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There are 219 Catholic colleges and universities in the United States, 28 of whom are schools operated by the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). For over 400 hundred years, the Jesuits had been training their men for the priesthood following the same prescribed manner. The subjects entered the Jesuit novitiate as that process began to undergo a revolution and, as a result, a new formation process was being forged. At the same time, the Roman Catholic Church was undergoing its own changes with the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council.

Against this tumultuous backdrop, the subjects of this study began their Jesuit formation process. Their studies ended when a new Jesuit formation process was being quickly carried out and when the changes affecting the Catholic Church for the Second Vatican Council were just coming to fruition and influencing the clergy and lay members of the Church.

In light of the information that was gleaned, the direction of this multiple case study focuses on the Jesuit formation process the five subjects shared, their background and that of their families, and the review of the professional track that led them to the position of president at some of the finest institutions of higher education in the United States. These five men have been at the helm of a number of Catholic schools throughout the last three decades and have guided their institutions through the ever-changing waters of Catholic higher education in the post-Second Vatican Council era.

This research is an interpretive multiple case study guided by open-ended interviews, observation, and document analysis. The information gathered from this study clearly shows that the subjects' experiences in the Jesuit formation process have influenced their leadership style as presidents. All of these men were called to be leaders in education; four of the five were also called to the Jesuit priesthood. As a result, they have become personally richer and have positively touched the lives of thousands of men and women across the country.
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Chapter One

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative dissertation was to address issues of presidential leadership at Catholic schools of higher education. The focus was narrowed to five participants who were or are now presidents at Catholic colleges, universities, and seminaries. As the topic was further studied, by way of informal discussions, it was learned that these five men were from the New York and Maryland Provinces of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). Furthermore, it was discovered, through the biographical inventory that each participant completed, that these men shared a common experience through a major portion of their Jesuit formation process: they all studied a portion of their philosophy together at Shrub Oak Seminary in Peekskill, New York, and a portion of their theology at Woodstock College in Woodstock, Maryland (interviews with Matt Quinn and Ed Glynn, 1999).

For 400 years, the Jesuits had been training their men for the priesthood following the same prescribed manner. However, these five subjects entered the Jesuit novitiate as that process was beginning to undergo a revolution and, as a result, a new formation process was being forged. At the same time, the Roman Catholic Church was undergoing its own dramatic changes with the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council. The changes stemming from the Second Vatican Council have had an immediate and continuing dramatic effect on the Catholic Church.

M.A. Fahey, a Church historian, highlighted the reason why the Second Vatican Council was called by Pope John XXIII (1979):
The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World (Guadium et spes) of Vatican II noted the undeniable fact of change in the world and in particular the contemporary rapidity of change. These changes were viewed as challenges to mankind and to the Church. The text spoke of profound and rapid changes in the whole world and identified them as social, psychological, moral, and religious.

(p. 101)

Speaking to the effects of the Second Vatican Council on the Church, Christopher Hollis, an author and former member of the British Parliament, (1967) stated:

The Council, said Pope Paul in his closing address on December 8th, 1965, has been one of the greatest events in the history of the Church. For four hundred years the Church had been an army on the defensive. Attacked first by positive Protestantism and afterwards by infidelity, the ecclesiastical authorities had thought, naturally enough, that their first task was to prevent the disruption of Christendom in Europe and to defend the faithful against attack. (p. 108)

Ford, Horrigan, Kavanaugh, Merton, and Stuhmueller, Catholic Church historians and theologians, (1966) highlighted the changes in the Church stemming from the Second Vatican Council in the following manner:

Despite the occasional disappointments and uncertainties that marked the progress of the Council the past four years, it is now established as one of the truly decisive events in the history of the Church. It has profoundly influenced every aspect of the Church's life and work and without doubt will continue to do so for generations to come. (p. 75)
Directly relating the changes in the Church to the Society of Jesus, Joseph M. Becker, SJ, former Director of the Jesuit Center for Religious Studies at Xavier University, (1997) described the changes in the Jesuit formation process as:

…following the Second Vatican Council, the Jesuit order (the Society of Jesus) underwent a significant internal transformation, probably greater than any event it had experienced in its previous four-hundred-year history. There had been abundant instances of great external changes, as when the order was suppressed in 1773 by Pope Clement XIV. … In all probability, however, it had never before experienced so great an internal, self-chosen transformation. (p. 9)

It was against this tumultuous backdrop that the individuals of this study began the Jesuit formation process under one Jesuit system and in a pre-Second Vatican Council Catholic Church. They ended their studies when a new Jesuit formation process was being quickly carried out and when the changes affecting the Catholic Church from the Second Vatican Council were just coming to fruition and influencing the clergy and lay members of the Church. It was a turbulent time in which these men studied for the priesthood and ended their formation process.

In light of the information that was gleaned, the direction of this study focused on the Jesuit formation process the five subjects shared, their backgrounds and that of their families, and the review of the professional track that led them to the position of president at some of the finest institutions of higher education in the United States. These five men have been at the helm of a number of Catholic colleges, universities, and seminaries throughout the last two decades since the end of their formation process and have guided
these schools through the ever changing waters of Catholic higher education in the post-
Second Vatican Council era.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this dissertation was to address issues of presidential leadership at Catholic schools of higher education. Creswell (1994) defined the grand tour research question as “...a statement of the question being examined in the study in its most general form. This question, consistent with the emerging methodology of qualitative designs, is posed as a general issue so as to not limit the inquiry” (p. 70). For the purpose of this study the following grand tour research question and sub-questions will be examined.

**Grand Tour Question**

Have their particular experiences in the Jesuit formation process influenced the leadership style of these men in their ministry as presidents?

**Sub-Questions**

1. At each distinctive phase of the formation process, how would they describe the academic and general lifestyle of the formation process, and what was it about those two areas that have influenced their leadership as presidents?

2. What particular talents do they believe they bring to the position of president, and how do these talents relate to their formation as Jesuit priests?

3. Were they groomed or mentored during their formation process for their eventual leadership roles as presidents? If so, how?
Definitions of Terms

Terms that are imbedded within higher education generally, Catholic higher education and Jesuit higher education more specifically, and terms that come from the Society of Jesus were used throughout this dissertation. Consequently, definitions for the specified terms are as follows:

Diocesan. Having to do with the territorial jurisdiction of a bishop.

Ecclesial. Relating to the Church.

Ex Corde Ecclesiae. "From the Heart of the Church," a 1990 apostolic constitution on Catholic higher education (O'Brien, 1994).

Jesuit American Education System. The system of schools operated by the Society of Jesus that includes 46 secondary schools and 28 schools of higher education (Rhodes, 1989).

Juniorate. A two-year period of study dedicated to the humanities; also referred to as Poetry and Rhetoric (McDonough, 1992).

Novitiate. Two years of time devoted to prayer and spiritual testing after which the scholastics take their first vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience (McDonough, 1992).

Ordination. After the third year of theology, men are ordained as Jesuit priests and celebrate their first Mass. After ordination, they complete the final year of theology.

Pontifical Institution. Those Catholic universities which have been established or formally approved as such by the Holy See (Gallin, 1992).

Philosophate. An establishment where the men study philosophy for a three-year period (McDonough, 1992).
Provinces. The Society of Jesus in the United States is organized into ten geographical regions referred to as provinces. Every university, college, high school, parish, and retreat house or other ministry the Jesuits operate in the United States belongs to one of these ten provinces (http://www.Jesuits.org).

Ratio Studiorum. The traditional rules, dating back to 1599, that laid the foundation of Jesuit education (Donohue, 1963).

Regency. A three-year period, after completing philosophy, when the men usually work in Jesuit high schools as teachers (McDonough, 1992).

Scholastics. Term used for men studying for the Jesuit priesthood prior to their ordination (McDonough, 1992).


Shrub Oak Seminary. The philosophate located in Peekskill, New York, an hour’s drive from Fordham University in the Bronx (McDonough, 1992) where the five subjects studied philosophy.

Society of Jesus (Jesuits). The largest Roman Catholic religious order, whose members are called Jesuits, was founded by Saint Ignatius Loyola. It is noted for its discipline based on the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius and for its lengthy training period. Jesuit communities are apostolic rather than monastic, meaning that they are outwardly directed and changing (Bangert, 1986).

Spiritual Exercises. A thirty-day prescribed spiritual journey. “People engage in the Exercises ...to learn how to pray, to receive more intense spiritual counsel, to move
further in their spiritual lives, to reform their lives within their station, and, of course, to make an election about a new station” (O'Malley, 1993, p. 131). Those studying for the Jesuit priesthood engage in the Exercises during the novitiate and again during the tertianship.

**Tertianship.** One year, upon completion of their theological study, “…that was designed as a recapitulation and more mature in tone but nonetheless a renewal, of the novitiate experience in which the Jesuit priest was supposed to do little studying and a good deal of praying” (McDonough, 1992, p. 137).

**Theologate.** An establishment where the men studied theology for four years, the “queen of the sciences” (McDonough, 1992, p. 173).

**United States Assistancy.** The organizational structure of the Society of Jesus that incorporates the ten provinces in the United States.

**Woodstock College.** The flagship theologate located in the Patapsco Valley west of Baltimore, Maryland (McDonough, 1992) where the five subjects studied theology.

**Delimitations**

The study was focused on five men who all entered the Society of Jesus between 1954 and 1958 and who were from the New York or Maryland provinces. McDonough (1992) described the Jesuit formation process as a prescribed thirteen to fifteen year journey comprised of the following parts:

1. Novitiate spiritual formation two years
2. Juniorate two years
3. Philosophate three years
4. Regency three years
5. Theologate four years
6. Ordination — at the conclusion of the third year of theology
7. Tertianship — final formation period one year

The shared experience for these five men were the years they spent together studying philosophy at Shrub Oak Seminary in New York and theology at Woodstock College in Maryland.

Limitations

The research method, the multiple case-study, that was used has the advantage of providing detailed and descriptively rich data (Creswell, 1994). However, the study was limited to five men from two Jesuit provinces that entered the Society of Jesus during the middle to latter part of the 1950s. The narrow scope of the focus group does not allow for this study to be generalizable to a larger population. In addition, the findings of this study can certainly be open to other interpretations. Documents outlining the theologate and the philosophate were difficult to access because both Shrub Oak Seminary in New York and Woodstock College in Maryland closed their doors in 1969. The nature of this study is retrospective, i.e., based upon the memories of the subjects. Consequently, what is reported was the recollections of those involved in the study as they reflected upon a shared experience that occurred more than 30 to 40 years ago.

Bias Statements

In a qualitative study, the researcher is the data collector and interpreter. The reader of the study absorbs the data that has been collected and its interpretation through the eyes of the researcher. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) noted that qualitative researchers guard against their own biases by recording detailed fieldnotes that include their own
personal reflections on their subjectivity. However, it was necessary to confront any possible attitudes, training, or experiences that might bias the collection or the interpretation of data and then inform the reader of this in the study.

First, the research method, the multiple case-study, that was used has the advantage of providing detailed and descriptively rich data. The study was based on the information from only five men from Maryland and New York provinces and that entered the novitiate during the middle to latter part of the 1950s. The narrow scope of the focus group indicated that the study is not generalizable to a larger population.

Second, the findings of this study can certainly be open to other interpretations. Men who have undergone the same formation process at the same period in time and who are or who have been college, university, or seminary presidents could view their experiences in quite a different way than the subjects.

Third, comprehensiveness of the documents outlining the theologate and the philosophate were limited because both Shrub Oak Seminary and Woodstock College closed their doors in 1971 at their locations in New York and Maryland, respectively. However, the documents did exist in some form in the archives of the Jesuit Office in New York City, the Jesuit Office in Baltimore, Maryland, and library of Georgetown University. Without the help of the local archivists and their willingness to share the information, the necessary documents would have been difficult to obtain.

Fourth, the nature of this study was retrospective. Consequently, what was reported was only the recollections of those involved in the study as they reflected upon a shared experience that occurred more than 30 to 40 years ago.
Generalizability

Merriam (1998) stated that:

Qualitative research...is not conducted so that the laws of human nature can be isolated. Rather, researchers seek to describe and explain the world as those in the world experience it. Since there are many interpretations of what is happening, there is no benchmark by which to take repeated measures and establish reliability in the traditional sense. (p. 205)

The reader is cautioned that case-study research provides important information about a single individual, group of individuals, or source while not pretending to control for any biases or variables that may operate in the subject. The data was presented as seen from the perspective of the subjects and as interpreted by the researcher. These two factors alone make generalizing the data to other subjects not involved in the study a step that should be taken with caution.

Role of the Researcher

Seidman (1998) noted that:

No matter how diligently we work to that effect, however, the fact is that the interviewers are a part of the interviewing picture. They ask questions, respond to the participant, and at times even share their own experiences. Moreover, interviewers work with the material, select from it, interpret, describe, and analyze it....Every aspect of the structure, process, and practice interviewing can be directed toward the goal of minimizing the effect of the interviewer and the
interviewing situation has on how the participants reconstruct their experiences. (p. 16)

In addition, the researcher has been an educator in Catholic higher education for the past 24 years and brought to this research a certain bias due to that background. The author's experiences in Catholic higher education have been at three Catholic colleges and Universities which were not affiliated with the Society of Jesus, nor were these experiences at the level of president. The researcher's experiences in Catholic higher education, however, have led to his being directly supervised by seven presidents, two of whom were trained for the Jesuit priesthood, three of whom had worked extensively at four Jesuit institutions for up to 32 years, one of whom received his bachelor's degree from a Jesuit institution and taught at another Jesuit college, one of whom studied to be a Benedictine monk, and each of whom exhibited different leadership styles and abilities.

During the past four years as a doctoral student in the Education Leadership program of The University of Montana, the researcher gained a great deal of knowledge about leadership in an educational setting. This knowledge enabled the researcher to examine the individuals with whom the researcher has worked from a more enlightened perspective. In turn, the knowledge obtained by the researcher led to a great deal of questions concerning the educational and career backgrounds of educational leaders and how their backgrounds have impacted their success and leadership style.

**Significance of the Study**

There exist 219 Catholic colleges and universities in the United States (Rosenberg, 2000). Twelve of these institutions of higher education are Diocesan, one is a Pontifical institution, and the rest are tied, either through direct control or history, to
Catholic religious orders. Each year, approximately one to two dozen of these institutions conduct national searches for presidents, and more often than not, they do so with the aid of an outside national search firm that has little knowledge of or no affiliation with Catholic higher education.

There are no studies, neither qualitative nor quantitative, that speak exclusively to the characteristics of Catholic college, university, and seminary presidents, nor to the previous training of those presidents. The body of information that was gathered addressed the educational training of the five subjects and their common characteristics; those two areas of research were examined in light of their lives as college, university, and seminary presidents. This study will assist governing boards of Catholic colleges and universities who are about to conduct a national search for a new president to glean helpful information about the characteristics and backgrounds of these participants that could provide useful criteria for future presidential searches.

The multiple case-study method allowed for a holistic or complete study that included family background, educational formation, and presidential experiences. The subjects’ stories were told with the idea that what they conveyed about their families’ backgrounds, their early life experiences, their formation processes, their work histories, and their work as presidents were of interest and value to others, especially Catholic colleges and universities that will seek similarly skilled candidates for their institutions.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Catholic Higher Education

David J. O'Brien, the Loyola Professor of Roman Catholic Studies at the College of Holy Cross, (1994) addressed the subject of American Catholic higher education:

One group stresses the proper Catholic understanding of human knowledge and, thus, of the university as the center where knowledge is preserved, extended, and transmitted. At the other pole, academics emphasize the modern understanding of knowledge, and therefore of the university, held by scholars since the late nineteenth century. The one element is supposed to explain the Catholic adjective, the other the university noun; the first is concerned with faith and the church, the second with intellectual life as structured around America's diverse array of colleges and universities. (pp. 16-17)

In the introduction to The Applications of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* for the United States (2000) the National Conference of Catholic Bishops described Catholic higher education in the following manner:

Catholic colleges and universities are related to the ecclesial community, the higher education enterprise of the United States, and to the broader society. Founded and developed by religious communities of women and men, they now involve lay administrators, professors, and trustees who are Catholic and not Catholic--all committed to the vision of Catholic higher education. (p. 1)

Catholic colleges and universities, where culture and faith intersect, bring diversity to American higher education. Diversity is present among the
institutions: two-year colleges and graduate program universities; liberal arts
colleges and research universities; schools for the professions and schools for
technical education. (p. 1)

The fact that these Catholic institutions were located in the United States of
America said a great deal about their origins and the manner in which they were
governed. Their history revealed a commitment to address the educational needs for the
working class Catholics who emigrated to the United States since the end of the
eighteenth century. Not only did American history play an important role in the
establishment of these 219 institutions (Rosenberg, 2000), but the schools were also a
product of the 2000-year history of the Catholic Church and its Catholic intellectual
tradition, including more than a 200-year history of the American Catholic Church.
O'Brien (1994) asserted, “Yet America’s colleges and universities, including Catholic
schools, are, more than in any other country in the world, the people’s colleges and
universities. And so they were, and are, American, very American” (p. 17).

Catholic schools were deemed necessary to enable Catholic communities to meet
their twin objectives of preserving the traditional culture and improving their economic
and social conditions. O'Brien (1994) further explained that the schools also helped the
local bishops and clergy build an identifiable Catholic Church and secure its place in the
larger society. For decades, the bishops worked hard to establish schools. They placed
the highest priority on identifying and educating candidates for the priesthood. Becker,
the former Director of the Jesuit Center for Religious Studies at Xavier University,
(1992) noted that it was for this very reason that Bishop John Carroll, Bishop of
Maryland, established the very first American Catholic college in Georgetown, Maryland
in 1789. Georgetown College, later known as Georgetown University, is the alma mater of Catholic higher education in the United States. Becker (1992) further stated that, a year after the Society's restoration in the United States in 1804, Bishop Carroll asked the Society of Jesus to take over the operation of Georgetown College, thus marking the beginning of Jesuit higher education in the United States.

Phillip Gleason (1967), a noted Catholic educator, spoke to the fact that Catholic higher education differed socially, organizationally, and ideologically from other American higher education institutions. The Catholic schools were socially different in that the majority of their teachers and their students were newcomers to America. O'Brien (1994) mentioned that the schools were organized along European lines by immigrant religious (priests and nuns) and often reported to European superiors. Not only were they administered in a different manner than their American counterparts, but they also stood apart ideologically in areas such as discipline.

The system of Catholic higher education remained very constant until the end of World War II with the influx of GI students who had just returned from the war. William Leahy, SJ, professor of history at Marquette University, (1991) suggested that changes in Catholic culture and American higher education after World War II shaped the evolution of Catholic colleges and universities during the post-war decades. Leahy, SJ (1991) maintained that, "Before 1945, American Catholics lagged well behind Jews and most Protestant denominations in social and economic standing. But late in the 1940s, Catholics gradually moved into the mainstream of American life, rising in income, political power, and social position" (p. 123). Leahy (1991) further stated that:
During the period between 1945 and 1970, enrollment in American colleges and universities grew by nearly 800%. The Catholic segment grew at a smaller rate but, nevertheless, grew from 92,000 students in 1944-45 to 220,000 in 1948 to 430,000 in 1970, an increase of 430%. (p. 126)

Leahy (1991) noted that to meet this rising demand for higher education under Catholic auspices and to strengthen Catholicism, lay Catholics, priests, and bishops frequently urged Catholic higher educational institutions to expand. Many thought that this expansion would enhance the prestige of Catholic higher education in the American academic culture. Some educators tended to equate size and graduate programs with influence. Consequently, they favored increasing enrollments, starting new schools, and introducing graduate programs.

However, the development of Catholic higher education in post-war America provoked severe criticism from Catholic educational and religious leaders. The Catholic School Journal (1950) denounced this expansion as “senseless multiplication” and “our betrayal of one another that resulted in a perpetuation of mediocrity” (p. 116). While Catholics commonly rose in economic and social status after 1945, only a few Catholic higher education institutions exceeded the general improvement in American higher education and significantly advanced their academic reputation. Instead, Catholic educators focused on the current needs and opportunities instead of the long-range plan. Catholic colleges and universities maintained their autonomy and engaged in what some considered to be wasteful competition, rather than concentrating their financial and educational resources necessary to develop quality institutions (Leahy, 1991).
At the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council, Catholic Church historians and theologians, Ford, Horrigan, Kavanaugh, Merton, Smith, and Stuhmueller, (1966) described Catholic higher education when he stated that:

This group of colleges and universities represents a unique phenomenon. There is no adequate parallel to be found in any other age or country. For better or worse, they have profoundly influenced the history and character of the American Church, and they will be a factor of importance as the church in this country responds to the new challenges and opportunities of a new age. (p. 76)

Rowntree (1994), a former professor of philosophy at Loyola University in New Orleans, stated that:

I claim that U.S. Jesuit colleges and universities have never been better than they are today precisely because of the changes made after Vatican II. The Council’s discussion of mission strategies, lay ministries, ecumenical relations and religious freedom were especially influential. To be an authentic Vatican II inspired university means to support academic freedom (freedom to teach, to inquire, to debate) and, further, to support the freedom of faculties to recruit fellow faculty and to assess their qualifications and performance when called for. (pp. 6-8)

In 1990 Pope John Paul II released *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, an apostolic constitution on worldwide Catholic higher education. O’Brien (1994) asserted that, “Since this is the most authoritative official statement of the meaning and mission of Catholic higher education, it deserves to be widely read” (p. 63). He further stated that, “The text itself, as distinct from the general norms for legislation with which it concludes, is very
affirmative, claiming for the Catholic university a central role in the mission of the Church” (p. 63).

Pope John Paul II (1990) stated in *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* that a Catholic university must have the following essential characteristics:

1. a Christian inspiration not only of individuals but of the university community as such;
2. a continuing reflection in the light of the Catholic faith upon the growing treasury of human knowledge, to which it seeks to contribute its own research;
3. fidelity to the Christian message as it comes through the Church;
4. an institutional commitment to the service of the people of God and of the human family in their pilgrimage to the transcendent goal which gives meaning to life. (pp. 13-14)

For the past twelve years, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB), presidents of Catholic colleges and universities, and others have been part of a long dialog regarding the implementation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*. While few argued with the points raised in the actual text of the document, the contentious aspect of the document seemed to be the general norms.

On Wednesday, November 17, 1999, America’s Roman Catholic Bishops voted on an official response to the Vatican regarding the implementation of *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* in the United States including a specific response to the general norms that caused much of the controversy since *Ex Corde*’s publication. That controversy centered on the authority of the local bishop to grant a *mandatum*, or permission, for a theology
faculty member to teach at a Catholic college or university. An article in The Washington Post by Rosin and Murphy (1999) observed:

Most of the colleges have opposed this measure. In the years leading up to the debate, the presidents of many Catholic colleges, including Georgetown University, wrote letters and editorials describing the proposal, for example, as 'profoundly detrimental' and an 'obvious threat to academic freedom.' (p. A1)

In the same Washington Post article, Rosin and Murphy (1999) quoted Rev. James L. Heft, chairman of the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities, who stated, “This is not a document the majority of presidents would have preferred. People are concerned it sends out the perception that Catholic universities don’t have real and legitimate academic freedom” (p. A1). On the other hand, Rev. David M. O'Connell, C.M., president of The Catholic University of America, was quoted by Rosin and Murphy (1999) who expressed that, “Institutions should be eager to be accountable, loyal, and faithful” (p. A1).

