

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This material 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.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

**Xerox University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-6143

STEWART, Jr., Bailey Thomas, 1939-  
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE DEGREE AND LEVEL OF  
DECISION INFLUENCE ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY  
MEMBERS EXERCISE AND HAVE EXERCISED IN SELECTED  
BARGAINING AND NON-BARGAINING JUNIOR COLLEGES  
IN MICHIGAN.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1973  
Education, administration

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE DEGREE AND LEVEL OF DECISION  
INFLUENCE ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY MEMBERS EXERCISE  
AND HAVE EXERCISED IN SELECTED BARGAINING AND  
NON-BARGAINING JUNIOR COLLEGES IN MICHIGAN

by

Bailey T. Stewart, Jr.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1973

## ABSTRACT

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE DEGREE AND LEVEL OF DECISION  
INFLUENCE ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY MEMBERS EXERCISE  
AND HAVE EXERCISED IN SELECTED BARGAINING AND  
NON-BARGAINING JUNIOR COLLEGES IN MICHIGAN

by

Bailey T. Stewart, Jr.

This study sought to determine if significant differences exist between administrators and faculty members in four selected community junior colleges in Michigan regarding the degree and level of influence they exercise and have exercised over decisions in areas of institutional concern such as financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs from the period 1965 through 1970. The institutions in the sample were selected so as to permit analysis of these opinions on the basis of the presence or absence of collective negotiations as an element in the colleges' decision-making structure.

The degree and level of decision-making influence were determined by a measuring device titled, Decision-Making Influence Questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed specifically for use in the current study, has a reliability coefficient of .79, and consists of statements

regarding five major categories of community college institutional concern (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs).

The sample for this study was drawn from a population of four junior colleges in Michigan: two with formally negotiated contracts and two without formally negotiated contracts. Having identified the institutions which met specified criteria, eight administrators and 129 full-time faculty members were identified and included as participants of this study.

Analysis of the data was done by using the multivariate analysis of variance (programmed by Jeremy Finn). Results were deemed significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The following conclusions pertain to and were made as a result of this study:

1. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of those junior colleges involved in collective bargaining and those not involved in collective bargaining.

2. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of the junior colleges within the categories of collective bargaining and no collective bargaining.

3. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members.

4. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members when comparing individual junior colleges.

5. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with administrators and faculty members of junior colleges not involved in collective bargaining.

6. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

7. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges.

8. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing administrators and faculty members.

9. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of individual junior colleges when comparing presently perceived degree of decision-making influence with the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

10. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 of administrators and faculty members in junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with non-bargaining junior colleges.

11. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of individual junior colleges when comparing presently perceived degrees of decision-making influence with the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

12. Administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, perceive the majority of their decision-making influence to be exerted with deans and division chairmen.

13. Administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, presently perceive that a greater number of decision-making influences are

exerted with the faculty organization than with the president, vice-president, and board of trustees.

14. Administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, do not perceive that their present decision-making influence is ever exerted at the individual faculty member level with regard to the five variables measured (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs).

15. Administrators employed in junior colleges, not operating with a formally negotiated contract, do not perceive changes in the level of influence or with the number of people influenced.

16. Administrators employed in bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges perceive their decision-making influence to be exerted with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents and boards of trustees more often than with individual faculty members, faculty organizations or department chairmen; and, perceive little change when comparing the present number of people influenced with the number of people influenced prior to 1965.

17. Faculty members employed in bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges exert their decision-making influence with co-workers, faculty organizations, and department chairmen more often than with deans and



Bailey T. Stewart, Jr.

division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents and boards of trustees; and, presently exert decision-making influence upon a greater number of people than they did prior to 1965.

DEDICATED TO THE LOVES OF MY LIFE IN THE  
ORDER IN WHICH THEY APPEARED --  
MY MOTHER; MY WIFE, BARBARA;  
AND MY SON, GREG.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Appreciation is expressed to the administrators and faculty members of the four junior colleges for time and effort expended in completing the instrument.

Thanks go to Mary Kennedy for her statistical advice and assistance.

The writer extends a special note of appreciation to Dr. C. Keith Groty, committee chairman, for his counsel, friendship, support, and critical analysis throughout this study. Thanks go to the other members of the committee, Dr. John C. Howell, Dr. Vandell C. Johnson, Dr. Max R. Raines, and Dr. Louis C. Stamatakos for their willingness to serve in this capacity.

To my wife, Barbara, whose encouragement and faith have been inspirational to me, I gratefully express my appreciation. To my son, Greg, who has been neglected by his father during the past two years, I love you.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
PREFACE . . . . .	ix
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Introduction . . . . .	1
Significance of the Study . . . . .	1
Objectives of the Study . . . . .	9
Hypothesis . . . . .	10
Definition of Terms . . . . .	12
Collective Bargaining; Collective Nego- tiations; Professional Negotiation . . . . .	12
Decision-Making . . . . .	13
Negotiation . . . . .	13
Public Employment Relations Act . . . . .	13
Scope of Bargaining . . . . .	14
Delimitation of Research Conducted . . . . .	14
Organization of Study . . . . .	14
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	16
Introduction . . . . .	16
Background of the Problem . . . . .	16
Concept of Collective Bargaining . . . . .	17
Labor Movement in the United States . . . . .	20
Law and Collective Bargaining in the Private Sector . . . . .	24
Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector . . . . .	30
Federal Level . . . . .	32
State and Local Level . . . . .	36
Collective Negotiation in Public Education . . . . .	37
Michigan's "Little Wagner Act" for Public Employees . . . . .	40
Collective Negotiation in Michigan Communtiy Colleges . . . . .	44

Chapter	Page
Decision-Making . . . . .	45
Related Studies . . . . .	56
Studies of Faculty Involvement . . . . .	57
Related Studies of Decision-Making . . . . .	61
Summary . . . . .	66
III. THE METHODOLOGY . . . . .	69
Introduction . . . . .	69
Definition of the Population . . . . .	69
Source of the Data . . . . .	70
Data Collection . . . . .	74
Description of the Instrument . . . . .	74
Validity and Reliability of the Instrument . . . . .	75
Scale and Index Construction . . . . .	76
Questionnaire Item Development . . . . .	77
The Statistical Model and Computational Procedures . . . . .	80
Summary . . . . .	83
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	85
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	85
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	87
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	90
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	90
Hypothesis 5 . . . . .	94
Hypothesis 6 . . . . .	95
Hypothesis 7 . . . . .	97
Hypothesis 8 . . . . .	100
Hypothesis 9 . . . . .	102
Hypothesis 10 . . . . .	102
Hypothesis 11 . . . . .	105
Category I: Administrators--Bargaining . . . . .	105
Category II: Faculty Members--Bargaining . . . . .	109
Category III: Administrators--No Bargaining . . . . .	111
Category IV: Faculty Members--No Bargaining . . . . .	113
Summary . . . . .	115
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	120
Summary . . . . .	120
Conclusions . . . . .	123
Implications . . . . .	131
Recommendations . . . . .	137

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	141
APPENDICES . . . . .	152
Appendix A . . . . .	153
Appendix B . . . . .	155
Appendix C . . . . .	157
Appendix D . . . . .	159
Appendix E . . . . .	171

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Identification of Michigan Community Colleges by Founding Dates and Bargaining Agents . . . . .	46
2.2 Trends in Organizational Theory . . . . .	50
3.1 Sample Responses . . . . .	73
4.1 Multivariate Analysis of Variance-- Bargaining vs Non-Bargaining. . . . .	86
4.2 Weighted Mean Scores of Bargaining vs Non-Bargaining . . . . .	87
4.3 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Differences Between Schools within Bargaining Categories. . . . .	88
4.4 Weighted Mean Scores of Individual Schools . . . . .	89
4.5 Multivariate Analysis of Variance-- Administration vs Faculty Members . . . . .	91
4.6 Weighted Mean Scores for Administrators and Faculty . . . . .	92
4.7 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Schools and Administration-Faculty Interaction . . . . .	93
4.8 Weighted Mean Scores of Schools for Administrators-Faculty of Variable 4 (Working Conditions). . . . .	94
4.9 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Bargaining- No Bargaining and Administration-Faculty Interaction . . . . .	96
4.10 Weighted Mean Scores of Bargaining-No Bargaining and Administration-Faculty for Variable 1 (Financial Affairs) . . . . .	97

Table	Page
4.11 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre) vs After Legalized Bargaining (Post) . . . . .	98
4.12 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Bargaining-No Bargaining when Compared by Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre) and After Legalized Bargaining (Post) . . . . .	99
4.13 Weighted Mean Scores of Bargaining and No Bargaining Junior Colleges when Comparing Pre and Post Categories for Variable 4 (Working Conditions) . . . . .	100
4.14 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre) and After Legalized Bargaining (Post) when Comparing Administrators and Faculty Members . . . . .	101
4.15 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Comparing Individual Schools by Scores Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre) and Scores After Legalized Bargaining (Post) . . . . .	103
4.16 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Three-Way Interaction (Bargaining--No Bargaining, Administrators--Faculty, and Pre--Post) . . . . .	104
4.17 Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Three-Way Interaction (Individual Schools [1, 2, 3, and 4], Administrators - Faculty, and Pre - Post) . . . . .	106
4.18 Level of Influence--Percentage of Responses for Administrators--Bargaining . . . . .	107
4.19 Level of Influence--Percentage of Responses for Faculty Members--Bargaining . . . . .	110
4.20 Level of Influence--Percentage of Responses for Administrators--No Bargaining . . . . .	112
4.21 Level of Influence--Percentage of Responses for Faculty Members--No Bargaining . . . . .	114



## PREFACE

"True history presents a facinating picture of the conflicting races, interests, sections and classes; it tells the interesting story of the struggle of the masses upward toward equality of opportunity."\*

---

\*Frank Tracy Carlton, Organized Labor in American History (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1921).

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Introduction

This study examines the opinions of administrators and faculty members in selected community junior colleges in Michigan regarding the perceived degree and level of influence they exercise and have exercised over decisions in areas of institutional concern, such as financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs from the period 1965 through 1971. The institutions in the sample have been selected to permit analysis of these opinions on the basis of the presence or absence of collective negotiations as an element in the colleges' decision-making structure.

#### Significance of the Study

Most literature related to educational negotiation has been written by people identified with educational organizations, but there is also a growing body of literature which represents independent investigation. The history of collective action by teachers, legal

developments and organizational positions, have been extensively documented.\*

However, the professional literature has had little to say regarding the effects of collective bargaining upon decision-making in higher education. In the fall issue of Educational Record, (1969), Logan Wilson indicated that: "if anyone has ever made a thorough-going empirical study of how decisions are now reached on a single American college or university campus, I am unaware of it" (76:389). Since then a study conducted by Annette Ten Elshof (77) was designed to determine whether or not there was a single overall decision-making process at the University of Michigan at Flint and to determine who is making the decisions. This study and the results thereof will be discussed in Chapter II.

The expansion of teacher unionism into higher education has developed very rapidly, for until the 1960's there was little known activity in this realm (78:42). Because of the ever increasing number of institutions

---

\* See bibliography:

Lieberman, Myron and Michael Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration, New York: Rand McNally and Company, 1966, pp. 431-446.

And also:

"Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector: A Bibliography," Upjohn Library, Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1967.

involved in the collective negotiation process (79:345) the need to determine the influences of administrators and faculty members upon decisions made within the institution is of great concern to educators. "In short, by virtually any standard, collective negotiations have emerged as a major educational concern" (89:170).

Determining the degree of influence upon decision-making within the collective negotiation and no collective negotiation categories, as well as future research concerned with collective negotiation and education, may assist in developing and improving the process of collective negotiation in education. By this, the author is calling attention to the borrowing of collective bargaining processes and techniques from the private and public sectors of employment and superimposing these identical techniques and processes in the educational sector of employment.

Ralph Campbell, professor of industrial and labor relations, Cornell University, indicated some common features between labor-management and faculty-administration relationships. These features were:

(1) The tendency to develop stereotyped thinking about roles and to battle over the prerogatives of role or function rather than to seek intelligent solutions to the basic problems of the organization and the individuals in the organization; (2) The struggle for control of decision-making in the area of wages, working conditions, job security, and status; and (3) Problems of developing attitudes and machinery in support of effective communications (80:50).

H. J. Heneman spoke on the topic of labor-management and faculty-administration relationships, saying:

Because there are some sound business principles which can be applied in certain areas of college and university management, that does not mean that business practices can be transferred to the educational field indiscriminately. There are basic differences which govern those things which are transferable and distinguish them from those which are not. These include such things as objectives and organization (81:45).

On the other side of the coin, Campbell indicated fundamental differences between labor-management and faculty-administration relationships in, (1) The policy-making role of faculty members as a group and (2) the academic freedom of the faculty member as an individual . . . and (3) the reluctance of faculty members to use the strike as a bargaining weapon" (80:53).

The process of collective negotiation needs to adjust and develop within the field of education.

Since the collective negotiations movement is spreading rapidly, its long-range effects are matters of legitimate concern. Any effort to envisage them is inherently speculative to some degree, but such efforts are needed before undesirable policies and practices have become established (79:345).

As stated by David Seldon,

. . . we are only in the beginning stages of development of collective bargaining; the thinking of most teachers, and even most AFT leaders, has not gone much beyond protections against abuses of administrative power (82:237).

Research is needed in the area of college and university governance; the most important method seems to be descriptive in nature. Lundsford suggests,

The research that most needs to be done at this time, in my view, is essentially descriptive and analytical, rather than evaluate or experimental; and research on broader problems even with relatively crude methods of investigation, is more important now than on narrower issues susceptible to greater methodological control (83:4).

Logan Wilson indicates more specific areas of governance which need to be studied by listing some basic questions asking: "Who now decides what? Which facets of governance are sources of dissatisfaction, and for whom? What changes are being proposed, and, why? How can their feasibility and desirability be assessed? What are the implications for proposed changes?" (76:388) The need to answer Wilson's first question of who decides what, has been identified by Herbert Simon in developing his decision-making model (84) and by Chester Barnard (85) in giving increased emphasis to the central significance of decision-making. More recent considerations of this matter are exhibited in the writings of Chris Argyris (86), Frederick Hertzberg (87), A. H. Maslow (88), and by Roger Heynes when he said, "We must identify the major decision making points" (89:170). There are many other significant articles in recent professional journals of education

and also professional journals in the field of public administration and management.

Junior college administrators are becoming more aware of the decision-making process within their own organization. Benjamin Gold, in his study, "Quantitative Methods for Administrative Decision-Making in the Junior College" (90) states that the three major pressures for junior college administrators which require decision-making techniques are the increasing enrollments, competition for the tax revenues, and the number of increasing responsibilities of the junior college.

The past few years have shown tremendous growth in terms of student enrollments for all of the Michigan community colleges. The 1966 Junior College Directory indicates that in 1965 there were nineteen public community junior colleges in Michigan with a combined enrollment of 59,495 students (91:57). A report prepared for the Michigan Community College Association indicates the enrollment for the twenty-nine Michigan community junior colleges in 1970 was 125,782 (92:5). The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education has projected community college enrollments in the Nation to be as high as 4,430,000 by the year 1980 and 6,620,000 by the year 2000 (93:34).

Indications of dramatic growth in Michigan community junior colleges suggest the importance of attaining educational objectives, for to fail so many people would be

unforgivable. Never before in history has any segment of education been called upon to educate large numbers of students through such a broad curricula. Offering this broad curricula is evidenced by junior colleges assuming a larger role within the community as noted by the rapid growth and development of the community services programs (90:4-5).

Institutions, regardless of their purposes, are based upon and grow out of the needs of the people they serve. They are continually growing, contracting or changing in reaction to shifts in the forces of society and the evolving attitudes and needs of individuals and groups. Such is the nature of the community college. This comparatively young institution is a part of a significant change reflecting, in part, the massive and rapid changes which are taking place in the State of Michigan, in the United States of America and in the world-at-large.

The change which the investigator wishes to focus attention upon is the process of collective negotiation and related components. The increasing momentum of the collective negotiation movement among professional educators has produced a demand for legislation establishing legal rules and procedures through which such negotiations can take place and disputes in the schools can be resolved (94:304). There can be no doubt as to the importance of the effects of collective negotiation upon education, for the image



of public education has suffered due to those severe conflicts which have already taken place within the brief history of collective negotiation in education.

The Michigan Legislature passed the Public Employment Relations Act, (P.A. 379), in 1965, which gave public employees in Michigan the right to negotiate with their employers. Although the right to negotiate has been legally granted, the scope of negotiation varies among the Michigan community colleges. Reasons for these differences in the scope of negotiation are many (i.e., the institution is newly founded, there is a strong academic senate, and the desire of the community, administration, and faculty is such as to avoid educational contractual relationships). The development of the scope of bargaining has expanded and there is no evidence that it will not continue beyond its present boundaries.

As the scope and process of collective negotiation develops and as researchers document evidence, impacts upon the roles of educators will become more evident. Educators have "assumed-roles," as well as "actual or official-roles" described by the board of trustees in most institutions, which are directly and/or indirectly influenced by collective negotiation. Collective negotiation according to Redfern,

. . . is introducing new and significant elements in educational decision-making. What is new is that teachers are insisting on the right (1) to

negotiate many of the matters which affect the daily operation of local schools; (2) to negotiate directly with top school officials; and (3) to negotiate through their freely chosen representatives. . . . In insisting upon bringing more and more topics to the negotiating table, to be settled on a systemwide basis, teachers are no longer content to leave administrative discretion decisions regarding class size, teaching assignments, auxiliary duties, . . . and similar matters (95:52).

This study will also serve to increase the data-base concerning collective negotiations and education. This supply of data can then be utilized as a basis for further study of the development of collective negotiation within the community college movement.

#### Objectives of the Study

This study is concerned with two junior colleges involved in formal collective negotiations and two junior colleges not involved in formal collective negotiations which are drawn from a universe to be found in Michigan.

The objective of this study is threefold. First, the investigator will seek to determine and examine the degree and level of influence administrators and faculty members perceive they have exercised over decisions in areas of institutional concern prior to the year 1965. Second, the investigator will seek to determine and examine the degree and level of influence administrators and faculty members perceive they presently exercise over decisions in areas of institutional concern. Finally, the

investigator will seek to determine if there are commonalities and differences among questionnaire responses related to those institutions and individuals involved in collective negotiation and those institutions and individuals not involved in collective negotiations.

### Hypotheses

Hypotheses were tested for acceptance or rejection at the .05 level of significance using multivariate analysis of variance. All of the hypotheses were stated as null hypotheses for the purpose of statistical measurement.

1. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of those junior colleges involved in collective bargaining and those not involved in collective bargaining.
2. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of the junior colleges within the categories of collective bargaining and no collective bargaining.
3. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members.
4. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members when comparing individual junior colleges.
5. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with administrators and faculty members of junior colleges not involved in collective bargaining.

6. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.
7. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges.
8. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing administrators and faculty members.
9. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of individual junior colleges when comparing presently perceived degrees of decision-making influence with the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.
10. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 of administrators and faculty members in junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with non-bargaining junior colleges.
11. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of individual junior colleges when comparing presently perceived degrees of decision-making influence with the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

### Definition of Terms

The meaning of a word is often rather vague, nebulous and non-definitive. Frequently in the literature the word is used without any attempt on the part of the writer to define or delimit the word, the assumption being that both the writer and reader will achieve an immediate and compatible consensus. Concomitantly, the word is found frequently in popular usage which adds further confusion. For the purpose of this research, the following terms will be used as defined below.

#### Collective Bargaining; Collective Negotiation; Professional Negotiation

Three terms which are used interchangeably in the literature. Basically, two parties sitting down and reducing their mutual concerns to a written contract by which their relationship is governed for a given period of time. Harold Roberts expands this concept stating,

Until recently collective bargaining was described as the process of negotiating the terms and conditions of employment. It was used almost synonymously with the term negotiation.

Within recent years the term has been used more broadly and encompasses not only the negotiating process, but the actual interpretation and administration of the employer and the union to meet the problems that arise in the operation of the plant (96:58).

### Decision-Making

The systematic series of actions of an individual or group utilized to reach a decision. John Dorsey helps to clarify this by saying that a decision occurs on, "the receipt of some kind of communication, it consists of a complicated process of combining communications from various sources and it results in the transmission of further communication" (97:309).

### Negotiation

"The process whereby the representatives of employees and the employer meet for the purpose of reaching agreement on wages, hours, and conditions of employment for those in the appropriate bargaining unit, and the methods for administering the agreement" (96:280).

### Public Employment Relations Act

(PERA - Act 336 of Public Acts of 1947, as amended by Act 379 of Public Acts of 1965.) A Michigan legislative act passed in 1965 which gave public employees the right to negotiate with their employers. The responsibility for administering the act is in the hands of the Employment Relations Commission (Formerly the Labor Mediation Board) (111:5).

### Scope of Bargaining

"The actual scope or subject matter which management and unions bring within the area of the collective bargaining contract. An examination of the subjects which labor and management have discussed at the bargaining table and which have been incorporated into contracts indicates that the scope of bargaining depends in large part on the kind of problems the economic and social conditions create" (96:384).

### Delimitations of the Research Conducted

Although the strength of the study is that it is a basal study, this is also a weakness. This study is limited by those variables which are a part of a design which uses a questionnaire as the method of collecting data. Problems related to the use of a questionnaire include the possible bias of the questionnaire. This study was conducted at selected Michigan community junior colleges. Thus, the implications from the results of the study are limited to these institutions.

### Organization of the Study

The general plan of the study has been organized into five chapters:

Chapter I: The introduction presents the problem, the significance of the study, the objectives of the

study, hypotheses, the definitions of terms, and the delimitations of the study.

Chapter II: The survey of the literature includes the background of the problem, the labor movement in the United States, law and collective bargaining in the private sector, collective bargaining in the public sector, collective negotiation in public education, and the decision-making process in administrative theory.

Chapter III: The methodology presents a definition of the sample, the design of the study, the method of data collection, a description of the instrument used, and the statistical techniques used to analyze the data.

Chapter IV: The analysis of the data includes a general description of the data obtained, the results of the statistical analysis of the data, the findings and the interpretations of the results.

Chapter V: The final chapter presents a summary of the findings of the study, the conclusions based upon these findings, and the implications for further study based on these findings and conclusions.



## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This chapter will proceed from the "concept" of collective bargaining to collective negotiation\* in education today. Throughout this section an effort has been made to keep in mind Frank Carlton's concept of true history:

True history presents a fascinating picture of the conflicting races, interests, sections and classes; it tells the interesting story of the struggle of the masses upward toward equality of opportunity (10:1).

#### Background of the Problem

To glean an understanding of collective negotiation, it is necessary to discuss the model from which educational bargaining emerged, namely the private sector labor movement. Becoming familiar with the concept of collective bargaining, the basis upon which American law is established, and the history of the United States labor movement should be helpful in understanding the development of collective negotiation in higher education.

---

\*"Collective negotiation" will mean "collective negotiation in education" unless a different meaning is obvious or indicated.

### Concept of Collective Bargaining

What Hutt calls, "the very useful term 'Collective Bargaining' was coined by Mrs. Sidney Weeb in her work on the cooperative movement in 1891" (11:21). There are innumerable instances in which workers have formed cooperative movements against their social superiors. These movements or "strikes" are as old as history itself. The ingenious seeker of historical parallels might find the revolt of the Hebrew brickmaker in Egypt, 1490 B.C., against being required to make bricks without straw a precedent for the strike of the Stolybridge cotton-spinners, 1892 A.D., against the supply of bad materials for their work (41:2).

The idea of cooperative movement suggests a system of agreement or control leading toward a common goal. Man has always been slow to recognize any other authority than "the voices" of all concerned. Therefore, early unions, guilds, trade clubs, and associations appear to be manifestations of these early desires. However, they were democracies in the simplest form. The Weebs (12:3-13) referred to them as a form of "primitive democracy." These early organizations were not so much concerned with the growth of the organization as the immediate needs of their warfare with the employers.

If democracy means that everything which "concerns all should be decided by all" and that each citizen should

enjoy an equal and identical share in the government, then unions functioned under the old theory of democracy. A more recent and familiar example of "primitive democracy" would be the New England town meetings. However, resorting to the aggregate meeting diminishes as the size and purposes of the organization change. Finally, the typically modern form of democracy, the executive committee under whose direction the permanent official staff performs its work, the elected representative who every year finds himself exercising the larger freedom of a representative, and the mass membership, emerges.

Union development or cooperative efforts against employers always started as uphill battles. Frederic Harrison described one of the reasons for the protest (the trade union movement) of the working class as arising,

. . . from the fact that typical ignorant upper-class opinion during the nineteenth century was quite unable to appreciate the complexity of the social and economic tendencies operating among the "lower orders" (11:31).

Foner (13:14-15) indicates another, in that as early as 1360, London Parliament declared all alliances and associations of masons null and void. Later, in 1584, punishments such as the example that follows, were established for workmen who joined forces to establish wages and hours of work:

For the first offence ten pounds . . . or twenty days imprisonment and (he) shall have

only bread and water; and for the second offence (he) shall forfeit twenty pounds. . . or suffer punishment at the pillory, and for the third offence shall forfeit thirty pounds. . . or shall sit on the pillory and lose one of his ears, and shall at all times after that be taken as a man infamous. (13:15-16)\*

It is "that" person who organized in spite of the severity of the punishment to whom union members of today owe their organizational existence.

Economists had discussed collective bargaining from the concept that labor was at the disadvantage because; (1) individual efforts were futile against employers; (2) employees were not looked upon as intellectual, financial, or social equals of the aristocracy; (3) employees were subsistently dependent upon the employer; (4) labor was a perishable commodity; (5) labor's own exclusion factor prevented solidarity among the masses; (6) the "wage-fund" theory enabled employers to keep wages down and profits up (11:21-75).

Hutt indicates that the overthrow of the "wage-fund" theory was the turning point in regard to the economists' attitude toward trade unionism (11:22). The "wage-fund" theory held that wages depended upon the proportion of the wage-fund (capital) in relation to the number of

---

\* As cited from Arthur H. Thomas, ed., Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls, A.D., 1323-1364, Cambridge, 1926, p. 225; Edward III, 9-11, Statutes of the Realm, Vol. I, p. 367, Vol. IV, Pt. I, p. 59.

workers. Economists renounced the wage-fund theory during the 1870's and gave support to the view that there was some way in which unions could gain, not at the expense of other workers but at the expense of the capitalistic employer. This new idea brought into the discussion of collective bargaining, "a theory that the price of labor was indeterminate, and that within the range of its indeterminateness trade unionism had a legitimate field of action" (11:79). Man had haggled the buying price of an article with merchants ever since trading began. Now, he would bargain for the price of his labor.

#### Labor Movement in the United States

This section does not pretend to be a comprehensive history of the American labor movement; such studies are readily available elsewhere. Instead, it is directed toward setting the backdrop for collective negotiation today.

Captain John Smith gave advice to the English merchant capitalists, who looked to America as a source of great profits, that nothing was to be expected there but by labor (14:360). William Sylvis, a labor leader of the Civil War years, said that the foundation of America was based upon labor (15:98).

However, it is important to call attention to the kind of labor existing in America during this era. First

would be the indentured servants, who were trying to escape from the misery of Europe. The escape was no easy job in that it was expensive and the voyage was so frightful that many people died (13:17).

A second labor style was that of enslavement. Slavery did not develop in America until the 1660's. It was then that the indentured system was viewed as less profitable than slavery; for to have a worker for life, whose children became the property of the masters, made slavery a desirable labor system.

Free workers, the third category, were the least numerous during the Colonial period (13:19). However, as America began to change its economic life from that of the farmer to the craftsman, the free laboring class came into being. As the demand for commodities grew, the shopkeeper found that he could not supply the market by himself and thus "wage-earners" emerged. Initially, wages and conditions of employment were good, but all was not milk and honey. Periods of unemployment often befell the worker, not to mention the well documented, inhumane working conditions (16:16).

Faced with degrading conditions, the American worker could do one of three things; (1) remain on the job and accept wages and conditions of employment as they were; (2) quit and seek employment elsewhere; (3) band together for

improvement of the situation. Needless to say, there were people who followed each of these alternatives. The "following" which is of interest in this study is the group that united with his fellow workers to force the employers to grant the improvements required.

In 1786 the journeymen printers formed a temporary association in New York to obtain a dollar a day. The employers turned them down and the printers "turned out," as it was called, and won their demands (13:70). They had conducted the first strike in the United States.

These temporary associations were formed at special times to get specific demands. After they won their demands and disbanded their organization, however, they found that employers restored the old conditions. To keep the gains they had made and continually to improve their conditions, the journeymen formed more permanent unions. The Philadelphia shoemakers took the lead. In 1792 the Philadelphia shoemakers organized the first permanent union in the United States, with a constitution, dues, a treasury, and provisions for regular meetings.

In the year 1806, eight shoemakers found themselves standing in a Philadelphia courtroom awaiting the verdict of the jury in the now famous Cordwainer's Case. Their employer had brought them to court as lawbreakers. The crime they had committed was in forming a union and striking for higher wages (17:38).

The court upheld the position of the employer and found the shoemakers guilty of "'criminal conspiracy' in joining together in a union and forming a combination and conspiracy to raise wages" (8:1-15). Strikes and court decisions such as the Cordwainer's decision were numerous around the early 1820's (16:43, 1:503).

Lieberman indicates that there were nineteen instances between 1800 and 1820 where conspiracy charges were upheld against workers' organizations (8:15). The "conspiracy doctrine" was the underlying policy guiding the judicial dicta of this era. Likewise, the "restraint-of-trade doctrine" which has the underlying premises: (1) each individual and the public in general has a right of trade to be free from unreasonable obstruction, (2) that employer and employee have the right to employ their services for money or exchange their money for services of others free from the dictation of others, and (3) that the volume of trade should not suffer unreasonable diminution due to agreements, was applied to create an unlawful end to a lawful union by declaring it an illegal conspiracy (1:506-7).

As mentioned earlier, legal decisions or severe punishments did not deter the formation of workers uniting for a common cause in England. Likewise, this holds true in America. Had the suppressive tactics of management; legislation, thugs, spies, and strikebreakers been



totally successful, unions and associations could possibly have had a less successful history than is indicated. Blau suggests that,

. . . workers participate in unions not only to improve their employment conditions but also because they intrinsically enjoy the fellowship in the union and derive satisfaction from helping to realize its objectives (70:37).

A study of the history of labor unions or associations in America warrants notice that during periods of prosperity, union membership, the number of unions, and the strength of the union tend to increase. Whereas, in periods of depression these organizations suffer losses and little or no activity occurs (1:46, 16:45). Organized labor, being a social institution, (10:3) appears to be affected by social phenomenon, again, as opposed to management suppression.

#### Law and Collective Bargaining in the Private Sector

The specific dangers which one may encounter in discussing the legal aspects of labor are clear. One may become lost in the esoteric technicalities of the law or go wrong on the facts and/or one may lead into a discussion off the main track and of no particular value to the study. Therefore, there is a special need to focus upon significant events which will guide the development of this section toward collective negotiation and its legality today. The investigator seeks to throw light upon the

changing attitudes of society and the judiciary toward labor unions.

The English and American law in its fundamental concepts of free contract, individual liberty and property rights, was the crystallization of the social philosophy of the rising bourgeois or employing class (1:499). Whereas, the Constitution of the United States is based upon the notions of natural and inalienable rights (13:33, 1:25). The natural rights which it especially guarantees are the right to property and the equal protection under the law. These rights of the individual employer and employee became the basis for American law, as it fundamentally was conceived for an individualistic society, in an era when the competitive ideal was uppermost. Among its main purposes, as related to labor, were the protection of freedom of individual contract, freedom of trade, free industrial action of individual, and property rights.

Whereas, unions aim to protect their members against the effect of this individual vulnerability, one might tend to question whether the legality of the union "in fact" had a real meaning. As such, they were legal, but depending upon their method of function, they could easily be judicially ruled lawless (18:685-717, 1:506). This can occur because precedents are the basis of the American judicial system; such as, a law may exist in the statutes but it is

up to the courts to interpret that law. Their interpretation is based upon preceding cases and judicial foresight.

Parker indicates that legislative bodies are more responsive to popular trends and opinions than the courts (6:5). Thus, it should be noted that laws are enacted by the legislative bodies and if judicial dicta is other than that intended by the legislative body, a new law will be passed and evolutionary law occurs.

The evolutionary theory of American law, hopefully, is in concert with the times and moving toward "justice for all." As described in the following cases on labor law, one can clearly see evolutionary justice occur.

America, as well as its legal system, developed partly as a reaction against a previously restrictive system which had outlived its workability and partly in response to a new social philosophy. The legal systems of England and America were pragmatically true for the time of their development, i.e., they harmonized with the general thought of the period and they fitted the conditions and needs of the economic situation. However, America had hardly written its Constitution when the industrial revolution, occurring between the Civil War and World War I, caused a new economic situation and social philosophy which created a need for changes in its laws (1:44).

The industrial revolution had many significant consequences for workers. However, Chief Justice Taft clearly indicated a major consequence when he said,

A single employee was helpless in dealing with an employer. He was dependent ordinarily on his daily wage for the maintenance of himself and family. If the employer refused to pay him the wages that he thought fair, he was nevertheless unable to leave the employ and to resist arbitrary and unfair treatment. Union was essential to give laborers an opportunity to deal equally with their employer (2:372).

During the early years of the 1800's, especially marked by the Philadelphia Cordwainers Case of 1806, the courts ruled in favor of the employer. Later employees were not prosecuted because public opinion was siding with labor (3:23). Despite the hostile attitude of the courts, 1809-1914, and the suppressive tactics of employers, a strong public opinion held that workers should be granted the right to organize unions and employers should be required to recognize and deal with their employees' union.

Businesses were big and getting bigger when in 1890 the small businessman, farmers, and workers succeeded in passing the Sherman Anti-Trust Law aimed at controlling the growth of monopolies (4:10). In the course of time, however, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act had been used as a strike-breaking weapon by the issuance of injunctions (3:103, 1:568). To counter this interpretation of the

Sherman Act by the courts, the Clayton Act was passed in 1914. The Clayton Act was designed to limit and control the granting of temporary restraining orders by the federal courts, to clarify and improve the practice in issuing injunctions, to limit penalties imposed for contempt, and to provide the right of jury trial in cases of criminal contempt (5:79-81 & 112-113, 8:97-98).

There were some defects in the injunction sections of the Clayton Act allowing what pro-union followers considered adverse decisions from the courts. Therefore, the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act was proposed and passed in 1932. Like the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act was designed to change the law as it was being enforced in the federal courts, to limit and regulate the granting of temporary restraining orders and labor injunctions, to provide for jury trial and possible change of trial judge in contempt cases, and to make the "yellow-dog" contract unenforceable (5:124-134, 3:102-112).

The Wagner Act was passed by Congress on June 27, 1935 (7:449). The official name for this act is the National Labor Relations Act, but in this study it shall be referred to by its popular name.

With the passage of the Wagner Act, government approval of collective bargaining reached the high-water mark (6:9). This law was passed to protect and encourage the growth of the union movement (3:915). It also

established the National Labor Relations Board which was designed to implement the purpose of the law.

Public policy had come a long way since the Philadelphia Cordwainer's Case of 1806, for now collective bargaining was socially acceptable (9:230). For the first time, employees had the legal right to self-organize and engage in collective bargaining with their employers while under a legal shield which also provided for penalties to employers who violated it. Needless to say, the growth of unions and of collective bargaining under the Wagner Act was rapid (6.9). Until the passage of the Wagner Act, unions had been the "under-dog."

However, by the end of World War II, charges of irresponsibility and racketeering were mounting against unions. This attitude gained enough momentum in 1947 to have Congress pass the Taft-Hartley Act, officially known as the Labor Management Relations Act. Especially noteworthy is that the Taft-Hartley Act introduced the concept of unfair labor practices on behalf of the unions (9:417). Further control over unions was evidenced when Congress enacted the Landrum-Griffin Labor-Management Reporting Disclosure Act of 1959 (3:916-918). In this act the area of unfair labor practices was broadened and all levels, international to local, were required to reveal internal procedures.

Such legislation, as has been indicated thus far, is often questioned as to whether it is progressive or seeking vengeance. The answer would depend upon the position of the respondent. Being neutral in this study, the investigator looks upon it as the evolutionary process of labor law.

### Collective Bargaining in the Public Sector

Public employees now share many of the same rights extended to the private employee by the enactment of the Wagner Act of 1935. This is evidenced by the proliferation of associations and unions which represent public employees and their ever-increasing memberships.

