

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-5361

DONOHUE, William Richard, 1944-  
A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1972  
Education, higher

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company , Ann Arbor, Michigan

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

By

William R. Donohue

A THESIS

Submitted to

Michigan State University

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and

Higher Education

1972

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have  
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

## ABSTRACT

### A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

by

William R. Donohue

#### Problem

The purpose of this study was to describe the attitudes of the undergraduate student body of Central Michigan University toward Collective Bargaining. It was the intent of this study to build baseline, descriptive data on student attitudes toward four basic areas related to collective bargaining:

1. Organized labor and management.
2. Organized university faculty and administration.
3. Organized student unions.
4. The relationship of the above continua to student sex, classification, hometown, race, residence, and age.

#### Methods and Procedures

The design of this study was based on 253 undergraduate Central Michigan University students. The population was sampled in both random fashion and from intermediate level core courses in psychology and history. Additional information, though not statistical, was also gathered through interviews and discussions with some 75 faculty, students and administrators.

A 120-item questionnaire was developed for this study. Utilizing a previously published Likert Continuum for labor and management, by John Horvat and Robert Merrill Publishers, two additional scales were modified to measure identification toward faculty and administration and student union attitudes. The correlation coefficients on all three

scales were found significant beyond the .05 level.

A statistical analysis of the data provided mean scores, standard deviation, and analysis of variance measures. The .05 level of significance was used to determine the level of significance in all cases.

### Findings

Central Michigan University students as a whole have no distinct identification with, and in fact, are very neutral toward organized labor and management. On the faculty-administrative continuum, however, they were more identified with faculty concepts than administrative ones, showing a low to moderate identification. Students identified most with student union concepts, showing a moderate identification.

The writer concluded that these general findings, while somewhat neutral, were most temporary and could easily and significantly be affected by collective bargaining situations which the students perceived as impacting on their daily lives. Certainly such events as a faculty strike or increased tuition as a result of collective bargaining would be such an event.

The statistical analysis of responses to the questionnaire show that there were significant attitudinal differences among the students sampled in the following areas:

1. Females are less identified with Student Union concepts than males.
2. Twenty-year olds identify more with Labor and Student Union concepts than 18 year olds.
3. Juniors identify more with Labor and Student Union concepts than freshmen.
4. Of the juniors who more strongly identify with Labor and Student Union concepts than freshmen, the men differ more towards these concepts than the women.
5. Students living in the various living arrangements differ in attitudes toward collective bargaining.
6. Non-whites identify more with Labor, Faculty, and Student Union concepts than whites.

As a result of this study, the writer recommended further investigation in the following areas:

Recommendations for Further Study

1. A comparative study of students and faculty in the context of collective bargaining would be both interesting and useful. If faculty exposure is significant in attitude development, it would seem worthwhile to investigate departmental attitudes toward collective bargaining, from student through department head.
2. With no clear-cut models for student participation in university governance and no definitive models for student participation in collective bargaining, a specific delineation of student attitudes might be useful.
3. An important area to investigate seems to be the whole scope of awareness, knowledge, and understanding students have regarding collective bargaining in both public and private sectors. A thorough analysis of parental occupation and hometown environment would amplify such study.
4. Another concept useful for study is the longitudinal knowledge and attitude change regarding collective bargaining. What knowledge or attitudes exist prior to unit determination on a campus, at the end of bargaining, and at the end of the contract period? Does this differ significantly among students, faculty, or administrators?
5. Finally, a collective bargaining area needing investigation in higher education is a regional one. What differences, if any, do geographical regions make in a student, faculty and administrator knowledge and attitude? Are the students at Rutgers more aware and understanding of collective bargaining than the students at Oakland? Are the faculty more knowledgeable regarding collective bargaining?

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the members of his guidance committee, Dr. Keith Groty, Dr. Richard Featherstone and Dr. Lou Stamatakos, three exceptionally busy men who always found time when there wasn't any. A special note of gratitude to Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, Chairman of my Guidance Committee, for the autonomy, time, support and understanding he provided throughout the course of my doctoral program.

The completion of this study would not have been possible without the wealth of warm and stimulating relationships of many individuals to whom I am deeply indebted.

To my many collegiate friends who have had such provocative and heartening effect on my development.

To my parents, Mr. and Mrs. D.A. Donohue whose love and confidence have been with me throughout my life.

And most of all, to my dear wife Nancy, for the profound patience, love and understanding she has given to me.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
LIST OF APPENDICES .....	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Need for the Study .....	2
Statement of the Problem .....	3
Definitions and Limitations .....	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....	9
Attitudes .....	9
Historical Perspectives on Students and Collective Bargaining .....	11
Student Identification with Labor .....	13
Student Identification with Management .....	17
Developments in Participatory University Governance ....	19
Collective Bargaining and the Student .....	22
Research Findings .....	31
Central Michigan University, Its Students and the CMU Faculty-Administrative Agreement .....	35
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....	41
Sources of Data .....	41
Method of Collecting Data .....	42
General Characteristics of the Instrument .....	42
The Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire .....	43
The Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire ..	44
The Student Union-Non Student Union Attitude Questionnaire .....	44
Presentation of the Data .....	46
Analysis of the Data .....	47
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA .....	48
Presentation and Analysis of the Complete Sample .....	48
Presentation and Analysis of the Major Groups .....	51
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	59
Limitations .....	63
Recommendations for Further Study .....	64
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	67
APPENDICES .....	72

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Distribution of All Scores on Scale A .....	48
2.	Distribution of All Scores on Scale B .....	49
3.	Distribution of All Scores on Scale C .....	50
4.	Means and Standard Deviations for Three Separate Sample Sources .....	50
5.	Analysis of Variance for Three Separate Sample Source Group Means on Scales A, B, and C .....	51
6.	Means and Standard Deviations for Major Sample Groupings on Scales A, B, and C .....	52
7.	Analysis of Variance for Males and Females on Scales A, B, and C .....	53
8.	Analysis of Variance for Five Age Groupings on Scales A, B, and C .....	54
9.	Analysis of Variance for Academic Classifications on Scales A, B, and C .....	54
10.	Analysis of Variance for Academic Classifications of Males on Scales A, B, and C .....	55
11.	Analysis of Variance for Student Residences on Scales A, B, and C .....	56
12.	Analysis of Variance for Non-Urban Residential Students on Scales A, B, and C .....	56
13.	Analysis of Variance for Home Town Classification on Scales A, B, and C .....	57
14.	Analysis of Variance for Race on Scales A, B, and C ...	57

# LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX		PAGE
A	Demographic Distribution of Central Michigan University Students and the Study's Sample .....	72
B	Instrument Instructions and Demographic Questionnaire .....	74
C	The Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire (Scale A), The Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire (Scale B), and the Student Union-Non Student Union Attitude Questionnaire (Scale C) .....	76
D	Letter of Invitation to Participate in University Research .....	85
E	Follow-Up Letter on Participation in University Research .....	87
F	Classification and Distribution of Urban and Non-Urban Home Towns Used in the Study .....	89

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The advent of collective bargaining<sup>1</sup> among faculty, administrators and, more recently, students in higher education is more than a curious phenomena. The burgeoning of negotiated contracts in community colleges, the push of national teachers' organizations in college and university unit determination and the legal ramifications in our courts and legislatures regarding public employee negotiation places collective bargaining in the forefront of issues in higher education.

Contemporary journals and professional publications are just beginning to document faculty and administrative attitudes and opinions toward collective bargaining as a form of university governance. Their mutual concerns about professionalism, decision making and economic stability are becoming more and more clear as contracts continue to be negotiated and signed.

An area as yet unexplored and vastly ignored has been the student attitude and opinion toward these negotiations. With faculty and administrative groups vying for economic and governing positions, it may well be that the students have some ideas, if not some particularly strong attitudes, regarding these legal agreements.<sup>2,3,4</sup> The rise of student expression for participation in university governance, the age of majority now a reality in a number of states, including Michigan, and the increase of student sophistication and identification with labor generally, poses more than just a peripheral concern for some colleges and universities.<sup>5,6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See definitions, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>William A. Sievert. Chronicle of Higher Education (August 30, 1971), p. 1.

<sup>3</sup>William A. Sievert. Chronicle of Higher Education (September 27, 1971), p. 3.

<sup>4</sup>Myron Lieberman. "Professors, Unite," Harpers. CCXLIII (October, 1971), p. 61.

<sup>5</sup>Clive L. Grafton. "A Latitudinal Study of Attitudes Comparing Certain Student Groups on Issues Related to University Life." Dissertation, University of Southern California, (1968).

<sup>6</sup>Sievert, op. cit. (August and September, 1971).

#### NEED FOR THE STUDY

Since 1969 there have been eleven institutions of higher education which have signed contracts with their faculty under collective bargaining law.<sup>7</sup> National teachers' organizations are presently vying to represent college faculty on scores of other campuses.<sup>8</sup>

In conjunction with this rise in collective bargaining activity, two recent journal articles have spoken about the need of investigation into the idea of students and collective bargaining. In the Journal of Higher Education, William McHugh discusses the likelihood of student involvement in collective bargaining: "It is reasonable to assume that students will become substantially involved...as some faculty-administrative issues will directly affect the self-interest of students, and in such issues they will seek a stake."<sup>9</sup>

The American Association of University Professors Bulletin began a 1971 issue with a discussion of campus governmental and economic stress which warned of the emergence of organized student groups. Mathew Finkin states, "The role of students in institutional decisions where a collective bargaining relationship between faculty and administration exists remains to be established. It would be ironic for students to secure representation on institutional deliberative bodies whose authority was placed in question by a bargaining agent."<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>Central Michigan University, SUNY, CUNY, Rutgers University, St. Johns University and S.E. Massachusetts, Oakland University, New Jersey State College, New York Institution of Technology, U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, Boston State College.

<sup>8</sup>Malcom G. Scully and William Sievert. "Collective Bargaining Gains Converts Among Teachers," Chronicle of Higher Education (May 10, 1971).

<sup>9</sup>William McHugh. "Collective Bargaining and the College Student," Journal of Higher Education (March, 1971), pp. 175-185.

<sup>10</sup>Mathew W. Finkin. "Collective Bargaining and University Government," American Association of University Professors Bulletin. Vol. LVII, No. 2, (June, 1971), pp. 149-162.

In Michigan alone, there are nearly 30 contracts between two-year schools of higher education and their faculties. There is not yet, however, any conclusive evidence to show that collective bargaining is supportive or even productive in a student-related educational context.<sup>11</sup>

Of particular concern to this writer is the fact that at this juncture there is a paucity of research or literature on the attitudes and opinions of college students in institutions where collective bargaining is taking place. Certainly, knowledge of their perceptions and ideas may be significant to know as students become more and more active in college and university decision making generally and possibly in a form of collective bargaining itself.

#### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The state of Michigan has for many years been a leader in the field of labor relations and labor legislation. In an educational context also, Michigan has often been a bellwether of national affairs. The combined area of collective bargaining in higher education in Michigan is developing with understandable speed and significance.

Presently there are several faculty organizations seeking bargaining contracts in Michigan's four-year schools. At Wayne State University and Eastern Michigan University, elections have been held, and at Saginaw Valley College negotiations are under way. At Michigan State University faculty organizations are presently campaigning in preparation for elections hearings.<sup>12</sup>

At this writing, only two of Michigan's four-year schools, Central Michigan University and Oakland University, have successfully negotiated bargaining contracts. Not only are these the only Michigan schools, but they are also two of only a dozen such contracts in the nation.

Of the two Michigan contracts, the Central Michigan University faculty-administrative agreement has had the longest duration, having first been signed in 1969. The potential for student attitudes to have developed under

---

<sup>11</sup>Telephone interview with Ben Munger, Michigan Education Association, Lansing, Michigan, June, 1971.

<sup>12</sup>Telephone interview with Bill Owen, Michigan Education Association, Lansing, Michigan, April, 1972.

collective bargaining, therefore, seems greater on the Central Michigan campus. For this reason, it was selected for this study.

1. What are the student attitudes at Central Michigan University toward collective bargaining among organized labor and management?

Students nationally have demonstrated a great awareness of organized labor, even to the point of imitation in their efforts to bring about social, political and university reform.<sup>13</sup> This is somewhat of a contrast to the managerial character or career orientation generally associated with higher education. The question points to the need for greater understanding of student attitudes toward labor and management in a collective bargaining context. It also seeks to identify with which end of the corporate continuum students identify.

2. What are the student attitudes at Central Michigan University toward collective bargaining among faculty and university administration?

Public opinion, as represented by government legislation, has shown a general support for the principles of organized labor in the private sector since 1935. In the public sector, however, there has been a legislative reluctance to support organized labor. The responses to this question will reflect student identification with public labor issues, particularly among public teachers and administrators in higher education. The responses will also amplify the previous question and provide greater data for comparison of student attitude.

3. What are the student attitudes at Central Michigan University toward student participation in collective bargaining in higher education?

With growing student involvement across the nation in university governance and in some cases actual organized student labor groups, the response of Central Michigan students seems important.<sup>14</sup> Some student bodies have expressed frustration in being left out of the bi-party agreements, while others have shown no visible concern or interest. The responses to this question will reflect identification toward student union concepts or a more non-participatory identification. The responses will also continue to amplify the previous questions, providing additional comparative data.

---

<sup>13</sup>Sievert, op. cit.

<sup>14</sup>Sievert, op. cit.

4. What relationships exist between the study's attitudinal continua and the sex, academic classification, residence, race or home town size of Central Michigan University students?

Since so little data has been gathered on student attitudes and opinions regarding collective bargaining, responses to this question will provide considerable comparative data. Do women exhibit stronger identification with labor groups? Do upperclassmen or students from urban backgrounds differ significantly in their attitudes? This question is designed to amplify the scope of the previous three questions, providing a broad base of demographical information.

All four questions focus on Central Michigan University students and their attitudes toward the continua of labor groups and managerial groups.

#### DEFINITIONS AND LIMITATIONS

Many terms in educational and labor circles are used interchangeably. A few definitions are provided to assist the reader in a consistent interpretation of this study.

Administration - (1) The determination and execution of policies subject to the authority delegated by an institution's governing bodies; (2) the officers who determine and execute such policies. Administrative personnel may be classed as general, those serving the institution as a whole; and departmental or divisional, those engaged in the administration of a department or component college of a university.<sup>15</sup>

Attitude - A complex, sum-total of a person's inclinations and feelings, prejudices and bias, pre-conceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specified topic, with a predisposition to act on those conditions. An attitude can be induced from the acceptance or rejection of an opinion and is subject to change.<sup>16,17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "Definitions of Student Personnel Terms." (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 2.

<sup>16</sup>L.L. Thurstone. The Measurement of Attitude (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapter I, 1929).

<sup>17</sup>Merriam Webster. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (Massachusetts: AG & C Merriam Company), p. 592.



Collective Bargaining Agreement - A written contract between an employer (or employers) and an employee organization, usually for a definite term, defining conditions of employment, (wages, hours, vacations, holidays, over-time payments, etc.) the rights of the employees and their organization, and the procedures to be followed in settling disputes or handling issues that arise during the life of the contract.<sup>18</sup> In this study the term collective bargaining will be synonymous with collective negotiations and professional negotiations.

Faculty Organizations - Parties which represent faculties through local, independent, or national organizations, such as the AAUP, MEA, MAHE, or AFT. They may or may not limit their membership to full-time employees, tenured employees or teaching employees.

Labor Organization - A group of workers in a voluntary association combined for the common purpose of protecting or advancing the wages, hours, or working conditions of their members. Although these organizations are occasionally concerned with matters of social and political concern, this is not their primary aim, but a function which is made necessary by the common interest in protecting and advancing the member welfare. The National Labor Relations Act defines "labor organization" as "any organization of any kind, or any agency or employee representation, committee or plan, in which employees participate and which exists for the purpose whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rate of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work." Definitions under a statute, however, apply only to the purpose of that statute and for the purposes of that statute.<sup>19</sup>

Management - The term when used as a noun applies to an employer or to executives of a corporation who are accountable and responsible for the administration and direction of an enterprise and the functions of leadership. The term also concerns itself with the general management and motivating of the activities of a corporation or other business enterprise (to include planning and organizing) so that it may achieve its objectives most efficiently and economically.<sup>20</sup>

Opinion - An opinion is a belief, judgment or view about a particular matter, often a verbal expression or symbol of an attitude.<sup>21,22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup>William Millery and David Newbury. Teacher Negotiations: A Guide For Bargaining Teams, Glossary (New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1970).

