

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.**

University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA

St. John's Road, Tyler's Green

High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

77-18,530

PARR, Kenneth Stewart, 1935-
A SURVEY OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AT MICHIGAN PRIVATE
LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES.

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1977
Education, administration

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

**A SURVEY OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AT MICHIGAN PRIVATE
LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES**

By

Kenneth Stewart Parr

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1977

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY OF FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AT MICHIGAN PRIVATE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

By

Kenneth Stewart Parr

The purpose of this study was:

(1) To determine whether or not the prospect for the implementation of collective bargaining at Michigan's private liberal arts colleges is imminent, and

(2) To investigate the relationship between various background factors and the individual professor's attitude toward collective bargaining, and

(3) To investigate the relationship between the individual professor's attitude toward collective bargaining and the professor's perception of factors inherent at the college where his or her appointment was held.

The study was conducted on a population of 330 professors randomly selected from the faculties of 12 private liberal arts colleges situated in southern Michigan. An instrument developed for the study containing an eight-item Likert Scale (referred to as an attitudinal index) with reliability of .91 according to Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was administered by mail with a 75.6 percent return.

The main statistical method used was that of chi square analysis with simple percentages being resorted to on 1 of the 14 hypotheses.

The statistical analysis led to the following conclusions:

(1) Those professors who opposed collective bargaining were likely to be more religiously inclined, older, tenured, to have held longer appointments, and to be more moderate or conservative politically than those professors favoring collective bargaining.

(2) Neither sex nor academic discipline were significantly related to attitudes toward collective bargaining.

(3) Religious colleges (as operationally defined) had small faculty segments who favored collective bargaining.

(4) Professors were more likely to favor collective bargaining if they perceived that: their colleges could be paying them better; their influence on policy-making was lacking; their administrators were not performing well; their administrators were not as sympathetic toward academic freedom as they should be.

(5) The professors who favored collective bargaining tended to believe they would reap dividends in terms of greater power as well as salaries. Moreover, they believed it was simply a matter of time before collective bargaining would be instituted at their college, particularly in view of its presence at nearby public colleges and universities.

Subsequent to the gathering of the data for this study, three of the subject faculties held elections to determine if there would be bargaining. One faculty accepted while the other two rejected by relatively close margins.

In view of the data of this study, the continued surplus of personnel in higher education, and the acute financial stress felt by private colleges, collective bargaining will be instituted at the colleges of this study with the probable exception of those that are strongly religious.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the years of my education in Sociology, I have been privileged to come under the instruction of two great and wise men: Professor F. O. Parr, my father, and Dr. Wilbur Brookover, Chairman of my doctoral committee. I am grateful to them for their patience, when I was inclined to be impatient, and especially to my father for his belief in me as a human being as well as a student.

My wife, Marilyn, and mother, Mrs. F. O. Parr, were never failing in their encouragement toward the achievement of this life-long objective. Marilyn's skills as an editor and typist reveal this to be a team effort, but I am especially grateful to her for the gentle responses and affection in moments of tension and when I was discouraged.

I would like to thank my children, Philip and Katy, for "letting Dad study" and "letting Mom type."

The encouragement and persistent prodding of three friends--Mr. Floyd Loomis, my father-in-law and a sailor of the Great Lakes, Rev. Allen Rice, Executive Director of the Michigan Council on Alcohol Problems, and Dr. Joel Epstein, Professor of History at Olivet College--was very much appreciated. They cared.

I would like to express further appreciation to the other members of the doctoral committee: Dr. Walter Scott, Dr. William Farquhar and Dr. Van Johnson. The late Dr. William Sweetland was especially generous of his time and encouragement in the early stages of the doctoral program.

Finally, I am glad to acknowledge the invaluable assistance Dr. Tom Jukam rendered on the agonizing details of statistics and computer programming.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.	1
Historical Perspective	1
The Problem.	3
Questions.	6
Theoretical Background	7
Overview	16
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	17
Introduction	17
Review of Literature	18
Summary.	24
III. HYPOTHESES AND PROCEDURES	26
Purpose and Design	26
Population	26
The Instrument	29
Hypotheses to be Tested.	34
Procedures for Analysis of Data.	35
Summary.	35
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RESULTS.	37
Preliminary Explanation of Data Presentation	37
Hypotheses and Results	38
Summary.	69

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	72
Summary	72
Conclusions	75
Discussion.	77
Consideration for Future Research	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
APPENDICES	
A. College Faculties Included in Survey.	91
B. Correspondence with Respondents	92
C. Faculty Questionnaire	94
D. Supplementary Tables.	98
E. Information and News Items Pertaining to the Events Subsequent to this Survey at Adrian and Albion Colleges	102

LIST OF TABLES

<u>NO.</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
3.1	Frequency distribution of voting responses of 403 Michigan private liberal arts college professors in the 1972 presidential election	28
3.2	Frequency distribution of 403 Michigan private liberal arts college professors regarding their vote on collective bargaining if the election were held today	29
3.3	Correlation matrix of eight collective bargaining attitudinal items	33
4.1	Frequency distribution of 330 Michigan private liberal arts college professors' attitudes toward collective bargaining	38
4.2	The attitudes of 330 professors at 12 Michigan private liberal arts colleges toward collective bargaining by degree of religious orientation of the college	40
4.3	Combined faculty attitudes at 12 Michigan private liberal arts colleges toward collective bargaining by degree of religious orientation of the college	42
4.4	The attitudes of 327 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by frequency of church attendance	43
4.5	The attitudes of 322 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by orientation of political ideology	44
4.6	The attitudes of 109 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by frequency of church attendance controlling for political liberalism	45

<u>NO.</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
4.7	The attitudes of 124 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by frequency of church attendance controlling for a moderate/conservative political orientation	46
4.8	The attitudes of 75 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by political orientation controlling for rare frequency of church attendance	47
4.9	The attitudes of 158 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by political orientation controlling for frequent church attendance	48
4.10	The attitudes of 330 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by sex	49
4.11	The attitudes of 326 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by age	50
4.12	The attitudes of 322 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by tenure status	51
4.13	The attitudes of 328 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by duration of present faculty appointment	52
4.14	The attitudes of 320 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by academic discipline	55
4.15	The attitudes of 327 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by attitudes toward salary	56
4.16	The attitudes of 324 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by attitudes toward faculty/administration distribution of power	57
4.17	Proportion of professors favoring collective bargaining by attitudes toward faculty/administration division of power, controlling for attitudes toward salary	59

<u>NO.</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
4.18	Proportion of professors opposing collective bargaining by attitudes toward faculty/administration division of power, controlling for attitudes toward salary	60
4.19	Projections of colleagues' most important reasons for organizing for collective bargaining by respondents' attitudes toward collective bargaining	62
4.20	The attitudes of 321 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by professorial evaluation of college administrative performance	63
4.21	The attitude of 318 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by faculty perceptions of administrative attitudes toward academic freedom	64
4.22	The attitudes of 288 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by reaction to the institution of collective bargaining at state universities	66
4.23	The attitudes of 326 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by changes in such attitudes in recent years	68
4.24	Summary of acceptance and rejection for the hypotheses	69

Tables in Appendix D

1	Analysis of variance of collective bargaining attitudes of 330 Michigan private liberal arts college professors on the basis of ten variables	98
2	The attitudes of 308 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by 1972 presidential vote	99
3	The attitudes of 327 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by perceived collective bargaining effects on salary	100

NO.

PAGE

- 4 The attitudes of 323 Michigan private liberal
 arts college professors toward collective
 bargaining by attitudes toward faculty control
 of budget

101

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Historical Perspective

Among the multitude of problems that face higher education and the numerous challenges that confront it, no single item seems to portend more controversy than the emergence of collective bargaining.

Collective bargaining at any level of education is of relatively recent development. Its active origins are usually attributed to the efforts, only approximately a decade ago, of the public schools of Michigan and New York City. From this base, collective bargaining diffused to other urban centers and from them into the hinterlands beyond. Today, no part of the country has entirely escaped its impact in elementary and secondary schools.

A breakthrough occurred in 1965 when Michigan enacted legislation granting public employees, particularly teachers, the right to bargain collectively. Several other states followed suit in the same year. Today, at least 30 states have passed such enabling legislation in some form and several others are deliberating such action. The breakthrough occurred primarily, but certainly not exclusively, in the elementary and secondary education levels and among certain other public employees. Some postsecondary institutions were affected.

In 1968 it was estimated that perhaps 10,000 faculty members in higher education were under the protection of collective bargaining, the

overwhelming majority of whom were faculty in community or junior colleges or vocational institutes. In 1976, published figures show that more than 100,000 faculty members have achieved or been granted this status. This growing number includes faculties not only of two-year institutions but of four-year colleges and universities and of several entire state systems. It includes some Catholic colleges and other church-related institutions, especially in the urban areas.

While there are conflicting data regarding a precise list of the colleges and universities with bargaining contracts, some form of contractual agreement has been implemented on approximately 460 campuses. Approximately 88 percent of these are public institutions, and slightly over one-third of that total are four-year colleges or universities.¹

There is as yet primarily a regional pattern in collective bargaining in higher education, but "islands" of initiation across the nation allow for at least the inference that coast-to-coast and border-to-border impact may be in the offing. Some 21 states are currently involved to some degree.

The entire state college systems of New Jersey, Hawaii, Vermont, Nebraska and Pennsylvania have collective bargaining. In Rhode Island the three public institutions of higher education in the state, which share a common governing board, have all entered into collective bargaining, each with a differing bargaining agent representing the faculty. Most of the eleven state colleges in Massachusetts are already certified and are sitting at the bargaining table. In the state of Michigan, five

¹Phillip W. Semas, "Faculty Unions Add 60 Campuses in 1975-76 Academic Year," The Chronicle of Higher Education, (May 31, 1976), p. 5.

state universities, each acting independently, have elected to go the collective bargaining route, and more are showing interest.

Accompanying this trend are pronouncements from various sectors of the educational establishment that "unionization" is inevitable for all of American higher education, including the small private liberal arts college.

The Problem

The basic concern of this study was to determine whether or not collective bargaining is a likely prospect for the private liberal arts colleges of Michigan and whether or not such a prospect poses a financial threat to these institutions from the standpoint of a demand for higher salaries.

While collective bargaining became prevalent in Michigan's community colleges in the late sixties, the predominant view of professors in four-year institutions large and small was that the problems of faculties at this type of institution were somehow different than those of the university and liberal arts college. Perhaps four-year college professors held this view due to the high school teaching background of large numbers of community college professors. It is also likely they held their community college colleagues in some disdain because of the partial vocational orientation of the community college.

It is probably true that the high school teaching background of many community college professors was a major factor in bringing collective bargaining to community colleges first among institutions of higher education in Michigan. The public schools had instituted collective bargaining in the early sixties and, as many of their teachers gravitated to community colleges, they took their favorable attitudes toward

bargaining with them and influenced the professors already there. No doubt another important factor was the significant gains public school teachers made in salary increases and power over the operation of the schools.

Many writers have dealt at great length with the general question of why college professors organize and more specifically, as alluded to above, why faculties at certain types of institutions organize when they do.

In 1970, Central Michigan University became the first four-year institution in Michigan to organize for collective bargaining purposes. Dr. William Boyd,² then President of Central Michigan University, speculated the presence of a domino effect and, particularly where his own institution is concerned, cites sudden growth and expansion of mission with the inevitable stresses and strains which accompany the necessary reorganization.

In alluding to institutions such as Central Michigan and Eastern Michigan, Boyd further speculated that since these smaller universities were originally teacher training institutions, their faculties more strongly identify with public school teachers.³

Although not a few administrators view collective bargaining as a precipitator of crisis, it is also possible to view it as the culmination of previous crises; perhaps even an aspect of the general challenge of the authority of tradition and fundamental institutions in society. Boyd alludes to this general problem also.

²William Boyd, "Collective Bargaining in Academe: Causes and Consequences," Liberal Education, LVII, (October, 1971), pp. 306-318.

³Ibid.

What bearing does the question of collective bargaining have on the small private liberal arts college? While most perceive private liberal arts colleges as an integral part of higher education that made great contributions to American society, they have had a history of perpetually passing from one crisis of survival to another. Moreover, while there is a substantial number of relatively secure liberal arts colleges, each year there are those who close their doors while fewer make their appearance on the higher education scene. There are, however, approximately 500 more private colleges in the country than public. It would, therefore, seem that in spite of their precarious position they still constitute a vital element of higher education in American society.