Prior to the 1960's, the thrust of union organization had been aimed at the blue-collar worker. During this era, America was involved mainly in goods-producing industries as opposed to service-producing industries. There has, however, been a reversal of these trends. Growth in white-collar employment has been under way for many decades. In discussing conditions of the American worker of the 1920's, Bernstein indicated that there was a marked movement from blue-collar work, stating that, "during the twenties, that is, the American worker on an increasing scale took off his overalls and put on a white shirt and necktie (20:55).

The greatest manpower increase has been in local, state, and federal government. And so, government has become one of the nation's largest employers (21:3). Between the years of 1946 and 1966, public employment grew from 5.6 to 11.5 million employees which is slightly better than a one hundred percent increase (21:4). Kruger suggests this expansion of public employment is a result of population growth, war and national defense, urbanization, increased technology, and public demand for more and better services (21:3-4).

It can clearly be seen that public employment has increased, but what factors have influenced the unionization of these public employees? In defense of the traditional policies of unilateral public employer-employee relations, it is usually maintained that government, in its role as employer, is surrounded by special social, economic, political, legal, and ideological considerations (19:6-12). Under such conditions, public employers claiming state sovereignty have rendered collective bargaining unfeasible and undesirable.

Even though such attitudes toward unionism and collective bargaining existed, early cases of unionization and collective bargaining, such as the postal union of the letter carriers of New York City, 1863, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, 1933, are in evidence (21:25, 19:42).



In a society which was promoting unionization and collective bargaining among private employees, it became difficult to sustain differential normative and legal standards for governmental and non-governmental employer-employee relations.

### Federal Level

The Magna Carta of federal collective bargaining was Executive Order 10988, entitled Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service, issued by John F. Kennedy on January 17, 1962 (28:551-556). Executive Order 10988 encouraged unionism in federal employment by such statements as,

. . . the efficient administration of the Government and well-being of employees require that orderly and constructive relationships be maintained between employee organizations and management officials (19:128).

Basically Executive Order 10988 grants:

1. The right to organize and present views collectively to executive officials, Congress or other appropriate authority;
2. The right of an employee organization to informal, formal, or exclusive recognition;
3. The right to formally and exclusively recognized organizations to be consulted and to raise for joint discussion matters of concern to their members; and

4. The right of exclusive representatives to negotiate written agreements applying to all employees within a unit (19:126).

It is astonishing that 11.5 million (21:4) federal, state, and local government employees are employed today on terms which are traceable directly to the medieval doctrine of the divine rights of Kings and that public employer-employee relationships are so far behind employment relations in the private sector.

Following the pattern evidenced in the private sector, the Executive Order 10988 was not interpreted in the most liberal sense as intended by the Presidential Task Force but rather in conformity with the traditional attitude that employee organizations must be resisted and government can best serve the public interest if unhampered by employee organizations (19:103).

The rights retained by management upon issuance of Executive Order 10988 were:

(1) to direct employees of the agency; (2) to hire, promote, transfer, assign, and retain employees in positions within the agency, and to suspend, demote, discharge, or take other disciplinary action against employees; (3) to relieve employees from duties for lack of work or other legitimate reasons; (4) to maintain the efficiency of the government operations entrusted to them; (5) to determine the methods, means, and personnel for conducting such operations; and (6) to take whatever actions may be necessary to carry out the mission of the agency in emergency situations (22:144).

The traditional attitude toward unionism and collective bargaining in the public sector was instrumental in fostering the problems influencing the success of collective bargaining. Thompson and Weinstock have concluded that,

Managerial attitudes toward employee organizations may prove to be the most important factor influencing collective bargaining in the public service. There can be little doubt that the attitudes of white-collar TVA employees toward and the obvious success of collective bargaining have mainly been the product of TVA management's affirmative willingness to share its decision-making powers with unions in matters affecting the employees (23:21).

Despite the general agreement that Executive Order 10988 has had a positive effect upon public employer-employee relations in federal government, it was stated in 1969 that collective bargaining was still a partially attained objective in federal government labor relations (24:168).

Major criticism of Executive Order 10988 were aimed at the facts that no provisions for the settlement of impasses had been established and that it was one-sided, favoring management. Late in 1967, President Johnson established a commission to examine Executive Order 10988 because it established the form and not the meaningful substance dealing with collective bargaining (25). However, President Johnson never got around to initiating any action concerning Executive Order 10988.

In 1969, President Nixon also established a committee to deal with Executive Order 10988 and as a result Executive

Order 11491, entitled Labor-Management Relations in the Federal Service, emerged (27:1501). Here again, one can witness an evolutionary process in the development of labor law.

A comparative analysis (26) of Executive Order 10988 and Executive Order 11941 by the School of Labor and Industrial Relations at Michigan State University, revealed changes in the more recent executive order. Major changes could be categorized into administrative procedural changes and process (new pieces of machinery) changes.

The administrative procedural changes noted were the broadening of the determination of the bargaining unit, clarification of the scope of negotiation, elimination of formal and informal recognition, and the granting of exclusive recognition on a majority basis by secret ballot and determining unfair labor practices.

The new pieces of machinery established for dealing with negotiation impasses were the establishment of a central authority, Federal Labor-Relations Council, to administer the program, the transfer of authority from agency heads to the Assistant Secretary of Labor to decide administrative disputes, and the creation of the Federal Service Impasse Panel within the Labor Relations Council to settle impasses on substantive issues in negotiations (27:1508). In a summarizing statement, Professor Repas (25) concluded that there have been substantial improvements in Executive Order 11941 over Executive Order 10988.

### State and Local Level

Collective bargaining in state and local government developed in much the same manner as collective bargaining in the private sector prior to and after (31:138-139) the Wagner Act of 1935. The Wagner Act provided the machinery for the enforcement of union rights in the private sector. Only recently, following the lead of the federal government, have states adopted legislation establishing collective bargaining for state and local employees.

Prior to 1962, some state legislation had been enacted which had guaranteed the right of public employees to join labor unions and spelled out the right of the employer to enter into collective bargaining contracts with unions (29). Generally, legislation remained permissive and did not require the employer to negotiate with the employee organization.

However, the impetus from Executive Order 10988 led to enactment of laws in 1965 in Michigan (30:18), Massachusetts (30:12), and Connecticut (30:1) which made it compulsory for public employers to bargain with representatives chosen by the workers. Failure to comply with these statutes resulted in an unfair labor practice.

Public reaction, success of the unions, the attitude of public officials, and an increase in liberal legislation favoring collective bargaining are all creating an atmosphere of union acceptance which has heretofore barely tolerated the existence of unions in public employment.

### Collective Negotiation in Public Education

As indicated previously, there has been a tremendous growth in public employment, especially in the various levels of government. At the state and local levels, education is the largest user of government employees (21:5-7). Since public education is the primary responsibility of each state, those states that have passed legislation providing for public employees to negotiate with public agencies have, in a sense, provided a "Little Wagner Act" for those involved in public education. Thus, changing the relationship between public employer-employee from one of "sovereign-slave" to a "partner in democracy."

John Horvat indicates that,

Negotiation is a rapidly growing force in American education because it is a method by which teachers can gain some real control over decision-making in the schools. No longer can administrators and board members choose to, or afford to, reject out of hand or ignore the requests and demands of teacher groups. Collective negotiation processes create political, psychological, and in some cases legal pressures which force boards and administrators to listen to and respond to the demands of teachers of their districts (72:53-54).

Apparently the first formal collective negotiation agreement in education was between the Norwalk Teachers' Association and the Norwalk Board of Education in 1946. This contract resulted from a bitter teacher's strike (42:7). Between 1946 and 1962 many agreements, most of which were in Connecticut, were entered into by boards of education and faculty.

Since the Norwalk Teachers' Association and the Norwalk Board of Education agreement, much has happened in educational employer-employee relations. Whether one picks up a scholarly journal, popular magazine, or daily newspaper, articles dealing with collective negotiation, teacher power, new collective bargaining legislation, strikes, impasse procedures, and dispute settlements are ever present. These articles indicate the characteristics of employer-employee relationships in education today.

If one were to attempt to locate the single event that stimulated teacher organizations around the country to greater collective activity, it would have to be the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by the United Federation of Teachers and the New York City Board of Education in 1962. Charles Schmidt of the School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University, wrote,

Although there are probably thousands of examples of some type of consultations between teachers and boards of education over the past fifty years or more, the acknowledged breakthrough that served as a forerunner for contemporary bargaining activity in Michigan and elsewhere was the December, 1961, recognition of the United Federation of Teachers as the exclusive bargaining agent for public school teachers in New York City. Their negotiated settlement has been followed by similar settlements in Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, and hundreds of other districts throughout the nation (32:3-4).

Whereas, collective negotiation in education began in the public elementary and secondary schools, this has been the area which has experienced the greatest expansion

of negotiation. However, collective negotiation at the two and four-year college level is becoming more widespread. At the present time, Central Michigan University, Rutgers, Southeastern Massachusetts University, St. Johns University, Lawrence Tech, and City University of New York (CUNY) are four-year institutions operating under negotiated contracts (43.5). Other four-year institutions are in various stages of development such as signing of authorization cards and carrying out representational elections (44:1).

An article in the Educators Negotiating Service entitled "Teachers Unions Proliferate on Junior College Campuses" calls attention to junior colleges involved in collective negotiations.

As evidence of the increase in collective negotiations on junior college campuses, the Cook County College Teachers Union in Chicago presently is the bargaining agent for twelve junior colleges, an increase of eight from the 1969 school year. Another indication is that the AFT membership in California junior colleges rose ten per cent in 1969.

Union organizers find it easier to organize junior college campuses than four-year institutions. Norman Severson, president of the Cook County AFT affiliate, observes, "Junior colleges are particularly fertile ground for organizing because the . . . teachers have too long



been receiving second-class treatment." The article goes on to indicate two key factors, in their opinion, which spur junior college organization, that being:

(1) lower pay and (2) heavier teaching loads than the four-year schools. (71:54)\*

Organizational activity at the two-year college level has been much greater than at the four-year college level, resulting in a substantially greater number of negotiated contracts. Frankie and Howe discussed faculty participation in the two-year college in an article titled, "Faculty Power in the Community College," saying,

At no other formal level of education are faculty members' militant efforts greater than they are in the two-year college where their pressures to participate more directly have forced changes in its nature and administration (109:83).

#### Michigan's "Little Wagner Act" for Public Employees

The Public Employment Relations Act (Act 336 of Public Acts of 1947, as amended by Act 379 of Public Acts of 1965), hereafter referred to as PERA, was signed into law on July 23, 1965, by Governor Romney. Upon signing PERA into law, Romney issued the following statement that said, in part:

The bill is the most basic revision of the act (Hutchinson Act) since its adoption in 1947. The major provision of the bill gave public employees

---

\* The proceeding two paragraphs mainly paraphrase this article.

primarily at the local level, the rights of organization and collective bargaining.

It also eliminates the automatic penalties for striking employees but permits employers to discipline striking employees, to the extend of discharge, with the employees having the right of appeal to circuit court.

It is apparent that public employees in our state and throughout the nation are demanding and deserve a greater voice in their own working conditions than we have historically given them (33:5-6).

The Michigan PERA encompasses all public employees in any branch of public service in Michigan except state employees within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission. Major provisions of the Michigan PERA are as follows:

Sections 1, 3, 6, and 7 are amendments to existing sections of Act Number 336 of the Public Acts of 1947 (Hutchinson Act). Eight new sections were added to stand as cited:

1. Right to organize (Section 9) - Public employees may lawfully organize, form, join or assist in labor organizations for the purpose of collective bargaining.
2. Unfair labor practices of employer (Section 10)-
  - (a) to interfere with, restrain or coerce public employees in the exercise of their rights guaranteed in section 9. (b) To initiate, create, dominate, contribute to or interfere with the formation or administration of any labor organization: Provided, that a public employer shall not be prohibited from permitting employees to confer with it during working hours without loss of time or pay.
  - (c) To discriminate in regard to hire, terms or other conditions of employment in order to encourage or discourage membership in a labor

organization. (d) To discriminate against the public employee because he has given testimony or instituted proceedings under this act. (e) To refuse to bargain collectively with the representatives of its public employees, subject to the provisions of section 11.

3. Voluntary designation of bargaining representatives (Section 11) - Representatives designated or selected for purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the public employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the public employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment or other conditions of employment, and shall be so recognized by the public employer.
4. Non-voluntary recognition (Section 12) - Whenever a petition shall have been filed in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the board: (a) By a public employee or group of public employees, or an individual or labor organization acting in their behalf, alleging that 30% or more of the public employees within a unit claimed to be appropriate for such purpose wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their public employer declines to recognize their representative. (b) By a public employer or his representative alleging that one or more individuals or labor organizations have presented to him a claim to be recognized as the representative described in section 11.
5. Determining the bargaining unit (Section 13) - The board shall decide in each case, or in order to insure public employees the full benefit of their right to self organization, to collective bargaining and otherwise to effectuate the policies of this act, the unit appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining.
6. Elections (Section 14) - An election shall not be directed in any bargaining unit or any subdivision within which, in the preceding 12-month

period, a valid election has been held. The board shall determine who is eligible to vote in the election and shall establish rules governing the election.

7. Duties of employer and employees (Section 15) - . . . to bargain collectively is the performance of the mutual obligation of the employer and the representative of the employees to meet at reasonable times and confer in good faith with respect to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, or the negotiation of an agreement, or any question arising thereunder, and the execution of a written contract, ordinance or resolution incorporating any agreement reached if requested by either party but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or to require the making of a concession.
8. Remedies and procedures for unfair labor practices (Section 16) - Violations of the provisions of section 10 shall be deemed to be unfair labor practices remediable by the Labor Mediation Board (35:745-750).

The PERA of Michigan is similar to the National Labor Relations Act (36:29) in that it (1) is administered by a specific body, the Employment Relations Commission, formerly the Labor Mediation Board, and (2) its provisions are similar.

The Employment Relations Commission's responsibilities are (1) labor relations division which conducts representation and decertification elections and is concerned with unfair labor practices, and (2) the mediation division which helps the parties reach mutually agreeable settlements of disputes (34:5).

In summary, keeping in mind the Presidential Executive Orders and the Michigan PERA, the major distinctions

between various aspects of collective bargaining in industry and collective negotiation in education as indicated by Shils and Whittier are:

1. There appears to be a body of legislative documents providing ground rules for labor-management relations in industry. Whereas, educators find the field of information and precedent somewhat barren.
2. Industry has bargaining specialists. Whereas, education is without experienced personnel in this area.
3. Industry has a sound body of tradition in regard to scope of bargaining. Whereas, education has not yet determined what is negotiable.
4. Industrial strikes arouse little public interest. Whereas, education strikes become well publicized (59:151-157).

#### Collective Negotiation in Michigan Community Colleges

Legislatively lawful bargaining began in the Michigan community colleges shortly after the enactment of the Michigan PERA. By January 26, 1971, twenty-six of the twenty-nine community college faculties in Michigan had elected bargaining agents to represent them.

A total of sixteen of these institutions are represented by the Michigan Education Association, four are represented by the Michigan Federation of Teachers, six are independently represented (not affiliated with a national parent organization), and three have not elected bargaining representatives and are not involved in formal collective negotiation.

In looking at the founding dates of the community colleges and their involvement in collective negotiation, it is interesting to note that all community colleges in Michigan with a founding date of 1965 or after, of which there are eight, have elected bargaining agents and are engaged in collective negotiation. Table 2.1 summarizes this information for the Michigan community colleges as of January 26, 1971.

John Helper summarizes the unionization of higher education in Michigan when he said:

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 would come to a four-year institution in the Wolverine State (110:104).

### Decision-Making

The decision-making process has undergone changes through time. Apparently, in the early days, managers made decisions based to a large extent on hunch, intuition, and guess. F. W. Taylor recognized this and preached the word of "scientific analysis" instead of the rule of thumb. Gradually through the years managers have turned to the "scientific" rather than the intuitive approach to problem solving, as did Taylor. Once they recognized the value of the scientific approach to making decisions, managers have continued to develop their skills in the use of

TABLE 2.1.--\* Identification of Michigan Community Colleges by Founding Dates and Bargaining Agent.

Bargaining Agent		MEA	MFT		INDEPENDENT		No Agent	
Founding Date Prior to 1965	Alpena	1952	Highland Park	1918	Bay De Noc	1962	Delta	1957
	Genesee	1923	Henry Ford	1938	Grand Rapids	1914	North Central	1958
	Gogebic	1932	Lake Michigan	1946	Macomb	1962	Northwestern	1951
	Jackson	1928			Oakland	1964		
	Kellogg	1956						
	Lansing	1957						
	Monroe	1964						
	Muskegon	1926						
	St. Clair	1923						
	Schoolcraft	1961						
	Southwestern	1964						
Founding Date 1965 or After	Glen Oaks	1965	Wayne County	1968	Kirtland	1966		
	Kalamazoo	1966			West Shore	1967		
	Mid Michigan	1965						
	Montcalm	1965						
	Washtenaw	1965						

\*The table style found in this dissertation is that recommended by William W. Farquhar, "Directions for Thesis Preparation," Michigan State University, Spring, 1969.

scientific rather than haphazard decision-making models.

The development of the computer, of course, has done much to change management's approach to decision-making, inasmuch as it has made it possible for a manager to have vast quantities of information about both internal and external facts about the organization at his call. He is, as a result, learning to scientifically synthesize, interrelate, and use knowledge from diverse sources in the form of quantitative models.

Community colleges, as well as other educational institutions and businesses, have evolved organizational structures that exhibit many of the characteristics of bureaucracy (as defined by Weber and elaborated by other students of formal organization). Max Weber, a German sociologist, is considered by many to be the father of the modern concept of "bureaucracy," which one may think of as synonymous with "massive organization." Weber opted for an "ideal type" of bureaucracy. The name, ideal type, was not to be construed as a value judgment, rather it stood for a model of bureaucratic operation. Basically the "ideal type" included:

Emphasis on form. Its first, most cited, and most general feature has to do with its emphasis on form of organization. In a sense the rest are examples of this.

The concept of hierarchy. The organization follows the principle of hierarchy, with each lower



office under the control and supervision of a higher one.

Specialization of task. Incumbents are chosen on the basis of merit and ability to perform specialized aspects of a total operation.

A specified sphere of competence. This flows from the previous point. It suggests that the relationships between the various specializations should be clearly known and observed in practice. In a sense the use of job descriptions in many American organizations is a practical application of this requirement.

Establish norms of conduct. There should be as little as possible in the organization that is unpredictable. Policies should be enunciated and the individual actors within the organization should see that these policies are implemented.