<sup>19</sup>Harold S. Roberts. Roberts Dictionary of Industrial Relations (Washington, D.C.: BNA Incorporated, 1966).

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Thurstone, op. cit.

<sup>22</sup>Webster, op. cit., p. 57.

The nature of this study is descriptive and is designed to provide baseline data from which hypotheses may be drawn and developed. Because of the newness of this research area and the breadth of design, there are many limitations for generalization. The uniqueness of Central Michigan alone will limit much of the broader application of this study. Central Michigan is located in a rural, farming section of an industrial state with comparatively liberal labor laws. Other states which have four-year institutions with bargaining contracts are both urban and industrial.<sup>23</sup> In another sense, inferential generalizations may be difficult in that Central Michigan is now under its second contract and student attitudes and opinions may not approximate those on campuses where collective bargaining is in its beginning stages.

A limitation found in any research using attitudes and opinions is that of change. Since people's perceptions change, the measurement of their attitudes and opinions will not be static or infallible. We must be content to assume that it is important to know what people say they believe or think at a given time.<sup>24</sup>

Another limitation will involve the instrumentation. Only the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire has been extensively validated. The two questionnaires have been piloted, redesigned and validated, but only in approximation of the Labor-Management questionnaire. In the end, the instruments are being used to apply some linear measurement to the multi-dimensional concepts of attitude.<sup>25</sup> In the same sense, it bears repeating that the study is descriptive and the instrumentation is used only to induce a greater understanding of the student in the developing context of collective bargaining at Central Michigan University and in collective bargaining relationships generally.

---

<sup>23</sup>New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts.

<sup>24</sup>Thurstone, op. cit.

<sup>25</sup>Thurstone, op. cit.

## OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Chapter II consists of a review of the literature pertinent to the study. Much of this chapter will be background since so little research has been conducted in this area. Where appropriate, the findings of research conducted regarding student attitudes and collective bargaining are presented.

In Chapter III the method used in conducting the study is presented. The source of the data, the procedure and instrumentation used in collecting the data and the methods of presenting the data are discussed.

Chapter IV will present the findings and statistical analysis of the data. This chapter will specifically respond to the four questions outlined in Chapter I.

A summary of the study, with its limitations and conclusions will be presented, along with recommendations for further research, in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter summarizes the available literature pertaining to college student attitudes toward collective bargaining and the areas associated with this inquiry. The chapter is divided into the following segments:

#### Attitudes

Historical Perspectives on Students and Collective Bargaining

Student Identification with Labor

Student Identification with Management

Developments in Participatory University Governance

Collective Bargaining and the Student

Research Findings

Central Michigan University, Its Students, and the Central  
Michigan University Faculty-Administrative Agreement.

#### Attitudes

Katz and Stotland describe an attitude as an individual's tendency or predisposition to evaluate an object or symbol of that object in a certain way.<sup>1</sup> They conceive attitudes as having affective, cognitive and behavior components which involve feelings, emotions, belief and action. Some of our attitudes, they assert, are heavily loaded with affective components and do not require any action beyond the expression of feelings. Other attitudes are heavily intellectualized to the point where they cannot be used as valid predictors of the course an individual will take in a social situation. Action-oriented attitudes may involve a minimum of feeling and belief and may emerge when a need can be satisfied simply and directly.<sup>2</sup> Hoveland, Janis, Kelley and Allport define attitude somewhat differently. They claim an attitude to be an orientation toward or away from some object, concept or situation

---

<sup>1</sup>D. Katz and E. Stotland. "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change." Educational Psychology: A Study of a Science (Vol. III, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

<sup>2</sup>Henry C. Lindgren. An Introduction to Social Psychology (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969), p. 71.

as well as a predetermined readiness to respond to these or related objects, concepts or situations.<sup>3</sup>

Allport suggests four common conditions for the formulation of attitudes:

1. The accretion and integration of responses learned in the course of growing up. For example, being raised in a home in which the father is deferred to and the sons are valued above the daughters will affect general attitudes regarding male supremacy.
2. The individuation, differentiation or segregation of experiences. Experiences do not merely accumulate; they become sharpened and patterned, so that attitudes may become more specific as the individual grows up.
3. The influence of some dramatic experience of trauma. Sometimes a single experience may have a lasting influence and may generalize to related stimuli. Nausea following the eating of strange food may generate a distaste for all related dishes. A bad experience with a single member of some ethnic group may lead to a distrust of all members of that group.
4. The adoption of ready-made attitudes. Sometimes attitudes are picked up through imitation of the attitudes of parents and others.<sup>4</sup>

In the case of college student attitudes and collective bargaining, some generalizations can be asserted. Many student attitudes have been developed and nurtured in the family and community environment. A working-class family will likely have differing attitudes than the family of a corporation manager. In the same sense, both inner city youth and farm youth may have negative feelings toward corporate powers, but for reasons stemming from widely differing attitudes. The Allport conditions suggest a myriad of social, economic and vocational conditions for the attitude development in such an area as collective bargaining.

Feldman and Newcomb summarize college student attitudes and their tendencies for change:

The general finding that attitudes change little after college years cannot be attributed simply to "inherent inertia" or to some sort of early hardening of psychological arteries. The basic fact is that one's attitudes and values do not change whimsically, but in response to new information or to new ways of viewing one's world. The older one becomes, the less the

---

<sup>3</sup>Ernest R. Hilgard. Introduction to Psychology (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962), p. 564.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid. p. 564.

relative impact of any particular set of new experiences. The unique thing about late-adolescence-merging-into-early-maturity is that at this stage of development one is, in our society, maximally motivated to achieve autonomy and at the same time minimally constrained to conform to the restrictions of adult roles. The typical consequence may well be this: if one does not change during this period one is not likely to change thereafter. Or, alternatively, if one has changed during these years one may have acquired a propensity for changing oneself in response to changes in the world outside oneself.<sup>5</sup>

Since most students have never experienced full-time employment, many of their attitudes toward labor and unionism are naturally developed through second and third-hand sources. Feldman suggests that the collegiate environment is one of change, though in relation to work and labor attitudes, it may simply be an incubation period. The advent of collective bargaining in colleges and universities, however, may introduce new trends in this area of attitude development.

#### Historical Perspectives on Students and Collective Bargaining

While the emergence of collective bargaining in colleges and universities today appears to be a contemporary one, there is considerable underpinning to the concept of the student and collective negotiation. Though it can be said that students have always had attitudes and opinions about their desires to share in the decision-making affairs of their own education, nowhere, it appears, was it so demonstrated as in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries.

The most complete control of the "universitas" by students occurred in Bologna.<sup>6</sup> Students formed societies called "nations" which were patterned after trade guilds. The nations established rules for themselves, their

---

<sup>5</sup>Kenneth A. Feldman and Theodore M. Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students (Volume I, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.), p. 333.

<sup>6</sup>V.R. Cardozier. "Student Power in Medieval Universities." Personnel and Guidance Journal (June, 1968), p. 944.

landlords, their servants and most of all, their professors. The professors were required to swear obedience to the rector (elected student leader) and follow classroom procedures established by the students.<sup>7</sup> Likewise, teachers organized into "faculties" or a "collegium" to control the flow of new entrants into the profession and protect themselves from abuses perpetrated by local authorities, the local bishop or the king.<sup>8,9</sup> A combination of royal and religious decrees from time to time also protected the students and faculty from taxation, military service and arrest.

Cardozier reports that in Paris, Montpellier, Prague, Angiers, Orleans, Toulouse and Avignon, variations of this theme of student dominance continued into the fourteenth century. Students at these institutions negotiated directly and collectively with their faculty for fees as well as teaching conditions. Fines or boycotts were sanctions imposed on inefficient or obstinate faculty. By 1200 the community of teachers and students had developed in many places a "studium generale" of sufficient stature (in Paris, at least) to ask for and receive a charter as the University of Paris. (Sorbonne)<sup>10,11</sup>

The cities sponsoring these universities were often the spoils for the privileged students. It was no wonder that in Bologna when the professors appealed for endowed chairs (as opposed to bargaining with the students) the city complied. The first two chairs were awarded in 1230, and a trend which would eventually erode the student control in Bologna was established. By 1381 there were 23 chairs underwritten by the city.

As the city's financial contribution increased, so then did its influence and controlling interest. Even though the position of rector was still being

---

<sup>7</sup>S.E. Frost. Introduction to American Education (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1962), p. 86.

<sup>8</sup>Cardozier, op. cit., p. 944.

<sup>9</sup>Earl McGrath, Should Students Share the Power (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970), p. 10.

<sup>10</sup>Frost, op. cit. p. 87.

<sup>11</sup>Frank W. Hull. The Organized Organization (Toledo, Ohio: University of Toledo, 1971), p. 13.

occupied by a student when Napoleon's troops dispersed Bologna in 1796, student power had for some time been diminished.<sup>12</sup>

While it may be argued that the medieval universities exhibited at best a crude form of collective bargaining, it was clearly in the economic, political and sociological spirit of present day labor struggles.

#### Student Identification with Labor

It would be difficult to extensively trace student attitudes toward labor in the context of this review, but a few movements and some identification can be ascribed. Certainly one need look no further than the boycotts and strikes staged by students in the late 1960's and the early 1970's to draw at least some understanding of students and their awareness of organizational sanctions. The development of this behavior and the attitudes behind it are both interesting and complicated.

In Russia at the turn of this century students and laborers developed a powerful but short-lived coalition. Feuer reports:

Students were thrust into places of leadership, and university halls became chambers for the workers' soviet. G.S. Krustalev-Nosar, with his reputation as the Social Democratic leader among the St. Petersburg studentry, became president of the Workers' Soviet in 1905. The university became the forum for revolution. The great student strike of 1905, which followed the massacre of Bloody Sunday, brought drastic changes to the academic world. A Students' Soviet virtually administered the University of St. Petersburg. Throngs of workers found their way to the university to see what was going on...to satisfy them it was decided to hold meetings in the university twice a day; in the morning on academic issues and in the evening on political issues. The university in the evenings became and belonged to the revolutionary workers.<sup>13</sup>

In western Europe, however, the more recent and prevalent form of student movements have been truly student syndicates, or student trade unions, devoted to the material welfare of students in their status as apprentices to the intellectual elite.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>Cardozier, op. cit., p. 948.

<sup>13</sup>Lewis S. Feuer. The Conflict of Generations (New York: Basic Books Inc., Publishers, 1969), p. 124.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 263.



In 1968 French students made their most historical effort to shed a tradition of elitism and achieve unity with the working class. It accomplished certain things: it occupied Sorbonne for thirty-four days, it brought the General Confederation of Labor to call a general strike, it compelled the dissolution of the National Assembly, the dismissal of two ministers and the holding of new elections. But the student activists failed in their supreme objective -- they could not weld the student movement and the workers into one:

A certain sociological truth became evident; it is only in proto-industrial and pre-industrial societies, among relatively unorganized working class, or among a peasantry, that student intellectuals can hope to seize power. In a developed society, however, where working-class organizations have developed their own traditions, customs, and leadership, the student leaders cannot hope to fulfill their messianic elitism in alliance with the labor movement...and the idealism of student movements will partake even more of the character of fantasy. While the workmen accept almost unanimously the industrial society, its advantages, its organization, its inevitability, the student activists by contrast are anti-industrial, anti-organizational and voluntarist.<sup>15</sup>

Sanche de Gramont wrote of the disparity between workers and student goals in a similar fashion, saying:

The great majority of the workers, however, showed that far from repudiating the consumer society decried by the students, that what they really wanted was a more active participation in it. They asked not for an overthrow of the society, but for full membership. Ninety percent of the students come from non-working-class families...The working men are men with families, men of all ages, but they do not feel spiritually oppressed, they feel materially deprived.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 281.

<sup>16</sup>Sanche de Gramont. "The French Worker Wants to Join the Affluent, Not Wreck It," New York Times Magazine (June, 1968).

In the United States there has not been the violence or the magnanimity of the Russian and French coalitions of students and laborers. In 1939 an American Student Union, later to be called the Young Communist League, claiming a membership of 20,000, attempted to support striking mine workers in Kentucky with a "back-to-the-people" gesture.<sup>17</sup> More recently, the Students for a Democratic Society have taken up the banner for a reunification with the workers. In St. Louis, Philadelphia and a few other cities, somewhat successful attempts were made with laborers to protest the war, investigate mutual goals, and discuss organizational directions. In New York City, however, a similar attempt failed as long-shoremen and other industrial laborers showed support for administrative peace efforts, denounced mutual goals and beat radical-appearing onlookers.

Two 1970 underground student newspapers in the United States carried articles on student-labor relations. In the Fifth Estate, a Detroit paper, the following article by a factory employee was carried:

"Students who've worked in factories for short periods keep telling me the same thing. Workers won't get behind radical student programs because their heads are into fast cars, color TV's, split-level homes, etc. And then they tell me how they got hassled by some workers because of their long hair. Sure, but you're going to college. You have a ticket out of the plant. You aren't going to spend 20-30 years of your lives in these industrial cesspools.

Long hair symbolizes all this to a worker. How can we relate to your long hair and radical projects when we know god-damned well you'll graduate, get a white collar job, and start accumulating all the material things you're putting us down for getting now.

We've been in the business of running strikes a hell of a lot longer than you have and we have well organized, well disciplined structures for running them so they get results. We call our organizations unions...and they're run out of union halls near the plants.

The way I feel right now, I'll personally whip the ass of the next bush league campus rebel who leaflets our people at our plant gates without first having the common courtesy to visit our union hall and let our Executive Board know about your program. You'd bitch and moan if someone started running programs to your people without working through your organizational structure. But you're perfectly willing to by-pass our organizations and still expect us to support your projects."<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Feuer, op. cit., p. 353.

<sup>18</sup>Fifth Estate, Detroit, May 14-27, 1970 (Vol. V, No. 9105), p. 4.

In New York, the Liberated Guardian featured this request by workers for student support:

"Rank and file leaders of the biggest trucking strike in Los Angeles since 1943 have called on students to help man picket lines; and in response 150 students from four colleges showed up on May 14 and 15 to picket a key trucking company.

Teamsters are on wildcat strike in several major cities, rejecting a new union-negotiated trucking contract because it contains no provision for sick leave. The strike is in its sixth week and Los Angeles trucking companies are using scab drivers and an injunction against union picketing in an effort to break the strike.

The Teamsters have been enthusiastic about the student picket line at Western Car Loading. Eddy McKiernan, a shop steward and strike leader said, 'At first we thought a lot of our people would have objections. They might have their pride hurt by having students do their work -- but it's worked out just fine. And since the students joined us, the newspapers have begun covering the strike.'

Joe Ramos, a driver at Western Car Loading for 11 years, said, 'The students have been a shot in the arm to every worker--to know that somebody believes in what we are doing, that somebody thinks we are right'.<sup>19</sup>

In the past year the National Student Association (NSA) has attempted to bring student and labor groups together. A new "Labor-University Alliance" has been formed by the NSA and several labor and university leaders, including such labor notables as John Kenneth Galbraith and George Wald.<sup>20</sup>

Of all student-labor coalitions, probably none will be as clearly demonstrated as that which presently exists in Red China. While much is still unknown, recent television and news reports indicate that the famous Cultural Revolution has placed a joint emphasis on scholarly achievement as well as hard physical work. Professors, students and managers from time to time work side by side on assembly lines and in the fields with regular workers. Interestingly enough, the coalition came not from student or laborer solidification, but from military and political decree. After the

---

<sup>19</sup>Liberated Guardian, New York, (May 23, 1970).