Probably the most frequent problem confronting private colleges is lack of money. The fiscal crisis in the first half of the seventies may well be comparable to that of the Great Depression. Private institutions have always been more dependent on tuition for the majority of their budgetary needs, and their tuition rates have generally been higher than public universities making it perpetually difficult to compete with them from that standpoint. Hence with the abolition of the draft and intensified competition of public institutions resulting from the creation of large numbers of community colleges and growth of public universities, the enrollments at smaller colleges are dropping or leveling off. When this situation is seen with an awareness of the rate of inflation, the magnitude of the crisis becomes evident.

Aside from the general problem of organizational restructuring which is necessary with the inception of collective bargaining, at least

two other problems are posed by the appearance of collective bargaining at struggling liberal arts colleges.

First, one of the major incentives for organizing for collective bargaining purposes is to improve the financial position of the constituents of the bargaining unit. While there are conflicting indications as to how much this has motivated college faculties to organize for collective bargaining, the fact remains that improved faculty salaries have resulted. How can a private college expect to give substantial raises to its faculty at the same time it is cutting the budget?

Secondly, how is it possible to recruit critically needed administrative talent to an institution with financial pressures and an "entrenched," "unionized" faculty as well? This question is especially important when first-rate administrative talent is difficult to recruit under good circumstances. Therefore it is evident that collective bargaining at a small college may precipitate a crisis which threatens the survival of that college.

Questions

The gravity of the concerns and potential problems led to the undertaking of this study in which answers to the following questions were sought:

(1) What are the overall faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining at 12 private liberal arts colleges in Michigan?

(2) What motives do faculty members have for favoring collective bargaining?

(3) What are the faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining at each specific college?

(4) Are the following background factors related to the individual faculty member's attitude toward collective bargaining: teaching discipline, church attendance, tenure, age, political ideology, sex?

(5) Are the following factors, within a given college, related to the faculty's attitudes toward collective bargaining: faculty evaluation of administrative performance, salaries, faculty perceptions of administrative incursions of academic freedom, mean age of faculty, religious orientation of the college?

(6) Are liberal arts college professors influenced by successful collective bargaining at other institutions of higher learning in the state?

Theoretical Background

Amitai Etzioni provides an organizational classification scheme which allows us to see how institutions of higher learning compare with other types of organizations. His scheme is based upon compliance relationships. Compliance refers both to a relation in which an actor behaves in accordance with a directive supported by another actor's power, and to the orientation of the subordinated actor to the power applied. Three main organizational types are: (a) coercive organizations, in which coercion is the means of control and high alienation exists among the participants; (b) utilitarian organizations, in which remunerative power and calculative involvement are characteristic; and (c) normative organizations, in which normative power and high professional commitment among the participants are found.⁴

⁴Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York: Macmillan Company, 1961), p. 23.

There are several types of normative organizations among which are colleges and universities. Etzioni's classification of these educational organizations may be called into question if unionization achieves significant gains in that a growing preoccupation with remuneration and job security is concomitant with unionization. The theoretical implication, of course, is that colleges and universities are becoming utilitarian or what Etzioni calls dual-structured organizations: they contain elements of two classifications.

The inception of collective bargaining presupposes an increase in the democratization of an organization. This, of course, also involves a fundamental change in organizational structure as well as operational procedures. As alluded to above, a primary theoretical frame of reference for this study is the causes of organizational change which exist in the environment external to the organization. Lipset, Trow, and Coleman,⁵ as well as Homans⁶ and others, provide examples of an expanding literature which recognizes that the purposes and environmental situation of an organization will influence its structure and behavior.

Another theoretical consideration is the organizational magnitude as related to democratic/autocratic structure. Some writers have assumed that smaller organizations are more democratic.^{7,8} Their

⁵Seymour Martin Lipset, Martin Trow, and James Coleman, Union Democracy (Glenco, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956), pp. 407, 415-416.

⁶George Homans, The Human Group (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950), pp. 90-94.

⁷Mary Woods Bennett, "Changes in the Liberal Arts College," Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Logan Wilson, ed., (1965), pp. 62-65.

⁸Morris T. Keaton, Models and Mavericks (McGraw-Hill, 1971), pp. 82-83.

assumptions seem to be based on the idea that smallness facilitates intimacy and good communication which, in turn, enable organization members to participate more directly in the decision-making processes of the organization. The research of Boland, as well as Blau, tends to refute this assumption. In a study which compared degree of democratic procedure in large and small institutions of higher education he found that:

. . . increasing institutional size was strongly associated with development of a considerable power, on the part of the faculty, to influence the institution's educational policy as well as matters of particular interest to each group of academic professionals through the faculty's governmental system and autonomous subject matter departments.⁹

While Boland's research provides one explanation for why small private educational institutions of higher learning have not been and generally are not democratically administered, their strong sectarian origins may provide another.

The great majority of the private liberal arts colleges in this country have sectarian origins. Their original purpose was to provide training for ministers and further religious indoctrination for laymen. While large numbers of these colleges have departed from their religious orientation, many have managed to maintain a high degree of religious emphasis. In view of the frequent conflicts between science and religious dogma, and the skeptical, questioning attitudes which higher education seeks to foster, it is easy to understand why many of these religious institutions were in the forefront of the secular trend which ultimately prevailed in American society.

⁹Walter R. Boland, "Size, External Relations, and the Distribution of Power: A Study of Colleges and Universities," Comparative Organizations, Wolf V. Heydebrand, ed., (1973), pp. 428-440.

We can see the relevance of Hegelian thought in that these institutions contained within them the seeds of their own destruction - at least to the extent rationality was and is emphasized as opposed to faith, dogma, and the sacred. Even though Broom and Selznick assert "secularism encourages rationality in social organization,"¹⁰ we can see justification for reference to Hegel and why these colleges provided some of the impetus in American society for secularism: many in fact were "hotbeds" of rationality.

Ironically, as the authority of tradition declined and rationality became dominant in American society, traditional or autocratic power alignments continued to prevail within most of the very institutions of higher learning which helped precipitate a more democratic spirit (by means of their rational thrust) in the rest of American society. That is to say, while many of these institutions became dominated by attitudes of skepticism and rationality, they retained their old autocratic models of governance. Herein lies another reason autocratic governance is the antithesis of collegial governance. One of the underlying questions to which this study addresses itself is the extent to which these autocratic power alignments are now under attack. An explicit question of this study is whether or not religious orientation of an institution is related to its faculty's attitude toward collective bargaining.

As secularism began to make an impact on the thought of sectarian institutions of higher learning, much of their religious emphasis

¹⁰Leonard Broom and Philip Selznick, Sociology (Harper and Row, 1963), p. 46.

was discarded. This led to a crisis in the educational goals to be pursued. What was really necessary was a conscious re-examination of organizational objectives. Those newly secularized colleges without good academic reputations were in a precarious position and many with good reputations were in peril as well because they began to lose their students to state institutions.

The secular milieu and religious colleges' adaptation to it suggests another theoretical orientation: that of goal displacement. If these institutions have "forsaken" their religious heritage, their *raison d'etre*, how are they unique from state institutions? Michels addresses himself to this problem of goal displacement and suggests that an organization can become self-perpetuating simply for purposes of providing employment for a certain number of people.¹¹

In reference to the Ford Motor Company, Etzioni reminds us that the product is automobiles; the goal is profits. The parallel of the private liberal arts college is: the product is education; the goal is a large freshman class. In both instances the ultimate goal is survival.

As institutions become preoccupied with their survival, an attendant sense of insecurity sometimes precludes the risks which are inherent in reform or innovation. In this context, then, collective bargaining may be seen as a conservative force as faculties fight to retain their precarious positions which reform may threaten. This phenomenon is what prompts Ray Howe to suggest that the function of

¹¹Robert Michels, Political Parties (Glenco, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949), p. 373.

collective bargaining is, under these circumstances, the protection of faculty interests rather than the advancement of them.¹²

When innovations are instituted for purposes of remaining competitive in attracting students, they are frequently a result of administrative initiative and sometimes seen by the faculty as an attempt to "water down" the "high quality" of the present program; a compromise of the academic integrity of the college. At one college familiar to the writer a new student recruiting brochure, disdainfully regarded by many on the faculty, was entitled, "Do Your Own Thing at ----- College." Many entrance and graduation requirements had recently been discarded after a heated struggle between the faculty and administration during which faculty members felt coercive tactics had been used by the administration. Given the crises which these small colleges currently face, it is likely that their administrations, in search of solutions, will seem indifferent or hostile toward the more academic interests of their faculties. Unilateral decisions are frequently deemed necessary by administrators thereby undermining faculty cohesion and morale. In addressing the organizational aspect of power relationships Blau asserts that "social cohesion is dependent on social equality." Suffice it to say social equality is precluded when decisions are imposed on subordinates. Blau continues:

Cooperative interaction, such as the pattern of consultation, affects cohesion in two opposite ways. Cooperation is a major source of cohesion in work groups, because it unites members in the voluntary exchange of valued assistance, but it simultaneously weakens cohesion by giving rise to status

¹²Ray Howe, "Bargaining: Evolution, Not Revolution," College and University Business, LIII, (December, 1972), pp. 25-28.

distinctions which inhibit social intercourse and thus limit feelings of fellowship. As a result of these conflicting forces, cohesiveness is not a stable condition.¹³

The lack of stability of which Blau speaks could well refer to the traditional rivalry which characterizes relations between faculty and administration in higher education. In an effort to categorize various types of organizational conflict, Caplow calls rivalry "continuous conflict" - hence the relevance of conflict theory to the present study. This theory holds that a certain degree of conflict in an organization is not harmful but that it is indeed a provider of organizational vitality. What collective bargaining seeks to do is define the parameters of the conflict so as to prevent it from becoming harmful.

One can speak meaningfully of the balance of power among competing bureaucratic agencies, between the two houses of the same legislature, among churches in the same town, or among departments of the same faculty. In all of these cases, attrition is minimized and violence is reduced as the number of organizations in the set increases, as they approach parity in power, if they are moderately insulated from each other, and if the intervention of outsiders [emphasis mine] is minimized.¹⁴

The emphasized statement above raises the question: does collective bargaining bring with it a dangerous intervention of outsiders, particularly when national organizations are trying to recruit voters in the early unionization process?

We will conclude this discussion of organizational theory with reference to one final theoretical problem which has a bearing on the present study: namely that of the professional as an employee. Essentially this is a problem of divided loyalties since professional

¹³Peter M. Blau, Dynamics of Bureaucracy (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955), pp. 202-203.

¹⁴Theodore Caplow, Principles of Organization (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1964), p. 349.

prerogatives sometimes conflict with organizational aims and procedures.

In a recent publication Blau reports that bureaucratic developments are similar to those in other types of organizations. He examines the degree to which the professional is able to act autonomously in a bureaucracy, albeit an educational bureaucracy.¹⁵ One pragmatic situation which may well confront the professor at a college faced with a declining enrollment is how or whether to maintain high standards of evaluation after having heard the college president say, "In the final analysis, this is a business." This infers, among other things, "We must attract customers (students) and do little to make them unhappy." It probably would be no surprise to discover upon a perusal of the list of board members of the private liberal arts college, that such boards are dominated by business executives. Paul Goodman asserts that such an emphasis on "efficient management" results in the community of scholars being replaced by a "community of administrators and scholars with administrative mentalities, company men and time-servers, grade seekers and time-servers among the students."¹⁶

For management to channel the initiative of professionals into administrative improvements instead of stifling it requires frequent contact and close collaboration [emphasis mine] between managers and professionals. Though conflicts between professional and administrative concerns are inevitable, the best chance for advantageous compromise is probably provided by extensive [emphasis mine] communication between the officials responsible for professional decisions and those responsible for administrative decisions.¹⁷

¹⁵Peter Blau, The Organization of Academic Work (New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1973), p. 8.

¹⁶Paul Goodman, The Community of Scholars (New York: Random House, 1962), p. 74.

¹⁷Peter M. Blau, Wolf V. Heydebrand, and Robert E. Stauffer, "The Structure of Small Bureaucracies," Comparative Organizations, (1973), p. 523.

The above emphasis is meant to call attention to what is perhaps another cause of any movement toward collective bargaining which this study may reveal.

Peter Blau, in another publication, asserts that "what discourages bureaucratic centralization of educational responsibilities most in a university or college is an institutionalized faculty government in which a large part of the faculty participate. Such a government is not mere window dressing but an effective mechanism for restricting centralized control over educational programs, in accordance with the professional demands of the faculty."¹⁸

The theoretical orientation of this study, as has been presented, is that of organizational theory. The major perspective within this theory which applies to the present study focuses on how college and university organizations respond to forces in the social environment: displacement of goals and internal conflict.

