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CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The general objective of this dissertation is to develop a sociological understanding of the financial crisis that has affected the nonpublic schools in the United States in recent decades. This objective will be accomplished by intensively studying how the organizational complex of a religious community in one district has responded to the problem of financing its schools. The study will examine the structural relations among several sectors of the organizational complex of the Catholic diocese of Columbus, Ohio.

This introduction will discuss significant prior research and will introduce the research problem. The chapter will:

(1) discuss the recent controversy concerning the relative merits of private and public schools,
(2) outline the history and development of the dual system of education in the United States,
(3) examine the financial problems that have faced nonpublic schools in recent decades,
(4) present the theoretical framework for the study, and,
(5) introduce the research question.
**Significant Prior Research**

One of the most controversial reports in the field of sociology of education in recent years was *Public and Private Schools* by Coleman, Hoffer and Kilgore (CHK)(1981). This report, commissioned by the National Center for Educational Statistics, was based on data produced by, "High School and Beyond" (HSB), a national longitudinal study of 58,728 high school students in 1,016 high schools. It presented new data on private and public schools.

The contested findings were:

1. greater effectiveness of Catholic than public schools, on average,
2. greater benefits of Catholic schools to students from less advantaged backgrounds,
3. higher levels of discipline and academic standards of the Catholic schools that account for their greater effectiveness, and,
4. that Catholic schools are less segregative than public schools.

Relying on these results CHK recommended the introduction of tuition tax credits which would benefit lower income groups by giving them increased access to better quality education. Such a measure would, according to the authors, be a step in the direction of expanding educational opportunity.

CHK's interpretation of the data and their policy recommendations were severely criticized. Morgan (1983) pointed out that, "probably
never has one educational study been so closely scrutinized by so many competent scholars in so short a period of time." The report was considered inadequate by most of these scholars, and Goldberger and Cain (1982) argued that the report fell below the minimum standards for scientific research.

There were several serious criticisms of the report. The results were based on a sample which included only 51 Catholic schools and an even smaller number of other private schools. The reliability of comparisons based on such a sample composition was questioned (Bryk 1981). The study did not account for the fact that private school enrollment entails a high degree of self-selection, while public schools have open enrollment (Noell 1982; Finn 1981). While there may be less evidence of segregation within the private sector, CHK did not account for the high level of between sector segregation which would result from this initial selection bias (Taeuber and James 1982). They did not control for tracking, a variable that is important when making comparisons between sectors (Alexander and Pallas 1983; McPartland and Dill 1982; Crain and Ferner 1982). The use of a synthetic-cohort comparison as a measure of academic growth was considered inadequate (Sassenrath et al.1984; Braddock 1981; Heyns 1981). Finally, the policy recommendation was criticized on the grounds that it would benefit only already economically privileged families. Additionally, even if tuition tax credits did benefit lower income groups, this would serve only to blur the distinction between private and public schools (Catterall and Levin 1982; Guthrie and Zussman 1981).
Whatever it's shortcomings, the report "...brought considerable visibility to the comparative study of public, Catholic and nonCatholic private schools" (Bryk 1981). It also provided "...significant information about the size and geographical distribution of different types of private schools, their curricula, and the demographic characteristics and skills of their students" (Murnane 1981). While the report and the subsequent debate did little to resolve issues with respect to the relative merits of private versus public schools, it did establish important differences between the two sectors. Additionally, the report indicated that schools do make a difference to student achievement levels.

Coleman (1982) argued that, although the findings withstood criticism, that did not mean that they were correct. Rather, it indicated that further efforts to investigate them should take two tracks. These efforts should:

(1) further test the results not with reanalysis of existing data but with different data, and,

(2) take the results as provisionally correct and answer the question of why they are as they are.

The CHK report, and the literature it generated emphasized the difficulties inherent in doing research that has policy implications. This literature made less reference to the tuition tax credit policy as a contentious political issue than to the methodological shortcomings of CHK's study. It is important to note that the policy recommendation was questionable not only on the
basis of the data analysed by CHK, but because of the nature and the purpose of the nonpublic school system. The significance of CHK’s report, and of the controversy generated by this report, becomes clearer when it is considered in the context of development and maintenance of the nonpublic school sector of the educational system. This issue is addressed by Coleman and Hoffer in their most recent report Public and Private High Schools (1987) which is based on the first follow-up wave of the HSB survey collected in 1982.

This follow-up survey allowed comparisons between private and public students' growth in achievement over the last two years of high school. A second set of questions addressed in the follow-up survey concerned the issue of what happens to students once they finish high school. As Coleman (1987) indicated, the question of how students fare once they leave school is the critical test of the claim that private schools are more effective than public schools. The examination of these outcomes of education was a sequel to the earlier analysis. As with the results of the earlier analysis, these "are relevant to educational policy and to youth policy more generally." These analyses of the follow-up data largely confirmed the earlier findings. However, Coleman stressed that "...an extension of the earlier analysis to study additional outcomes is not the only aim of this book, nor even the principal one. For underlying the controversy surrounding private schools is a much deeper issue involving both the goals of education and who will determine these goals." The controversy surrounding the nonpublic
schools, then, has many dimensions. A first step in exploring these dimensions is to consider, very briefly, the origins of this controversy.

Public and Nonpublic Schools: History and Development

The co-existence of public and private school systems in the United States has always been controversial. Three problems in American education that have persisted since Colonial times were identified by Cremin (1954) as the problem of: (1) the proper role of education in relation to the state, (2) the proper role of religion in education and, (3) equality of educational opportunity. He argued that of the three, the problem of the proper role of religion in education was the oldest and most difficult to solve. Historically, separation of Church and State was enshrined both in the United States Constitution and in all major institutions. The educational institution proved to be one of the central problems in Church-State separation. When Church and State finally did separate, the State retained its legal rights to authorize private and religious education under a grant of power from the State by charter and legislative enactment. This, in Cremin's view, is of paramount importance in the history of education.

Initially the public school system was hailed as both an instrument and a potential reflection of American democracy. Early opposition to the public schools took the forms of: (1) fear of a State monopoly of education insofar as this implied the potential for totalitarianism, and, (2) fear that religious neutrality would
mean "godless" schools. This latter fear was voiced primarily by Catholics who believed that religious neutrality meant indifference, especially to Catholic teachings. These fears were expressed also by Protestant groups, but many Protestant groups believed that a denominational system would be the worst of the two evils. In the Catholic demand for a public school system of their own, Protestant groups saw the danger of a situation in which Catholic loyalties would be to Rome rather than to the United States.

Catholics proceeded to build their own parochial school system without public support. As Dolan (1982) pointed out, this struggle for Catholic education in America was critical. So central was this issue to the life of the Church that John Hughes (Archbishop of New York in the 1860's) stated that "in our age the question of education is the question of the Church." In these early years were sown the seeds of controversies that have not yet been resolved.

Since the 1960's, the escalating costs of education have affected public and nonpublic school education alike (Tyack and Hansot 1984; Nelson 1983; Bakalis 1983). Financial problems (which have been particularly acute in the nonpublic school sector) are the primary reason why the Catholic church has lost more staff and students than any other group (Erickson et. al. 1978; Kraushaar 1972). Two sets of factors help explain why financial problems in the Catholic school system have been so acute. External factors such as inflation, decreasing enrollments, high operating costs, decreased public confidence and diminishing numbers of citizens with children in school have adversely affected all schools (Brodinsky 1982; Boyer
Internal factors, such as the decrease in the number of religious faculty in the schools, increases in teacher salaries, and tuition increases have led to curtailed enrollment in Catholic schools.

The Church has responded to these financial problems in a number of ways. Over the past thirty years many Catholic schools throughout the United States have been closed, some completely, some by way of consolidation with neighboring schools. Many schools are currently threatened with closure. The attempt to secure more government funds represents another response, and the Church has met with limited success in this endeavor. Kraushaar (1972) pointed out that, "The issue of state aid has never been in the United States a question of whether the state shall or shall not aid nonpublic schools; it is in most states a question of how and how much." In the past three or four decades, there have been significant changes in the relationship between Church and State, with the State funding an increasing number of programs for the benefit of children who attend nonpublic schools (Selakovich 1984). However, the problem of the proper role of religion in education has not yet been resolved.

There are at least four positions taken with regard to the issue of state funds for nonpublic schooling:

(1) The position taken by many Catholic and other nonpublic school educators is that public funds should be granted nonpublic schools in recognition of their role in serving public welfare. Nonpublic schooling provides freedom of choice, promotes cultural diversity and is a bulwark against
totalitarianism. They argue that in recognition of these valuable functions, it is unfair that parents who choose nonpublic schools are doubly taxed. They also point out that increasing closures of schools in the nonpublic sector will threaten an already overburdened public school system (Abramowitz et al. 1978), though this argument was strenuously rejected by research such as that of Larson's "When Parochial Schools Close" (1972).

(2) The courts have generally upheld the principle that direct aid is contrary to good policy and the separation of Church and State. They have in some cases found it justifiable that public funds be used for indirect aid to parochial schools, as long as these funds benefit the individual children concerned, without thereby benefiting the institution.

(3) Many public school educators, the American Civil liberties union, and some teacher unions argue that both direct and indirect aid is unconstitutional. These critics believe the ultimate goal of Catholic leaders is full support of their own Catholic schools and they fear that vast expansion of private schools will create divisiveness and disunity. They stress the value of public schools in promoting ecumenism and unity.

(4) Finally there is the controversy within the Catholic church to which Greeley (1976), and Brown and Greeley (1970) alluded. This controversy follows two courses. In the first instance there are Catholics that would object to trading
control of the schools for public funds. In the second instance there is controversy among Catholics concerning the value of maintaining a separate school system.

Regardless of the controversy between supporters and nonsupporters of public aid to nonpublic schools, and the controversies within the Catholic church about the value of (1) receiving government aid and, (2) maintaining a separate school system, the fact is that the State has found an increasing number of grants to nonpublic schools to be constitutional. In his unpublished dissertation on the administration of public funding programs in private schools, Sorohan (1972) noted that aid to religiously affiliated schools was rejected until 1947 when the Child Benefit theory was born. According to this theory, the government can provide public funds to the children attending private schools, as long as the religious institution itself does not benefit directly from the funding program.

To date, the United States Supreme Court has upheld free textbooks for religious schools (Cochran vs. Louisiana State Board of Education, 231 US 370 (1930), bus transportation (Ewerson vs. Board of Education, 330 US 664 (1947), property tax exemption (Walt vs. Tax Commission, 397 US 664 (1970), lending textbooks and other materials from public to private schools (Meek v Pittenger, 421 US 349 (1975), and supplying state textbooks and tests at no cost to sectarian schools (Wolman v Walter, 45 US LW4861 (June 24th 1977).
In 1973 the Supreme Court struck down a voucher type plan in the State of New York (Committee for Public Education and Religious Liberty vs. Nyquist, 413 US 756 (1973).

During the 1960's there was an increase in the number of public financial aid programs to church related educational institutions; an increase in the type of public aid programs to church related schools; and a substantial increase in the amount of public funds made available to these schools. This indirect aid represents a departure from traditional Court interpretation of Church-State separation. However, for the Church, this change has had a high price. Sorohan's study indicated that the Catholic church had exchanged considerable administrative autonomy in return for increased public funding. Still, the National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) continues to press for more public funding because "...although the courts have moved somewhat in the direction of providing the same benefits for private and public school students...it is clear that public school students continue to have many benefits provided by tax money which are not enjoyed by private sectarian school students." (Selakovich, 1984)

The Packwood-Moynihan Proposal (Senate Bill 330) was first introduced in Congress in 1978. An NCEA publication described this bill as,

"...one of the many current legislative attempts to ease a growing crisis in American education, and to protect parents' constitutionally protected choice to direct the education of their children by enrolling them in a non-public school. The
Packwood-Moynihan proposal (is for) federal tuition tax credits for parents who pay tuition in order to send their children to a non-public school. Most nonpublic schools are church affiliated, and, as such, tuition tax benefit legislation raises questions concerning the validity of such programs under the constitutional command that government shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion. National legislation, unlike state level legislation permits the inclusion of a broad class of beneficiaries, and is less likely to be "symbolically identified" with establishment of one or a small number of religions" (NCEA, 1982).

The strength of this proposal is that, in contrast to legislation of the type that was struck down in the Nyquist decision (1973), it is directed at federal rather than at state level funding programs. This proposal is still the subject of intense debate and controversy. It can be assumed that, as Selakovich (1984), pointed out, "Given the size of the nonpublic school sector, plus the fact that it is well organized, plus the financial difficulties facing many nonpublic schools, it is unlikely that the debate over some form of national public assistance will end soon."

The proportion of school costs currently met by Government is not large. Most of the costs of Catholic schools are currently generated from private funds. Tuition tax credits would benefit parents of children in Catholic schools, and additionally, would provide incentive for corporate donations. The increasing pressure
for public funding indicates a need to examine why Catholic schools now require funding when they have operated without it until recently.

**Nonpublic School Financing**

Research in the field of private education is "very slender indeed" (Doyle 1981). For many years systematic study of the nonpublic school system was not possible due to the difficulty of obtaining data. Record-keeping, even in the large Catholic school system, is a practice that developed only as recently as the 1970's. Cooper et. al. (1983) pointed out that,

"Despite increased interest, little basic reliable information exists on the size and growth trends in private elementary and secondary schools. This lack of data is confounded by the nature of some schools. The universe of private schools is still open to debate."

Kraushaar's (1972) study of nonpublic schools was a landmark in the area of gathering data on the extent and nature of the nonpublic sector. He was reasonably successful in locating data on Catholic schools, but encountered more difficulties locating data on many of the other-private school groups. His study provided an informative description of nonpublic schools, their history, goals, significance, problems and prospects. The major problem at that time was that nonpublic schools were in the midst of a financial crisis. This crisis was particularly severe in Roman Catholic schools. Catholic school enrollment had declined more sharply, and
teaching costs had increased at a greater rate than was the case in many of the other-private (non-Catholic) schools. Prospects for the survival of all nonpublic schools were bleak. Although schools had begun to adopt a number of efficiency measures, he found that all private school leaders were speculating openly about the capacity of many schools to survive. This was so "...not only (for) the new experimental schools, but (for) long established ones." His evidence showed that, "...the cost of nonpublic education now exceeds the combined resources of individual and organized private support." On the basis of these findings he predicted that, "Unless Federal and State aid are forthcoming in significant amounts, the private sector will be seriously weakened, either by accelerated school closings or by progressive deterioration in the quality of education the surviving schools are capable of offering."

Kraushaar found that of all the nonpublic school educators, Catholics formed the strongest lobby for the increase of government aid to schools, because the Catholic system was undergoing the most severe financial retrenchment. He indicated that sufficient state aid would not be forthcoming, given the strength of the separationist lobby. He predicted that nonpublic school enrollment would continue to decline, and that Catholic enrollments would continue to decline at a greater rate than other-private schools.

Contrary to Kraushaar's predictions, Erickson et. al. (1978) reported that decline in Catholic school enrollment had levelled off even without a dramatic increase in state aid. They pointed out
that, "Just as one cannot pinpoint with certainty the most important factor behind the Catholic school crisis, so no one knows why relative stability has been restored, though numerous elements have contributed to the improvement." They suggested that the likely causes of the earlier decline were: (1) the declining birth rate, (2) the migration from the central city to the suburbs, (3) changing parental preferences, (4) rising costs, and (5) administrative decisions of nonpublic school officials to close certain schools, not to build new ones, to control class size, and to increase tuition. They attributed the cessation of the decline to growing disaffection with public schools combined with the efforts of Catholic school leaders to mitigate the problem of school financing.

The entire nonpublic school sector has witnessed an upsurge in enrollment in recent years, though the patterns have altered. There are now many more other-private than there are Catholic schools, though enrollment still favors Catholic schools. This upsurge in enrollment has been dramatic. Despite increased enrollment in the other-private schools and stabilization in Catholic school enrollment, financial problems in the nonpublic sector have not disappeared. As Bryk et. al. (1984) in their study of Effective Catholic High Schools pointed out,

"Although the positive academic achievements of Catholic schools and their stabilized enrollment have received considerable public recognition, much less attention is focused on finance. Along with governance issues...finance constitutes one of the most
pressing problems facing Catholic schools. If the schools are to survive in their present form and maintain their capacity they must appropriately address these issues."

Greeley, one of the most prominent researchers to have addressed these issues, provided an important analysis of the financial crisis in the Catholic school system. His conclusions have influenced the design of the present study.

The Education of Catholic Americans

Sociological studies of the Catholic school system have been sparse, although scholars have shown increasing interest in this topic recent years. The study of The Education of Catholic Americans by Greeley and Rossi in 1966 was the first study of American Catholic education. In his preface to this study Bradburn remarked with surprise that systematic studies of the large and controversial Catholic school system had never before been undertaken. While outlining the nature of the problem in which they were interested, Greeley et. al. noted that,

"Of all modernized countries, the United States is the only one which maintains an extensive denominational school system financed by nongovernmental sources. To be sure, there are denominational school systems in other countries, but none is financed almost entirely through tuition and private contributions as is the large and complex system of schools administered by the Roman Catholic church."

This study focused on the question of "...discerning in what
significant ways adults who have gone through the schools maintained
by the Roman Catholic church differ from others." The findings
indicated that there was, overall, a small yet significant
correlation between Catholic school education and adult religious
behaviour. Additionally, they found that the schools were
"...neither as bad as the critics suggest, nor as good as they might
be."

Greeley et. al. replicated this study in 1974, and this time they
were concerned not only with "school effectiveness", but also with
the impact of social change on the school system. The years between
the two studies had seen tremendous upheaval in the Catholic Church
resulting from Vatican II. The Catholic population had gone through
dramatic changes during that decade. One of these changes was the
increased upward mobility of Catholics. Another was the financial
crisis in the schools, a crisis which was precipitating "...growing
controversy within the church about the value of maintaining a
separate school system." They reported that the principle reasons
for non-attendance of Catholics at Catholic schools were: (1)
unavailability of schools and, (2) increasing expense. This study
indicated that, "...paradoxically, the Catholic schools in 1974 are
in a state of declining use and sustained high regard."