<sup>20</sup>Skip Roberts. Telephone interview to the National Student Association, Washington, D.C., December 15, 1971.

Red Guard (students) removed the supposed corruption within government and industry, their strength allegedly threatened Mao himself and the Cultural Revolution became a student-worker coalition for the nation.

While the conclusions regarding student trends or identification with labor may be somewhat spotty or temporary, there nevertheless is a precedent for, and resemblance of economic, legal and political thought to present day organized labor.

#### Student Identification with Management

College students have had a rather substantial identification with management. Whether in acceptance of management and administrative concepts or in anti-labor attitudes, there seems to exist a grassroot or "silent majority" support for management.

This is a difficult concept to thoroughly document, for in many cases acceptance of the status quo is support for management, institutional administration, or the like. Identification, even collective identification, with management principals seldom receives the media attention college student demonstrations with labor, demonstrations for social change, or university political postures do. There are, however, a few supportive examples of these attitudes in American college students.

The most recent documentation comes from the American Council on Education research which shows that from 1967-70, which were very tumultuous years for college administrators, the freshman class felt that the collegiate officials were being "too lax" with protestors.<sup>21</sup> This would support claims by political figures, college presidents and the like who have maintained steadfastly that by far the majority of the college students support general collegiate policy and only a small minority identify with the radical fringe.

Certainly a significant part of college student identification with management is a function of background and aspiration. The ACE report showed only ten percent of the freshman class of 1971 coming from homes where the father's occupation was classified semi-skilled or unskilled. Of the same

---

<sup>21</sup>Robert L. Jacobson. Chronicle of Higher Education (January 10, 1972), p. 4.

freshmen, "occupational aspirations" listed no reference to these working classifications.<sup>22</sup>

Irving Krauss introduces an article for the American Sociological Review on Educational Aspirations of Working Class Youth as follows:

"Characteristic of industrial society is growth in the proportion of better paid and more prestigious occupations, increased educational requirements for the more desirable jobs, and greater availability of education. These conditions encourage individuals to develop mobility aspirations, and increasingly education is a primary channel for upward movement."<sup>23</sup>

Regarding specific goals of a college education, Feldman and Newcomb report: "The general trend of student change is toward those of 'general education' and 'appreciation of ideas' and away from such instrumental goals as narrow preparation for a vocation...thus seniors, as compared with freshmen, tend to demand a 'good fit;' they also want opportunities for self expression. Furthermore, seniors appear less concerned about job security."<sup>24</sup>

Feldman and Newcomb also state that "because of anticipatory socialization on their part, lower status students entering college may even rather closely resemble higher status entrants in their attitudes and orientations."<sup>25</sup>

As the number of economically disadvantaged students entering higher education increases, and public employee unionism grows, college student identification with management may decrease, but there is no evidence to indicate a drastic change at this juncture.

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 4 .

<sup>23</sup>Irving Krauss. "Sources of Educational Aspirations Among Working-Class Youth," American Sociological Review, Vol. XXIX (December, 1964), pp. 867-879.

<sup>24</sup>Newcomb and Feldman, op. cit., p. 19.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 277.

### Developments in Participatory University Governance

The literature has shown that universities have been operated or highly influenced by students, labor leaders, and military organizations. The most traditional form of university governance in the Western world, however, has always been a faculty or trustee body. McGrath characterizes the role of the student in the history of American education:

They might voice their opinions of their teachers, their courses of study, or the conditions of campus life; they might petition for redress of grievances; they might foment demonstrations or rebellions; all of these things American college and university students have done for three centuries. But theirs was a privilege of protest, not a power, and theirs was a duty of obedience, not of participation. In a patriarchal culture and in an autocratic or oligarchic institution, it was unthinkable for students to expect to exert direct influence on educational policies through membership on institutional councils.<sup>26</sup>

Though students haven't run the educational systems in the United States, they have had a pronounced effect on all the movements which have revolutionized it. Lacking "de jure" power, students have frequently used their "de facto" power of numbers and persistence. They have initiated or supported efforts to introduce into the college curriculum all of the modern disciplines, the modern languages, the sciences, the fine arts, the technologies and more recently, a variety of professional and vocational instruction.<sup>27</sup> The recent upsurge of the "free universities" across the country and some of the "non academic" encounter groups on and off campus reflect some contemporary efforts of students to re-shape or supplement their education.

To think that some students don't effect in a real or direct way their education or the decisions which shape it is misleading. Antioch College has for many years admitted students to full membership on deliberative bodies, as have Roosevelt University, Sarah Lawrence, Bennington, Marlboro and Goddard College, to name a few. In 1970 Otterbein College voted to

---

<sup>26</sup>McGrath, op. cit., p. 16.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., p. 20.

give students full and equal voice in all of its campus affairs, to include the board of trustees and the academic senate. Activities in these areas would include hiring faculty, establishing budgets and shaping the curriculum.<sup>28</sup>

In many respects, however, the previous examples are atypical according to McGrath, who indicated that only twenty percent of today's colleges and universities even let students attend Board of Trustee meetings, and only three percent allow voting membership. The schools showing the largest amount of student participation had enrollments under 500, were public and were in New England. The schools indicating the lowest student participation tended to be Catholic, in the north central portion of the country and had enrollments between 2,000 and 5,000 students.<sup>29</sup>

An interesting study by E.G. Williamson and John Cowan shows responses of Deans of Students and Student Body Presidents around the country on various questions of university governance. In response to the question, "Have students pressed for changes or clarifications of policies regarding student expression in the last two and one-half years?" the Deans of Students at nineteen percent of the Catholic schools surveyed responded affirmatively, while sixty-three percent of the Student Body Presidents at the same surveyed schools responded affirmatively.

In the same study the question was asked, "Do student organizations have an opportunity to review policies governing student expression before adoption?" The response from private schools indicated that fifty-one percent of the Deans of Students responded affirmatively, while only thirty-six percent of the Student Body Presidents at the same surveyed schools responded affirmatively.<sup>30</sup>

This seems to show, if little else, that student participation is a perceptual phenomenon seen in differing lights.

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 40.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., pp. 110-115.

<sup>30</sup>E.G. Williamson and John L. Cowan. The American Students' Freedom of Expression (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966), p. 140.

The rationale asserted for and against student participation in university governance is equally vigorous. McGrath cites the traditional arguments:

FOR: Institutional Professions and Actions - Students today have unprecedented awareness of the society they live in, the significance of education and their roles in their own development.

Sophistication of Today's Student - In contrast to their predecessors, today's students are more informed, more aware and more serious about social, racial, political, economic and international problems.

Students Should be Educated for Democratic Living - If colleges and universities propose to educate in effective citizenship in an increasingly complex society, what better place to involve students than in decisions affecting their growth.

Students Could Help Improve Education - Students could accelerate the correction of patent deficiencies in present curricular offerings and the methodologies used in the teacher-learner process. Also, by participation, they could restore much of the community concept of academic and university governance.

The Abolition of "In Loco Parentis" - Students could help usher out the legally and socially extinct doctrine of paternalism which affects the condition, style and life of the academic community.

AGAINST: Students Will Dominate The Academic Society - Students have already affected in major ways such things as admissions, curriculum and advisory systems without formal status.

Immaturity of Students - The youthful and limited experience renders students ineffective in mapping out long-range developmental needs either for themselves or the institutions.

Brief Involvement of Students - Most students spend only two to four years in school and have a shallow and transient concern for the institution.

Ignorance of Professional Values - Students simply don't embrace the rich complement of skills and comprehensive knowledge involved in the broad practice of a profession.

Interference With Study and Gainful Employment - Students can't give the time necessary for the faithful discharge of their responsibilities. The time commitments are too exhaustive to sacrifice in lieu of future goals and immediate study needs.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>McGrath, op. cit., pp. 51-68.



Whatever the outcome of these extended arguments, some combination generally finds real or token student representation on decision-making bodies. Hardly any institution remains untouched by the activities of students aimed at getting a voice in policy-making decisions. If there has been one trend in the past decade, the increased participation in community governance must be it.

#### Collective Bargaining and the Student

While there may be a trend in public employment toward collective bargaining and there may be a similar trend in higher education, the direction and attitude of the student appears very unclear.

Two student newspaper editorials highlight this dichotomy:

"Since faculty bargaining is such a recent occurrence, results remain unclear. The essential purpose in collective bargaining by any group is, of course, economic, but even economic results of faculty bargaining are too recent to be conclusive. Yet pay raises that might occur under contract have been discussed only in hushed tones among faculty members, presumably because professional people should not concern themselves with such labor class issues as salary.

If higher salaries are achieved, however, the money has to come from somewhere. And since the state will be somewhat reluctant to raise the university appropriations because of faculty demands, the crunch will be felt by the students who could end up financing higher salaries through higher tuition, less financial aid, and reduced general university services.

At this juncture one trend seems clear and that is the diminution of other academic governance units, such as the Academic Council. The issues must be weighed carefully, for a union once gained is almost impossible to dispose of."

The above editorial was taken from the Michigan State University newspaper, the State News, in March of 1971 and reflects a cautious concern for faculty bargaining. The following editorial is also from a student newspaper, the Phoenix, printed in December of 1970. This Queens College (CUNY) paper reflects not only acceptance of bargaining, but a vigorous press for its students.

"An opinion poll is presently being conducted by Student Association President Harry Nussdorf regarding the incorporation of the SA as a student labor organization.

The main purpose of this move is to enable SA to negotiate a binding contract with the College Administration and the Board of Higher Education, specifically spelling out in detail the rights and the privileges of college students, what the university's responsibilities are in regards to the student, and what the students' responsibilities are to the university.

The student union would be similar to the United Federation of College Teachers and the Legislative Conference, the two unions representing the College Faculty, that it would specify such rights as due process appeal, and retention of students. It would spell out a student voice in academic affairs, tenure and curriculum. The union would also attempt to include the traditional labor provisions of health plans, insurance options, and a united buying service. It also would provide for student control of student monies and facilities as well as jurisdiction over all student activities, services, rules and regulations."

There has been research which would indicate faculty attitude toward students and their relationship to collective bargaining. A 1970 social science survey at Michigan State University dealt with a variety of topics related to collective bargaining attitudes on campus. Response to a questionnaire indicated that graduate students are more in favor of bargaining than any other group surveyed (undergraduates, faculty and administrators), with administrators being least in favor. However, when investigating which group most favored collective bargaining for graduate students, the study showed faculty most negatively disposed to the idea. Interestingly, it is the students, both undergraduate and graduate who are most evenly divided on the issues of collective bargaining. The faculty and administration showed a more consistently strong and negative attitude toward the topic.<sup>32</sup>

While the above study may have shown comparative student support for collective bargaining, it appeared misleading for faculty opinion at Michigan State. The university's faculty affairs committee conducted, in 1971, an "Impartial Review of Collective Bargaining by University Faculties" asking questions regarding bargaining at campuses presently experiencing contracts. Of 43 questions asked eight schools and three experts, not one question involved the effect or importance of collective bargaining on the student.

---

<sup>32</sup>"Omnibus Survey #1." Michigan State University (Winter, 1970).

There were no questions asked of the quality of education or of any impact on or attitude of the student.<sup>33</sup> A follow-up study in 1972 by the university's Ad Hoc Committee on Collective Bargaining showed a similar trend. The 39-page report indicated only a handful of direct references to students: a fear of students' potential to erode present governing systems, a fear of student activism generally and a fear of faculty losing involvement in student affairs as a result of collective bargaining.<sup>34</sup>

A 1970 review of faculty opinion in the California State Colleges revealed a similar student concern when considering collective bargaining. A survey of some 67 questions of attitudinal and demographic information had only two items vaguely related to educational quality, curriculum or students generally.<sup>35</sup>

Since collective bargaining is a two-way street only and there is no present legal avenue for students to actually engage in collective bargaining with the faculty and administration, a likely direction for students may be seen in the recent cases regarding student employees. Wayne State University (Michigan) student employees organized and petitioned the Michigan Employee Relations Commission for unit representation to the Board of Governors of the university. The part-time student technicians and assistants were subsequently denied representation on the basis that their community of interest was non-distinct from that of other employees.

Striking Wisconsin teaching assistants began an uproar that has taken hold on some campuses for graduate students. With the consent of the University of Wisconsin, a unit of representation was determined (Teaching Assistants Association) and bargaining was completed concerning work loads, grievance administration, health plans, class size and performance evaluation.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>"An Impartial Review of Collective Bargaining by University Faculties," Faculty Affairs Committee, Michigan State University (March, 1971).

<sup>34</sup>"Report of the Ad Hoc University Committee on Collective Bargaining," Michigan State University (January 31, 1972).

<sup>35</sup>James O. Haehn. A Report to the Academic Senate, California State Colleges (1970).

<sup>36</sup>William F. McHugh. "Collective Bargaining and the Student," Journal of Higher Education (March, 1971), p. 182.

At Michigan State University, students have sought a workers' union for cafeteria employees, and charges unfair wage differentials between student and non-student salaries.<sup>37</sup> A similar and more successful venture already completed in Oregon found part-time food service employees (students) seeking affiliation with the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME). They sought and received a petition for election and unit determination.<sup>38</sup> At the University of Michigan, residents and interns at the University Hospital were granted recognition by the Michigan Employment Relations Commission. The student labor union sought to bargain for better salaries and to represent the interests of patients and hospital workers. This recognition was later overruled in court, where the interns were ruled not to be public employees.

While most college student attitudes toward collective bargaining are latent and are likely directed mainly toward private sector bargaining, we are just now beginning to see student responses to faculty negotiations. Three examples in Michigan seem pertinent.

At Oakland University, the faculty completed bargaining in the fall of 1971 after a faculty shut-down and a number of debated issues. One of the issues was salary. The faculty was seeking increases and the administration was claiming an inability to pay. With the faculty hold-out, all university accounts came into competition with faculty salaries, and it was felt by some that the direction of the university, its budget and its commitment to the urban thrust (a costly program) was at stake over the salary issue.

It was this issue which prompted the following press release on September 15:

RE: Shutdown at Oakland University

Representatives of Oakland University's Black students, faculty and administrators expressed today their concern with regard to the circumstances which recently led to the closing of Oakland University.

---

<sup>37</sup>Bill Holstein. "Group Plans to Create Student Workers Union", State News (May, 1971), p. 1.

<sup>38</sup>McHugh, op. cit., p. 183.

It was stated that the outcome of the current withdrawal of the faculty services may be the establishment of new priorities affecting the university for decades to come. One possible effect of reordered priorities would be to return Oakland University to its virtually all-white and elitist orientation of the early 1960's, while ignoring the ramifications this would have for black students who come to this institution to acquire skills necessary for the development of their own particular communities.

They suspect that the real issue underlying the faculty-administration conflict is that of Power. That is, who will make decisions on priorities. More specifically, the real issue may be to expand the role of the faculty in the determining of University priorities.

With respect to where this power should lie, it is necessary to point out two factors. The first factor is the position the administration has taken in regard to recognizing the real social dynamics to which institutions of higher education must address themselves. This position is reflected in President O'Dowd's statement to the University Community on 9/1/71, where he addresses these urban concerns and the "direction and ambitions of the university"... "arrived at carefully and as a result of continuous consultation throughout the university community over a number of years." The second factor indicates the recalcitrant posture on the part of the faculty to recognize any such urban thrust as being relevant to the institution. In other words, the real question is, can Oakland University be returned to its middle-class posture of pre-1967, where the concerns of white faculty and students and the suburban communities were all that mattered. The representatives of Oakland's black community view any retrenchment by the University from these stated goals as a retreat from social responsibilities as well as a step backwards in the development of the institution and the communities it should serve.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Chapter at Oakland University, the bargaining agent for the virtually all-white faculty, has refused to commit itself to the position that any gains to its members are not to reduce funds for these high priority programs now being run by the University. It is clear that gains for the AAUP given a fixed budget, will necessitate cuts elsewhere. If the AAUP's actions lead to reductions in these programs, both the AAUP and the administration would be guilty of social irresponsibility and will be held accountable for their actions.