As American culture has become more secular, the institutions of higher learning have modified their goals, sometimes unconsciously, and their traditionally authoritarian administrations have been challenged. Such changes do not generally occur without conflict.

As American society has become a mass society, large organizations have come to dominate. This implies that the individual, including the professional person, becomes subservient to the organization.

The institution of collective bargaining has been created in an attempt to maintain some degree of integrity and welfare for the individual working within organizational confines. Traditionally, professional persons have a high degree of autonomy, but they too have "come

¹⁸Blau, op. cit., p. 164.

to work" for organizations in large numbers. The advocates of collective bargaining for college and university professors believe it is a means by which professional prerogatives can be achieved by some and maintained where they have not eroded.

Overview

In Chapter 2 the literature relevant to collective bargaining in the small liberal arts college is reviewed. The design of this study is presented in Chapter 3. The results of this study are presented and analyzed in Chapter 4. In Chapter 5 the study is summarized and conclusions are drawn.

We have pointed out in Chapter 1 the cultural, philosophical, and theoretical factors relative to collective bargaining in higher education. At this point we turn to some of the more specific or precipitating causes.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

While the literature on collective bargaining and governance of higher education is abundant, it is also redundant and impressionistic. There are actually very few factual inquiries. Many books and articles make reference to "colleges and universities" in their titles, but proceed to devote themselves exclusively to the large public and private university. They seem to assume that the distinctions between the large universities and small colleges are either insignificant or non-existent. The cause may be that the decade of the sixties saw such phenomenal growth of the universities and such rapid proliferation of community colleges that the small liberal arts college was simply overlooked or ignored. The locus of "the action" in higher education over the past ten years simply was not the liberal arts college. Therefore, in view of the brevity of the review of the literature pertaining to collective bargaining, the reader should bear in mind that very little of it was written with the small liberal arts college as a background. It is therefore hoped that this study will be a partial remedy for this paucity of literature.

The lack of literature is also somewhat baffling in view of the fact that the faculties of approximately 55 private colleges in the United States have organized for purposes of collective bargaining in

the past five years. One of the colleges in this study has organized; two more in the study conducted elections supervised by the National Labor Relations Board in which the "No Agent" ballot option prevailed, while another college faculty, not in the study, scheduled an election with the NLRB but canceled it when the administration made certain concessions.

Review of Literature

In what he implies is an extensive survey of literature, David Newton summarizes the reasons faculties unionize as follows:

the economic feast and famine experienced by colleges and universities--the boom period (1945-1965) and quasi bust period which followed;

the depersonalization and bureaucratization of campus life engendered by the growth of gargantuan multicampus universities (particularly in the public sector);

a diminution of the sense of collegiality between campus faculty and burgeoning central administrators, and faculty dissatisfaction with existing institutional governance schema;

the explosive nature of the sixties which politicalized the campuses in the wake of student uprisings and thrust for student power;

the sudden spurt of state public employment laws beginning in 1965 which provided legally enabling and protective ability to organize.¹⁹

It should be noted that there is no mention of financial remuneration.

One article written by a vice-president at Blackburn College, in Illinois, articulates a commonly held view that college professors are organizing primarily in the "full expectation that they will accrue

¹⁹David Newton, "Faculty Attitudes & Bargaining," Collective Bargaining in Higher Education - The Developing Law, ed. Judith P. Vladek and Stephen C. Vladek, pp. 97-113.

financial dividends."²⁰ Since some colleges are already closing, he strongly implies that collective bargaining will precipitate the demise of any financially pressed liberal arts college.

Blysma and Blackburn²¹ tend to confirm the view that faculties are more preoccupied with "personal welfare" (salary) than shared decision-making. They make it clear that their findings do not repudiate the claim that faculties are interested in more influence over the institutional decision-making processes; merely that faculties have made more gains in the area of salary than power. It should be noted that this was a study among community college professors.

In a study on the mobility of college professors, NicholSEN found that salary is not of major consideration for professors who stay at a given institution, but that such items as teaching load and courses taught are of greater concern.²² Since that study is more than six years old, it could well be that the tight job market for college professors would change NicholSEN's finding, i.e., that the professors more preoccupied with high salaries are remaining where they are and demanding higher salaries.

Brown, in a survey of public institutions on the Eastern seaboard, found that shared decision-making was considered a more critical issue than salaries in collective bargaining.²³

²⁰Clarence Hughes, "Collective Bargaining and the Private Colleges," Intellect, CI (October, 1972), pp. 40-41.

²¹Donald Blysma and Robert Blackburn, "Changes in Faculty Governance and Faculty Welfare: Some Empirical Consequences," Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining on Campus, (1971), pp. 237-262.

²²Edward NicholSEN, "Job Decisions of Ohio Liberal Arts College Members," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII (1970).

²³Ralph S. Brown, Jr., "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education," Michigan Law Review, XII:MLXVII (March, 1969), p. 1081.

While it is difficult to determine college professors' motives for choosing to "organize", there is a consensus in the impressionistic literature as well as the few factual surveys that a desire for more money and more power are the two major issues. William F. McHugh probably sums it up best:

There can be no doubt that professionals will be negotiating for salaries and fringe benefits; the City University of New York contract makes that abundantly clear. But if recently negotiated contracts are bellwethers, it is equally clear that faculty are introducing matters that include academic and policy matters...institutional policies.²⁴

The most frequently reported faculty characteristic which seems to be related to a favorable predisposition toward collective bargaining is youth. Boyd, in his frequently cited essay, speculates that younger professors favor bargaining due to their unwillingness to wait long years before ascending to positions on powerful faculty committees.²⁵ He also feels that more youthful instructors and assistant professors are simply more radical. Lane found, in a survey taken at a California university, that the younger members of the faculty felt outright hostility toward administrators.²⁶ Garbarino, in another oft-cited article, suggests that it may not be youth per se which is related to a favorable predisposition toward collective bargaining, but that the relatively powerless position of the newer faculty member is the real motivating factor.²⁷ Boyd is very forthright concerning this when he says that

²⁴William F. McHugh, "Recent Developments in Collective Bargaining in Higher Education," College Counsel, V (1970), pp. 159-208.

²⁵Boyd, op. cit., p. 312.

²⁶Tracy N. Lane, "An Investigation of Some Non-Economic Factors in Collective Bargaining Associated with the Satisfaction of Negotiators," Dissertation Abstracts, XXXII (1971).

²⁷Joseph W. Garbarino, "Faculty Unionism: Theory and Practice," Industrial Relations, XI (February, 1972), pp. 4-5.

collective bargaining is "a means by which departmental control can be wrested from old entrenched colleagues."²⁸ Blyma and Blackburn's survey of community college faculty personnel is consistent with Lane's findings and with Boyd's and Garbarino's impressions vis-a-vis the age factor.²⁹

A Carnegie Commission on Governance of Higher Education conducted a survey of five types of institutions including private liberal arts colleges regarding faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining. The findings of their survey would seem to indicate little difference in attitudes toward bargaining between the small private college faculty and the large university faculty. The statement: "Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university" was submitted. Sixty-eight percent of community college faculty members surveyed strongly disagreed or disagreed with reservations with the statement, while 61 percent of liberal arts college faculty members held the same position. The attitudes of the various other types of institutions such as doctoral degree granting institutions are of comparable persuasion: some types of institutions slightly higher than liberal arts faculties; some slightly lower.³⁰ This survey was published in the spring of 1973.

In addition to conforming with the above findings on age of faculty members, the commission also reported a relationship between political leanings and predisposition toward bargaining, i.e., leftward-leaning faculty demonstrated a more favorable attitude toward bargaining

²⁸Boyd, op. cit., p. 422.

²⁹Blyma and Blackburn, op. cit., p. 252.

³⁰The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems (McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 39-52.

regardless of age, teaching discipline or type of institution. Even the more conservative faculty had quite favorable attitudes toward bargaining: 53 percent regardless of age or type of institution. The faculty in the social science disciplines also indicated a more favorable attitude toward bargaining than other disciplines.

A 1974 analysis of faculty attitudes in post-secondary institutions in Hawaii indicates that a variety of points of view toward unionism and collective bargaining are to be found among faculty members in institutions of higher education, and that these attitudes will influence their voting choices in a representation election. Each faculty member will make an election choice, ranging from no representation through moderate to militant collective bargaining organizations, that will reflect and be consistent with the attitudes that he holds. His attitudes, in turn, will be associated with or affected by his academic rank, whether his position is tenured or non-tenured, the highest degree that he holds, the location of his appointment, and the areas of his specialization. His choice will also be affected by such factors as the financial situation of his institution; movements of living costs; faculty involvement and effectiveness in the decision-making process on campus; personality factors, both in the administration of his institution and in leadership positions in employee groups; and collective bargaining successes or failures in comparable institutions elsewhere in the country and in bargaining units with which he may be familiar closer to home.³¹

A survey of 1,457 colleges and universities published by the Bureau of National Affairs in 1976 reports three findings relevant to the present study:

(1) More than half of the colleges and universities organized indicated that the issue of salaries and fringe benefits was the principal focus of the organizing campaign.

(2) Salaries and fringe benefits were the principal areas of conflict during the contract negotiations.

³¹ Anonymous, "Faculty Organizing: Special Report," White Collar Report, CMLXXXIX (March 26, 1976), pp. 1-2.

(3) By almost a two-to-one margin, administrators said that the costs of education had risen as the result of recognition of the bargaining agent.³²

The last study to be cited here is probably the most relevant to the foci of the present study: size and religious orientation.

Peter Blau studied a sample of 115 colleges and universities in an attempt to determine whether their administrative structures are the same as those of government bureaus and private firms. In comparing bureaucratic with professional authority, Blau examined appointment power and the centralization of educational matters. It was discovered that:

Bureaucratic authority over faculty selection is more pronounced in small than in large academic institutions, contrary to the stereotype of the bureaucratization of large universities. In a small college, the number of new faculty members to be hired every year is small enough for the president and academic dean to become involved in their selection, and they typically wield much influence when they do become involved.³³

Blau further discerned that while religious institutions of higher learning generally are less affluent and smaller than secular ones, affluence and size were not as significant as the religious orientation with respect to administrative domination of faculty appointments. He acknowledges that there are some fine sectarian institutions where faculties are dominant in the appointment of their colleagues, but they are exceptional. Blau concludes this section of his report with a scathing quotation from David Riesman: "In such institutions, the teachers are but hired hands, and their institutions are colleges only

³²Joel Seidman, Aledge, and Lane Kelley, Faculty Attitudes and Choice of a Collective Bargaining Agency in Hawaii, (August, 1974), p. 34.

³³Blau, op. cit., p. 172.

by the grace of semantic generosity."³⁴ In any case, Blau found that the small religious college is generally characterized by a high centralization of power in their faculty appointments and policy-making decisions.

Summary

The literature reviewed above pertains primarily to public universities and community colleges. At this point it is not clear what relevance it has for the small private liberal arts college. A major concern of this study was to discern not only to what degree sentiments for or against collective bargaining existed among liberal arts college professors and the bases of such sentiments, but what comparison and contrast could be made with professors at other types of institutions of higher education.

The evidence as to professorial motivation in opting for collective bargaining is conflicting. One study indicates that salary is the major consideration, while another indicates that faculty are more interested in greater leverage in the institutional policy-making processes.

A youthful age is the most frequently reported faculty characteristic related to favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining.

A very comprehensive survey published by the Carnegie Commission indicates that a 68 percent majority of professors surveyed across the nation tend to favor collective bargaining. Moreover, the survey also found a relationship between political inclination and academic discipline and attitudes toward collective bargaining.

³⁴Ibid., p. 174.

A final study conducted by Peter Blau was the only one to report that religious orientation was a significant factor in relation to faculty/administrator power relationships. The administrators generally dominate the faculty appointment and policy decisions at small sectarian colleges.

CHAPTER 3

HYPOTHESES AND PROCEDURES

Purpose and Design

The objectives of this study were to determine (1) the attitudes of lower Michigan liberal arts college faculty members toward collective bargaining and (2) how those attitudes were related to the following: religious orientation, political ideology, sex, age, tenure status, length of service at a given institution, teaching discipline, attitude toward faculty involvement in institutional policy making, attitude toward salary, perception of administrative performance, perception of administrative posture toward academic freedom, and the trend toward collective bargaining at public institutions of higher education in the state of Michigan.