In July 2000, the United States Catholic Conference published the Application of Ex Corde Ecclesiae for the United States. The United States bishops were asked to take the Applications back to their dioceses in order to continue their dialog with the institutions of higher learning. After this dialog, they met in May of 2001 to finalize the Applications which were fully implemented in June of 2001.

Jesuit Higher Education

Rhodes, the former president of Cornell University and a noted British geologist, (1989) noted that:
From the modest beginning almost 200 years ago with the supervision of Georgetown College, now known as Georgetown University, the Society of Jesus, as part of the American Catholic education system, has given rise to a system that includes 28 colleges and universities and 46 Jesuit high schools. (p. 55)

The notion of “ministry” in higher education sounds unfamiliar to many outside of Catholic higher education, but it seems to be the secret to the success that Catholic institutions of higher learning in general, and Jesuit higher education in particular, have celebrated. The Jesuits have played a prominent role in the Catholic life of America and have also exerted a major influence on the general course of American Catholic higher education.

Given the fact that the name “Jesuit” is almost synonymous with education today, it may come as a surprise to many to learn that Ignatius Loyola and six others from the University of Paris did not found the Society of Jesus in 1540 to open and direct schools. Rather, their first project was a mission to the Holy Land. After they received their papal approval in 1540, Ignatius and his followers vowed to “…devote themselves to traditional religious activities such as preaching, doing charitable works, and especially teaching the catechism” (Grendler, 1989, p. 363). Eight years later, the city of Messina in Sicily requested that the Society of Jesus open a school for the youth in the town. Other requests soon followed.

Ignatius and his followers quickly decided that, through education, the Society of Jesus could best serve the Church. Not only could the Society best serve the Church in this way, but an educational system run by the Jesuits could also serve its own needs better in the education of those seeking membership in the Society. Unlike Ignatius and
his six original followers who were distinguished scholars from the University of Paris, the new members of the Society were far less versed in the classics. At first, the new recruits were sent to the best universities in Europe. Later, they were sent to the schools and colleges founded by the Society. By the time that Saint Ignatius died in 1556, the Society of Jesus had founded 39 colleges for lay students (McKevitt, 1991).

After having been in existence for 233 years, Pope Clement XIV, on July 21, 1773, abolished the Society of Jesus. Lacouture, a journalist and author, (1995) posited that Pope Clement XIV was being, “jostled, harassed, and threatened by the four Most Christian sovereigns of Lisbon, Paris, Madrid, and Naples – all shrines of Jesuitism” (p. 262). What led to the suppression was described by Lacouture (1995) as the “Triumph of Philosophy over the Church” because the *philosophes* were the ones in power in Lisbon as well as in Paris, Madrid and Naples, and had played leading roles in the tragedy” (p. 263). Lacouture (1995) quoted from the decree signed by Pope Clement XIV where he began by stating his case against the Society of Jesus, based primarily on the political pressures from the four sovereigns previously mentioned:

...there was almost no charge too serious to be leveled against the Society, and the peace and tranquility of Christendom were long troubled by it [so much so that] our most dear sons in Jesus Christ the Kings of France, of Spain, of Portugal, and of the Two Sicilies were obliged to send away and banish from their Kingdoms, States, and Provinces all the religious of this Order, convinced that this extreme measure was the only remedy for so many ills, and the only one that must be taken to prevent Christians from insulting one another, from provoking one another, and from rending one another in the very bosom of the Church, their
mother. But these same Kings, our most dear sons in Jesus Christ, believed that this remedy could not have a lasting effect and be sufficient to establish tranquility in the Christian world unless the Society itself were wholly suppressed and abolished. (p. 294)

Continuing, Lacouture (1995) quoted from the Pope's decree where the pope spoke to the action that he was to undertake and the expected behavior that had to be followed by stating that:

...acknowledging that the Company of Jesus could no longer produce those abundant fruits and those considerable advantages for which it was constituted...after ripe reflection, and in the fullness of our apostolic power, we suppress and we abolish the Society of Jesus; we liquidate and abrogate each and every one of its offices, functions and administrations, houses, schools, colleges, retreats, hospices, and all other places that belong to it under any title whatsoever, and in whichever province, kingdom, or state they may be.

...we further call upon and prohibit, in the name of holy obedience, all and every regular and secular ecclesiastic, whatever his rank, dignity, quality, and condition, and particularly those who have until now been attached to the society and who belong to it, to oppose this suppression, attack it, write against it, and even to speak of it, as of its causes and motives. (pp. 294-295)

At the time of the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773, the Jesuits were operating 845 educational institutions throughout the world, over 700 of them colleges for non-Jesuits, mostly in France, Germany, and Italy and had over 20,000 members (McKevitt, SJ, 1991). Their ministry had reached all corners of the globe, and their
influence on generations of students was growing enormously. Rhodes (1989) indicated that, “Those two hundred years of unprecedented educational growth still stand as an extraordinary achievement” (p. xx).

Even the French Revolution and Pope Clement XIV did not destroy the Society’s commitment to its educational ideals. On August 7, 1814, when Pope Pius VII restored the Society, it again continued its educational mission. Lacouture (1995) questioned whether the third Jesuit General, Francesco Borgia, spoke the following phrase, “We came in like lambs, and we rule like wolves. We shall be expelled like dogs and return like eagles,” but believed that this did sum up the early experience of the Society of Jesus. Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum, proclaimed by Pope Pius VII, restored the Society of Jesus to its rights and privileges. Yet the public reading of this document by the Pope was the only formal celebration of the Society’s restoration. Lacouture claimed that elsewhere in Europe it was, “just a laborious reentry, improvised, sometimes painful, even shamefaced, closer to artificial respiration than resurrection...But in fact the fathers returned more or less everywhere on tiptoe and in a trickle” (p. 331).

Martin (1988), a historian, claimed that Jesuit schools were distinguishable from other schools by the way they were explicitly Christian in nature; understanding that knowledge was not simply an end to itself, but rather a means to an end; and that the education provided by the Jesuits “…was a combination of humanist, classically oriented curriculum and the morally disciplined religion of the Catholic Reformation” (p. 241). The schools were focused on the humanistic educational ideals of the Renaissance and thus led to the study of the humanities, especially classical Greek and Latin languages and literature, the natural sciences, philosophy, and theology. Ganns, SJ (1970), a Jesuit
historian at St. Louis University, noted that Jesuit education was described simply and unequivocally by Ignatius himself in the fourth part of the Society's Constitutions as: “The end of the Society and of its studies is to aid our fellow men to the knowledge and love of God and to the salvation of their souls” (p. 49).

Gray, SJ (2000), an expert on Jesuit spirituality, noted that:

But I want to emphasize that education for Ignatius antedated those eleven years Ignatius spent as a student and persisted until his death....for Ignatius education was an event that came ‘from above,’ from within and from outside himself. For Ignatius education was a code that socialized his experiences so that others could share these. For Ignatius education was an apostolic enterprise that would have an impact on both the Church and civil society. (p. 2)

When Jesuit education began at Georgetown College in 1805 it drew upon its long European experience. The Jesuit educational experience also drew from its American culture because of the flood of immigrants to the United States from 1814 to 1914, many of whom were Catholic. In fact, most of the Jesuit founders of the first colleges were themselves refugees from Europe (Leahy, 1991).

These roots had deep implications for Jesuit education in the United States. For example, Jesuit schools were known for their student discipline codes which stemmed from the European notion that children were to be protected from the world and its moral and physical ills. The founding of boarding schools in rural areas outside of the cities is another example of the European influence. Additionally, the teachers adopted a classical model for educating their students that was both formative and informative. The Jesuit
schools aimed at the development of the students' faculties and the training of their character. In other words, the education they received was holistic in nature.

Ganns (1991) pointed out that it is from Part IV of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus where Ignatius lays out the foundation of the Ratio Studiorum. The Ratio Studiorum, published in 1599, produced a unity of procedure throughout Europe and the Americas for all Jesuit schools. O'Malley, SJ (2000) articulated that:

The Ratio is an altogether top-down document in two crucial ways. It begins with the Jesuit Provincial Superior and works down eventually to the students. It also begins with the so-called 'higher faculties' – Scripture, scholastic theology, cases of conscience or ethics – and works down the program to philosophy to rhetoric and grammar, the 'lowest' disciplines in the system but the heart of the matter in the traditional humanistic program.

Three observations are apposite. First, it is clear from some details in the 'Rules for the Provincial' that the Ratio is designed first and foremost as a master plan for the training of Jesuits themselves. Second, the design of the Ratio reduces studia humanitatis to a preparatory program for academic specialization, namely, for further studies in science and theology. Third, the Ratio insists that the acquisition of the power of self-expression or eloquence is the scope of the class devoted to rhetoric and, more broadly, of the 'lower' disciplines, with the acquisition of information a secondary goal. (pp. 137-138)

The American Jesuit schools were built on the Ratio Studiorum which spoke to the vision of the teacher and established a very detailed program of operating a Jesuit school. Go (2000) noted that:
The detail with which the *Ratio* spelled out how professors and teachers ought to teach and how students ought to behave shows us the importance, the priority on the formation of teachers and the students. Teachers’ work must reflect their best efforts toward doing the *magis*, that is, choosing the better, more effective means to help students grow. In this, however, *cura-personalis*, the personal care of students, will guide and modify generic norms. (pp. 103-104)

Padberg, SJ (2000), a Jesuit historian, noted that the *Ratio Studiorum* legislated:

...everything from the number of classes or years in school to material on repetitions, new students, exams, grading practices, promotions, books, and time for private study....In addition, there was material on disputation, the academics, and public prizes, the corrector, the classrooms, the school church or chapel, the way in which exams were to be written, and the conferring of prizes or recognitions for academic accomplishments. Each class then had its own rules, including those, for example, of the professor of rhetoric, the professor of humanities, the professor of grammar. (pp. 96-97)

Rhodes (1989) described Jesuit education when he stated that:

First was the conviction that moral excellence was the ultimate goal of Jesuit education. Second was the belief that scholarly excellence was vitally important because of the role it played in achieving moral excellence. The third characteristic was the role of the teacher. The teacher’s responsibility was not only to keep the instruction lively and his students engaged, but also to set an example, through his personal conduct and through his membership in the Jesuit
community, that would inspire students to a life of moral and intellectual excellence and spiritual commitment. (p. 56)

O’Malley, SJ (1993) quoted Ignatius from a letter to the scholastics at Coimbra that they were to, “Be models of virtue yourselves, so as to make them what you are...Wherefore, if you would perfect others, be first perfect yourself” (p. 17).

Ganns, SJ (1969) quoted Ignatius from Part IV of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus where Ignatius reveals his major objectives for education of which, according to Ganns, eleven have always been operative in Jesuit higher education:

1. The end of the Society and of its studies is to aid our fellow man to the knowledge and love of God and to the salvation of their souls, that is, in other terms, to the intellectual virtue of supernatural wisdom and the theological virtue of charity.

2. The students should strive to attain excellence in mastering their fields of study, both sacred and secular.

3. The Society of Jesus hopes by means of education to pour capable leaders into the social order, in numbers large enough to leaven it effectively for good.

4. The branches of the curriculum should be so integrated that each makes its proper contributions toward the goal of the curriculum as a whole: a Christian outlook on life, as reasonably and even scientifically worked out as possible.

5. Theology should be regarded as the most important branch in the university, since the light it gives is the chief means of imparting the scientifically based Christian worldview and of tying the other branches to unity.
6. In a Jesuit university, any faculty or department can function, provided that it contributes to the general purposes of education envisioned in Jesuit aims.

7. The formation imparted in Jesuit schools should be both intellectual and moral, providing reasoned-out bases for moral living.

8. The professors should be personally interested in the intellectual and spiritual progress of their students.

9. Jesuit educational institutions should transmit the cultural heritage of the past and also provide facilities for men engaged in research.

10. Jesuit schools should be alert to appropriate education and adapt and improve the best procedures which they see emerging in the non-Jesuit schools of the day.

11. Jesuit schools should adapt their procedures to circumstances of times, places, and persons. (pp. 21-23)

O'Malley (1993) quoted Juan Alfonso Polanco, one of the six companions of Ignatius who later served as Secretary for the Society of Jesus, as he expounded on the Constitutions and listed the benefits of the educational ministry the Society was to undertake:

For the Society

1. Jesuits learn best by teaching others.

2. They profit from the discipline, perseverance, and diligence that teaching requires.

3. They improve their preaching and other skills needed in ministry.
4. Although Jesuits should not try to persuade anybody to enter the Society, especially not young boys, their good example and other factors will, nonetheless, help gain “laborers in the vineyard.”

For the Student

1. They will make progress learning.
2. The poor, who could not possibly pay for teachers, much less for private tutors, will be able to do the same.
3. Students will be helped in spiritual matters by learning Christian Doctrine and hearing sermons and exhortations.
4. They will make progress in purity of conscience and every virtue through monthly confession and instilling of good habits.
5. They will draw much merit and profit from their studies by learning to direct them to the service of God.

For the Locality

1. Parents will be relieved of the financial burden of educating their sons.
2. They will be able to satisfy their consciences of their obligations to educate their children.
3. The people of the area will be helped by the Jesuits’ preaching and administration of the sacraments.
4. Parents will be influenced by the positive example of their children to live as good Christians.
5. Jesuits will encourage and help in the establishment of hospitals, houses of convertidas and similar institutions.
6. Those who are now only students will grow up to be pastors, civic officials, administrators of justice, and will fill other important posts to everybody's profit and advantage. (pp. 213-124)

The Jesuit Formation Process

The story of the Jesuit formation process started with the conversion of Ignatius Loyola. He was born as Inigo Loyola in 1491 in Spain. The turning point for Ignatius came in 1521 at the age of 30, when, during a battle with the French, a cannon ball passing between his legs tore open his left calf and broke the right shin. The Spanish troops he was leading lost heart at his falling and surrendered. The French carried him to Loyola, Spain where his wounds were treated. Letellier (1912), a noted author, stated:

...where his leg had to be re-broken and re-set, and afterwards a protruding end of the bone was sawn off, and the limb, having been shortened by clumsy setting, was stretched by weights. All these pains were undergone voluntarily, without uttering a cry or submitting to be bound. But the pain and weakness which followed were so great that the patient began to fail and sink. On the eve of Sts. Peter and Paul, however, a turn for the better took place, and he threw off his fever. (p. 81)

Lacouture (1991, 1995) described his convalescence as a time when Ignatius read books devoted to the saints and to Jesus Christ. Ignatius would have preferred to read about romances in books of chivalry; however, as time went on, Ignatius realized that his daydreams about the saints and Christ were becoming more frequent and more fulfilling.

In 1522, his convalescence complete, he left Loyola without a definite plan or future. He did, however, set out for Monserrat where, after three days of introspection,
he confessed his sins. He was later shown a cave in Manresa where he could continue his
life of prayer and contemplation. It was during this two-year period that he began to
make notes of his spiritual experiences. These notes later evolved into a small book
called The Spiritual Exercises. It is these Exercises that lie at the heart of the Jesuit
formation process (McDonough, 1992).

The Spiritual Exercises were written very concisely, in the form of a small
handbook for the priests who were to explain them. The Exercises have been and
continue to be used twice during the formation process: once during the novitiate, the
beginning of the process; and once during the tertianship, the conclusion of the process.
In addition, a Jesuit priest or any lay person might enter a Jesuit Retreat House at any
time to take part in the 30 day Spiritual Exercises for renewal. Gray, SJ (2000) summed
up the Spiritual Exercises when he noted:

From the beginning of the Exercises—which encourages both the one who gives
the Exercises and the one who makes them to trust one another throughout the
process—to the intense conclusion of the Exercises—in which the one who is
making them holds the entire experience as an act of divine love, human
acceptance, and mutual surrender—trust is the glue that holds this spiritual
education together. Trust is the essential component in Ignatian spirituality.
Trust, in turn, will permeate the life and mission of the Society of Jesus. Trust
will characterize the way Jesuits deal with people, cultures, and other religious
experiences. (p. 5)
Gray, SJ (2000) further explained:

There are three aspects of Jesuit formation that are crucial: the process of how to become a contemplative in action, the environment that promotes formation within the company, and the ways in which a man’s ability to live a Jesuit life and to do its ministry were assessed. In the Constitutions Ignatius spells out what the process might be that can dispose a man to become a contemplative in action. ‘In everything they [the young Jesuits] should try and desire to give the advantage to the others, esteeming them all in their hearts as better than themselves and showing exteriorly, in an unassuming and simple religious manner, the respect and reverence befitting each one’s state, in such a manner that by observing one another they grow in devotion and praise God our Lord, whom each one should endeavor to recognize in his neighbor and in His image.’ This directive centers three constitutive operations. The first is what I would call attention, the ability to be present to a relationship in its particularity. It stands for that presence in which one person allows another reality, here another Jesuit, to enter his awareness on his own terms. The second operation is reverence, the ability to cherish the reality that reveals itself, here the other Jesuit, in all his integrity. The third operation is actually the operation of grace. The word ‘devotion,’ which denotes this third step, is precious to Ignatius. In other words, through attention and reverence one can hope to be led to devotion, the ability to discover how God exists in another, here in another Jesuit.

The ramifications of this formation directive are wide and rich, suggesting an important key not only to the personal religious event of finding God in all
things but to the apostolic mind set of expecting to find God in all people, places and events. (pp. 9-11)

McDonough (1992), a historian, described the Jesuit formation process that the five participants in this study experienced when he stated:

The twin pillars of the formation system were the sense of overflowing love – of transcendent devotion that Jesuits encountered or felt they encountered in the novitiate – and the discipline that surrounded them, persistently though not quite relentlessly, through the course. Discipline, regular devotions, and the academic sequence made up the channel into which emotion flowed. They were the mechanisms by which heroic yearnings and generous impulses took on value, indeed became values – of reliable conduct, sacrifice, competence – that gave form to an enclave of Catholicism in the modern United States.

Energies were shaped in academic competition and released in allegories of military combat. Commitment to service during regency provided further training and gave a measure of personal satisfaction. The experience entailed intense interaction with relatively tractable outsiders, followed by withdrawal into the cloistered world of the seminary. Liturgical ritual and the flow of the seasons reinforced the rhythms of obedience and the hierarchical patterns of community. There seemed to be a natural order to things, a way of life so cohesive that the abstractions of the classroom blurred into the long pulsations of the course of training. The ceremonies were sensual and tellurian in their regularity, like the rocking of a cradle. They conveyed an unspoken security beneath the disputations over the points of doctrine and the tension of the stylized academics.
Yet, during this time, signs of imbalance and pathologies in the system began to appear. For a process that had been fine tuned for over 400 years, an extraordinary amount of care continued to go into making the program function according to plan. The written record – rules posted by rectors, the correspondence of superiors, and similar materials – leave the impression that as times changed (for worse, so it was perceived), vigilance increased. New rules were added, almost none were abandoned. Prohibitions outweighed incentives. Refutational minutia swamped exhortations to keep up with new developments. For every danger that caught the eye of the superior like an incoming round from the enemy camp, a defense shot up. Many regulations were not enforced meticulously, but their proliferation reveals concern about fortifying the Jesuit ethos and Jesuit achievements in a hostile environment. (pp. 156-157)

It was against this background, one filled with tension between the tried and true of the past and the uncertainty of the future within the formation process, that the five participants entered the Jesuit order. What follows is a description of each stage of the formation process and the revolution that took place in that process between 1955 and 1975.

**Novitiate**

Candidates for admission to the Society of Jesus came from not only high schools and colleges operated by the Jesuits, but also from other schools. In addition, men came from the world of business and other professional careers, as well as post-graduate and professional schools. The novitiate was a two-year period that was devoted to prayer and spiritual testing (McDonough, 1992). Becker, SJ (1992) referred to the novitiate as the,
...entrance gate, the screening process, which serves to admit only those who show solid potential of becoming members of the order. It also provides the basic mold of values into which the rest of the long years of training are to be poured. As soon as possible, the scholastic is to make the Spiritual Exercises for 30 days. The first week is on sin and its consequences; the second is on Christ's life on earth; the third reflects upon His passion; and the fourth examines His risen life. (p. 194)

Letellier (1912) noted that a certain number of instructions were added to teach the scholastic, "...how to pray, how to avoid scruple, how to elect a vocation in life without being swayed by the love of self or of the world" (p. 83).

In addition to the Spiritual Exercises, the novice worked in a hospital, made a pilgrimage, taught catechism, and performed chores around the house. Becker (1992) explained that:

There were three objectives to be attained by these experiences: to exercise the novice in self-abnegation, to test him in circumstances when he was on his own responsibility, and to train him from the very beginning to serve others. Though the Jesuits are an apostolic or active order, the emphasis in these experiments was less on the importance of the work than on the formation of the novice in such ascetical virtues as poverty, obedience, and the acceptance of humiliations. For example, the objective of the Spiritual Exercises, as the title states was 'to conquer oneself'. The work in the hospital was to enable the novice 'the more to lower and humble himself'. A pilgrimage was undertaken to introduce the novice to 'begging from door to door' and to accustom him to 'discomfort in food and
lodging'. The catechism was to be taught to children and people who are *rudiores* (the uneducated, belonging to the lower social classes). The work about the house was to be 'in various low and humble offices'. (p. 195)

The objective of the novitiate, as noted by Becker (1992), was to take the novice out of the life that he had experienced thus far, weed out those who found the novitiate life to be too difficult, to acclimate them to subordinating their personal wishes in favor of the good of the community, and to achieve a bonding experience with the other novices. During these two years the novices were almost completely removed from the secular world and, step-by-step, were prepared for reentry into that same world.