We hope that the total University Community recognize its social and egalitarian educational objectives and not buckle under the pressure of demands that would tend to undermine the University's thrust in that direction.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>Manual H. Pierson. (contact person) Press Release, Oakland University, (September 15, 1971).

This release and its implications for minority students raises more than just the normal economic controversies associated with collective negotiations. When asked about the attitudes of students regarding the Oakland contract, the Vice President for Student Affairs, James Appleton, responded, "The students have an enormous non-understanding. I can't comprehend why students are not more pushy on this whole issue of collective bargaining. It is legally a two-way street only, and they simply are not included. They must be organized to influence, and will be forced to buck heads with issues already contracted."<sup>40</sup>

In a seventeen page presentation to the 1972 National Association of Student Personnel Administrators in Las Vegas, Appleton went on to point out the potential for rapid growth in student employee unions.<sup>41</sup>

"Frankly, the students may find themselves, in some instances, the innocent third party victims. Both faculty and administration may try to 'use' students as support for either position. Students will find that it is the faculty, not only the president and his administrative team with whom they have to deal."

At Saginaw Valley College a different issue has recently emerged from a struggle for governing power. Until the fall of 1971, the college had been experimenting under a tripartite or community governance system, including a bicameral legislature of equally represented students and faculty.

In the fall of 1971, the administration dissolved the governing system, when the faculty elected to seek a collective bargaining contract with the administration. This investigator contacted in March, the three separate parties for their perceptions and received the following responses:

The Business Manager said, "It seemed apparent that some of the faculty felt a need for their own protection to have a more direct and controllable channel to the administration and the board -- and collective strength appealed to them. In some instances with the governing system

---

<sup>40</sup>James R. Appleton. Vice President for Student Affairs, Oakland University, telephone interview on March 12, 1972.

<sup>41</sup>James R. Appleton. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education with Emphasis on the Impact of Bargaining on Students and Student Affairs Personnel." Oakland University (March, 1972).

it seemed as though the faculty felt students delayed important faculty measures and programs, and the channel to the administration became increasingly important."<sup>42</sup>

From Chris Ferguson, the Student Body Vice President, came a different story:

"The number one reason for the dissolution of our community governance system was non-economic, as the faculty are admittedly well paid. The issue was the fact that great animosity between faculty and administration developed from the community governing set-up. The administration did not make it work and distrust set in.

A second reason came from contract hassles; the administration sent out non-binding memorandas of appointment to the faculty. A third concern is that students now feel they are being punished for something they had nothing to do with. While there was a mutual resentment of the bicameral system, not unlike any adversary situation, there are some students who now are afraid for their rights and participation, and are dedicated to breaking the union.

Other students feel that the faculty are fighting for their lives against the administration. I believe the vast majority of the students could care less about the governing structure of collective bargaining, and most, I believe, are anti-union, but now they support the faculty."<sup>43</sup>

The faculty viewpoint was far from clear in the spring 1972. In a telephone interview, Dr. Donald Novey, president of the faculty association, made it emphatically clear that with bargaining going on, there was obviously a strategy involved and to discuss any aspect of the faculty attitude towards students, the administration, the past governing situation, or a future one would be inappropriate.

At Central Michigan University, where the state's longest (and for some time, Michigan's only) faculty bargaining contract exists, there have been no public disagreements as in the other two schools. Both bargaining heads, Joyce Pilotti for the faculty and Neil Bucklew for the administration feel that unless students get organized in some fashion, they stand to lose

---

<sup>42</sup>Russel B. Driver. Vice President and Business Manager, Saginaw Valley College, telephone interview on March 11, 1972.

<sup>43</sup>Chris Ferguson. Vice President, Saginaw Valley College Student Government, telephone interview, March 12, 1972.

influence in future negotiations. Tim Horan, Student Body President, acknowledged this need. His feelings were that since there were no legal channels, the most viable form of representation would be through an active and involved student association, to include representation on faculty committees, board of trustees, local community governance, and state higher education lobbies. Several faculty, administration and student leaders had indicated the potential for students becoming a political football in the negotiations as class size or student educational budgets square off against something like a faculty salary raise.<sup>44,45,46</sup>

When asked to draw a conclusion regarding college students and student attitudes regarding collective bargaining in higher education, Drew Olim, National Student Association (NSA) executive secretary, replied, "Students simply do not have the legal inroads to affect in significant ways the initial bargaining efforts of faculty and administration. They may maintain active governments to exert student opinion, but the likelihood of most students getting excited about collective bargaining when it counts (at first) is slim. Our efforts at student unions in Wisconsin and Michigan and forming national representation have not been successful to date. It is not as easy as in Europe; we seem to have more political fragmentation, and in some cases, more elitism among our student bodies."<sup>47</sup>

The National Student Association convention in September of 1971 voted to initiate a pilot union project in an attempt to build a national union of students.<sup>48</sup> The program has achieved limited success, though

---

<sup>44</sup>Neil Bucklew. Vice Provost, Central Michigan University. A series of interviews from January through March, 1972.

<sup>45</sup>Joyce Pilotti. Faculty Bargaining Chairman, Central Michigan University. Interviewed on January 5, 1972.

<sup>46</sup>Tim Horan. Student Body President, Central Michigan University. Series of discussions from October 1971 to March 1972.

<sup>47</sup>Drew Olim. National Student Association Executive Secretary, Washington, D.C. Interviewed in Chicago, March 7, 1972.

<sup>48</sup>William Sievert. Chronicle of Higher Education, September 27, 1971.



efforts continue in this direction to achieve a broader base of bargaining power.<sup>49</sup>

David O'Connor suggests an answer may be soon to come. In a recent law review he builds a case for students and collective bargaining under the National Labor Relations Act, claiming students are employees merely by their presence. He asserts that there is more than a service contract involved and that the university could not exist from tuition alone--that it must have the student to continue to get federal monies, state aid, and the like to continue to build, research, buy, and invest.<sup>50</sup> Since the National Labor Relations Board decision to assume jurisdiction over private institutions with incomes of at least \$1 million has accelerated the movement toward collective bargaining at those institutions, O'Connor's position may be heard sooner than expected.<sup>51</sup>

One of the most radical departures from the traditional approaches to collective bargaining emerged in April of 1972 at Boston State College. The entire governance structure of the college was written into the contract, including student membership on such committees as curriculum, budget, and college development. Though the governing structure itself is not unique, the fact that it, along with students, faculty and administrators, are all involved contractually, is unique.<sup>52</sup>

The entire development of students in collective bargaining is, at best, young. As with the faculty developments in recognition and contract settlement, the student movement will be marked by hearings, court cases and considerable uncertainty.

---

<sup>49</sup>William Sievert. Chronicle of Higher Education (September 27, 1971).

<sup>50</sup>David O'Connor. "Student Employees Under the National Labor Relations Act: An Alternative to Violence on Our Campuses." George Washington Law Review (July, 1970), pp. 1023-1050.

<sup>51</sup>Malcolm G. Scully and William A. Sievert. "Collective Bargaining Gains Converts Among Teachers. Three National Organizations Vie to Represent Faculties," Chronicle of Higher Education (May 10, 1971).

<sup>52</sup>Phillip W. Semas. Chronicle of Higher Education (April 3, 1972).

### Research Findings

No research has been uncovered by this writer which directly relates college student attitudes and collective bargaining. A thorough review of ERIC and DATRIX research sources show no dissertations or studies similar to this investigation have been conducted. There have been a very few research studies conducted with high school students and other areas peripheral to this study, i.e. attitudes and residence, sex, race. This section will focus on those studies.

The most comprehensive study done on student attitudes and collective bargaining was done in Michigan in 1969.<sup>53</sup> Blendinger investigated attitudes of 1,167 high school students in the state of Michigan attending secondary schools in districts which had experienced teacher strikes. The areas of inquiry included image of teacher, economic status attributed to teaching profession, teacher strikes, violation of law by teachers, student power, evaluation of educational opportunity and violation of law by students.

Blendinger's study sought to determine whether or not there was a significant difference in the aforementioned attitudes in regard to sex, career plans and whether or not the students' parents were AFL-CIO union members or not.

Conclusions reached by Blendinger on students who had experienced teacher strikes included: that students see teachers as important people and are as a powerful force in the community; they do not support teacher strikes as a means for improving education; they do not believe either students or teachers should violate the law even if practices are unfair or if violation would assist students; they want opportunities to evaluate their teachers; they do not believe that their teachers are more interested in what they think or feel now than before the strikes.

---

<sup>53</sup>Jack Glenn Blendinger. "Attitudes of Secondary School Students in the State of Michigan Who Have Experienced Teacher Strikes." (Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation. Greeley: Colorado State College, 1969).

Chi-squared tests of independence yield other findings. More girl students perceive the teacher image positively than boys. Students whose parents are AFL-CIO union members are significantly less certain that students should participate in the evaluation of their teachers than students whose parents are not union members.

Finally, general conclusions were drawn: teacher strikes are not detrimental to the image of the teaching profession, do not promote an observable tendency toward lawlessness, do not diminish students' own interest in power, and do not promote attitudes in students that the quality of their education has improved.

General research on college student attitudes have been compiled in a number of studies. A latitudinal study of college student attitudes was done by Grafton in 1967 in which he replicated a 1957 study of campus issues.<sup>54</sup> He found that in 118 of a possible 176 areas of comparison, the 1967 students differed significantly. The 1967 students were more affirmative in attitudes on pre-marital sex relations, use of alcohol and issues perceived as student rights; in 1967, traditional class standings, i.e., freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, were less predictive of student attitudes; greater skepticism exists among college students in 1967; students in 1967 seek greater individuality whether in an organization or as individuals; and students in 1967 enter college with a greater degree of sophistication than the previous decade.

Simon (et.al.) 1968, after conducting interviews with 1,200 students at 12 colleges and universities noted that 80% were politically inactive. Fewer than 5% were extremely interested in politics. The authors concluded that seniors were no more interested or committed toward a particular orientation than freshmen.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup>Clive Llewellyn Grafton. "A Latitudinal Study of Attitudes Comparing Certain Student Groups on Issues Related to University Life." (Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1968).

<sup>55</sup>W. Simon, E.E. Carns, G.H. Gagnon. "Student Politics: Continuities in Political Socialization." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Boston, August 1968.

More recent research by the American Council on Education reveals similar data on freshman college student attitudes, but a rise in protest experience and predisposition.<sup>56</sup>

The 326-institution research of 171,509 fall freshmen in 1971, showed less enthusiasm for education generally and more predisposition for dissent than their predecessors. Thirty-five percent of the students perceived themselves as liberal politically. On collegiate issues, seventy-six percent of the students felt they should help decide faculty promotions and forty-two percent felt college grades should be abolished.

McGaw attempted to explain and predict the political attitudes of college students in his 1968 research.<sup>57</sup> On the basis of perceptions of relatives, friends, news sources and professors, he sought to predict attitudes and investigate the role of social class, self-esteem and education in the development of political attitudes.

His findings were: that the peer group and mass media explain the most variation in student attitudes; that working class college students tend to identify more with their professors than middle class college students; and that the more years spent in college, the greater identification with professors.

Two research studies regarding teacher attitudes and collective bargaining reveal some demographic data. In 1968 Ostrander found, of Tennessee teachers, Negroes were significantly more sympathetic to collective action by teachers.<sup>58</sup> Evans found in 1968 that Minnesota teachers exhibited a lack of knowledge about both collective bargaining and bargaining power. Evans also found in measuring 1,300 teachers' perceptions of (1) factors which give them bargaining power and (2) attitudes toward the use of that power, that there was a very low correlation, or slight relationship between the

---

<sup>56</sup>Robert L. Jacobson. "Freshmen Reported More Protest-prone Than Predecessors." Chronicle of Higher Education (January 10, 1972).

<sup>57</sup>Dickinson Lamb McGaw. "The Effects of Socializing Agents on Students' Learning of Political Attitudes." (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1968).

<sup>58</sup>Kenneth H. Ostrander. "A Study of the Scalability of Selected Attitude Items Related to Collective Action by Teachers." (Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1968).

two scales. Of 14 categories of personal and professional data used in the study, only three factors were found significantly associated at the .05 level with both tests. Men scored higher than women, AFT members scored higher than NEA members and the more recent a teacher's course work, the more likely he was to score high on both measures.<sup>59</sup>

Concerning changes of interest or attitudes regarding world and national affairs, Nasatir found the highest change in college student interest associated with the type of residence. The greatest overall change, both increase and decrease, was found among students living in apartments. Nasatir's record of 800 University of California freshmen and sophomore men showed also that the least change was found among students living in fraternities.<sup>60</sup>

Feldman and Newcomb attempt to summarize freshmen to senior changes they see having considerable uniformity in most American colleges as follows:

"Declining 'authoritarianism', dogmatism and prejudice, together with decreasingly conservative attitudes toward public issues and growing sensitivity to aesthetic experiences."<sup>61</sup>

Feldman and Newcomb also characterize residential impact on attitudes and values.

"This process of reinforcement or consolidation is less conspicuous than that of change in individuals' attitudes and values. But it represents just as real an impact, in the sense that, in the absence of the reinforcing or consolidating experiences, outcomes would have been different. Students, like other people, tend to meet or to seek out and associate with others who have similar attitudes and values. Insofar as this occurs, processes of consolidation are ubiquitous; we suspect that they are at once the most common and the least noticed sources of colleges' impacts on their students."<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup>Geraldine Ann Evans. "Perceptions of Attitudes Toward the Use of Collective Bargaining Power." (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1968).

<sup>60</sup>D. Nasatir. "Collegiate Contexts." Paper presented at College Student Personnel Institute, Claremont, California, November, 1965.

<sup>61</sup>Feldman and Newcomb, op. cit., p. 326.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid. p. 330.

Many research findings to date have only touched on the peripheral aspects of this study. Research on student attitudes toward organized labor, unionism and economic issues is seemingly non-existent. With several national conventions and conferences now focusing on collective bargaining and students' potential involvement, research will no doubt be forthcoming in this area.

Central Michigan University, Its Students, and the Faculty-Administrative Agreement

Central Michigan University is governed by an eight-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Governor of the State of Michigan with the consent of the Senate.

The University serves four primary goals:

1. To provide a liberal education which will engage and develop the intellectual, cultural and moral capacities of its students;
2. To provide an extensive program of teacher education and experimentation in the science and art of teaching;
3. To provide programs, both undergraduate and graduate, terminal and preparatory, which will qualify students for a number of occupations, and
4. To offer graduate instruction, ultimately including doctoral programs, in a number of academic areas.

Through the efforts of a group of local businessmen the institution from which Central Michigan University has developed was established in Mount Pleasant. Central Michigan Normal and Business Institute opened its doors on September 13, 1892.

In 1895 the state legislature was persuaded to accept the normal school as a gift. But it was not until 1897 that state appropriations were made. The institution thus became the second state normal school in Michigan.

A Life Certificate, granted after two years of work beyond high school, was authorized at Central in 1903. The faculty increased to forty-four.

In 1918 the Bachelor of Arts degree and in 1927 the Bachelor of Science degree were authorized. A cooperative program with the University of Michigan permitted the introduction of graduate courses in 1938. The

Copeland Experiment, along with a number of other innovative programs, established a reputation for Central as a teacher training institution.

From 1939-1959 the campus was expanded to 235 acres. Nineteen buildings were built or started. The graduate program became independent of the University of Michigan and was accredited by the North Central Association. The degrees of Bachelor of Music, soon changed to Bachelor of Music Education, and the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration was added. The development of the Teacher Extern Program helped maintain the reputation for leadership in teacher training.

This program of development culminated in the recognition of Central as a university on June 1, 1959.

President Judson W. Foust (1959-1968) led the University through years of reorganization and accelerated expansion. New building programs moved the center of the campus southward, with the library building, started during President Foust's year of retirement, climaxing this trend. The addition of the degree, Specialist in Education, marked the entrance of Central Michigan University into training beyond the master's level.

