student enrollment, layoffs, increased competition for students, and government influence are present once again. Additionally, the December 2014 National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) decision ruling against Pacific Lutheran University has contributed to increased interest in collective bargaining at private and religiously affiliated institutions.

While a number of studies have investigated factors influencing faculty and administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at primary and secondary Catholic schools, little research has been conducted to understand how senior-level administrators perceive collective bargaining at Catholic colleges.

Your participation in an interview is voluntary and no individual names will be used in my dissertation. You could refuse to answer any question or discontinue participation at any time during the interview. The interview would be approximately 60 to 90 minutes long at a location convenient for you. I would like to schedule this interview sometime between November 2016 and January 2017 based on your availability. If relevant, I would also request that you provide an electronic copy of any collective bargaining agreements at your institution as well as an electronic copy of any public communication or statement your institution has made regarding collective bargaining.

The interview will be audio-taped to ensure the accuracy of findings. Agreeing to be recorded is required for study participation, though you can request that the recording could be stopped temporarily at any time during the interview. Only the researcher will have access to the recordings. I will store the interview files, transcripts, documents, and data analysis on my password protected personal computer labeled by aliases and erase the audio files on the recording devices. A list of aliases will be stored separately in a locked file cabinet at my home. No names or other information that could be used to identify you would be included in the transcript. You will be emailed a copy of the interview transcript for review and additional comment. Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law.

For more information about your rights as a participant in research, you can contact the Fordham University Institutional Review Board Manager, Michelle Kucera at 718-817-0876, or by email at irb@fordham.edu. If you have questions about the project, your participation, or you are willing to be interviewed, you can contact me by phone or email. I am happy to schedule a meeting with your administrative assistant at a time convenient for you.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Michele L. Nelson
PhD Candidate
Educational Leadership, Administration, and Policy
Graduate School of Education

APPENDIX B
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Questions

Senior-Level Administrator Perceptions of Collective Bargaining at Catholic Colleges and Universities

1. Describe your perception of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities.
2. What have you experienced at your current institution that has affected your perception of collective bargaining?
3. What other experiences have affected your perception of collective bargaining?
4. What dimensions, incidents, and/or people connected with your experiences stand out for you?
5. How have these experiences affected you? What changes do you associate with these experiences?
6. How does your perception of collective bargaining differ, if at all, for staff, contingent faculty, or tenured/tenure-track faculty? Why?
7. How does your understanding of Catholic Social Teaching affect your perception of collective bargaining?
8. How do your personal and professional perceptions of collective bargaining align or differ?
9. How does your perception of collective bargaining affect your campus leadership and decision making?
10. Have you shared all that is significant with regard to you perception of collective bargaining?
11. Do you have any questions for me?

APPENDIX C
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent

Protocol Title: Senior-Level Administrator Perceptions of Collective Bargaining at Catholic Colleges and Universities

Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study: While a number of studies have investigated factors influencing faculty and administrator perceptions of collective bargaining at primary and secondary Catholic schools, little research has been conducted to understand how senior-level administrators make sense of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities and about the factors that influence their decisions. The researcher hopes to add to the literature a better understanding of how senior-level administrators perceive collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities.

Who is conducting and funding the study: The researcher is Michele L. Nelson, a PhD candidate at Fordham University in the Graduate School of Education at Fordham University. Her faculty mentor is Gerald Cattaro, Professor of Education and Executive Director of the Center for Catholic School Leadership.

What you will be asked to do in the study: If you decide to volunteer, you will be asked to participate in one interview. You will be asked several questions. The interview will take 60-90 minutes. With your permission, I will record the interviews on two audio devices. Agreeing to be audio recorded is a requirement for this study. You will not be asked to state your name on the recording. You will be asked about your experience with and perception of collective bargaining. The interviews can take place in a location convenient for you including your campus, at a conference, or at another mutually agreed upon location. Within a month of the interview the researcher will provide you with a copy of the transcript for review and additional comments to ensure you have adequately expressed your opinions and experiences.

Access to Existing Records: The researcher also requests a copy of any collective bargaining agreements for your college or university (if applicable) and access to any public statements made by senior leadership or press releases about collective bargaining in higher education.