Records. Administrative acts, decisions, and rules should be recorded as a means of insuring predictability of performance within the bureaucracy (37:56-57).

Weber's theories about formal hierarchy contain a command and authority structure which flows from the top of the organization down through the ranks.

The challenge to this traditional concept of top-down authority came in the mid-nineteen thirties by Chester I. Barnard (38). The essence of the Barnard thesis is that people differ in their degree of effort exhibited to achieve the organizational goals and that the organization must in some way secure their willingness to pursue these goals. Barnard also postulated that the degree of effective authority is measured by the willingness of his

subordinates to accept it. In this sense, Barnard viewed authority as deligated upward (38:92-94).

A metamorphosis of organizational theory was developed by Emery E. Olson on the basis of materials prepared by John M. Pfiffner. Table 2.2 is a reproduction of this data.

As indicated in Table 2.2, there has been a change in decision-making theory from decisions as an individual, highly centralized act to decisions as collegial, situational; thus, a review of that process is in order.

Roger Jones generated the following model from various plans on how (step by step) to arrive at a decision.

The decision maker cannot avoid choosing when, how, whether, and in what order his problem requires him to:

1. analyze the situation to be sure there is a problem.
2. collect facts.
3. analyze the relationship between facts and the problem.
4. consider new ideas and new ways to tackle the problem.
5. weigh alternative courses of action.
6. choose a course of action.
7. rejudge that course in the light of four questions;
  - a. will it achieve the purpose?
  - b. will it actually solve the problem?
  - c. is it feasible?
  - d. are there undesirable results to offset the advantages?

Table 2.2.--Trends in Organizational Theory.

FROM	TO
Traditionalism	Social Dynamics
Job-Task Hierarchy	Social Process
Efficiency as a Mechanical Process	Efficiency as a Human Process
Organization as a Bureaucratic Structure	Organization as a Social Institution
Control through Command	Control through Communication
Authority from the Top Down	Authority from the Group
Leadership by Authority	Leadership by Consent
Decisions as an Individual, Centralized Act	Decisions as Collegial, Situational
Regimented Work Environment	Democratic Work Environment
Technological Change by Fiat	Technological Change by Consultation
Social or Financial Incentive	Social and Financial Incentives
Job as Subsistence	Job as Satisfying Experience
Planning as Crisis Technique	Planning as Formalized Process
Incomplete and Delayed Information	Complete and Current Information
Policy and Administration Dichotomy	Policy and Administration Continuum
Profit with Buccaneering	Profit with Social Responsibility

8. make and issue a decision.
9. follow it up (39:160).

The new concepts of authority and the group dynamics movement, coupled with the advent of collective negotiation, have sired a new approach to decision-making. The investigator sees this new approach as a continuance of the established process of arriving at a decision as indicated by Jones, but changing the "who" will be involved in making the decision and to "what degree" they will be involved.

The old authoritarian style of management permitted little or no employee involvement in administrative matters. The "boss" was rewarded and evaluated in terms of his success at making decisions, while the employee was subject to these decisions but had no say about them. Today the group-centered concept of organization calls for a type of leadership which will stimulate group as well as individual response.

Emphasis upon new decision theory came into being about forty years ago. It was then that Herbert Simon discussed the features of organizational structure and function as being derived from the characteristics of human problem-solving processes and rational choice (40:169). Through Simon's writings there is a common thread reflecting his bias in favor of group involvement in decision-making.

Simon feels it is impossible for one person to determine all consequences and alternative strategies stating:

The number of alternatives he must explore is so great, the information he would need to evaluate them so vast that even an approximation to objective reality is hard to conceive (45:79).

Continued development of group structure, situations and involvement gave rise to the concern of human needs. Taxonomies of such needs were generated by Maslow, Hertzberg, and McGregor. They generally followed a pattern which progressed from basic physiological and safety needs to needs for realizing one's own potentialities, continued self-development and creativity (56:18).

Arguments have been forwarded in justification of faculty involvement in community college decision-making. In a recent Junior College Journal article, Atwell and Watkins discuss a rational approach toward faculty, student, and administrative involvement in the organizational processes of their institutions, indicating:

It is readily apparent that our society has come to depend to an increasing degree on work which is performed by groups and teams rather than by individuals working alone (56:17).

Eugene Fram suggests that faculty involvement is essential because "they represent the scholarship in American life, the important basis of higher education " (46:390). The implication here is that the quality of

education will improve as a result of faculty participation. Roger Garrison also supports the concept of enriched educational quality through faculty participation (47:517-525).

A second justification for faculty participation was noted in a Phi Delta Kappan article describing the consequences of teacher negotiations in Michigan. Here, Richard Dashiell indicates that the realization of a more significant teacher role in policy formulation has facilitated an increase in faculty morale. He concludes:

. . . not only has improvement been achieved in many areas of welfare and instruction, but the morale of the teacher in the classroom moved forward several light years (48:20-21).

Peter Blomerly, in an assessment of the role of the junior college faculty on decision-making, also found morale to be positively correlated with the influence attributed to faculty members in departmental decision-making (51:39).

Burton Clark adds a third justification. He proposes that the inclusion of faculty members in matters of institutional governance tends to enhance the psychological identification of the faculty with the college. He states:

In a sense, a faculty that captures control is also captured in return, committed to the college by involvement in policy making (49:300).

The fact that the faculty and administrators should be a group decision-making body as opposed to one

person commanding all decision-making power is best summarized in a quotation by John Galbraith:

When power is exercised by a group, not only does it pass into the organization but it passes irrevocably. If an individual has taken a decision he can be called before another individual who is his superior in the hierarchy, his information can be examined and his decision reversed by the greater wisdom or experience of his superior. But if the decision required the combined information of a group, it cannot be safely reversed by an individual. He will have to get the judgment of other specialists. This turns the power once more to the organization (50:18).

Blomerley indicates that there has been a trend toward increasing the participation of junior college faculties in institutional governance. However, junior college faculty members are more concerned about being involved in decisions relating to personnel matters and working conditions than other areas of departmental concern (51:38-39).

How did the junior college faculty member upset the traditional administrative structure of their institutions? With the administrative pyramid, superior-subordinate relationships existed which permitted trustees to control the institution, administrators to control faculty, and faculty to control students. Faculties have challenged and changed, in some cases, the authority relationships through:

1. collective bargaining legislation.
2. the withholding of services.
3. the promotion of tenure laws, and
4. other efforts aimed at establishing the independence of the teaching profession from undesired domination of either administration or the board (57:21, 58:3).

In spite of arguments favoring faculty involvement in decision-making, such factors as the changing nature of the community college, enrollment increases, the broadened curriculum, and the old, established concepts concerning who should "run" the college have created problems and situations which tend to prevent or at least deter the fruition of the new faculty role in decision-making.

The centralization of the decision-making process tends to emerge with the increasing complexity of institutions. A wide assortment of organizational structures has come into being, all of which seem to reflect highly specialized divisions of labor and management. This pattern implies that extensive faculty involvement in matters of "administrative concern" is undesirable. John Corson mentions four characteristics of higher education systems which tend to inhibit faculty effectiveness in the area of policy formulation:

1. increasing lack of necessary information related to policy formation and/or recommendation.



2. most faculty members are subject-matter specialists, and few are educators in a comprehensive sense.
3. most policy is formulated by bits and pieces without comprehensive consideration of the educational program or prevailing practice.
4. as subject-matter specialists, faculty members tend to resist proposals that might encroach upon the established preserves of each subject-matter discipline (52:104).

Educators throughout the nation and at all levels have arduously debated these two positions concerning faculty involvement.

Priest (53) and Garrison (54) both indicate that the lack of faculty involvement in policy formulation is a major source of animosity between community college administrators and faculty members.

In the final course of action, whether the faculty is included or excluded from the decision-making process, it is important to keep in mind George Odiorne's statement:

It is far better never to have asked subordinates to participate in decisions that affect them, than to ask them--, and then ignore what they have to say (55:26).

#### Related Studies

Collective negotiation, as an area of educational research, is relatively new. Most of the writing in this area is recent. A comprehensive survey of the literature revealed several studies of a pertinent nature.

### Studies of Faculty Involvement

Studies of faculty involvement have, for the most part, indicated a desire on behalf of the faculty to have a greater role in the making of decisions. This can come about only by readjustment of authority roles in the operation of the educational institution.

The investigator reviewed the 1970-1971 negotiated contracts of the Michigan community colleges, noting the breadth of scope of issues bargained. The scope of bargaining included such items as:

Curriculum	Personnel Policies
Class Size	Provisions for Physical Facilities for Instructors
Discharge and Discipline of Teachers	Salaries and Wages
Grievance Procedures	Teaching Assignments
In-Service Education	Transfers and Promotions*
Leaves of Absence	

Looking at this list, one can see that the faculty by means of their representative organization have become involved in areas which have heretofore been administrative spheres of control. This faculty involvement has brought about a change in the traditional role of the administrator bringing about conflict and readjustment.

The process of conflict was investigated by Cave (60:15) when he visited school districts in which the school administrator was involved in conflict with the teachers' union. Cave looked at the impact of leadership

---

\*This list is not intended to be comprehensive but shows broad areas of faculty involvement.

behavior of school administrators on teacher-negotiation strife. A Leadership Behavior Questionnaire was used to develop an ideal administrative behavior. A sample of administrators, teachers' union representatives, and school board members involved in a conflict situation were given the questionnaire asking them to record the behavior of administrators in this conflict situation. Cave concluded that administrators contribute to the conflict by their lack of arbitration and group skills and pointed out a need for administrator training programs.

Potts examined the possible change in the administrative task performance of principals. In the study, Potts looked at the effect of negotiations in one state and the lack of negotiations in another state upon the task performance of principals, concluding, in part:

1. Change has taken place in the task performance of Michigan and Indiana high school principals over the past five years.
2. These task performance changes have been greater in Michigan than those in Indiana, a state not having compulsory professional negotiations.
3. These changes of task performance cannot be directly attributed to the passage of a professional negotiation statute.
4. The organizational patterns of high schools have no relation to the task performance of principals (61:113).

Olsen (62) did a survey which pointed up the fact that most principals felt they should be involved in professional negotiations as members of a total teachers'

organization. It was felt this membership was needed to retain the principal's authority. It is pointed out, however, that where the future of the child is at stake, there should be no teacher-principal conflict and they should be avoided at all costs.

Garver in his study of the attitudes of principals toward negotiations revealed that principals who participated on the board of education bargaining team had a better attitude toward the total process of negotiation than did those who did not (63:206).

This is carried one step further by Munger's study of the attitudes of Michigan principals toward negotiating their own school board contract. Munger concluded that a majority of Michigan principals should have the right and should negotiate a contract with their local board of education (64:110).

Involvement studies at the community college level were conducted by Campbell (65) and Nicholson (66) to analyze faculty positions within the influence structure of the community college. The findings of these studies indicate that faculty involvement is minimal and that it tends to be subordinated to the direction of administrators.

Garrison (54) supports these findings in a study aimed at identifying issues and problems of community college faculties. He concluded that community college

faculties perceive themselves as having little or no voice in the policy affairs of the institution.

Murphy, in a study examining attitudinal factors which influence faculty morale and perceptions of involvement, concluded:

1. Faculty involvement in the formulation of community college policy is limited.
2. Faculty members deserve a high level of involvement in the formulation of community college policy.
3. Current levels of faculty involvement in community college policy formulation are considered inadequate to the extent that they fall below the desired levels (68:137).

While investigating the Chicago junior college teachers' strike in 1967, Swenson and Novar (107) found that the deterioration of administration-faculty relationships was due, in large part, to a total exclusion of the faculty in the policy making process.

In another study Dunn, et al., (108) surveyed the faculty and administrators at Peralta Junior College, located in California, in an effort to determine reactions to a plan implemented for faculty involvement in policy formulation. They found that most respondents felt that the plan had fostered better communications and working relations between administrators and faculty.

The findings of studies related to community college faculty involvement in policy formulation have been minimal. One area of exception seems to be in the area of

curricular policy. It is also evident that the formal role of the community college faculty member is not that of a policy formulator.

However, Whittier suggests:

Decision-making in educational institutions is shifting away from the tradition of unilateral action taken by one group or individual in the system and accepted by most other members. More and more the process is involving the participation of representatives of many of those who will be influenced by a decision (69:44).

He goes on to say that institutions will be stronger if the knowledge and expertise of all members of the organization can be effectually utilized (69:45). Harnak supports and extends this idea, saying cooperative and individual teacher decision-making in today's schools is a necessary staff activity (104:12).

#### Related Studies of Decision-Making

In the area of decision-making, studies tend to point out a need for emerging administrators to be prepared and meet the challenge of collective negotiation in education.

Capper and Gaddy suggest:

Faculty participation in institutional governance is one of the most controversial issues facing the contemporary community junior college. According to the American Association of Higher Education Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, the future pattern of governance in institutions of higher education depends on the manner in which administrators deal with faculty aspirations (105:1).

Capper and Gaddy feel that if an institution does not have a faculty senate which provides faculty members with means of policy-formation and policy-implementation, it can expect external pressure from organizations whose interests may not be consistent with those of the institution.

The challenge is for administrators to adjust and cope with greater decision-making involvement of faculty and non-instructional personnel in decisions which affect them; for the purpose of collective negotiation is to secure an active role in determining institutional decisions.

It is not uncommon for administrators, board members and others to claim that all of the aspects of school planning, decision-making, and operations were shared with teachers long before collective negotiation procedures became prevalent. However, the difference today is that the sharing is no longer a matter of permitting teachers to participate in decision-making and planning. Sharing is seen by a large number of today's teachers as a matter of formal and often legislated right, rather than privilege (72:55-56).

Ann Mitchel states the teachers' position in education, saying:

. . . In the educational hierarchy, he is the low man. . . In the power structure, he is the one without power. In the line of order, he is the one who takes orders from everyone else. He has little chance to exercise creativity, to show intelligence, or to use democratic procedures. He has no say in the important decisions affecting the schools. The educational system in America today is a vertical hierarchy and the teacher is at the bottom (100:66).

University decision-making is discussed by Charles Neff in a recent Journal of Higher Education article, stating:

The ways virtually all universities make decisions--particularly crucial decisions about resource allocations--are still geared more to the traditional conceptions of the university's social role than to the new demands to which higher education is being asked to respond. Decision making based on unexamined assumptions about purpose, process, and organization are not likely to work effectively much longer (106:116-117).

Teachers are determined to change the present level of involvement and are winning a voice for themselves in the decision-making process. If this educational change is occurring, how are administrators preparing for this adjustment? Scott surveyed the nature of the preparation program for school administrators in its relation to collective negotiation (101:1). The sample for this study included eleven deans of the colleges of education from big ten schools plus Wayne State University and ninety-eight school superintendents randomly selected from midwestern school districts which were involved in collective negotiation. Scott concluded that he found no appropriate programs or agreement on what plan to utilize in providing administrators with the information or teaching the skills needed in the area of collective negotiation.

In the area of instructional decision making, Steele (102) investigated the impact of collective bargaining on



the improvement of instruction. She found that there were significantly more instructional provisions in Michigan master contracts in the second year of negotiating than were present in the first year of negotiating. This tends to point out teacher interest in taking an active part in instructional decisions. Harnack concurs by saying:

. . . that the needs of the decision-making teacher . . . are outgrowths of a deep concern professional teachers have for the improvement of an instructional program. Also, there are need which were not described (salary, economic security, status, and the like) because they are not directly related to the improvement of instruction. However, all these items are inextricably tangled, one to another, in such a way that few would dare to separate them -- even academically (104:101).

The area of institutional response in urban school systems was investigated by Gittell and Hollander in 1968 (103). The authors selected six large city school systems, assuming that innovation was a valid measure by which big school systems could be evaluated. Some of the pertinent conclusions were:

1. Public school systems have removed decision-making from the agents closest to the school-child -- the teachers and parents, violating traditionally established goals of public education.
2. Parents have been sidelined in educational policy-making constantly reminded by professionals of their lack of expertise.
3. Because participants in the policy process are so limited, alternatives are also limited, and school policy choices are narrowly conceived. Innovation is rare, and creativity, competition and experimentation are discouraged.

4. School systems are very much a product of the political culture of the city. On the other hand, school systems seem to have little influence on the political culture of the city.

Love (98), in 1968, looked at the impact of teacher negotiations on school system decision-making. He found that although administrative and school board discretion is narrowed by collective negotiations, administrators quickly learn to use the negotiation process to preserve areas of discretion and school boards retain their right to represent the public interest and make all final decisions. Love also concluded that:

1. Evidence suggested that the establishment of collective negotiation does enlarge teacher participation in decision making.
2. Collective negotiation creates a new structure of decision making and a need for the readjustment of teacher, administrator, and school board roles within it.
3. The process of negotiation is primarily concerned with the determination of personnel policies, and
4. Educational policies are being negotiated but, in addition, non-negotiating decision-processes are being created for the involvement of teachers in complex educational decisions.

Thus far, involvement and decision-making studies have been discussed, but what is and can one identify the decision-making process at a specific educational institution? Annette TenElshof (77) designed a study to determine if there is a single overall process for decision-making

in the small college and to discover who is making the decisions. The sample for this study included the administration, faculty, and students at the University of Michigan at Flint. From the findings of the study, she concluded that:

1. There is a single overall decision-making process which can be measured.
2. There is a perceived power structure at the University of Michigan at Flint.
3. In most areas related to the faculty the students have not contributed in the decision making.
4. In the decisions involving students the results suggest that the students are told about the decision rather than participating in them.

### Summary

Chapter II proceeds from the concept of collective bargaining to collective negotiation in education today. This was accomplished by discussing the labor movement in the United States, public and private sector bargaining, decision-making theory, and trends and related studies.

Labor in the United States has moved from indentured servants to enslavement to free workers. As early as 1786, workers attempted to organize but were

restricted by a system which had outlived its workability. Restrictive laws had been in concert with the general thought of this early period but such notable legislation as the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, the Clayton Act, the Wagner Act, and Executive Orders 10988 and 11491 are examples of the evolutionary process of law enabling collective bargaining to become socially acceptable.

Decision-making theory was also experiencing a metamorphosis during the mid-nineteen-thirties. This change was from decisions as an individual, highly centralized act to decisions which are collegial and situational. The new concepts of authority and the group dynamics movement, coupled with the advent of collective negotiation, have sired a new approach to decision-making.

Studies of faculty involvement have, for the most part, indicated a desire on behalf of the faculty to have a greater role in the making of decisions.

In the area of decision-making, studies tend to point out a need for emerging administrators to be prepared and meet the challenge of collective negotiation in education.