Overall, Greeley's studies indicated that Catholic school
Catholics were "better" than their public school counterparts in
their involvement in Church activities and their understanding of
Catholic theology. These studies did not prove conclusively that
schools were responsible for these differences. They indicated that
social class, ethnicity, and family religiosity were also highly correlated with adult religious behavior. Even if the correlations were spurious, the studies indicated that schools played an important part in transmitting strong Catholic values, if only to the extent of preaching to the converted.

On the question of the importance of the schools to the church, Greeley (1970) noted that, "Since the beginning of their existence in this country, the Catholic schools have been a subject of controversy both inside and outside the Church." Greeley et. al. (1976) found that among the lay population there was, "...a fundamental loyalty to the church, vigorous endorsement of the parochial school system, and more financial resources available than the church has yet been willing to use." These resources were primarily in the form of promises from the lay population that they would, if canvassed, be willing to contribute money enough to help maintain and expand the parochial school system. The problem of financing schools was, in Greeley's estimation, a problem of leadership rather than a problem of support. He indicated that Church leaders were not responsive to the needs and wishes of the lay community, and suggested that the solution to the financial problems affecting schools should be sought not in pursuit of additional government funds, but, rather in the generation of more funds within the Catholic community. Almost a decade later Bryk et. al. (1984) indicated that financial pressures in Catholic
elementary and secondary schools were still enormous. They suggested that finance and governance remained the major problems in Catholic education.

Importance of the Topic

The increasing costs of education have seriously affected Catholic educators, but are of concern to a much wider public. Cooper et. al. (1983) pointed out that,

"Private education in the United States has become a topic of great interest and controversy. While for a century and a half children attended private and parochial schools without much notice, today policymakers, families and wider publics are vitally concerned about the existence of private education and its programs, regulations, and sources of financial support."

At the present time, approximately nine percent of high school students are being educated in the nonpublic sector. Two-thirds of these children attend Catholic schools. Eleven percent of students enrolled in Catholic high schools are nonCatholic. Although the nonpublic school system enrolls only a small percentage of American school students, such research as Coleman's initial and follow-up studies indicated the important role nonpublic schools play in the educational system. Given the importance of the nonpublic school system in the United States, and the importance of the Catholic school system in the nonpublic sector, examination of how the organizational complex of the Catholic church is responding to the difficulties of financing their schools is important. The church's
response to these financial difficulties will have a profound effect not only on the shape of Catholic education in the future, but of the educational system as a whole.

Theoretical Framework

The manner in which schools are financed is a result of conflicting political pressures. The financial crisis in the Catholic schools is believed to be as much a result of conflicts within the organization as it is a result of external pressures (Davis 1983). As Donovan et. al. (1971) pointed out, "The dilemmas of the Catholic schools do not derive simply from a shortage of dollars and cents." This topic falls under the rubric of the sociology of a financial crisis.

Financial crises are usually viewed as problems that should be dealt with by economists, but recently sociologists have argued, for example, that inflation is "...not just a technical economic problem, to be resolved by technical expertise, but is rather itself a solution of sorts to more fundamental problems of a sociopolitical character..." (Hirsch & Goldthorpe 1978). Goldthorpe (1978) pointed out that,

"The ambition of any sociological enquiry...must be to investigate how inflation, understood as the monetary expression of distributional conflict is ultimately grounded not in error, ignorance, or unreason on the part of the actors involved, but rather in the ongoing changes in the social structure and processes....The supposition that must be basic to sociological
inquiry....is that the economic problem is to an important degree
epiphenomenal. The claim necessarily made is that in order to
understand the relationship between economic quantities in terms
of which the problem is defined, one must understand the
underlying generative relationships between social groupings, and
that these will themselves present further "problems" of a kind
which are not open to merely technical resolution in the light of
economic science."

Hirsch (1978), likewise indicated that while economic factors and
they alone can explain how inflation happens, economic factors alone
cannot explain why.

The financial crisis in the Catholic school system, like
inflation, cannot be resolved by technical economic expertise alone.
The concept of financial crisis in this context raises the question,
"A Crisis For Whom?" The Catholic church is not a "poor"
organization, and in fact, in recent years it has amassed
considerable wealth. The Church is now one of the primary owners of
real estate in the United States (Dolan 1975). Furthermore, the lay
population which traditionally was predominantly working-class has
become increasingly middle-class (Greeley 1976). It is somewhat
paradoxical that as the organization is becoming more wealthy, the
problem of financing the schools is becoming greater.

One would normally assume that the hierarchy would be putting
enormous pressure on the laity to support and continue parochial
education, because growth in this area would give the clergy more
power, status, and wealth. In this scenario the laity should feel
strongly pressured. But Greeley said the reverse is true. He said the laity is willing to pay more money for the upkeep of the schools than the Church is prepared to solicit. These contradictions require further investigation.

The Research Question

This study focused on the problems of leadership which Greeley maintained were preventing the development of adequate solutions to the financial crisis in the school system. The study did not examine Greeley's contention that there was untapped support for the schools among the laity. The research attempted to determine whether, and to what extent, there was division concerning the financial crisis in the school system within the organizational complex of the Catholic community in the Columbus diocese.

Perceptions of the financial crisis were examined in terms of the following issues: (1) importance of the schools to the church's mission, (2) typicality of the Columbus diocese, (3) origins of the current financial problems, (4) definition of the financial situation, (5) responsibility for financial problems, (6) support for Greeley's analysis, (7) local issues of governance and, (8) solutions to the financial problems.

As a sociologist, one assumes that position in the organizational complex influences perception. Four sectors were identified as those which included the important actors in the organizational complex of the church as this relates to the school system. These sectors were:
(1) Clergy and Hierarchy: This sector included Bishop, Vicars, and Pastors.

(2) Diocesan Officers: This sector included employees of the (1) Education Vicariate Office, (2) Religious Education Office, (3) Office of Government Programs and (4) Finance Office. These employees work with or serve the schools directly. Also included here were employees of the (5) Catholic Conference of Ohio, (6) Pastoral Planning, (7) Development Office, (8) Newspaper, and (9) Catholic Records. These employees work with or serve the schools indirectly. Officers of the Teachers' Association and the Principals' Association were also included in this sector, because, although not employed by the diocese to fill these positions, they are, as a result of these positions, involved in a number of diocesan committees.

(3) School Principals: This sector included both elementary and high school principals.

(4) Lay Influentials: This sector included a wide variety of volunteers who are well known and highly esteemed by both clergy and lay members of the community. Included here were school board presidents, members, professionals who are influential in the business community as well as in the church, and some former office holders. All had a history of service to the church over a number of years.

The organizational complex of the Catholic church is not a typical formal organization, because it is composed of both closed and open
systems which are inter-related. The authority of the Bishop in the
diocese is absolute, and so also is the authority of the pastor in
the parish, though pastors are of course accountable to the Bishop.
Diocesan offices usually have power over their particular area of
concern, but are answerable to the hierarchy. Lay boards,
commissions, and special committees typically have only advisory
power, and the strength of this power generally depends on the
discretion of the official church leaders. Consequently the
organizational complex of the Catholic community as I have defined
it in four sectors displays decreasing power from the first
position, which is that of clergy and hierarchy, to the fourth
position which is that of lay influentials. It was expected that
the sectors would respond to the issues in the following manner:

Clergy and Hierarchy: According to Greeley, this sector was
expected to downplay the importance of the schools to the church's
mission. The origins of the crisis for this group would be
circumstances beyond human control. Examples would be the decline
in the birth rate, the rising standards/costs of education and,
perhaps the government's unwillingness to sanction more funds for
nonpublic schools. Responsibility for the crisis would be assigned
to Catholic parents who do not send their children to the Catholic
schools, parishioners who don't contribute enough to the parish
funds, and the government.

Disagreement with Greeley's hypothesis would be expected. This
sector would not support a significant increase in lay power,
because the more lay power increases, the more their power
decreases. In this sector, support for government funds, continued school closures in areas where the schools are burdensome, and increasing contributions from the general Catholic population would be expected, while support for the expansion of the school system would not be great.

Diocesan Officers: This sector would be expected to see schools as essential to the church's mission. They would concur with clergy and hierarchy on the origins of the crisis, and blame circumstances. While they do not have direct responsibility for financing, but at the same time are in a position to know how the problem strikes at both the diocesan level and the level of the individual school, they would see financial responsibility as being shared both by clergy and local contributors.

They would be expected to agree with Greeley only partially because of their official role in diocesan leadership. They would support an increase in lay power both in schools and in the Church, since this would also extend power in diocesan offices. Support for tuition tax credits, increased drives to raise more funds, expansion of the school system, and opposition to school closures would be expected.

School Principals: This sector would be expected to see schools as essential to the Church's mission. They would be expected to blame both clergy and hierarchy and parishioners for lack of support. They would be expected to see responsibility for the crisis shared between clergy and hierarchy and parishioners whose contributions are insufficient.
They would agree with Greeley because they would perceive themselves as being in frustrated leadership roles. They are overworked and often do not see their efforts being rewarded by full support from church leadership. They would agree that more power should be extended to the laity since this would encourage more lay support of schools. They would be expected to support strategies for generating more funds within the community for expansion of the school system. They would be divided in their support of government funds because of the potential administrative encroachment. They would be opposed to school closures.

Lay Influentials: This sector would be expected to view schools as vitally important to the church’s mission. They would be expected to locate the origins of the crisis in the general lack of support for schools by clergy and non-supportive Catholics. They would assign responsibility for the crisis to these same groups.

They would agree with Greeley because while they volunteer a lot of time to the cause, they have only advisory power, if any. They would support an increase of lay power in the organization. They would support solutions designed to expand the system, such as canvassing of the wealthy, more school building, more help from the diocese for schools in difficulty, and they would oppose school closures.

It was expected that all sectors would find the Columbus diocese typical, and would agree the school system is facing serious
financial difficulties. Differences on this issue would be expected on the basis of financial circumstances of the school or parish, rather than position.

The Hypotheses

These are not hypotheses in the usual sense of the term; they are crude predictions of the major expected findings based on the work of Greeley and others. Strong consensus concerning financial problems was expected between clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers; weaker consensus was expected between clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers combined, and school principals and lay influence combined. The latter two groups were expected to be more distinct than the former two, because school principals are an occupationally homogenous group while lay influentials hail from a variety of positions (both occupational and in the Catholic community). Conflict between clergy and laity also was expected (where clergy were defined as all the non-land members of the sample). It was expected that cleavages in the organizational complex would be:

1. slight within the clergy and hierarchy as a sector,
2. larger but nonetheless slight between clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers with more consensus between these two than any other sectors,
3. larger between clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers combined, and school principals and lay influentials combined,
larger between school principals and lay influentials than between clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers and, large between clergy and laity.

Key Assumptions

(1) The Columbus community, though not representative in the demographic or statistical sense, is illustrative of national trends.

(2) There are clear discrepancies in peoples' perceptions of financial problems, and these discrepancies are related to position in the organizational complex.

Limitations

(1) The study was limited to a single community.

(2) The personal interviews were conducted primarily in the City of Columbus, rather than the Columbus diocese, because the diocese, though a more "natural" division from the point of view of Catholic organizational structure, was too large a geographical area for me to cover. Since most of the diocesan offices are located in the city this means that most of the official leaders were accessible.

(3) The study focused on a select sample of lay Catholics. Only lay people that are highly committed to Catholic education were included.

(4) Although interest in this topic is increasing, existing empirical research is scarce. Much of the current empirical
research is based on national survey data. This research, however, was focused on the local community level and no direct model for the study was available.

**Contribution of this Study**

To date most sociological studies of private and public schools have been concerned with measuring their relative merits. Many of these have been evaluative studies designed to remedy one or other problem in education. Few studies have focused exclusively on financial problems.

The emphasis of this study was different. The study examined cleavage and convergence in the organizational complex of the Catholic community in relation to the financial crisis in the school system. The focus of the study was the local community. Analysis of the politics of the organizational complex at this level should add an important dimension to explanations of the financial crisis that have been provided by large scale survey data.
CHAPTER 2 THE ORGANIZATIONAL COMPLEX OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Introduction

This study examined convergence and cleavage among several sectors of the organizational complex of the Catholic church in relation to financial problems that have faced the Catholic school system in recent years. In order that this division of the sample into sectors can be readily appreciated, it is necessary to describe this organizational complex. This chapter focuses on how the school system fits into the organizational structure of the Church. The chapter will describe:

(1) the organizational complex of the Catholic church in the United States,

(2) the administrative structure of the school system and related offices.

The Catholic Church in the United States

The Catholic church in the United States is not an inconsequential organization. Catholics now make up 22.5% of the total population. They are distributed throughout 19,118 parishes. Areas of the country that have the heaviest concentrations of Catholics are: New England States, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, Northern Illinois, Southern
Florida, Louisiana and Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and the West Coast of Washington, Oregon and California.

The governance structure of the Catholic church is hierarchical, with boundaries that stretch beyond the United States.

"The Hierarchy, as the supreme governing body of the Catholic Church, consists of the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter, and the Bishops joined together with him in one apostolic college to provide for the common good of the Church. The Cardinals, now always Bishops, serve as the chief counsellors of the Roman Pontiff. The Pope is further assisted by the Departments of the Roman Curia. The Bishops, of whom some bear the titles Patriarch and Archbishop, are united with the Roman Pontiff in the governance of the whole Church; the Bishops, when assigned to particular Sees, are individually responsible for the teaching, sanctification and governance of their particular Church. Apostolic Vicars and Prefects together with certain Abbots and other prelates are also joined in this work." (Official Catholic Directory, 1984).

The organizational structure of the Catholic Church in the United States consists of 177 distinct, separate, and diverse diocesan systems. These dioceses, though separate and diverse, are to some extent unified by two organizations of Catholic Bishops. The first of these is the National Conference of Catholic Bishops. This is an organization which brings Bishops together so that they can share ideas and resources relating to the management of the Church. This
organization is a sponsoring organization for the United States Catholic Conference which is,

"A civil entity of the American Catholic Bishops Incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia, assisting the Bishops in their service to the Church in this country by uniting the people of God where voluntary collective action on a broad interdiocesan level is needed. The USCC provides an organizational structure and the resources needed to insure coordination, cooperation and assistance in the public educational, and social concerns of the Church at the National or interdiocesan level." (Official Catholic Directory, 1984).

From Rome to the National Organizations of Bishops to the dioceses it is evident that the Catholic church is a large and sprawling bureaucracy, with several layers of government and administration. At the same time, even though dioceses are, in many respects, subject to the authority and influence of several levels of hierarchy, this does not mean that the dioceses are all alike. On the contrary, Donovan (1971) described the diocesan structure as one in which there are subtle and sometimes dramatic variations between these basic units, even between dioceses in the same state, in organizational, policy, and administrative structure.

The educational policy of the Catholic Church has traditionally espoused the desire for all Catholics to receive a Catholic education. This policy, which has been pursued (with varying degrees of success) world-wide, means that the Catholic church has a considerable investment in the educational systems of a number of
different countries. In the United States, for example, students in nonpublic schools represent approximately eleven percent of the total number of elementary and secondary students. Of this eleven percent, 63% are in Catholic schools, and the other 33% attend other religious denominational schools or private schools. The United States Catholic Church runs a total of 10,023 separate educational institutions. This total includes: 86 Diocesan seminaries; 233 Religious order seminaries; 239 colleges and universities; 880 diocesan and parish high schools; 576 private high schools; 7,696 parish elementary schools, and 313 private elementary schools. There are, in addition, 99 protective institutions. A total of 3,594,501 children are attending all Catholic schools (full time), with a total of 7,670,760 additional children receiving religious instruction. Obviously, those states with the highest concentration of Catholics have the highest concentration of students in Catholic schools (Official Catholic Directory, 1984).

The administrative structure of schools, like that of the dioceses is not coherent. In fact, "The term school system itself, when applied to the organization and structure of the Catholic schools, is misleading if it is construed in the usual sense. Unlike a public school district, where individual schools are controlled by a central administrative office, the individual Catholic schools in a diocese are merely an assemblage of more or less (usually less) coordinated schools" (Donovan, et. al. 1971). Given the variations among the dioceses in organization and
administration, the following discussion of diocesan organization and administration will rely on the model provided by the research on the Columbus diocese.

Diocesan Organizational Structure

**Diocesan Administration**
- Bishop
- Chancellors
- Episcopal Vicars
- College of Consultors
- Officers of the Court
- Diocesan Judges

**Consultative Bodies**
- Diocesan Pastoral Council
- Diocesan Priests' Senate
- Deacon Council
- Council of Religious
- Finance Council

**Boards, Commissions, Committees**
- Budget Review Committee
- Building Committee
- Campaign for Human Development
- Catholic Times Board of Directors
- Diocesan Commission for Justice and Peace
- Diocesan Elementary School Board
- Diocesan Secondary School Board
- Family Life Commission
- Columbus Diocesan Foundation
- Liturgical Commission
- Personal Board
- Diocesan Retirement

**Diocesan Offices**
- Education Vicariate
- Office of Religious Education
- Office of Government Programs
- Development Office
- Pastoral Planning
- Catholic Conference of Ohio
- Catholic Records
- Catholic Times
- + 54 offices unrelated to schools

Pastors

- Elementary Schools

High Schools

Figure 1
Individual dioceses are organized on a number of levels. For instance, in the Columbus diocese, there are four levels of organization. These levels, represented in Figure 1, are:

1. Diocesan Administration,
2. Consultative Bodies,
3. Boards, Commissions, and Committees and,
4. Diocesan Offices.

The Diocesan Administration includes the Bishop, the Chancellor and vice-Chancellor, the Episcopal Vicars (4), the College of Consultors (9), the Office of the Court (12, four of whom are lay), and the Diocesan Judges (10). There are five Consultative Bodies. These are composed of 80 people, with 21 of these being lay people and the rest clergy or nuns. There are 12 Boards, Commissions and Committees, made up of 77 members. Forty-seven of these are lay people and 30 priests/nuns. Finally there are 62 Diocesan Offices, and these offices include several lay employees, as well as priests, nuns and lay volunteers. The Catholic schools are interwoven into this diocesan structure, and the financing and governance of these schools presents yet another dimension of the sprawling bureaucracy of the church.