McDonough (1992) described the novitiate where:

Devotions were modulated as always by the ringing of the bell. The day was subdivided, the novices had periods for all of their duties, everyone was kept busy. The regularity of life was the steadying counterpoint – a rhythm of activity, the prayer and meditation, then meals, then activity again – of the exultation of the encounter with the divine that the young Jesuits experienced during the early days of their training, often in the course of the thirty-day retreat that took place in the first autumn of the novitiate. Thought was supposed to be secondary to physical work and prayer. The repetitious tempo of a shared life girded religious commitment through habituation and collective movement. The novices absorbed the regimen through doing and from one another, and the ritual of it absorbed them. (pp. 145-146)

McDonough further explained that:
The novitiate was not a school. The development of the disciplined spirituality was the objective of this stage. Some reading, almost entirely of religious classics, went on. But the power of the novitiate was not conveyed primarily through written materials. It came instead through the repetitive behavior in groups and tuning in to aural signals – the indefatigable bells – and a modicum of oral communication, between silence at meals and periods of prayer and collective worship, in rudimentary Latin. Silence and the sound of rustling cassocks came before articulation. The regularity of the schedule, bolstered by the shielding of men from the outside, stood for a kind of certainty. In this way the novitiate transmitted a sense of primeval order, purpose, and solidarity. The sense of security was strong. Certainly, security, solidarity – it was first of all a way of life and only secondarily a matter of conscious belief. (pp. 146-147)

McDonough (1992) summed up the transition from the novitiate to the juniorate and philosophate as:

Two years of regimentation and cadenced training in obedience in the novitiate gave way to the study of the humanities and philosophy….The transition from the novitiate to the academic phases of Jesuit formation built on virtue – the practice of piety and familiarization with the liturgical routine and hierarchy of religious life – and moved toward the acquisition of skills, specifically, the development of an assertive masculinity. Combativeness, controlled by obedience, was emphasized. Verbal competitiveness was fostered; aggression was ritualized. It was not a movement from spiritual to real-world concerns, for both stages were
stylized. The movement was rather from the feminine to the masculine pulls of Jesuit life. (p. 149)

At the end of the two-year novitiate, the candidate made his decision to enter the order, the order agreed to accept him, and the novice made his first vows of chastity, poverty, and obedience.

This traditional order of the formation process, including the novitiate, was introduced in the United States after 1804 and remained substantially unchanged until the early 1960s (Becker, 1992). The changes in the formation process seem to have started with the novices that entered, “... along about 1957 or 1958 when the novices had begun to be a ‘different breed’. Different in what way? They were more independent in their thinking, less willing to follow traditions, more likely to challenge authority” (Becker, 1992, p. 201). The changes that occurred throughout the formation process between 1965-1975 were attributed to the novices that entered the novitiate from 1955 to 1959. It was this group of novices that, at each stage of the formation process, worked towards changing each separate step of the formation program (Becker, 1992).

Juniorate

During the following two years, the juniorate was intertwined with the novitiate, since this course of study generally took place in the same house where the novices attended the novitiate. The novices usually occupied a separate wing of the house, however the juniorate was marked by the dual objectives of two Jesuit professions, the religious and sacerdotal (Becker, 1992). Not only were the scholastics to follow a prepared program of academic pursuits, but they were also expected to allocate at least two and a half hours each day to prayer. The juniorate was to prepare the scholastic for
the study of philosophy and theology later on in the formation process. In order to achieve these goals the scholastic academic regimen emphasized language and philosophy. Consequently, the scholastic studied Greek, Latin, and English in order to be able to read theological sources in their original language during the theologate. "The junior also would study a literary form—drama, epic, oration, lyric poetry, essay simultaneously in all three languages" (Becker, 1992, p. 263). O'Malley (2000) also noted:

But, besides helping us get better brains, the classics were also supposed to help us young Jesuits achieve 'perfect eloquence'—*eloquentia perfecta*. I did not find this claim absurd even for the twentieth century because I knew that Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt, perhaps the last truly great political orators in the English-language world, were products of schools where the classics were central to the curriculum. But I also knew all too many products of Jesuit classical education who were windbags. (pp. 140-141)

There were no electives in this course of study and everyone was to be trained in the fundamentals. Becker (1992) explained:

...the total community still carried a novitiate flavor. Silence and ubiquitous cassock, the country locations, the absence of movies, radios, newspapers, and secular magazines—all continued to characterize daily life for the juniors. The move from novitiate to juniorate was clearly governed by the principle of gradualism....The purpose of the arrangement was clearly stated to be ascetical, namely, to protect the novitiate fervor from injury before it had become firmly rooted. (p. 263)
Philosophate at the Shrub Oak Seminary

At the conclusion of the juniorate the men moved out of the house to another house for the philosophate. The three years of the philosophate represented a very different experience for the scholastic. All of his time was devoted to the study of sciences and philosophy and not to the study of literature. Becker (1992) explained:

The lifestyle of the philosophate differed somewhat from the juniorate. The men were older; they were more in contact with the secular world through their studies and sometimes through their activities; and they had more responsibility for the allocation of their time. The rule of silence was still in effect, of course, but in the nature of things was less strictly observed. There were more frequent occasions for doffing the cassock and the donning of clerical suit and collar. Outside speakers made their appearances in the philosophate from time to time. On the whole, however, the life of the philosophate, like Jesuit life in general at the time, still had a distinctive religious look. (p. 264)

The Shrub Oak philosophate, which the five subjects of this dissertation shared, was opened in 1955 for study for both the Provinces of Maryland and New York and remained open until 1971. McDonough (1992) stated that, “When it began operation in the fall of 1955, with the library still to be completed, the seminary was considered ‘an enduring memorial to the generosity of our friends and benefactors, and to the wisdom and planning of our Fathers’ ” (p. 366). McDonough (1992) concluded his description of Shrub Oak by stating, “When shut down in 1971, it had become notorious among Jesuits as ‘the single most disastrous scholasticate that we had in modern times in the United States” (p. 367). Becker (1992) continued:
From the opening of Shrub Oak until its closing in 1971, the drum beat of criticism and the certain restless stirring never ceased. Frederic M. O'Connor, a long-time spiritual director at Shrub Oak, recalled the history of the house falling roughly into three periods: gradual escalation of unrest, 1955-60; sharp increase in restlessness, taking the form of overt agitation, 1960-65; and a slowed state of disturbance, 1965-69. It was primarily because of the unrest at Shrub Oak that the Committee of Spiritual Review (C.S.R.) was set up in 1964 at the request of Father Arrupe. (p. 296)

Another indication of the unrest and the impending change taking place in the formation process was seen in a letter from one of the faculty members written to the New York provincial describing the students in the philosophate. Becker (1992) quoted from the letter the following:

...It is rather that we are now confronted with a new and qualitative different phenomenon: the absence in a sizeable and growing body of our scholastics of an interior understanding and appreciation of Jesuit community life as such...[They] are engaged, more than half-consciously, in an endeavor to remold the Society in their own image, to their own concept of religious life, apostolic activity and the life of supernatural perfection. (p. 297)

To further make the point of the restlessness that existed at Shrub Oak, Becker (1992) elucidated this restlessness in the following excerpt from a member of the C.S.R.:

I think the young man of today finds its extremely difficult to conform himself to a set time order where everyone does the same thing at the same time. I cannot begin to analyze all the reasons for this, but it is a fact. Perhaps it is because this
runs counter to the young man of today's preoccupation with personalism and action. He feels less a person because he is pushed into the anonymity of a uniform order.

Perhaps this partially explains the explosions which have occurred at Shrub Oak in recent years. After four years within a structure which he never wholeheartedly accepted, in which he felt no real growth but where he never articulated his objections, he came to Shrub Oak where the 'official' structure was still fairly rigid but where in philosophy class he was bombarded intellectually with the demands of personalism, self-realization, and 'authenticity'. The result was that he began to operate outside the structure in his quest for individuality, often in a bizarre way. (p. 298)

Regency

After two years in the novitiate, two more in the juniorate, and three years at the philosophate, the young Jesuits entered a very different stage of formation. This period usually lasted for three years and took the form of teaching in a Jesuit high school. This period of formation was called regency, and it is here that they began to hone their skills in educating young men in the Jesuit high schools. Becker (1992) stated that there were three primary objectives to the regency part of the formation process:

One was to exercise the young Jesuits in self-giving. After nineteen years or more of attending school, where he was the center of the enterprise and was constantly urged to develop himself, he needed the experience of expending himself to others, to give rather than to receive. Second, regency was to exercise the young man in practical skills. He would have many responsibilities and have
to make many decisions, both in teaching his classes and in managing extracurricular activities. Third, regency would also restore the scholastic’s relationship with the outside world. After seven years of isolation, he would again be mingling on a daily workaday basis with others than Jesuits. For practically all of the scholastics, regency was a welcome change. (p. 324)

After having experienced the tensions in the novitiate, juniorate, and the philosophate, the scholastics entered high schools and colleges to teach. Neither the high schools nor the colleges had experienced the changes that the scholastics had not only lived through but had brought about during the previous seven years. Consequently, there also existed a built-in tension between the regents and the communities of Jesuits in which they resided. The degree of friction between the regents and the established Jesuit communities was less because the regents only made up a small part of the Jesuit communities, and the scholastics now had many of the freedoms during regency they had fought for during the previous seven years (Becker, 1992).

Theologate at Woodstock College

Upon completion of this three-year regency the men were sent to the theologate. It is here where for four years they studied theology, referred to by McDonough (1992) as the “queen of the sciences” (p. 137). Priestly ordination came at the conclusion of the third year of theology. The men were ordained priests and celebrated Mass the next day. After ordination, the men continued with their fourth and final year of theology. This was explained by Becker (1992):

The traditional theologate of the United States Assistancy was a completely Jesuit enterprise; its essential goal was not a degree but ordination. All of the professors
and all of the students were Jesuits. The school was entirely under the control of religious superiors, followed norms established in canon law, and awarded degrees that were ecclesiastical – for example, the licentiate degree. There was not a provision for organized student participation in academic decisions. Students found waiting for them a complete program of courses, class times, study times. The school, and the religious community were closely entwined, with everyone – students, teachers, administrators – living and working on the same campus. The language used, both in the classroom and for textbooks, was Latin.

(p. 142)

McDonough (1992) stated that:

Woodstock College was the flagship theologate of the Society of Jesus in the United States. Located in the Patapsco Valley twenty-five miles west of Baltimore, it opened its doors in 1869, less than three months before the start of the First Vatican Council, when papal infallibility was pronounced....Woodstock College served as a model for the final stages of the training of Jesuit priests in the United States. The setting in the rolling hills of Maryland was bucolic; the air was damp and fresh, still touched even that far inland with the tang of Chesapeake Bay....The detachment of Woodstock typified, on a slightly grander scale, the self-sufficiency of Jesuits...The seminary and its grounds composed a physical image that magnified the customs and the ideal of a protected subculture. (pp. 153-154)

The changes that occurred within the Jesuit Society as a whole started to take root in the theologate. Most of the men were, by this time, in their thirties and were
convinced that the road to maturity involved making decisions for themselves. "The prevailing mood among these men – a mood set by the leaders, as usual, but spreading rapidly to the majority – was one of 'taking charge,'" observed Becker (1992, p. 102).

The men of this study attended the theologate in the mid-1960s and had entered the order in the mid-1950s, which was the time that Becker (1992) referred to as the time the men were starting to be "different." He explained:

The theologians were younger than the university faculty members. As has been said, the revolution came mainly from below – partly from the younger faculty, who supplied the ideas of the reform, but especially from the students who carried them into action. The influence of youth was particularly noticeable in the change in lifestyle. The changes in dress, for example, appeared among the young theologians well before they were adopted by the Jesuits in the universities. (p. 103)

The changes that were discussed and brought forward during the theologate years dealt with location, academic programs, and lifestyle. The theologate was more of a "monastic" way of life for the theologians who had enjoyed a freer experience during regency. Modern psychology, at the time, was emphasizing that maturation required not protection, but exposure to the outside world. As a consequence there were discussions about the issue of exposure to the outside world through newspapers, television, radio, magazines, speakers, and trips off-campus for pastoral work. The discussion centered on the call of Vatican II, which spoke to the emergence of the Church more fully into the secular world.
Some of the academic changes that occurred at Woodstock College led to classes becoming optional for the theologians as well as a reduction of required courses. Ecclesiastical degrees were to be replaced with civil degrees recognized by the American Association of Theology Schools, such as the Master of Divinity and Master of Theology. Another change that occurred at this time was the inclusion of theologians in the decision-making process regarding academics and governance (Becker, 1992).

Becker further posits that:

*Lifestyle changes have a great significance, for a religious order it is essentially a ‘way of life’ in which the individual religious vows to live according to the order’s constitution and rules. A change in an order’s way of life is a change close to its heart.* (p. 162)

The traditional lifestyle was the prescribed daily order which had been part of the Jesuit formation for generations and remained stable until the early to mid-1960s. Becker (1992) explained what the traditional lifestyle and the daily order of the house was during the theologate:

*The entire house started the day together with a rising bell at 5:00 or 5:30. After a first visit to the Blessed Sacrament, there followed an hour of meditation. An official visitor (usually a brother) saw to it that everyone was out of bed and another visitor (a scholastic) saw to it that everyone was at prayer. At the end of meditation, all assembled in the chapel for community Mass, which, with a period of thanksgiving, occupied about forty-five minutes. Then followed breakfast, which was taken in silence. Individuals were free to leave breakfast whey they finished, and they normally stopped for a brief chapel visit.*
...Dinner, the main meal was usually at noon, with supper in the evening. Both were sit-down meals served by the scholastics, and the community entered and left the refectory together. During both meals someone read aloud from a book, usually a work of history or biography. The meals began with common prayer and were followed by a chapel visit.

The reading at table was an important channel of communication within the order. For example, it provided an opportunity to hear letters addressed by the General or provincial to the Society or province. More important, once each month the reading consisted of the Rules of the Summary (a collection of key passages from the Jesuit Constitutions), the Common Rules (more detailed and changeable guidelines for Jesuit lifestyle), and Saint Ignatius' Letter of Obedience. This monthly recitation gave the materials a strong social sanction that tended to produce automatic acceptance. Also, the continuous repetition throughout a lifetime imprinted whole passages indelibly on the group psyche. A common heritage owned by all, a single phrase or even a single word would be understood by everyone in total context. This common heritage was intergenerational, for each generation had heard the identical rules read out monthly throughout their entire Jesuit lives.

Most of the day was taken up with classes, which all the students were expected to attend, and with study. There was a general rule, less strictly enforced in the later stages of formation, that silence was to be observed outside of times of recreation. There were two periods of common recreation – after dinner and after supper – useable for conversation, or reading the few, selected...
parts of the newspaper (sports and some national events) that were available, or pursuing group activities — such as choir practice, making Christmas decorations, or rehearsing a play. There was another period of recreation in mid-afternoon, which the scholastics were expected to use for walks and outdoor games. The workweek was broken up by two holidays conveniently spaced at Thursday and Sunday.

A minimum of three hours of prayer was prescribed. In addition to an hour of meditation, there were the forty-five minutes allotted for Mass, a quarter of an hour for the noon examen (review of conscience), and a half hour at night for evening examen and preparations of the morning's meditation. In addition, the scholastics who were ordained read the Divine Office (Liturgy of the Hours), which before Vatican II took about an hour. The scholastics were expected to read some spiritual book for a period of each day. The community also assembled daily, usually just before dinner, for the common recitation of the litany of the saints.

Each semester was punctuated by a triduum, a three-day period of prayer during which the scholastics attended a spiritual conference each day; the triduum ended with a public renovation of vows. Once a year, the scholastics made an eight-day community retreat, a time devoted totally to silence and prayer under the direction of a retreat director.

The scholastics spent their summer vacations together at a villa; a place separate from the seminars [which the] superiors described as an instrument of province unity because it provided the best opportunity for the scholastics to get
to know each other. During the vacation period, the prayer requirements held, but most other aspects of life were relaxed....

Contacts with the outside world were minimal. During the school year, scholastics generally left the seminary only for health reasons, to visit a doctor or a hospital. The fourth-year theologians, recently ordained, were permitted occasionally to exercise their priestly ministry outside the seminary, but permission to travel to a library, for example, or to a meeting of a learned society was not easily obtained.

Newspapers and magazines were available only to a very limited and controlled extent. Radio (later, television) gradually became available, but only in community and always under closely controlled conditions. Films were beginning to make their appearance, but only when provided by the seminary, at the seminary, on special occasions. The community furnished some of its own entertainment: the large number of scholastics provided abundant talent for skits, plays, and musicals.

Modes of address were formal. Superiors and faculty were addressed by their last names, with proper title. Among themselves the scholastics were permitted the use of first names, but in formal situations, such as a class, they were expected to refer to a fellow scholastic as “Mr. Smith.” Outgoing mail was deposited in the superior’s box unsealed, and incoming mail was delivered opened...

However, by the end of the 1960’s, little of the traditional lifestyle remained. (pp. 163-165)
Tertianship

At the end of the four years of study at the theologate the scholastic was now ordained a priest in the Society of Jesus and was prepared for the last and the shortest stage of the Jesuit formation process, tertianship, which lasted eight to ten months. It was considered the third probation period, the first coming before the novitiate, the second being the novitiate itself, and third being the tertianship. Becker (1992) explained tertianship this way:

It is probably more helpful to think of this 'third' as extending the work of the two years of novitiate; for the tertianship is a return in some ways to the novitiate values and lifestyle – modified appropriately to suit older and more mature men....

Ignatius termed the tertianship the “school of the heart” – in contrast to the ‘school of letter’. He described it in the Constitutions as follows: ‘After those who were sent to studies have achieved the diligent and careful formation of the intellect by learning, they will find it helpful during the period of last probation to apply themselves in the school of the heart, by exercising themselves in its spiritual and corporal pursuits which can engender in them greater humility, abnegation of all sensual love and will and judgment of their own, and also greater knowledge and love of God our Lord.’ (p. 332)

More than any other stage of the formation process, except perhaps the novitiate, the tertianship emphasized the contemplative, prayerful side of the Jesuit vocation which centered around the 30 day retreat in the Spiritual Exercises. As Becker (1992) explained:
The tertianship is a kind of finishing school designed to impart a final and definitive shaping. Because that shape includes two equally essential but quite different elements, there has always been and probably always will be some debate over the proper mixture of the two in the final formative action. The Jesuit is to be a contemplative in action. In the tertianship, how much should contemplation be emphasized and how much action? ...this issue surfaced at every stage of formation during the changing sixties; but was especially sharp at the stage of the tertianship. More than any of the other stages except the novitiate, the tertianship emphasizes the contemplative, prayerful side of the Jesuit vocation, whereas the trend of modern times has been toward finding God less in formal prayer and more in action, action that directly touches one’s neighbor. (pp. 333-334)

At the end of this very lengthy process the Jesuit priest was ready to take up his life’s work. Most went on to teach in the high schools and colleges operated by the Society of Jesus, and some were later chosen to pursue administrative positions. Go (2000), a former principal of Xavier High School in Manila, the Philippines, noted that:

It is obvious that the ‘Jesuit way of proceeding’ is a cornerstone, a heritage, a tradition, a charism that has been handed down as part of Jesuit institutions and education throughout the world. In fact when one analyzes the ‘Jesuit way of proceeding,’ one finds that when thoroughly and well exercised, it is what excellent leadership and good management is all about. A more appropriate term might be the ‘spirituality of Ignation leadership.’ (p. 102)
It was clear that the Jesuit formation process was about making leaders, both for the Church (priests) and for education (teachers).

Higher Education Presidential Leadership and Organizational Culture

While the clear Jesuit emphasis on the role of the educator was one of teacher and scholar, it was not necessarily on that of being a president. Yet, in 2002, 26 out of the 28 colleges and universities under the auspices of the Society of Jesus had a Jesuit as president, with Georgetown University and Detroit Mercy being the only exceptions since 1789. Colleges and universities moved away from “in-loco-parentis” to a culture of individual freedoms and responsibilities. Boyer (1990), a noted education researcher from the Carnegie Foundation, stated that, “Everywhere, campus leaders have been asking how to make their institutions a more intellectually and socially vital place” (p. xiii). What role does the organizational culture play in defining student life, administration, and curriculum? What role does the president, in this case a Jesuit priest, play? How does the interaction of the Jesuit-trained president with the culture in higher education impact change within the organization? What makes a Jesuit priest an effective president? Can a college or university president really make an institution more effective? What roles do other leaders of the campus play in the overall effectiveness of the institution? All three – culture, leadership, and change – are so intertwined that it is difficult to separate them and still get a view of the big picture of higher education.

Berquist (1992), president of the School of Psychology in San Francisco, California, explained, “...culture provides meaning and context for a specific group of people. The culture holds the people together and instills in them an individual and collective sense of purpose and continuity” (p. 2). He further stated, “A culture is
established around the production of something valued by its members. A culture does not exist for itself; rather, it exists to provide a context” (p. 2).

Bimbaum (1992), a professor of higher education at the University of Maryland College Park, believed that gaining an understanding of the culture of an institution may have a direct impact on the leadership and the ability to exact change within that culture. Berquist (1992) explained that, “Institutional image, traditions, history, and character are shaped by the four distinct cultures in higher education (collegial, managerial, developmental, and negotiating) and how they interact with them” (pp. 4-6). The need for understanding the culture that exists within an institution of higher education is crucial when leaders, responding to interior and exterior pressures for change, exercise their leadership in planning for innovations. Birnbaum (1992) suggested that, “Institutional culture and history play a major role in determining what presidents can do” (p. 160). Schein (1985) has argued that:

…once an organization has evolved a mature culture because it has a long and rich history, that culture creates the patterns of perception, thought and feeling of every new generation in the organization, and, therefore, also ‘causes’ the organization to be predisposed to certain kinds of leadership. (p. 313)

Masland (1983), an expert in the field of organizational culture, stated that, “Indicators of organizational culture that clarify both past and present cultural influences include sagas, heroes, symbols and rituals” (p. 158). How one goes about learning the culture would include learning about those heroes and rituals that live on a daily basis within the institution. Masland (1983) continued by stating:
A saga usually describes a unique accomplishment of the organization, while heroes play a central role in an institution's saga because heroes are those who made crucial decisions or who exemplify the proper way to act. A symbol can make tangible an implicit value or belief and it can be recognized by the public as well. Finally, rituals translate culture into action (e.g., an outstanding teaching award ceremony). (p. 142)

Murphy (1991), a Vincentian priest and Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at DePaul University, conducted a study at five Catholic institutions of how higher education relates value sharing within the organizations to the rituals and stories of their cultures and leaders.

Not only does an understanding of institutional culture play an important part in leadership and change, it is also useful in understanding the value of the concepts and techniques of organizational development. Schmuck (1987), a noted educator, stated that:

...Because schools are social organizations, school effectiveness depends on the school's organizational culture; ... attempts to institute educational reforms and school culture mesh; ... student's emotional and social problems in school may be based in the school's organizational culture; and... it is possible to change the culture and improve the climate for learning and organizational success. (p. 2)

Once the culture of the institution is understood, the effective leader can actually begin to lead the institution. This may be easier for Jesuit priests since they share the same formation process and share a common view of education as outlined in the 1599 Ratio Studiorum. More and more followers and those outside of higher education are...
looking for effective leadership within higher education in order to restore public
certainty. Laughlin (1994), an educator, spoke to the fact that to lead effectively a
leader must communicate well; establish clear directions; be able to motivate
subordinates through shared participation, rewards, and morale boosting; develop and
maintain openness with employees and the public; strive for excellence; and recognize
subordinate behavioral patterns. In addition, Lees (1994), a researcher, noted that good
leadership is seen in terms of empowering followers to gain personal and professional
successes, and inspiring others to achieve organizational goals.