It should be noted that no emperical investigations concerned with the degree and level of

decision-making influence in community colleges have been conducted.

## CHAPTER III

### THE METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The literature reported in Chapter II provides a background for an investigation of the relationship between collective negotiation and the task of decision-making. The complexity of the task of arriving at a decision, due to a vast number of variables affecting a final choice, points up a need for an investigation of the present state of involvement in decision-making. To better understand the present situation, the study also looks at the prenegotiating period of involvement in decision-making.

In this chapter, the population of the study will be identified, the source and collection of the data described, a description of the instrument given, and the statistical treatment of the data discussed.\*

#### Definition of the Population

There are four community colleges involved in this study, two with formally negotiated contracts, two without formally negotiated contracts.\*\*

---

\*The statistical treatment of the data was parametric analysis of possibly nonparametric data.

\*\*See Appendix E.

The population of this study consists of 129 full-time faculty members and eight administrators under contract with their specific community college from 1965 or prior and through the 1970/71 academic year. The reason there are so few administrators included in this study is that there are so few administrators meeting the criteria of having been administrators of their institutions from 1964 to 1970.

Administrator and faculty listings published in Michigan community college catalogues from the year 1964 through 1971, the Directory of Institutions of Higher Education, Pattersons American Education, and the Michigan Education Directory and Buyer's Guide were the references for identifying the population of this study. In June, 1971, the four participating community colleges provided the names and addresses of all full-time faculty members who had been employed at their respective institutions since 1965 or prior to that date and who are still employed within the institution.

#### Source of the Data

The total population, consisting of 137 participants, is the source of the data for this study.

Identification of the participants was based upon the following criteria:

1. The basis for the selection of Michigan community colleges involved in collective negotiation was

(1) the founding date of the institution must have been prior to 1964; (2) the institution must be presently functioning under a negotiated written agreement; (3) the president and one other administrator must have been employed as administrators of their respective institutions from 1964 to 1970 (minimum) and; (4) the faculty must be represented in the negotiation process by their designated representative.

Based upon the above criteria, two Michigan community colleges were identified. Their names have been kept anonymous to protect their rights and privacy.

2. The basis for the selection of Michigan community colleges not involved in collective negotiation was (1) the founding date must have been prior to 1964; (2) the institution must never have been and not now be functioning under a negotiated written agreement; (3) the president and one other administrator must have been employed as administrators of their respective institutions from 1964 to 1970 (minimum), and; (4) the faculty must not be represented by a bargaining agent.

Based upon the above criteria, two Michigan community colleges were identified. Their names have been kept anonymous to protect their rights and privacy.

Having identified the institutions which met the specified criteria, the administrators and full-time



faculty members to participate in the study were also determined.

The administrative participants were contacted by telephone, prior to the mailing of the questionnaire, to secure their expressed willingness to participate in this study. Following this, letters of introduction and questionnaires\* were sent to 145 possible participants (all faculty and administrators who met the defined criteria).

The first returns revealed eight faculty members were not eligible due to recent promotions to administrative positions, identification errors on behalf of the first year of employment and self disqualification. On the basis of this information, the original population was thereby reduced to 137.

The first correspondence with the sample produced 50 useable returns. Follow up letters\*\* and a second copy of the questionnaire was mailed to all non-respondents on July 19, 1971.

A total of 85 useable questionnaires were returned from both sets of correspondence. This response represents 62.94 percent of the revised sample, two individuals expressed a preference not to participate in the study,

---

\* See Appendices B and D.

\*\* See Appendix C.

and 50 failed to respond, (See Table 3.1.) Of the eight administrators who met the criteria to be included in this study, six returned questionnaires. Of the 129 faculty members who met the criteria to be included in this study, 79 returned questionnaires.

TABLE 3.1.--Sample Responses.

Response Category	Frequency by Institution*				Percent
	1	2	3	4	
Useable Returns	42	18	18	7	62.04
Refuse to Participate	1	1	0	0	1.46
No Response	27	10	10	3	36.50
Totals	70	29	28	10	100.00

\* Schools one and two throughout the study will be bargaining institutions and schools three and four will be non-bargaining institutions.

A relatively high percentage of useable returns together with the distribution of responses from participating institutions suggest the following conclusions:

1. That a sufficiently large number of returns were obtained to permit a statistical analysis of the data, and;
2. That the distribution of responses from participating institutions indicates a high probability that the sample is representative of the population from which it was drawn.

### Data Collection

Time span utilized in collecting the data for this study was June 16, 1971 to February 2, 1972. The data were collected by mail correspondence with the sample. This method of collecting data was selected for use in this study for the following reasons, some of which were more influential than others:

1. It is less expensive.
2. Skills to administer the instrument are negligible (self-administering).
3. Can be given to large groups simultaneously.
4. It can be sent through the mail.
5. The questionnaire allows standardized wording, order, instructions, and responses.
6. Ensures uniformity from one measurement situation to the next (73:156).

### Description of the Instrument

The measuring device used in this study is titled, Decision-Making Influence Questionnaire. The development and procedures associated with this instrument as used in this study are as follows.

This instrument was developed specifically for use in the current study, and designed to obtain estimates concerning two dimensions: (1) the degree of influence exercised in decision-making and (2) the level at which this influence is exerted.

The questionnaire consists of statements regarding five major categories of community college institutional concern (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, staffing and working conditions, and student affairs). Categories were established on the basis of a statement by Jahoda:

. . . ideas for categorization should always come from two sources, an intimate acquaintance with the evidence in hand and general knowledge and general anticipatory analysis of the possible types of responses, based on theoretical, logical or practical considerations (73:263).

#### Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Validity is defined as the degree to which a measurement achieves a particular objective (73:108-117). Since questionnaires and scales are used for a variety of purposes, somewhat different types of validation are involved depending upon the purposes of the questionnaire or scales. There are five basic aspects of validity, namely, content validity, concurrent validity, construct validity, predictive validity, and face validity.

Validity of the instrument in this study is assumed (face validity\*) on the premise that all items included in the questionnaire were derived from decisions which commonly

---

\* Face validity means the degree to which a test or scale appears to measure what it is intended to measure.

characterize higher education and that experts and practitioners in the field concur.

The Decision-Making Influence Questionnaire was administered (test and retest) to graduate students majoring in educational administration at Michigan State University to determine the coefficient of stability, sometimes called test-retest reliability.

Reliability is the consistency with which a measure yields stable values for individuals and is free from random error when a series of measurements are made.\* In order to evaluate reliability, a determination must be made of the consistency of repeated measures for the same individuals. However, in practice only two measures of the characteristics to be studied are usually used. The degree of agreement between these two measures indicates the reliability of the measuring device.

An estimate of reliability, using the above-mentioned population, was computed on the 3600 computer at Michigan State University with a resulting coefficient of .79.

#### Scale and Index Construction

Before one is able to examine the degree and level of decision-making influence, one must form concepts of the

---

\* For a good discussion of reliability see (73:100-107).

variables related to the model. Next, these concepts must be translated into observable, quantitative indices so that individual persons or groups can be ranked in terms of each variable.

The questionnaire in this study contains a five-point rating scale to provide estimates of the degree of influence. These influence ratings in each category are transformed into quantitative terms by assigning numerical values from one to five. A score of one represents minimal involvement. A score of five represents maximum involvement.

Since part "B" of each item is divided into discrete categories, tallies will be generated. This data will be used to indicate the level at which decision-making influence was and is exerted.

#### Questionnaire Item Development

The questionnaire items were generated by the author compiling a list of decisions<sup>\*</sup> which are common to most

---

<sup>\*</sup> The following indicates a partial list of readings guiding the author:

1. "Statements on Government of Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin, LII, No. 4, December, 1966.
2. John J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
3. Gerald Burns, Administration in Higher Education, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

institutions of higher education. These items were modified for the present study by a final synthesis with the items of the questionnaire utilized by Committee "T" of the AAUP (74:182).

From such groups of items, a draft questionnaire was developed and pretested on a sample of graduate students majoring in higher education administration at Michigan State University. Adjustments were made and a second pretest was conducted in June, 1971, at one of the community colleges in Michigan which was not included in the study. Reasons for the pretest were:

. . . a try-out of the questionnaire to see how it works--whether changes are necessary before the start of the full-scale study. The pretest provides a means of catching and solving unforeseen problems in the use of the questionnaire, the phrasing and sequence of questions, the length of the questionnaire (75:429).

Discussing the instrument with the pretest participants after they had answered it was also a valuable aspect of pretesting (75:430).

From the results obtained from the pretesting, the questions were edited and rewritten to eliminate ambiguity and to increase specificity. The entire questionnaire was then rewritten, resulting in the instrument titled, Decision-Making Influence Questionnaire.

The final questionnaire was composed of thirty questions, each containing two parts. Part "A," the first

part was concerned with the degree of influence that was and is exerted by the participants upon various aspects of institutional concern. The era associated with "was" in this study was indicated as prior to the year 1965. The era associated with "is" in this study was indicated as the present time.

Part "B," the second part, seeks the organizational level at which this influence was and is exerted. The possible responses included in this section were (1) Individual faculty members, (2) Faculty organization, (3) Department chairman, (4) Dean or division chairman, (5) President, vice-president, or board of trustees, and (6) Other, please specify.

The scales to be used were constructed by coding the items on the questionnaire, using the summated ratings technique developed by Rensis Likert. Scales constructed using this method generally consist of a series of items to which a person responds with some degree of agreement. An individual or group is given a score which is either the sum or the average of his responses to all of the items. In this study, theoretically, the likelihood that a person will respond to each item in a certain manner is dependent upon his degree of influence. A participant who has a substantial degree of influence will respond to the item in this manner. A participant who has little or no influence will respond at the opposite end of the scale.



This method identifies persons at both the high and low ends of the influence continuum. A difficulty arises, however, in interpreting scale scores that fall between the extremes. Because many different patterns of response are possible, several persons may receive the same composite score, yet may differ in their responses to particular items. Nevertheless, the Likert technique does permit an ordering of individuals on the basis of the degree of influence that is measured. The scale thus formed is ordinal and not interval and does not impart meaning to the distance between scale scores (i.e., the difference between scores of 1 and 3 is not necessarily the same as the difference between the scores of 3 and 5).

The final instrument was mailed to participants in the study in June, 1971. Enclosed in each packet was: (1) A letter of introduction,<sup>\*</sup> (2) Directions for completing the questionnaire,<sup>\*\*</sup> and (3) One copy of the questionnaire.

#### The Statistical Model and Computational Procedures

After a review of several possible statistical models, multivariate analysis of variance was selected

---

<sup>\*</sup> See Appendix A for a copy of the administrative introductory letter.

<sup>\*\*</sup> See Appendix D.

as the most appropriate technique to analyze part "A" of the questionnaire.

A computer program was used to analyze the data. The program, entitled, Multivariate - Version 4, was written at the State University of New York at Buffalo by Jeremy D. Finn, Department of Educational Psychology, in June of 1968. Finn's program was then modified for the Michigan State University CDC 3600 and 6500 computer systems by David J. Wright, Office of Research Consultation, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan (112).

The following paragraphs paraphrase David Wright's description of A Generalized Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance, Covariance, and Regression Program indicating the treatment of the data in this study.

The program performs an exact least-squares analysis by the method described by Bock (1963). It also provides a solution for the model of deficient rank by having the user determine linear combinations of the group membership effects which are of interest in the study. Five sets of between-group contrasts are available, including non-orthogonal polynomials which is of concern as indicated in the design of this study.

The program is divided into three phases: input, estimation, and analysis.

The input phase of this program allows for six possible forms of data. The data input for this study was

punched as raw data, with no header cards and in order by cells.

The estimation and analysis phases are based entirely on the specification of single - degree - of - freedom planned contrasts.

In this study the estimation phase of the program will:

1. Estimate the magnitude of the effects and their standard errors.
2. Observed and estimated subclass means will be combined across subclasses as desired.
3. The error sum of squares and cross products are estimated, and are adjusted to yield the variances and correlations of the variates. These may be either the within-group term, the residual sum-of-products after fitting a given model to the data, or special effects which are user-determined. This feature allows for the analysis of any fixed, random, or mixed effects design. The design of this study is a fixed effects.

The analysis phase of the program used for this study is able to:

1. Allow the selection of subsets of variables from the original input set and perform the appropriate analysis.
2. If more than one variable is designated as a criterion measure, it will cause the program to consider

them simultaneously and to apply appropriate multivariate test criteria.

3. Partial correlations among the dependent measures, the adjusted variances and standard deviations are calculated and displayed.

4. The program will proceed with the exact non-orthogonal analysis of variance because subjects have been grouped in the sampling design. The contrasts established are grouped according to the user's desires.

5. A discriminant analysis will be performed for each contrast or set of contrasts, as desired. The variance of the discriminant function and the percentage of between-group variation attributable to it are computed by the program. In addition, raw and standardized discriminant function weights are calculated.

The main program and all of its subroutines are coded in Fortran IV.

### Summary

The population of this study consists of eight selected Michigan community college administrators and 129 faculty members who were employed at their respective institutions from 1965 or prior and through the 1970 academic year. The four institutions selected were identified with two being involved in collective negotiation and two not involved in collective negotiation.

The instrument used in the study was the Decision-Making Influence Questionnaire which was mailed to the participants. The validity of this instrument is assumed (face validity) on the premise that all items included in the questionnaire were derived from decisions which commonly characterize higher education and that experts and practitioners in the field concur. The estimate of reliability was computed with a resulting coefficient of .79.

Multivariate analysis of variance was used to analyze the data. The data were analyzed on Michigan State University's 3600 computer using David J. Wright's modified version of Jeremy Finn's Multivariate - Version 4. This program is divided into three phases: input, estimation, and "analysis."

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the results of the analysis of the data. Each hypothesis has been stated as the null or test hypothesis. All hypotheses were tested using the "Finn" program which is a multivariate analysis of variance test. An alpha level of .05 was selected for determination of significance of difference. Secondly, the perceived level at which decision-making influence is exerted will be discussed.

#### Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of those junior colleges involved in collective bargaining and those not involved in collective bargaining.

The overall F-ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level is 0.7641, which suggests that the null hypothesis is tenable. Results of the multivariate analysis test for hypothesis 1 are presented in Table 4.1. The mean scores of the bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges on the five variables are in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.1.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Bargaining vs Non-Bargaining.

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--0.5158			
d.f. = 5 and 148.0000			
P less than 0.7641			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	0.0811	0.1365	0.7123
Academic Affairs	0.4433	0.7211	0.3972
Personnel Policies	0.0486	0.0685	0.7939
Working Conditions	0.0108	0.0202	0.8872
Student Affairs	0.0315	0.0589	0.8086
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

TABLE 4.2.--Weighted Mean Scores of Bargaining vs. Non-Bargaining.

Group	Financial Affairs	Academic Affairs	Personnel Policies	Working Conditions	Student Affairs
Bargaining	2.104899	2.894117	1.971991	2.120883	1.714554
Non- Bargaining	2.211224	2.903061	2.402041	2.210368	2.077551

Therefore, it is concluded that there is no difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of those junior colleges involved in collective bargaining and those not involved in collective bargaining. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

#### Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of the junior colleges within the categories of collective bargaining and no collective bargaining.

The F-ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level for the overall test is 0.0009 and the null hypothesis is rejected. The evidence for this hypothesis is found in Table 4.3. It can be concluded that there is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of the junior colleges within the categories of collective bargaining and no collective bargaining.



TABLE 4.3.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Differences Between Schools Within Bargaining Categories.

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--3.1226			
d.f. = 10 and 296.0000			
P less than 0.0009			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	1.2512	2.1050	0.1254
Academic Affairs	0.1036	0.1686	0.8451
Personnel Policies	0.7671	1.0809	0.3419
Working Conditions	0.3133	0.5836	0.5592
Student Affairs	2.9257	5.4767	0.0051
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

By examining the univariate  $F$  data and their associated significance levels (Table 4.3), one observes that the last variable (student activities) contributes more toward the rejection of the hypothesis than do the remaining variables (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, and working conditions). Even though there is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of the junior colleges within the categories of collective bargaining and no collective bargaining, it may not be meaningful in this study.

Observing the cell mean scores presented in Table 4.4, it is noted that the last variable (student activities) has the lowest cell mean for each school except for the personnel policies variable mean in school 4. It can also be noted that the differences between cell means is greatest in the student activities variable.

TABLE 4.4.--Weighted Mean Scores of Individual Schools.

Group	Financial Affairs	Academic Affairs	Personnel Policies	Working Conditions	Student Affairs
School 1	1.944643	2.920238	1.829369	2.012692	1.506357
School 2	2.489457	2.831429	2.314286	2.374829	2.214286
School 3	2.232857	3.018571	2.517143	2.164772	2.057142
School 4	2.157143	2.757143	2.114286	2.324357	2.142857

### Hypothesis 3

There is no dignificant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members.

The analysis of the data shows that there is a over-all difference ( $P$  less than 0.0001) between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members. The evidence for this hypothesis is found in Table 4.5. The univariate  $F$  data suggest that all variables make a strong relative contribution toward the rejection of the null hypothesis.

An inspection of the cell means which are found in Table 4.6 shows that the administrators have a higher mean score on all variables than do faculty members. This suggests that administrators have a higher perceived degree of decision-making influence over all variables than do faculty members.

### Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members when comparing individual junior colleges.

The results of the multivariate test for this hypothesis show the significance level for the overall test is 0.0280 (Table 4.7). There is indeed a significant difference in the perceived degree of decision-making influence between administrators and faculty when comparing schools.

Viewing the univariate  $F$  data and their significance levels (Table 4.7), it is found that a variable 4

TABLE 4.5.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Administration vs Faculty Members.

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--9.7616			
d.f. = 5 and 148.0000			
P less than 0.0001			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	14.3610	24.1608	0.0001
Academic Affairs	7.1767	11.6737	0.0009
Personnel Policies	26.5007	37.3413	0.0001
Working Conditions	23.9325	44.5759	0.0001
Student Affairs	8.1561	15.2579	0.0002
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

TABLE 4.6.--Weighted Mean Scores for Administrators and Faculty.

Variable	Administrators	Faculty
Financial Affairs	3.316667	2.045083
Academic Affairs	3.566667	2.858013
Personnel Policies	3.658333	1.976968
Working Conditions	3.609333	2.034495
Student Affairs	2.750000	1.750218

TABLE 4.7.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Schools and Administration-Faculty Interaction.