Governance and Financing of Catholic Schools

Bryk et al. (1984) pointed out that there are three facts that complicate any discussion of governance of Catholic schools. First, there are three different categories of Catholic Schools: diocesan,
parish and religious order (sometimes referred to as private). The governance differences among these categories of schools are most distinct in financial and legal matters. Diocesan schools are the responsibility of the diocese and ultimately the bishop. Parish schools are ultimately the responsibility of the pastor as "the Chief Executive Officer" of the parish. Private schools are usually the responsibility of the religious order that sponsors the school.

Second, there are overlapping and occasionally conflicting jurisdictions. Canon Law (or the universal rules that govern the organization of the institutional church) decrees that the bishop maintains authority over Catholic schools within his diocese. This authority usually appears most forcefully in the areas of Catholic teachings, but the bishop's influence can extend substantially beyond this domain. The status of the various religious orders adds another complication to the governance picture. Some of these, for example diocesan congregations, fall under the direct supervision of the Bishop, while religious orders such as the Jesuits, do not. In addition, in the past two decades diocesan pastoral councils, parish councils, and local school boards have begun to exercise an increasingly important role in the system. Finally, there are diocesan boards of education which, in recent years, have become more involved in policy-making.

Third, the manner in which governance systems are interpreted and implemented vary considerably across dioceses. Some bishops may choose to exert a great deal of control over the schools, while others may delegate this authority to other individuals, such as the
superintendent of schools, and to advisory groups such as the diocesan board of education. Despite the existence of these advisory groups,

"the most important person in the governance of the Catholic elementary school remains the pastor of the parish - and this has not changed since the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884. Deference to the position and the perspective of the pastor ranks as the single most prominent feature of elementary school governance" (Bryk, et. al. 1984).

Not only do schools have different governance structures, but often they differ with respect to the manner in which they are funded as well. The role of the school principal is dramatically different in schools with different types of governance structure. In Columbus, for example, school principals at elementary and high school levels have almost completely different fund raising responsibilities. High schools are independent units in matters of financing, while the parish is the fund raising unit for elementary schools. In practice, (as one school principal pointed out), this means that while the high school principal engages in fund raising for actual running costs, the elementary school principal engages in fund raising for extras.

An important question addressed by Bryk et.al. in their (1984) study was, "What is the nature of the financial life of this educational community that stands apart from the usual source of educational revenues - taxes? " Their answer was that at least part of the support for Catholic high schools comes as a result of
financial sacrifice by faculty and staff. Salaries of teachers and
administrators in Catholic high schools are substantially lower than
salaries in public schools. Furthermore, the schools generally have
been affected by a number of changes that have occurred in the
Church in recent years. Perhaps the most important has been the
loss of religious order subsidies. As involvement of the religious
in the schools has continued to decline, so schools, generally, have
become more tuition-dependent. This tuition dependence is such that
current estimates for the source of high school funding indicate
that: tuition and fees account for 60% of the funds, subsidies
account for 11%, contributed services for a further 10%, fundraising
for 9%, interest income 2%, and 8% of funds come from other sources
(Bryk et. al. 1984). Typically, parochial schools are not as
tuition dependent as high schools, since these schools are the
"burden of the parish." Nonetheless, tuition has become an
increasingly important source of financing for the parish schools
also (Interview data)

Related Offices

Over and above the different categories and types of schools
there are a number of offices, and boards that are an integral part
of the Catholic school system (See Figure 2). There are also a
number of offices that have an indirect influence on this system.
Positions in these offices and boards range from employee, and
clergy to lay volunteer.
School Administration

FIGURE 2
The most important of these offices is the Vicariate for Education. This encompasses the School Office or the Office of the School Superintendent. Top personnel in this office include the Vicar for Education, the Superintendent of Schools, the Assistant Superintendent, and staff. The position of Vicar is second to that of the Bishop in terms of Canon Law. The Vicar for education has to answer only to the Bishop on educational matters. In practice, duties of the Vicar depend on how the bishop defines them.

Next in authority is the School Superintendent, the Assistant Superintendent, and their staff. As Bryk et. al. (1984) pointed out,

"Since the 1960's the responsibilities of diocesan superintendents and diocesan central offices have changed considerably. After the school-bulding boom of the 1960's, the dioceses faced huge capital debts, mounting operational deficits and became increasingly reluctant to build more schools. These financial pressures led dioceses to move in the direction of ceding financial responsibility to already exising schools. As some of these closed and the system contracted, the emphasis in diocesan offices of education shifted to providing support services that religious orders had previously supplied... The diocesan central offices, however, generally have small staffs and limited resources, which constrain their ability to provide the number and range of services requested."

In general, the functions of the school office are to provide various support services to pastors, principals and teachers. The
Office, as one respondent put it, serves as the Bishop's right arm. The Office of Religious Education works closely with the School Office, and manages the religious programs for the schools of the diocese.

Next in importance in terms of the direct effects on the schools would undoubtedly be the School Boards. In Columbus most schools have local school boards. Most local school boards have a representative to the diocesan board. These boards, at both local and diocesan levels, are charged with reviewing and setting school policy. They function in an advisory capacity, communicating directly with the Vicar for Education and the School Office, and communicating more indirectly with the Bishop.

The Finance Office deals not only with the schools but with the financial affairs of the entire diocese. It is an office of finance, budget, capital expenditure, self-insurance, auditing and review. In the Columbus diocese high school principals cited this office as the one with which they are in most frequent contact, whereas elementary school principals cited the School Office. This, presumably, is because they each rely on different sources of funding. The Finance Office is important, not only in relation to the day to day operation of the high schools, but also, of course in terms of setting policy relating to school consolidation, school closure, and school building.

School Principals, at both the elementary and the high school levels, have a wide range of duties. As Bryk et al. (1984) indicated,
"Although limited to a single institution, the responsibilities involved are equivalent in range and nature to those of the public school principal and superintendent combined. The Catholic school principal bears responsibility for financial management, development, fundraising, public and alumni relations, faculty selection and supervision, student recruitment and in many cases discipline and instructional leadership. The principal must also maintain amicable relationships with the diocese, the neighbouring parishes, the religious order and the local community..."

In Columbus most of the school principals belong to the Principals' organization (PACES). This organization was set up in the late 1960's for the purpose of bringing principals together to share ideas and resources. Representatives of the principals' organization sit on both school boards, on the arbitration committee, and on other short-term committees. They work closely with the Teachers' Association.

The Columbus Diocesan Education Association (CDEA) was set up in 1967 with the objective of getting better benefits for teachers. Not all dioceses have teacher associations, and in fact the association in Columbus is restricted to teachers in Franklin County. Both secondary and elementary school teachers can join this association. Like PACES, representatives from the CDEA sit on the diocesan school boards and on various committees. One of the most important functions fulfilled by the association is negotiation of teacher salaries for Franklin County teachers. The importance of
this function is that traditionally teachers salaries were negotiated with individual pastors. In many areas, including the Columbus diocese outside of Franklin County, this tradition survives.

The Catholic Conference of Ohio, is one of the state members of the United States Catholic Conference. One of their functions is to monitor legislation that relates to the church. The educational division of the Catholic Conference is responsible for monitoring legislation that relates to Federal and State programs that provide assistance for nonpublic school children.

Other boards, commissions, committees and offices affect the schools indirectly, for example, the Development Office, the Pastoral Planning office, the Office of Government Services, and the Foundation of the Catholic Diocese of Columbus. At the parish level, of course, parish councils and local school boards are an important element in the operation of individual schools.

This chapter described the organizational complex of the Catholic church, focusing on how the school system fits into this structure. The following chapter discusses the methodology of the study, explaining how the sample was developed to represent various segments of this organizational structure.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to outline and discuss the methods of research used in this study. The chapter will discuss:

(1) Columbus as a site for study
(2) data collection techniques employed
(3) the selection of respondents
(4) response rates, difficulties encountered, and
(5) the data analysis procedure.

The Columbus Diocese

The State of Ohio is divided into six dioceses with 18.6% Catholics in Cincinnati, 33% in Cleveland, 10% in Columbus, 10% in Steubenville, 23% in Toledo and 23% in Youngstown for a statewide percentage of 21.6% of the total population of the state being Catholic. This is close to the National average, but it is important to remember that there are heavier concentrations of Catholics in other states, and a majority of States which have a small percentage of Catholics. Of the 1.8 million students in school within the State of Ohio, approximately 11.7% of them attend nonpublic schools. Of the nonpublic schools in Ohio, 85% are Catholic (Catholic Conference of Ohio 1985).
The Columbus diocese, though geographically the largest in Ohio, is numerically one of the smallest. The choice of Columbus as a site for this study was based primarily on accessibility. The typicality of the Columbus diocese is not easy to assess. I have not compared this diocese to the other 177 dioceses in the country in terms of any specific characteristics. I did include in the personal interview schedule a question asking how typical respondents believed the diocese was, and from this a picture of the unique, as well as the typical features of Columbus emerged.

One of the unique features cited was the small percentage of Catholics as compared to other Ohio dioceses, but especially as compared to the large East and West coast urban dioceses. Additionally, the Columbus diocese is composed of both urban and rural parishes. The effect of this on the school system is that the thinly spread population cannot support schools in many rural districts. The Columbus diocese also has had a relatively stable and thriving economy compared to some areas with large numbers of Catholics. Respondents indicated that there have been fewer school closures in Columbus than in other dioceses in the United States.

It may seem that the diocese is not a very typical one, and in this respect the study will speak less of the financial crisis in Catholic education than of financial problems in the Columbus schools. However, a key assumption of this study is that the Columbus diocese, while not representative in a statistical or demographic sense, represents the same kinds of problems in Catholic education experienced throughout the nation. In discussing the
structure of the organizational complex of the Catholic church, Donovan (1971) indicated that the structures of the 177 dioceses in the United States vary tremendously in organization, policy and administration. This supports the above assumption. While there will be no attempt to overgeneralize the results of this study, it appears that studies of other dioceses might be expected to yield similar findings.

Collecting the Data

This study was designed as a community analysis of convergence and cleavage in the organizational complex of the Catholic church in relation to the issue of school financing. The Catholic population of the Columbus diocese is composed of the following constituents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLERGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Bishops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminarians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAY POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Catholics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School Students in CCD*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CCD — Religious instruction classes.
The data of this research included existing documents, responses to personal interviews, and responses to mailed-out questionnaires.

The data from existing documents included:

(1) Catholic publications which contained records of school enrollment, school financing, and other information relevant to Columbus,

(2) publications of court decisions relevant to school funding and,

(3) published and unpublished studies of school financing.

The data from the personal interviews were collected in two stages. Stage one was exploratory interviewing conducted during April and May of 1986 to build a roster of key informants, and to develop a set/s of pertinent interview questions. Nine informants were contacted during this time. Eight of them were cooperative, but one refused to grant an interview. A follow-up request yielded a second refusal. I asked one of the cooperating respondents to intervene, but he was unable to do this. These respondents included two school principals, an employee of the Catholic Conference of Ohio, an employee of the School Office, one parent of children in Catholic schools, one Catholic parent of children in public school who attend religious instruction classes, and two pastors. The interviews were completely open ended. In preparation for each interview I had a set of three or four themes. I sought general information concerning the school system, the organizational structure of the diocese, the financial problems in the schools, and
the best people and documentary sources of information for further development of the study. Interviews lasted at least an hour, and in some cases longer than this.

A number of insights emerged from this pilot study. The interviews generated: (1) the names of 26 "influential" pastors, diocesan and school administrators, and lay parishioners and, (2), information concerning the size and structure of the diocese, and the financial situations of different schools and parishes.

The 26 names were put on a roster, and the "reasons for the mention" were used as a basis for giving the names a priority rating. This rating took some time to develop, as several interviews had to be conducted before the status of many important actors in the community became apparent.

Knowledge of the size and structure of the diocese indicated that the city of Columbus would have to be the focus for interviewing, since the diocese was too large a geographic area to cover given time and transportation constraints. Pastors, school principals and lay influentials were drawn from the City rather than the diocese as a whole. Church leaders and diocesan officers, located in the City, represent the entire diocese. Additionally, the mail-out questionnaire was sent to all diocesan school board members.

The pilot interview also indicated the need for the study to represent some of the variation in financial situations among the parishes in the Columbus diocese. As a result, the method of sample construction was designed to include pastors and school principals from parishes that represented a variety of financial situations.
Included in the sample were parishes where schools were financially viable, where schools had low enrollment, where schools had long waiting lists, as well as parishes in which schools had consolidated, parishes in which schools may be forced to consolidate, parishes where schools are faced with imminent closure, and parishes in which the schools have already closed.

Eighteen parishes were represented in the sample either by the pastor and elementary school principal, or in cases where there were no schools, or where the pastor was an important actor, by the pastor only. Of these, five parishes were described by the respondents as Upper Middle Class, six were described as Middle Class, four as Blue Collar, and three as Poor. Two of the schools in Middle Class parishes, one of the schools in a Blue Collar parish, and one of the schools in a Poor parish were consolidated. One of the schools in a Blue Collar parish and one of the schools in a Poor parish are presently threatened with consolidation or closure. In one of the poor parishes the school has been closed for a number of years.

Two of the schools in the Middle Class parish have low enrollment, and while they are not in crisis, there is some cause for concern about their futures. One of the schools in a Middle Class parish has greater demand for places than it is able to meet. One of the Upper-Middle class parishes does not have a school, and has a huge enrollment in religious instruction classes.

Because of the need to include such a variety of parishes, in many of which the school principal and the pastor were interviewed,
teachers as a group could not readily be included in the study. Of course, several of the respondents were former teachers. The only other representation of teachers was a representative from the Teachers’ Association, and a half day visitation at an elementary school which included a brief discussion with a number of teachers. Otherwise, the sample concentrated on those sectors in the organizational complex that have authority and power over others, and lay influential.

Inclusion in the sample was based on a variety of considerations. Some respondents, like church leaders and diocesan officers, occupied important positions. Pastors and elementary school principals were usually included in the sample by virtue of the peculiar financial situation of the parish or school. A number of pastors and principals were included because they were recommended as important informants. All high school principals (urban) were included, because they were few in number, and represented different levels of financial stability. Lay influential were included in most cases on the basis of the reasons, and the number of times they were mentioned.

The interview roster developed as the study progressed. Many more names were mentioned than were included in the sample. Several of the names of the lay volunteers were based on their work in a single parish. Only those lay people who had been involved in the organization at the diocesan as well as the parish level were
included in the sample. When no new names (except for the local names) were being mentioned by respondents, it was decided to complete this step of the data collection.

Sixty-nine members of the Catholic community were interviewed from August 1986 to February 1987. Only one member of the chosen sample declined to be interviewed. This refusal was followed by a letter requesting reconsideration, but the letter was unanswered. One final phone contact was made toward the end of the data collection, and the high level of response in the diocese was indicated, but the refusal stood firm.

Initial contact was usually by phone, and in all but one case the interview was set up on the first contact. The response to this part of the survey was overwhelming. The majority of respondents were extremely cooperative, helpful, and were available for further consultation. Many respondents mailed information or reports that they felt would be useful. As an interviewer, the task of gaining entry, and of building up rapport was facilitated by my own educational background. In this respect, my position in the field might be described as one where the "politics of trust", rather than the "politics of distrust" were operating (Form, 1969).

Interviews lasted anywhere from one to three hours. Three of the interviews were considerably shorter (30 minutes) due to respondents' time constraints. But often, although a respondent had indicated that s/he could spare only thirty minutes, interviews lasted longer. In some cases, as well as answering the basic questions, respondents played more of an informant role, supplying
more information than the interview schedule solicited. These informants gave useful leads to important actors in the diocese, and in some cases helped me gain entry.

All interviewees were asked the same basic questions, but the introductory questions on the interview schedule were adapted for different sectors. Occasionally, questions were improvised where there was a lead to useful information. Top administrators were the last to be interviewed and, in addition to the basic questions, they were asked to respond to some of the initial findings.

Of the 69 respondents that were interviewed, 14 belonged in more than one sector. They were assigned to a sector on the basis of the reason they were included in the sample. For example, several of the pastors in this sample sat on influential boards, committees, and commissions, but if they were included in the sample because their parish represented a particular state of school finances, the primary classification was pastor. As a result of this networking, several more positions in the organizational complex were represented than number of respondents indicates.

Fifty percent of this sample had been in their position for one to three years, and the other fifty percent for four or more years. The diocesan school board representatives were usually in the position one or two years. The majority of respondents were not new to the Columbus diocese, though they may not have been long in a particular position, or parish. Most of them had been affiliated with the diocese for long periods, so it was assumed that they knew the place well.
The third source of data was mail-out questionnaires. These questionnaires, a shortened version of the interview schedule, were sent to all members of both the elementary and the secondary school boards, because, in the course of interviewing, it became clear that school board members were a significant group in the organization and running of the schools, and a pivotal group in terms of the tension between clergy and lay forces of power.