In the fall of 1971 Central Michigan University had nearly 15,000 students with over 500 faculty.<sup>63</sup>

Three percent of the Central Michigan University student body come from thirty-five foreign countries and thirty of the United States. The other ninety-seven percent come from eighty-two of Michigan's eighty-three counties. Eighty-five percent of the student body come from a thirty-three-county belt running diagonally across the state from Traverse City to Detroit. Sixty percent of the student body come from areas south and east of Mt. Pleasant.<sup>64</sup>

Approximately three percent of the student body represent ethnic background other than white. Fall term 1971 reports indicated that there

---

<sup>63</sup>University Catalog, Central Michigan University, 1970, pp. 40-45.

<sup>64</sup>Margaret J. Smith. Financial Aids Officer, Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan.

were 180 Afro-American (Black) students, thirty-four American Indians, eighty-six Spanish Americans (Chicano) and thirty Oriental students.<sup>65</sup>

The average income of the student body was broken down as follows:<sup>66</sup>

<u>Income Range</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Average Income</u>
0-2,999	3.2%	\$1,893
3,000 - 5,999	6.01%	\$5,229
6,000 - 7,499	6.43%	\$6,449
7,500 - 8,999	14.93%	\$8,433
9,000 - 11,900	21.57%	\$10,924
12,000 - 14,999	12.4%	\$13,497
15,000 plus	30.30%	\$23,690

Independent - 4.84%

Central Michigan University students have social, political, economic and psychological similarity with most mid-western, lower-middle class college students.

The following are a list of statements used to describe Central Michigan University's students:<sup>67</sup>

They tend to be first generation college students.

They tend toward the conservative.

They are not "fast" socially, enjoying simple party pleasures.

They fall in the lower-middle income bracket.

They are vocationally oriented (many in teacher preparation).

They are not politically active.

Most don't care about student government.

Most are upward mobile.

Most are Republican, Mid-American.

Most are approachable, easy to get to know.

They respect faculty and go to them easily.

---

<sup>65</sup>Ibid.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid.

<sup>67</sup>Taken from a compilation of interviews with twenty-five counselors, administrators, faculty, staff and students. The list represents the most common descriptions used to describe the Central Michigan University student body.



Two events in the 1971-72 academic year also distinguished the Central Michigan University students. Fall term student voter registration exceeded the 2,500 mark, and a winter term presidential primary found Richard Nixon winning handily over the Democratic candidates in a mock election.

In respect to the faculty-administrative collective bargaining agreement, scattered winter term (1972) interviews by this investigator with fifty students revealed that the vast majority of the students are not aware of the contract, its implications for University governance, or their own feelings about public or private employee bargaining. Nearly 75% had great difficulty even formulating a definition of collective bargaining.

Organized faculty labor arrived formally on the campus of Central Michigan University on September 24, 1969. On that day, 463 full-time faculty members, including instructors and some temporary instructors, voted on the issue of whether MAHE (Central Michigan University District of the Michigan Association of Higher Education, associated with MEA, the Michigan Education Association) should serve the faculty as its exclusive bargaining agent. A total of 239 said yes and 221 no (three ballots were challenged and not opened). Thus, by eighteen votes, MAHE won what a number of people believe is a landmark election. Although it is not a major school in the sense of an Ivy League or Big Ten university, Central Michigan University is representative of numerous other state-supported institutions throughout the United States.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup>Central Michigan University is one of several Michigan state-supported universities and colleges to have developed as multipurpose institutions from normal schools. It enrolls over twelve thousand students and has a faculty of 540. It is located in the center of the state's lower peninsula at Mt. Pleasant, which according to the 1970 census had a population of 19,961.

On March 23, 1970, the second formal faculty election was held. At issue this time was the ratification of an actual collective bargaining agreement. Of 451 ballots cast, 369 approved; 82 disapproved. The Central Michigan University faculty -- with over eighty percent of the faculty voting -- ratified the contract.

Although the background of labor's formal involvement on the campus is tangled, the chief reasons included an antiquated step-salary schedule, significant salary inequities, dissatisfaction with teaching loads in terms of hours and students, unhappiness over fringe benefits, and what may be called, for want of a more precise term, a heritage of general discontent. Since unions, in Michigan, are virtually habitual in industry, in the public schools, and in community and junior colleges, it was clear that sooner or later unionization or formal organization would come to a four-year institution in the Wolverine state.

In addition to its pervasive problems, Central Michigan University became a target because of an unusually large number of young and new faculty members; mostly instructors had been added in the years 1968-69 and 1969-70. In fact, forty-six new instructors alone had joined the faculty in the fall of 1969. In other words, twenty-four percent of the faculty was in the lower ranks and had been members of the faculty either one or two years. Many of these young people felt they were insufficiently compensated. They became a formidable bloc. There is a saying these days among faculty at colleges and universities: Allegiance among the young is first to themselves, second to their discipline, and finally to the institution. So it seemed in this case.

Another factor was considered to be new president, William Boyd. He assumed the presidency in the summer of 1968. His chief interest and experience were in student affairs. With his arrival on campus, there appeared to be a focus on student problems in particular. If Central Michigan University has had only isolated cases of violence but no devastating riots or major confrontations, it is chiefly the result of President Boyd's extraordinary empathy with students.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup>John C. Helper. "Timetable for Takeover." The Journal of Higher Education, Vol. XLII, No. 2 (February, 1971), pp. 103-105.

But with this emphasis, neither the transformation of the university senate to an organization which was becoming each day a more effective means of faculty participation in university affairs, nor the establishment of numerous administrative advisory committees was enough to quiet a sense of uneasiness among some faculty members. As one looks back, two facts stand out. One was a widespread fear that the new president might not be able to obtain adequate money from the state legislature at appropriation time. The second was a smoldering resentment that Mr. Boyd was not so much concerned with faculty interests as he was with student problems, which included finding ways and means of enabling the black student community on campus to be served and enlarged.<sup>70</sup>

In the fall of 1971, a second contract was ratified which extended the terms until 1974. As Helper wrote, "It is a workable, highly supported agreement that can evolve a fruitful dignified product."<sup>71</sup>

It would appear as though the student population, too, will continue to support the agreement either through its general passivity or through its governmental structures.

---

<sup>70</sup>Ibid. p. 113.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid. p. 115.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

It was the purpose of this study to investigate and describe attitudes of undergraduate students at Central Michigan University toward collective bargaining. In this chapter the method employed to accomplish this purpose is described.

### SOURCES OF DATA

The population for this study was the undergraduate student body of Central Michigan University. Central Michigan is located in Mt. Pleasant and has an undergraduate enrollment of approximately 12,000 students. It is "essentially a State Regional Institution of Higher Education. Eighty-five percent of the student body come from thirty-three counties centrally located in a belt running diagonally across the state from Traverse City to Detroit. Sixty percent of the students live south and east of Mt. Pleasant. The institution was first opened in 1892 and is presently governed by an eight-member Board of Trustees which are appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Senate."<sup>1</sup>

The sample drawn for this study comes from three sources -- two classrooms and a random mailing. The two classes sampled were intermediate level "core courses" common to most general education requirements, one a history class, the other a psychology class. The classroom volunteers, totalling 285, were chosen for their sampling ease as well as their broad cross section of the student body. A third group of 200 randomly selected students were mailed an invitation to participate in the project.<sup>2</sup> Of those 200, twenty-five (12.5%) responded. Within the total sample of 510 students, fifty-seven were invalidated because of incomplete instruments or demographic forms, leaving a final working sample of 253 responses. A demographic breakdown of the sample may be found in Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup>Central Michigan University Catalog, 1970-71.

<sup>2</sup>Randomization by table of random numbers and the university telephone directory, Fall 1971.

#### METHOD OF COLLECTING DATA

Beginning with the winter academic term, 1972, the various sources for the sample population were contacted by this investigator with the assistance of the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice Provost, several faculty and the Student Body President.

In the case of the two classrooms, each student who volunteered to complete the questionnaire (APPENDIX C) was handed the instrument. A cover sheet which included directions as well as a brief demographic questionnaire (APPENDIX B) was stapled to the instrument. The group of students who responded to the randomly mailed invitation (APPENDIX D) met in a reserved classroom and were given the instrument in a similar fashion. A week later, a follow-up letter and questionnaire (APPENDIX E) were sent to a random group of students who did not respond to the initial invitation.

#### GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument in this investigation included three forty-item Likert<sup>3</sup> scales: The Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire, The Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire, and The Student Union-Non-Student Union Attitude Questionnaire. Each item of the three scales is scored by a five-point, strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree ranking. The total score range for each scale was 40 to 200, the higher the number, the more identification with labor, faculty, and student union attitudes. The lower the score, the greater the identification with management, administrative, and non-student union attitudes. On each scale, the items were worded to prevent response bias and item slanting.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Rensis Likert, researcher and psychometrist who developed the scaling method described above.

<sup>4</sup>A common technique to provide balance on negative and positive questions. Balance was also sought by inverting the direction of some items to prevent consistently positive or negative responses from slanting the total scale score.

### The Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire

This scale was derived from earlier instruments and instrumentation by John W. Helper and R.J. Campbell.<sup>5</sup> The completed instrument which is used in this study was developed by John J. Horvat and is presently being used by Charles E. Merrill Publishers in their simulated negotiation series, "Professional Negotiations in Education."

The questionnaire indicates seven attitudinal ranges from high identification with Management to high identification with Labor, based on responses to forty items reflecting labor and management concepts. The validity of the instrument was found to be significant beyond the .01 level by computing *t* with groups of different *N*'s.

The reliability of the questionnaire was determined by test-retest method, showing a .86 correlation. Internal consistency of the instrument using the Kuder Richardson formula showed a .89 coefficient of reliability.<sup>6</sup> There has been little recorded data on use of the instrument, though nineteen colleges and universities are now administering it.<sup>7</sup>

This investigator administered the questionnaire to seventeen college students as one-third of a total instrument to be tested for reliability. Using a thirty-day test-retest interval, the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire showed a correlation coefficient of .93 which was found to be significant at the .05 level.

---

<sup>5</sup>The instruments are both unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertations from The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio. John W. Helper, "The Relationship Between the Efficiency of the Group Decision-Making Process and Group Polarization" (1953) and R.J. Campbell, "Team Composition and Group Decision-Making in a Collective Bargaining Situation" (1960).

<sup>6</sup>John J. Horvat. "A Quasi-Experimental Study of Behavior in the Professional Negotiations Process." (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertation. Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1968).

<sup>7</sup>Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, Ohio, letter received June, 1971.

#### The Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire

The Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire was modified by this investigator from the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire. It also utilizes a Likert scale, contains forty items, and constitutes one-third of the total questionnaire administered to the sample. Modification of the scale was performed in three ways. In some instances the words faculty and administration were substituted for labor and management in items from the Labor-Management scale. In other instances, items from D.A. Harris's "Potential for Institutional Conflict" were used.<sup>8</sup> Finally, a few additional items were constructed using a combination of the two instruments.

Seventy-nine items were screened for clarity and redundancy and finally examined by a group of fifty students. Each student was requested to read each item and indicate if, in his/her opinion, the item expressed an identification with faculty attitudes, administrative attitudes, or neither of the above. Based on recommendations from the Michigan State University Office of Education Research, any item lacking seventy percent directional agreement was rejected.<sup>9</sup>

Reliability of the scale was determined by a thirty-day test-retest interval on seventeen students. The Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire showed a correlation coefficient of .84 which was found significant at the .05 level.

#### The Student Union-Non-Student Union Attitude Questionnaire

This scale was also modified from the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire. Similar to the other two scales, it is forty items in length, utilizes the Likert scaling technique, is one-third of the total instrument, and measures attitudes on a possible score continuum of 40 to 200. Modification of the scale from the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire was

---

<sup>8</sup>David Allen Harris. "The Development of an Instrument Designed to Assess the Potential for Conflict Relative to Faculty-Administrative Relationships." (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy dissertation. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1970).

<sup>9</sup>Roy Gabriel, consultant, Office of Educational Research, College of Education, Michigan State University, January 17, 1972.

done in three different ways. In some cases items were used directly from the Labor-Management scale with a word like student inserted for worker or student organization inserted for unions. In some cases items were constructed from Earl McGraths traditional arguments for and against student participation in university governance.<sup>10</sup> Finally, a few items were constructed using a combination of the two methods indicated above.

Seventy-six items were screened for clarity and redundancy, and, like the Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire, fifty students were used to identify directional agreement. Again, on the recommendation of the Office of Educational Research, those items not showing seventy percent directional agreement were rejected.

For a test of reliability, this investigator administered the questionnaire to seventeen college students. Using a thirty-day test-retest interval, The Student Union-Non-Student Union Attitude Questionnaire showed a correlation coefficient of .89, which was found significant at the .05 level.

---

<sup>10</sup>McGrath, op. cit. pp. 110-115.



# PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

All three of the scales were presented as recommended by the publisher of "Professional Negotiations in Education."<sup>11,12</sup> Seven ranges of identification were ascribed to each instrument as follows:

MANAGEMENT	% high	% moderate	% low	% neutral	% low	% moderate	% high	LABOR
(score)	40- 102	103- 111	112- 120	121- 128	129- 137	138- 146	147- 200	

ADMINISTRATION	% high	% moderate	% low	% neutral	% low	% moderate	% high	FACULTY
	40- 102	103- 111	112- 120	121- 128	129- 137	138- 146	147- 200	

NON STUDENT UNION	% high	% moderate	% low	% neutral	% low	% moderate	% high	STUDENT UNION
	40- 102	103- 111	112- 120	121- 128	129- 137	138- 146	147- 200	

Along with the above continua, a number of tables were used to show the variety of means for the three scales, correlations, analysis of variance, and demographic comparisons. The data were comprised of the following: (1) student scores on each of the three attitudinal scales (2) student age, race, sex, academic classification, hometown, and campus residence. The data were coded and key punched for utilization of the C.D.C. 3600 and 6500 computers' statistical programs.

---

<sup>11</sup>Robert Merrill Publishers, op. cit. p. 20.

<sup>12</sup>Recommended also by research consultants Roy Gabriel and Jo Lynn Cunningham, Office of Educational Research, Michigan State University.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

To seek answers to the questions outlined in Chapter I, the data were analyzed in a number of statistical ways. Means and Standard Deviations of the scores were used to generally describe the student attitudinal responses on the three scales. They are delineated by major groupings of sex, home town, race, age classification and by selected sub-grouping to include female freshmen, urban males and the like.

A multivariate analysis of variance was also used to show the relationship between the three scales, the various major groupings and between selected sub-groupings. This analysis will compare means on the three scales, both as a profile and independently.

# CHAPTER IV

## PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

It has been the purpose of this study to describe the attitudes of Central Michigan University students toward collective bargaining. Three scales were used to gather the data: The Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire which is used interchangeably with Scale A, The Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire which is used interchangeably with Scale B, and the Student Union-Non Student Union Attitude Questionnaire which is used interchangeably with Scale C. These three scales relate student identification with opposite ends of a continuum, scoring from 40 to 200. The higher the score reflects the more the identification with Labor, Faculty, and Student Union concepts, the lower the score reflects the more the identification with Management, Administration, and Non-Student Union concepts.

This chapter presents the data in two sections: (1) presentation and analysis of the complete sample, (2) presentation and analysis of the major groupings of the sample.

### Presentation and Analysis of the Complete Sample

Table 1 indicates how the 253 students' responses were categorically distributed on the Labor-Management Attitude Questionnaire (Scale A). This questionnaire measured the degree of identification the students had with Labor and Management concepts.

TABLE 1. Distribution of All Scores on Scale A

	7%	16%	21%	26%	19%	9%	5%	
MANAGEMENT	high	moderate	low	neutral	low	moderate	high	LABOR
(score)	40- 102	103- 111	112- 120	121- 128	129- 137	138- 146	147- 200	

On Scale A there was a mean score of 123.10 and a standard deviation of 14.49. From Table 1 it is apparent that the distribution of student attitudes is somewhat symmetrical, with two-thirds of the sample exhibiting low or neutral identification with either end of the continuum. If any direction or identification were ascribed it from Scale A, it would be a very slight preference for Management attitudes.