Population

There are 16 private liberal arts colleges in Michigan. Questionnaires were mailed to a 50 percent random sample of the faculty of 12 of these colleges. Five of the colleges are independent with sectarian origins. Two of these have Roman Catholic attachments; the remaining three have theological roots in the Dutch Reformed, Baptist, and Presbyterian churches. The denominational affiliations of the remaining seven colleges are: two Roman Catholic, two United Methodist, one Baptist, one Christian Reformed, and one Free Methodist. While all of these colleges are identified as Christian, they range across the theological

spectrum from fundamentalist to humanist. All 12 colleges are co-educational. They had an average enrollment of 1,460 in the 1973-74 school year. (See page 91 for list of colleges.) The colleges are all located in the southern half of the lower peninsula of Michigan. Faculty rosters published in the respective catalogs were used for the random selection of respondents. The questionnaires were distributed by mail. Since in their response to the initial mailing several professors had requested the results of the study and thereby identified themselves, one professor at each college was contacted by telephone and asked to assist in ensuring that the personnel selected to receive the questionnaires were, in fact, still at the institution. In rare instances where a professor was no longer there, the contact person was instructed to randomly select a substitute. The substitute received a questionnaire in a second mailing. Questionnaires were sent to a total of 533 respondents; 403 were returned for a 75.6 percent return.

Seventy-three of the 403 subjects in the sample population did not complete the attitudinal index (specific questions relating to attitudes toward bargaining: the dependent variable) and could not be used in the analysis. The attitudinal index consisted of eight items; the questionnaire was rejected if any of the items were left unanswered. A frequency distribution was performed on these rejects and compared with a frequency distribution performed on those questionnaires acceptable to the study. The accepted questionnaires were very comparable to the rejected ones vis-a-vis responses to the independent variables. Table 3.1 reveals the similarity. Although the Table draws only on the question of how the professors voted in the 1972 presidential election,

the similarity is typical for such other questions (independent variables) as age or attitudes toward salaries.

TABLE 3.1 -- Frequency distribution of voting responses of 403 Michigan private liberal arts college professors in the 1972 presidential election

How Voted		Accepted Questionnaires	Rejected Questionnaires ^a	Total
Republican	N	168	38	206
	%	51	53	51
Democratic	N	162	34	196
	%	49	47	49
No Response	N	---	1	1
	%	---	---	---
Total	N	330	73	403
	%	82	18	100

^aWhile it was necessary to reject a questionnaire when one or more questions on the attitudinal index was left unanswered, most index questions were in fact answered on the rejected questionnaires to generate these data.

When a similar comparison is made of the most pertinent question (Table 3.2) of the collective bargaining attitudinal index, it initially appears that a much higher percentage (56 percent) of those rejected oppose collective bargaining. Even though the percentages in Table 3.2 reveal apparent differences in the two populations with respect to attitudes toward collective bargaining, when the percentages in the row totals column are compared with those of the accepted questionnaires, the effect of losing 73 questionnaires from the study is seen to be minimal. It was therefore concluded that a reduction of N did not unduly bias the results of the study.

TABLE 3.2 -- Frequency distribution of 403 Michigan private liberal arts college professors regarding their vote on collective bargaining if the election were held today

Response		Accepted Questionnaires	Rejected Questionnaires	Total
Favor	N	131	10	141
	%	40	14	35
Oppose	N	199	41	240
	%	60	56	60
No Response	N	---	22	22
	%	---	30	5
Total	N	330	73	403
	%	82	18	100

Perhaps the best indication that the loss of the 73 questionnaires did not affect the results of the study is that the data indicated that if an election had been conducted at Albion³⁵ and Adrian Colleges these two faculties would have voted in favor of collective bargaining. Subsequent events have confirmed such a prediction. Indeed, the percentage opposing collective bargaining in the actual collective bargaining election at Adrian was precisely the same as that indicating opposition in this study - 30 percent.

The Instrument

The instrument for this investigation (see page 94) was composed of four parts. The first part contains questions for purposes of gathering personal background information (independent variables) on each of the professors. The second part of the questionnaire consists of items

³⁵Albion does not have bargaining although a majority of their faculty initially voted for either the American Association of University Professors or the Michigan Association of Higher Education to represent the faculty for collective bargaining purposes. A runoff election between MAHE and "No Agent" resulted in a victory for the latter. (See page 109.)

pertaining to the professor's perceptions of the distribution of power and salary situation at his or her college. In the third part the respondent is asked to assess his colleagues' motivation for developing favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining. While the subjective nature of this question is apparent, the assumption was made that the respondents would indeed have a fairly accurate perception of their colleagues' sentiments in these small colleges.

The writer held a faculty appointment at one of Michigan's private liberal arts colleges (not in this study) where collective bargaining was seriously contemplated by the faculty. As a participant in numerous discussions on the subject of bargaining, recurrent themes became evident. They were: how collective bargaining would affect faculty power, salaries, faculty-administration relationships, and the image of the college with potential financial contributors.

For purposes of this study it was assumed that the idea of collective bargaining was an abstraction to many of the respondents. For this reason an eight-item Likert-type scale³⁶ was developed incorporating the above themes. Rather than relying on a simple statement indicating an attitude toward collective bargaining, the attitudinal scale reminded the respondents of some of the possible implications of collective bargaining.

Each item in the scale was scored by a four-point strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree ranking. The total score on the scale could range from 0 to 24. The higher the score the more negative the attitude toward collective bargaining. The lower the score the more

³⁶Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: Dryden Press, 1951), pp. 194-197.

positive the attitude toward collective bargaining. The items in this scale were worded to provide balance on negative and positive questions. Balance was also sought by reversing the direction of some items to prevent consistently positive or negative responses from slanting the total scale score. The reliability of the collective bargaining attitude scale as determined by Hoyt's Reliability Coefficient³⁷ was .91 which is within the acceptable range.

Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was also used to check the reliability of the attitudinal index. The result was the same ($R = .91$).

Listed below are the items of the attitudinal index. A correlation matrix of the eight items is presented in Table 3.3. The similarity of items seven and eight was obvious from the outset, but it was felt that there may have been a significant number of respondents who might favor collective bargaining in principle but still reject it in the light of considerations unique to the situation at a given college. These items appear in abbreviated form in Table 3.3; the underlined words are the key terms in the table column headings.

- (1) Collective bargaining is desirable because it would enable our faculty to exercise a greater influence over faculty promotions and tenure.
- (2) Collective bargaining is desirable because it would enable our faculty to exercise more power over the college budget and the establishment of institutional priorities.
- (3) Collective bargaining is desirable because it would enable our faculty to exercise more power over administrative appointments such as presidents, deans, and department heads.

³⁷Cyril Hoyt, "The Reliability Estimated by Analysis of Variance," Psychometrika, VI (June, 1941), p. 26.

- (4) Collective bargaining is undesirable because it would cause a serious decrease in financial donations to the college.
- (5) Collective bargaining is undesirable because it would cause a damaging and permanent split between faculty and administration.
- (6) Collective bargaining is undesirable because it would cause faculty salary demands which exceed budgetary limitations.
- (7) I would vote to approve collective bargaining for our faculty ~~if~~ an election were held today.
- (8) I believe collective bargaining would be a good thing for my college.

TABLE 3.3 -- Correlation matrix of eight collective bargaining attitudinal items

	Influence Faculty Promotions	Influence Institut. Priorities	Influence Admin. Appointments	Donations Will Decrease	Fac./ Admin. Split	Excessive Salary Demands	Vote C.B. Today	Collective Bargaining Good Thing
Influence Faculty Promotions	1.00	.71	.67	.34	.49	.47	.71	.72
Influence Institut. Priorities		1.00	.70	.35	.46	.44	.72	.74
Influence Admin. Appoint.			1.00	.32	.40	.41	.61	.66
Donations Will Decrease				1.00	.57	.42	.45	.47
Faculty/ Admin. Split					1.00	.51	.62	.62
Excessive Salary Demands						1.00	.53	.55
Vote for C. B. Today							1.00	.93
C. B. Good Thing								1.00

$$\text{Reliability Coefficient} = \frac{N}{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{\text{Sum of Variances of Item}}{\text{Co-Variance Matrix}} \right)$$

$$r_{tt} = \frac{8}{7} \left(1 - \frac{6.6577}{32.8927} \right) = .9115$$

Hypotheses to be Tested

(1) The faculties at religious colleges will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than faculties at secular colleges.

(2) Religious professors will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than will non-religious professors.

(3) Professors who are liberal in their political orientation are more likely to favor collective bargaining than conservatives.

(4) Female professors will be more likely to oppose collective bargaining than males.

(5) Opposition to collective bargaining will be more likely as the professors progress in age.

(6) Tenured professors will be less likely to favor collective bargaining than non-tenured professors.

(7) The longer the service at a given college the more likely the faculty member will oppose collective bargaining.

(8) Professors in certain disciplines are more likely to favor collective bargaining than in other disciplines.

(9) Dissatisfaction with salary will be related to a favorable attitude toward collective bargaining.

(10) Dissatisfaction with involvement in policy-making decisions (powerlessness) will be related to a favorable attitude toward collective bargaining.

(11) The favorable attitude of professors toward collective bargaining is more likely to be based on the desire for more power than on a desire for higher salaries.

(12) Professors who view their college administration's performance negatively are more likely to favor collective bargaining than those professors who view an administration's performance positively.

(13) Faculty perceptions of administrative posture toward academic freedom will be related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining: incursions of academic freedom will be seen as justification for organizing for collective bargaining purposes.

(14) No relationship will be established between the initiation of collective bargaining at other institutions of higher learning and professors' attitudes toward it.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

It has been the purpose of this study to determine the attitudes of professors at 12 private liberal arts colleges in Michigan toward collective bargaining as well as the bases for their attitudes.

Several statistical procedures were used in analyzing the data. Analysis of variance³⁸ (.01 level of significance accepted) and chi square (.01 level of significance accepted) were used to determine the relationship between respondent background factors and individual college characteristics and respondent attitudes toward collective bargaining. In view of the ordinal nature of the data, Kendal's Correlation Ratios³⁹ Tau B and Tau C were used. In one instance coefficient of contingency was substituted for Tau.

Summary

For purposes of gathering information on professorial attitudes toward collective bargaining, a questionnaire was sent to professors at 12 private liberal arts colleges in Michigan. Questionnaires were sent to a 50 percent random sample of the faculty at each institution. The instrument gathered the following background information on each professor: sex, age, discipline, tenure status, duration of appointment, frequency of church attendance, and political orientation. The

³⁸Initially the decision was made to use analysis of variance exclusively until the writer was advised that chi square was more appropriate considering the relatively small population of the study. The decision to use the chi square analytical procedure was made after the analysis of variance data had been obtained from the computer. The analysis of variance findings will not be referred to in the presentation of findings but are presented in a summary table on page 98.

³⁹William H. Beyer, ed., Handbook of Tables for Probability and Statistics (Cleveland: Cleveland Chemical Rubber Co., 1966), pp. 331-332.

questionnaire also included an attitudinal index relative to the issue of collective bargaining. Two mailings were required to obtain a return of 403 questionnaires, or 75.6 percent of the population (533) surveyed. The data were punched and coded on IBM cards and processed through the CDC 3600 computer at the Michigan State University Computer Center.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RESULTS

Preliminary Explanation of Data Presentation

The purpose of this study has been to analyze the relationship existing between the attitudes of liberal arts college professors in Michigan toward collective bargaining and individual background factors and characteristics of the professors' respective colleges.

For cross tabulation analysis, collapsing the attitudinal index into a small number of categories is necessary in order to insure sufficient frequencies in each cell. Given the small N, working with the discrete 25 points of the index would have limited the utility of the cross tabulation of analysis. For this analysis the attitudinal index was collapsed from a five-fold field attitudinal measure of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, into a three-fold field attitudinal measure ranging from agree to disagree. Such a reduction was based on careful examination of the frequency for the index. The final choice of the measure insured that no wide disparity of frequencies existed among the categories and that each category contained N's of sufficient size for contingency analysis. As presented in Table 4.1, the three categories were determined by dividing the Likert scale scores into upper, medium, and lower ranges: the higher the score the greater degree of opposition to collective bargaining. Those respondents who scored zero to nine on the scale were

considered to have favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining. Those respondents who scored 10 to 14 were considered to be neutral toward collective bargaining. Those respondents scoring 15 to 24 were considered to be opposed to collective bargaining.