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--2.0552			
d.f. = 10 and 296.0000			
P less than 0.0280			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	0.8917	1.5001	0.2264
Academic Affairs	0.0692	0.1126	0.8936
Personnel Policies	1.5600	2.1982	0.1146
Working Conditions	2.3935	4.4580	0.0132
Student Affairs	1.1002	2.0594	0.1311
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

(working conditions) seems to contribute most toward the rejecting of the hypothesis.

The cell mean scores presented in Table 4.8 show that administrators have a higher mean on variable 4 (working conditions) than do faculty members. This suggests that administrators perceive themselves as having greater decision-making influence over variable 4 (working conditions) than do faculty members.

TABLE 4.8.--Weighted Mean Scores of Schools for Administrators-Faculty of Variable 4 (Working Conditions).

School	Administrators	Faculty
1	3.550000	1.977636
2	3.300000	2.318758
3	3.128000	2.040484
4	4.275000	1.544100

#### Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with administrators and faculty members of junior colleges not involved in collective bargaining.

The F-ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level for the

overall test is 0.0349 and the null hypothesis is rejected. The evidence for this hypothesis is found in Table 4.9. It can be concluded, then, that there is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with administrators and faculty members of junior colleges not involved in collective bargaining.

By examining the univariate  $F$  data and their associated significance levels (Table 4.9), one observes that the first variable (financial affairs) contributes more toward the rejection of the hypothesis than do the remaining four variables.

Observing the cell means presented in Table 4.10, it is noted that non-bargaining administrators have a higher mean score on variable 1 (financial affairs) than do bargaining administrators. This suggests that non-bargaining administrators have a higher perceived degree of decision-making influence with regard to financial affairs than do bargaining administrators.

#### Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

The overall  $F$ -ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level for the



TABLE 4.9.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Bargaining-No Bargaining  
and Administration-Faculty Interaction.

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--2.4736			
d.f. = 5 and 148.0000			
P less than 0.0349			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	2.0106	3.3826	0.0679
Academic Affairs	0.4173	0.6789	0.4113
Personnel Policies	0.3960	0.5579	0.4563
Working Conditions	0.9217	1.7167	0.1921
Student Affairs	0.2681	0.5018	0.4798
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

overall test is 0.8566. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The evidence for this hypothesis is presented in Table 4.11.

TABLE 4.10.--Weighted Mean Scores of Bargaining-No Bargaining and Administration-Faculty for Variable 1 (Financial Affairs).

Category	Administration	Faculty
Bargaining	2.950000	2.075504
No Bargaining	3.500000	1.959732

#### Hypothesis 7

There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges.

The overall F-ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level is 0.2668, which suggests that the null hypothesis is tenable. Results of the multivariate analysis test for hypothesis 7 are presented in Table 4.12. Of the five variables, the mean scores of variable 4 (working conditions) show the most difference (Table 4.13).

Consequently, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived

Table 4.11.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre)  
vs After Legalized Bargaining (Post).

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--0.3878			
d.f. = 5 and 148.0000			
P less than 0.8566			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	0.0627	0.1055	0.7458
Academic Affairs	0.0931	0.1515	0.6977
Personnel Policies	0.2909	0.4099	0.5230
Working Conditions	0.5692	1.0602	0.3049
Student Affairs	0.7015	1.3131	0.2537
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

TABLE 4.12.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Bargaining - No Bargaining  
When Compared by Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre)  
and After Legalized Bargaining (Post).

---



---

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--1.3006			
d.f. = 5 and 148.0000			
P less than 0.2668			
<hr/>			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
<hr/>			
Financial Affairs	0.2781	0.4678	0.4951
Academic Affairs	0.1624	0.2642	0.6080
Personnel Policies	0.1652	0.2328	0.6302
Working Conditions	2.1379	3.9820	0.0478
Student Affairs	0.9290	1.7391	0.1893
<hr/>			
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			
<hr/>			

degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges.

TABLE 4.13.--Weighted Mean Scores of Bargaining and No Bargaining Junior Colleges When Comparing Pre and Post Categories for Variable 4 (Working Conditions).

	Pre	Post
Bargaining	2.009752	2.233898
No Bargaining	2.141667	2.278000

#### Hypothesis 8

There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing administrators and faculty members.

The overall F-ratio for the multivariate test for this hypothesis shows that the significance level for the overall test is 0.5893. For the purpose of this study it is not significant and, therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing administrators and faculty members. The results of the analysis of the data for this hypothesis are presented in Table 4.14.

TABLE 4.14.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre) and After Legalized Bargaining (Post) When Comparing Administrators and Faculty Members.

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--0.7474			
d.f. = 5 and 148.0000			
P less than 0.5893			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	0.8551	1.4386	0.2323
Academic Affairs	0.5678	0.9235	0.3381
Personnel Policies	1.0614	1.4955	0.2233
Working Conditions	1.9936	3.7132	0.0559
Student Affairs	0.5133	0.9609	0.3286
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1			
Degree of Freedom for Error = 152			

### Hypothesis 9

There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of individual junior colleges when comparing presently perceived degree of decision-making influence with the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

The overall F-ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level for the overall test is 0.9493. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The evidence for the acceptance of this hypothesis is presented in Table 4.15.

### Hypothesis 10

There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 of administrators and faculty members in junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with non-bargaining junior colleges.

The overall F-ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level is 0.6338, which suggests that the null hypothesis is tenable. Results of the multivariate analysis test for hypothesis 10 are presented in Table 4.16.

Therefore, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges when considering pre and post scores of administrators and faculty members. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

TABLE 4.15.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Comparing Individual Schools by Scores Prior to Legalized Bargaining (Pre) and Scores After Legalized Bargaining (Post).

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--0.3932			
d.f. = 10 and 296.0000			
P less than 0.9493			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	0.4170	0.7016	0.4975
Academic Affairs	0.1807	0.2940	0.7458
Personnel Policies	0.0448	0.0631	0.9389
Working Conditions	0.0884	0.1646	0.8485
Student Affairs	0.1083	0.2028	0.8167
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			



TABLE 4.16.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Three-Way Interaction  
(Bargaining-No Bargaining, Administrators-Faculty,  
and Pre-Post).

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--0.6874			
d.f. = 5 and 148.0000			
P less than 0.6338			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	P less than
Financial Affairs	0.2768	0.4657	0.4960
Academic Affairs	0.0016	0.0026	0.9596
Personnel Policies	0.1836	0.2587	0.6118
Working Conditions	1.1350	2.1141	0.1481
Student Affairs	0.3512	0.6574	0.4188
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 1			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

### Hypothesis 11

There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of individual junior colleges when comparing presently perceived degrees of decision-making influence with the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

The overall F-ratio for the multivariate test of this hypothesis shows that the significance level for the overall test is 0.8140. Consequently, the null hypothesis is not rejected. The evidence for the acceptance of this hypothesis is found in Table 4.17.

This part of Chapter IV presents the results of the data concerning perceived levels of decision-making influence. The five levels of decision making influence used in this study were: (1) Individual Faculty Members, (2) Faculty Organization, (3) Department Chairmen, (4) Dean or Division Chairmen, and (5) President, Vice-President, or Board of Trustees. The perceived levels of influence were tallied for all five variables (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs) then totaled and evidenced in Tables 4.18, 4.19, 4.20, and 4.21.

#### Category I: Administrators--Barqaining

An inspection of the cell percentages found in Table 4.18 shows the level of influence percentage to be highest for dean or division chairmen in both pre (prior to 1965)

TABLE 4.17.--Multivariate Analysis of Variance--Three-Way Interaction  
(Individual Schools 1,2,3 & 4 , Administrators-Faculty,  
and Pre-Pcst).

F-Ratio for Multivariate Test of Equality of Mean Vectors--0.5995			
d.f. = 10 and 296.0000			
P less than 0.8140			
Variable	Between Mean Sq	Univariate F	F less than
Financial Affairs	0.0150	0.0252	0.9752
Academic Affairs	0.0101	0.0165	0.9837
Personnel Policies	0.2833	0.3992	0.6716
Working Conditions	0.6675	1.2432	0.2914
Student Affairs	0.4661	0.8725	0.4200
Degrees of Freedom for Hypothesis = 2			
Degrees of Freedom for Error = 152			

TABLE 4.18.--Level of Influence--Percentage of Response\*  
Administrators--Bargaining.

	Individual Faculty Members		Faculty Organi- zation		Depart- ment Chairman		Dean or Division Chairman		President, Vice- President or Board of Trustees		
	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Total Responses
School I											
Pre**	2	5.4	3	8.1	2	5.4	28	75.7	2	5.4	37
Post***	0	0.0	1	3.2	2	6.5	28	90.3	0	0.0	31
School II											
Pre	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	3.2	5	16.1	25	80.7	31
Post	0	0.0	13	40.6	1	3.1	9	28.1	9	28.1	32
Total											
Pre	2	2.9	3	4.4	3	4.4	33	48.5	27	39.7	68
Post	0	0.0	14	22.2	3	4.8	37	58.7	9	14.3	63

\*Rounding to the nearest 1/10 of 1 percent accounts for some total percentages not equalling 100 percent.

\*\*Prior to 1965

\*\*\*Presently (1971)

post (present, 1971) categories. This suggests that those administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, perceive the majority of their decision-making influence to be exerted with deans and division chairmen.

Further observation indicates a 17.8 percent increase at the faculty organization level and a 25.4 percent decrease at the president, vice-president, and board of trustee level. This may indicate that those administrators employed by institutions operating under a negotiated contract, presently perceive that a greater number of decision-making influences are exerted with the faculty organization than with the president, vice-president, and board of trustees.

It is also noted that in this classification of bargaining administrators there were no responses recorded at the post (meaning 1971) individual faculty member level. Thus, indicating that presently bargaining administrators do not perceive that their decision-making influence is ever exerted at the individual faculty member level with regard to the five variables measured (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs).

Category II: Faculty Members--Bargaining

Observing the cell percentages presented in Table 4.19, it is noted that in the total percentages, 74.9 percent of the responses in the pre section and 80.2 percent of the responses in the post section fall within the individual faculty member, faculty organization and department chairman levels of influence. This is the converse of bargaining administrators where the total percentages reveal 88.2 percent of the responses in the pre section and 73.0 percent of the responses in the post section fall within the dean and division chairman or president, vice-president, and board of trustee level. This suggests that bargaining faculty exert their decision-making influence with co-workers, faculty organizations, and department chairmen more often than with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees. While within the bargaining administrator category, their decision-making influence is perceived to be exerted with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees more often than with individual faculty members, faculty organizations, and department chairmen.

Comparing the total number of responses in the post cells (1631) with the total of the pre cells (1530) indicates the bargaining faculty presently perceives their influence to be exerted upon a greater number of people than

TABLE 4.19.--Level of Influence--Percentage of Responses\*  
Faculty Members--Bargaining.

	Individual Faculty Members		Faculty Organi- zation		Depart- ment Chairman		Dean or Division Chairman		President, Vice- President or Board of Trustees		
	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Total Responses
School I											
Pre	362	34.7	182	17.4	279	26.7	179	17.1	44	4.2	1046
Post	351	31.8	287	26.0	251	22.7	191	17.3	25	2.3	1105
School II											
Pre	57	11.8	116	24.0	150	31.0	75	15.5	86	17.8	484
Post	145	27.6	188	35.7	83	15.8	82	15.6	28	5.3	526
Total											
Pre	419	27.4	298	19.5	429	28.0	254	16.6	130	8.5	1530
Post	496	30.4	475	29.1	334	20.7	273	16.7	53	3.2	1631

\*Rounding to the nearest 1/10 of 1 percent accounts for some total percentages not equalling 100 percent.

they did prior to 1965. This suggests that the recommendations and wishes of bargaining faculty members are presently heard and may be taken into consideration by more people than they were prior to 1965.

Category III: Administrators--No Bargaining

The percentages of Table 4.20 show little change between the pre and post levels of influence responses. It is noted that the percentages of school IV show no change either between pre and post scores or the levels of influence. This suggests that administrators employed in junior colleges not operating with a formally negotiated contract do not perceive changes in the level of influence or with the number of people influenced. In addition, this implies that the Legislative Act of 1965 (PERA) had little if any effect upon the number of people influenced or the levels of influence as perceived by administrators of these non-bargaining institutions.

A difference of four responses exists when subtracting the total post from pre number of responses in Category III [(Table 4.20) Administrators--No Bargaining]. An examination of Category I [(Table 4.18) Administrators--Bargaining] exhibits a difference of five responses when subtracting the total post from pre number of responses. This suggests little change in the number of people



TABLE 4.20.--Level of Influence--Percentage of Responses\*  
Administrators--No Bargaining.

	Individual Faculty Members		Faculty Organi- zation		Depart- ment Chairman		Dean or Division Chairman		President, Vice- President or Board of Trustees		
	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Total Responses
School III											
Pre	4	3.7	12	11.2	19	17.8	42	39.3	30	28.0	107
Post	4	3.9	12	11.7	16	15.5	39	37.9	32	31.1	103
School IV											
Pre	14	19.7	1	1.4	0	0.0	31	43.7	25	35.2	71
Post	14	19.7	1	1.4	0	0.0	31	43.7	25	35.2	71
Total											
Pre	18	10.1	13	7.3	19	10.7	73	41.0	55	30.9	178
Post	18	10.3	13	7.5	16	9.2	70	40.2	57	32.8	174

\*Rounding to the nearest 1/10 of 1 percent accounts for some total percentages not equalling 100 percent.

influenced by the administrators included in this study when comparing total pre and post responses.

Category IV: Faculty Members--No Bargaining

An inspection of the cell percentages found in Table 4.21 shows that in the total percentages 80.2 percent of the responses in the pre section and 62.1 percent of the responses in the post section are found within the individual faculty member, faculty organization, and department chairmen levels of influence. This is directly opposite non-bargaining administrators where the total percentages reveal 71.9 percent of the responses in the pre section and 73.0 percent of the responses in the post section fall within the dean and division chairmen or president, vice-president, and board of trustee level. This suggests that faculty members of non-bargaining junior colleges exert their decision-making influence with co-workers, faculty organizations, and department chairmen more often than they do with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees.

In the non-bargaining administrator category (Table 4.20), it is perceived that decision-making influence is exerted with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees more often than with individual faculty members, faculty organizations, and department chairmen.

TABLE 4.21.--Level of Influence--Percentage of Responses\*  
Faculty Members--No Bargaining

	Individual Faculty Members		Faculty Organi- zation		Depart- ment Chairman		Dean or Division Chairman		President, Vice- President or Board of Trustees		
	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Responses No.	%	Total Responses
School III											
Pre	144	36.7	39	9.9	152	38.8	43	11.0	14	3.6	392
Post	118	27.6	60	14.0	89	20.8	152	35.5	9	2.1	428
School IV											
Pre	66	60.0	2	1.8	0	0.0	18	16.4	24	21.8	110
Post	29	22.8	19	15.0	30	23.6	24	18.9	25	19.7	127
Total											
Pre	210	41.8	41	8.2	152	30.3	61	12.3	38	7.6	502
Post	147	26.5	79	14.2	119	21.4	176	31.7	34	6.1	555

\*Rounding to the nearest 1/10 of 1 percent accounts for some total percentages not equalling 100 percent.

Comparing the total number of responses in the post cells (555) with the total of the pre cells (502) indicates the non-bargaining faculty presently perceives their influence to be exerted upon a greater number of people than they did prior to 1965. This suggests that the recommendations and wishes of non-bargaining faculty members are presently heard and may be taken into consideration by more people than there were prior to 1965.

Table 4.21 also reveals a 15.3 percent decrease in the individual faculty member level while showing a 19.5 percent increase in the number of responses at the dean and division chairmen level. This suggests that non-bargaining faculty members presently exert their decision-making influence on fewer occasions with co-workers while increased occasions exist for exerting their decision-making influence with deans and division chairmen.

### Summary

The following statements resulted from an analysis of the data collected for this study. They are:

1. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members in those junior colleges involved in collective bargaining when compared with administrators and faculty members of junior colleges not involved in collective bargaining.

2. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of the junior colleges within the categories of collective bargaining and no collective bargaining.

3. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members.

4. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members when comparing individual junior colleges.

5. There is a significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with the administrators and faculty members of junior colleges not involved in collective bargaining.

6. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

7. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 when comparing bargaining and non-bargaining junior colleges.

8. When comparing administrators and faculty members, there is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965.

9. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence when compared with the perceived degree of decision-making influence prior to 1965 of individual junior colleges.

10. There is no significant difference between the presently perceived degree of decision-making influence and the perceived degree prior to 1965 of administrators and faculty members in junior colleges involved in collective bargaining as compared with non-bargaining junior colleges.

11. There is no significant difference between the perceived degree of decision-making influence of administrators and faculty members of individual junior colleges when comparing presently perceived degrees of decision-making influence with the degree perceived prior to 1965.

12. Administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, perceive the majority of their decision-making influence to be exerted with deans and division chairmen.

13. Administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, presently perceive that a greater number of decision-making influences are exerted

with the faculty organization than with the president, vice-president, and board of trustees.

14. Administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, do not perceive that their present decision-making influence is ever exerted at the individual faculty member level with regard to the five variables measured (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs).

15. Faculty members employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, exert their decision-making influence with co-workers, faculty organizations, and department chairmen more often than with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees.

16. Administrators employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, perceive their decision-making influence to be exerted with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees more often than with individual faculty members, faculty organizations, and department chairmen.

17. Faculty members employed in junior colleges operating under a negotiated contract, presently perceive their influence to be exerted upon a greater number of people than they did prior to 1965.

18. Administrators employed in junior colleges not operating with a formally negotiated contract, do not

perceive changes in the level of influence or with the number of people influenced.

19. Bargaining and non-bargaining administrators perceive little change when comparing the present number of people influenced with the number of people influenced prior to 1965.

20. Faculty members employed in junior colleges not operating with a formally negotiated contract, exert their decision-making influence with co-workers, faculty organizations, and department chairmen more often than with deans and division chairmen or presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees.

21. Administrators employed in junior colleges not operating with a formally negotiated contract, perceive their decision-making influence to be exerted with deans and division chairmen and presidents, vice-presidents, and boards of trustees more often than with individual faculty members, faculty organizations, and department chairmen.