In March, I attended one elementary and one high school board meeting. I was introduced and distributed my questionnaire to the members present. The absent members of the board received questionnaires with letters of introduction in early April. Stamped addressed envelopes were provided for all respondents. Within three weeks twenty-two people had returned their questionnaires. I then mailed out a reminder letter, and another 12 questionnaires were returned. Finally, I mailed a letter and a postcard which the respondents could return if they had mislaid their questionnaires, and the response to this was minimal. In all, thirty-six questionnaires were returned out of a possible sixty-five. Twenty-eight out of fifty-three of these were from members of the elementary school board, and eight out of twelve were from the secondary school board. As well as having a very poor response rate on these questionnaires, many of those that were returned were not completed in full. The respondents, in many cases, left one or several questions unanswered.

As a final effort to increase the return rate on the questionnaires, I made contact with the school office to ascertain
whether they would provide the phone numbers of school board members. They would not give out the numbers, but in discussion they mentioned that my return rate would probably not get much higher since the active elementary school board members numbered only about 35. Given this information it was decided that looking up phone numbers for 64 people scattered all over the Columbus diocese which covers a number of counties in Ohio was not practical. Presumably, if people do not attend board meetings they are not very influential or indeed very well informed of the ongoing concerns of the boards.

**Analysing the Data**

This is a predominantly qualitative analysis. The data were coded, and to a certain extent quantified to produce frequency distributions, and cross-tabulations. The frequency distributions provided a basis for organizing the survey data in a coherent description. The cross-tabulations indicated relationships between position in the organizational complex and the following dependant variables: importance of the schools to the Church’s mission, typicality of the Columbus diocese, origins of the current financial problems, definition of the financial situation, responsibility for the financial problems, support for Greeley’s analysis, local issues of governance, and solutions to the financial problems. Position in the organizational complex was measured both by sector and by religious status.
The application of statistics was not appropriate for this kind of study, because the sample was not a random sample of the organizational complex of the Catholic community, but, rather, a stratified sample of important activists in this community. Some sectors of the Catholic community and of the leadership structure have greater representation than others in this sample.

Church leaders were well represented insofar as the Bishop, and two out of four of the episcopal vicars in the diocese were included in the sample. Out of 46 members of the Diocesan Administration, 12 of the key office holders were included in this sample. Pastors were not as well represented. Of the 293 priests in the diocese, 108 are pastors. Fifteen of these pastors and two priests were included in the sample. The clergy have not been randomly sampled, so in speaking of clergy and hierarchy as a sector, or in comparing clergy and laity, the select nature of this sample must be borne in mind.

All the key personnel in the diocesan offices, boards, commissions and committees that directly or indirectly work with the schools were included in the sample. In this sense, we can speak with confidence of diocesan officers. School principals were not as well represented as diocesan officers, but, none the less, we can speak with some confidence about this sector because their organization was represented, half of the high school principals were represented (though all urban and no rural schools), and two
elementary school principals were informants rather than respondents. They were able to provide many insights about the views of principals.

Lay influentials are not a formal organization and were drawn for the purpose of this study. It can be assumed that they represent the important lay actors in the community, but we are dealing with a sample of 16 from an indeterminate universe, so the issue of representativeness remains uncertain.

With respect to the representation of the "clergy" and the "laity", their members in the sample were simply added together to see whether they, as a collectivities, differed in their views. The laity as would be rather poorly represented by this sample because all of the lay people in this sample either work for the church or hold one or more voluntary offices of note in the organization.

The sample was not representative of the entire Catholic community, nor was it a random sample of the important sectors of the organizational complex. Nonetheless, the sample included a wide variety of offices and positions of both a voluntary and a non-voluntary nature. In this sense, the important actors in the community, important clergy and voices as it were, spoke on behalf of the community.

When examining differences among sectors of the organizational complex, proportions of observations were compared. While emphasizing the non-quantitative nature of the analysis, it was
necessary to determine what proportional differences would be considered significant. The Lawshe-Baker formula for testing the significance between two percentages,

\[ t = \omega \sqrt{\frac{2N_1N_2}{N_1 + N_2}} : N_1 \neq N_2 \]

was solved for omega, using the largest N's, (alpha level = .01, df = 38). The significant difference in proportions in the tail of the sample (0 to 20%) was approximately 10%, and the significant difference for proportions in the centre of the sample (40% to 60%) was approximately 25%. As N becomes smaller, the percentage difference needed for statistical significance becomes larger. These percentages were used as a rough guide in estimating differences between sectors.
CHAPTER 4 THE FISCAL CRISIS AS GENERALLY DEFINED

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the study for the sample as a whole. The sample, which includes the various sectors of the organizational complex, will be treated as a unit in this chapter. I will not refer to position in the organizational complex as influencing perception of the financial problems in the schools.

These findings are based on the results of an extensive interview conducted with 69 members of the organizational complex of the Catholic community, and of short questionnaires returned by 37 out of 65 diocesan school board members. The sample represents a cross-section of the organizational complex of the Catholic community in the Columbus diocese.

Some of the findings are based solely on the interview sample, because the short mail-out questionnaire did not allow the same extent of detailed examination that was possible in the interview. In discussing the findings in this and the next chapter, all references are to the interview sample, unless where otherwise noted.

The findings are summarized in Table 1, which shows modal responses for each question.
Table 1 General Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages Catholic Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Faith Development</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Good Academics</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Discipline</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantages Catholic Education:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Availability</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Lack of Resources</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Separation from Peers</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why Catholics Attend Public Schools</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Finances</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Superior Facilities</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Lack Parental Commitment</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of Schools to Church’s Mission:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Vital</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Used to be more important</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New School Building:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Support</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Support in North West</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) No Support</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typicality Columbus Diocese:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Typical</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Fewer Problems</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Atypical</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Pressing Problem Catholic School System:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Funding</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Maintenance Quality Education</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Leadership Conflicts</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Salaries</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is Funding a Serious Problem?:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Agree</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Serious?:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Very Serious</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Quite Serious</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Critical</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General or Limited Problem:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) General</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Different Each Level</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) More Serious High Schools</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 continued.

**Funds Determined By Parish Wealth:**
- (1) Agree: 61%
- (2) Disagree: 23%
- (3) Agree in Part: 16%

**Church Changes Affecting Schools:**
- (1) More Lay Faculty: 58%
- (2) Less Authoritarian: 15%
- (3) Cost More: 15%

**Reasons for School Closures:**
- (1) Enrollment and Finances: 42%
- (2) Lack of Students: 29%
- (3) Finances: 15%

**Responsibility for Financial Problems:**
- (1) Church Leaders: 31%
- (2) Parents/Parishioners: 30%
- (3) Teachers: 20%

**Who Contributes Most To Schools:**
- (1) Parents of Children in Schools: 35%
- (2) Parents and Parishioners: 30%
- (3) Teachers: 16%

**Who Should Contribute More:**
- (1) All Catholics: 25%
- (2) Business People: 19%
- (3) Wealthy Catholics: 17%

**Abolition of Bingo:**
- (1) Agree: 66%
- (2) Disagree: 21%
- (3) Unsure: 13%

**Enough Effort at Solution:**
- (1) No: 58%
- (2) Yes: 25%
- (3) Unsure: 17%

**Problem of Leadership rather than Support:**
- (1) Agree: 52%
- (2) Agree in Part: 30%
- (3) Disagree: 18%

**Raising Teacher Salaries:**
- (1) Agree: 75%
- (2) Disagree: 13%
- (3) Unsure: 10%

**CDEA Serve Teachers Needs:**
- (1) Yes: 70%
- (2) No: 16%
- (3) Don't Know: 14%
Importance of the Schools to the Church's Mission

Respondents were asked: (1) the most important advantages of a Catholic school education, (2) the most important disadvantages of a Catholic school education, (3) the reasons so many Catholic children attend public school, (4) whether the Catholic schools were still important to the Church's mission and why, and (5) whether there was a need for more schools in the Columbus diocese.

There was overwhelming consensus about the advantages of Catholic schools. The first choice for a majority of respondents (68%) was instruction in the Catholic faith, or the transmission of this faith to the school-aged generation. Thirteen percent of respondents emphasized that Catholic schools offer more choice than public schools in matters of religion.

The second choice of almost half (48%) of the sample was academic excellence. Discipline was seen as an important second choice by 18%. To a lesser extent, religious choice and the creation of community were reported as important advantages. The third choice of one-third of the sample was discipline, followed by community, and then religious choice.

These findings indicated that transmission of faith is the most important advantage of a Catholic education, followed by academic excellence, discipline, choice in matters of religion and governance, and community bonding.

Similar consensus was found for disadvantages. The most popular first choice (44%) was lack of accessibility and availability of
schools. Some objected to the geographic dispersion of the schools, and others objected to the high tuition which makes the Catholic school a luxury for poorer families. Thirty-five percent of the sample cited the lack of resources of Catholic compared to public schools as a first choice, and 17% felt that the separation of Catholics from children of other backgrounds had adverse effects on Catholic children.

The most popular second choice was the lack of resources in Catholic schools, which was cited as a disadvantage by 45% of the sample. Access and availability was the second choice of 31%. There were very few third, fourth, and fifth choices of disadvantage. This possibly reflects the high level of commitment to Catholic education in the general sample.

The major disadvantages reported were lack of access and availability of schools, and lack of resources in Catholic as compared with public schools. The separation of Catholic school children from their peers was perceived as a third disadvantage.

A certain amount of consensus was exhibited about the reasons why so many Catholics go public schools. By a wide margin of 65% the first choice was finances. Catholic schools are too expensive, while the public schools are free. The first choice of another 22% was that parents are not committed to the Church and to Catholic education, and the first choice of a further 12% was that the public schools have superior facilities. This was the second choice of 48% of the respondents. The second choice of another 28% was the lack
of committment of parents to the Catholic church and the schools. The third choices were superior facilities (48%), lack of parental committment (35%) and changes in the church (13%).

In order of importance the data indicated that finances, superior facilities in public schools, lack of parental committment, and changes in the church are the reasons why so many Catholics send their children to public rather than to Catholic schools.

Almost everyone in this sample (95%) felt that the schools were very important to the Church's mission. For most this response was emphatic. They mentioned that the schools were "essential to the future of the church" or that the Church "is unaware of just how important the schools are." Several respondents mentioned that schools are a much more effective vehicle for transmission of the faith than are weekly religious instruction classes.

Building more schools was approved of by most, though for some respondents this was a qualified approval. Over a third of interviewees (36%) said they would approve of building more schools in the diocese, while another 29% said they would approve this for the Northwest area. Less than a quarter (22%) did not approve of building more schools, and another 13% were unsure.

Respondents who did not approve of more school buildings suggested that the buildings already in existence should be put to use before money is spent building new facilities. It was suggested that children from the Northwest of the city, where demand for schools exceeds supply, could be bussed to areas where supply of school places exceeds demand. This would solve problems in both
areas. One drawback here is that lack of "access and availability" was cited as the main disadvantage of Catholic school education, so, while this may be a good theoretical solution to financial problems in the school system, it is probably not a very practical one.

Those who answered that more schools should be built were asked who should be responsible for building them. The almost unanimous response was that the parish should take on this responsibility, or perhaps, the parish with some help from the diocese.

Consensus about the advantages and disadvantages of Catholic school education was relatively strong, as was consensus about reasons why Catholic parents send their children to public schools, and the importance of schools for the Church's mission. The schools are obviously held in "very high regard", as Greeley put it. People reported very few disadvantages in Catholic education, and the biggest disadvantage, lack of access/availability indicated that respondents would like to see the Catholic school system expanded. Less consensus was apparent on the issue of building new schools, insofar as 35% of people were not in favor of building, especially while there are unfilled places in existing schools.

Typicality of the Columbus Diocese

Respondents were asked how typical they thought Columbus was terms of the problems that have faced Catholic schools throughout the nation. One-quarter reported that Columbus is typical and has faced the same problems as other dioceses in the United States in the last three decades.
Almost another quarter (23%) reported that Columbus has had to deal with the same problems as other dioceses, but that, given the smaller number of Catholics in the diocese and the fact that this diocese has been fairly stable economically, these problems have been on a somewhat smaller scale. As such, about half of the sample saw Columbus as typical or close to typical.

Approximately 40% of respondents reported that Columbus was different, and that due to unique local circumstances that Columbus could not be compared to other dioceses. Some of the unique features of the Columbus diocese cited were: (1) the small number of Catholics spread over a very large geographic area, making a school an unviable proposition in many outlying rural areas, (2) the prosperity of the Columbus diocese compared to other cities which have far greater problems with poverty and, (3) the absence of large numbers of ethnic groups, meaning fewer problems with racial integration. A small number of respondents thought that Columbus was ahead of other dioceses because of the Teachers' Association, and the extent to which the schools are staffed with lay people. However, others reported that Columbus lagged behind other dioceses because of the low diocesan taxes and the failure to centralize administration and planning.

It is difficult to establish the typicality of Columbus as a diocese. It was not the purpose of this question to do this, rather the question was intended to tap peoples' perceptions of where Columbus as a diocese "fits in" to the Church as a whole. Most people admittedly guessed. They stressed that they had very
little knowledge of other dioceses. This reveals how separate the dioceses are in terms of their organization and interaction. Only a few respondents felt confident that they knew enough about other dioceses to make an assessment of the typicality of their diocese. This confidence was typically derived from experience in another diocese or regular work contacts with members of other dioceses.

Origins of the Current Financial Problems

Interviewees were asked about: (1) the most important changes in the Catholic church that have affected the schools, (2) the number of schools that have been closed in the diocese since 1970 and (3) the reasons for these school closures. Twelve of the respondents had been involved with one of the recent school closures, and they were asked an additional set of questions pertaining to the reasons for these closures.

By far the most frequently mentioned change in the church that affected the school system was the change from religious to lay faculty. More than half of the sample gave this as a first choice and another quarter gave it as a second choice. Though cited by far fewer, the reduction in authoritarianism in the church was cited as the next most significant church change. This was chosen by 9% of the sample as a first choice, by 15% as a second, and by 15% as a third choice. The third significant change reported was the increasing cost of Catholic education. This was the second choice of 15% of the sample.
When I asked respondents to estimate the number of school closures that had taken place in the diocese since 1970 their estimates were invariably too low. During these years 17 elementary and 4 high schools in the Columbus diocese have been closed. All but three of these closed before 1979, at a time when enrollment was steadily declining nationwide. Few people gave an accurate or approximately accurate figure. Most knew only of the two most recent school closings, (one an inner-city elementary school, the other a rural-area high school).

There are several explanations for the low estimates. Typically, a consolidation is viewed as different from a school closing. Although a consolidation always involves closing at least one or more school buildings, it is perceived as a way of accommodating the needs of the existing students rather than as a school closure. Also, many people were not familiar with school closings in rural areas of the diocese. They wondered why I asked about school closings, and when asked why there had been so many school closures they replied "There haven't been that many." Perhaps they were thinking of the past eight years, during which time only three schools in the diocese have closed.

Fairly clear consensus was evident on the reason for closing the Columbus schools. Enrollment and finances were thought to be the root causes, with 42% of the sample citing a combination of the two as their first choice, while 29% cited only lack of students, and 15% cited only finances as the main cause of the decline.
In a sense, there was consensus concerning the most significant changes in the Church that affected the schools, and also the reasons for school closures. Many changes in the church have been responsible for the changing situation in the schools. In the eyes of some people, the departure of religious faculty has meant that the schools have lost their Catholic appearance, and this has helped curtail enrollment. Additionally, the departure of religious, who traditionally worked for a nominal salary, helped raise costs, so that Catholic school became more expensive for many Catholics. Though the departure of religious from the schools is perceived as one of the major factors in the financial crisis, many people took pains to point out that they did not blame the religious for wanting to be involved in ministries other than teaching.

On the question of the reasons for school closures, financing is not the only variable that has effected enrollment. In Columbus, for example, the movement of the population from the city center to the suburbs means that many potential Catholic school students live in areas where there are no schools.

All twelve of the people who answered the additional questions about recent school closures in Columbus referred to enrollment and financing as major problems. This does not mean they all approved of the school closures. Five thought the city-center school should have been kept open by the diocese as a "mission school." In the case of the rural high school, they agreed that low enrollment did not warrant the continued operation of the school, but some felt that the abrupt manner in which the school was closed indicated a
lack of concern on the part of the "powers that be" for the local community. This school closure was described by one respondent as a "typical" example of the clergy and hierarchy "displaying authority but not leadership."

Respondents failed to agree on who suffered most as a result of these closures. In the case of the city-center school, responses ranged from "the local community", to "the credibility of the Catholic church." In the case of the high school, the students, or the local community or again the credibility of the Church were thought to have suffered most.

Several respondents who did not respond to these additional questions mentioned these school closures in other contexts. For example, in a few of the mail-out questionnaires, the closure of the high school was mentioned as one of the most serious events in the diocese in the past year. In a few interviews, people mentioned the loss of the "mission school" as one example of the clergy and hierarchy's lack of support for schools.

**Definition of the Financial Situation**

Respondents were asked: (1) to indicate the most pressing problem in the parochial school system, (2) whether the funding of the schools was a serious problem, and, if so, how serious, (3) whether the funding was a general problem, or limited to the elementary or high schools, (4) whether funding was determined by the wealth a particular parish, and (5) for whom is the problem of funding greatest.
By a wide margin the most pressing problem was finances and funding. More than half (63%) of the sample cited funding as their first choice, 23% as their second choice, and 10% as a third. This pattern may have been partly in response to my research. My introduction encouraged people to think about funding.

The maintenance of a quality Catholic education was defined as the second most important problem, with 17% of the sample citing it as a first choice, 24% as a second choice, and 19% as a third. This indicates that, while there may not have been "many school closures" in the Columbus diocese, nonetheless there have been enough closures and threatened closures for people to be conscious that the school system is in "danger."

Other problems mentioned as important (though not by the same magnitude as these two) were: (1) teachers are so poorly paid that they often have to leave the system, and (2) leadership conflicts. Importantly, the latter was mentioned as a pressing problem before the introduction of the questions concerning Greeley's findings.