TABLE 4.1 -- Frequency distribution of 330 Michigan private liberal arts college professors' attitudes toward collective bargaining

Attitude	Index Code	Frequency	Relative Frequency
Favor	0-9	111	33.6%
Neutral	10-14	89	27.0%
Oppose	15-24	130	39.4%
Total		330	100.0%

The total number of respondents was 330. A total of 39.4 percent (N=130) of the professors oppose collective bargaining while 33.6 percent (N=111) favor it and 27 percent (N=89) were neutral in their attitudes.

Hypothesis 1

The faculties at religious colleges will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than faculties at secular colleges.

Results. The data pertaining to this hypothesis are presented in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. The concept of religious orientation was operationalized by means of a simple index of college policies regarding student chapel attendance, a required theological position for appointment to the faculty, and the degree to which religion is perceived as playing a role in campus life (see page 94, items 8, 10, 11). For example,

if 60 percent or more of the responses from a particular college indicated that students were required to attend chapel, 60 percent or more of the responses indicated that appointment to the faculty required a commitment to a particular theological position, and 60 percent or more of the responses indicated that religion was a major factor in campus life, this college was considered to be religious. If 50 percent or more of the responses to at least two of the aforementioned index items were in the direction of the designated religious classification, that college was considered to be moderately religious. A secular college is one where 60 percent or more of the respondents indicated there is no required chapel attendance or theological adherence for faculty members, and that religion was not an important factor in campus life. According to these designations, two colleges in the study are religious, one is moderately so, and the remaining nine are considered secular. Table 4.2 shows the two religious colleges, Calvin and Spring Arbor, on the left. Their religious indices are very high. One hundred percent of the Calvin faculty sample indicated that religion influences campus life a great deal, 98 percent indicated that their appointment to the faculty was dependent on a prior theological commitment, and 92 percent indicated that a religious chapel service was required of the students. One hundred percent of the Spring Arbor sample indicated that religion greatly influences campus life, 83 percent indicated that commitment to a particular theology was a prerequisite to appointment to the faculty, and 100 percent of the sample indicated that chapel attendance is a requirement for students.

TABLE 4.2 -- The attitudes of 330 professors at 12 Michigan private liberal arts colleges toward collective bargaining by degree of religious orientation of the college

Collective Bargaining Index		Religious		Moderately Religious	Secular								Total	
		Calvin	Spring Arbor	Hope	Adrian	Albion	Alma	Aquinas	Hillsdale	Kalamazoo	Mary Grove	Mercy	Nazareth	
Favor	N %	3 5.5	7 29.2	9 21.9	14 46.7	23 67.6	5 20.9	7 29.2	7 53.9	9 32.1	6 37.5	11 52.4	10 50.0	111 33.6
Neutral	N %	17 30.9	4 16.7	16 39.0	7 23.3	1 2.9	8 33.3	6 25.0	4 30.8	10 35.7	7 43.8	4 19.0	5 25.0	89 27.0
Oppose	N %	35 63.6	13 54.1	16 39.0	9 30.0	10 19.4	11 45.9	11 45.9	2 15.4	9 32.1	3 18.8	6 28.6	5 25.0	130 39.4
Total	N %	55	24	41	30	34	24	24	13	28	16	21	20	330 100.0

The one moderately religious college is Hope College. Eighty-nine percent of the faculty sample indicated that religion is a great influence in the campus life, 64 percent indicated that a theological commitment was not a prerequisite to appointment to the faculty, and 56 percent that chapel attendance was required for the students. The faculty of one secular college (Alma), as an example, indicated (100 percent) that a theological commitment is not a prerequisite to faculty appointment, 81 percent indicated that the religious influence was very little or non-existent, and 87 percent indicated that there is no required chapel attendance. Sixty-three point six percent of the Calvin faculty oppose collective bargaining and 54.1 percent of the Spring Arbor faculty oppose it. The percentage of faculty who oppose collective bargaining at both religious colleges is much higher than even the moderately religious college, Hope.

When the N's for the religious and secular colleges are combined, as in Table 4.3, it can be seen that only 12.7 percent of the faculty at the two religious colleges favor collective bargaining, while 43.8 percent of the faculty at the secular colleges favor it. Sixty point eight percent of the faculty at the religious colleges oppose collective bargaining while 31.4 percent of the faculty at the secular colleges oppose it. With a significance of .001, the hypothesis is confirmed.

TABLE 4.3 -- Combined faculty attitudes at 12 Michigan private liberal arts colleges toward collective bargaining by degree of religious orientation of the college

Collective Bargaining Index		Religious	Moderately Religious	Secular	Total
Favor	N	10	9	92	111
	%	12.7	21.9	43.8	33.6
Neutral	N	21	16	52	89
	%	26.5	39.0	24.7	27.0
Oppose	N	48	16	66	130
	%	60.8	39.0	31.4	39.4
Total	N	79	41	210	330
	%	100.0	99.9	99.9	100.0

P = .001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based.

Hypothesis 2

Religious professors will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than non-religious professors.

Results. Religious inclination was determined by frequency of church attendance. The respondent was given four options on the instrument regarding the frequency of his or her attendance: never, rarely, once or twice a month, or once a week. The data for this hypothesis are presented in Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.4 -- The attitude of 327^a Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by frequency of church attendance

Collective Bargaining Index	Frequency of Church Attendance				Total	
	Never	Rarely	1-2 Times Per Month	Weekly	N	%
Favor	67.9%	42.3%	27.0%	22.7%	110	33.7
Neutral	18.9%	32.7%	35.1%	25.4%	87	26.6
Oppose	13.2%	25.0%	37.8%	51.9%	130	39.7
Total N ^b %	53 100.0	52 100.0	37 99.9	185 100.0	327 ^c	100

Tau C = .29

P = .00015

^aIn some instances the respondents failed to answer a question, thereby causing a discrepancy between a given table total and the actual total N of the population of 330.

^bNumber upon which percentages are based.

^cNo response to question = 3

While it can be seen that the relation is not an especially strong one, as indicated by Tau C, it is significant. It can be observed that 67.9 percent of those who never go to church favor collective bargaining, while only 22.7 percent who go to church weekly favor it. Moreover, 51.9 percent of those who attend church weekly oppose collective bargaining while only 13.2 percent of those who never attend church oppose collective bargaining.

Based on the findings in Table 4.4, the hypothesis is accepted. These results support the hypothesis that religiously inclined professors will tend to oppose collective bargaining or non-religiously inclined professors are more likely to favor collective bargaining.

Hypothesis 3

Professors who are liberal in their political orientation are more likely to favor collective bargaining than conservatives.

Results. The respondents were asked to classify themselves according to liberal, moderate, or conservative categories of political ideology.

Table 4.5 reveals that a significant relationship exists between attitudes toward collective bargaining and political ideology.

TABLE 4.5 -- The attitudes of 322 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by orientation of political ideology

Collective Bargaining Index	Conservative	Moderate	Liberal	Total	
				N	%
Favor	13.7%	23.9%	44.4%	105	32.6
Neutral	10.3%	31.0%	27.8%	89	27.6
Oppose	75.9%	45.1%	27.8%	128	39.7
Total N ^a %	29 99.9	142 100.0	151 100.0	322 ^b	99.9

Tau B = .28

P = .0000

^aNumber upon which percentages are based.

^bNo response to question = 8

The political conservatives overwhelmingly oppose collective bargaining (75.9 percent) while a plurality of 44.4 percent of the liberals favor it. A relatively larger number (27.8 percent) of the liberals are neutral in their attitudes. The hypothesis is confirmed.

A chi square analysis was also performed on the question of how the respondents voted in the 1972 presidential election. The data are presented on page 99.

An attempt was made to determine the relative effect of religious inclination or political philosophy on attitudes toward collective bargaining. This attempt was made by: combining the factors of opposition to collective bargaining and frequency of church attendance - controlling for political leanings; combining the factors of favoring collective bargaining and frequency of church attendance - controlling for political leanings; combining the factors of opposition to collective bargaining and political leanings - controlling for frequency of church attendance; combining the factors of favoring collective bargaining and political leanings - controlling for frequency of church attendance. The data are presented in Tables 4.6 through 4.9.

TABLE 4.6 -- The attitudes of 109 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by frequency of church attendance controlling for political liberalism

Frequency of Church Attendance		Liberals		
		Favoring Collective Bargaining	Opposing Collective Bargaining	Total
Rarely	N	41	6	47
	%	61	14	43
Frequently	N	26	36	62
	%	39	86	57
Total	N ^a	67	42	109
	%	100	100	100

$$C = .42$$

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

It can be concluded from Table 4.6 that among political liberals, those who rarely attend church are more likely to favor collective bargaining than those who attend church frequently.

TABLE 4.7 -- The attitudes of 124 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by frequency of church attendance controlling for a moderate/conservative political orientation

Frequency of Church Attendance		Moderate/Conservative		
		Favoring Collective Bargaining	Opposing Collective Bargaining	Total
Rarely	N	14	14	28
	%	37	16	23
Frequently	N	24	72	96
	%	63	84	77
Total	N ^a	38	86	124
	%	100	100	100

C = .22

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

It can be concluded from Table 4.7 that among political moderates and conservatives, those who rarely attend church are slightly more likely to favor collective bargaining than those who attend church frequently.

TABLE 4.8 -- The attitudes of 75 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by political orientation controlling for rare frequency of church attendance

Political Orientation		Rarely Attend Church		
		Favoring Collective Bargaining	Opposing Collective Bargaining	Total
Moderate/Conservative	N	14	14	28
	%	25	70	37
Liberal	N	41	6	47
	%	75	30	63
Total	N ^a	55	20	75
	%	100	100	100

C = .38

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

It can be concluded from Table 4.8 that among those who rarely attend church, political liberals are more likely to favor collective bargaining than those politically moderate or conservative.

TABLE 4.9 -- The attitudes of 158 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by political orientation controlling for frequent church attendance

Political Orientation		Frequently Attend Church		
		Favoring Collective Bargaining	Opposing Collective Bargaining	Total
Conservative	N	3	19	22
	%	6	18	14
Moderate	N	21	53	74
	%	42	49	47
Liberal	N	26	36	62
	%	52	33	39
Total	N ^a	50	108	158
	%	100	100	100

C = .20

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

It can be concluded from Table 4.9 that among those who attend church frequently, the political liberals are more likely to favor collective bargaining than the moderates or conservatives.

The data tend to confirm what is generally recognized; political and theological conservatism (as well as liberalism) are highly correlated. Perhaps the most important finding here is that liberals who attend church frequently are not as likely to approve collective bargaining as liberals who never attend church: 61 percent of the liberals who favor bargaining rarely go to church, whereas 86 percent of the liberals who oppose it go to church frequently.

The relatively high coefficient of contingency (.42) in Table 4.6 suggests that religion is a more basic factor in determining attitudes toward collective bargaining than political orientation.

Table 4.8 has the next highest coefficient of contingency (.38). Political orientation seems to be the dominant factor here, but it is self evident that for those who do not attend church, political orientation would in fact be more basic in determining attitudes toward collective bargaining.

Hypothesis 4

Female professors will be more likely to oppose collective bargaining than males.

Results. The null hypothesis was confirmed. There is no relationship between sex and attitudes toward collective bargaining. The data for this finding are presented in Table 4.10. Relatively equal percentages of the men favor and oppose collective bargaining (35 percent and 37.8 percent) while 29.5 percent of the women favor collective bargaining and 43.6 percent oppose it.

TABLE 4.10 -- The attitudes of 330 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by sex

Collective Bargaining Index	Female	Male	Total	
			N	%
Favor	29.5%	35.0%	111	33.6
Neutral	26.9%	27.1%	89	27.0
Oppose	43.6%	37.8%	130	39.4
Total N ^a %	78 98.0	251 99.9	330	100

Tau C = .04

P = .1174

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

Hypothesis 5

Opposition to collective bargaining will be more likely as the professors progress in age.

Results. The ages of the respondents were categorized as follows: 25-30, 31-40, 41-50, and over 50. The data for this hypothesis are presented in Table 4.11 and reveal a very consistent pattern: as age increased, favor for collective bargaining decreased.

TABLE 4.11 -- The attitudes of 326 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by age

Collective Bargaining Index	Age				Total	
	25-30	31-40	41-50	Over 50	N	%
Favor	50.0%	38.6%	28.1%	19.7%	109	33.4
Neutral	27.8%	29.3%	28.1%	19.7%	88	27.0
Oppose	22.2%	32.1%	43.8%	60.6%	129	39.6
Total N ^a %	36 100.0	140 100.0	89 100.0	61 100.0	326 ^b	100.0

Tau C = .23

P = .0018

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 4

Fifty percent of those between 25-30, which is the smallest category in terms of N, favor collective bargaining while only 19.7 percent of those professors over the age of 50 favor it. At the same time, 60.6 percent of those over 50 oppose collective bargaining while 22.2 percent of those between 25-30 oppose it. Those who are neutral toward collective bargaining range from approximately 20-30 percent of

each age category. With a P of .0018, the hypothesis is confirmed, but again a low Tau indicated that age accounts for very little of the variance of the attitudes.