The distribution of scores shown in Table 2 indicates that the Faculty-Administrative Attitude Questionnaire (Scale B) is also somewhat symmetrical. Scale B shows more directional identification than Scale A, however, and reflects a slight identification and preference for faculty attitudes over administrative attitudes. The mean of 129.00 places the average student response in the "low" identification range toward faculty. The 13.22 standard deviation for Scale B indicates approximately sixty-eight percent of the students in the neutral to moderate identification ranges toward faculty.

TABLE 2. Distribution of all Scores on Scale B.

	4%	4%	19%	28%	25%	14%	7%	
ADMINISTRATION	high	moderate	low	neutral	low	moderate	high	FACULTY
(score)	40- 102	103- 111	112- 120	121- 128	129- 137	138- 146	147- 200	

An inspection of Table 3 reveals student attitudes on The Student Union-Non Student Union Attitude Questionnaire (Scale C) show a low to moderate identification with Student Union concepts. Over fifty percent of the responses indicated a low to high identification with student concepts while only twenty-two percent reflected the same identification with the opposing Non-Student Union concepts. The mean score on Scale C was 130.00 with a standard deviation of 13.03.

TABLE 3. Distribution of all Scores for Scale C.

NON STUDENT UNION	2%	7%	13%	24%	27%	19%	8%	STUDENT UNION
	high	moderate	low	neutral	low	moderate	high	
(score)	40- 102	103- 111	112- 120	121- 128	129- 137	138- 146	147- 200	

Inspection of the overall sample revealed a fairly normal distribution without an exaggerated identification with any of the six poles. Scales B and C deviated the most from the neutral response, showing some identification with Faculty and slightly more identification with Student Union concepts.

A comparison of the three separate sources for the sample seems appropriate at this time in discussion of the complete sample. Table 4 shows the means and standard deviations for the history class, the psychology class, and the random mailing.

TABLE 4. Means and Standard Deviations for Three Separate Sample Sources

	<u>Scale A</u>	<u>Scale B</u>	<u>Scale C</u>
History Class	123.13	128.83	128.40
Psychology Class	122.31	129.07	130.31
Random Mailing	124.96	128.92	130.24
Standard Deviations	14.52	13.28	13.21

Table 5 displays a multivariate analysis of variance, showing the profiles (Scales ABC) of each group. A significance level of .8343 indicates no significant differences between the group profiles. Table 5 also indicates the results of the univariate analysis of variance which shows a similar lack of difference between groups across Scales A, B, and C.

All three sample groups, therefore, show no significant difference in their group attitudes toward the continua Labor-Management, Faculty-Administration, and Student Union-Non Student Union. Nor, in the comparison of profiles which reflect a composite group attitude on all three scales, do the three sample groups show any significant difference.

TABLE 5. Analysis of Variance for Three Separate Sample Source  
Group Means on Scales A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
A Score	80.8106	0.3830	0.6823
B Score	1.4280	0.0081	0.9920
C Score	94.7527	0.5424	0.5821

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2

Degrees of Freedom for Error = 250

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 0.4651

D.F. = 6 and 496.0000

P = less than 0.8343

#### Presentation and Analysis of Major Groups

This section shows the data and analysis of the data associated with the major groupings of sex, hometown, campus residence, race, age and academic classification. Hometown refers to either an urban or non-urban setting, as determined by Industrial Psychologist David Donovan, Northwestern Michigan College, and Sociologist Milton Hagelberg, Michigan State University. For further reference, See Appendix F. Under Residence, "Other" refers to living arrangements in fraternity and sorority housing or at home.

TABLE 6. Means and Standard Deviations for Major Sample Groupings on Scales A, B, and C.

Major Group	Cell N	Scale A	Scale B	Scale C
<b>SEX</b>				
Male	124	123.81	130.01	132.00
Female	129	121.85	128.00	127.58
Std. Dev.		14.48	13.22	13.03
<b>AGE</b>				
18 yr. old	106	120.31	127.92	128.62
19 yr. old	78	124.41	129.87	129.01
20 yr. old	43	126.25	129.72	134.55
21 yr. old	9	125.88	133.00	131.55
22+ yr. old	17	120.76	127.58	127.05
Std. Dev.		14.39	13.28	13.09
<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>				
Freshmen	142	120.34	125.32	127.08
Sophomore	65	124.38	129.38	130.92
Junior	31	126.58	130.54	134.06
Senior	14	123.71	131.28	131.50
Std. Dev.		15.99	18.81	14.91
<b>HOMETOWN</b>				
Urban	91	123.35	129.45	130.59
Non-Urban	162	122.51	128.72	129.27
Std. Dev.		14.51	13.25	13.20
<b>RESIDENCE</b>				
Residence Hall	187	122.53	128.95	129.64
Other	29	126.96	126.44	125.82
Apartment	37	120.97	131.16	133.35
Std. Dev.		14.46	13.23	13.10
<b>RACE</b>				
White	241	122.32	128.58	129.34
Non-White	12	132.58	137.00	137.83
Std. Dev.		14.35	13.14	13.09

Table 6 displays the means and standard deviations for each of the major groupings. The following portions of this chapter refer to it several times, as it reflects the statistical heart of this study.

Between the male and female groups on the profile (ABC), the difference was of only marginal significance (.0667). However, a one-way analysis of variance as shown in Table 7 indicated a significant difference on Scale C. Women were found significantly less identified with student union concepts than men.

TABLE 7. Analysis of Variance for Males and Females on Scales A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
A Score	243.3334	1.1596	0.2826
B Score	265.9967	1.4694	0.2266
C Score	1238.9250	7.2963	0.0074

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1  
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 251  
F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 2.4201  
D.F. = 3 and 249.0000  
P = less than 0.0667

Among the age groupings, Table 8 indicates that no significant differences exist either in profile scores or in the one-way analysis of variance. A post hoc examination of the mean scores at the .05 level of significance, however, indicate that there is a significant difference between 18 and 20 year olds on Scales A and C. This pattern of higher identification with Labor and Student Union concepts during the middle age groupings is similar to the corresponding groupings in the academic classification found in Tables 6 and 9.



TABLE 8. Analysis of Variance for Five Age Groupings on Scales A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
A Score	382.1342	1.8443	0.1210
B Score	95.5204	0.5412	0.7057
C Score	330.9128	1.9294	0.1061

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 4

Degrees of Freedom for Error = 248

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 1.2091

D.F. = 12 and 651.1463

P = less than .2724

In a very similar comparison to the age analysis, Table 9 displays the academic classification differences. A significance level of .4314 indicates that no significant profile differences exist among the academic classifications in the study. On the individual scales an analysis of least squares estimates revealed, however, significant differences exist between freshmen and juniors. On both Scale A and Scale C juniors score significantly higher than freshmen.

TABLE 9. Analysis of Variance for Academic Classifications on Scale A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
A Score	477.1370	1.8645	0.1362
B Score	507.1319	1.4320	0.2340
C Score	548.4652	2.4642	0.0630

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 3

Degrees of Freedom for Error = 250

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 1.0089

D.F. = 9 and 603.7174

P = less than .4314

Further analysis of the academic classification comparison reveals, as exhibited in Table 10, that it is the males which reflect the significant differences. The female profile significance level for all three scales is .7377, whereas the male profile significance level is at .0289 for academic classification. Table 10 shows further that on the individual scales there are high significance levels of .0049 (Scale A) and .0153 (Scale C). While juniors show significantly more identification toward labor and student union concepts than freshmen, it appears to be the males who most significantly affect this.

TABLE 10. Analysis of Variance for Academic Classifications of Males on Scale A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
A Score	847.6921	4.5255	0.0049
B Score	255.8002	1.4198	0.2404
C Score	461.0235	3.6159	0.0153
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 3			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 120			
F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 2.1087			
D. F. = 9 and 287.3316			
P = less than .0289			

A significant difference was found among the Central Michigan University student residences. A significance level of .0081 reflected profile differences among the student residences. Among fraternity, sorority, and those students living at home (all classified as "Others") there was only a one point mean spread on all three scales. Residence hall students reflected a 7 point spread and apartment residences exhibited a 13 point mean spread on the three scales. Table 11 reflects, however, that no significant differences existed between the individual scales.

TABLE 11. Analysis of Variance for Student Residences on Scales A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F.	P Less Than
A Score	319.9031	1.5299	0.2168
B Score	181.0991	1.0338	0.3572
C Score	464.0180	2.7021	0.0691

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2

Degrees of Freedom for Error = 250

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 2.9344

D.F. = 6 and 496.0000

P = less than .0081

Further analysis of Residence comparisons showed significant differences with the urban, non-urban classifications. Comparing the residential categories (Residence Hall, Apartment, Other) for urban hometowns, no significant differences were found for their profiles. An examination of the univariate analysis of variance comparing the three scales confirmed this.

Table 12 shows the non-urban students; however, with a significantly high profile level of .0013. The univariate analysis of the scales found apartment residents significantly less identified with student union concepts than either residence hall students or those categorized as Other (Fraternity, Sorority, Home).

TABLE 12. Analysis of Variance for Non-Urban Residential Students on Scale A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
A Score	384.5206	2.0403	0.1334
B Score	283.6449	1.8469	0.1611
C Score	667.4055	4.6724	0.0107

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2

Degrees of Freedom for Error = 159

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 3.7518

D.F. = 6 and 314.0000

P = less than 0.0013

Between the Hometown classifications there were no significant differences either among profiles or individual scales. Table 13 reflects the strong similarity between the Urban and Non-urban scales.

TABLE 13. Analysis of Variance for Hometown Classification on Scale A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F	P Less Than
A Score	41.0462	0.1949	0.6593
B Score	30.3876	0.1729	0.6780
C Score	100.8562	0.5785	0.4477

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1

Degrees of Freedom for Error = 251

F-ratio for multivariate test of equality of mean vectors = 0.1955

D.F. = 3 and 249.0000

P = Less than .8994

Analysis of the data has shown significant differences in Race. On all three individual scales Non-whites were significantly more identified with Labor, Faculty, and Student Union concepts than the whites. Table 14 indicates that there was also a significant profile difference between whites and non-whites, showing a significance level of .0491.

TABLE 14. Analysis of Variance for Race on Scale A, B, and C.

Variable	Between Mean Sq.	Univariate F.	P Less Than
A Score	1202.2484	5.8355	0.0165
B Score	808.6325	4.6822	0.0315
C Score	822.9236	4.7995	0.0294

Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1

Degrees of Freedom for Error = 251

F-ratio for multivariate test of mean vectors = 2.6559

D.F. = 3 and 249.0000

P = Less than .0491

In summary, the analysis of the data has shown the following to be statistically significant at the .05 level:

1. Females are less identified with Student Union concepts than males.
2. Twenty year olds identify more with Labor and Student Union concepts than 18 year olds.
3. Juniors identify more with Labor and Student Union concepts than freshmen.
4. Of the juniors who more strongly identify with Labor and Student Union concepts than freshmen, the men differ more towards these concepts than the women.
5. Students living in the various living arrangements differ in attitudes toward collective bargaining.
6. Non-whites identify more with Labor, Faculty, and Student Union concepts than whites.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter is devoted to a summary of the study, including a discussion of the results of Chapter IV, research limitations, and recommendations for further research. Attention will be given to both the general findings of the study as well as the statistically significant data gathered in the research.

The objective of the study was to obtain descriptive, baseline data regarding Central Michigan University student attitudes toward collective bargaining. While no hypothesis or predictions were advanced, four questions were asked.

1. What are the student attitudes at Central Michigan University toward collective bargaining among organized labor and management?

It would appear as a whole that Central Michigan University students have no distinct identification with and in fact are very neutral toward organized labor and management. Within the sample the students most identified with management concepts seemed to be the younger (18 year olds) and those students over 22 years of age. Other groups showing a similar identification with management were freshmen and students living in apartments. The lowest mean score by any sub-group was 115.00 by 20 female students living in apartments.

Those students who most identified themselves with labor concepts appeared from the responses to be 20 years old, juniors, and students either living at home or in fraternity or sorority housing. The highest mean score for any sub-group was 133.00, recorded by ten males living in apartments.

It is felt one primary factor influenced the neutral response to the Labor-Management continuum. As many students indicated through remarks written on the questionnaire, commented informally, and in interviews, they simply know very little about collective bargaining. The neutral response on the Likert scale, UNDECIDED, may well reflect most student attitudes.

Another possible reason for the neutral response, and one complementary to the explanation above, is the lack of formal working experience of most college students. Having not worked for an extended length of time or under a corporate structure could certainly influence a neutral response on questions of labor and management.

A final explanation may be that extreme sub-groups within the sample cancelled themselves out. The small standard deviation would seem to minimize this explanation, however.

2. What are the student attitudes at Central Michigan University toward collective bargaining among university faculty and administration?

In comparison to the Labor-Management continuum, the students seemed more able to identify with one of the polar concepts. There was a low to moderate identification with faculty concepts. The highest scores, those most reflecting faculty identification, came from 21 year olds, seniors and apartment residents. The highest sub-group mean was 138.72, recorded by 11 males living at home or in Greek housing.

The group of students most identified with administrative concepts seemed to be freshmen and students living at home. The lowest sub-group mean was 120.45 recorded by 20 females living in apartments.

The reason for this identification pattern can only be speculated from the data gathered and the research available on student attitudes. The lower identification with faculty by freshmen and students living at home, it is felt, reflects a lack of exposure to faculty primarily, just as the whole sample identifying with faculty may reflect a lack of exposure to university administrators. McGaws (1968) study would support this conclusion.

It is also likely that administrative concepts may be less understood and appreciated by students in that the most frequently encountered administrative principles include social regulations, class registration and the like.

The recent history of student demonstrations and media representation has more often reflected a student-faculty relationship in such areas of social, political, and university reform than any sort of

student-administrative alliance. When students differ with administrative concepts it often is publicly, whereas faculty-student disagreements are often individual or in deliberative bodies.

3. What are student attitudes at Central Michigan University toward student participation in collective bargaining in higher education?

Central Michigan University students exhibited a low to moderate identification with student union concepts, concepts which reflected active participation in collective university governance. Of the three scales used in the questionnaire, the students showed the strongest identification in this area of student union participation. Within the sample, the students showing the strongest identification with student union concepts were the 20 year olds, and the juniors. Of the sub-groupings, the highest mean score was 140.83 by 12 male juniors. The lowest sub-group mean score was 119.00, recorded by 20 female apartment residents.

Reasons associated with this data are again illusive. Since very few student labor unions exist, the concepts or items on Scale C are difficult for students to interpret and understand. In a collective bargaining context, these concepts become more questions of group participation and group involvement in institutional decision-making. Students, however, have traditionally reflected attitudes which would indicate their desires to participate and be involved. Finally, the concept of students being primarily learners in the institutional framework, may not be as thoroughly accepted as it once was.

4. What relationships exist between the study's attitudinal continua and the sex, race, age, residence, hometown, and academic classification of Central Michigan University students?

In comparing the three continua as a profile for student attitude, a few generalizations can be asserted. Of the 16 major groupings, 11 showed a pattern of increasing their scores from Scale A to Scale B to Scale C. In all 16 groups the difference between Scale A and Scale B was greater than between scales B and C. Again, the explanation is felt to be one of exposure and daily contact. On a regular basis students deal with faculty attitudes and issues which require them to consider their time and interest



in participation. Once these students enter the working world on a permanent basis, their attitudes may change significantly. At the present time, however, their ability to identify with labor and management concepts is not great.

In relation to the demographic comparisons, there are a few specific, though sporadic, differences. By far the largest percentage (67%) of the sub-group means fell in the neutral range. The following comparisons, however, were found to be significant at the .05 level:

1. Females are less identified with student union concepts than males.

Though partially supported by the Evans study (1968), the reasons for this finding are not perfectly clear. A possible, though general reason, may lie in the whole Western socialization pattern in which men are encouraged to participate and lead more than women. Also, it seems as if men are more commonly associated with unions and unionism than women.