An overwhelming majority of respondents (91%) thought that funding was a serious problem. Only a small number (9%) saw it as a critical problem, more than half (59%) saw it as very serious, and less than a quarter (22%) saw it as quite serious. Only six percent saw it as not too serious, while four percent thought it depended on the individual school.

There was also consensus that funding was a general problem (72%). A small percentage (12%) reckoned that funding was a different problem for each level of schooling and that the problem
could not really be spoken of in general terms. About one-tenth thought that funding was more of a problem for high schools than for elementary schools. They explained that the sources of funding are different, with the parish as the fund-raising unit for most elementary schools, and the individual high school as the fund-raising unit at secondary level. Only 1% of the respondents reported that funding was not a problem.

More than half of the respondents (61%) reported that school funding was determined by the wealth of the individual parish or high school district. Another 16% reported that there was a relationship between the wealth of the parish or high school district and the financial viability of the school, but that this relationship was not one to one. The remaining 23% felt that funding was not a matter of the wealth of a particular parish or high school district.

Those who felt that funding was determined by the wealth of the parish or high school district explained that the parish structure and the ties to particular parishes are still very strong. They pointed out that funding is currently a critical problem in many of the poorer parishes in Columbus, while in the more affluent parishes the problem of funding exists, but is not as pressing. Several of the city-center schools are threatened with consolidation and/or closure in the coming years.

Those who felt that there was a relationship, but that it was not one-to-one pointed out that schools in some of the more affluent
parishes in Columbus are not doing well, due to competition from the suburban public school system, or the declining numbers of young people in these parishes.

Those who disagreed with the idea that funding was determined by the wealth of the parish or high school district explained that funding depends on peoples priorities; if they want something badly enough, they will pay for it.

Over one-third (35%) of the respondents reported that the problem of funding is greatest for parents with children in the schools. Another 32% felt that this problem seriously affected the whole Catholic community.

What these findings appear to reveal is that there is a widespread awareness of financial problems, that this is perceived as quite threatening, but not as a crisis. The problem is considered very serious, rather than critical. Perhaps "critical" is defined as immediate danger of school closings, and there are some Columbus schools where the financial situation is, by this definition, critical. Very serious, on the other hand seems to indicate that the problem could become critical in the foreseeable future. The "crisis" in Catholic education, then, is something that is threatened by current financial difficulties, but it has not yet arrived.

**Responsibility for the Financial Problems**

Respondents were asked to locate those individuals who: (1) were responsible for financial difficulties in the school system,
(2) contributed most to the upkeep of the schools, and (3) should be expected to contribute more to the upkeep of the schools.

Primary responsibility for financial difficulties in the schools was shared by the clergy and leadership (31%), and by parents and parishioners (30%). Twenty percent thought teachers (who demand high salaries) were responsible. It would appear that responsibility is perceived as being fairly widely distributed throughout the community.

Parents were reported as those who contribute most to the upkeep of schools, especially parents who send their children to Catholic schools. One-third of the respondents (35%) agreed that these parents contribute more than any other group to the upkeep of schools. Parents of children in Catholic schools in combination with parishioners were identified as the greatest contributors by 16% of respondents, while an equal percentage identified parents and teachers as the greatest contributors to Catholic education. The common explanation for the choice of parents in this category was that, along with tuition, they often donate time for fund-raising, and other services to the schools.

The most popular response (25%) to the question of who should be expected to contribute more to the upkeep of the schools was "all Catholics." After this came business people, with 19% of the sample suggesting that since the business community derives much benefit from having a well educated "pool of labor", it should help pay for the education of this potential labor force. Wealthy Catholics should also give more, and 17% of respondents felt that many of the
wealthy had themselves benefitted from Catholic education and should repay this debt. Twelve percent of respondents had no opinion.

Many respondents could not assign primary responsibility for the financial difficulties to any particular group. Those who blamed the clergy mentioned that, while they, as parishioners had been urged to contribute more to the church, the clergy were "living it up". This was mentioned with much bitterness. Those who thought the whole Catholic community was to blame felt there was a need for more unity and purpose in the church. Those that cited parents pointed out, disparagingly, that Catholics had become very materialistic and that parents did not have proper priorities.

Division on the question of financial responsibility was evident but lines of division were not clear-cut. Even though people mentioned groups that "might be expected to give more," they were reluctant to assign responsibility for the financial difficulties to a particular group. In short, there was not much consensus about responsibility for the financial difficulties in the schools.

**Support for Greeley's Analysis**

In this category, respondents were read Greeley's analysis of the financial crisis in the Catholic school system. He indicated that the crisis in the Catholic school system was a problem of leadership rather than one of support, and that the laity was willing to contribute more to Catholic education, but that the clergy and the hierarchy were not providing the leadership. Respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed. Agreement was followed up with a
"why," while those who disagreed were asked to provide a better explanation than Greeley's for the financial crisis. All respondents were asked why Greeley had come to these conclusions. These questions were included in both the interview schedule and the mailout questionnaire.

All of the interviewees were familiar with Greeley, and most were aware of his studies of Catholic education. Most people showed amusement when I mentioned him, indicating that Greeley is quite a character. Slightly more than half of the respondents (52%) agreed that clergy and hierarchy are not providing the leadership, even though laity is willing to make all sorts of sacrifices for the Catholic education of their children. Less than one-fifth of the respondents (18%) disagreed with Greeley, while almost one-third (30%) of respondents agreed in part.

Those who answered that Greeley was partially right explained that while the clergy could be providing more leadership, the laity also needed to display more commitment to Catholic education. Other explanations were that Greeley's analysis was too cut and dried, because some of the clergy were very committed to Catholic education, but Greeley focused only on the ones that weren't. Others suggested that pastors were so "burnt out" from tending so many duties that they cannot devote all of their energies to schools. An explanation offered by a small number of people, but which was interesting in light of the theoretical framework, was that the crisis is not in education but is, rather, in the faith. One informant questioned Greeley's assumption that the clergy and
hierarchy constitute the "leadership", and suggested that he needed a broader conception of "church" than one in which the laity is powerless.

The most common explanation of Greeley's analysis by those who disagreed with him was that he is biased against the hierarchy. The most common explanation by those who agreed was that he had done studies that support his position and that he is outspoken and very concerned about the preservation of Catholic schools.

There was relatively strong agreement that clergy and hierarchy are not providing the leadership adequate to maintain the school system. At least eight respondents offered this insight before I introduced Greeley's work. For example one respondent said "I see plenty of examples of people trying to help with the crisis, but the clergy and the hierarchy are putting up blocks. There have been many indications of the Church's lack of commitment to Catholic education. The crisis, in my view, is a lack of leadership from the Bishop on down to the Education Office. What I find in the leadership level is people who are looking for ways of doing nothing." This respondent, along with several others, suggested that pastors were not giving enough positive endorsement to schools "from the pulpit." They mentioned the need to to "make the product more marketable" to the Catholic population, and agreed that the clergy were in the best position to do this. A general feeling was that pastors are afraid that by publicly promoting Catholic schools they will alienate parishioners whose children attend public schools.
Local Issues of Governance

Respondents were asked whether teacher salaries should be increased to a level comparable to those of public school teachers, and how successful they felt the Teachers' Association was in meeting teachers' needs.

On the question of salaries, three-quarters of respondents agreed that teacher salaries should be increased. Thirteen percent felt that the salaries should not be increased, and ten percent did not know. Those who answered affirmatively emphasized that this should be a priority, and that while salaries did not have to be exactly the same as those of public school teachers, they should be just.

Those who answered in the negative felt that Catholic schools are getting good teachers anyway regardless of salaries, that teaching in Catholic schools has many advantages, and that teaching, as a vocation, should involve some sacrifice.

On the question of the effectiveness of the Columbus Diocesan Education Association (CDEA), the majority did not know much about how well the organization served teachers, but they supported it and assumed that it served teachers well. A few respondents suggested that the association was too much like a labor union and did not belong in the Catholic church. Others suggested that teachers needed to become more like a union and thereby have more "say so." Two respondents mentioned that the association was of little benefit to the nuns who teach in the system, while another indicated that
there was a need for organization of the teachers outside of Franklin County. The consensus, though, was that people supported the union and assumed that it was of benefit to teachers.

In this context, many people mentioned the recent conflicts in salary negotiations, and conflict about the role of the Diocesan School Board representatives. In last year's negotiations, the teacher salary increase was approved by the secondary school board, and initially rejected by the elementary school board. There ensued a bitter struggle that involved administrators, teachers, pastors, and school board representatives. The salary issue was resolved in arbitration, but an unresolved issue has been the definition of the proper role of the school board representative. Apparently, what discomfited so many people about the negotiations was the fact that a few pastors insisted that school board representatives should bear the vote of the pastor, rather than exercise their individual discretion. The issue has yet to be resolved. It was because of the importance of this conflict that the diocesan school board was asked to respond to the mail-out questionnaire.

Finally, a question that appeared on the mail-out questionnaire that was not in the interview schedule asked what had been the most serious events in the diocese in the past year. Impressions from the interviews led me to expect clear agreement that the teacher salary negotiations had been most serious, but salary negotiations were cited most often by only a small margin. The next most serious event was the closing of Bishop Flaget High school in Chillicothe,
and the firing of a school principal at Rosencrans. Some respondents did not answer this question, and a few of them said that the year had not been turbulent at all.

Solutions to the Financial Problems

Respondents were asked: (1) if the issue of funding was ever discussed in their organization/school, and how often, (2) if their organization had done anything to address the problem of funding in the past year/five years, (3) what they thought of the Bishop's proposal to abolish Bingo, (4) whether all possible was being done to fund the schools, (5) if not, then what were their ideas on how school funding could be improved. After they had ventured their own ideas, they were presented with a set of 10 strategies or potential "solutions" to the financial problems, and they were asked to rate these strategies on a five-point scale from strongly approve to strongly disapprove.

All respondents, save a few who were retired or were in positions indirectly related to the schools, reported that their organization/school discussed the issue of financing "constantly" or "frequently." Almost all had addressed the problem of funding in the past year/five years. At the diocesan level, The Catholic Foundation of Columbus has been set up to generate funds for the general needs of the diocese with a portion of these funds going to education. The Development Office, which again deals with the financing needs of the diocese as a whole, deals with financing for education as part of its concerns. In all of the schools,
principals were able to cite a several fundraisers, attempts to facilitate tuition payment, and attempts to budget. Several pastors referred to similar efforts. The sample as a whole then was familiar with problems of funding and fundraising.

A clear majority of respondents (66%) thought that it was a good idea to phase out bingo as a way of supporting schools. In addition, they felt that it was impractical as an immediate solution to the financial problems. The majority stressed that there would have to be sound alternative sources of funding to replace bingo before it could be phased out. Respondents disliked bingo for a number of reasons. It is difficult to operate and requires many hours of volunteer work to organize and run profitably. Some had misgivings about Catholic schools being run on money that accrued from gambling. In some cases, they felt that running bingo was bad because of the necessary association with the types of people that gamble. Others felt that Bingo was a form of exploiting the poorer sectors of society. Still others felt that Bingo was just not a very reliable source of funding, and they mentioned that development funds, sound investments and the like would be more reliable.

Almost six-tenths of the sample (58%) reported that not all that was possible was being done to fund schools. By contrast, one-quarter felt as much as possible was being done. The remainder had no opinion. Many respondents reported that the Bishop was moving in the right direction in establishing an endowment fund, and they stressed the need to expand and develop such efforts. Others felt that the Bishop was not at all supportive of schools, and at least
six respondents were extremely critical of current fundraising efforts. They had developed tailored solutions to funding problems in the Diocese, or in their parishes, and they reported that these solutions were rejected out of hand by church leaders. One of these respondents felt that the "endowment fund" was a way of enhancing the Bishop's own power rather than an efficient way of financing schools. On the question concerning the Bishop's attempt to phase out bingo, one respondent replied "He is trying to phase out the schools."

The suggested strategies for solving the financial problems in the schools met with mixed responses, as Table 2 indicates. Increased government funding in the form of tuition tax credits was approved by 79% of respondents, disapproved by 13% and the remaining 8% were neutral. Canvassing wealthy alumni was also approved by a majority of respondents (81%), disapproved by only 4%, and the remaining 15% were neutral.

Increasing tuition was not strongly approved. Only 36% of respondents approved of this while 40% disapproved. The remaining 24% were neutral. Expansion of fundraising drives was approved by a majority (59%) of respondents, and disapproved by only 17%. One-quarter of the respondents remained neutral.

Building new schools was approved by only 27% of respondents. Two-fifths (40%) disapproved of this and the remaining 33% were neutral. This was not at all a popular solution, with many people objecting to building on the grounds that there was a need to utilize existing facilities. Reorganization of the parish structure
so that the wealthy parishes would subsidize the poorer parishes was approved by a clear majority of respondents (67%). Only 12% disapproved of this, and the remaining 20% were neutral.

Table 2 Support of General Sample of Strategies for Solving the Financial Problems in the Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canvassing Wealthy Alumni</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Tax Credits</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Schools</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization of Parish Structures</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Current Fund-Raising Drives</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on Parishioners to Contribute More</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training More Clergy/Nuns as Teachers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Tuition</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building More Schools, Recruiting More Students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing Out Schools, More Emphasis on CCD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 106
Consolidation, has already been tried and seems to work well. There is always much resistance to consolidation in the beginning. Three-quarters of respondents approved of this, with many of them commenting that this solution was already in operation. Only 11% disapproved, usually in areas where schools were threatened with consolidation/closure. The remaining 12% were neutral. Training more clergy and nuns as teachers was an option considered by some respondents. Regressive as this solution is, it was not strongly opposed, though many people were amused at the question and wondered where the clergy and nuns would be found. This was approved by 42% of respondents, was disapproved by 28% of them and 30% of them were neutral. The disapprovals and, to some extent, the neutrals were based on the idea that, given the lack of vocations, this was not really a viable alternative. Occasionally, it was disapproved on the grounds that nuns and priests should have a choice of ministry and should not be forced into teaching.

Putting pressure on parishioners to raise their contributions to the church gave rise to the comment that, "parishioners are already being pressured enough to contribute." Many people objected to the use of the word pressure. Despite these reservations, almost six-tenths (57%) approved of this strategy, 19% disapproved, and the remaining 24% were neutral. Phasing out schools altogether, and placing more emphasis on effective religious instruction classes was strongly dissapproved of, and was perhaps the only question in the survey on which there was almost complete consensus. Only 4% approved of this strategy, 12% remained neutral and 86% disapproved,
most of them strongly. This accords with the earlier discussion of the importance of the schools for the church's mission. Several people commented that CCD programs were just not an effective means of transmitting the faith.

Respondents were also asked to rank the solutions they strongly approved of. The most important solutions chosen were more government funds in the form of tuition tax credits and canvassing wealthy alumni. Consolidation of smaller schools into larger units, with the development of more inter-parochial schools, was also popular as was the reorganization of the parish structure so that wealthy parishes would subsidize poorer ones.

Solutions that met with moderate approval were the expansion of current fundraising drives, though many objected to this on the grounds that current fundraising drives are "nickle and dime" projects. Training of more clergy and nuns as teachers, where it was approved of, was considered very unrealistic. At the same time, the extent to which it was approved indicates that there is perhaps a growing concern about the loss of the religious both from the schools and from the church. Finally, the collection of more parish funds met with moderate approval, though in some instances people were very much opposed, feeling that many parishioners were already contributing as much as they possibly could. Others, however took the opposite viewpoint, and claimed that Catholics had, for years, been receiving a "free" education, and that they had never been trained to properly tithe. For a number of people, this "lack of stewardship" was a major problem. Again, in light of Greeley's
analysis, this is interesting, because it suggests that leaders need to set this "stewardship" in motion. People have to be asked and encouraged to contribute more before they will do so.

Building new schools and increasing tuition, were solutions that were not strongly approved of, while phasing out the Catholic schools altogether and putting more emphasis on building more effective CCD classes was almost completely rejected. This suggested strong consensus about the importance of the Catholic school system.

Of course, discrepancies can exist between what people approve of in theory and what they will do in practice. For example, most people approved of restructuring parishes so that poorer ones are subsidized by wealthier ones. They also approved of consolidation of small schools into larger units. However, in practice, these solutions might not be greeted enthusiastically. The consolidation of schools, for instance, has always caused much tension, because at least one school building is closed. In parishes that face consolidation in the near future, this tension was particularly evident. As for the reorganization of the parish boundaries, two respondents in the "poorer" parishes cited the reluctance of parents from nearby "more affluent" parishes to send their children to school in the poorer district. Citing approval of these solutions is not a strong indicator of how they would be supported in practice.
Summary

This chapter presented an overview of findings for the sample as a whole. The objective was to get a general idea of how the activists responded to questions concerning governance and financing of Catholic schools in the Columbus diocese. The results substantiated some of Greeley's findings: the schools appear to be held in "very high regard" by this sample, and the major disadvantage of Catholic school was lack of access and availability. General concern about the seriousness of the financial problems, and interest in finding solutions to these problems were evident. Some disagreement about the most viable and appropriate solutions was apparent.

The most evident and immediate conflict concerned responsibility for the financial crisis in the school system, and for leadership, generally. The need to "sell the schools" was mentioned by respondents at many levels indicating that there is general concern about the "future" of the school system. The following chapter will report the findings for the sample differentiating both by sector, and by religious status.
CHAPTER 5 CONSENSUS AND CLEAVAGE IN CRISIS BELIEFS

Introduction

This study examined Greeley's contention that the crisis in the Catholic school system is a problem of leadership rather than one of support. For the purpose of identifying sources of conflict and convergence in the organizational complex of the Catholic community the sample was divided into four sectors. Each sector represents a level of leadership in that members exert authority and/or influence over others in the community. The sectors are represented in the following numbers:

- Clergy and Hierarchy ..........20
- Diocesan Administration ..........13
- School Principals .................20
- Lay Influentials ..................53
  Diocesan School Board Members ..37

TOTAL ................................106

This chapter discusses the differences among these sectors. The findings are presented in the same order as the previous chapter. Although I will highlight the differences among the sectors, some repetition of the previous chapter is inevitable.
Importance of the Schools to the Church's Mission

Respondents were asked: (1) the most important advantages of a Catholic school education, (2) the most important disadvantages of a Catholic school education, (3) the reasons why so many Catholic children go to public school, (4) whether Catholic schools are still important to the Church's mission and why, and, (5) whether there is a need for more schools to be built in the Columbus diocese.