How did the Jesuit formation process in the late 1950s and 1960s prepare a
person, who was formed for the priesthood, teaching, and scholarship, to embrace these
effective leadership skills? If one were to look at the development of the Ratio
Studiorum, one could gain a sense of the Jesuit approach to leadership. Go (2000) noted
that:

1. The Ratio underwent a number of trial editions before the definitive edition
   was published and promulgated. It was the product of fifty years of corporate
   international experience. It resulted from a process of gathering the teaching
   experiences of the early Fathers and reflecting on those experiences before the
   codification of the Ratio was accomplished. This process is very Jesuit. It
   was always trial runs before a decision is made; it is reflection on experience,
   articulating, interpreting experience, a discernment before action is taken.

2. Very early on, even at the time of Ignatius Loyola and the early Superiors
   General of the Society, the Ratio prepared what we today would call ‘job
descriptions’ (the functions and responsibilities) for all, from the Jesuit
provincials, rectors, prefects of discipline, teachers, professors, to scholastics.

Up to this day, most Jesuit institutions are similarly very well organized.

3. There was an effort to make the *Ratio* reflect the whole educational spectrum and to make it *universally acceptable and applicable* as possible by integrating the comments, suggestions, and desires from most provinces into the document.

4. ‘Flexibility’ and ‘adaptation’ are key concepts in Jesuit documents. Provision was made for more individualized implementation of the *Ratio*, much according to the demands and needs of each province, which we today would call ‘adaptation to context and cultures,’ ‘enculturation,’ ‘adaptation to the needs of times, places, and person.’ ...Again this is meeting the people where they are, not where we think they are. (pp. 102-103)

Balderston (1995), an author in the field of higher education, stated that the five major functions of leadership generally are characteristic of organizations:

1. Clarification of mission...and determination of long-range objectives and short-range goals.

2. Allocation of organization’s resources to priority uses within the terms of objectives and goals.

3. Selection and evaluation of key personnel.

4. Representation of the organization to external constituencies.

5. Strategic management and organization change. (p.78)

Some theoretical approaches assert that leadership can be understood only in the context of followership. But in higher education, there is a strong resistance to leadership...
as it is generally understood in more traditional and hierarchical organizations; in particular, in most institutions it may be more appropriate to think of the faculty as constituents rather than as followers (Bimbaum, 1988). Keeping this dilemma in mind, it is important to know how that leadership is often defined, not only by what leaders do, but also by the ways in which followers think about leadership, interpret a leader’s behavior, and come, over time, to develop shared explanations for the causes and outcomes of ambiguous events (Bimbaum, 1992).

Attention should be directed to the four basic administrative styles of leadership articulated by Laughlin (1994): a) the structured, classical, traditional model; b) the participatory or employee-involved operation; c) a more behavioral scientific style; and d) the situational or environmentalist style. Paul Blacketor (1991), a researcher in educational leadership, indicated that participatory leadership would encourage constructive change, professional participation in leadership, and personal and professional development. It seems that the president of a college or university needs to understand the group that he is to lead, their make-up, and their culture. Thus, one would assume that the president must approach leadership in a rather eclectic manner with the use of a situational leadership style. Short and Greer (1997) noted, “The situation approach thus reviewed leadership as a composite response to the peculiar characteristics of a given group of setting” (p. 20).

As previously stated, the five participants entered their formation process at a time when that process came under attack. At the same time, the Roman Catholic Church was undergoing a revolution and a rebirth. By the end of their formation process, the
Church and the Jesuit formation process were transformed into something new and vibrant.

Hanson (1985), an expert in educational administration, noted the findings of the Hawthorne Studies that were carried out from 1927 through 1932. While the Hawthorne Studies, by Elton Mayo, focused on the workers at the Western Electric Company’s Hawthorne Works near Chicago, much of the findings can be used to explain how the changes in the Jesuit formation process came about. Hanson (1985) further stated that of all of the findings in the study:

…the most significant were associated with the discovery that workers tend not to act as individuals but as members of informal groups. The informal group is defined…as a ‘system of interpersonal relations which forms within an organization to affect decisions of the formal organization, and this system is omitted from the formal scheme or is in opposition to it.’ (p. 54)

The research by Becker (1992) clearly showed that the novices who entered the novitiate between 1955-1959 drove the changes brought forth in the formation process. Those men were informally challenging a four-hundred-year old formation process. At first, they challenged the simple rules of life such as not attending classes, going off campus, reading magazines, and not adhering to the silence periods, to name a few. The ultimate changes that occurred restructured the entire formation process ranging from what classes were taught to the entire structure of the class day, both academically and devotionally. It was, as Becker (1992) surmised, a revolution not unlike the findings of the Hawthorne Study.
Summary

This review of the related literature has examined four areas: Catholic higher education, Jesuit higher education, Jesuit formation process, and presidential leadership and culture. In order to see how each relates to the other it is important to know specifics information about each component of the research. Catholic higher education has impacted Jesuit higher education and vice versa; the Second Vatican Council and *Ex Corde Ecclesiae* have impacted Catholic and Jesuit higher education; the Jesuit formation process affected the leadership characteristics of a Jesuit-formed person; and that formation process did have an effect on the organizational culture of a Jesuit institution of higher learning.

A review of the literature clearly leads one to conclude that Catholic higher education, Jesuit higher education, the Jesuit formation process, and the presidential leadership and culture of the Jesuit-formed person are interrelated. What is being examined here is how these four areas of research converged and influenced the subjects in their formation process and how that process has affected their higher education presidential leadership. In other words, what was it about the Jesuit formation process from the middle 50s to the middle 60s that prepared the subjects for ministry as presidents, and how did that formation process influence their leadership as presidents at their respective Catholic institutions?
Chapter Three

Methods and Procedures

A qualitative methodology was used in this study to gain an understanding of the experiences of five volunteers. The basic assumptions of qualitative research include the following: (a) qualitative researchers are concerned primarily with process, rather than outcomes of products, (b) qualitative researchers are interested in meaning – how people make sense of their lives, experiences, and their structures of the world, and (c) the qualitative researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1998).

For the purpose of this research, one grand tour research question and three sub-questions, was examined:

Grand Tour Research Question

1. Have their particular experiences in the Jesuit formation process influenced the leadership style of these men in their ministry as presidents?

Sub-Questions

1. At each distinctive phase of the formation process, how would they describe the academic and general lifestyle of the formation process, and what was it about those two areas that have influenced their leadership as presidents?

2. What particular talents do they believe they bring to the position of president and how do these talents relate to their formation as Jesuit priests?

3. Were they groomed or mentored during their formation process for their eventual leadership roles as presidents? If so, how?
Multiple Case-Study

In order to discover the answers to the research questions as set forth above, five men were chosen who were trained to be Jesuit priests and teachers through their Jesuit formation process. It is their experiences in and outside of the formation process, their characteristics, family and personal background, home life, and their leadership styles that had an effect on the nature of the information to be gathered. The data obtained also depended greatly on the willingness of the subjects to share their information and insight and their ability to be accessible.

This chapter provides a discussion of the methods that were used during subject selection, data collection, and data analysis. The qualitative research method that was used in this study is the multiple case-study method. The definition of the multiple case-study used was from Merriam (1988) and Yin (1989), as cited by Creswell (1994), which described a multiple case-study as one “...in which the researcher explores a single entity or phenomenon (‘the case’) bounded by time and activity (a program, event, process, institution, or social group) and collects detailed information by using a variety of data collection procedures during a sustained period of time” (p.12).

Patton, (1985) as cited by Merriam, (1998) described qualitative research as:

...An effort to understand situations in their uniqueness as part of a particular context and the interactions there. This understanding is an end to itself, so that it is not attempting to predict what may happen in the future necessarily, but to understand the nature of that setting, what their lives are like, what’s going on for them, what their meanings are, what the world looks like in that particular setting.
and in the analysis to be able to communicate that faithfully to others who are interested in that setting ...the analysis strives for depth of understanding. (p. 6)

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) described qualitative research as having five features:

1. **Naturalistic.** Has actual settings as the direct source of data and the researcher is the key instrument. Qualitative researchers go to the particular setting ...because they are concerned with context.

2. **Descriptive Data.** The data collected take the form of words or pictures rather than numbers. The written results contain quotations from the date to illustrate and substantiate the presentations. The data include interview transcripts, fieldnotes, photographs, videotapes, personal documents, memos and other official records. The qualitative research approach demands that the world be examined with the assumption that nothing is trivial, that everything has the potential of being a clue that might unlock a more comprehensive understanding of what is being studied.

3. **Concern with Process.** Qualitative researchers are concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes. How do the people negotiate meaning? How do certain terms and labels come to be applied? How do certain notions come to be taken as part of what we know as "common sense"? What is the natural history of the activity or event under study?

4. **Inductive.** Qualitative researchers tend to analyze their data inductively. They do not search data or evidence to prove or disprove hypotheses they hold before entering the study; rather, the abstractions are built as the particulars that have been gathered are grouped together. Theory developed this way
emerges from the bottom up (rather than from the top down), from many disparate pieces of collected evidence that are interconnected. The theory is grounded in the data....the direction you will travel comes after you have been collecting the data, after you have spent time with your subjects. The process of data analysis is like a funnel: Things are open at the beginning (or top) and more directed and specific at the bottom. The qualitative researcher plans to use part of the study to learn what the important questions are. He or she does not assume that enough is known to recognize important concerns.

5. *Meaning*... is of essential concern to the qualitative approach. Researchers who use this approach are interested in how different people make sense of their lives. They focus on such questions as: What assumptions do people make about their lives? What do they take for granted? (pp. 4-7)

Family background and work experiences were included in this qualitative study. In addition, the design and common characteristics of the Jesuit formation program that were shared by these five subjects are described in this dissertation. The study of the Jesuit formation process included, but was not limited to, their time together at Shrub Oak Seminary for the study of philosophy and at Woodstock College for the study of theology.

Triangulation, according to Bogdan and Biklen (1998) is simply the gathering of information from several sources and, thereby, being able to verify the accuracy of the information. Triangulation was achieved by comparing the answers of the five subjects to the same interview questions and to their biographical data. In addition, the
information provided by the subjects was verified by examining documents retrieved from the Jesuit archives in New York City, Baltimore, and Washington, DC. In addition, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) define the steps necessary for coding as:

You search through your data for regularities and patterns as well as for topics your data cover, and then you write down words and phrases to represent these topics and patterns. These words and phrases are coding categories. They are a means of sorting the descriptive data you have collected (the signs under which you would pile the toys) so that the material bearing on a given topic can be physically separated from the other data. (p. 171)

The information that was gleaned from the transcripts and the fieldnotes were treated in the manner described above. All information was separated into like categories and then further separated into thematic units.

Data

Sample

There were seven men who met the criteria listed below. However, one declined to participate in the study and the other was located in Japan, a location deemed to be too distant to interview by the researcher. The five subjects that were chosen met the following criteria:

1. They are or have been Catholic college, university, or seminary presidents.
2. They were trained for the Jesuit priesthood.
3. They are from the Maryland or New York Provinces.
4. They entered the novitiate between 1954 and 1958.
5. They studied their philosophy at Shrub Oak Seminary in New York.
6. They studied their theology at Woodstock College in Maryland.

In addition to meeting all of the above criteria, all received a letter of invitation to participate in the study and all agreed (appendix A). The five participants also returned a completed biographical inventory which was sent to them in March 2001 (appendix B).

The five volunteers were:

1. Fr. Vincent Cooke, SJ President Canisius College
   Buffalo, NY

2. Fr. Dan Degnan, SJ Past President St. Peter's College
   Jersey City, NJ

3. Fr. Tom Gleason, SJ Past President Jesuit School of Theology
   Berkeley, CA

4. Fr. Ed Glynn, SJ President John Carroll University,
   Cleveland, OH

5. Dr. Matt Quinn Past President Carroll College
   Helena, MT

Biographical Data

To determine if they all met the requirements for this study, the Directory of Jesuit Priests for the Maryland and New York Provinces was consulted to verify the subjects' dates of entry into the novitiate and ordination. After this initial research, each person was sent a letter inviting him to participate in the study (appendix A). The letter of invitation outlined the purpose of the study by identifying the potential research questions.

After receiving their favorable reply, a biographical inventory was sent to each one of the subjects to assist the researcher in developing a rudimentary picture of each participant (appendix B). In addition, other information was requested through the biographical inventory concerning education, family background, and professional
positions, all of which were pertinent to the research. The sum of this information was especially useful in the future development of the formal interview questions (appendix F).

Archival Research

Prior to conducting the formal interviews, the archives at the Jesuit Office in New York City, the Jesuit Office in Baltimore, Maryland, and the Georgetown University Library were researched for relevant documents pertaining to the subjects' formation period at Shrub Oak Seminary and Woodstock College. While both of these institutions have been closed since 1971, their archival documents were available at the locations mentioned above, and a visit to the facilities in February of 2000 supplemented the information gathered to that point.

Practice Interviews

Before entering the field to interview the subjects it was necessary to practice the prescribed interviewing techniques. A pilot study was performed with a volunteer Jesuit priest to enable the researcher to practice the interviewing techniques. In addition, two faculty members at Carroll College in the Communications Department were willing to help the researcher fine-tune this process. Whenever possible, the practice-interviews were videotaped and then critiqued. A journal of the practice interviews was kept so that they could be referred to at a later time in order to identify areas for improvement.

Interviews

At the very heart of what it means to be human is the ability of people to share their experiences through the use of language and story telling. Siedman (1998) stated, “Interviewing, then, is a basic mode of inquiry. Recounting narratives of experiences has
been a major way throughout recorded history that humans have made sense of their experiences” (p. 2). The purpose of in-depth interviewing is to reach a greater understanding about the experiences of other people and to make sense of those experiences rather than to get answers to questions or test hypotheses (Seidman, 1998). At the very heart of interviewing, then, is to have a keen interest in other individuals’ stories because they are of worth.

Siedman (1998) also noted that:

Interviewing provides access to the context of people’s behavior and thereby provides a way for researchers to understand the meaning of that behavior. A basic assumption in in-depth interviewing research is that the meaning people make of their experiences affects the way they carry out that experience. (p.4)

All of the background information was gathered prior to the beginning of the face-to-face interviews with the subjects by way of the biographical inventory, archival research, and the review of the literature. The majority of the data collection came from the insiders’ perspective or the viewpoint of the subjects (Merriam, 1998), done in one face-to-face interview with each of the five subjects. Permission to videotape and audiotape the interviews was requested prior to the interviews. If the subjects had preferred not to have the interviews videotaped, permission would have been gained to audiotape the proceedings. The interviews of the five subjects took place at their home bases during the summer of 2001 using both video and audio tapes and were then professionally transcribed during the same summer months. The conditions of the interviews were adapted to the wishes of each subject.
The interview technique chosen was the open-ended question technique. The main task for the researcher was to build upon and explore each participant’s response to the questions. The goal for the researcher was to have the participant reconstruct his experiences within the scope of the study (Seidman, 1998).

Seidman (1998) stated, “People's behavior becomes meaningful and understandable when placed in the context of their lives and the lives of those around them. Without context there is little possibility of exploring the meaning of an experience” (p. 11). Therefore, the interview was divided into three distinct parts. During the first section of the interview, the researcher concentrated on the life history of the participant, where the task of the researcher was to ask the participant to recall his early experiences in his family, in school, with friends, and in his neighborhood. The second part of the interview concentrated on the concrete details of the participant’s formation experiences. The third and final portion of the interview asked the participant to reflect on the meaning of his experiences and how those experiences influenced his ministry as president.

Fieldnotes

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) described the field notes as “…the written account of what the researcher hears, sees, experiences, and things in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data in a qualitative study” (pp. 107-108). Bogdan & Biklen (1998) also noted that the content of the fieldnotes can be categorized into two kinds of material; descriptive and reflective. The researcher, after each individual interview, formulated the fieldnotes which included a description of the person that was interviewed, the setting of the interview, events and activities surrounding the interview, and a general description
of the interview itself. In addition, the fieldnotes included ideas, strategies, and reflections of each interview (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). The fieldnotes were transcribed and then analyzed by the researcher.

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) further stated that the use of fieldnotes with taped interviews can provide, “the meaning context of the interview…. The tape recorder misses the sights, smells, impressions, and extra remarks said before and after the interview” (p. 108). In summarizing the use of fieldnotes, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) noted that:

Fieldnotes can provide any study with a personal log that helps the researcher to keep track of the development of the project, to visualize how the research plan has been affected by the data collected, and to remain aware of how he or she has been influenced by the data. (p. 108).

Data Reliability

In describing data reliability Bogdan and Biklen (1998) stated that:

In qualitative studies, researchers are concerned with the accuracy and comprehensiveness of their data. Qualitative researchers tend to view reliability as a fit between what they record as data and what actually occurs in the setting under study, rather than the literal consistency across different observations. (p. 36)

Lincoln and Guba, (1985) as cited by Merriam, (1998) posited that the term reliability in qualitative research should mean, “dependability or consistency.” By this, Merriam (1998) noted:
...rather than demanding that outsiders get the same results, a researcher wishes outsiders to concur that, given the data collected, the results make sense – they are consistent and dependable. The question then is not whether the findings will be found again but whether the results are consistent with the data collected. (p. 206)

The reliability of the data was checked in several ways. First, the reliability of the data was checked by comparing the information that was provided by each subject to the other subjects’ answers to the same questions. All experienced the same formation process during the same time period, and the facts about that process were verifiable by each subject and by archival material.

**Data Analysis**

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) described data analysis as, “the process of systematically searching and arranging the interview transcripts, fieldnotes, and other material that you have accumulated to increase your own understanding of them and to enable you to present what you have discovered to others” (p. 157). Merriam (1998) spoke to the fact that data analysis is one of the few facets in qualitative research that is either done the right way or the wrong way. She further noted that data analysis should be done simultaneously with data collection and that the, “final product is shaped by the data that are collected and the analysis that accompanies the entire process” (p. 162).

The purpose in collecting this data was to develop a multiple case-study of five men who have been or are now presidents of a Catholic college, university, or seminary, using the information to analyze the grand tour question and the three sub-questions. Each interview was transcribed within a prescribed amount of time by a professional
transcriber. The videotapes and audiotapes were compared to the transcripts and fieldnotes on additional observations were made concerning the interviews.

The transcripts were reviewed in order to break down the information into the smallest common pieces of information which could easily be understood without more than a general knowledge of the subject. These bits of information were then grouped into categories and themes that were easily identifiable. These categories and themes were not based on frequency, but rather on what was considered to be significant to the research questions.

The task of identifying the information thematically was accomplished through coding. Merriam (1998) stated, "coding is nothing more than some sort of shorthand designation to the various aspects of the data so that you can easily retrieve specific pieces of data." (p. 164). Creswell (1994) described the importance of coding by stating:

Flexible rules govern how one goes about sorting through interview transcripts, observational notes, documents, and visual material. It is clear, however, that one forms categories of information and attaches codes to these categories. These categories and codes form the basis for the emerging story to be told by the qualitative researcher. (p. 154)

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) expanded upon the importance of coding by stating:

As you read through your data, certain words, phrases, patterns of behavior, subjects’ ways of thinking, and events repeat and stand out. Developing a coding system involves several steps: You search through your data for regularities and patterns as well as for topics that your data cover. These words and phrases are coding categories. They are the means of sorting the descriptive data you have
collected …so that the material bearing on a given topic can be physically separated from other data. (p. 171)

At the conclusion of these tasks the narrative for the multiple case-study was written based upon the categories and themes.

After each case-study was written the transcripts and the tapes were reviewed to look for additional information related to the grand tour question and the three sub-questions. All necessary additions, deletions, or changes were made during this final review of the material extracted from the interviews.
Chapter Four

Findings From the Qualitative Inquiry

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the lives of five Jesuit formed men who, during their careers, became presidents of Catholic colleges, universities, and seminaries. The information that these men shared with the researcher by providing the necessary biographical information and through extensive interviews assisted in the understanding of the influence of their formation as Jesuit priests on their leadership as higher education presidents. The positive and negative aspects of the lives of these five men helped shed light on how their shared past has helped shape their many and varied leadership roles throughout their career.

A qualitative methodology was used in this study. The in-depth interview used as part of the multi case-study approach allowed various aspects of the subjects’ lives to be explored and examined. Categories and themes were discovered in the narratives of the lives of these men which formed the basis for the data analysis conducted in this study. Areas of future research may be suggested as a result of the interview format and the information which emerged from their interviews.

This chapter will consist of three sections. The first section will introduce the five subjects who participated in the study. The second section will outline and explain the categories and themes which emerged from the analysis of the interviews of these men. The third section will be a summary of chapter 4.

Several aspects of the data collection process are worthy of note. First, six men were invited to participate in this study. Five accepted the invitation, and one declined
to participate due to job-related issues and concerns. Second, the five who accepted the invitation to participate did so willingly and were extremely cooperative. Third, all interviews took place at the home site of each one of the subjects. Fourth, all of the men were very forthright and eager to be of assistance during this entire process by willingly providing background information, filling out forms, and by opening their lives to the researcher.

**Study Volunteers**

The five volunteers are described below. As a group, the men were highly educated, all came from modest Catholic family backgrounds, all received the majority of their education at Catholic institutions, and all achieved significant success during their careers. The subjects ranged in age from 65 to 75 and studied for the New York or Maryland Provinces of the Society of Jesus.

**Fr. Dan Degnan, S.J.**

The first volunteer to be interviewed, Fr. Degnan, was born in 1926 in Orange, New Jersey. Both of his parents were Roman Catholics. Fr. Degnan’s mother worked in the home, and his father was involved in real estate and was the mayor of his hometown. The paternal grandparents emigrated to the United States from Ireland while the maternal grandparents were from New Jersey.

Fr. Degnan received his primary, secondary, and most of his post-secondary education at Catholic schools. His undergraduate degree, which he received in 1950 from Georgetown University, was in history and government. He continued his education at the Seton Hall University Law School where he received his JD degree. In addition, he also earned an MA from Harvard Law School.
Prior to receiving his bachelor's degree from Georgetown University, Fr. Degnan served for two years in the United States Navy near the end of World War II. After receiving his JD from Seton Hall University, Fr. Degnan was employed as a law clerk in Newark, NJ and later was an attorney in that same city. In 1958 he entered the Society of Jesus in the novitiate at St. Andrew's on the Hudson in Poughkeepsie, NY. Due to the fact that he already had earned his bachelor's degree, he skipped his juniorate years and went directly to study philosophy at Shrub Oak Seminary in Peekskill, NY. His regency years were spent at Harvard Law School. Following regency, he returned to the classroom at Woodstock College outside of Baltimore, MD to complete his theology studies and was ordained in 1966.

Following ordination, Fr. Degnan returned to Harvard Law School to become a teaching fellow for one year. The following five years were spent as a professor at Syracuse Law School which was followed by two years as a visiting professor at Georgetown Law School. His first administrative post was that of academic vice president at Loyola College in Baltimore, MD. A year later he was named dean and associate provost at the Seton Hall University Law School where he served in that capacity for five years in addition to being a professor. Fr. Degnan subsequently relinquished his administrative responsibilities but continued to teach at Seton Hall University Law School for the next five years. Following his duties at Seton Hall University Law School he once again returned to Harvard Law School as a one-year visiting professor.