2. Twenty year olds identify more with labor and student union concepts than 18 year olds.

This difference is somewhat opposed to the previously mentioned findings of Simon, et.al. (1968). The difference may be simply a function of maturity or work experience and exposure. Two collegiate years or two additional years of work experience beyond high school may identify students more with workers or with concepts expressing a more active student role in institutional governance.

3. Juniors identify more with labor and student union concepts than freshmen.

Similar to the above finding, it appears as though increased exposure to either work or participation in university affairs influences student attitudes. Grafton's (1967) study asserts that this is less predictive than a decade ago, however.

4. Of the Juniors who more strongly identify with labor and student union concepts than freshmen, the men seem to differ more towards these concepts than women.

This appears consistent with the first significant finding, that men seem to identify more with student union concepts than women. For the reasons advanced in that section, it also seems relevant for labor attitudes generally.

5. Students living in different living arrangements reflect different attitudes toward collective bargaining.

The research of Feldman, Newcomb, and Nasatir would support this finding, though the attitudes reflected above are not in a consistent pattern and are reflective more of total profiles than individual scales. More specific investigation in this reas is needed to clarify the differentiation.

6. Non-whites identify more with Labor, Faculty and Student Union concepts than whites.

Assertions in this area are particularly non-conclusive in light of the small cells analyzed as well as erroneous racial stereotypes. It may be that the non-whites are from working class families which would readily score in this pattern, or more in keeping with the demography of this study that the majority of the non-whites were not freshmen (9) and the majority were not 18 (8). At this juncture, however, it doesn't appear that enough data is available for any conclusive judgments.

#### Limitations

It seems important at this juncture to identify some of the limitations encountered in the study.

The 120 item Likert scale, though taking only 20 to 25 minutes to complete, seemed to be too long for students, particularly when one of the scales (Labor-Management) seemed to be an area they knew little about. This caused difficulty in two situations: (1) responses with all three scales not fully completed and (2) follow-up mailings which were not returned.

The instrument did not measure knowledge in any way, so it is difficult to derive any understanding of collective bargaining from the attitudinal response. Particularly in relating Scale C (Student Union) to collective bargaining, it is difficult to determine the exact meaning of the response.

Scale C in itself is not perfectly clear. Though the reliability and validity tests would indicate that the scale measures "student union" attitudes, it is felt the actual items may sometimes be unclear to students in that context.

Because of the large number of responses which were thrown out because of uncompleted scales (50) and incomplete demographic information (7), the

size of the sample was reduced some, making the cells in some cases quite small.

In regard to cells, the demographic study of racial differences is particularly limited in this sense. The range limitation seems quite severe.

The actual sampling technique could be improved. Though it is felt from the experience with mailed follow-ups in which no responses were received, that mailing is not a good technique, better randomization would assist the study. Possibly departmental randomization would alleviate this problem if cooperation could be gained for testing in departments.

#### Recommendations for Further Study

A comparative study of students and faculty in the context of collective bargaining would be both interesting and useful. If faculty exposure is significant in attitude development, it would seem worthwhile to investigate departmental attitudes toward collective bargaining, from student through department head.

With no clear-cut models for student participation in university governance and no definitive models for student participation in collective bargaining, a specific delineation of student attitudes might be useful.

An important area to investigate seems to be the whole scope of awareness, knowledge, and understanding students have regarding collective bargaining in both public and private sectors. A thorough analysis of parental occupation and hometown environment would amplify such a study.

Another concept useful for study is the longitudinal knowledge and attitude change regarding collective bargaining. What knowledge or attitudes exist prior to unit determination on a campus, at the end of bargaining, and at the end of the contract period? Does this differ significantly among students, faculty, or administrators?

Finally, a collective bargaining area needing investigation in higher education is a regional one. What differences, if any, do geographical regions make in student, faculty and administrator knowledge and attitude? Are the students at Rutgers more aware and understanding of collective bargaining than the students at Oakland? Are the faculty more knowledgeable regarding collective bargaining?

### Personal Summary

While not directly related to the statistical results of the study, this investigator's interviews and informal contacts with the Central Michigan students have in many instances complemented the data previously presented. In concluding the dissertation, this writer has taken the liberty to assert some additional findings and predictions as a result of the overall investigation.

It is this writer's belief that the Central Michigan University students will become involved in collective bargaining only when it is perceived by them to be directly impacting on their daily lives. The neutral response reflected in the data is not necessarily a response of apathy, but more likely one of immediate disinterest or unawareness, and may change significantly from time to time. These changes, increased interest, or concern, for whatever reason, may precipitate or be precipitated by discontent among the bargaining parties. Certainly a faculty strike or increased tuition as a result of collective bargaining would have an impact on student attitudes.

Most collective bargaining processes today are essentially private, two-party relationships. It is not likely in most instances that students will be apprised to the discussions or even the issues on the bargaining table. Consequently, as issues such as parking privileges, faculty-student ratio, classroom size, instruction, and student services are discussed, the students must assume a role of interested third parties learning of decisions after the fact. As more contracts are agreed to and decisions are made relative to student concerns, it does seem likely that students at Central Michigan will seek, if not demand, a more active participation in collective bargaining. The actual form of this participation is, of course, questionable. Post contract committee work, fact-finding, and research may well comprise the initial inroads the students may have in the bargaining process.

It is this writer's opinion that there are interested and capable students on the Central Michigan campus who will seek involvement in collective

bargaining. It seems also that there are faculty and administration who in the main are sensitive to this student interest and will seek to involve them. It would seem to be to the advantage of all concerned to involve even the most mildly interested students where possible. It would indeed be unfortunate and difficult if a situation arises from some aspect of collective bargaining where a greatly aroused student body found it too late or impossible to participate.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Feldman, Kenneth A. and Newcomb, Theodore M. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers Volume I, 1969.
- Feuer, Lewis S. The Conflict of Generations. New York: Basic Books Inc., Publishers, 1969.
- Frost, S.E. Introduction to American Education. New York: Doubleday and Company Inc., 1962.
- Goldsen, R.K. What College Students Think. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1960.
- Greenwald, Anthony G. and Brock, Timothy C. and Ostrom, Thomas M. Psychological Foundations of Attitudes. New York: Academic Press, 1968.
- Hilgard, Ernest R. Introduction to Psychology. New York: Harcourt, World, and Brace, 1962.
- Hull, Frank W. The Organized Organization. University of Toledo, 1971.
- Jacob, Phillip E. Changing Values in College. The Edward Hazen Foundation, 1956.
- Katz, D. and Stotland E. "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change." Educational Psychology: Study of a Science. Edited by S. Koch. New York: McGraw-Hill, Volume III, 1959.
- Kerr, Clark. Uses of the University. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Lehmann, I.J. and Dressel, Paul. Critical Thinking, Attitudes and Values in Higher Education. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1962.
- Lindgren, Henry C. An Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1969.
- McGrath, Earl J. Should Students Share the Power? Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1970.
- Millery, William and Newbury, David. Teacher Negotiations: A Guide for Bargaining Teams. New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1970.
- Roberts, Harold S. (ed.) Roberts Dictionary of Industrial Relations. Washington, D.C.: BNA Incorporated, 1966.

- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History.  
New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Thurstone, L.L. The Measurement of Attitude. Chicago: University of  
Chicago Press, 1929.
- Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and  
Dissertations. University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Webster-Meriam. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary.  
Massachusetts: G. & C. Meriam Company, 1963.
- Williamson, E.G. and Cowan, John L. The American Students Freedom of  
Expression. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966.
- Yamamoto, Kaoru (ed.). The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis.  
Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

#### Articles and Periodicals

- Brown, Ralph S., Jr. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education,"  
Michigan Law Review, LXVIII (March 1969) 1075.
- Cardozier, V.R. "Student Power in Medieval Universities," Personnel  
and Guidance Journal, No. 46 (June 1968), pp. 944 - 948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Faculty Unionization: A Very Knotty Question," State News,  
Editorial, Michigan State University, (March 2, 1971).
- Garbarino, Joseph W. "Precarious Professors: New Patterns in Represen-  
tation," Industrial Relations, No. 10, (February 1970),  
pp. 1 - 20.
- Gramont, Sanche de. "The French Workers Want to Join the Affluent  
Society, Not Wreck It," New York Times Magazine, (June 1968).
- \_\_\_\_\_. Fifth Estate, Detroit, Volume V., No. 9105 (May 14, 1970).
- Harbison, Fredrick H. "Campus Revolt From an Industrial Relations  
Perspective," Department of Economics, Princeton University.
- Helper, John C. "Timetable for Takeover," Journal of Higher Education,  
Volume XXXII, No. 2 (February 1971), pp. 103-105.
- Holstein, Bill "Group Plans to Create Student Workers Union," State News,  
Michigan State University, (May 5, 1971).
- Horvat, John J. "Professional Negotiations in Education," Robert  
Merrill Publishers, 1969).

Jacobson, Robert L. "Freshmen Reported More Protest-Prone Than Predecessors," Chronicle of Higher Education, (January 10, 1972).

Krauss, Irving. "Sources of Inspiration Among Working Class Youth," American Sociological Review, No. 29. (December 1964), pp. 867 - 879.

\_\_\_\_\_. Liberated Guardian, New York, (May 23, 1970).

McHugh, William F. "Collective Bargaining and the Student," Journal of Higher Education, XLII, No. 3, (March 1971), pp. 175 - 185.

\_\_\_\_\_. Michigan Employment Relations Commission, "Wayne State University and Board of Governors and United Workers Organization Committee," R69 F-212, (1969).

O'Connor, David. "Student Employees and Collective Bargaining Under the National Labor Relations Act: An Alternative to Violence on America's College Campuses," George Washington Law Review, No. 38 (July 1970) pp. 1026 - 1050.

\_\_\_\_\_. Phoenix, Queens College, Editorial, (September 1971).

Scully, Malcolm G. and Sievert, William A. "Collective Bargaining Gains Converts Among Teachers," Chronicle of Higher Education, Volume V. No. 31 (May 10, 1971).

Sievert, William. Chronicle of Higher Education (September 1971).

\_\_\_\_\_. University Catalog, Central Michigan University (1970), pp. 45 - 55.

Waldron, Andrew. "The Student as Hardhat," New York Times, (May 31, 1971).

#### Unpublished Sources

Blendinger, Jack Glenn, "Attitudes of Secondary School Students in the State of Michigan Who Have Experienced Teacher Strikes." Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, Colorado State College, 1969.

Dawson, Leslie M. "Social and Professional Dimensions of the Image of Business: A Study of Attitudes of College Students and Recent College Graduates Representing Selected Fields of Study." Unpublished Dissertation PhD., Michigan State University, 1968.



- Evans, Geraldine Ann, "Perceptions of Attitudes Toward the Use of Collective Bargaining Power." Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1968.
- Grafton, Clive Llewellyn, "A Latitudinal Study of Attitudes Comparing Certain Student Groups on Issues Related to University Life." Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1968.
- Haehn, James O. "A Survey of Faculty and Administrator Attitudes on Collective Bargaining: A Report to the Academic Senate," California State Colleges, 1970.
- Harris, David Allen, "The Development of an Instrument Designed to Assess the Potential for Conflict Relative to Faculty-Administrative Relationships." Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- McGaw, Dickinson Lamb, "The Effects of Socializing Agents on Students' Learning of Political Attitudes." Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation, Indiana University, 1968.
- Michigan State University Faculty Affairs Committee, "An Impartial Review of Collective Bargaining by University Faculties," (March 9, 1971).
- Michigan State University, Social Science Omnibus Survey #1, Bureau of Social Science Research, 1970.
- Nasatir, D., "Collegiate Contexts." Paper presented at College Student Personnel Institute, Claremont, California, November 1965.
- Ostrander, Kenneth H. "A Study of the Scalability of Selected Attitude Items Related to Collective Action by Teachers." Unpublished Doctor of Education Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1968.
- Simon, W., Carns, E.E., and Gagnon, G.H., "Student Politics: Continuities in Political Socialization." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Boston, August 1968.

#### Other Sources

- Appleton, James. Vice President for Student Affairs, Oakland University. Telephone interview on March 12, 1972.
- Appleton, James. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education with Emphasis on the Impact of Bargaining on Students and Student Affairs Personnel." A paper prepared for presentation at the 1972 NASPA convention, in April of 1972.

Bucklew, Niel. Vice Provost, Central Michigan University. A series of interviews and personal conversations throughout the winter of 1972.

Driver, Russel B. Vice President and Business Manager, Saginaw Valley College. Telephone interview on March 11, 1972.

Ferguson, Chris. Vice President, Saginaw Valley Student Body. Telephone interview on March 12, 1972.

Gabriel, Roy. Research consultant, Michigan State University. A series of conversations regarding research design.

Groty, C. Keith. Assistant Vice President, Michigan State University. A series of conversations over a two-year period regarding collective bargaining, collective bargaining research, and students, education and industrial relations.

Horan, Tim. President, Central Michigan University Student Body. A series of discussions and interviews throughout the academic year, 1971-72.

\_\_\_\_\_. Robert Merrill Publishers, letter received 1971.

Munger, Ben. Michigan Education Association. Telephone interview in June, 1971.

Olim, Drew. National Student Association Executive Secretary, Washington, D.C. Interviewed on March 7, 1972.

Owen, William. Michigan Education Association. Telephone interviews in June of 1971 and April of 1972.

Pierson, Manual H. Dean of Students, Oakland University. Press release September 15, 1971.

Pilotti, Joyce. Faculty Bargaining Chairman, Central Michigan University. Interview on January 5, 1972.

Roberts, Skip. National Student Association, Washington, D.C. Telephone interview on December 15, 1971.

Smith, Margaret J. Financial Aids Officer, Central Michigan University. Correspondence and telephone interviews during the winter of 1972.

Sytsma, Sidney. Research consultant, Michigan State University. A series of consultations throughout the winter and spring of 1972.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY  
STUDENTS AND THE STUDY'S SAMPLE

# APPENDIX A

<u>CLASSIFICATION</u>	<u>SAMPLE</u>		<u>ACTUAL CMU**</u>	
	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>PERCENTAGE</u>
Male	124	49	6,045	45
Female	129	51	7,216	55
White	241	95	12,911	97
Non-White	12	5	3,500	3
Freshmen	147	56	3,434	26
Sophomore	65	25	3,303	25
Junior	31	12	3,356	25
Senior	14	6	3,114	24
Urban*	91	36	6,000 <sup>o</sup>	45
Non-Urban*	162	64	7,200	55
18 year old	106	42		
19 year old	78	31		
20 year old	43	17		
21 year old	9	4		
22 and over	17	7		
Residence Hall	187	74	5,750	48
Apartment	37	15	3,800	29
Other (Residence)	29	11	2,100	23

\* Classification system designed by Industrial Psychologist David Donovan and Sociologist Milton Hagelberg. See Appendix G.

\*\* Figures supplied by Central Michigan University Admissions and Financial Aid Offices on Fall 1971 population.

<sup>o</sup> Approximation by Admissions Office.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT INSTRUCTIONS AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

## APPENDIX B

This research questionnaire is part of a study investigating student attitudes at Central Michigan University toward collective bargaining - generally, and in several specific forms. The study is being conducted with the approval of both the Dean of Students and the Provost. Your time and assistance are greatly appreciated.

Please fill in or circle the appropriate information.

Age - 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and over

Sex - Male, Female

Race - Black, Brown, Red, White, Yellow, Other

Residence - Apartment, Residence Hall, Fraternity/Sorority, Other

Classification - Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Other

Hometown - \_\_\_\_\_

A

B

C

The following 120 statements are divided into three, 40-item sections. Read each statement carefully and in the row to the left of the statement, circle the letter that most reflects your attitude about the statement.