Looking at the advantages of Catholic education, the modal category for all groups was faith training. This advantage was strongly emphasized by clergy and hierarchy (95%), followed by principals (70%), lay influentials (53%) and diocesan officers (47%). This difference in emphasis by clergy and hierarchy was significant and, contrary to expectations, was especially pronounced between them and diocesan officers. The second choice was academic excellence. Again this was the modal second choice across sectors. Discipline, choice, and the sense of community were other advantages reported by respondents in all sectors but in a somewhat different order for each sector. No significant differences among sectors were evident. Advantages by religious status show almost identical responses.

For disadvantages, there were no significant differences among sectors. The modal category for clergy and hierarchy (80%) and principals (75%) was that Catholic schools have fewer resources than public schools. The modal category for diocesan officers (69%) and lay influentials (63%) was limited access and availability of
Catholic schools. The groups reversed the order for the second most frequent disadvantage. All sectors agreed on the third disadvantage which was that segregation of children in Catholic schools can have an adverse effect on them, as did clergy and laity.

With respect to the question of why so many Catholics go to public schools, the modal category for all sectors was finances. Principals ranked the superior resources of public schools as an equally important choice. There were no significant differences among sectors on this question. However, ninety percent of clergy compared with seventy-seven percent of laity reported finances as the main reason why so many Catholics send their children to public school. This difference by religious status was significant.

One hundred percent of all sectors except clergy and hierarchy reported that the schools were very important to the Church's mission. Eighty percent of clergy and hierarchy agreed, while 20% did not. This deviation by clergy and hierarchy was significant, and was in accordance with Greeley's hypothesis. All of the laity and 87% of clergy approved, with 10% against and 3% neutral. This difference by religious status was significant.

On the question of new school building, some notable differences appeared (See Tables 3 and 4). Lay influentialis indicated most support for building new schools while clergy and hierarchy indicated least support. This difference was clearly evident when comparing clergy and laity, with 46% of laity compared to 23% of clergy supporting new school building, and 33% of clergy compared with 13% of laity opposing this.
Table 3  Support for Building More Schools By Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Clergy &amp; Hierarchy</th>
<th>Diocesan Officers</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th>Lay Influentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Some Areas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 20 13 20 16 (69)

Table 4  Support For Building More Schools By Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Clergy</th>
<th>Laity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Some Areas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 39 30 (69)
The significant differences exhibited on this issue were: (1) clergy and hierarchy placed greater emphasis than any other sector on faith development as an advantage of Catholic education, (2) compared with laity, more clergy indicated finances as the main reason why so many Catholic children attend public schools, (3) one-fifth of clergy and hierarchy were not convinced that the schools were vitally important to the Church's mission, and were the deviant sector on this question, and (4) on the question of new school building, lay influentials were the most supportive and clergy and hierarchy the least supportive. This difference was also evident when comparing clergy and laity.

Typicality of the Columbus Diocese

Respondents were simply asked how typical they thought Columbus was in terms of problems that have faced Catholic schools throughout the nation in the last three decades. The modal category in this instance was the same for three out of four sectors, that Columbus had fewer difficulties than other cities. The school principals differed insofar as the modal belief was that Columbus was typical. There were no differences on the basis of religious status.

Origins of the Current Financial Problems

Respondents were asked about: (1) the most important changes in the Catholic church that have affected the schools, (2) the number of schools that have been closed in the diocese in the last 20 years, and, (3) the reasons for these school closures.
The most significant change in the Catholic church which has affected the school system was the change in the ratio of lay to religious faculty. As a first choice, this was the modal category for all sectors. Sectors were divided on their second choices, with clergy and hierarchy (45%) and diocesan officers (31%) reporting increase in the Church's emphasis on social justice issues, and principals (55%) and lay influentials (56%) reporting diminishing authoritarianism. Significantly fewer lay influentials (6%) cited increasing social justice, while this was reported by at least one-quarter of all other sectors. Diminishing authoritarianism was mentioned by about 40% of clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers as another important recent change. Finally, increasing cost of education was cited as an important change by almost two-fifths of clergy and hierarchy and lay influentials compared with only 15% of diocesan officers and 10% of principals. No significant differences appeared on the basis of status.

No significant differences were revealed in people's knowledge of school closures on the basis of sector, except, of course, that school office administrators had immediate access to this information. Similarly, on the question of causes for school closures, no significant differences by sector or by status were evident.

The significant differences exhibited on this issue were: (1) only a small proportion of lay influentials compared with all other sectors saw an increasing emphasis on social justice as an important
church change and, (2) a larger proportion of clergy and hierarchy, and lay influential than other sectors cited increasing costs of education as an important church change.

**Definition of the Financial Situation**

Respondents were asked: (1) what is the most pressing problem in the parochial school system, (2) whether funding was a serious problem, and, if so, how serious, (3) whether funding was a general problem, or was limited to the elementary, or high schools, (4) whether funding was determined by the wealth of a particular parish or high school district, and (5) for whom the problem of funding was greatest. The first two questions were included in the mail-out survey.

All sectors chose finances as the modal category, indicating that sector made no difference in the identification of the most pressing problem in the parochial school system. Some difference in emphasis appeared among sectors. Only 69% of diocesan officers and 78% of lay influential compared with 95% of principals, 85% of clergy and hierarchy emphasized this problem. Maintaining quality Catholic education was a second choice for all sectors.

Notably, "leadership conflicts" were mentioned as a problem by 23% of diocesan officers, 45% of school principals and 30% of lay influential, but by only 10% of clergy and hierarchy. Clergy and hierarchy was again a deviant sector, indicating less consciousness and/or acknowledgement of leadership conflict than others. Clergy and laity differed on the question of the most pressing problems.
The problem of leadership conflicts was mentioned by 73% of laity compared with 34% of clergy, and this difference was significant.

There was agreement that financial problems are very serious and that these problems are of a general nature. The modal category for all sectors in response to the question of how tied funding is to the parish was that funding is influenced by the wealth of the parish or high school district.

There were differences among the sectors in choosing for whom the problem of funding was greatest. The modal choices for each sector differed; clergy and hierarchy and principals cited parents with children in the schools, diocesan officers cited parents with no children in the schools, and lay influentials cited teachers.

Another difference was that 20% of lay influentials, and 32% of principals and clergy and hierarchy cited "all Catholics" while none of the diocesan officers cited this choice.

The significant differences exhibited on this issue were: (1) finances, the modal response to the question of the most pressing problem in the school system, was more strongly emphasized by clergy and hierarchy, and principals, combined, than either lay influentials and diocesan officers, (2) leadership conflicts were identified as a pressing problem by only a small proportion of clergy and hierarchy compared with each of the other sectors (difference on this question was evident by religious status also), and (3) choices by sector on the question of who was most burdened by financing problems differed, though not with any clear directionality.
Responsibility for the Financial Problems

Respondents were asked to locate those individuals who: (1) are responsible for financial difficulties in the school system, (2) contribute most to the upkeep of the schools, and, (3) should be expected to contribute more to the upkeep of the schools.

Some differences among sectors were apparent in locating those most responsible for financial difficulties in the school system. Half the lay influentials found church leadership responsible, but only one-fifth of clergy and hierarchy assigned blame to themselves. This difference was significant. Clergy and hierarchy, rather than blaming any one group, distributed responsibility for financing throughout the community. More than a third of school principals and diocesan officers blamed parents and parishioners, and a fifth of all respondents blamed teachers. No clear consensus concerning responsibility for the crisis was apparent. Different sectors assigned blame to different groups.

This difference persisted when comparing clergy and laity. Most of the laity (43%) compared with 15% of clergy held church leadership responsible for the crisis. Clergy (35%) generally blamed parents who do not send their children to Catholic schools, and then parents, parishioners, and teachers. Only 9% of laity blamed parents who do not send their children to Catholic school.

In response to the question of who contributes most to the upkeep of the schools, neither complete consensus nor sharp dissention were apparent. All sectors had choices that embraced a wide variety of
people/groups. Most of clergy and hierarchy (45%) chose the parish, and another 40% chose parents who have children in the schools. Of the diocesan officers, 46% chose parents and parishioners. Lay influentialss reported parents with children in the schools, followed by parishioners. The least mentioned contributors overall were pastors and volunteers. There were no significant differences when comparing clergy and laity.

In response to the question of who should be expected to give more to the schools, no consensus by sector appeared, but again, neither was dissent clearly evident. The modal categories for each sector were as follows: for clergy and hierarchy, wealthy Catholics; for principals, business people; for diocesan officers and lay influentialss, all Catholics. Here diocesan officers and lay influentialss agreed, and principals and clergy and hierarchy were also in agreement. Overall, many people were expected to give more. No difference appeared between clergy and laity on this issue.

On this issue differences among sectors, particularly between lay influentialss and clergy and hierarchy in assigning responsibility for the crisis were evident. These differences were also apparent between clergy and laity. Laity assigned responsibility to Church leadership, while clergy assigned responsibility to the whole community. On the question of who contributes most to the upkeep of the schools, and who should be expected to give more to the schools there was neither clear consensus, nor a directionality of dissent.
Support for Greeley's Analysis

Respondents were asked to indicate their support for Greeley's analysis of the financial crisis in the Catholic school system. He indicated that the crisis was a problem of leadership rather than one of support in that the laity was willing to make all sorts of sacrifices for the Catholic education of their children, but the clergy and the hierarchy were not providing the leadership. Agreement was followed with a "Why?", and disagreement was followed by asking respondents to provide a better explanation than Greeley's for the financial crisis. All were asked why Greeley had come to the conclusions that he did. This question appeared on mail-out surveys as well as interviews.

Sector made a difference in responses to the Greeley issue (See tables 5 and 6). For diocesan officers (54%), principals (50%) and lay influentials (69%) the modal category was agreement with Greeley's analysis. Only 20% of clergy and hierarchy agreed, 40% disagreed, and another 40% agreed in part. Only 6% of lay influentials and 11% of principals disagreed. A third (31%) of the diocesan officers disagreed with Greeley. This was the second strongest disagreement next to clergy and hierarchy. Differences between clergy and hierarchy and each of the other sectors were significant.
### Table 5  Responsibility for Fiscal Crisis By Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Responsible</th>
<th>Clergy &amp; Hierarchy %</th>
<th>Diocesan Officers %</th>
<th>School Principals %</th>
<th>Lay Influentials %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 20 13 18 49 (100)

### Table 6  Responsibility for Fiscal Crisis By Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clergy Responsible</th>
<th>Clergy %</th>
<th>Laity %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 30 70 (100)
Disagreement among sectors appeared also on the question of who should be responsible for providing this leadership. Percentages are not convincing in this instance, because only those who answered yes to the initial question were asked about the assignment of responsibility. Of those who agreed with Greeley's diagnosis, the majority of lay influentials and school principals reported that the bishop and pastors should take responsibility for this kind of leadership. Diocesan officers divided this responsibility evenly among the bishops, the pastors, the school boards, and the whole Catholic community.

Many of the respondents who disagreed with Greeley could not offer a better explanation for the crisis. Of those that did, diocesan officers, principals, and lay influentials felt the laity, as well as the clergy, were not as committed as they might be to the Catholic schools. Another common response for clergy and hierarchy, principals and lay influentials was that while some pastors and church leaders are committed to Catholic education, some are not and Greeley limited his vision to the uncommitted people.

In response to the question of why Greeley made this particular diagnosis of the financial crisis, 55% of the clergy and hierarchy, 31% of diocesan officers and lay influentials, and 21% of principals reported that he is biased against the clergy. This was the modal choice only for the clergy and hierarchy. Half the diocesan officers and almost half the principals responded that Greeley was drawing attention to the issue because of his interest in the schools. A third of lay influentials reported that he was correct.
These differences were especially evident when comparing clergy and laity. Forty percent of clergy disagreed, while 66% of laity agreed with Greeley. Additionally, less neutrality was evident among the laity. Laity held bishops and pastors responsible for the provision of leadership, while clergy held the entire Catholic community responsible. Half of the clergy reported that he was biased against the hierarchy, 37% of the clergy and 37% of the laity said he was interested in the schools, (so there was some agreement on this), while 36% of laity compared with 13% of clergy reported that he was correct in his diagnosis.

Much disagreement among sectors and between clergy and laity was revealed on the issue of support for Greeley's analysis. The significant differences exhibited were: (1) a majority of all sectors except clergy and hierarchy agreed with Greeley, (2) few principals and lay influencers (compared with clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers) disagreed, (3) in response to the question of why Greeley made this diagnosis, a majority of clergy and hierarchy reported that Greeley was biased, a majority of diocesan officers and principals reported that he was interested in the schools, and a majority of lay influencers reported that his analysis was correct.

Local Issues of Governance

Respondents were asked: (1) whether teacher salaries should be increased and (2) whether the Teachers' Association adequately serves the teachers needs.
The modal category for all sectors on teacher salaries was agreement, with 88% of lay influentials compared with 55% of clergy and hierarchy agreeing with this. There was no difference when comparing clergy and laity.

On the issue of the adequacy of the Columbus Diocesan Education Association (CDEA) in serving the teachers, the modal response for all sectors except the clergy was affirmative. The modal response for the clergy was that they did not know. No significant differences were exhibited on either of these questions.

Solutions to the Financial Problems

Respondents were asked: (1) what they thought of the Bishop's proposal to abolish Bingo, (2) if all is being done that can be done to fund the schools and, (3) if not, then what were their ideas for how funding the schools could be improved. After they had offered their own ideas they were presented with a set of 10 strategies for potential solutions to the financial problems and they were asked to rate these strategies on a five-point scale from strongly approve to strongly disapprove. These strategies appeared on both the mail-out questionnaires and the interviews.

On the question of bingo, strong consensus was exhibited concerning the need to eliminate it as a source of funding for the schools. No difference appeared between clergy and laity on this issue. On the question of whether all possible was being done to fund schools, no differences were revealed by sector or by religious status. The majority believed that more effort was required.
On the question of solutions to the crisis consensus was revealed concerning general approval or disapproval of most strategies. Where differences among sectors appeared, they were mostly differences in emphasis (See Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7 Approval of Strategies for Solving Financial Problems in Schools By Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Clergy &amp; Hierarchy</th>
<th>Diocesan Officers</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th>Lay Influentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Tax Credits</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvassing Wealthy Alumni</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization Of Parish Structure</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on Parishioners to Contribute More</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Current Fund-Raising Drives</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Tuition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training More Clergy/Nuns as Teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing Out Schools, Emphasis on CCD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building More Schools, Recruiting More Studen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 Disapproval of Strategies for Solving Financial Problems in Schools by Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Clergy &amp; Hierarchy</th>
<th>Diocesan Officers</th>
<th>School Principals</th>
<th>Lay Influentials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building More Schools, Recruiting More Students</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Clergy/Nuns as Teachers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing Tuition</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing Out Schools, More Emphasis on CCD</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Current Fund Raising Drives</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure on Parishioners to Contribute More</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reorganization of the Parish Structure</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvassing Wealthy Alumni</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Tax Credits</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuition tax credits were approved by all sectors, with 100% of clergy and hierarchy, 92% of diocesan officers, 80% of principals and 68% of lay influentials citing approval. This sectoral difference was significant. None of the clergy and hierarchy or diocesan officers disapproved of this strategy while 15% of principals and 21% of lay influentials disapproved. Clergy and laity were divided on this question with a greater percentage of clergy than of laity approving.

Approval was unanimous for the canvassing of wealthy alumni by sector, and by religious status.

Increasing tuition was a strategy on which all sectors showed similar internal divisions. Approximately one-third of all of the sectors approved, a third of all sectors disapproved, and a third of all sectors were neutral. No differences were revealed either by sector, or by religious status for this unpopular strategy.

Some differences in emphasis were exhibited among sectors on the question of expanding current fundraising drives. The majority of respondents in all categories approved of this strategy. More disapproval was evident for clergy and hierarchy (30%) and principals (25%) combined, than either diocesan officers (8%) or lay influentials (11%). No significant difference was revealed by religious status.

For building more schools and recruiting more students, the modal category for all sectors was disapproval. Only 5% of clergy and hierarchy approved, while 23% of diocesan officers, 30% of principals and 22% of lay influentials approved of this strategy.
Differences between clergy and hierarchy and each of the other sectors were significant. No difference was evident when comparing clergy and laity.

For restructuring the parishes so that wealthy parishes could support the poorer parishes strong approval was evident. Lay influentials were the least enthusiastic supporters of this strategy, with 22% of this sector compared with much fewer clergy, diocesan officers and principals disapproving. No difference was revealed when comparing clergy and laity.

Consolidation of existing schools into larger units was approved of by a majority in all sectors. Clergy and hierarchy (100%) and diocesan officers (90%) unanimously approved of this strategy. Only 60% of principals and 74% of lay influentials approved. The difference between these pairs of sectors was significant. No difference was evident between clergy and laity.

Differences among the sectors appeared on the question of whether more clergy and nuns should be trained as teachers. A majority of clergy and hierarchy (60%) were neutral, 25% approved of this strategy, and 15% disapproved. By contrast, 55% of lay influentials approved. The difference between these sectors was significant. A difference was also revealed when comparing clergy and laity. The majority of the clergy were neutral, while almost half (48%) of the laity approved of this strategy. Putting pressure on parishioners to raise their present contributions to the church was approved of by all.
Strong consensus was revealed on the question of phasing out Catholic schools and placing more emphasis on building more effective religious instruction classes. Most respondents disapproved of this strategy. Clergy and hierarchy was something of a deviant sector in that 35% did not disapprove of this strategy. Religious status revealed no significant difference.