Hypothesis 6

Tenured professors will be less likely to favor collective bargaining than non-tenured professors.

Results. In view of the fact that this hypothesis pertains to "job" security and that many colleges and universities are changing their tenure policies, this is one of the more crucial hypotheses of the study. The data are presented in Table 4.12.

TABLE 4.12 -- The attitudes of 322 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by tenure status

Collective Bargaining Index	Tenure Status		Total	
	Tenured	Untenured	N	%
Favor	25.5%	44.4%	109	33.9
Neutral	27.2%	27.5%	88	27.3
Oppose	47.2%	28.1%	125	38.8
Total N ^a %	180 99.9	142 100.0	322 ^b	100.0

Tau C = .21

P = less than .0015

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 8

One hundred eighty (55.9 percent) of the respondents are tenured. As might have been anticipated, those who are tenured are much less likely to favor collective bargaining than the untenured. Collective bargaining is opposed by 47.2 percent of the tenured faculty while 25.5 percent of them favor it (nearly a two-to-one margin). A large plurality (44.4 percent) of the untenured faculty favor collective bargaining while 27.5 percent are neutral and 28.1 percent of the untenured are opposed to it. The hypothesis is confirmed.

Hypothesis 7

The longer the service at a given college the more likely the faculty member will oppose collective bargaining.

Results. The duration of appointment was divided into four categories: 5 years or less, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and over 15 years. The data related to this hypothesis is presented in Table 4.13.

TABLE 4.13 -- The attitudes of 328 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by duration of present faculty appointment

Collective Bargaining Index	5 Years or less	6-10 Years	11-15 Years	16 Years or more	Total	
					N	%
Favor	42.3%	31.3%	35.6%	15.7%	110	33.5
Neutral	28.5%	31.2%	22.2%	21.1%	89	27.1
Oppose	29.2%	35.5%	42.2%	63.2%	129	39.4
Total ^a N %	130 100.0	96 100.0	45 100.0	57 100.0	328 ^b	100.0

Tau C = .24

P = less than .00001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 2

While the pattern is not quite as consistent as that observed for age, as might be expected the findings here are very comparable. The longer a respondent has held his or her appointment, the greater the likelihood of an opposing attitude toward collective bargaining, and vice versa. Forty-two point three percent of the respondents with appointments of five years or less favored collective bargaining while only 15.7 percent of those with appointments of 16 years or more were in favor of it. Yet 29.2 percent of those with appointments of five years or less opposed collective bargaining, while 63.2 percent of the professors holding appointments of 16 years or more opposed collective bargaining. The percentages of those respondents who are neutral in the five years or less category and the 16 years or more category are relatively comparable - 28.5 percent and 22.1 percent respectively. With a P of less than .00001, the hypothesis is confirmed.

Hypothesis 8

Professors in certain disciplines are more likely to favor collective bargaining than in other disciplines.

Results. The liberal arts concept of higher education generally precludes any emphasis on vocational training. Two of the colleges in the study have nursing programs. Other than nursing, library science is the only discipline or academic subject which might not normally be classified as one of the liberal arts or found in a liberal arts college curriculum.

The disciplinary breakdown of those who participated in the study is as follows: Education 19 (5.9 percent); Arts & Humanities 96 (30 percent); Languages 22 (6.9 percent); Natural Sciences 73 (22.8 percent);

Physical Education 21 (6.6 percent); Social Science 72 (22.5 percent); Nursing 8 (2.5 percent); and Library Science 9 (2.8 percent).

In order to insure sufficient N's in each cell, the disciplines were combined as follows: Education and Physical Education 40 (12.5 percent); Arts, Humanities, and Languages 118 (36.9 percent); Natural Sciences and Nursing 81 (25.3 percent); Social and Library Sciences 81 (25.3 percent).

As can be seen from a perusal of Table 4.14, no attitudinal pattern is observable. The percentages of faculty who favor collective bargaining range from 25 percent in Education and Physical Education to 42.4 percent in Arts, Humanities and Languages. The percentage of faculty who are neutral toward bargaining ranges from 23.7 percent among those in Arts, Humanities, and Languages to 37.5 percent in Education and Physical Education. The percentage of faculty who oppose bargaining ranges from 33.9 percent in Arts, Humanities and Languages to 46.9 percent in Natural Sciences and Nursing. Conventional wisdom would seem to have indicated a higher percentage in the Social and Library Sciences would have favored collective bargaining than perhaps any other discipline, whereas only 30.7 percent of those professors did, in fact, favor it. The hypothesis is rejected.

TABLE 4.14 -- The attitudes of 320 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by academic discipline

Collective Bargaining Index	Educ. & Physical Education	Arts, Human. & Language	Natural Sci. & Nursing	Social & Library Sciences	Total	
					N	%
Favor	25.0%	42.4%	25.9%	30.7%	106	33.1
Neutral	37.5%	23.7%	27.2%	29.6%	88	27.5
Oppose	37.5%	33.9%	46.9%	40.7%	126	39.4
Total Na %	40 100.0	118 100.0	81 100.0	81 100.0	320 ^b	100.0

Tau C = .05

P = .5369

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 10

Hypothesis 9

Dissatisfaction with salary will be related to a favorable attitude toward collective bargaining.

Results. The attitude of a professor toward the ability of his or her college to pay good salaries was determined by the response given to the following question:

Q: In view of the financial strain most colleges are experiencing, what is your attitude toward the salary situation at your college?

A: (a) The college is doing its best; (b) the college could do better; (c) the college could do much better.

The chi square statistical procedure was performed; the results are revealed in Table 4.15.

TABLE 4.15 -- The attitudes of 327 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by attitudes toward salary

Collective Bargaining Index	The college is doing its best	The college could do better	The college could do much better	Total	
				N	%
Favor	16.8%	38.3%	71.6%	111	33.9
Neutral	21.9%	36.4%	21.7%	87	26.6
Oppose	61.2%	25.2%	6.7%	129	39.5
Total Na %	160 99.9	107 99.9	60 100.0	327 ^b	100.0

Tau B = .47

P = less than .0001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 3

Seventy-one point six percent of those who believe the college could do much better on the issue of salaries favor bargaining, while only 6.7 percent believing the same about salaries oppose bargaining. Of those who believe their college is doing its best regarding salaries, 16.8 percent favor collective bargaining while 61.2 percent of them oppose it. If we combine the columns entitled, "The college could do better" and "The college could do much better" we realize that 50.2 percent (this figure is not discernable from Table 4.15) favor collective bargaining while 61.2 percent of those who believe their college is doing its best salary-wise oppose collective bargaining.

The attitudes toward collective bargaining among liberal arts college professors are related to their attitudes toward the respective college's ability to pay good salaries. The respondents were also asked if they thought collective bargaining would, in fact, improve salaries.

The data for this question is found in Table 3, page 100, and closely conforms to the data in Table 4.15.

Hypothesis 10

Dissatisfaction with involvement in policy-making decisions (powerlessness) will be related to a favorable attitude toward collective bargaining.

Results. The professors were simply asked whether or not they agreed with the following statement:

The distribution of power (the ability to influence institutional policy) at my college should be more equitable between the administration and faculty than is presently the case.

The data, as presented in Table 4.16, reveals that attitudes toward collective bargaining are related to attitudes regarding the distribution of power between faculty and administration.

TABLE 4.16 -- The attitudes of 324 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by attitudes toward faculty/administration distribution of power

Collective Bargaining Index	Faculty should have more power	Satisfied With present situation	Total	
			N	%
Favor	56.6%	12.1%	110	34.0
Neutral	29.6%	24.8%	88	27.2
Oppose	13.8%	63.0%	126	38.8
Total N ^a %	159 100.0	165 99.9	324 ^b	100.0

Tau C = .50

P = less than .0001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 6

As in the relation between collective bargaining attitudes and attitudes toward salary, we see a high correlation between attitudes toward collective bargaining and attitudes toward the distribution of power between the faculty and administration at the respective colleges surveyed. Approximately 50 percent (N=159) of the respondents agree that power should be more equitably distributed between faculty and administration. Of those professors who feel they should have more power, 56.6 percent favor collective bargaining while 13.8 percent oppose it. Moreover, 63 percent of those faculty members who are satisfied with the present power alignment oppose collective bargaining while 12.1 percent of the satisfied professors favor it. The hypothesis is confirmed.

The chi square analytical procedure was also performed between the collective bargaining attitudinal index and faculty perceptions relating to control of the budget. This data is presented in Table 4, page 101.

Hypothesis 11

The favorable attitude of professors toward collective bargaining is more likely to be based on the desire for more power than on a desire for higher salaries.

Results. The population being examined for the present hypothesis is restricted to those faculty members who favor collective bargaining. In determining whether attitudes toward faculty salaries or faculty power vis-a-vis the administration was the basic factor in affecting attitudes toward collective bargaining, the following procedure was utilized: the factors of favoring collective bargaining and attitudes toward the faculty-administration power division were combined,

controlling for attitudes toward salary in terms of whether the college: (a) was doing its best; (b) could do better; and (c) could do much better. In view of the relatively few respondents (110), and to simplify interpretation, (b) and (c) above were combined. The data are presented in Table 4.17.

The reader should be aware that overall (professors who favored, opposed, and were neutral) 50.7 percent of the respondents believe salaries could be improved and 49.2 percent of the respondents are dissatisfied with the present faculty-administration power distribution.

TABLE 4.17 -- Proportion of professors favoring collective bargaining by attitudes toward faculty-administration division of power, controlling for attitudes toward salary

Faculty Attitudes Toward Salary		Desire More Faculty Power	Satisfied With Present Faculty Power	Totals
College is doing its best	N %	22 20.0	5 4.5	27 24.5
Salary raises are in order	N %	68 61.8	15 13.6	83 75.4
Total	N %	90 81.8	20 18.1	110 99.9

One hundred ten professors in this study favor collective bargaining. Sixty-eight of them (61.8 percent) expressed a desire for salary raises as well as for more faculty power in the development of college policy. Ninety of the respondents (81.8 percent) want more power, while 83 (75.4 percent) want more money. Thirty-seven of the respondents (cells one and four) have expressed a desire for more money

or more power but not both; 15 (13.6 percent) want more money while 22 (20 percent) want more power. While there is a slight indication that power has a higher priority than salaries among the professors, in view of the simplified analysis the hypothesis cannot be confirmed.

As might be anticipated, the data as presented in Table 4.18 reveal that 67.2 percent of those who oppose collective bargaining are satisfied with the degree of influence of the faculty in policy-making and they believe their respective colleges are doing their best regarding salaries. A further perusal of the Table does reveal that these professors are more interested in salary raises than in greater influence over college policy.

TABLE 4.18 -- Proportion of professors opposing collective bargaining by attitudes toward faculty-administration division of power, controlling for attitudes toward salary

Faculty Attitudes Toward Salary		Desire More Faculty Power	Satisfied With Present Faculty Power	Totals
College is doing its best	N %	11 8.8	84 67.2	95 76.0
Salary raises are in order	N %	11 8.8	19 15.2	30 24.0
Total	N %	22 17.6	103 82.4	125 100.0

One item on the instrument asked the respondent to state what factor he or she believed would cause their colleagues to vote for collective bargaining: an unequitable distribution of power between the faculty and administration, success of collective bargaining at other

private colleges in Michigan, a low faculty sense of job security, discontent with salaries, violations of academic freedom, poor communication with the faculty by the administration.

For example, in column 3 of Table 4.19, 86 of the respondents (26 percent of the population) believe a low faculty sense of job security would be the major thing to cause their colleagues to favor collective bargaining. Of that number, 39 percent actually oppose bargaining while 31 percent favor it.

The data in column 1 of the same table pertain to this present hypothesis. Sixty-four percent of those who believe their colleagues would vote for collective bargaining to gain greater power vis-a-vis the administration, favor collective bargaining. These respondents constitute just 18 percent of all those who favor collective bargaining (22 over 329). If, in fact, those professors who favor collective bargaining do so more in a quest for faculty power than for higher salaries, it is not revealed here. They do not impute their own sentiments to their colleagues as revealed especially in columns 3 and 4. As might be anticipated from the findings pertaining to the previous hypotheses, job security, salary, and violations of academic freedom are seen in Table 4.19 to be the major potential precipitators of favorable votes on the issue of collective bargaining.