22. Faculty members employed in junior colleges not operating under a formally negotiated contract, presently perceive their influence to be exerted upon a greater number of people than they did prior to 1965.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Summary

This study sought to determine if significant differences exist between administrators and faculty members in four selected community junior colleges in Michigan regarding the degree and level of influence they exercise and have exercised over decisions in areas of institutional concern such as financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs from the period 1965 through 1971. The institutions in the sample were selected so as to permit analysis of these opinions on the basis of the presence or absence of collective negotiations as an element in the colleges' decision-making structure. The degree and level of decision-making influence were determined by a measuring device titled, Decision-Making Influence Questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed specifically for use in the current study: it has a reliability coefficient of .79 and consists of statements regarding five major categories of community college institutional concern (financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs).

The sample for this study was drawn from a population of four junior colleges in Michigan: two with formally negotiated contracts and two without formally negotiated contracts. The identification of the participants was based upon the following criteria:

I. Bargaining category

- A. The founding date of the institution must have been prior to 1965.
- B. The institution must be presently functioning under a negotiated written agreement.
- C. The president and one other administrator must have been employed as administrators of their respective institutions from 1964 to 1970 (minimum).
- D. The faculty must be represented in the negotiation process by their designated representative.

II. Non-bargaining category

- A. The founding date of the institution must have been prior to 1965.
- B. The institution must never have been and not now be functioning under a negotiated written agreement.
- C. The president and one other administrator must have been employed as administrators of their respective institutions from 1964 to 1970 (minimum).
- D. The faculty must not be represented by a bargaining agent.

Having identified the institutions which met the specified criteria, eight administrators and 129 full-time faculty members were identified and included as participants of this study.

Analysis of the data was done by using the multivariate analysis of variance (programmed by Jeremy Finn). Results were deemed significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Relevant literature was discussed in Chapter II which included the concept of collective bargaining; the labor movement in the United States; law and collective bargaining in the private and public sectors; collective negotiation in public education; and collective negotiation in Michigan community colleges. In addition, decision-making theory and studies relating to this investigation were carefully scrutinized.

In Chapter III the methodology used in this study was presented. This included such areas as: the definition of the population; source of data; data collection; description of the instrument; validity and reliability of the instrument; scale and index construction; questionnaire item development; and the statistical model and computational procedures.

In Chapter IV the data were presented and the methods of analysis discussed. In the first part of Chapter IV a general discussion of the hypotheses and the analysis of the data for the hypotheses were described. In addition, the results of the data concerning perceived levels of influence are discussed. This Chapter was concluded with a summary presentation.

### Conclusions

This study did not deal with the quality or quantity of decisions. It was concerned with perceived degrees and levels of decision-making involvement. No attempt was made to determine whether decisions are presently better or whether the number of decisions are greater or less. Some concerns of this study were: did the people feel there had been a change in the organizational level at which they participate in the decision-making process and were they presently more involved in the making of decisions? They were not asked to state which way they felt involved, just did they feel more involved.

Another attempt was made to determine whether individuals in bargaining institutions really have a greater involvement in the making of decisions than non-bargaining individuals now that bargaining institutions were functioning under a negotiated written contract.

Pertinent conclusions to this study were:

1. There is no difference between the individually perceived degrees of decision-making influence when comparing bargaining and non-bargaining scores of participants of this study.

Emery Olson (Table 2.2) indicates that decision-making today is going from a more authoritarian approach to a more collegial or group approach. In both the

institutions with collective bargaining and without collective bargaining this shift from the authoritarian to the collegial approach toward decision-making could be going on as a natural consequence of the theories of decision-making. If this were true, it could have had a masking effect upon the results found in this study. The contrast between the collective bargaining schools and non-bargaining schools would not be as great or as obvious as it might, if the non-bargaining schools were functioning under an authoritarian approach and the bargaining schools were operating under more of an involvement approach.

The fact that there was no measurable difference in the decision-making power between bargaining and non-bargaining institutions was not the matter of one having more decision-making power and one having less decision-making power and thereby evening each other out. It could be simply that in all facets at both places there was a similar change taking place at the same time. Therefore, the change or lack of change could not be attributed to the advent of collective bargaining.

2. In the making of decisions, faculty members tend to interact with other faculty members, administrators tend to interact with other administrators, and the faculty organization is the bridge bringing the two groups together.

Gittell and Hollander (103) selected six large city school systems in 1968 in which to conduct a study of institutional response. One of the more pertinent conclusions to their study was that public school systems have removed decision-making from the agents closest to the school child, namely the teachers and parents.

In this study it was found that administrators interact with other administrators. When asked to identify the organizational level at which they exert influence upon decisions being made, faculty members tend to influence peers and their faculty organizations. Although citizens were not included as one of the possible selections on the Decision-Making Influence Questionnaire, the instrument used to collect data for this study, there was an "other" category in which citizens could have been included. There were no instances in which citizens were indicated as being that person or group being influenced with regard to institutional decision-making. Gittell and Hollander indicate that parents were excluded from educational policy making while constantly being reminded by professionals of their lack of expertise. From what was found in this study, it appears that faculty interacts with faculty, administrators interact with administrators, and faculty organizations may tend to bridge the gap between the two groups. However, neither group perceives citizen groups

as being involved in the decision-making process. Therefore, this study tends to support the findings of Gittell and Hollander and suggests that the same situation seems to be happening at the junior college.

3. Faculty members presently influence a greater number of people with regard to the making of decisions than they did prior to 1965.

In 1968 Love (98) examined the impact of teacher negotiations on school system decision-making. He found that although administrative and school board discretion is narrowed by collective negotiations, administrators quickly learn to use the negotiation process to preserve areas of discretion and school boards retain their rights to represent the public interest and make all final decisions. He found further evidence that suggested that the establishment of collective negotiation does enlarge teacher participation in the decision-making process.

Data collected in this study would tend to support Love's findings. Here it was found that bargaining and non-bargaining faculty members presently influence a greater number of people than they did prior to the passage of the 1965 Public Employment Relations Act, thereby enlarging teacher participation in the making of decisions. It was also found that administrators perceived relatively no change in the number of people they influenced. This

would tend to support Love's finding that administrators quickly learn to use the negotiation process as a means of preserving as much status quo within the decision-making process as possible.

Ann Mitchell describes the position of the teacher as:

In the educational hierarchy, he is the low man . . . In the power structure, he is the one without power. In the line of order, he is the one who takes orders from everyone else. He has little chance to exercise creativity, to show intelligence, or to use democratic procedures. He has no say in the important decisions affecting the schools. The educational system in America today is a vertical hierarchy and the teacher is at the bottom (100:66).

From the perceptual data of faculty members in this study it appears that although the hierarchial order does not seem to change in the interaction of teachers with others within the educational system, the quantity of impact or the number of people with whom teachers interact is greater. Therefore, faculty impact upon decision-making is greater but kept at the same level within the hierarchy as it was prior to 1965.

It was also found that administrators interact at the same level and with the same number of people as they did prior to the advent of collective bargaining. Therefore, administrative impact upon decision-making has not changed with regard to degree or level of influence.



4. Findings of this study support, as would be expected, that individual administrators perceive a higher (greater) degree of decision-making influence than faculty members in the areas of financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs.

Involvement studies at the community college level were conducted by Campbell (65) and Nicholson (66) to analyze faculty positions within the influence structure of the community college. The findings of these studies indicate that faculty involvement is minimal and that it tends to be subordinated to the direction of administrators.

Garrison (54) supports these findings in a study aimed at identifying issues and problems of community college faculties. He concluded that community college faculties perceive themselves as having little or no voice in the policy affairs of the institutions.

In line with Campbell, Nicholson, and Garrison's findings it would appear that the administrative perception of their more ordinate role to the faculty in decision-making and involvement in decisions was supported by the data of this study. Administrators both pre and post bargaining perceived a greater degree of influence upon the decisions of institutional concern measured in this study than faculty members.

5. Pre and post degrees of individual decision-making influence are similar.

The metamorphosis of organizational theory as outlined by Emery E. Olson indicates there has been a change in decision-making theory from decisions as an individual, highly centralized act to decisions as collegial and situational. In the community colleges of Michigan one does not presently find the dichotomy of that's management and that's labor, which would have been extremely noticable in the decision-making process. The faculty was not employed for subsistence alone but found the job to be a satisfying experience meeting other needs.

Any changes in the decision-making system after the advent of collective bargaining are not really so much a major change in the philosophy of the organizational theory (management versus labor) but subtle changes in the representational system within the organization.

The community college faculty is not emerging from a slave labor situation where they worked for subsistence; where their job was controlled by command; where authority came from the top down; or, where the work environment was regimented as was found in the private sector. The community college faculty actually had many of the organizational traits of involvement; of the job being a satisfying experience; of a democratic work experience; of

authority from the group; and, leadership by consent prior to ever having collective bargaining.

When community college faculties made a transition from non-bargaining to bargaining, it was not a matter of going from autocratic decision-making to democratic decision-making as much as it was going from: "we appoint your representatives," to "you choose your own representatives." This was a much more subtle variation. The perception exhibited by participants of this study that there has not been a change in the degree of decision-making influence could be the result of their looking at traditional collective bargaining change as found in the private sector and applying this expectation to their educational institution where the change was much more subtle.

Educational systems, and higher education systems in particular, differ from other kinds of organizations and always have. The fact that the participants of this study saw no great change in the degree of pre and post bargaining decision-making could be because these organizations were already acting in a more democratic method and therefore changes were far more subtle, far more discreet, and less perceptible.

### Implications

This section discusses some conditions which could have been operative prior to, during, or within this study.

1. One of the criteria which had to be satisfied prior to the execution of this study was that it was necessary to identify community colleges in the State of Michigan which were involved in formal collective bargaining and an equal number of institutions not involved in formal collective bargaining. The identification of the non-bargaining institutions created the greater difficulty and was a factor in limiting the size of the sample.

In Michigan there is a history of formal organization not only in the private sector but also in the K-12 school system. Therefore, it is suggested that even in non-bargaining institutions the heavy labor influence of the State of Michigan and the historical impact of union involvement within the State of Michigan could have caused the non-bargaining community colleges to display some of the characteristics of bargaining community colleges such as faculty involvement and the use of representatives. In other words, because of the labor history in Michigan, in its K-12 system, and in some of its community colleges, the non-bargaining community colleges have incorporated some of the involvement features of bargaining institutions.

2, That there is no appreciable difference between the degree of decision-making influence in bargaining and non-bargaining community colleges could result from the fact that representational systems exist in both bargaining and non-bargaining colleges though not exercised in the classic collective bargaining form. This would tend to support the concept that organizational involvement in higher education is greater than in non-educational organizations.

It is noteworthy that the administrators in the non-bargaining colleges did not feel that the representative system had a greater impact upon present decisions. Whereas, administrators in the bargaining colleges did perceive the representative system to play a greater role in the making of decisions.

This may be attributable to behavior associated with collective bargaining since under collective bargaining the rank and file expect their leaders to "deliver." Therefore, one may expect that the faculty would feel a greater impact upon their representatives in the collective bargaining schools. One may also expect administrators in the bargaining schools to feel the impact of the faculty representatives.

Under the classical system of faculty representation, the administration has been working with faculty representatives. Those representatives are not functioning

as political representatives, as they are in a formal collective bargaining situation, but as collegial representatives. Consequently, the militancy or the impact probably would not be quite as apparent to the non-bargaining administrator. But, the individual faculty representative is probably under pressure because of the number of community colleges involved in collective bargaining in the state.

If the faculty representative is going to make the collegial system work, he is going to have to be more responsive to the people he represents. This may be the explanation as to why the faculty in the non-bargaining institutions feel that they now have more access to their representatives. This study points out that individual faculty members of both bargaining and non-bargaining community colleges presently perceive a greater impact and involvement in the decision-making process through a representational system than they did prior to 1965.

3. The fact that there appears to be no change in the perceived decision-making involvement does not necessarily imply that there is no greater acceptability of the decisions being made. The very process of bargaining may build in an acceptability for decisions that otherwise would not have been there. The decision could have been the same as it would have been without bargaining but because of the collective bargaining process, the decision

now becomes acceptable to all concerned. The bargaining process may not change the decision, nor the level at which the decision is made. But, it may build in acceptability for the decision before it is even made and predetermine its implementation.

Because this study implies that decisions are still being made by the same people, it does not necessarily mean that the decisions have the same level of acceptability as they used to have. They may be more acceptable today even though they are being made at the same organizational level. The person who makes the decision, now through the process of bargaining, is talking to people before the decision, even though he may make the same decision in the long run.

4. Collective bargaining may not have changed the decision-making system at all, even in the bargaining schools. It may have preserved the decision-making system by placing it in a written contract. This would tend to be supported by the finding that there is no perceived change between the degree of decision-making influence when comparing pre and post bargaining scores.

Given the history of faculty involvement in the junior college's decision-making system what really has changed appears not to be the decision-making system but possibly the codifying of the system into written language.

5. What of collective bargaining in the future?  
Are we going to continue to have collective bargaining?

Collective bargaining accomplishes more than producing what are considered traditional benefits such as; a formalized written contract, salary increases, fringe benefits, and a voice in decision-making. It may be that these benefits could have resulted even if collective bargaining were not being included as part of the educational administrative modus operandi.

The three needs associated with collective bargaining are economic needs, psychological needs, and social-political needs. The economic needs could possibly be met with or without collective bargaining. It is possible that collective bargaining has no effect upon economic decisions. However, the faculty is saying they are our representatives, they are accountable to us, it's our organization, they are our people, and they speak for us. That alone may be worth all the exercise of collective bargaining.

Even if collective bargaining does not change the ultimate decision that is made over economic factors or curriculum factors, the very involvement process, the very representational process whether it be through collective bargaining or representation by means of another system, may be what is more important. The process may be more



important than any startling outcome or changes as a result of the process.

This study has shown that the participants do not perceive a change in the degree of decision-making involvement as an individual. However, faculty participants indicate that they have greater involvement in the decision-making process through their faculty organization. What is important here is that it may be just as important for the individual to feel involved in the decision-making process through his representatives as it would be for him to be directly involved as an individual.

Bargaining administrators indicate they exert a greater number of decision-making influences with the faculty organization now than they did prior to 1965. This implies that the faculty organization is presently involved in more decisions.

The fact of the matter is after having done this study, it is suggested that collective bargaining is not for individuals, collective bargaining is for organizations. There has been no measurable change in the fact that faculty members do not have a lot of influence upon the making of decisions as individuals. What appears to have changed is that organizations of these individuals are having more influence and greater impact with administrators.

### Recommendations

1. The findings of this study should be judged against what higher education has been in the past, not what the results of collective bargaining have been in the past in noneducational organizations. There is great concern in finding that the change which has occurred as a result of collective bargaining in public and private noneducational organizations does not appear to have happened in the educational organizations examined in this study.

It is apparent that employees in higher education are not in the same position as were the coal miners, the auto workers, or the workers in the sweat shops of thirty to sixty years ago. The perceptual change to be viewed could be, is higher education changing, rather than is collective bargaining causing the same kind of changes in educational organizations as it caused in the private sector?

The perceptual data collected in this study indicates that collective bargaining is not causing the same kinds of changes that it did in the private sector. It may be changing higher education but the change is so small that it may not have been realized by the person who is viewing this phenomena subjectively.

In this context, it is recommended that a comparative study be conducted between private sector employees

and higher education employees from the turn of the twentieth century to the present, with regard to decision-making involvement and changes which accompanied collective bargaining.

2. The data collected for this study resulted from questions asked regarding the degree of decision-making involvement in areas of institutional concern, such as financial affairs, academic affairs, personnel policies, working conditions, and student affairs. The attempt was made to identify if there were perceived changes in the degree and level of decision-making over the period from 1964 through 1971. Participants of the study did not perceive a significant change in their degree of decision-making influence. A possible explanation for this result is that it could have been caused by the collapsing of the cells during the analysis of the data. Looking at all areas of decision-making collectively may have produced a masked effect over any one of the five specific decision-making areas identified in this study. It is possible that in any one or more than one decision-making area, bargaining or non-bargaining participants may have perceived a significant change in the degree of decision-making influence.

Therefore, it is recommended that a study be conducted with regard to specific decisions which could be identified within the categories identified in this

study to determine the impact or lack of impact of collective bargaining upon those decisions.

3. The results of this study may not portray a true picture based upon the fact that the organizational structures of the community colleges that are not bargaining and the organizational structures of the community colleges that are bargaining may be influenced by factors that are totally nonrelated to the decision-making system. The organizational structures may be related to the geographic setting, financial structure, size, age of the college, or composition of the board of trustees and have nothing whatsoever to do with the presence or absence of collective bargaining.

These are factors which may have had a more influential effect upon the results of the study than the attitudes of the participants. The attitudes of the participants may be structured more importantly by these other variables than by collective bargaining. As a result, any replication of this study should make an attempt to control some of these variables to determine whether or not these similarities between the non-bargaining colleges and the similarities between the bargaining colleges and the differences between bargaining and non-bargaining colleges had the influence which created the results of this study.

4. Based upon results realized from this study which indicate no significant change between the pre and post bargaining degrees of decision-making influence, it is recommended that a longitudinal study be conducted.

Could the difference between the pre and post bargaining degree of decision-making influence be significant even though this study did not reveal this to be so, in that the memory of the participants could be questionable? The difference between the pre and post scores, if the actual degree of decision-making influence had been recorded in 1964 and recorded again in 1971, may have been more obvious. In this study the author has asked the same person to call upon his power to recall and since memory may be poor and changes so subtle that there appears to have been no change in the degree of decision-making influence.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Millis, Harry A., and Montgomery, Royal E. Organized Labor. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1945.
2. Taft, Chief Justice. "American Steel Foundries v. Tri-City Central Trades Council 27." American Law Reports 360, 1921.
3. Cox, Archibald, and Bok, Derek Curtis. Cases and Materials on Labor Law. 6th ed. Brooklyn: The Foundation Press, 1965.
4. Foster, William Z. American Trade Unionism. New York: International Publishers, 1947.
5. Witney, Fred. Government and Collective Bargaining. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1951.
6. Parker, Reginald. A Guide to Labor Law. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961.
7. U.S., United States Statutes at Large, Vol. XLIX, Part I, United States Government Printing Office, 1936.
8. Lieberman, Elias. Unions Before the Bar. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
9. Gregory, Charles O. Labor and the Law. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1946.
10. Carlton, Frank Tracy. Organized Labor in American History. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1921.
11. Hutt, W. H. The Theory of Collective Bargaining. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.
12. Weeb, Sidney and Beatrice. Industrial Democracy. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1926.
13. Foner, Philip S. History of the Labor Movement in the United States. New York: International Publishers, 1947.