The significant differences exhibited on this issue were: (1) more clergy and hierarchy than either lay influentials or school principals approved of tuition tax credits, and this difference was significant by status also, (2) more clergy and hierarchy, and principals than diocesan officers and lay influentials disapproved of expanding current fundraising drives, (3) clergy and hierarchy were not as approving of school building as other sectors, (4) more lay influentials than any other sector disapproved of parish restructuring, (5) clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers were more approving of consolidation than were principals and lay influentials, (6) more lay influentials than clergy and hierarchy approved of training more clergy and nuns as teachers, and (7) disapproval for the phasing out of the Catholic schools was not as unanimous among clergy and hierarchy as among the other three sectors.

In summary, this chapter examined the differences among four sectors of the organizational complex of the Catholic community on issues related to the funding and governance of Catholic schools. The final chapter will summarize these findings, and assess their practical and theoretical implications.
CHAPTER 6  SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the research findings and discusses their significance and implications. The chapter will:

(1) compare sectors, indicating their points of convergence and cleavage in relation to the expected findings,
(2) outline the theoretical and practical implications of the results and,
(3) conclude with a discussion of how these findings relate to prior research in the field.

Comparing Sectors

(1) Clergy and Hierarchy: Clergy and hierarchy agreed with other sectors on the advantages and disadvantages of the schools, and on the reason why Catholics send their children to public schools. The main advantages were faith development, academic excellence and discipline; the main disadvantages were that Catholic schools have fewer resources than public schools, and the lack of access/availability; the main reason why so many Catholics send their children to public schools was finances. Clergy and
hierarchy, more than other sectors, reported that schools were not important to the church's mission, and did not support building of new schools.

In agreement with most sectors, clergy and hierarchy reported that the Columbus diocese has had to deal with fewer problems than other dioceses. Agreement with others was also evident in identifying church changes that have affected schools. The identified changes were the exodus of the religious, increasing emphasis on social justice, and diminishing authoritarianism. Like most others, their estimate of the number of school closures in the diocese since 1970 was low. Enrollment and financing were cited as the reasons why so many schools had closed.

Finances was identified as the most pressing problem in the school system, and was considered a very serious problem. Parents with children in Catholic school were identified as those who bear the heaviest financial burden. This sector was deviant in its failure to identify leadership conflicts as a pressing problem.

All Catholics were identified as having responsibility for the crisis; the parish and parents with children in the schools were identified as those who contribute most to the upkeep of schools, and wealthy Catholics were identified as those who should contribute more. Responsibility for financial problems and for their alleviation was perceived to lie with the whole community.

Strong disagreement with Greeley's analysis was apparent, as was a strong tendency to see Greeley as biased against the hierarchy.
Support was evident for increasing teacher salaries, but uncertainty about the adequacy of the Teachers' Association for its members.

On the question of solutions to the financial problems, the consensus was that bingo should be abolished, and that everything possible was not being done to fund the schools. Of the suggested strategies for solving the financial problems, approval was evident for tuition tax credits, canvassing wealthy alumni, restructuring parishes so that wealthy parishes would subsidize poorer parishes, consolidation of schools, and exerting pressure on parishioners to increase contributions. Disapproval was evident for increasing tuition, expanding fundraising drives, training more clergy and nuns as teachers, phasing out Catholic schools in favor of religious instruction classes and building new schools. With respect to these last two strategies clergy and hierarchy were, to some extent, deviant. A few approved of phasing out Catholic schools and placing more emphasis on building effective CCD classes, and, while all sectors disapproved of new school building, clergy and hierarchy showed the strongest disapproval for this strategy.

(2) Diocesan Officers: Diocesan Officers agreed with other sectors on the advantages and disadvantages of Catholic education, and the reason why so many Catholics send their children to public schools. They deviated somewhat from clergy and hierarchy in that: (1) their emphasis on faith development as an advantage was not as strong, (2) they revealed greater endorsement than clergy and hierarchy for the importance of the schools to the church's mission
and, (3) they more strenuously supported building of new schools, with their support for school building in the Northwest area particularly strong.

They agreed with most sectors that the Columbus diocese has had fewer problems than other dioceses. Important church changes identified were similar to those identified by clergy and hierarchy. Knowledge about school closures was greater in this sector than in any other, and the reasons for school closure were, as with other sectors, enrollment and financing.

This sector identified finances as the most pressing problem in the school system and leadership conflicts as a second problem. On both of these questions their perceptions differed somewhat from those of the clergy and hierarchy. They did not place as much emphasis on finances and they more strongly emphasised leadership conflicts. Financing was perceived as a very serious problem that is related to the wealth of the parish, and parishioners who do not have children in the schools were perceived as bearing the heaviest financial burden.

Responsibility for the financial crisis was assigned to parents and parishioners, and, at the same time, parents and parishioners were reported as the greatest contributers to the upkeep of the schools. All Catholics should contribute more, according to diocesan officers.

Most diocesan officers agreed with Greeley, though notably, they had the second highest rate of disagreement after clergy and
hierarchy. Unlike clergy and hierarchy, they indicated that Greeley was drawing attention to the seriousness of the financial problems, rather than merely exhibiting his biases.

The diocesan officers supported salary increases for teachers, and agreed that the Teachers' Association adequately serves their needs. They supported the abolition of bingo and the idea that not all was being done that could be done to fund the schools.

Of the suggested strategies, support was exhibited for tuition tax credits, for canvassing wealthy alumni, for consolidation of schools, for putting pressure on parishioners to increase their contributions, and for restructuring parishes so that wealthy parishes support poorer ones. This was in accord with choices made by clergy and hierarchy, but diocesan officers supported expansion of current fundraising drives while clergy and hierarchy did not.

They did not support increasing tuition, training more clergy and nuns as teachers, school building and phasing out Catholic schools. In these latter solutions they differed from the clergy and hierarchy in that they were more supportive of new school building, and none approved of phasing out the schools.

(3) School Principals: School Principals agreed with other sectors on the advantages and disadvantages of Catholic education. They deviated on the question of why so many people send their children to public schools in citing that superior public school facilities was as important a factor as finances. They agreed that schools were important to the church's mission. They were not as
disapproving of school building as clergy and hierarchy, yet not as approving as lay influentials, but they supported school building in the Northwest.

They were deviant in identifying Columbus as a typical diocese. On the question of recent important church changes they agreed with other sectors in identifying the change from religious to lay faculty as the most important. Their knowledge of school closures was not accurate, and the causes of school closures were, as for other sectors, enrollment and finances.

On the question of the most pressing problem, principals, along with clergy and hierarchy, strongly emphasized finances. The strongest support for leadership conflicts as a pressing problem was from principals. Financial problems were viewed as serious, finances were perceived as being related to the wealth of the parish, and parents with children in the schools were thought to bear the heaviest financial burden.

Parents and parishioners were seen as responsible for the decline in Catholic education, and "all Catholics" contribute most to the upkeep of the schools. Business people were identified as a group that could contribute more.

The principals revealed strong agreement with Greeley, and their disagreement, like that of lay influentials, was minimal. Most reported that Greeley was drawing attention to the issue, due to his interest in the maintenance of the schools.
Principals agreed with other sectors that teacher salaries should be increased, and that the Teachers' Association adequately serves the teachers' needs.

On the question of solutions to the financial problems, principals agreed that bingo should, if possible, be phased out, and additionally that all possible efforts to fund schools were not being made. On the question of approval of the strategies for solving financial problems, principals differed to some extent from clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers. Like these sectors they supported tuition tax credits, consolidation of schools, and expansion of current fund-raising drives, but in the case of all of these strategies, they revealed significantly more disapproval. For restructuring of parishes and putting pressure on parishioners to contribute more, their support was equal to that of both other sectors.

They did not support increasing tuition, training more clergy and nuns as teachers, phasing out the schools, and new school building. In the case of these last two strategies, however, the principals differed from clergy and hierarchy; they revealed more support than clergy and hierarchy for new school building, and they revealed less support for phasing out schools.

(4) Lay Influentials: Lay influential agreed with other sectors on the advantages and disadvantages of Catholic education, and agreed also on the reason why so many Catholics send their children
to public school. They endorsed the importance of Catholic schools and the building of new schools, and in both instances differed from clergy and hierarchy.

They reported that Columbus has had fewer problems than other dioceses. Church changes cited were the change from lay to religious faculty and diminishing authoritarianism. They differed from other sectors in that they did not report the social justice emphasis of the church as an important recent change. Their knowledge of school closures was not extensive, and finances and enrollment were cited as the causes of school closures.

Finances were identified as the most important problem in the school system, but leadership conflicts were identified as a second major problem. Lay influentials emphasized this more than other sectors. They agreed that funding of the schools is related to wealth of the parish, and suggested that teachers bear the greatest financial burden.

They assigned responsibility for the decline in Catholic education to church leadership, and in this they differed from clergy and hierarchy. Parents with children in the schools were identified as the greatest contributors, and all Catholics were perceived as having an obligation to contribute more.

Lay influentials were the strongest supporters of Greeley's analysis, and they differed from clergy and hierarchy on this issue. They revealed the least disagreement with Greeley, and in this they
were similar to principals but different from diocesan officers. They suggested that Greeley offered this explanation for the decline of Catholic education because he was correct.

Lay influentials supported the idea of increasing teacher salaries, and they perceived the Teachers' Association as beneficial for teachers. In line with other sectors, they supported the idea of phasing out bingo, and they agreed that all possible was not being done to fund the schools.

On the question of strategies for the solution of the financial problems, they differed to some extent from other sectors. They revealed support for canvassing wealthy alumni, and for putting pressure on parishioners to contribute more. Support was also evident for tax credits, though they exhibited, along with principals, stronger disapproval than other sectors for this solution. Support was also revealed for expanding current fundraising drives, and with diocesan officers, they showed more support for this than either clergy and hierarchy or principals. While supporting the restructuring of parishes, so that wealthy ones support the poor, they revealed more disapproval than all other sectors. They deviated also in supporting training of more clergy and nuns as teachers.

They were not in favor of increasing tuition, of building more schools, and of phasing out the schools. On the last two strategies, they were more approving than clergy and hierarchy of
new school building, and more united than clergy and hierarchy in their rejection of phasing out the schools as a solution to financial problems.

**Comparing Clergy and Laity**

The comparison of clergy and laity revealed the following differences: (1) clergy placed stronger emphasis than laity on finances as a pressing problem, (2) laity more strongly endorsed the importance of schools to the church's mission, (3) new school building was supported by laity but not by clergy, (4) leadership conflicts were cited as a problem by laity but not by clergy, (5) laity blamed clergy for the decline in Catholic education, while clergy blamed parents with children in public schools and parishioners, (6) clergy mostly disagreed with Greeley while laity mostly agreed, (7) more clergy than laity approved of tuition tax credits, and (8) more laity than clergy supported training more clergy and nuns as teachers.

This summary indicates the points of cleavage and convergence exhibited by the important actors in the organizational complex of the Catholic community in Columbus. Among sectors, differences were mostly as anticipated. The largest difference appeared between clergy and hierarchy and lay influentials. Differences between clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers were not great, but there were, nonetheless, differences on some key issues. The expected affinity between principals and lay influentials was evident. Finally, as expected, clergy and hierarchy and diocesan officers
were more alike than principals and lay influentials combined. The most surprising finding was that the consensus between diocesan officers and clergy and hierarchy was somewhat weaker than expected, with clergy and hierarchy appearing as a deviant sector on several questions and many issues.

Significance of the Findings

This study highlighted the points of cleavage and convergence among sectors of the organizational complex of the Catholic community, and the data provided evidence of divisions on several questions. In discussing the significance of these findings I stress that the numbers representing disagreements were sometimes quite small. The data revealed:

1. weaker support for schools by clergy and hierarchy than by all other sectors,
2. stronger support for schools by laity than by clergy,
3. that church leaders were mostly perceived by the laity as being responsible for the decline of the schools,
4. that leadership conflicts were less salient for clergy and hierarchy than for other sectors,
5. general consensus about the seriousness of financial problems in the schools and,
6. general consensus on all of the strategies suggested as solutions to the financial problems, though there was unanimous agreement on only three of them.
Considerable agreement concerning the gravity of the financial situation was evident. Support for many strategies for solving the financial crisis was strong, though some disagreement concerning solutions was also revealed. Clergy and hierarchy were not as convinced as other activists of the importance of schools, and were reluctant to endorse any new school building. Additionally, the dominant perception of other activists was that church leaders were unsupportive of schools. One respondent suggested that "Pastors need to worry more about saving souls, and less about finances." This lack of support for schools was typically viewed as a function of position in the organizational complex. For example, one respondent suggested that, "Bishops don't see their responsibility to the schools and to the children. They are preoccupied with other things and just don't see the need. As a parent the need is obvious." Another indicated that, "The hierarchy is getting rid of the schools not intentionally, but because they are overburdened with other problems." Others hinted that certain pastors were working to close the schools. One respondent said that, "There are a number of pastors with narrow views about education and an inflated sense of their own importance." These pastors were generally identified as "powerhouses," and were considered unsupportive of schools.

Although this research found weak support by church leaders for schools, the leadership conflicts identified differed somewhat from those referred to in Greeley et. al's research. On the basis of the 1976 research findings, Greeley located responsibility for
leadership with church officials. Some respondents questioned this
definition, suggesting that the concept of "church" which it implied
was narrow and outdated. According to these respondents the laity
needs to actively assume more responsibility. In the Columbus
diocese, leadership conflicts between church leaders and important
lay groups in the community were more apparent than were conflicts
among church leaders. This is not to imply that conflict among
church leaders was non-existent. It was apparent that some of the
clergy and hierarchy were more supportive of schools than others.
Additionally, church leaders were not perceived as a uniform group,
with several respondents suggesting that some of the clergy were
very supportive of schools while others were not. Nonetheless the
conflict between clergy and hierarchy and other sectors was
obviously of a far more serious nature. Evidence of this conflict
was abundant.

One informant suggested, "Priests resist the sense that they will
lose power they have been taught to feel is their due. The haggling
in the Teachers' Association over money is a power struggle." This
struggle has already had serious consequences. One school principal
pointed out that, "There has been a widening gulf between the
teachers and the clergy, and the principals and the clergy. We have
suffered the loss of some good teachers due to the negotiations."
The gulf has been experienced by other groups also. As one
volunteer reported, "Volunteers are spending hours and hours making
recommendations only to be ignored as if we didn't exist, with the
decisions being made by the hierarchy. Then they wonder why people
won't run for parish organizations." Another confided that, "I have been so disgusted with the clergy over the negotiations that I feel like resigning my position."

This power struggle, in turn, appeared to be preventing execution of solutions to the financial difficulties. In response to the question of how often funding was discussed in his parish one informant replied, "We never discuss it - we just fight about it." Another respondent revealed that, "Centralization (of funding) is a good solution, but you'll never get the pastors to relinquish control." Similarly, another pointed out that, "The major problem we face is the pressing need for centralized administration. How will clergy give up the controls they've had? Some would like to but they can't (due to others not doing this)." Apparently, as one informant observed, there is "a need for dialogue between the clergy and the laity."

The findings generally supported the contention that the crisis in the schools does not derive simply from a shortage of "dollars and cents," but is, rather, a symptom of a deeper organizational crisis. One respondent who has spent several years in the diocese indicated that, "Finances is not the major problem, but it is being made to seem like it." In her estimation the problem was a lack of vision, of purpose, in the Church. Another suggested that, "Funding is a symptom of the crisis." An informant who described herself as "radical" in relation to other volunteers, indicated that, "The trend may already be in the direction of lay control because the schools are becoming more centralized. Pastors are more short term,
there aren't as many priests to go round so they don't have the time to lead, and let me add, these are all positive trends." These observations suggested that growth in the school system would give more power and prestige not to the clergy, but rather to the laity. In my estimation, this is a very interesting explanation for the clergy's lack of enthusiastic support for the schools. Why should the clergy support a system which threatens their power and prestige? Of course, another interpretation of these observations is that the clergy, faced with more and more work to be accomplished by a dwindling number of pastors, simply do not have enough time to be more enthusiastic about the school system. There is possibly some value in both explanations.

Recommendations

Many people in the diocese have given generously of their time and thoughts in making this research possible. It is time now to consider what the findings revealed by way of suggestions to help those engaged in the organization and running of schools make their task more manageable. One pastor suggested that "To maintain the schools requires competent planning, and this has not been done." How might this task of planning be approached?

The theoretical framework which guided this research indicated that,

"...in order to understand the relationship between economic quantities in terms of which the problem is defined, one must understand the underlying generative relationships between social
groupings, and that these themselves will present further "problems" of a kind which are not open to merely technical resolution in the light of economic science" (Hirsch and Goldthorpe 1978)

Additionally, Hirsch and Goldthorpe indicated that inflation was "...not just a technical economic problem, to be resolved by technical expertise, but is, rather, itself a solution of sorts to more fundamental problems of a sociopolitical character." The present study supported this theory because, although finances was generally acknowledged as a pressing problem, leadership conflicts were acknowledged as a problem by all except the official leaders. It was apparent that, for respondents concerned about leadership conflicts, financial problems were less the result of lack of money than lack of unity and vision in the church. This was put succinctly by the respondent who said that, "money follows mission."

To date, a number of strategies for solving problems of school financing have been adopted throughout the Columbus diocese at both parish and diocesan levels. At the diocesan level, the Catholic Foundation of the Diocese of Columbus has been set up recently with the aim of encouraging donations and endowments to the Church. It is expected that some of the funds generated by the Foundation will benefit schools. The Pastoral Planning Project was a novel attempt to involve the laity in setting priorities for diocesan policy for a five year span. This project involved an extensive "needs assessment" study of the entire diocese and indications were that
educational financing was one priority. The project identified the need for (1) organization and long term planning and (2) a central agency for management and funding of schools. It was stressed that these priorities did not imply that the parish schools become diocesan schools, but rather, that the management and funding of local schools be overseen by a central agency.