SD = Strongly Disagree

D = Disagree

U = Undecided

A = Agree

SA = Strongly Agree

APPENDIX C

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE (SCALE A), THE  
FACULTY-ADMINISTRATIVE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE (SCALE B),  
AND THE STUDENT UNION-NON-STUDENT UNION ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE (SCALE C)

APPENDIX C

SCALE A

(LABOR-MANAGEMENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE)

- |    |   |   |   |    |     |   |
|----|---|---|---|----|-----|---|
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 1.  | Union demands of excessive wage increases are primarily responsible for large increases in prices.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 2.  | Layoffs should be made on the basis of seniority.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 3.  | The company should be given the right to discharge a man it considers unsatisfactory at any time during his employment.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 4.  | Individual initiative is more important than collective security.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 5.  | Union leaders are more interested in their own financial welfare than in the worker's financial welfare.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 6.  | The union should be given equal representation with management on the Board of Directors.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 7.  | White collar workers as well as laborers should be organized.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 8.  | Since management considers the workers as just another commodity to be used in production, workers must organize unions to defend their rights as individuals.                        |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 9.  | Management must preserve the sole right to govern the company's pricing policy if industry is to survive.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 10. | Unions should lobby for labor legislation.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 11. | Unions struggle to keep existing work rules in order to ensure the health and safety of the worker, not to make unnecessary work or to featherbed.                                    |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 12. | Most of the violence found at picket lines is instigated by management itself.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 13. | In all probability, management will someday break all unions since they do not fulfill any duty which cannot be fulfilled by management.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 14. | John L. Lewis has gained much for his men, but most of his gains have been at the expense of the public.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 15. | In recent years, high profits of management have been thrown away on advertising and the like when they should have been used to compensate workers for their increased productivity. |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 16. | A union shop (all workers must join the union) is beneficial to the worker.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 17. | The union does not represent the plant owners and should not attempt to participate in management decisions on plant policies.  |



- SD D U A SA 18. Corporation profits today are excessive.
- SD D U A SA 19. The unions no longer represent the interests of the working man, but that of top union executives.
- SD D U A SA 20. Management statements to the effect that inflation is a result of rising labor costs is a distortion of facts and degrades labor's contribution to industrial growth.
- SD D U A SA 21. In a piece-rate system of payment, management should be allowed to set the piece rate since they have hired experts in this field to do the work.
- SD D U A SA 22. The AFL-CIO merger was a great step forward for American industry.
- SD D U A SA 23. There is no reason why high union officials should not be paid as much as high management officials.
- SD D U A SA 24. Shortening the work week with no loss of pay is a sensible solution to the problem of automation and unemployment.
- SD D U A SA 25. The union should help management in setting the policy of the company.
- SD D U A SA 26. The higher standard of living that is enjoyed by the average American workingman today would have come about without the aid of unions.
- SD D U A SA 27. Some of the union's power should be taken away from it.
- SD D U A SA 28. Unions will eventually bring about the downfall of the Free Enterprise system.
- SD D U A SA 29. Management's practice of discrimination against older workers makes the union's fight for seniority rules unnecessary.
- SD D U A SA 30. The problems in labor relations today is not that unions are too strong but management's refusal to accept labor as an equal partner in the industrial process.
- SD D U A SA 31. Unions should intensify their efforts to organize government employees.
- SD D U A SA 32. The recent spiral in prices is due to price hikes on the part of management after which the unions demand pay hikes to keep up with the cost of living.
- SD D U A SA 33. The actions of top union officials are more for their own benefit than for the workers.
- SD D U A SA 34. Unions should not meddle in politics.

- SD D U A SA 35. The union is not interested in power itself, but only in protecting the welfare of the workers.
- SD D U A SA 36. Unions are more to blame for inflation than managements.
- SD D U A SA 37. Unions weaken individual initiative.
- SD D U A SA 38. Any policy changes in personnel procedures should be worked out in a joint conference between both management and union officials.
- SD D U A SA 39. White collar workers should not be unionized.
- SD D U A SA 40. The motives governing the action of top union officials are prestige and financial gain, not the welfare of the workers.

SCALE B

(FACULTY-ADMINISTRATIVE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE)

- SD D U A SA 1. The College should be given the right to discharge a faculty member it considers doing unsatisfactory work at any time during his employment.
- SD D U A SA 2. Faculty organizations should be given equal representation with the Administration on the Board of Trustees.
- SD D U A SA 3. Since the administration considers faculty as just another commodity in the college learning process, faculty must organize to defend their rights.
- SD D U A SA 4. The College administration must preserve the right to govern such things as tuition, fees and admissions, if the college is to survive.
- SD D U A SA 5. Faculty organizations should lobby for labor legislation and educational reform.
- SD D U A SA 6. Most of the conflict found between faculty and administration (bargaining, mediation, fact-finding, arbitration, strikes) is instigated by the administration itself.
- SD D U A SA 7. Faculty organizations struggle to keep existing teacher conditions the way they are to ensure academic freedom, not to make unnecessary work or to be featherbed.
- SD D U A SA 8. In all probability, the College will someday break the faculty organization, since the organization does not fulfill any responsibility the administration cannot assume itself.

- SD D U A SA 9. The National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, and American Association of University Professors have gained a lot for faculty organizations, but most of their gains have been at the expense of the students.
- SD D U A SA 10. In recent years too much college money (grants, tuition, etc.) has been thrown away on needless research and special programs when it could have been spent on better education for students and better faculty compensation.
- SD D U A SA 11. Faculty organizations do not represent the college and should not attempt to participate in the administration's decisions on college policy.
- SD D U A SA 12. University-wide strikes by faculty could not be justified.
- SD D U A SA 13. Faculty organizations represent the interest of full and tenured professors more than younger faculty.
- SD D U A SA 14. Administrative statements to the effect that higher tuition and fees are a result of such things as higher faculty wages is a distortion of the facts and degrades the faculty contribution to college growth.
- SD D U A SA 15. In a course-load system of teaching, the administration should be allowed to set the number of courses each faculty member should teach, since they are the ones who did the original hiring.
- SD D U A SA 16. There is no reason that faculty leaders should not get paid as much as administrative leaders.
- SD D U A SA 17. The numbers of courses a faculty member teaches is strictly a departmental concern, not an administrative one.
- SD D U A SA 18. The faculty organization should help the administration in setting college policy.
- SD D U A SA 19. The higher standard of living that is enjoyed by the average faculty member would not have come about without faculty organization.
- SD D U A SA 20. Some of the power of faculty organizations should be taken away.
- SD D U A SA 21. Faculty organizations will eventually bring about the downfall of a community governance system in higher education.
- SD D U A SA 22. The administration's discrimination against un-tenured faculty makes the fight for self-determination by faculty organization necessary.

- SD D U A SA 23. The problem in university governance today is not that the faculty organizations are too strong, but that the administration's refusal to accept faculty as equal partners in the educative process.
- SD D U A SA 24. The actions of faculty organization leaders are more for their own benefit than for the individual benefit of faculty members.
- SD D U A SA 25. Faculty organizations should not meddle in politics.
- SD D U A SA 26. Organizations weaken individual initiative.
- SD D U A SA 27. Since they are really administrators, department heads should not be unionized.
- SD D U A SA 28. Motives of faculty organization leaders are for personal prestige, promotion, and mobility, not for the welfare of the faculty.
- SD D U A SA 29. Use of group action by university faculty organization is necessary to present a united front to the University Administration and Board of Trustees.
- SD D U A SA 30. The Board of Trustees are genuinely concerned about improving faculty conditions at the university.
- SD D U A SA 31. Because of area specialization, faculty are unaware of the many and diverse problems confronting our university.
- SD D U A SA 32. Faculty involvement on university policy-making committees tends to slow the decision-making process.
- SD D U A SA 33. Our university is allocating its funds in an appropriate manner.
- SD D U A SA 34. The size of the gap between faculty salaries and administrative salaries is unreasonable.
- SD D U A SA 35. University faculty members in order to fulfill the goals established by the institution must establish some form of collective negotiator.
- SD D U A SA 36. Public demonstrations by faculty members are necessary techniques for informing the administration, the board of trustees, and the public of faculty demands.
- SD D U A SA 37. Unionization creates an environment wherein cooperative solving is made very difficult.
- SD D U A SA 38. Under certain circumstances, college faculty organizations should go on strike.
- SD D U A SA 39. Local college faculty organizations should negotiate class size.
- SD D U A SA 40. Local college faculty organizations should negotiate conditions appropriate for student learning.

SCALE C

(STUDENT UNION-NON STUDENT UNION ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE)

- |    |   |   |   |    |     |  |
|----|---|---|---|----|-----|--|
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 1.  | The University should be given the right to dismiss a student when his academic work is not in accordance with the standards of school.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 2.  | Student government leaders are more interested in their own welfare than in that of the students.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 3.  | Student organizations should be given equal representation with faculty and administration on decision making boards.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 4.  | Student employees should seek collective bargaining rights.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 5.  | Since the university administration considers students as just a commodity in the total societal learning process, students must organize to defend their rights as individuals.                 |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 6.  | The college administration must preserve the sole right to govern student education if higher education is to survive.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 7.  | Student organizations should lobby for student-centered legislation.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 8.  | Student organizations struggle to change social and academic regulations in order to assist the students in their pursuit of education, not make things easier or more enjoyable.                |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 9.  | Student governments have gained much for students' organizations, but most of the gains have been at the expense of quality education for all.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 10. | Student organizations by and large do not represent the board of trustees and should not attempt to participate in faculty or administrative decisions on university policy.                     |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 11. | Some of the power of student organizations should be taken away.   |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 12. | A student union would eventually bring about the downfall of a community governance system in higher education.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 13. | The problem in university governance today is not that faculty and administrative organizations are too strong, but that they do not accept students as equal partners in the educative process. |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 14. | University budgets are purely an administrative-faculty concern, not a student one.  |
| SD | D | U | A | SA | 15. | The actions of student organization leaders are more for their own benefit than for the individual student.  |

- SD D U A SA 16. Student organizations are not interested in power itself, but protecting the welfare of its members.
- SD D U A SA 17. Organizations weaken individual initiative.
- SD D U A SA 18. Policy changes involving faculty evaluation should be worked out in joint conference with faculty, administrators, and students.
- SD D U A SA 19. Students should have a voice on faculty and administrative salaries.
- SD D U A SA 20. There are some decisions relative to long range institutional goals which students aren't interested in.
- SD D U A SA 21. There are some institutional decisions which faculty and administration have no business participating in.
- SD D U A SA 22. Student organizations should directly influence curriculum and curriculum control.
- SD D U A SA 23. Most students don't really care about student government.
- SD D U A SA 24. Student employees should get the same hourly wage as non-student employees.
- SD D U A SA 25. Placing students in positions of power or shared power would increase the "community concept of academic" and university governance.
- SD D U A SA 26. Students today are more aware of the society they live in and the significance of their education than those of past generations.
- SD D U A SA 27. Students are more sophisticated economically and politically today than in previous years.
- SD D U A SA 28. Students have special insights into curriculum and teaching that should be used to improve their education.
- SD D U A SA 29. If students are to be trained in effective citizenship they should participate in the decisions concerning education early in life.
- SD D U A SA 30. Students are more aware of their developmental needs than faculty and administrators.
- SD D U A SA 31. Students are more serious and concerned about getting a worthwhile and meaningful education than in previous years.
- SD D U A SA 32. The limited experience of most students makes them relatively ineffective in developing their own curricular needs.

- SD D U A SA 33. A recognized academic organization of students could effectively accelerate the correction of deficiencies in present curricular offerings.
- SD D U A SA 34. Most students spend such a brief time in school they don't want to be involved with long-range curricular planning.
- SD D U A SA 35. Students have already made significant changes in colleges and universities without formal status.
- SD D U A SA 36. The limited experience of most students makes them somewhat ineffective in mapping out long-range institutional goals.
- SD D U A SA 37. Students simply don't embrace the rich compliment of skills and knowledge necessary to participate effectively in institutional decision making.
- SD D U A SA 38. Students have little interest in the technical and complicated problems of university economics.
- SD D U A SA 39. Most students can't give the time and the commitment necessary for such things as legislative proposals, professional ethics, deliberations and the like.
- SD D U A SA 40. Most students don't have the time to participate actively on regular policy bodies of the university.

APPENDIX D

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN UNIVERSITY RESEARCH



APPENDIX D

January 24, 1972

Dear CMU Student:

You are invited to participate in an important research study being conducted through the offices of the Vice President of Student Affairs and the Provost. The research will involve your attitudes regarding a number of university issues and will take only a few minutes of your time.

Please come to the third floor auditorium of the Union Center at 7:00, Monday evening, January 31.

Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

William R. Donohue  
Researcher

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER ON PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

APPENDIX E

February 10, 1972

Dear CMU Student:

Recently you were mailed an invitation to participate in a University Research project which was conducted in University Center. We are sorry to have missed you there.

Enclosed is the research instrument which was given to some of your fellow students. I would appreciate it greatly if you would assist me by completing this questionnaire and returning it to me in the enclosed envelope. Your help and time will be greatly appreciated, I can assure you.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

W.R. Donohue  
Researcher

WRD:cw

Enclosure

APPENDIX F

CLASSIFICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN  
HOME TOWNS USED IN THE STUDY

# APPENDIX F

## CLASSIFICATIONS AND DISTRIBUTION OF URBAN AND NON-URBAN

### HOME TOWNS USED IN THE STUDY

<u>CITY</u>	<u>CLASSIFICATION</u>	<u>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</u>
Adrian, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Allen Park, Mi.	Urban	1
Alma, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Alpena, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Ann Arbor, Mi.	Urban	2
Baltimore, Md.	Urban	1
Bay City, Mi.	Urban	3
Barryton, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Benton Harbor, Mi.	Urban	2
Bloomfield Hills, Mi.	Urban	3
Birch Run, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Brighton, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Cadillac, Mi.	Urban	3
Caro, Mi.	Urban	2
Carsonville, Mi.	Urban	2
Cedar Springs	Non-Urban	3
Central Lake, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Chelsea, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Chesaning, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Clare, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Clawson, Mi.	Urban	2
Coldwater, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Coopersville, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Coleman, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Corunna, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Dearborn, Mi.	Urban	3
Detroit, Mi.	Urban	8
Dundee, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
East Lansing, Mi.	Urban	2
Edinburg, Texas	Non-Urban	2
Emmet, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Farmington, Mi.	Urban	5
Fair Haven, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Fenton, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Filion, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Flint, Mi.	Urban	12
Frankenmuth, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Fremont, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Gaylord, Mi.	Non-Urban	5
Gladstone, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Grand Ledge, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Grand Rapids, Mi.	Urban	6
Grosse Isle, Mi.	Urban	4
Hartford, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Hilliard, Ohio	Non-Urban	1
Hillsdale, Mi.	Urban	1

CITY	CLASSIFICATION	NUMBER OF RESPONSES
Holland, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Holt, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Jackson, Mi.	Urban	3
Kalamazoo, Mi.	Urban	1
Kinde, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Kingston, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Lake City, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Lake Orion, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Lansing, Mi.	Urban	3
Livonia, Mi.	Urban	1
Ludington, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Madison Heights, Mi.	Urban	2
Manchester, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Marlette, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Marysville, Mi.	Non-Urban	8
Midland, Mi.	Non-Urban	7
Montague, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Moranci, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Mt. Pleasant, Mi.	Non-Urban	30
Muskegon, Mi.	Urban	4
Owosso, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Pincenning, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Plymouth, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Portiac, Mi.	Urban	2
Portage, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Portland, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Reed City, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Remus, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Rochester, Mi.	Urban	1
Rockford, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Rockwood, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Romeo, Mi.	Urban	1
Rosebush, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Royal Oak, Mi.	Urban	1
Saginaw, Mi.	Urban	2
Southfield, Mi.	Urban	2
Southgate, Mi.	Urban	2
St. Charles, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Stevensville, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Toledo, Ohio	Urban	1
Traverse City, Mi.	Non-Urban	4
Troy, Mi.	Urban	3
Udly, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Union Lake, Mi.	Non-Urban	2
Utica, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
Waterford, Mi.	Non-Urban	1
West Branch, Mi.	Non-Urban	3
Ypsilanti, Mi.	Non-Urban	2