In 1990, Father Degnan was named the president of St. Peter's College in Jersey City, NJ where he served in that capacity for three years. He then served as an adjunct
faculty member at Seton Hall University Law School for two years. The remainder of his
career has encompassed working as a writer of scholarly literature and carrying out his
pastoral work as a priest in Jersey City, NJ.

Father Degnan resided in the old main building of the St. Peter’s Preparatory
School, which was a brown stone in the heart of Jersey City, New Jersey. It was the main
building of the St. Peter’s Preparatory School located approximately two city blocks from
the Hudson River, right at the edge of New Jersey. The neighborhood was somewhat
dilapidated, an urban landscape of run down houses, garages, and businesses, located
approximately three blocks from the New Jersey turnpike. Fr. Degnan, prior to starting
the interview process, took the researcher up to the roof of the building to look at the
view of New York City and the Hudson Bay. The view was magnificent. Off to the east,
one could clearly the Statue of Liberty and the Ellis Island Park associated with the
Statue. Off to the north stood the twin towers of the World Trade Center.

Fr. Degnan led the way to his rather spartan, one-room: a dwelling which
consisted of a twin bed, a desk, a couple of chairs, his library, and a television. It was a
very simple and plain room, yet filled with memorabilia representing significant items in
his life. On the wall, hung a picture of a ship upon which he served, as well as a picture
of his mother and him at a much younger age, possibly when he was ordained. The
chairs were the typical sorts of collegiate chairs, a rocking chair, and sitting chair and the
desk was light formica with a plain chair next to it. A small area rug covered a portion of
the floor.

The room was not opulent and was probably smaller than most hotel rooms. It
struck the researcher, however, that the Jesuits are sometimes called to different duties at
different locations. They are called to go where and when they are asked and there is no need for a lot of material belongings or fancy surroundings. The strength that they find in their lives is in being of service to God and in their intellectual life as it relates to the search for the Ultimate Truth.

Father Degnan is in his middle seventies and has rather wavy, grayish hair. During the interview he was seated in a rocking chair, and the researcher was seated across from him in a desk chair with an insignia of Fairfield University on the back of it. The window to the room was open, and the researcher could clearly hear the noises of the city; traffic, conversation, and sirens.

Father Degnan was very articulate and had given considerable advanced thought to this interview. He was very open, very honest, and he truly seemed to enjoy the conversation. Even with his preparation, some questions were asked during the interview which were not anticipated, and he seemingly appreciated the opportunity to give some thought to those questions and enter into a dialog.

Father Degnan seemed to be a very intellectual individual. He also was a person who came from a political background, as he explained in the interview, and had political aspirations of his own at one time. His mother provided the real basis for his spirituality, while his father provided more of the political hunger and ambition that he has had in his life. During the interview itself, he delved into areas that were a direct response to the questions but also raised issues that the researcher could not have anticipated. For example, he willingly spoke about the number of scholastics that sought out psychiatric care during the formation process to help with their discernment about their future vocation. He also spoke about not necessarily being from a very religious family,
although his mother certainly pushed the religious envelope in the family. But when she tried to have the family recite the rosary around the table, he stated that most of the children, and there were seven in the family, did not really participate. Even though his mother was more outwardly spiritual, his father certainly supported her.

Fr. Degnan was not afraid to speak his mind. He had a number of very thoughtful opinions about a number of issues, and his face lit up when he spoke about his time in the profession of law. It was quite clear that he truly enjoyed law – not only studying it, but also being the Dean of the law school at Seton Hall. He spoke earnestly about his ability to take that department, mold it, and give it a vision and a sense of vibrancy and life. His experience at Syracuse Law School, unfortunately, was less positive. As he described it, he felt isolated in Syracuse and unable to get in touch with the community.

Fr. Degnan seemed to get a great deal of satisfaction from being in an urban setting. His return to his roots gave him a sense of purpose and brought joy to his life. He enjoyed the interaction of the people within that setting, specifically the political game centered around urban life.

He spoke warmly about the politics in that area of New Jersey and throughout the rest of the state. During our conversation he even admitted that his ambition, at one particular point, was to become the governor of the State of New Jersey. It was clear that the desire to lead had surfaced at a very early age. When he spoke about his religious life he stated that it was not something he had realized for himself early on in life. He never had any thoughts about becoming a Jesuit per se, but he did talk about the influence of one particular Jesuit that led him in the direction of the Society of Jesus.
Fr. Degnan went to great lengths to talk about the difference of age between him and the other novices as they entered into the novitiate and that he still had a love for the law and wanted to maintain that interest. He mentioned that during theology at Woodstock, he believed the changes taking place to be revolutionary and likened that to the revolution the Church was undergoing under Vatican II.

He was outspoken with strong opinions and a clear vision. When he became president of St. Peter's he had a vision for taking the college to the next level by increasing enrollment and building the residential life component of the college. Even though his predecessor had made attempts in these areas, they were minimal. Fr. Degnan felt that in order for an institution to be vibrant, it had to have a living component within the campus walls; thus, he created the residence life component of the college. He found great strength and enjoyment in being part of the urban setting in which St. Peter's was located. St. Peter's seemed to be a perfect fit for where Fr. Degnan was in his life, for his vision of Jesuit higher education, and for the fact that it was in an area in which he had grown up; an area in which he was extremely comfortable; an area from which he drew great strength for his own life. When Fr. Degnan spoke about his presidential leadership, he revealed a real joy because, in some respect, he was a very pragmatic individual who liked to see things built and who liked to see things evolve out of his own thinking and his own ideas.

Fr. Degnan shared with the researcher that he had hoped to be a president at other institutions before he became president at St. Peter's and, in fact, had been a finalist in three different presidential searches. There was no doubt that those second place finishes were disappointing and disheartening to him and he had hoped to be able to do more. He
stated that, for him, in his leadership roles, five years was about the maximum he could handle in any one position and still consider himself to be effective.

Fr. Degnan also spoke a great deal about how learning took place for him; that he did not particularly care for the old ways of teaching within the theology, and that he probably learned much more from the informal intellectual groups that had been formed within Woodstock. Many of the students there had already gone on to get their doctorates. They had come back from the regency years to study theology as part of the formation process and were more than capable of dealing with theological issues in a very intellectual manner. He found the theological discussions that took place among the theology students to be exciting and meaningful. As he continued to speak, Fr. Degnan began to recollect events during the formation process; some were negative, but most were positive. He shared freely and easily about his intellectual life as he talked about books he had read, articles he had written, and papers he had delivered. After listening to him, it was obvious that his real joy came from the intellectual life of the mind and from being a contemplative; yet he also found great joy in taking action to enact his vision as a presidential leader.

In talking about his spiritual life, the researcher sensed that Fr. Degnan’s faith was very personal to him. He enjoyed the basic responsibilities of the priesthood but was not overly concerned with the implied expectations, such as attendance at daily Mass. His spiritual nature was more intrinsic and more individual, and from this, he gained great strength. Although he did not necessarily agree with everything within the Ignatian spirituality, his own was strongly rooted in it.
The second volunteer to be interviewed was Fr. Ed Glynn. He was born in the small town of Clarke Summit, PA just a few miles north of Scranton, PA in 1935. His parents were both Roman Catholic and were born in the United States. Fr. Glynn’s maternal grandparents emigrated from Germany to the United States.

Unlike the other subjects of this study, Fr. Glynn received his elementary education from the public school system. After he finished eighth grade his family received financial help from a parishioner so that he was able to attend Scranton Preparatory High School in Scranton, PA where he was exposed, for the first time, to the Society of Jesus. He attended the University of Scranton for a short while before transferring to Fordham University, both of which were Jesuit institutions, and ultimately earning an AB in history from the latter. He also received a Licentiate of Philosophy and MA in teaching from Fordham University. At Woodstock he received a Bachelor of Sacred Theology (ST.B.), at Yale he earned a ST. M. and from the Graduate School of Theology at Berkeley he earned his Doctorate of Sacred Theology (ST. D.).

Fr. Glynn entered the novitiate in 1958 at Wernersville, PA where he also studied during his juniorate. His philosophy studies were completed at Shrub Oak Seminary in Peekskill, NY. During his regency years he served as a teacher at St. Joseph’s Preparatory High School in Philadelphia, PA from 1962-1965. After completing his regency, he traveled to Woodstock College outside of Baltimore, MD where he studied theology. Fr. Glynn was ordained a Jesuit priest in 1967.

For six years Fr. Glynn was an assistant professor in the Department of Theology at Georgetown University in Washington, DC. During that time he was also a
contributing staff member of America, a weekly magazine published by the United States Assistancy. In addition, for a two-year period he was the director of the Woodstock Theological Center at Georgetown University. For a one-year period he served as the acting director of the Center for Theology and Public Policy in Washington, DC.

In 1978, Fr. Glynn became the academic vice president at Gonzaga University in Spokane, WA but was only there for one year before assuming the duties of president at St. Peter's College in Jersey City, NJ where he remained for the next twelve years. In 1990 he became the provincial for the Province of Maryland in Baltimore, MD where he served for six years before being named president at Gonzaga University. Fr. Glynn served at Gonzaga University for only six months before assuming the post of interim vice chancellor and provost at the University of Massachusetts in Boston. Since 1998, he has served as president of John Carroll University in Cleveland, OH.

The interview with Fr. Glynn took place in his temporary office within John Carroll University’s main administration building. He was in a temporary office because the entire floor of the main administration building, where his permanent office was located, was under construction. The main administration building was located at the heart of a beautifully manicured university campus in an upper middle class neighborhood of Cleveland named University Heights, where the homes had brightly colored flowers and beautifully sculpted bushes. The campus, with wonderfully maintained green lawns with sculptured gardens all around, was filled with gothic style buildings of red brick. The air was clean, the sky was blue, and people relaxing around the lawns, sitting at picnic tables, and having lunch. While the campus was rather large
and buildings were spaced well apart from each other, the greenery gave one a sense of intimacy.

The temporary office was located in a newly renovated area in the basement. The room contained a number of empty boxes, which had held items that he had brought from his old office, and several others boxes that would not be unpacked until he returned to his newly renovated office, scheduled for completion by the end of summer. He had a dark cherry wood desk, a computer and a printer, several collegiate chairs, some high back leather chairs, a leather sofa and coffee table, and a couple of lamps. The space was very utilitarian. There were two large windows, one of which stretched from the floor to the ceiling and overlooked the corridor adjacent to the office. The other window was on a different wall and had a view of an exterior window of the building.

As the interview started, Fr. Glynn was seated in one of the collegiate chairs. Fr. Glynn, about 5'8", was a rather heavy individual with grayish, white hair that was thinning in the front. He was dressed in his Roman collar and seemed to be very comfortable in his seat.

Fr. Glynn was an excellent storyteller, and his answers to the questions were thoughtful and insightful. There were times during the discussion that he dwelled on certain items at length, and there definitely seemed to be a willingness to converse about the subject matter. He seized the opportunity to talk about his spirituality and his spiritual life, an aspect of his being that seemed to permeate the discussion. When asked about his discernment about being a priest, Fr. Glynn said that he had seriously thought about that process throughout his entire life. He always felt that that was his calling and so, consequently, he attended daily Mass for many years as he was growing up as a child.
in the Pennsylvania mining region of Clarke Summit. He talked about a parishioner who gave his family a scholarship in order to enable him to go the Jesuit Preparatory School. The first two years he hitchhiked going to and from school and worked at the A&P food market after classes were over. He was the eighth of nine children in his family.

When asked about the importance of Catholicism within his family, he stated that his mother had the greatest influence on him and his family. His mother brought religion into the home and strengthened the role of Catholicism by encouraging the family in saying the rosary, praying, and reading scripture together.

Over the years Fr. Glynn served in a variety of leadership roles as president of three different Jesuit universities and as provincial of Maryland. A disagreement with the board of trustees at Gonzaga University regarding institutional governance led to his short-lived presidency there.

He spoke at great length about his time at Georgetown University as a professor of sacred scripture and about the challenges that faced him at Georgetown. Fr. Glynn took leadership roles at the institution, both in directing the Woodstock Center at Georgetown after Woodstock College had closed, and by defending one of his fellow Jesuits, an academic vice president, who found himself in an internal struggle with the president. His stories strongly indicated he was willing to insert himself into the public eye in matters of principle and was willing to become embroiled in such matters as necessary. He faced such challenges at Georgetown while he was a provincial and at Gonzaga when he was president.

One of the more interesting facets of the conversation revolved around Fr. Glynn's understanding of leadership. He came to the conclusion that his identity as a
person had never been determined by the positions he had held but, rather, it came completely from within – from the person that he knew himself to be. He stated that if tomorrow, he were no longer a president, that would be fine with him because his personal identity had been established and was not defined by his position. Consequently, when the problems at Gonzaga culminated in his leaving there, the fact that he was terminated after six months did not bother him. He engaged in the struggle with the board because the board did not seem, to him, to be a principled body. The resulting loss of his presidency was not of deep concern to him because he knew he had acted according to his principles, principles which defined his behavior, his individuality, and his work ethic. He had done the right thing, and he found great solace in that.

One of the principles Fr. Glynn strongly supported was urban education. He started partnership programs at St. Peter’s College and at John Carroll which effectively dealt with this issue. He believed that Catholic higher education has a commitment to educating urban children; he was a firm believer in this principle, and felt that there is worth in carrying it out. He also believed that there also should be a commitment from the students and from the people who work within the university to better society as a whole. This view of higher education continued to emerge throughout our conversation.

In discussing his leadership, Fr. Glynn seemed to be very collaborative and very collegial. He made a point of talking about committees he had formed and their diverse composition. Whether search committees or standing committees, he ensured there was representation from faculty, staff, and students whenever possible, and he emphasized the importance of making sure that members from all facets of the community were part of the decision making process. He was also pleased to note that he had never rejected a
committee's top recommendation, though it was clear that he would have done so if he
believed a recommendation would not be in the best interest of the institution.

Father Glynn seemed to be a very open and honest person, and he never hesitated
to give his opinion about any issue. He came across as being very pragmatic yet the
importance he placed on the intellectual life was central to the overall discussion. This
was reflected not only in his own scholarly work and papers that he had delivered, but
also in his understanding of scripture and theology.

The theme of urban teaching was revisited when he discussed his regency at
Gonzaga High School in Washington, DC. Father Glynn spoke of the students there and
some of their family situations which were less than ideal. Some parents were drug
addicts, some were in jail, others were dead; the home life of most of the students was not
very stable. To this end, he felt that the Jesuits within their academic institutions have
always had a commitment to urban students, providing a vehicle for them to better
themselves. This belief goes back to the original view of Jesuit education, that is,
education was not simply to teach or to mold students' moral lives, but that education
also allowed the students to leave school and make society a better place for everyone
living in it.

Fr. Vincent Cooke, S.J.

The third interview was with Fr. Vincent Cooke who was born in New York City,
NY in 1936. Both of his parents were of the Roman Catholic faith and both emigrated
from Germany to New York City. Fr. Cooke's father was in real estate and his mother
was a shopkeeper. His entire education was in Catholic schools, with his high school and
college experience taking place at Jesuit schools. He graduated from Fordham University
with a BA in history and earned numerous postgraduate degrees, including two MA degrees in teaching and philosophy from Fordham University, a Master of Sacred Theology from Yale University, and a Ph. D. from the University of Wisconsin.

Fr. Cooke entered the novitiate in 1954 at St. Andrew's on the Hudson in Poughkeepsie, NY. After his first year of study he was transferred to Plattsburg for his second year of novitiate. His juniorate also took place at Plattsburg, followed by his study of philosophy at Shrub Oak Seminary in Peekskill, NY. He spent his regency as a teacher at Regis High School in New York City and at Fordham University. Following his regency he studied theology at Woodstock College outside of Baltimore, MD. He was ordained a Jesuit priest in 1967.

For five years, from 1971-1976, he was a professor of philosophy at Fordham University. During the next eight years he assumed leadership roles as part of the Province of New York, first as vice provincial for higher education and then as provincial. In 1984 he returned to the faculty at Fordham University as a philosophy professor before being named academic and executive vice president at John Carroll University in Cleveland, OH in 1991. He held that post until 1993 when he was named president of Canisius College in Buffalo, NY, a position he occupies to this day.

The interview with Fr. Cooke took place in his office on the campus of Canisius College in Buffalo, New York. His private office and his office complex were quite opulent. The offices were well appointed with several cherry wood furniture pieces, and everything seemed to be in order. All of the books were in one place, and his desk was clean. He had two leather chairs positioned in front of his desk. Father Cooke wore his Roman collar and was seated behind his desk in a large executive black leather chair. His
desk was empty save for a paper tray, a telephone, and more of the normal office
necessities. There was no sign of paperwork either on the desk or on the credenza
situated directly behind the desk. In short, his office was immaculate.

From the start, Father Cooke was very friendly and, in some ways, a little guarded
in his answers. His answers were short and to the point. As the conversation continued it
became quite clear that he was a man of few words. While he did not share a great deal
about his family and his own background, he did seem to be more animated as he spoke
about his presidential leadership.

His answers to the questions about the Jesuit formation process included a little
bit more detail. It became quite clear that Father Cooke was very much his own person.
He did not get very caught up in the changes that occurred during the formation process.
Rather, he seemed to be a man who set his own pace and his own tempo, and essentially
stayed out of the fray.

As he continued to discuss his time during formation it also became quite evident
that his goal was to learn his theology and to be ordained. Distancing himself from the
academic and lifestyle changes taking place at Woodstock at that time might have been
due to the fact that Fr. Cooke seemed to be older than the other men, and because of this,
there may have been more distance between the other men and himself as they were
going through this formation process.

Fr. Cooke spoke eloquently about the intellectual life of the community. This
seemed to be the part of the process that Father Cooke most appreciated, and it definitely
seemed to be what drove him to continue in the formation process. He did not seem to
recollect too many of the negative aspects of life in philosophy or theology, but rather, he
concentrated more on the academic side of the process.

He also spoke passionately about his spiritual life as it was practiced then and as
he has lived it. He conveyed how his spiritual life has encompassed daily worship and
spoke of the power of prayer. It seemed to be not only something that he practiced daily;
it also made up the very fabric of the person. At one point, he stated that as a president,
he did not seem to think there was any possible way one could be a president without
having a prayer life, asking for guidance and asking for protection. As a college
president, he certainly seemed to see a strong prayer life as part of the duties. Father
Cooke spoke quite a bit about his work with faculty, about his leadership style, and how
he depended on his executive team to make run the day-to-day operation of the
institution.

Fr. Cooke spoke about always trying to be a very positive person. He looked at
things in a very positive manner, especially when he was asked about Ex Corde
Ecclesiae. He spoke affirmingly of the document and said that he would do whatever
was in the best interests of Canisius College with regard to Ex Corde. He felt that the
document itself was a positive influence on Catholic higher education. He was quite
proud of what he seemed to have accomplished at Canisius College. In particular, he was
proud of the increase in enrollment, his vision of the College, and his relationship with
the faculty.

When he discussed his leadership style, he pointed out that he encouraged his
executive team to make decisions and that he tried not to interfere with those decisions.
He also recognized that he seemed to be more of an office president, rather than a
president who would go out into the community and be with students and faculty. Although he had done so occasionally, he did not seem to spend a great deal of time out of his office and away from meetings.

Although initially the researcher perceived him very business-like, he found Fr. Cooke to be friendly and personable. Fr. Cooke seemed to be a person who was very task oriented. At the end of the interview, Fr. Cooke appeared to be thankful that the interview had not taken as long as he had thought and that he had gained back some of his day in order to conclude a number of tasks that awaited him.

Fr. Tom Gleeson, S. J.

Fr. Gleeson, the fourth volunteer of this study, resided at the Loyola Retreat House, which was situated on the Maryland banks of the Potomac River. Fr. Gleeson was born in Leavenworth, KS in 1936 but spent most of his life growing up in Bethesda, MD, a suburb of Washington, DC. His father and mother were both Roman Catholic, although his father was a convert to Catholicism. While most of his relatives were American-born, his paternal great-grandparents emigrated from Ireland to the United States.

He received his primary education at a Catholic grade school, and his high school education was at Gonzaga High School in Washington, DC, a Jesuit school. After graduating from Gonzaga High School he earned his BS degree from Georgetown University in history and government. He went on to earn an MA in education from Teachers College of Columbia University, a Ph. L. from Fordham University, and a M. Div. from Woodstock College. In addition, he earned an Ed. D. from Teachers College of Columbia University. Fr. Gleeson entered the Jesuit novitiate in 1960 at Wernersville,
PA. He skipped the juniorate years, due to the fact that he already had obtained his undergraduate degree prior to entering the Jesuits, and studied philosophy at Shrub Oak Seminary in Peekskill, NY. During his regency he worked as a teacher at St. Joseph’s Preparatory High School in Philadelphia, PA. After completing his regency, Fr. Gleeson attended Woodstock College outside of Baltimore, MD to study theology. He was ordained a Jesuit priest in 1966.

After being ordained he was assigned as a faculty resident at St. Joseph’s University in Philadelphia, PA. At the same time, he served as the assistant to the president. He was also asked to take on the job of principal of St. Joseph’s Preparatory High School in Philadelphia, PA, which he did from 1970 until 1974. Fr. Gleeson then served as dean of the college and assistant professor of education at St. Joseph’s University from 1974 until 1978. Immediately following this, he held the position of assistant to the chancellor for planning at St. Louis University for one year. For the following two years he served as the provincial assistant for higher education for the Province of Maryland in Baltimore.

Fr. Gleeson returned to Philadelphia to become the director of campus ministry for one year at St. Joseph’s University before taking the part-time position of provincial assistant for planning for the Maryland Province, while at the same time holding the position of rector of the Jesuit community and assistant professor of education at St. Joseph’s University. In addition, he was also the chair of the education department and the director of the graduate education program at St. Joseph’s. In 1986 Fr. Gleeson was asked to take the position of president and dean of the pontifical faculty at the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, CA. Since his time at the Jesuit School of Theology, Fr.
Gleeson served as the superior of the Leonard Neal House in Washington, DC and as Jesuit Conference Secretary for Higher Education at the Jesuit Conference in Washington, DC, where he is today.

The interview with Fr. Tom Gleeson occurred at the Loyola Retreat House on the eastern shore of Maryland, sitting along the Potomac River. The property was located in a rural area of the eastern shore of Maryland. Fr. Gleeson’s office was located on the grounds of the Loyola Retreat House, which was a beautiful part of eastern shore. The Retreat House itself was situated on a cliff overlooking the Potomac. The grounds were covered with dense woods and vegetation of all kinds and the wildlife seemed to be abundant.

Father Gleeson’s office was located in a very old home at the edge of the property by the entrance gate. His office was very small and crowded with a desk, table, and several chairs. The desk was L-shaped and made out of laminate. He was seated behind the desk during the interview. It was very much of a working office. He had a table in the office overflowing with paperwork. His desk was also cluttered with stacks of paper and his computer was situated on the desk. He was dressed very casually in khaki shorts and a Polo shirt and was extremely friendly and open.