The bishop has also set up a committee to investigate alternative projects for school financing. This committee is composed of representatives from the school-related diocesan offices and from the diocesan boards, organizations, and associations. However, in the words of one representative, "not all representatives have the same power." The committee is dominated by the present financial policy makers.

Aside from the perceptions of influential activists the strongest evidence in the present study for lack of support for schools was failure to build new schools; there have been no new school built in Columbus in twenty years. However, since the completion of these interviews the decision has been made to open a school in the populous Northwest of Columbus. On the parish level, and the level of the individual high school, the diocese has been encouraging the adoption of "novel" ways of raising funds. Particularly at the high school level this has come to mean the employment of development officers, or at least a development orientation.

Several respondents reported dissatisfaction with the current fiscal policy of the diocese. The foundation was considered as a "stopgap" by several respondents. Two respondents indicated that
this was a means of increasing the Bishop's power, rather than an effective way of resolving the schools' financial problems. One respondent had reservations concerning the significance of lay voice in the School Financing Committee. Many respondents suggested the adoption of what they believed were more appropriate solutions. The main suggestions were:

1. the introduction of sliding-scale tuition,
2. centralization of planning and funding,
3. stewardship, with strong appeals at both diocesan and parish levels for increased contributions,
4. increasing diocesan taxes,
5. a less conservative diocesan investment policy and,
6. more "selling" or "marketing" of the schools, on a diocesan scale, but with special emphasis by the pastors.

I am not in a position to evaluate the "technical economic solutions" that are already in operation nor, indeed, to evaluate the merits of solutions respondents believed should be adopted. My task was to examine perceptions of financial problems by sectors of the organizational complex. I would certainly recommend that the feasibility of these suggestions be examined, because it was reported that some of these techniques are already being successfully employed by other dioceses.

On the question of governance issues, one interesting suggestion was the need for more lay involvement in the form of boards and other entities that operate in a "middle-management" capacity. This, of course, is as much a problem as a potential solution, as
the conflict concerning the role of school board representatives illustrates. If financial problems in the school system are, as Hirsch and Goldthorpe's theory suggests, due to problems of a sociopolitical character, then it is imperative that leadership conflicts be acknowledged by those in power, and that the dialogue between traditional and emergent power groups be continued. It appears that the maintenance of the Catholic school system depends on resolving these leadership conflicts.

Research, as well as providing answers, inevitably generates further questions. Important questions generated by this research were: (1) How do teachers perceive their role in the Catholic school system? What are the differences between teachers who leave the Catholic system, and those who remain in it? (2) How do Catholic parents who send their children to public school perceive Catholic schools. Are there conditions under which enrollment in Catholic schools would increase? (3) How feasible would the centralization of planning and funding be in the Columbus diocese? How might the feasibility of this, and some other suggested solutions, be determined? Investigation of these important issues would, I think, be of benefit to the Catholic community.

Conclusion

Discussion of the practical and theoretical implications of the results would not be complete without reference to the opening theme of this study: the sociological literature comparing private and public schools. The literature generated by CHK's report criticized
Coleman's policy recommendations for a number of reasons: (1) the methodological shortcomings of the study did not warrant the conclusion that introduction of tuition tax credits would promote equal educational opportunity, (2) it appeared likely that tuition tax credits would benefit only already privileged groups and, (3) even if they did benefit lower income groups, tuition tax credits would ultimately serve only to blur the distinction between private and public schools. The present study raises an additional question about the viability of this policy recommendation. How viable and useful would tuition tax credit legislation be from the viewpoint of the organizations that operate nonpublic school systems?

If the Hirsch and Goldthorpe interpretation is appropriate, it seems likely that the introduction of tuition tax credits, or any similar policy, would be of limited value to these organizations. Certainly, a tuition tax credit policy would, to some extent, mitigate financial difficulties in the Catholic school system, particularly if, as anticipated, their introduction encouraged corporate contributions. As one respondent who strongly supports tuition tax credits indicated, "If tuition tax credit legislation were adopted it would stimulate more private contributions to Catholic education. It would be a tax motivation to business and high earners to contribute more." It is unlikely that this policy would be strongly opposed, insofar as respondents in this study generally approved of the policy. However, even if the introduction
of tuition tax credits served to ease financial problems, and was not strongly opposed by the members, it would nonetheless treat only the symptoms of the problems identified in this research. It would leave untouched the root problems facing these schools; the problems of leadership conflicts, and uncertainty about the importance of maintaining a separate school system.
APPENDIX A

Basic Interview Schedule
1. How long have you been in this position?

2. Could you describe what your job entails?

3. Are you involved in any other Catholic groups or activities?
   ______ NO ______ YES Which ones?

4. In your view, what is the most important advantage of a Catholic school education?
   What would be the next most important advantage?
   Are there any others?

5. What would be the most important disadvantage?
   What is next?
   Are there any others?

6. What do you think is the main reason why so many Catholics send their children to public school rather than Catholic school? Any other reasons?

7. The Catholic Church has undergone many changes over the past two or three decades, and some of these changes have obviously affected the school system. What, in your view, is the most significant change that has occurred in the Catholic school system in the last thirty years? Any other important changes.

8. Now let’s turn to the Columbus Catholic schools. In terms of the problems that have faced the Catholic school system in the last twenty or thirty years how do the Columbus Catholic schools compare with other cities? (For example have there been problems in Columbus that other cities have not had to deal with, or have you had problems in other cities that Columbus has not had to deal with. Explain.)

9. What do you think is the most pressing problem in the parochial school system in Columbus at this time?
   Any other problems you think are important?
   Any others?

10. Is the funding of the schools a serious problem at the present time?
    ______ NO ______ YES
    How serious a problem is it? Very serious? Not so serious?
    Why?

11. Would you say that funding is a general problem, or is it limited to say elementary schools, or high schools, or universities?
12. Is funding a matter of how wealthy a particular parish or high school district is?

______ NO  ______ YES  Explain.

13. For whom is the problem of funding greatest? The teachers? The clergy? The parents with children in elementary school? In high school? The parents with no children in the schools? Any other groups?

14. In your organization/group is the issue of funding the schools ever discussed?

______ NO  ______ YES

How often? Frequently? Seldom? Rarely?

15. Has your organization done anything to address the problem of funding the schools say in the past year? In the past five years?

______ NO  ______ YES  What?

16. Andrew Greeley is one of the most well known social researchers on Catholic education in the United States. He says that the laity is willing to make all sorts of sacrifices for the Catholic education of their children, but that the clergy and the hierarchy are not providing the leadership. Do you agree?

______ YES  Then with whom would you say the responsibility for this kind of leadership lies?

Bishops? Priests? Parents? Teachers? Any other groups?

______ NO  Then what do you think would be a better explanation than Greeley's for what is being called the crisis in Catholic education?

17. Why do you think an eminent scholar like Greeley would say that the hierarchy is not doing all it can to maintain the Catholic school system? What do you suppose he is driving at?

18. Catholic school teachers are not paid as much as public school teachers. do you think their salaries should be similar to those of the public school teachers?

____ YES  ______ NO  Explain.
19. Do you think the Columbus Diocesan Education Association adequately serves the teachers needs?

   _____ YES   _____ NO   Explain.

20. It is said that the present Bishop is attempting to phase out bingo as a way of supporting the schools. Do you think this is a good or a bad idea? Why?

21. Do you think all is being done that can be done to fund the schools?

   _____ YES   _____ NO

   What are your ideas for how funding the schools could be improved?
22. Below are a number of strategies for solving the financial problems in the Catholic school system. Place a circle around the number which comes closest to your opinion of each suggested strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY APPROVE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAPPROVE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAPPROVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. More government funds in the form of tuition tax credits.

B. Canvassing wealthy alumni, Catholic business people, and so on.

C. Increasing tuition.

D. Greater efforts to expand current fundraising drives.

E. Building more schools, recruiting more students and thereby increasing the revenue from tuition.

F. Reorganizing the parish administration structure so that the wealthier parishes subsidize the poorer parishes?

G. Consolidation of smaller schools into larger units for example having more inter-parochial elementary schools.

H. Training more clergy and nuns as teachers

I. Putting pressure on parishioners to raise their present contributions to the Church.

J. Phasing out the Catholic schools altogether and putting more emphasis on building more effective CCD classes.
Now, you said you strongly support —- of these strategies. How would you rank these in order of importance.

Would you like to make any comments about any of the solutions you disapprove of?

23. Would you say that the Catholic schools are still important to the Church's mission?

_____ YES  _____ NO  Explain?

24. The Catholic population of the Columbus area has shifted in the last 20 years yet no new schools are being built. Should there be more schools built?

_____ NO  Why not?

_____ YES  Who should be responsible for this?

25. A number of schools in the Columbus diocese have closed in recent years. Do you have any idea how many elementary schools have closed since 1970?

_____ Guess 17 closed, some of these consolidated.

How many High schools have closed since 1970?

_____ Guess 4 closed.

What about the schools that have closed in the last five years? Do you know which schools these were? Are you familiar with the circumstances surrounding this school closure?

26. Why are so many schools in the Columbus diocese being closed down?

27. All Catholics are in one sense responsible for the decline of Catholic education but some people or groups should take more responsibility than others. Who would be the main groups in Columbus that bear responsibility for the decline?

28. At the present time who would you say contributes most to the upkeep of the schools?
29. Some people can obviously afford to give more money to Catholic education than others. Now thinking about the Columbus area tell me what group should be expected to give more than they are giving? Parents, Teachers, Priests, School board, Catholic businesspeople, Professional leaders.

30. Can you think of the names of any other people in Columbus, or in this parish that have been important in dealing with the issue of school financing?

Additional Questions (12 Respondents)

____________________________ SCHOOLNAME

Why was the school closed?

Who was mainly responsible for this closure?

Do you think anything could have been done to keep it open?

_____ NO _____ YES Who should have done more The bishop?

The Pastor? The parishioners? the teachers? the parents? Other?

What could they have done?

Who suffered most as a result of the closure?
APPENDIX B

Mail-out Questionnaire
Please circle the appropriate responses for questions 1 through 5

1. The high school you represent serves:
   a) rural parishes
   b) city center parishes
   c) suburban parishes
   d) a combination of the above (please explain)

2. The feeder parishes are predominantly:
   a) Upper Middle Class
   b) Middle Class
   c) Lower Middle Class
   d) Blue Collar
   e) Poor

3. Bingo is an important source of finance for the school:
   a) yes
   b) no

4. Your age is:
   20-29  30-39  40-49  50-59  60-69  70-79

5. You are:
   Male   Female

6. Your occupation or main activity (homemaker, retired etc.)

7. How long have you been a member of the Diocesan School Board?

8. Do you sit on any other DIOCESAN boards, commissions or committees?

   ____ NO  ____ YES If yes, which ones?
9. Are you involved in any PARISH boards, commissions or committees?

____ NO _____ YES If yes, which ones?

10. What, in your view, is the single most pressing problem in the Catholic school system in Columbus at the present time?

Are there any other problems that you think are important?

11. How much of a general problem is the funding of the Catholic schools at the present time in the Columbus diocese?

The problem is:

a) Critical
b) Very Serious
c) Somewhat serious
d) Not really serious
12. Below are a number of strategies that have been suggested as ways to solve the financial problems in the Catholic school system. Place a circle around the number that comes closest to your opinion of each suggested strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY APPROVE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>DISAPPROVE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAPPROVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRONGLY APPROVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>NEUTRAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>DISAPPROVE</strong></td>
<td><strong>STRONGLY DISAPPROVE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. More government funds in the form of tuition tax credits.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Canvassing wealthy alumni, Catholic business people, and so on.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Increasing tuition.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Greater efforts to expand current fundraising drives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Building more schools, recruiting more students, and thereby increasing the tuition revenue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Reorganizing the parish administration structure so that the wealthier parishes subsidize the poorer parishes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Consolidating smaller schools into larger units; for example, having more inter-parochial elementary schools.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Training more clergy and nuns as teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Putting pressure on parishioners to raise their present contributions to the Church.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Phasing out the Catholic schools and putting more emphasis on building more effective CCD classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Now, examine your responses to QUESTION 12. Go over all the responses you rated as **STRONGLY APPROVE** (1), and rank these in order of importance.

First in importance, #

Second in importance, #

Third in importance, #

Fourth in importance, #

Fifth in importance, #

14. Please comment on any of the solutions in Question 12 that you **STRONGLY DISAPPROVE** (5) of. Indicate the letter first, and then your comments.

15. List the names of the five **MOST INFLUENTIAL** Catholics in the Columbus diocese. (These can be either clergy or laity).

16. List the names of five people in the diocese who, in your view, are the **MOST DEDICATED** to maintaining the Catholic schools.

17. Many say that 1986 was a particularly turbulent year for those involved in Catholic education in the Columbus diocese. What, in your view, was the **MOST SERIOUS** of the turbulent events that occurred in the past year?

18. Fr. Andrew Greeley is one of the most well known social researchers on Catholic education in the United States. He says that the laity is willing to make all sorts of sacrifices for the Catholic education of their children, but that the clergy and the hierarchy are not providing sufficient leadership. Do you agree or disagree with Greeley's diagnosis? Circle the most appropriate response.

   a) Strongly Agree
   b) Agree
   c) Unsure
   d) Disagree
   e) Strongly Disagree

Please explain your choice.
19. It is not necessary to supply this information, but it would be helpful.

Your home parish is:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

************************************
APPENDIX C

Letter of Introduction
Personal Interviews
Dear ____________

I am a Ph. D candidate in the Sociology Department at the Ohio State University. I am conducting research on the financing of the nonpublic schools in the United States as part of my doctoral program. The research includes a case study of the Catholic community in the Columbus diocese. I will be interviewing at least sixty members of this community over the next few months. Respondents for these interviews have been chosen on the basis of their involvement in the Catholic community and/or school system. The names of interviewees were obtained from a pilot study of the Catholic community which I conducted earlier this year.

Interview material will be treated in the strictest confidence. In reporting the results of my research your anonymity is assured. If you have any questions regarding the research project, feel free to contact my advisor and/or the Department chairperson at any time. I will be happy to send you a summary of the research results when the project is complete, if you wish. Your co-operation is much appreciated.

Yours Sincerely

Mary E. Mulcahy  # 294-8224

Professor William Form
Dissertation Advisor  # 292-2110

Dr. Saad Nagi
Department Chairperson  # 292-8432
APPENDIX D

Letter of Introduction
Mail-out Survey
Dear School Board Member,

I am a Ph. D candidate in the Sociology Department at the Ohio State University. I am conducting research on the financing of the nonpublic schools in the United States as part of my doctoral program. The research includes a case study of the Catholic community in the Columbus diocese. I have already conducted personal interviews with more than seventy members of the Catholic community in Columbus. I interviewed members of the clergy and hierarchy, administrators, and lay volunteers.

The data from these interviews indicated that the diocesan school board plays an important role in the operation of the Columbus Catholic schools. Since I don't have the time and resources to conduct personal interviews with all of you school board members, yet feel it is important to include in my research your views on certain key issues, I have condensed the interview into a short questionnaire.

This questionnaire was distributed to the members who were present at the last school board meeting. I obtained the addresses of those members who were not in attendance at this meeting from the School Office.

I hope you can take time out of your busy schedule to answer these questions and return the questionnaire to me as soon as possible. Your responses to this questionnaire will be treated in strict confidence, and all respondents will remain anonymous. I am hoping to complete my study in June, and I will be making a copy of the dissertation available to the diocese.

If you have any questions regarding the project feel free to contact my advisor.

Your cooperation is sincerely appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you.

Mary E. Mulcahy # 294-8224

Professor William Form
Dissertation Advisor # 292-2110
APPENDIX E

Follow-up Request
Mail-out Survey
Dear School Board Member,

This letter is being sent to all school board members. In March, I distributed questionnaires, either at the School Board meetings, or through the mail, which I asked you to complete and return to me at your convenience. Less than half of the school board members have responded so far. If you have already completed and returned your questionnaire, then I thank you for your co-operation. However, if you have not yet completed and returned the questionnaire I am appealing to you to do so as soon as you possibly can. I am hoping to complete my study in June of this year, and the sooner I receive all of the completed questionnaires, the easier it will be for me to make this deadline.

As I already indicated in the letter of introduction that precedes the questionnaire, I am a PhD candidate in the Sociology Department at the Ohio State University. I am conducting research on the financing of the nonpublic schools in the United States as part of a doctoral program. The research involves a case study of the Catholic community in the Columbus diocese. I have already completed personal interviews with more than seventy members of the Catholic community in Columbus. I interviewed members of the clergy and hierarchy, administrators, and lay volunteers. The inclusion of your views on some of the key issues facing the diocese at the present time is of the utmost importance to the completion of my work.

I hope you can take time out of your schedule to return the questionnaire to me as soon as possible. Your responses will be treated in the strictest confidence, and all respondents will remain anonymous. The completed dissertation will be available to the diocese.

If you have any questions about the project, feel free to contact my advisor. Your co-operation is sincerely appreciated. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely

Mary E. Mulcahy  # 294-8224

Professor Wm. Form  # 292-2110
APPENDIX F

Second Follow-up Request
Mail-out Survey
April 1987

Dear School Board Member,

This letter is being sent to all school board members. Earlier this month I wrote you requesting that you return and complete the questionnaire I distributed to school board members earlier in the year. However, I received a very poor response to this second request. If you have already responded, I thank you. However, if you have not yet responded, I am appealing to you to do so, as the completion date for my dissertation is approaching.

In case you have misplaced the questionnaire, I am enclosing a stamped addressed post-card which you can return requesting another copy. I appreciate your co-operation. I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely

Mary E. Mulcahy  # 294-8224
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