14. Arber, Edward, ed. Travels and Works of Captain John Smith. Vol. I. Edinburgh: 1910.
15. Sylvis, James C. The Life Speeches, Labors and Essays of William H. Sylvis. Philadelphia: 1872.
16. Litwack, Leon. The American Labor Movement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.
17. Bonnett, Clarence E. History of Employers' Associations in the United States. New York: Vantage Press, 1956.
18. Mitchell v. Hetchman Coal and Coke Co., Federal Reporter, CCXIV (1914).
19. Woodworth, Robert T., and Peterson, Richard B. Collective Negotiation for Public and Professional Employees. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1969.
20. Bernstein, Irving. The Lean Years. Boston: Houghton Penguin Books, 1966.
21. Kruger, Daniel H., and Schmidt, Charles T., Jr., editors. Collective Bargaining in the Public Service. New York: Random House, 1969.
22. Mustafa, Husain. "Can Management Negotiate Aspects of Its Rights?" Public Personnel Review, XXIX, No. 3 (July, 1968).
23. Thompson, Arthur, and Weinstock, Irwin. "White-Collar Employees and the Unions at TVA." Personnel Journal, XLVI, No. 1 (January, 1967).
24. Levine, Marvin J. "Dealing with Inadequacies in Collective Bargaining in the Federal Government." Public Personnel Review, XXX, No. 3 (July, 1969).
25. Repas Robert. Labor and Industrial Relations Course 841. East Lansing: Michigan State University. Taken from lecture notes, May 21 and 28, 1970.
26. School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Comparative Analysis, Labor Service Program, No. 611. East Lansing: Michigan State University, January, 1970.



27. Nixon, Richard M. "Labor-Management Relations in Federal Service, Executive Order 11491." Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Vol. V., No. 44. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 3, 1969.
28. Kennedy, John F. "Employee-Management Cooperation in the Federal Service." Federal Register, Vol. XXVII, No. 13. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 19, 1962.
29. Labor Relations Reporter - State Labor Laws. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, 1971.
30. Salik, Richard L., ed. Public Employee Relations Library, No. 4. Chicago: Public Personnel Association, 1968.
31. Weisenfeld, Allan. "Public Employees Are Still Second Class Citizens." Labor Law Journal, XX, No. 3 (March, 1969).
32. Schmidt, Charles T., Jr.; Parker, Hyman; and Repas, Robert. A Guide to Collective Negotiations in Education. Social Science Research Bureau. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1967.
33. Romney, George. "Press Release, Office of the Governor." Mimeographed. Lansing, Michigan, July 23, 1965, as cited by Hyman Parker, Michigan Public Employment Relations Act and Procedures, The Employment Relations Study Series, No. 1. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1970.
34. Parker, Hyman. Michigan Public Employment Relations Act and Procedures. The Employment Relations Study Series, No. 1. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1970.
35. Hare, James M., compiler. Public and Local Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan. Session of 1965. Lansing: Speaker-Hines and Thomas, 1965.
36. Rhodes, Eric F., and Neal, Richard G. Managing Educational Negotiations. Washington, D.C.: Educational Service Bureau, 1968.

37. Pfiffner, John M., and Sherwood, Frank P. Administrative Organization. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
38. Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
39. Jones, Roger W. "The Model as a Decision Makers Dilemma." Public Administration Review, XXIV, No. 3 (September, 1964).
40. March, James G., and Simon, Herbert A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959.
41. Weeb, Sidney and Beatrice. History of Trade Unionism. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1920.
42. Cole, Stephen. The Unionization of Teachers : A Case Study of the UFT. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
43. Michigan State University Faculty Affairs Committee. "An Impartial Review of Collective Bargaining by University Faculties." Unpublished Report, March 9, 1971.
44. Michigan Education Association. Teachers Voice. XLVIII, No. 11 (February 22, 1971).
45. Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1945.
46. Fram, Eugene H. "Faculty Ownership of Higher Education." Junior College Journal, XXXII, No. 7 (March, 1962).
47. Garrison, Roger. "Effective Administration for Superior Teaching." Junior College Journal, XXXII (May, 1962).
48. Dashiell, Richard. "Teachers Revolt in Michigan." Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (September, 1967).
49. Clark, Burton. "Faculty Authority." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, XLVII (Winter, 1961).
50. Galbraith, John Kenneth. The New Industrial State, as quoted by Richard C. Richardson, "Needed : New Directions in Administration." Junior College Journal, XL (March, 1970).

51. Blomerly, Peter. "The Junior College Department and Academic Governance." Junior College Journal, XLI (February, 1971).
52. Corson, John. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.
53. Priest, Bill J. "Faculty-Administrator Relationships." Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1964).
54. Garrison, Roger. Junior College Faculty : Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.
55. Odiorne, George S. Management by Objectives. New York: Pitman, 1965.
56. Atwell, Charles A., and Watkins, J. Foster. "New Directions for Administration - But For Different Reasons." Junior College Journal, XLI, No. 5 (February, 1971).
57. Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Restructuring in Human Dimensions of our Colleges." Junior College Journal, XLII, No. 5 (February 1971).
58. Lombardi, John. "Collective Negotiation in California Colleges." The Little Kappan, U.C.L.A., LXVII-LXVIII, No. 1-P (November, 1967).
59. Shils, Edward B., and Whittier, C. Taylor. Teachers, Administrators and Collective Bargaining. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.
60. Cave, David R. "A Critical Study of the Leader Behavior of School Administrators in Conflict with Teacher's Unions." Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967.
61. Potts, Vernon Russell. "A Study of the Relationship of Professional Negotiations to the Administrative Tasks Performed by High School Principals in Michigan." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1970.
62. Olsen, Allen Dale. "The Principal and Professional Negotiations." The National Elementary Principal, XLVI (April, 1967).

63. Garver, George Gaylin. "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Public School Principals in Oakland County, Michigan, Concerning Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967.
64. Munger, Benson Scott. "A Study of the Relationship Between Selected Variables and the Attitudes of Michigan Principals Toward Organizing for Negotiations." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1969.
65. Campbell, Henry Arville. "An Analysis of Communications, Influences, and Reliance in Public Two-Year Branches of State Universities and Independent Public Two-Year Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas, 1963.
66. Nicholson, Samuel Newton. "A Comparison of the Communication, Reliance and Influence Networks in Two-Year Colleges Operating under the Independent District System and under the Public School System." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Texas, 1963.
68. Murphy, David E. "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Attitudinal Factors Which Influence Faculty Morale and Faculty Perceptions of Involvement in Policy Formulation at Public Community Colleges in Michigan." Unpublished Ed. D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1968.
69. Whittier, C. Taylor. "Intervention Between Administrators and Teachers." Educational Leadership, October, 1969.
70. Blau, Peter M. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1964.
71. "Teachers Unions Proliferate on Junior College Campuses." Educators Negotiating Service, April 15, 1970.
72. Horvat, John J. "The Nature of Teacher Power and Teacher Attitudes Toward Certain Aspects of This Power." Theory into Practice, Vol. 7, No. 2, April, 1968.

73. Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. Part One. New York: The Dryden Press, 1951.
74. "Report of the Survey Subcommittee of Committee T." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, LV (Summer, 1969).
75. Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. Part Two : Selected Techniques. New York: The Dryden Press, 1953.
76. Wilson, Logan. "Changing University Governance." Educational Record, L (Fall, 1969).
77. TenElshof, Annette R. "A Pilot Examination of Decision-Making in the Small College Setting." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1970.
78. Marmion, H. A. "Unions and Higher Education." Educational Record, XLIX (Winter, 1968).
79. Lieberman, Myron, and Moskow, Michael H. "The Future of Collective Negotiations." Collective Negotiation for Public and Professional Employees. eds., Robert T. Woodworth and Richard B. Peterson. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1969.
80. Campbell, Ralph N. "Insights from Labor Relations." Faculty-Administration Relationships. Report of a work conference, May 7-9, Sponsored by the Commission on Instruction and Evaluation of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1958.
81. Heneman, H. J. "Insights from Industrial Organization and Relations." Faculty-Administration Relationships. Report of a work conference, May 7-9, Sponsored by the Commission on Instruction and Evaluation of the American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1958.
82. Selden, David. "The American Federation of Teachers." Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal. Edited by Richard W. Saxe. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas, 1968.

83. Lundsford, Terry, ed. The Study of Academic Administration. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1963.
84. Simon, Herbert. Administrative Behavior. New York: The Mac Millan Company, 1947.
85. Barnard, Chester. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
86. Argyris, Chris. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
87. Hertzberg, Frederick; Mausner, Bernard; and Snyderman, Barbara. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.
88. Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
89. Smith, Kerry, ed. Stress and Campus Response. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.
90. Gold, Benjamin K. Quantative Methods for Administrative Decision-Making in the Junior Colleges. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1969.
91. 1966 Junior College Directory. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.
92. Community College Enrollments 1970-1971. Michigan Community College Association Research Series, Vol. 71, No. 1, January, 1971.
93. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open-Door Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, June, 1970, Table 3.
94. Wildman, Wesley A. "Collective Action by Public School Teachers." Collective Negotiation for Public and Professional Employees. eds. Robert T. Woodworth and Richard B. Peterson. Chicago: Scott, Foresmann and Company, 1969.
95. Redfern, George B. "Negotiation Changes Principal-Teacher Relationships." Professional Negotiation and the Principalship. Edited by Department of Elementary School Principals, 1969.

96. Roberts, Harold S. Robert's Dictionary of Industrial Relations. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, 1967.
97. Dorsey, John T., Jr. "A Communication Model for Administration." Administrative Science Quarterly. (December, 1957).
98. Love, Thomas. The Impact of Teacher Negotiations on School System Decision-Making. Dissertation. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Ltd., 1968.
100. Mitchell, Anne. "The Crux of the Matter." Saturday Review, XLIX, No. 3 (January, 15, 1966).
101. Scott, Walter Wood. "A Study of Preparation Programs in School Administration as Affected by Collective Negotiation." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan University, 1966.
102. Steele, Marilyn Harger. "Has Collective Bargaining Contributed to Instructional Improvement in Michigan Schools?" Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1969.
103. Gittell, Marilyn, and Hollander, Edward T. Six Urban School Systems : A Comparative Study of Institutional Response. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.
104. Harnak, Robert S. The Teacher : Decision Maker and Curriculum Planner. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Company, 1968.
105. Capper, Michael R., and Gaddy, Dale. "Faculty Participation in Junior College Governance." Junior College Research Review, III, No. 6 (February, 1969).
106. Neff, Charles B. "Planning and Governance." Journal of Higher Education, XLII, No. 2 (February, 1971).
107. Swenson, N. G., and Novar, L. "Chicago City College Teachers Strike." Junior College Journal, XXXVII (March, 1967).

108. Dunn, John W.; Jowise, Peter; and Jentile, Ralph. "Our Faculty Participates in Policy Development." Junior College Journal, XXXVII, No. 4 (combined December, 1966, and January, 1967, issue).
109. Frankie, Richard J., and Howe, Ray A. "Faculty Power in the Community College." Theory Into Practice, VII, No. 2 (April, 1968).
110. Helper, John C. "Timetable for a Take-Over." Journal of Higher Education, XLII, No. 2 (February, 1971).
111. Parker, Hyman. Michigan Public Employment Relations Act and Procedures. School of Labor and Industrial Relations, Michigan State University, 1970.
112. Wright, David J. Occasional Paper No. 9. Office of Research Consultation, School for Advanced Studies, College of Education, Michigan State University, March, 1970.



## APPENDICES

.

## APPENDIX A

1407-L SPARTAN VILLAGE  
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48823

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

I am pleased that you have expressed a willingness to participate in the study I am conducting. The investigation is being conducted for a doctoral dissertation and an abstract will be forwarded to you upon completion of the study. Responses will be kept in strictest confidence and no allusions will be made to individuals or community college names.

In this study I will seek to:

1. Determine and examine the degree and level of influence administrators and faculty members perceive they have exercised over decisions in areas of institutional concern prior to the year 1965.
2. Determine and examine the degree and level of influence administrators and faculty members perceive they presently exercise over decisions in areas of institutional concern.
3. Determine if there are commonalities among answers as related to those institutions and individuals involved in collective negotiation and those institutions and individuals not involved in collective negotiation.

Directions for the enclosed questionnaire are self-explanatory. However, if you have any questions please call me collect at my home (area code 517 355-0811).

Thank you for assisting me with this project.

Respectfully yours,

Bailey T. Stewart, Researcher  
Michigan State University

Enclosure

## APPENDIX B

1407-L SPARTAN VILLAGE  
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48823

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dear \_\_\_\_\_:

I am currently in the process of conducting a dissertation research project at Michigan State University. This project involves a study of two dimensions of the community college environment: 1) the degree of influence YOU exercise regarding selected decisions and 2) the level at which YOU exercise this influence.

The major emphasis of this research project is upon the differences and/or commonalities in decision making influence in selected Michigan community colleges involved in collective negotiation and those not involved in collective negotiation. All participants and institutions will remain anonymous.

The results of this study will be derived from a questionnaire which is being given to selected administrators and faculty members from the participating institutions.

Your name has been included in the sample being used in this study. Will you assist me in this project by completing the enclosed questionnaire? Your responses will be considered confidential.

Although this instrument appears to be quite lengthy, it contains only thirty questions. Once you establish a pattern for responding, you are able to answer questions quite rapidly. It should take you less than twenty minutes to complete the questionnaire.

A final report of this project will be filed for your reference at the Michigan State University Library. If you wish to receive an abstract of the final report, please indicate this along with your name and address on the returned questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this project.

Respectfully yours,

Bailey T. Stewart, Researcher  
Michigan State University

Enclosure

## APPENDIX C

1407-L SPARTAN VILLAGE  
EAST LANSING, MICHIGAN 48823

\_\_\_\_\_  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dear \_\_\_\_\_

I am writing with reference to my request for your assistance in completing a questionnaire which was mailed to you in June. As previously indicated, the responses to this questionnaire will provide the data for a doctoral research project which I am conducting at Michigan State University.

The initial response to this project has been most gratifying. Approximately fifty per cent of the faculty members and eighty per cent of the administrators included in the study have completed and returned the questionnaire. However, it is felt that a higher percentage of returns would greatly enhance the validity and reliability of the findings. For this reason, I am forwarding a second copy of the questionnaire to those who have not responded as of this date.

The coding device included on the originally mailed instrument was included for the sole purpose of keeping a record of responses in the event that a second mailing was deemed necessary. In an effort to dispell any misunderstanding concerning this action, all code devices have been removed.

Ultimately, the value of this project hinges upon a high percentage of returns. In short, it depends upon the responses of all concerned. Your assistance is both necessary and vital for the success of this research. Thus, I again request your cooperation in completing and returning the enclosed questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this project.

Respectfully yours,

Bailey T. Stewart, Researcher  
Michigan State University

Enclosure

## APPENDIX D



## DECISION MAKING INFLUENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

## DIRECTIONS:

In part "A" of each question, place an "X" in the appropriate box to indicate the degree of influence YOU have exercised or are presently exercising in each of the following areas, letting:

WAS - Indicate YOUR influence on decision making prior to the year 1965.

IS - Indicate YOUR influence on decision making as it is today.

In part "B" of each question, place an "X" beneath the appropriate answer or answers to indicate where or with whom YOU exert YOUR influence. You may indicate one or more levels at which YOU exert YOUR influence if desired.

It is very important that you answer all questions.

DECISION MAKING INFLUENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS:

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None	
1a. Annual Institutional Budgetary Plans	WAS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
	IS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
1b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
	WAS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
	IS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2a. Long Range Institutional Budgetary Plans	WAS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
	IS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
2b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
	WAS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
	IS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
3a. Determining Individual Faculty Salaries	WAS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
	IS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	
3b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
	WAS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
	IS	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
4a. Determining Faculty Salary Scales	WAS				
	IS				

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
4b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS					
	IS					

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
5a. Determining Allocation of Funds for Equipment and Supplies	WAS				
	IS				

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
5b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS					
	IS					

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS:**

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
1a. Determining the Curriculum Offered	WAS				
	IS				

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
1b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS					
	IS					

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
2a. Long Range Curriculum Planning (Institutional Academic Direction)	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
2b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
3a. Approval of Innovative Methods of Instruction	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
3b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
4a. Determining Acceptable Academic Per- formance of Students	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
4b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
5a. Determining Specific Degree Requirements	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
5b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

**PERSONNEL POLICIES:**

Staffing		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
1a. Increasing Faculty Size	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
1b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

2a. Determining Which Candidate Shall be Hired for a Specific Position		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
2b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
3a. Determining the Certification Requirements for New Faculty Members	WAS				
	IS				

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organization	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
3b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS					
	IS					

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
4a. Determining Tenure Requirements	WAS				
	IS				

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organization	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
4b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS					
	IS					

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
5a. The Releasing of Faculty Members (firing)	WAS				
	IS				

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organization	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
5b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS					
	IS					

## Working Conditions

1a. Determining the Number of Administrative-Faculty Communications (i.e., faculty meetings)

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
WAS					
IS					

1b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organization	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
WAS						
IS						

2a. Determining Grievance Procedures

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
WAS					
IS					

2b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organization	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
WAS						
IS						

3a. Establishing Faculty Working Hours

	Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
WAS					
IS					

3b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level

	Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organization	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
WAS						
IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
4a. Establishing Faculty Workload (Number of Students)	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
4b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
5a. Determining Leave Policies	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
5b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
6a. Determining Fringe Benefits	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
6b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						



		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
7a. Determining Promotional Policies	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
7b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
8a. Determining In-Service Training Policies	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
8b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
9a. Determining the School Calendar	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
9b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
10a. Determining Other Academic Duties (i.e., advising and committee obligations)	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
10b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	IS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

STUDENT AFFAIRS:

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
1a. Determining Extra-curricular Activities Offered on Campus	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
1b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	IS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
2a. Determining the Student Discipline Code for the Institution	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
2b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
	IS	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
3a. Determining External Speakers, Groups and Films Allowed on Campus	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
3b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
4a. Determining Student Organizat- ions Allowed to Function on Campus (i.e., social or service)	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other, Please Specify
4b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

		Unilateral Discretion	Very Substantial	A Moderate Amount	Relatively Little	None
5a. Determining "Student-Power" On Campus (i.e., voting power on faculty-administrat- ive committees)	WAS					
	IS					

		Individual Faculty Members	Faculty Organizat- ion	Department Chairman	Dean or Division Chairman	President, Vice President or Board of Trustees	Other Please Specify
5b. On the whole, your influence is exerted at the following level	WAS						
	IS						

## APPENDIX E

## STUDY DESIGN