From the start of the conversation it was quite apparent that Fr. Gleeson was being very honest and forthright. He exuded self-confidence as he spoke about his background and his many talents. He talked very positively about his family background, especially once they moved from Kansas to the Washington, DC area. He also touched on a number of Jesuits who influenced him greatly during his schooling and throughout his professional life.
Although the conversation revolved around a number of topics and his leadership roles throughout his career, much of the conversation seemed to be about his work as the president of the Jesuit School of Theology in Berkeley, California where he served for five years, his first and only presidency to date.

He was very proud of the fact that he was able to do fundraising and that he was able to build a modest endowment during that time. While his few associates handled the daily affairs of the school, he spent a great deal of his time away from the campus on fundraising trips. He went on the road for two to three weeks at a time and stopped to visit people, asking for donations to the school. The largest gift he ever received for the school was $100,000 and the rest of the gifts ranged between $1,000 and $10,000. Apparently, the school had not done much fundraising before he arrived at Berkeley, and he felt it was needed in order to upgrade the facilities and support the educational mission of the school. In order for him to concentrate on the fundraising area, he hired someone to help him do the admissions work for the school of Theology, thereby relieving him of some of the operating responsibilities. He was very proud of the fact that the school operated in the black while he was president, and that the fundraising he did, in essence, the "friend-raising" he was able to do guaranteed the financial future of the school.

He spoke quite candidly about a lawsuit that was brought against him and the Jesuit province in California. The lawsuit had to do with an accusation by a Jesuit theology student who had accused him, as well as others in the Society of Jesus, of sexual advances. The case went to court with the Society winning the first round but losing on appeal. The Society decided not to appeal to the Supreme Court but, rather, settled out of court with the young man. In the meantime, the story was carried throughout the country.
when the accuser went on 60 Minutes to make known his side of the story. The Society made the decision not to air their side of the story in public. Fr. Gleeson was never informed of the settlement particulars, but he seemed to be quite pained about the entire ordeal.

At the conclusion of his five-year presidency the Society transferred him to the Loyola Retreat House in Maryland, where he has been working on developing plans and processes for the ten separate provinces of the Jesuits throughout the United States. He has been able to carry out most of his responsibilities via his computer, and once a week he drives to Washington, DC, which is a two and a half hour drive, to work at the Society headquarters in Washington.

He strongly believed that he has talent and that another presidency could be in his future, a leadership opportunity he would very much like to have. He also believed that, due to the court case, the Society has been reluctant to place him in such a high profile position. He was completing his present assignment at the Loyola Retreat House, awaiting his next assignment.

Fr. Gleeson was asked about why he felt he had been successful in the Jesuits. He credited his successes to the individual he is and the methodical way he worked. He further stated that he felt that others have not appreciated the amount of talent that he has to offer and that he has, in the past, been accused of being too egocentric, thinking too highly of himself. He honestly feels that he has a great deal of talent to offer in whatever position he may receive and believes that he has done an excellent job in all of the positions to which he had been assigned.
Much of the conversation centered on his numerous appointments in Philadelphia, and he spoke about the political issues that were going on there. He talked about how he was never afraid to tackle the political issues, how he was never afraid to come forward and take on the very hard tasks of dealing with the public and personnel matters. He did not seem to be a person that shied away from controversy, but rather, while not looking for such controversy, believed in himself and the highly regarded principles for which he stood. They were the principles that allowed and moved him to confront the establishment when he felt he was right.

Fr. Gleeson had a young look about him and seemed to be very energetic. He seemed to enjoy some of his work but did not enjoy the fact that he was located in rural Maryland, away from the action, so to speak. The only administrative action he was involved in came through daily e-mails on his computer. He had accomplished the tasks he had set out to do and what the Society had asked him to do, so he felt he was being successful in that regard. However, the researcher felt that this was not the kind of job that seemed to be as fulfilling for Fr. Gleeson as it could be and that, because he is a very dynamic person, Fr. Gleeson will be heard from again within the Society, if given another opportunity. He was very willing to take on the hard tasks, and one assumed that he would be a good candidate for another presidency at another Jesuit institution.

As he described his leadership style he seemed to be collaborative and collegial. He spoke about the projects that he worked on and that he needed to try to get ten provincials, as well as ten Jesuits who are in charge of the business affairs of those provinces, to cooperate in trying to develop strategic plans. As he thought about that
process he stated that he had been successful in that collaboration and that they looked at him as the leader in order to get these projects underway and completed.

During his time at Woodstock he seemed to have been aware of the politics at Woodstock Seminary, but he did not get caught up in them. He spoke very favorably about the changes that were brought forward as a result of the Second Vatican Council. When he discussed the intellectual life of the seminary he spoke very highly of the education he received and the importance of that education in his life.

Dr. Matt Quinn

The fifth and final volunteer for this study was Dr. Matt Quinn who was born in 1935 in Brooklyn, NY. Both of his parents were Roman Catholic and emigrated from Ireland to the United States. He attended St. Teresa of Avila grade school before going to Brooklyn Preparatory High School, which was a Jesuit school.

After graduating from Brooklyn Preparatory School he received a BA degree in classical languages from Fordham University. He also received an MA in teaching from Fordham University. Dr. Quinn went on to earn his Ph. D. from Boston College and later returned to Fordham University to earn his JD degree. In addition, he earned a Lifelong Education Certificate from Harvard University.

Dr. Quinn entered the Jesuit novitiate located at St. Andrew's on the Hudson in Poughkeepsie, NY in 1954. He also completed his juniorate at St. Andrew’s. In 1958 he entered Shrub Oak Seminary in Peekskill, NY to study philosophy. He was sent to the Philippines to teach as part of his three-year regency. Upon his return from the Philippines he went to Woodstock College outside of Baltimore, MD to study theology.
Dr. Quinn was the only one of the five subjects who made the decision to leave the Society of Jesus before final ordination.

After leaving the Jesuits in 1966 he became an advertising copywriter for N.N. Ayer and Son in Philadelphia, PA where he worked for one year. He moved from that position to become the director of publications and public relations for the College of Holy Cross in Worcester, MA. He held that position until 1972 when he was named the assistant academic dean at Rider College in Trenton, NJ. In 1974 Dr. Quinn became the director of state colleges of New Jersey in Trenton, NJ, a position he held for seven years. The following three years he served as the dean of the graduate school of arts and sciences at Iona College in New Rochelle, NY. From 1984 until 1989 he was the executive vice president at St. Joseph's University in Philadelphia, PA. He became the president of Carroll College in Helena, MT in 1989 and completed his tenure there in 2000 when he was named the executive director of the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation located outside of Washington, DC. The foundation is a philanthropic venture concerned with educational access for individuals throughout society not otherwise able to receive funding to attend school.

Dr. Quinn was interviewed in his office complex at the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation located in Lansdowne, Virginia. The complex is located in an area comprised of office buildings, a golf club, hospital, retirement housing, and a resort. The area was full of mature trees, well-manicured lawns, beautifully constructed buildings, and wonderful wildlife. The entire development ran along the western shore of the Potomac River and was located in rural Loudon County, Virginia. The area where his office was located was still under construction, and the Foundation was the first tenant in
this building. Dr. Quinn graciously showed the researcher around the complex before he began to answer the interview questions. While the office complex shell was finished, the plans for remodeling the area were completed but the work remained to be done.

The interview took place in the boardroom of the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation. The boardroom had not taken on the magnitude that one would expect of a foundation worth $650 million except for the ever-present board table and chairs. Dr. Quinn was the first executive director of the Foundation, which Jack Kent Cooke established in his will through the sale of the Washington Redskins. The $650 million for the Foundation is to be used for educational purposes, and Dr. Quinn was starting the process of how that money might be allocated in supporting education. There were ten chairs around the board table and we occupied two of them, with the table situated in between Dr. Quinn and the researcher.

Dr. Quinn stood a little less than six feet tall with dark hair that was graying around the temples. He was casually dressed in a sports coat and a tie. From the beginning it became apparent that he took the conversation seriously and that he was willing to impart as much information as possible.

As he spoke about his childhood experiences growing up in Brooklyn, it was clear that the questions elicited a number of memories from him that he had not really thought about for a very long time. Dr. Quinn recalled his membership in a local neighborhood gang, a group of young boys that just hung around together and played football and baseball in the streets of Brooklyn. He also mentioned a near death experience at age three. He also recollected being somewhat of a rebel in Brooklyn, seemingly to always get into a lot of trouble. However, what became obvious during the conversation was
that he was a young man who did not believe he had the kind of talents others saw in him. This was a theme that permeated the conversation regarding almost every stage of his early life. Yet there were people along the way — in school, in the formation process, and even afterwards — who saw in him true potential for success. This potential had to be pointed out to him on a number of occasions, but even when this occurred, he did not necessarily believe.

Throughout high school there were people who would pull him aside and say, “We know you can do this work, we know you can do well academically, we know you have the leadership potential,” and yet, in his own mind, those things simply did not exist. This recognition of his talents by others also took place during the formation process, especially at Woodstock where people pointed out his potential and his academic prowess. At one point he mentioned that when he decided to leave the Jesuits, after his second year at Woodstock, someone stated to the Rector of Woodstock, “There goes the light of the Jesuits.” It was obvious that he was held in extremely high regard, not only by his peers, but by the faculty and the administration of the Jesuits as well. The faculty of his high school esteemed him and he has been highly acknowledged for his work in higher education since he left the Jesuits.

Dr. Quinn’s perception of the Jesuits was somewhat different than the other subjects, possibly because he did not actually become an ordained Jesuit priest. On the other hand, he stated that he received a lot of satisfaction from the intellectual life and from his leadership roles throughout the formation process. Fun was a point of emphasis in Dr. Quinn’s memories of his formation process. His participation in leadership in extra-curricular activities such as plays, choir, and oratory contests left him with fond
memories. He stated that he gained a good deal of experience from those activities, and by being involved in them he truly enjoyed his time during formation.

He enjoyed the banter as well as the give and take that took place in the classroom and with his classmates. The intellectual stimulation presented by some of the faculty and his classmates challenged him and helped establish his thinking processes. He excelled both within and outside of the classroom, and these combined experiences led him to see formation as simply having fun. No matter where he was, no matter what he was doing, he had fun.

Dr. Quinn spoke at length about his experiences in the Philippines as his regency assignment during the formation process and how exhilarating that time had been for him. He would have loved to have been there for a much longer time. He taught in Manila, and one of his classmates from the Jesuits was stationed in Japan for regency and is now the president of Sophia University in Tokyo. From his descriptions of this time in his life it seemed to have had a profound effect on him as a very enlightening experience.

When he spoke about why he left the Jesuits, Dr. Quinn made it clear that it was a very difficult decision for him to make. At one particular point, there was a sudden realization that he did not want to remain in the Jesuits or become a Jesuit priest: he did not feel that he wanted to be placed in a position where he heard other people’s confessions. Had that been removed as part of his priestly duties, he would have continued in the Jesuits, but that requirement was the stumbling block that he simply could not get beyond. His inability and unwillingness to carry out that responsibility as a priest in the Catholic Church was the motivating factor that made him leave the Jesuits two years into his theological studies at Woodstock.
He has not had any regrets about that decision. Dr. Quinn believed that the formation process formed his life, and he still has friends within the Jesuits with whom he keeps in contact. He had friends who also left the Jesuits at the same time he did with whom he still communicates. He spoke quite a bit about how some of the individuals who left the Jesuits blamed the Society for everything and his response to them is that, You need to get on with your life and stop thinking about those things. Move on and take responsibility for your actions and for your life as it is now and stop blaming the Jesuits or anybody in the organization for it.

Dr. Quinn’s honesty throughout the interview reflected a sense of soul searching on his part, and he seemed to enjoy the dialog that was taking place. It seemed the process was fun for him, a theme that ran throughout his reflections. As he answered some of the questions and as he was pondering the answers to other questions, he would close his eyes so that he could visually look at things as he was trying to formulate an answer. He used that technique often during the interview, stating once that he believed himself to be a visual person and that he likes to see the answers as they occur.

On a number of occasions, Dr. Quinn stated that he had not thought about a particular item until the question was asked and that a response to a question often elicited another memory and another response and so on. Consequently, some of the answers to the questions were rather lengthy; however, this back and forth dialog seemed to give him some joy and delight in the entire interview process and seemed to recall some memories he had tucked away in the back of his mind for many years.

Dr. Quinn spoke highly about the Jesuit intellectual experience and how that helped form him and shaped his appreciation for an academic life. He also spoke quite
eloquently about the spiritual side of his life, both during the formation process and afterwards. He seemed to be a deeply spiritual individual. There was a real sense that there was a personal relationship between God and him and that the relationship with God had been an ever-developing journey for him. He seemed to be at a time in his life where there was great satisfaction with that personal relationship with God and yet, there was still an intellectual curiosity about God and what God meant to man. Not only did he speak about a feeling of spirituality that nourished him, but he also spoke about a spirituality that intellectually stimulated him as he pondered about God and life with God and what that meant. He espoused his spirituality naturally, freely, and openly.

**Emergent Categories and Themes**

Four overarching categories and six themes emerged from the interviews of the five present and former presidents in this study. The information contained in this section is primarily descriptive as reviewed in the section entitled Content Analysis. The four categories are noted below along with the themes to which they relate. Under each category and theme are examples and explications of the thematic concepts as expressed by the subjects, in their own words. No two volunteer’s comments and responses are exactly alike, although there are common elements among the five volunteers on different themes.
### Table 1

**Emerging Categories and Themes Derived from Subject Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Formation Themes</th>
<th>Presidential Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Importance and Value of the Intellectual Life | Education Received  
 Highly Intelligent People  
 Working Together | Faculty  
 The Best and the Brightest for Collaboration |
| Mission And Vision                | Institutional Mission and Vision | Role of the President               |
| Role of Change                    | Individual Roles  
 Change Agents | Role of the President  
 Open to Change |
| Being Noticed for Potential and Inherent Talent | Tapped for Leadership | Positions |

### Importance and Value of Intellectual Life

The first category, Importance and Value of the Intellectual Life, includes those themes in which the volunteers in the study reflected upon the various components of the intellectual life during the formation process and their views on the intellectual life during their terms as president. As part of their formation process, their reflections speak to the challenges of the course work, the role of the faculty, and the learning that took place among the scholastics. Their observations regarding the intellectual life during their presidencies touched on the value of relating to faculty and gaining an appreciation for their work. They also spoke to the importance of collaboration and collegiality as part of their leadership style. Finally, the views that they shared touched upon the importance of the education their institutions impart to the students.

**Education Received.** The five volunteers shared the same view with regard to the courses they completed and to the faculty members that taught them. Some course work
was less challenging than others, and some faculty members were less respected than others. However, the overall view of the faculty and their course work was very positive. Fr. Degnan noted that, “The teachers ...had a certain independence of mind and intellectual vigor, and all of them were characters in their own right.” Regardless of their individual views, the overall course work was viewed as very favorable and stimulating.

Fr. Gleeson described his experience as, “We had some wonderful courses...that challenged me much more than I had been challenged in college. In particular, Bob Johan and a few others were really quite good.” “Highly intellectually stimulating and ...we had excellent teachers,” was the way Fr. Glynn described the intellectual atmosphere at Woodstock. Both Fr. Degnan and Dr. Quinn spoke about the how the formation process exposed them to the joys of an intellectual life. Each of the five subjects mentioned the names of several Jesuit professors to whom they were exposed, such as Gus Weigel, John Courtney Murray, and Avery Dulles. All of these men were outstanding theologians and, at the time, were on the cutting edge of theology during and after the Second Vatican Council. Fr. Cooke encapsulated the intellectual life during formation by stating, “The Jesuit view of education is taking very seriously the life of the intellect.” In reflecting on the Jesuit view of education, Dr. Quinn noted that, “I thought I got a superb education.”

Faculty. “I was a member of the faculty for many years, which I think also makes me a better president. It’s a culture of professors. And you’ve got to understand that culture, certainly if you are going to lead them,” stated Fr. Cooke when he spoke about the importance of knowing and understanding the role of the faculty in education. Fr. Cooke further stated, “You have to respect them for it and also have an appreciation
of how difficult the job of a professor is.” Continuing, he noted, “There is nothing more
difficult than teaching a good class. It takes a lot of preparation, and there’s a lot of
pressure…you’ve got to be sharp, and you’ve got to be prepared.” Fr. Cooke also
described the job of a professor as, “…a lonely job. Much lonelier than an
administrator’s.” As he reflected upon his own presidency, Fr. Cooke noted that having
been a teacher himself for many years, “…served him well. It’s the faculty that are the
main people that a college president has to lead and they have to respect that a president
understands their perspective on life.” While discussing his own views about faculty
members, Dr. Quinn noted,

I like to work with bright people. I have had a lot of opportunity to connect with
a lot of faculty in the arts and sciences over the years. I knew enough about a
broad range of academic disciplines to be able to ask questions. In many ways I
was prepared to be president because the education I received in the classics,
literature, theology, and philosophy allowed me to talk almost peer-to-peer with
faculty on a broad range of academic areas. So that prepared me, on an
intellectual level, for being a colleague to faculty even though I did not come up
in the ranks as a full time college faculty member.

As a result of his education from the Jesuits, Dr. Quinn opined that as a
president, “I found myself more supportive of those efforts to increase experiences in the
liberal arts or sciences or English and less open towards some of the experiences in the
professional areas such as education, or business, or engineering.” He continued his
thoughts about this area by stating that, “…the liberal arts ought to be the guts of the
academic program. I think that’s just a vestige of my Jesuit experience.”
The training that the scholastics received during the formation process was one of being a teacher. Dr. Quinn noted that, “Teaching helped me a great deal – it gave me a sense of presence so I didn’t have any self doubts about getting up in front of … faculty, either as an academic vice president or president.” Dr. Quinn continued to speak about his training during the formation process and how that experience allowed him to, be engaged with them in conversation on an equal level... I really enjoyed getting up before them and the give and take of a back and forth exchange. And I think that was, in good part, due to my preparation for teaching.

Intelligent People and Working Together. All five of the volunteers spoke glowingly about the intellectual level of their classmates. Many of them, those studying theology, already had earned advanced degrees in a number of areas from theology to education, from physics to engineering, and from the classics to law. This environment, filled with highly motivated and educated individuals, created wonderful learning opportunities outside of the classroom. “We learned as much from one another as we did from reading the textbooks or listening to lectures, by engaging in conversations and it was incredibly, for me, intellectually stimulating,” Fr. Glynn stated as he described the learning that went on outside of the classroom. Another reason Fr. Glynn noted for this highly charged intellectual environment was the fact that there were 265 men living together day in and day out, many of whom had earned their doctorates during the three-year regency period. “Working with those people, doing theology with them, and having the conversations with them was highly stimulating,” noted Fr. Glynn. Fr. Degnan also acknowledged that, “We were big on personalism and community from our European reading. So, we would just educate each other a great deal. That’s one thing that stands
out. Ed Glynn, for instance: somebody would walk into the room and he would say, ‘Why do we have to be saved?’ A big argument...I think the intellectual atmosphere amongst ourselves was the biggest education.”

The five volunteers lived together for up to four years with extremely well educated classmates and were taught by some of the best and brightest within the Society of Jesus. The scholastics themselves were placed in the long course or the short course depending on one’s academic prowess. Dr. Quinn and Fr. Gleeson noted that this was part of the weeding-out process and that those in the long course were the brightest, destined for future leadership in the Society. Those in the short course would become pastors or Jesuit brothers to continue their pastoral work. They lived with and recognized intelligence and appreciated those who were able to use their intelligence to the fullest. They recognized these abilities in themselves, their faculty members, and their administrators.

The Best and the Brightest for Collaboration. “I like to work with people who are very bright, that have a good sense of initiative, that I don’t have to watch over,” noted Dr. Quinn. He continued,

I like people to work with who can challenge me and push me to make me think about things. Because I will get excited about an idea and I need people to work that and say, ‘Matt, you better change your medication. That’s not going to work,’ but who are not going to go loony if I say, ‘I really think this is the right way to go.’ And they say, ‘Okay, we’ll give it try.’

Fr. Glynn recalled how he, “Always advocated for shared governance.” He went to great lengths to describe how he had addressed membership of institutional and search
committees by having members that were elected by the faculty, representatives from the administration, and from the student body, as well as faculty members appointed by him. He stated that he used his appointments for, “...affirmative action. I would appoint women, minorities, and Jesuits, usually, just to give the committees some balance.” Fr. Glynn continued by stating, “I am very comfortable with that format. I have always accepted the number one recommendation from any search committee but I want them to do their homework.” He concluded by quoting Camus, “I think it’s a line out of Camus that I can never find where he said, ‘The only true democracy is where everyone shares the guilt.’”

In discussing collaboration, Fr. Glynn noted, when he was on the search committee for a new president at Georgetown University he,

…went around and met with every department at Georgetown on the main campus asking, ‘What do you think should be done? What do you see the needs being? What do you see the needs, in terms of the University, in the type of person who will be the next president?

In speaking about his planning skills and how that relates to collaboration, Fr. Gleeson noted,

These kinds of staff positions are interesting. You simply have to use that sort of administrative planning skill to be able to maneuver groups along. The treasurers, and there are ten of them across the country, call me the nudger because I have absolutely no authority, but I get them to do things. And we are working well together.

In further discussing collaboration, Fr. Gleeson stated that,
I think that the experience has allowed me to see that if I'm going to do this process, I've got to let go of what I think that answer is and get as much as I can out of the people. But I think that the ability to see the scene and let go of your view and develop strategies to enable others to do something about the issues is the major thing.

Mission and Vision

The second category, Mission and Vision, includes those themes in which the volunteers reflected upon the mission and vision of the institutions of which they have been a part. They reflected upon the mission and vision of the formation process and Society of Jesus, as well as their perception of the role a president plays in setting the mission and vision for their various institutions. In particular, they spoke of the educational mission of the Society of Jesus and how, being part of that mission, they have been able to take a strong leadership role in defining the mission and vision of the institutions they have headed.

Articulation of Mission and Vision. Fr. Glynn sees the mission and vision as part of the Society of Jesus.

We play a role in God’s work of human salvation. We are called to respond to God’s presence in action and history. We live lives of communion. We, too, can work; we have something to do in God’s work of human salvation.

He continues by stating that:

Ignatian spirituality is highly Christocentric, it is highly Incarnational. It is very pragmatic and practical. It is one that’s always in every present moment; rapidly becoming the future under the influence of the past and every moment we should
be regularly asking, ‘where and how can I do the greater good in my life’. The Jesuit mission: it gives meaning to my life.

Fr. Cooke noted that:

Ignatius only really came to see the importance of education, it was at the very end of his life. So, it was something that he went through developmentally and it was only within the last couple of years of his life that he really decisively saw the importance of education.

In discussing the importance of that vision and the vision of any Jesuit academic institution, Fr. Glynn opined that, “I have this profound conviction that individuals shape institutions, institutions shape society. And there aren’t nameless faces that are making decisions that daily shape institutions. They are identifiable people.”