TABLE 4.19 -- Projections of colleagues' most important reasons for organizing for collective bargaining by respondents' attitudes toward collective bargaining

Collective Bargaining Index		Issue Most Likely To Bring About Collective Bargaining ^b						Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
Favor	N	22	12	27	28	16	13	120
	%	64	48	31	39	22	38	36
Neutral	N	6	6	26	19	21	9	87
	%	17	24	30	26	29	26	26
Oppose	N	10	7	33	25	35	12	122
	%	29	28	39	35	49	36	38
Total	N ^a	34	25	86	72	72	34	329
Horiz.	%	10	8	26	22	22	10	98
Vert.	%	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bColumn titles:

1. An unequitable distribution of power between faculty and administration
2. Success of collective bargaining at other private colleges in Michigan
3. A low faculty sense of job security
4. Discontent with salaries
5. Violations of academic freedom
6. Poor communication with the faculty by the administration

Hypothesis 12

Professors who view their college administration's performance negatively are more likely to favor collective bargaining than those professors who view an administration's performance positively.

Results. The information for the hypothesis was obtained by asking the respondents to evaluate administrative performance in terms of "poor," "satisfactory" or "very good." The chi square analytical

data are presented in Table 4.20. The correlation between collective bargaining attitudes and evaluation of administrative performance is very evident. Seventy-three point four percent of the professors who evaluate their administration's performance as poor favor collective bargaining, while 68 percent of those who believe their administration is performing very well oppose collective bargaining. But if the "satisfactory" and "very well" columns are combined to one of "general approval" of administrative performance, 47.1 percent (not discernable from Table 4.20) of those who approve administrative performance oppose collective bargaining. The hypothesis is confirmed. Attitudes toward collective bargaining vary as a function of evaluation of administrative performance. Moreover, the Tau measurement reveals that the variable of administrative performance accounts for 21 percent of the variance of attitudes toward collective bargaining.

TABLE 4.20 -- The attitudes of 321 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by professorial evaluation of college administrative performance

Collective Bargaining Index	Administration Performing			Total	
	Poorly	Satisfactorily	Very Well	N	%
Favor	73.4%	31.8%	9.3%	107	33.3
Neutral	17.2%	33.7%	22.7%	87	27.1
Oppose	9.4%	34.4%	68.0%	127	39.6
Total ^a %	64 100.0	160 99.9	97 100.0	321 ^b	100.0

Tau B = .46

P = less than .0001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 9

Hypothesis 13

Faculty perceptions of administrative posture toward academic freedom will be related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining: incursions of academic freedom will be seen as justification for organizing for collective bargaining purposes.

Results. "Do you feel the administration at your college has a proper attitude toward academic freedom?" The foregoing question was asked of the sample of faculty members at the 12 liberal arts colleges in Michigan. The data are presented in Table 4.21.

TABLE 4.21 -- The attitudes of 318 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by faculty perceptions of administrative attitudes toward academic freedom

Collective Bargaining Index	Good Attitude	Bad Attitude	Total	
			N	%
Favor	25.4%	74.5%	104	32.7
Neutral	28.8%	19.1%	87	27.3
Oppose	45.7%	6.4%	127	40.0
Total N %	271 99.9	47 100.0	318 ^b	100.0

Tau C = .31

P = less than .0001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 12

Of the 47 professors (14.8 percent) who see their administration as having bad attitudes toward academic freedom, 74.5 percent favor collective bargaining while 6.4 percent oppose it. Two hundred seventy-

one of the faculty members sampled believed their administration had good attitudes toward academic freedom; 45.7 percent of these professors oppose collective bargaining while 25.4 percent favor it.

While only 14.8 percent of the respondents believed their administrations had bad attitudes toward academic freedom, the level of significance confirms the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 14

No relationship will be established between the initiation of collective bargaining at other institutions of higher learning and professors' attitudes toward it.

Results. The data for this hypothesis were gathered by means of a question designed to determine whether or not the institution of collective bargaining at other colleges and universities in Michigan had any implications for their college (the "domino effect" referred to by President Boyd of Central Michigan University).

The respondents were simply asked their reaction when they heard about the institution of collective bargaining at several of the public universities. The data for this hypothesis are presented in Table 4.22.

TABLE 4.22 -- The attitudes of 288 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by reaction to the institution of collective bargaining at state universities

Collective Bargaining Index	There Are No Implications For My College	I Had No Reaction	Collective Bargaining Is Inevitable For My College	Total	
				N	%
Favor	19.0%	15.4%	64.8%	100	34.7
Neutral	21.0%	39.7%	23.8%	78	27.1
Oppose	60.0%	44.9%	11.4%	110	38.2
Total N ^a %	105 100.0	78 100.0	105 100.0	288 ^b	100.0

Tau B = .31

P = less than .0001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 42

An unusually high number of professors did not respond to the question (42 or 12.7 percent of the population). One speculation as to why they did not respond is that they just didn't take the time to think through a response. Of those who believed it was only a matter of time before collective bargaining came to their college, 64.8 percent favor collective bargaining (wishful thinking?). Eleven point four percent of the professors who think collective bargaining is inevitable oppose it. For those respondents who believed collective bargaining at state universities or public institutions had no implications for them, 60 percent oppose collective bargaining while 19 percent favor it. Seventy-eight professors indicated they had no reaction when they heard about the institution of collective bargaining at publicly supported colleges and universities: 15.4 percent of those professors favor

collective bargaining while 44.9 percent oppose it. When the "no reaction" and "no implication" columns are combined, it is realized that 53.8 percent oppose collective bargaining while 17.5 percent favor it. It can therefore be observed that reactions to collective bargaining at public colleges and universities are significantly related to attitudes toward collective bargaining at the respondent's own college at the .01 level of significance. The null hypothesis is confirmed.

Another question was asked which bears directly on this hypothesis. It was as follows:

My attitude toward collective bargaining during the last two or three years has: (a) grown more favorable; (b) remained the same; (c) grown less favorable.

While there cannot be absolute certainty as to what caused changes in attitude, the question was asked after the respondents had been reminded repeatedly in the questionnaire that collective bargaining had been adopted at some institutions of higher learning in the state and seriously considered by the faculties at private liberal arts colleges. A significant ($P = \text{less than } .0001$) relationship exists between the responses to this question and attitudes toward collective bargaining. The data are presented in Table 4.23.

TABLE 4.23 -- The attitudes of 326 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by changes in such attitudes in recent years

Collective Bargaining Index		Attitude More Favorable Now	Attitude Remained The Same	Attitude Less Favorable Now	Total
Favor	N	69	40	1	110
	%	70.4	22.2	2.1	33.7
Neutral	N	21	52	15	88
	%	21.4	28.9	31.3	27.0
Oppose	N	8	88	32	128
	%	8.2	48.9	66.7	39.3
Total N ^a		98	180	48	326 ^b
		30.1	55.2	14.7	100.0

Tau B = .46

P = less than .0001

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 4

This data perhaps is more revealing insofar as a trend is concerned - 30.1 percent of the total population has adopted more favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining and only 14.7 percent of the population has less favorable attitudes. The row percentages (not presented in table) of the neutral row also reveal a greater shift in favor of collective bargaining (23.9 percent) than in opposition to it (17 percent). It should be noted, however, that 59.1 percent of the neutrals did not change their attitudes one way or another. It is also interesting to note that there are a few (2.4 percent of the population) whose attitudes toward collective bargaining became more favorable while remaining basically opposed to it. The strong Tau B reveals that changes

in attitudes are significant predictors: 21 percent of the variance of the attitudes is accounted for here.

Summary

The population surveyed for this study consisted of 330 private liberal arts college professors at 12 colleges in Michigan. The attitudes of this group toward collective bargaining were fairly evenly divided with 130 (39.4 percent) opposing bargaining for their faculty, 111 (33.6 percent) favoring it, and 89 (27 percent) neutral toward collective bargaining.

Chi square analysis was applied to a number of variables to determine their bearing, if any, on the individual attitudes toward bargaining. Two variables were determined to be of no significance - sex and teaching discipline.

Religious orientation of the individual college was also analyzed. The faculties of the two colleges determined to be religious were found to be much more opposed to collective bargaining than the colleges which were determined to be moderately religious or secular.

The summary of outcomes for all hypotheses is presented in Table 4.24.

TABLE 4.24 -- Summary of acceptance and rejection for the hypotheses

No.	Hypothesis Tested	Acceptance or Rejection
1.	The faculties at religious colleges will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than faculties at secular colleges.	Accepted at .01 level

TABLE 4.24 -- Continued.

No.	Hypothesis Tested	Acceptance or Rejection
2.	Religious professors will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than non-religious professors.	Accepted at .01 level
3.	Professors who are liberal in their political orientation are more likely to favor collective bargaining than those who are conservative.	Accepted at .01 level
4.	Female professors will be more likely to oppose collective bargaining than males.	Rejected
5.	Opposition to collective bargaining will be more likely as the professors progress in age.	Accepted at .01 level
6.	Tenured professors will be less likely to favor collective bargaining than non-tenured professors.	Accepted at .01 level
7.	The longer the service at a given college the more likely the faculty member will oppose collective bargaining.	Accepted at .01 level
8.	Professors in certain disciplines are more likely to favor collective bargaining than in other disciplines.	Rejected
9.	Dissatisfaction with salary will be related to a favorable attitude toward collective bargaining.	Accepted at .01 level
10.	Dissatisfaction with involvement in policy-making decisions (powerlessness) will be related to a favorable attitude toward collective bargaining.	Accepted at .01 level
11.	The favorable attitude of professors toward collective bargaining is more likely to be based on the desire for more power than on a desire for higher salaries.	Rejected. The professors who favor bargaining do so as much for the perceived remunerative gains as for increased faculty power.

TABLE 4.24 -- Continued.

No.	Hypothesis Tested	Acceptance or Rejection
12.	Professors who view their college administration's performance negatively are more likely to favor collective bargaining than those professors who view an administration's performance positively.	Accepted at .01 level
13.	Faculty perceptions of administrative posture toward academic freedom will be related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining: incursions of academic freedom will be seen as justification for organizing for collective bargaining purposes.	Accepted at .01 level
14.	No relationship will be established between the initiation of collective bargaining at other institutions of higher learning and professors' attitudes toward it.	Rejected. The null hypothesis is proven. A significant relationship does exist at the .01 level.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was undertaken to determine the extent to which liberal arts college professors favor or oppose collective bargaining at their college. The relationship between the professor's attitude toward collective bargaining and such individual background factors as religion, political ideology, sex, age, tenure status, duration of professorial appointment, and teaching discipline was investigated. Further, the relationship was tested between attitude toward collective bargaining and the professor's attitudes toward the following items at their individual colleges: salary, faculty involvement in policy making, administrative posture toward academic freedom, and administrative performance.

The relationship of the climate toward collective bargaining in Michigan higher education (as created by the initiation of collective bargaining at a number of universities and community colleges) and liberal arts college professors' attitudes towards collective bargaining was investigated.

All data used in the study were solicited from 330 professors selected at random from 12 private liberal arts colleges in Michigan. The disciplines of education, arts and humanities, language, natural science, physical education, social science, nursing and library

science are represented by professors in the study.

A large majority of the respondents in the study are men between the ages of 31 and 50 who attend church frequently and are very evenly divided between political liberalism and political moderation. Approximately half of the respondents are tenured and consider their salaries to be "the best their college can do."

Eighty percent of the professors consider their administrators to be performing satisfactorily or very well, yet they are nearly evenly divided on the central issue of this study -- 33 percent favor collective bargaining while 39 percent oppose it.

A review of the literature reveals that little research has been aimed specifically at the small liberal arts colleges for purposes of determining the attitudes of the faculties toward organizing for collective bargaining. Two studies undertaken by Peter Blau and the Carnegie Commission included small private liberal arts colleges. These studies found that youth and the disciplines of social science and arts and humanities were correlated with favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining. The Carnegie Commission reported that 68 percent of their professors favored collective bargaining. The contrasting 33 percent favoring collective bargaining in this study suggests that this group of professors is a somewhat more conservative group than is generally the case for American college and university professors. Indeed, the Carnegie Commission reported that political ideology was related to attitudes toward collective bargaining.