Risks and Benefits: Senior leaders have serious pressures from inside and outside of their institutions and must balance these pressures with Catholic social teachings about the rights of the worker and expectations of shared governance structures when faced with increasing collective bargaining organizing efforts. This study will offer insights about the lived experiences of these leaders to help prepare other senior leaders for these significant leadership challenges. Speaking candidly about these topics could be perceived as a risk for participants who must always be strive to support and promote the wellbeing of their institutions. If a senior-leader is conflicted, if a senior leader personally believes differently than the public stance of the institution, and if either of these positions become newly known to a Board or his/her employees as a result of this study, the leader and/or the institution's credibility could be tarnished. If the leader is conflicted or personally supportive of collective bargaining, but the institution/Board has challenged it, an institution's faculty/staff could be energized by this revelation.

Given the somewhat limited number of Catholic colleges and universities in the Northeast, it may be possible for a reader to identify an institution. The researcher will make every attempt possible to limit identifiable information that will direct a reader to a specific institution or campus leader. The researcher will actively protect the collected information. Transcripts will be stored with aliases. A list of these aliases will be stored separately. Electronic records will be protected with passwords on the

researcher's personal computer. Hard copies will be kept under lock and key in the researcher's home. Benefits to this research include adding an understanding of participants' perceptions of collective bargaining at Catholic colleges and universities to the literature. Very little has been written about this topic at the college/university level. No research has addressed if a difference exists in the perceptions of these senior administrators about collective bargaining by tenure-track faculty, staff, administrators, and/or adjuncts.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. A list of aliases will be stored separately from audio recordings and interview transcripts in a locked file cabinet at the researcher's home. The researcher will follow Fordham's Institutional Review Board guidelines which require the researcher to store consent forms for three years following the conclusion of the research in a separate locked filing cabinet also at the researcher's home. No one will be able to see your interview. When the study is completed and the data have been analyzed, the list of aliases will be deleted. Study findings will be presented only in summary form and your name will not be used in any report.

Given the somewhat limited number of Catholic colleges and universities in the Northeast, it may be possible for a reader to identify an institution. The researcher will make every attempt possible to limit identifiable information that will direct a reader to a specific institution or campus leader.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. If you choose not to participate in this study. You may refuse to answer any of the questions we ask you and you may stop or end the interview at any time.

Right to withdraw from the study: You may choose to stop participating in the study at any time.

Recording: Agreeing to be recorded is required for study participation. However, the participant can request that the recording can be stopped at any time during the interview either permanently or temporarily. Only the researcher and a transcriber will have access to the recordings. The researcher will store the interview files and typewritten transcripts on her password protected personal computer labeled by aliases and then erase any audio files. They will be stored, and when they will be destroyed. They will not be used for any purpose other than the research study. No names or other information that could be used to identify the participant will be included in the typewritten version. Anything that could possibly indicate the identity of the participant will not be included in the typewritten version or will be disguised.

Who to contact if you have questions about the study:

Michele L. Nelson, PhD Candidate
Phone: 845-548-4338 Email: msampson@fordham.edu

Who to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:

Michele Kuchera, IRB Manager
Phone: 718-817-0876 E-mail: IRB@fordham.edu

YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS FORM WHETHER OR NOT YOU AGREE TO PARTICIPATE.

If you agree to participate in this study please sign below. Thank you.

Agreement:

I have read the procedure described above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the procedure and I **have received a copy of this description.** I understand that this interview will be audio-recorded.

Name (Printed) _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Principal Investigator: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX D
IRB APPROVAL



FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
THE JESUIT UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Fordham University IRB

Expedited Approval Notification

To: Michele Nelson

From: Michele Kuchera, IRB Office

Subject: Protocol #555

Date: 11/04/2016

The protocol **SENIOR-LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AT CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES** has been approved under the rules for expedited review, categories 6 & 7 on **11/04/2016**.

The approval of your study is valid through 11/03/2017, by which time you must submit an annual report either closing the protocol or requesting permission to continue the protocol for another year. Please submit your report by **10/06/2017** so that the IRB has time to review and approve your report if you wish to continue it for another year.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact irb@fordham.edu

Michele Kuchera,
IRB Office

Institutional Review Board
Fordham University
Collins Hall, B-31/B-34 Phone:
(718)-817-0876
(718)817-0055
Email: irb@fordham.edu

Attachments:

- Nelson Informed Consent.docx