**Role of the President.** Fr. Cooke’s perceived role as president regarding mission and vision in higher education is one where,

You try to build a vision for where you want, in this case, Canisius College to go, and you try to give clear definition to what that vision is and you try to be able to enunciate it so that people will understand it and try to communicate it enthusiastically, and then you try to get people to come up with ways in which you actually realize the vision.

Fr. Glynn also stated that,

Wherever I’ve been I’ve always addressed the mission of the institution, the Jesuit mission. So to my mind the most important role of the president of the college is precisely that. Set the vision, the course the ship should take and then try to
empower more of your people, once they know where they are going, to find a way to get there.

In guiding the institutions Fr. Glynn has led, his vision for those intuitions has always involved urban education. During his tenure at St. Peter's College he noted that, "...two of the greatest problems for the last half of the twentieth century, [are] the quality of urban life and the quality of urban education." The students at St. Peter's College, when Fr. Glynn arrived, were predominately first generation college students, sons and daughters of immigrants. "St. Peter's, who had the poorest student body in terms of finances of any of the 28 Jesuit schools, also had the lowest average SAT scores," noted Fr. Glynn. "We are called to be as sinners, called to be companions of Jesus in the most crucial struggle of our time – the struggle for faith and the struggle for justice," is how Fr. Glynn described the mission of St. Peter's. This vision of Jesuit education was also brought to the doors of John Carroll University, a school that does not share many of the same characteristics of St. Peter's except that they are both Jesuit. Hence, Fr. Glynn's vision was that John Carroll should also be involved in bettering the lives and education of young men and women in the urban areas of Cleveland.

Fr. Degnan was the successor of Fr. Glynn as president of St. Peter's College. His vision of the school was that the school should grow in enrollment while providing an education for those students who were from immigrant families. In addition, he moved the institution to being more residential. Fr. Degnan stated, St. Peter's was unique among the 28 Jesuit institutions and I felt that more had to be done for the population of the Jersey City area and to make sure that we did not neglect or forget the traditional population that St. Peter's historically served.
We had an obligation, as a Jesuit institution, to be of service to a very needy population.

Canisius College was primarily a local college, a commuter college. Fr. Cooke, after arriving at Canisius, changed the vision of the College from being a local college to a leading regional college. In order to accomplish that goal, Fr. Cooke noted,

What are we going to have to do? Well, we are going to have to have more residential students. How do you get more residential students? You have to have more residence halls. Well, either you raise money or you float a bond. Once you get the process started, then it begins to build upon itself. Then people get enthusiastic about the idea and then they come up with ideas.

Dr. Quinn arrived from Philadelphia and his work at St. Joseph’s University, in Helena, MT, and a change from a Jesuit institution to a Diocesan college. Upon his arrival Dr. Quinn had a vision to, “...strengthen the liberal arts component of the College, to make student life more vibrant, and to make Carroll College a top liberal arts college in the Northwest.” At the same time he noted, “I could not ignore the stated mission of the College; to serve the people of Montana, in particular, the Catholics of the Western Diocese of Helena.”

In describing the mission of a Jesuit institution, Fr. Glynn excerpted some thoughts from a speech he gives to new students and their parents every year,

…That, if after four years you have achieved a level of excellence in oral and written communication and, if after four years you have achieved a level of excellence also in the area of specialization for life’s work, we can take great pride in that we are an excellent University and that we’ve served you well.
However, if that is all we've done, if we haven't also provided you the motivation to live a life that is of greater service, so that your hearts ache with the daunting question for the rest of your life, ‘where and how can my life achieve the greater good, the universal good?’ — if we haven't provoked that question or triggered that ache in your heart to make you ponder that question, then we have failed you precisely as a Jesuit school. Without that, we may be an excellent University, but there are a lot of excellent universities around.

Role of Change

The third category, the Role of Change, includes those themes in which the respondents reflected upon changes that took place within the formation process, who played a role in those changes, and the changes that took place in the Catholic Church due to the Second Vatican Council. They further reflected on the role of change within the institutions of higher education they have led throughout the years and how they, themselves, approached change as presidents.

Change Agents. “It was a revolution down there, led by people like Justin Kelly and Leo Donovan. So in our second year, everything changed,” is the way Fr. Degnan described the changes that took place in the formation process during his days at Woodstock College. However, not all of the five volunteers agreed with that drastic of an assessment. In fact, several of the interviewees, while acknowledging that change was rapidly taking place at that time, did not see it as a revolution, but rather as a natural process.

In describing the lifestyle changes taking place at Woodstock College, Fr. Gleeson stated everything seemed to be,
In total transition. Felix Cardegna, the rector, used to say that...there's not enough time during the day and the night that someone isn't getting up or going to bed at Woodstock. So this was a major shift. I mean, it had been the long black line that did everything together and at the same time each and every day and at each and every hour of the day...like that, it flipped in terms of what the scholastics were expected to do.

The academic rigidity was loosened so that there were choices as to the classes that were to be taken and how those classes were delivered. Fr. Glynn, in reflecting upon the changes taking place at Woodstock, stated that:

I was there when lots of transformations took place. In fact, we had our options whether you would go to the regular lectures every day for class or go to a seminar once a week with your class, or you could do private tutoring with a faculty member.

Dr. Quinn recollected that when Felix Cardegna arrived at Woodstock, "...the changes opened things up, although I didn't feel oppressed." The changes encompassed both the lifestyle of the scholastics as well as their academic life. No longer were they herded from place to place for specific assignment; rather, they were allowed to come and go as they pleased.

How did the changes take place? All of the volunteers agreed that it was a conglomeration of people, from the rector to the scholastics, with younger faculty members also taking a lead. Where the perceptions differ is in how the five volunteers remember who took the lead in making the changes.

Father Glynn recollected that:
It was through discussion with faculty, and you can see where there were lots of people who had been at the finest universities and got their doctorates and came back to teach. They were used to what universities were like. The changes that took place came about from the scholastics, younger faculty members, and the leadership at Woodstock.

In describing why the changes took place, Fr. Cooke, observed:

I think that the leadership that we had in the Jesuits at that time, it was not nearly as decisive as it should have been. I think that people needed, at that time, a clearer enunciation of the fundamental principles, which were not up for grabs. I think that leadership, at that time, tended to back off a little bit, maybe because they were confused themselves. I'm not sure that I would have done anything better or differently. Looking back on it, I would say that was a lesson, that there is a point when an organization is confused, the leader can’t afford to be confused.

Fr. Degnan spoke about the scholastics taking charge in trying to get the requested changes enacted.

So they had committees, one for academic changes and the other for lifestyle changes, and they really pushed and got others involved and pushed the rector hard. Afterwards, the rector and a couple of the younger faculty members got everything changed, and some of the older faculty quit because we demanded tutorials and seminars and discussion.

"It was enabled by the Second Vatican Council. It enabled changes in Jesuit leadership. When Ed Sponga became the provincial, that flipped it. Sponga came in, and
it changed dramatically. He changed the people running the operation," is the way Fr.
Gleeson remembers how the changes took place. He continued by stating,

It was something of a groundswell, but I'm a firm believer that some significant
people made some major changes in the way things were done. Like when
Sponga came in, he named Felix Cardegna as rector of the theologate at
Woodstock. So he did certain things that really changed the relationship that
individual Jesuits would have with these superiors. It's not a revolution, no. I do
think that those changes started a process that looked revolutionary.

Role of the President. All five of respondents spoke at length about change
during their own presidencies and how they see the role of the president in change at their
institutions. Fr. Glynn stated that, "...if there is a need for change, that's my
responsibility as president," Fr. Cooke noted:

It's important that the leader, in my case the president, be open to ferment, for
ideas coming from below or elsewhere, lateral. He has to be willing to listen. I
guess the tough thing is to balance the two: to be open, and at the same time, on
certain indispensable things you've got be decisive and clear, crystal clear.

Dr. Quinn explained that he felt the formation process prepared him for change in
his future leadership roles because, "We changed a lot. We moved a lot. You didn't get
dependent on either places or programs or people. You could be moved and we did get
moved a lot. So change was part of what you expected." In relating that experience to
his career, Dr. Quinn noted,

Personally, I didn't mind going from one job to another, coming out from

Philadelphia to Montana and coming back here. I think I was more interested in
making changes than the rest of the institution was, particularly the faculty, although there were some changes that people wanted to make that I wasn't interested in. But change in and of itself I don't believe bothers me when I can see that it makes sense. I think that my—the training in the Society—kept me open to change and to—a willingness to listen to others when they wanted to make some changes.

When asked a question that dealt with how he believed that change occurs, whether from the bottom up or through outside change agents, Dr. Quinn stated,

I think it happens both ways but in the majority of cases, somebody coming in from the outside, not necessarily a president, could be a president bringing in a new vice president or deciding on a new faculty member getting hired in a department, that brings in an idea. It generally is somebody coming in from the outside with a new idea that gets other people excited about it and creates momentum. Sometimes, that momentum will really take a hold if there is readiness on the part of others at the institution; if there's an acceptability or willingness to go along with the new idea.

**Being Noticed for Potential and Inherent Talent**

The fourth category, Being Noticed for Potential and Inherent Talent, includes themes in which the volunteers discussed being called upon for leadership roles during their formation process and for leadership positions throughout their careers. They discussed how they were chosen for those positions.

**Tapped for Leadership.** From the very beginning, the five interviewees were noticed by faculty members and administrators for their leadership and academic
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achievements. For most, they were singled out in the latter stages of high school to be introduced to the Society of Jesus with the hope that they would enter the novitiate. In the juniorate and in the theologate, the volunteers were noticed for academic achievement by being placed in the long course, an academic program regarded as challenging and one that would lead to leadership roles within the Society. In addition, the volunteers were chosen to fill the student leadership positions such as manuduchter and beatle. The men who held these positions acted as the liaison between the scholastics and the administration.

Fr. Glynn, reflecting upon his leadership roles in the formation process stated,

I was appointed to positions of leadership. For example, at Shrub Oak, they have some, and it’s always a second year student, who is called the beatle. You have to go in and see the rector each day. Up there things had not changed that much during philosophy, so if we wanted to watch a special thing on television, some special show, I had to go and ask the rector for permission. I was also the beatle at Woodstock. The last thing the rector wants to do is appoint someone who is going to be trouble. What I mean by that is that it had to be someone the rest of the scholastics and others respected.

Dr. Quinn’s recollections of being singled out started in high school when he was being placed in more challenging courses and being told by scholastics teaching at the school and Jesuit teachers that he had great potential to do something with his life. He, too, was placed in the long course during the formation process and also held the leadership positions of manuduchter and beatle. In addition, his other talents were also acknowledged. Consequently, he was a lead singer in the choir, earned the lead roles in
drama productions, and was a leader in oratory contests during formation. "People stopped me and said, 'You've got talent, you've got ability, you've got this, you've got that, maybe you're unaware of it, but I just wanted to tell you that it's there.' Then in the Society, the same thing happened. I got put into honors Latin and honors Greek," Dr. Quinn stated.

Dr. Quinn also recalled that he did not seek out this notoriety, but rather he was continually being sought after for leadership roles and being placed in the more difficult academic courses. In one instance, Dr. Quinn spoke about what happened in a Latin class. He stated that,

[The teacher] had me start the Latin translation and he said, 'fine.' After a couple of sentences he had me go a little further. At that point it began to dawn on me that these guys thought more of me that I thought of myself. There was more ability here than I was aware of, because at that point, I was not translating the Latin, I was reading the Latin.

Fulfilling his regency was another example of Dr. Quinn being singled out. Within the Jesuits who were in the long course, four or five were chosen to go to the missions in the Philippines. Dr. Quinn was one of those chosen.

So there were moments all throughout the formation process that placed me in a leadership positions or allowed others to single me out for whatever reason. So maybe intuitively I was always singling myself out. Maybe I was being singled out, maybe it was a combination of both, but it was always very, very enjoyable. If an opportunity arose, I responded to it.
Four of the five subjects spoke to the fact that the scholastics had a great influence on them and that they were the ones who mentored the interviewees during their high school years. The scholastics were closer to their own age and were viewed by the subjects as very intelligent, good humored, and energetic. These young men exposed the respondents to the life of being a Jesuit in a positive way so as to peak their interest in seeking that kind of life.

**Positions.** A number of the volunteers spoke about being chosen for leadership roles after formation. Fr. Gleeson recalled that a fellow Jesuit placed him in several positions of leadership at St. Joseph's University. In such a way, their fellow Jesuits mentored many of the volunteers. The academic and leadership abilities they showed during formation were noticed so as to be called upon to apply for many leadership positions with the Society of Jesus. Fr. Glynn remembered that when he was teaching at Georgetown, he was asked to become the Director of Woodstock Center. Being singled out also went beyond the Jesuits for Fr. Glynn. While president of St. Peter's College he was appointed by the chancellor of higher education in New Jersey to be the chair of a committee on academic accountability.

Filling positions within the Jesuits takes place through being recognized by others within the organization who feel the person may have the ability to carry out the responsibilities of the position. In some cases, the person is asked to have his name sent forward as part of a group of three nominees for a particular position, such as president, for further consideration. In other cases, the person is tapped by the leadership of the Jesuits to be placed in that position. Similar methods are used to fill positions in higher education and the provinces. All of the respondents, with the exception of Dr. Quinn
who left the Jesuits prior to ordination, have been placed in positions of leadership within the Society by their superiors through the utilization of these methods.

Summary

This review and interpretation of specific aspects of the interviews with the five volunteers was intended to provide further insight into their lives. The interview process was used to draw out the categories and themes of their experiences as reviewed above. All of the respondents shared a common educational background through the formation process. Their perceptions of the intellectual life during that process are similar, and they also had similar leadership opportunities. Being with so many highly regarded intellectual men reinforced their view of the importance of learning in their lives.

The mission of Jesuit education has continued to influence their leadership roles in their educational service beyond formation. They differed in their views of how change took place during formation and whether or not the changes were revolutionary. However, they demonstrated a deep understanding of the nature of change, how change comes about, and the importance change can play in the vitality of an organization. A by-product of experiencing this change during the formation process was their common understanding about shared governance.
Chapter Five
Summary Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

This chapter addresses the Grand Tour question of the study: Have their particular experiences in the Jesuit formation process influenced the leadership style of these men in their ministry as a president? In addition, this chapter addresses the three sub-questions of the study: 1) At each distinctive phase of the formation process, how would they describe the academic and general lifestyle of the formation process, and what was it about those two areas influenced their leadership as presidents? 2) What particular talents do they bring to the position of president, and how do these talents relate to their formation process as Jesuits? And finally, were they groomed or mentored during their formation process for their eventual leadership roles as president? If so, how? The information shared by the men in the study will assist in the understanding of their spiritual, academic, and career backgrounds and specifically relate their experiences in the Jesuit formation process to their work as presidents. The positive and negative aspects of the lives of these men will help shed light on their issues, dilemmas, and joys that accompany their role as leaders within a Catholic higher education setting.

The study used qualitative research methodology to examine the lives of five high-achieving, professional men. After collecting the biographical information on each of the five volunteers, conducting an extensive one-on-one interview with each person, reading the transcripts, and coding the responses to the interview questions, the researcher selected representative quotations to include and analyze in an interpretive
narrative. This methodology allowed various aspects of the men’s lives to be fully explored.

One potential benefit of this study is in discovering the influences that culminated in the leadership qualities that the five respondents use on a day-to-day basis as presidents of their respective institutions. Another benefit of the study is to comprehend how the five volunteers view their role as president. Finally, an additional benefit that can be derived from this study is to understand the kinds of qualities that are necessary for successful leadership within Catholic higher education at the presidential level.

Summary Conclusions

The four categories that the five volunteers identified – a) the Importance and Value of the Intellectual Life, b) Mission and Vision, c) the Role of Change, and d) Being Noticed for Potential and Inherent Talent – are the overarching categories that were discovered during the research and gleaned from the individual interviews of the five men. These categories highlight the benefits derived from the formation process and carried over to the work the participants have been involved in as presidents of Catholic colleges, universities, and seminaries. These four categories do not reflect the only ones that were derived from the research but they are the dominant categories that came to light.

The six themes derived from the four categories – a) the Education Received and Faculty, b) Highly Intelligent People Working Together and The Best and the Brightest for Collaboration, c) Articulation of Mission and Vision and the Role of the President, d) Individual Roles and the Role of the President, e) Change Agents and Open to Change, and f) Tapped for Leadership and Positions are those themes that emerged from the four
categories noted above. They highlight specific areas of discovery from the formation process that have had an influence on the men’s work as presidents. Again, these themes do not reflect the only items discovered during the research but they are the dominant themes that surfaced in the process of analyzing the transcripts.

Overall, the five men in the study seemed to have gained a great deal from their formation process which they have been able to incorporate into their work as presidents. The formation process did not specifically teach these men how to be presidents; rather, the formation process itself exposed the five men to the mission and vision of Jesuit education and the importance of a vibrant and life-giving intellectual life. The fact that their formation occurred during a great time of change within the Roman Catholic Church and within the formation process itself exposed these men to change within those structures and enabled them to view, and in some cases participate, in how those changes took place. In addition, these men were all tapped for leadership roles because they excelled in their intellectual life and their life as a scholastic in general. Their inherent talent and potential were noticed during the formation process, which led to them assuming greater responsibility than the rest of the scholastics.

Sub-Questions One and Two

Sub-question one asks the question of how the distinctive phases of the subjects’ formation process influenced their presidential leadership. Sub-question two addresses the talents that the five men bring to the role of president and how those talents relate to their formation process. Both sub-questions support the overarching grand tour question.

The following three categories directly address sub-questions one and two which speak to the stages of the formation process and how those stages influenced the
interviewees as presidents and, consequently, the talents the five men brought to their roles as presidents. The first category addresses the intellectual life of the formation process and how that has influenced their work as presidents in leading academic institutions of higher learning. The second category speaks to the role of mission and vision during their formation process and how they have utilized mission and vision building throughout their careers in supporting the very fabric of their institutions and for building new directions for their schools. The third category addresses how the changes that took place during the formation process has influenced their understanding of the role of change within an academic institution and how change comes about in those organizations.

Importance and Value of the Intellectual Life

There is little doubt that these men have had very successful academic lives throughout their education. This can be evidenced by the fact that, among the five volunteers, they have earned a total of 20 academic degrees during their education, ranging from a Masters in Divinity to a Ph. D or Ed. D. They were taught by some of the finest theology professors of their time, Jesuits who were world renowned in their fields of study and who played important roles in formulating Church doctrine that came out of the Second Vatican Council. To this day, 30 years later, this doctrine still guides the men and women who are part of the Roman Catholic Church.

Other men of high intellect surrounded them. These were the other scholastics who also earned their doctorate degrees during their three-year regency. They all lived together, ate together, prayed together, learned together, and discussed theology together, as well as the important topics facing the American society during the 1960s. The 265
men studying for the priesthood at Woodstock were totally immersed in the intellectual life of the Jesuit community. Under these conditions, the five respondents gained an immense appreciation for the life of the mind and for the academic rigor that faced them daily.

As a result, all five men became academic administrators and presidents of some of the finest Catholic institutions of higher learning in the United States. Their appreciation for academic life carried over into their work as presidents. Their leadership skills impacted the academic caliber of the institutions they headed, by developing academic curricula and programs and hiring the best and the brightest available as new faculty members. An understanding of the joy that their academic pursuits have brought them allowed these leaders to direct their own institutions and to share the importance of intellectual life with the young men and women who have attended their institutions. In addition, they were all trained as teachers during their formation process and this, coupled with their exposure to their academic life, brought them to leadership positions in which they are well-respected. All have served the Church by having given most of their lives to the pursuit of excellence within Catholic higher education.

**Institutional Mission and Vision**

From their high school days through the formation process, the five volunteers were a part of the Jesuit educational system, a system established over 400 years ago by Ignatius Loyola. The system, as outlined in the *Ratio Studiorum*, emphasizes the study of the classics of theology. It has a two-pronged approach that strengthens the intellect and leads one to live a moral life.
It is according to this mission and vision of Jesuit education that the five men were formed to be teachers and priests. All of them spoke about the goodness of living and learning in such a system. They spoke about the profound effect the Jesuit system had on their individual being and how they lived their lives of service.

The men also articulated the importance of mission and vision in their own lives and in their work as presidents. The importance of the liberal arts and of molding young men and women into individuals who will be able to have a positive effect on the ills of society were paramount in their endeavors. Presidents lead through building a mission and vision within their respective institutions, and all five men saw this task as crucial in continuing the Ignatian concept of education.

Role of Change

The five volunteers studied at a time of great upheaval in the Roman Catholic Church and within the Jesuit formation process. It was a time of great consternation to the older Jesuits who were convinced the 400-year-old tradition should not be changed; they were very comfortable being an integral part of that tradition. It was also a great time of challenge and joy for those younger faculty members, administrators, and scholastics who were instrumental in bringing change to the formation process. In many ways, the changes that came about in the formation process were the precursor to the changes that would overtake all of higher education in the latter part of the 1960s and early 1970s. The similarities in the changes during formation and those that later occurred in colleges and universities were in areas such as a de-emphasis on the liberal arts, the relaxation of dress codes, and the easing of restrictions on visits off-campus. In addition, daily prayer was no longer required at certain times during the day.
Three of the five men were deeply involved in making the changes possible both in the academic area as well as in the lifestyle area of Woodstock College. Two were not directly involved but were the beneficiaries of those changes. All in all, whether one saw it as a "revolution" or as a natural developmental process, living through the changes and seeing what a powerful impact they had on everyone involved in the formation process had a profound effect on each participant's future leadership as president.

All five men embraced change as a way of governance. They saw themselves as change agents as they started their presidencies at each institution, and they nurtured change by hiring the best and the brightest for faculty and administrative positions. They saw change occurring at all levels of an organization and were receptive to new ideas and concepts. Change was not something to fear: rather, change was something to embraced and utilized for the betterment of the institution and for strengthening the mission and vision of the school.

Sub-Question Three

Sub-question three speaks to the mentoring process that took place during the formation process and how that mentoring relates to their role as president. Throughout the formation process the five subjects were identified as leaders because of their talents and potential for leadership. That mentoring process also has carried over to their career track as they were identified as strong leaders and asked to take on a number of positions during their careers by individuals who had know them during the formation process.

Being Noticed for Potential and Inherent Talent

All of the interviewees brought unique talents to the formation process. They were able to excel in the classroom as well as outside of the classroom. Throughout the
process, their fellow scholastics, faculty members, and administrators recognized their talents. They were appointed to positions of leadership by administrators, positions that depended on the respect of their fellow scholastics. Some were asked to take leadership roles by their fellow scholastics in order to bring about change while others were chosen to be leaders in extra-curricular programs. What is clear from this is that they were noticed and recognized for their inherent talent and their potential by every group with whom they interacted.

After the formation process, their reputations continued to grow. Most of the five men were regularly selected for leadership roles in various areas of the Society of Jesus. They were recognized for their excellence in the fields of education and administration. All were sought out for their wisdom and experience; some were called on to perform tasks under difficult circumstances. All have built their reputation on the foundation that was laid during the formation process; a foundation of extraordinary talent in the classroom and outside of the classroom. They continue to be called on to provide leadership in various positions where their expertise is of utmost importance.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Due to the nature of this study, a qualitative interview format with a small, purposeful sample, broad generalizations may not be made about applicability of the information; however, the nature of qualitative research is such that it may inform in ways that create implications for future research. This was the case in the study of five Jesuit formed Catholic college, university, and seminary presidents.

There are 219 Catholic colleges and universities in the United States, and while all them are chartered by individual states and accredited by secular accrediting bodies,
they are inextricably tied to the Roman Catholic Church. The future of that relationship
depends greatly on having well qualified individuals in the leadership role of president.
Therefore, additional research could potentially impact a substantial number of
organizations in decisions made by leaders within Catholic higher education.

Using findings from this study as a foundation, researchers may select
characteristics different from those used in this study, for example, men who were trained
by other religious orders within the Catholic Church such as the Benedictines or
Franciscans. Using the same methodology, the emergent themes of the new work may be
compared and contrasted to those of the current study.

A quantitative study could be conducted in which presidents are surveyed
regarding their educational and career backgrounds and their presidential leadership style.
The results could be used to determine if their educational and career experiences had any
effect on their leadership styles. If so, what might those effects be? Again, a comparison
could then be made with the findings of this study.

Using qualitative methods may produce dramatically disparate results from a
population having different educational, religious, or ethnic backgrounds. As noted, the
volunteers in this study share many characteristics, such as receiving the same education
at the same place, being Catholic, living with 265 other men studying for the priesthood,
experiencing the same formation process, and all being male. The themes of the personal
narratives for men who do not share those commonalities may be quite different than
those of the current subjects.

In addition, the themes that emerged from this study raised questions in the
following areas that raise an interest:
1. Would their common experiences through their formation have a different effect on their leadership if they were presidents of secular institutions of higher learning?

2. Had these men not experienced the changes that took place during their formation process, would they view the role of change any differently?

3. The mission of Jesuit education has been a powerful tool throughout the world for the past four and a half centuries. If these men had not been indoctrinated in that mission, would their idea of mission and vision building be any different today?

4. Had they not been part of a culture where individuals were recognized for academic prowess and talent, would they have appreciated the importance of surrounding oneself with the best and the brightest?

**Additional Information**

There was one aspect of the research that emerged from the interviews which did not clearly fit into one of the categories previously reviewed but might stimulate viable research topics. This information could be noteworthy for use by boards of trustees at Catholic colleges and universities across the country when entering into a presidential search. The men in this study clearly articulated the characteristics they believed a future president of a Catholic institution of higher learning ought to possess. These views were based on a cumulative 48 years of presidential experience.

All of the men agree that a future president needs to have a conviction about the mission of the Roman Catholic Church. They stated that in order to accomplish things that are good for the Church, the school, and society at large a person must have a strong
conviction that the institution they might lead should be a Catholic institution. A future
president should have a deep understanding of and appreciation for the enormous
ccontributions that the Catholic Church has made to worldwide culture, civilization, and
higher education. The successful president must be able to understand that the Catholic
Church has been a marvelous sponsor, an advocate, and a patron of the intellectual life
for over two thousand years. They stated that, even though there have been painful, even
shameful, episodes within the Church, there is still an enormous body of superlative
accomplishment, and the new president should be able to articulate that understanding.

Also, a future president must be able to understand and articulate the differences
between being a president at a secular institution and at a Catholic institution. The
individual should be able to speak to differences in mission between the two kinds of
institutions. Finally, the new president must have an awareness, and the skills to function
within the hierarchy of the Church with diplomacy, the appearance of deference, and
tolerance for the ambiguity much different from those experienced in secular institution
or in other religious settings.

These areas of strength are more than likely not a dominant part of the interview
process that presidential candidates undergo. The skills that search committees seek in a
Catholic president are more or less the same skills sought for in a candidate for a
presidency at a secular institution. However, the skills described above are at the heart of
Catholic higher education and the mission of these institutions.

Summary

The information gathered from this study clearly leads the researcher to believe
that the respondents' experiences in the Jesuit formation process have absolutely
influenced their leadership style as presidents. It is clear the academic and general
lifestyle has influenced their presidential leadership skills. While intellectual life of the
formation process has nurtured within them a love of life-long learning, it has also made
them keenly aware of excellent teaching and of the power of peer-to-peer learning. In
addition, the changes that occurred during the formation process have given the
interviewees great insight into the positive power of change within an organization, how
change occurs, and how to be open to change.

The talents the five volunteers possess were honed during the formation process;
their peers, faculty members, and administrators recognized those talents. In turn, as
presidents they have developed an understanding of what skills are necessary for
successful leadership within Catholic higher education. They have come to know the
importance of building teams made up of the best and the brightest. They have come to
understand the importance of listening and collaboration in governance. Most
importantly, they have come to recognize the important role a president plays in
establishing a mission and vision that all can embrace and how vital the president’s role
is in keeping that mission and vision alive.

All of these men were called to be leaders in education; four of the five were also
called to the Jesuit priesthood. All were called to actively and completely partake in the
Jesuit formation process. As a result, they have become personally richer and have
positively touched the lives of thousands of men and women across this country.
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Appendix A

8 September 1999

Reverend Vincent Cooke, S.J.
Office of the President
Canisius College
2001 Main Street
Buffalo, NY 14208

Dear Fr. Cooke:

Please allow me to introduce myself. My name is Bob Pastoor and I am currently the Vice President for Student Affairs at Carroll College in Helena, Montana where I work for a former classmate of yours in the Jesuits, Dr. Matthew Quinn. Also, I have recently met with another classmate of yours, namely, Reverend Edward Glynn, S.J. at John Carroll University. It is at their urging that I write this letter.

In addition to working full time at Carroll College I am a doctoral student at the University of Montana in the Educational Leadership program. As part of this program I was required to narrow my dissertation topic at an early stage. I have narrowed my dissertation topic and process down to wanting to do a multiple case-study of you, Dr. Quinn, Fr. Glynn, Fr. Dan Degnan, and Fr. Tom Gleeson, as classmates and as presidents of Catholic colleges and Universities. My intent would be to research your family, educational, and professional backgrounds to see if there are shared or similar experiences and/or characteristic commonalties, and to determine what influence you have had on Catholic higher education, and how all that relates to your backgrounds.

The timeline for the dissertation is as follows:

1. September & October 1999 – receive formal agreements to be part of the dissertation process.
2. December 1999 – Receive indication from the University by way of Mock Defense to proceed.
4. Spring 2000 – Conduct first on site visits and interviews.
5. Spring 2000 – Conduct library research at Fordham University and Georgetown University.
6. Fall 2000 – Prepare for the comprehensive exams.
8. Spring 2001 – Conduct second on site visit and interviews.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Reverend Cooke, S.J.
Page two
8 September 1999

I am extremely excited about the possibility of doing this research and writing the dissertation. I think that the topic will not only be of interest to the Society of Jesus but also to any one involved in Catholic higher education. The fact that five men share a common educational background and then went on to assume college and university presidencies would be rare. To be able to see how they have influenced Catholic higher education in their presidencies by researching their past and their common educational experience would be fascinating.

Fr. Cooke, I certainly hope that you will agree to be part of this dissertation study and that you will allow me the opportunity to meet with and interview you. I look forward to hearing from you with your thoughts. If you would like to speak to me, please feel free to contact me at my office at (406) 447-4530 or at home at (406) 449-2830. Dr. Quinn and Fr. Glynn have also offered to speak with you about this if you find that helpful. Thank you so much for considering this proposal and I look forward to meeting you in the future.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Pastoor
Vice President for Student Affairs

RAP/me

Cc: file
Appendix B: Biographical Inventory
## Biographical Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Date of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Place of Birth</td>
<td>(city) (state) (country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Grandmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Grandmother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Great-grandfather</td>
<td>Paternal Great-grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name _____________________</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion _________________</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation _______________</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City _____________________</td>
<td>City ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State ___ Country _______</td>
<td>State ___ Country ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maternal Great-grandfather</th>
<th>Maternal Great-grandmother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name _____________________</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion _________________</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation _______________</td>
<td>__________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City _____________________</td>
<td>City ______________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State ___ Country _______</td>
<td>State ___ Country ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools you attended

**Elementary**

Name ___________________________ State ___ Country ________________

Name ___________________________ State ___ Country ________________

**Junior High School/Middle School**

Name ___________________________ State ___ Country ________________

**High School**

Name ___________________________ State ___ Country ________________

**Undergraduate College**

Name ___________________________________ State ____

Degree earned ___________________________________ year ____
Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

**Graduate School**

Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

**Post Graduate School**

Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

Name___________________________________________________________State____
Degree earned___________________________________________________year____

**JESUIT FORMATION PROGRAM**

**Novitiate**

Year entered_____ year completed____ Place____________________________________

**Juniorate**

Year entered_____ year completed____ Place____________________________________
Philosophate
Year entered____year completed____Place_____________________________________

Regency
Year started____year completed____

Work Experiences
A). What work did you do?_____________________________________________________
Where did you do it?________________________________________________________
Years there____________

B). What work did you do?_____________________________________________________
Where did you do it?________________________________________________________
Years there____________

Theologate
Year entered____year completed____Place_____________________________________

Ordination
Year____

Tertianship
Year entered____year completed____Place_____________________________________

Work Experience
A). Title_______________________________________________________________
Where?_______________________________________________________________
Year started__________________________year ended________________________
Additional comments:
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Appendix C

Interview Protocol

Part I – Focused Life History

1. Could you describe your family life growing up in ________________?

2. Are there any moments in your childhood, as you reflect upon them now that were epiphanies for you?

3. Could you speak about how religion, specifically Catholicism, influenced your family and you personally?

4. During your childhood, who had a strong influence on your growth and why do you believe they had such an affect on you?

5. At what age did you first start to think seriously about entering the priesthood? Do you remember any thoughts or feelings while you were making this decision and after you had decided to enter the priesthood?

6. Were there any priests or other religious that influenced your decision? How did they influence your decision to enter into the priesthood?

7. How did your family members and friends react to your decision to enter the priesthood?

8. You made a conscious decision to enter the Society of Jesus. What went into your discernment process to reach that decision?

Part II – Jesuit Formation Process

1. When you think back on your formation experience, what are some of the things that are most vivid in your mind?

2. One of the first and last experiences was your participation in the Spiritual Exercises. Could you describe your thoughts and feelings as you went through the Exercises both times?

3. How would you describe your day-to-day life and the academic demands that were placed upon you during the formation process?

4. During your formation process, who had the greatest influence on you? [If they are Jesuits, what characteristics did they have?]

5. What does the phrase "Keep the rule and the rule will keep you" mean to you?
6. Ho would you describe the Woodstock "lifestyle" while you were there? What influence did the lifestyle have on the closing of Woodstock?

7. Among the theologians of the time, some who were faculty members at Woodstock were Avery Dulles, John Courtney Murray, Walter Burghart, and Gustav Weigel. What part did these men have on your views of theology, your formation process, and the changes that occurred in the formation process?

8. The changes in the formation process are said to have occurred from the "bottom up" and that the Theologate students of your time had a great affect on the changes that came about in the entire formation process. Do you think this is true? If yes, can you describe the change process that took place? If not, how do you believe that the changes occurred in the formation process? What role did the theology students play in the change process? What role, if any, did you play in the change process?

9. As you reflect on your entire formation process, are there any occurrences, events, or people that you have not described, thus far, that stand out in your mind and how did they affect you?

10. Much of your formation process occurred during the time of the Second Vatican Council meetings and the changes affected by that Council. Can you describe the feelings and emotions you felt as you learned of the events and decisions connected to the Council? How did these Council events and decisions effect your formation process?

11. Would you describe your experience of formation and renewal? [do they mention Turmoil? If so, what part did that play?]

12. It has been noted that you were part of a generation that challenged and questioned the old formation process, where did that spirit of challenge come from? [Did it come from your parents, Jesuit priests, writings, and studies, was it the social environment of the time, or was it the spiritual call of your own ministry?]

13. As you were going through the formation process, what alliances were you aware of? Did you form alliances with others that led to your positions of leadership?
Part III - Work as Presidents

1. How would you describe your leadership style? How do you think others interpret your leadership style?

2. You studied during a time of great change in the formation process and within the Catholic Church. What lessons about leadership did you take away from your formation process and how have those lessons served you as presidents?

3. How has your view of Catholic higher education been affected by the changes within the Church since Vatican II? How have you been able to deal with those changes as president?

4. Do you believe that the formation process prepared you for your work as president? If so, how did it prepare you? If not, why not?

5. What do you see as similarities in the culture of your formation process and the culture of the colleges, universities, and seminaries that you have headed?

6. What do you see as differences in the culture of your formation process and the culture of the colleges, universities, and seminaries that you have headed?

7. What role did the formation process have in your ability to make your institution more effective? How do you believe the interaction of a Jesuit trained president with the culture of Catholic higher education impacts change within that organization?

8. Do you believe that a president can really make an institution more effective? If so, how did the formation process enable you to make your institution more effective?

9. Does the Jesuit view of education make you a better leader within your institutions? If so, how? If not, why not?

10. Your formation prepared you for the priesthood and for teaching. How have you been able to take these learned skills and utilize them in your role as president?

11. How does the hierarchical structure of the Jesuits and the Church impact your leadership style?

12. How would you describe your spiritual life and practice during your formation process, during your years as president, and now?
13. How did the formation process prepare you for acceptance as the president of your institution both internally and externally?

14. Do you believe that you were groomed and or mentored for your future role as president? If so, who was involved and do you recall how that took place?

15. What particular talents do you believe you bring to the role of president and as you reflect on those talents how do you believe those talents were formed?

16. What do you believe are the attributes a person should possess to be a successful president at a Catholic institution? Do you think that those attributes were attained through your formation process?

17. How would you characterize the cultures of the organizations that you have led as president?

18. Can you tell me why you believe you have been successful within the Jesuit system?
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Appendix F: Biographical Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Father Name</th>
<th>Father Religion</th>
<th>Father Occupation</th>
<th>Father Place of Birth</th>
<th>Mother Name</th>
<th>Mother Religion</th>
<th>Mother Occupation</th>
<th>Mother Place of Birth</th>
<th>Paternal Grandfather</th>
<th>PGF Religion</th>
<th>PGF Occupation</th>
<th>PGF Place of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Cooke</td>
<td>24-May-36</td>
<td>New York City, NY</td>
<td>Vincent G. Cooke</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Saxony, Germany</td>
<td>Pauline Hatuska</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Housekeeper</td>
<td>Galicia, Aus/Hungary</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Deegan</td>
<td>16-Jul-26</td>
<td>Orange, NJ</td>
<td>Bernard M. Deegan</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Real Estate, Mayor</td>
<td>West Orange, NJ</td>
<td>Dorothy M. Dugan</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>West Orange, NJ</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Scranton, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Gleeson</td>
<td>9-Jul-36</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KA</td>
<td>John J. Gleeson</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Construction Worker</td>
<td>Aklason, KA</td>
<td>Geraldine Goddard</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KA</td>
<td>James Glynn</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Railroad switchman</td>
<td>Alchison, KA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Glynn</td>
<td>6-Oct-35</td>
<td>Clark Summit, PA</td>
<td>John Glynn</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Trolley/Bus Driver</td>
<td>Scranton, PA</td>
<td>Madeline Theobald</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Honesdale, PA</td>
<td>James Glynn</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Worker</td>
<td>Sligo, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Quinn</td>
<td>11-Oct-35</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
<td>Matthew Quinn</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Scranton, PA</td>
<td>Mary Dillon</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Meagherfield, Ireland</td>
<td>James Glynn</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Information**

- **Date of Birth**: 24-May-36, 16-Jul-26, 9-Jul-36, 6-Oct-35, 11-Oct-35
- **Place of Birth**: New York City, NY, Orange, NJ, Leavenworth, KA, Clark Summit, PA, Brooklyn, NY
- **Father Name**: Vincent G. Cooke, Bernard M. Deegan, John J. Gleeson, John Glynn, Matthew Quinn
- **Father Religion**: RC, RC, RC, RC, RC
- **Father Occupation**: Real Estate, Real Estate, Mayor, Construction Worker, Trolley/Bus Driver
- **Father Place of Birth**: Saxony, Germany, West Orange, NJ, Aklason, KA
- **Mother Name**: Pauline Hatuska, Dorothy M. Dugan, Geraldine Goddard, Madeline Theobald, Mary Dillon
- **Mother Religion**: RC, RC, RC, RC, RC
- **Mother Occupation**: Housekeeper, Housewife, US Government, Housewife, Housewife
- **Mother Place of Birth**: Galicia, Aus/Hungary, West Orange, NJ, Leavenworth, KA, Honesdale, PA
- **Paternal Grandfather**: UNK, Peter Deegan, James Glynn, James Glynn, James Glynn
- **PGF Religion**: UNK, RC, UNK, UNK, UNK
- **PGF Occupation**: UNK, Railroad switchman, Farmer, Gardener, UNK
- **PGF Place of Birth**: Frenchpark, Ireland, Scranton, PA, Alchison, KA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paternal Grandmother</th>
<th>Elana Boylan</th>
<th>Margaret Delaney</th>
<th>Elizabeth O'Hagen</th>
<th>UNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGM Religion</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM Occupation</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM Place of Birth</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Kiln Leck, Ireland</td>
<td>Atchison, KA</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Grandfather</td>
<td>Danel M. Dugan</td>
<td>Francis Goddard</td>
<td>Jacob Theobald</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGF Religion</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RC (Convert)</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGF Occupation</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Lawyer, Judge</td>
<td>Salesman</td>
<td>Gas Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGF Place of Birth</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Orange, NJ</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KA</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Grandmother</td>
<td>Anna C. Davis</td>
<td>Frances Wosser</td>
<td>Sophie Bried</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM Religion</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM Occupation</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM Place of Birth</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Orange, NJ</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KA</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Great-grandfather</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Joseph Gleeson</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGGF Religion</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGGF Occupation</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGGF Place of Birth</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>County Galway, IRE</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P Great-grandmother</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Mary O'Hara</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGGM Religion</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGGM Occupation</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGGM Place of Birth</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>County Galway, IRE</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Great-grandfather</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Daniel Dugan</td>
<td>Francis Goddard</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGGF Religion</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGGF Occupation</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGGF Place of Birth</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KA</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Great-grandmother</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Elizabeth Dunn</td>
<td>Mary Herndon</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGGM Religion</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGGM Occupation</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGGM Place of Birth</td>
<td>UNK</td>
<td>Killkenny, Ireland</td>
<td>Leavenworth, KA</td>
<td>UNK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Primary and Secondary Schooling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th>Our Lady of Grace</th>
<th>Our Lady of Lourdes</th>
<th>Our Lady of Lourdes</th>
<th>Public Schools</th>
<th>St. Teresa of Avila</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City, State</td>
<td>Hoboken, NJ</td>
<td>West Orange, NJ</td>
<td>Bethesda, MD</td>
<td>Scranton, Pa</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JHS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Country</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Xavier High School</td>
<td>Seton Hall Prep</td>
<td>Gonzaga High School</td>
<td>Scranton Prep</td>
<td>Brooklyn Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Country</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
<td>South Orange, NJ</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Scranton, PA</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Schools and Degrees</td>
<td>Graduate Schools and Degrees Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State, Country</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree Earned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year Graduated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State, Country</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree Earned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year Graduated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State, Country</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree Earned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year Graduated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State, Country</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree Earned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year Graduated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State, Country</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree Earned</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year Graduated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Undergraduate**
  - Fordham University, NYC, NY
  - Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
  - University of Scranton, Scranton, PA
  - Fordham University, NYC, NY

- **Graduate School**
  - Fordham University, NYC, NY
  - Seton Hall Law School, Newark, NJ
  - Teachers College, Riverside University, NYC, NY
  - Teachers College, Riverside University, NYC, NY
  - Boston College, Boston, MA

- **Degree Earned**
  - AB (History)
  - MA Teaching
  - J.D.
  - MA Teaching
  - MA Philosophy

- **Year Graduated**
  - 1960
  - 1962
  - 1964
  - 1965
  - 1972
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate School</th>
<th>State, Country</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Year Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock College</td>
<td>MD, USA</td>
<td>ST. B. M. Divinity</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>ST M.</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Ed. D.</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
<td>Grad. Theological</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>LL.B. Education</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Graduate Schools and Degrees Earned</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Year Graduated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Law School</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Madison, WI</td>
<td>Ph. D.</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jesuit Formation Program</th>
<th>Year Entered</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novitiate</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novitiate</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novitiate</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novitiate</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novitiate</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>St. Andrew on Hudson</td>
<td>St. Andrew on Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poughkeepsie, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>Bellermine College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsburg, 2nd year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Juniorate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Entered</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Completed</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>Bellermine College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsburg, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philosophate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>Shrub Oak</td>
<td>Shrub Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peekskill, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peekskill, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Completed</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Student for LL.M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work years</td>
<td>1963-1964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theologate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Entered</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>Woods&amp;ctock College</td>
<td>Woods&amp;ctock College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woodstock, MO</td>
<td>Woodstock, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tertianship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Entered</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Completed</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>Avriesville</td>
<td>Wernersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Study</td>
<td>Wernersville</td>
<td>Wernersville, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordination Year</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Philosophy Professor</td>
<td>US. Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Started</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Vice Provincial for Higher Education</td>
<td>Law Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>NY Province of SJ</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Provincial Attorney</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>NY Province of SJ</td>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Philosophy Professor</td>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Fordham University</td>
<td>Harvard Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Academic and Executive</td>
<td>Ass't and Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Canisius College</td>
<td>Georgetown Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Completed</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Academic Vice President</td>
<td>Provincial Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Loyola College of MD</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Started</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Dean and Ass’c Provost and Professor</td>
<td>Director of Campus Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Seton Hall Law School Nework, NJ</td>
<td>St. Joseph’s Univer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Provincial Assisant Int. Vice Chancellor Executive Director for Planning (PT) AA and Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Seton Hall Law School Nework, NJ</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD University of Mass. Boston, MA Jack Kent Cooke Foundation Lansdowne, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Completed</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Visiting Professor Rector of SJ Comm. Ass’t Prof. Education President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Started</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Completed</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>President Chair. Ed. Department Dir. Of Grad. Ed Prgr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>St. Peter’s College Jersey City, NJ</td>
<td>St. Joseph’s Univer. Philadelphia, PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Year Started</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Where</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>Seton Hall Law School, Newark, NY</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Writer, Pastoral Work</td>
<td>Fordham University, NYC, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President and Dean of Pontifical Faculty</td>
<td>Jesuit School/Berkeley, Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Leonard Neal House, Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Writer, Pastoral Work</td>
<td>Jesuit Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JC Secretary for Financial Resources</td>
<td>St. Peter's Prep School, Jersey City, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>JC Secretary for Higher Education</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where</td>
<td>Jesuit Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Started</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Completed</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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