An instrument developed by the writer was utilized to gather the data for the study. Questions regarding the respondent's personal background (such as age, sex, political leanings, etc.) were asked as

well as questions regarding the respondent's perception on such matters as salary, faculty/administrative division of power, administrative performance, etc. The instrument concluded with an eight-item Likert-type scale designed to reveal the respondent's attitude toward collective bargaining. The reliability of the scale was checked by Hoyt's Reliability Coefficient as well as Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The reliability was .91 in both instances. Except for hypothesis 11, where a simple percentage was used, chi square analysis was utilized to test the hypotheses.

The 14 hypotheses tested in this study, and the results, were as follows:

- (1) The faculties at religious colleges will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than faculties at secular colleges. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (2) Religious professors will be more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than non-religious professors. Confirmed.
- (3) Professors who are liberal in their political orientation are more likely to favor collective bargaining than are conservatives. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (4) Female professors will be more likely to oppose collective bargaining than males. Hypothesis rejected.
- (5) Opposition to collective bargaining will be more likely as the professors progress in age. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (6) Tenured professors will be less likely to favor collective bargaining than non-tenured professors. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (7) The longer the service at a given college the more likely the faculty member will oppose collective bargaining. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (8) Professors in certain disciplines are more likely to favor collective bargaining than in other disciplines. Hypothesis rejected.
- (9) Dissatisfaction with salary will be related to favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining. Hypothesis confirmed.

- (10) Dissatisfaction with involvement in policy-making decisions (powerlessness) will be related to a favorable attitude toward collective bargaining. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (11) The favorable attitude of professors toward collective bargaining is more likely to be based on the desire for more power than on a desire for higher salaries. Hypothesis rejected.
- (12) Professors who view their college administration's performance negatively are more likely to favor collective bargaining than those professors who view an administration's performance positively. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (13) Faculty perceptions of administrative posture toward academic freedom will be related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining: incursions of academic freedom will be seen as justification for organizing for collective bargaining purposes. Hypothesis confirmed.
- (14) No relationship will be established between the initiation of collective bargaining at other institutions of higher learning and professors' attitudes toward it. Hypothesis rejected.

Conclusions

The analysis of the data led to the following conclusions:

- (1) The faculties at religiously-oriented colleges are much more inclined to oppose collective bargaining than faculties at colleges not religiously oriented.
- (2) The religiously-inclined professor is much more likely to oppose collective bargaining than the non-religiously-inclined professor.
- (3) Attitudes toward collective bargaining are influenced by or partially derived from political ideology.
- (4) The sex of faculty members has no bearing on attitudes toward collective bargaining.
- (5) The tenured faculty member is much more likely to oppose (or less likely to favor) collective bargaining than untenured faculty.

Put another way, faculty members with job security are less likely to see a need for collective bargaining.

(6) The older the professor, the less likely collective bargaining will be favored.

(7) Professors who have held their present appointments for long periods of time are much more likely to oppose collective bargaining than professors with appointments of relatively short duration.

(8) The discipline of the professor has no influence on his or her attitude toward collective bargaining.

(9) Professors who believe they are underpaid are much more likely to favor collective bargaining than professors who believe their college is doing its best salarywise.

(10) Professors who feel the faculty at their college should be more involved in policy-making are much more likely to favor collective bargaining than those professors who feel the faculty is sufficiently involved.

(11) Professors who favor collective bargaining do so as much from the belief that they will gain more power as from the belief that they will reap significant financial benefits.

(12) Professors who believe their administrations are not performing well are more likely to favor collective bargaining than professors who consider their administrators' performance to be satisfactory.

(13) Those professors who perceive their administrators as having poor attitudes toward academic freedom are more likely to favor collective bargaining than professors who perceive their administrators as having good attitudes toward academic freedom.

(14) Professors who favor collective bargaining are more inclined to believe that it is inevitable at their college than those professors who oppose collective bargaining.

Discussion

An underlying question of this study has been, "How do the professors of Michigan's private liberal arts colleges compare in attitude toward the phenomenon of collective bargaining with their colleagues in the public institutions of higher learning?" At this point the findings of the present study will be compared with those reported in the literature.

This study has overlapped with several others with regard to the following variables: teaching discipline, tenure status, age of professor, and political ideology. With the exception of teaching discipline, the findings here have been in general conformity with the previous research. Any reasons which might be proposed as to why no significant relationship was found between teaching discipline and collective bargaining attitudes are speculative. Perhaps they would center around the religious orientation of most of the respondents. A strong religious orientation overshadows thinking toward many things, among which is collective bargaining or organized labor.

A major concern of this research is professorial attitudes toward collective bargaining. The Carnegie Commission, in its nationwide survey (not a random sampling) conducted in the Fall of 1972, asked their professorial respondents to agree or disagree with the following statement: "Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university." Sixty-eight percent of the respondents disagreed with that statement. Thirty-three percent of the respondents in

the present study agreed with the following statement: "Collective bargaining would be a good thing for my college." In other words, 35 percent fewer professors in this study have favorable attitudes toward collective bargaining as compared with the larger survey of the Carnegie Commission. It is the feeling of this writer that while the disparity of the two studies is wide, the explanation can probably be found in the obvious difference of the two questions: the question of the present study having direct personal implications. This explanation may also apply to why this group manifests a fairly strong politically liberal orientation, as evidenced by their support of George McGovern in 1972 (see Table 2, page 99), yet are conservative in their attitudes toward collective bargaining.

The responses to that section of the instrument (see items 20 to 26, page 96) where the respondents were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of the administration and express attitudes about the institution's salary schedule, etc., indicated what a "hot" issue collective bargaining is as well as the questions which underly it. A number of respondents left some of these sensitive questions unanswered, and one respondent went so far as to write in the margin of the instrument, "Do you also want to know how long it's been since I beat my wife?" It should be reiterated here that a relatively small plurality of 39 percent opposed collective bargaining, with a sizeable 27 percent who were neutral (see Table 4.1, page 38).

This brings us to the most crucial question of the study: are the faculties at these colleges likely to be organized for collective bargaining purposes in the near future? Is the domino theory espoused by President Boyd of Central Michigan valid when applied to the private

sector of higher education in Michigan? The data contained herein tend to support him.

The theoretical orientation most relevant to this study is that of conflict theory. While some of the respondents naively fear that collective bargaining would cause the traditional conflict between administration and faculty to become excessive, other respondents implicitly accept this conflict and want to formalize it by means of collective bargaining. This would probably serve the purpose of preventing the conflict from becoming excessive and alleviate the frustrations of those who want to be more involved in policy development or decisions made in trying to cope with the ever-present financial crises precipitated in part by earlier goal displacements. In the final analysis, however, conflict theory does not predict the initiation of collective bargaining.

Garbarino does not believe that collective bargaining will inevitably sweep through all of higher education, although he does believe negotiations outside the sanctions of the NLRB will become quite common.

One private college faculty in Michigan was recently informed that faculty cutbacks would have to be made for the 1977-78 academic year. This announcement was quickly followed with another giving assurances that the faculty would be involved in these decisions. Four years ago this faculty went so far as to schedule an election with the NLRB, but canceled it when the president made concessions by means of establishing a faculty policy committee which worked closely with the academic dean. The foregoing incident tends to bear out Garbarino rather than Boyd.

Since the data of this study were gathered, one of the faculties which were subjects of the study (Adrian) has voted to organize for collective bargaining purposes (see Appendix E, pages 102-108). It is

presently (Summer 1976) in the process of negotiating its first contractual agreement. A few months prior to the Adrian election, the NLRB supervised a similar election on the campus at Albion College. While the faculty registered a positive response to bargaining in the initial election, the vote was split between two would-be representative agencies (the American Association of University Professors and the Michigan Association of Higher Education). The two factions were unable to coalesce in a required run-off election and "no agent" carried (see page 109). Subsequent to the election at Adrian, the faculty at Hillsdale College petitioned the NLRB to conduct an election for purposes of organizing for collective bargaining. Again, the collective bargaining cause was defeated with 26 votes favoring bargaining and 37 opposing it. Mr. William Owen, a faculty organizer of the Michigan Association of Higher Education, stated in a telephone interview with the writer that the Hillsdale election was especially significant in that he felt the faculty was a particularly conservative one in what is perhaps the most conservative area in the state of Michigan. Mr. Owen's assessment of the results at Hillsdale, in light of that faculty's conservative orientation, was that a surprisingly large number of people voted in favor of collective bargaining. He is in frequent touch with the situations at Hillsdale and Albion and indicates that faculty unrest continues.

In view of the foregoing circumstances at 3 of the 12 colleges in this survey, the neutral posture of those professors mentioned above takes on a great deal of significance. The data of this study precisely predicted the opposing vote at Adrian: 30 percent. This indicates

that most of those faculty members who were formerly neutral toward collective bargaining switched to a favorable position when the election was conducted. Therefore, those who are neutral could well be seen as people who are waiting to see what's going to happen - particularly at Adrian. "What is collective bargaining going to do for the faculty at that college?"

The literature revealed conflicting information as to the motives of those professors who opt for collective bargaining. Mr. Owen agreed with an assumption of the writer that people who accept teaching appointments at private liberal arts colleges do so with an awareness that their salaries are lower than what they would probably receive elsewhere, particularly over many years. The private college simply doesn't have a lot of money to pay its faculty; therefore a professor at a college of this type who favors collective bargaining is not likely to do so in the hope that he will reap financial dividends, but primarily as an avenue which will open up greater participation in decision-making processes of the institution. Owen asserts that such is the major motive for those faculty members who favor bargaining at Adrian, Albion and Hillsdale. The data of this study do not conform to those impressions, however. Salary is at least of equal concern to that of greater power for the faculty.

An article in the September 1976 issue of Change magazine indicates that religiously affiliated colleges generally are in poor financial condition. Indeed, they are "in dire financial straits." Barring some major external aid, these colleges will probably close in the near future. The article reminds us that 200 similar institutions have either

closed or merged with other institutions in the last five years.⁴⁰ These are precisely the types of institutions which have been subjects of this study.

The literature reports that there were substantial financial gains for the faculty which resulted from collective bargaining regardless of the basic motives of the faculty for choosing to bargain collectively. While some of the literature is reporting on a time in which the economy was healthier and faculty raises more easily sustained by the budget of the individual college, the prospect of collective bargaining does seem to pose a genuine threat to the continued existence of that liberal arts college which is financially hard pressed.

One of the major forces in the society indirectly referred to in the theory section of this study is the bureaucratization of the society - the development of large complex organizations. Regardless of individual work motives of a given professor (a commitment to service; the essence of professionalism) the person whose work activities are within the confines of an organization is an employee be he the janitor who sweeps a classroom or the professor who stands behind the lectern therein.

One of the factors not addressed in this study is the matter of the self image of professors. It might be hypothesized that professorial resistance to collective bargaining in the face of low salaries and autocratic administrations is due to their inability to accept the status of employee. Indeed, one of the highlights of a survey made reference to

⁴⁰Andrew H. Lupton, John Augenblick, and Joseph Hyesin, "The Financial State of Higher Education," Change, VIII, No. 8 (September 1976), p. 21.

earlier was that, "according to college administrators, one of the biggest mistakes made by labor organizations during the organizing campaigns was under-emphasis of the faculty member's professional image."⁴¹ In other words, professors don't like being reminded of their employee status. The teaching profession has long been recognized as a major avenue of upward social mobility, and those professors with socio-economic backgrounds in the laboring classes may be particularly sensitive on this matter.

The roots of the traditional professions are religious. This may explain why the resistance to collective bargaining is strongest at the more religious colleges in this study and among the professors who are more religiously inclined. While great social reform has been accomplished consequential to religious impetus, the charge of Karl Marx that religion is the opiate of the masses may be justified in its application here. David Reisman's earlier observation that professors at many of the small religious colleges are "hired hands" seems to confirm Marx's charge. (It may also reveal him to be naive as to his own employee status - albeit at Harvard.) It is nothing short of tragic for conscientious men and women to be exploited under the guise of their "dedication to the cause of Christ." As Eric Fromm and others have so well amplified, there is much security to be found within the confines of autocratic social structures. This could well be a broader cause for professors allowing themselves to be "exploited" or ordered about under the guise of professionalism.

⁴¹ Anonymous, loc. cit.

Considerations for Future Research

Since the data for this study were collected, and as indicated in the first few pages of this dissertation, collective bargaining has made significant gains in higher education, including private liberal arts colleges. It is now quite feasible to broaden the scope of the research by including private liberal arts colleges in most parts of the country. The Carnegie Commission Report, as well as Blau, indicates that effective forms of governance are related to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining. No attempts were made in this study to determine or evaluate the nature of governance of the 12 colleges. That should be done in any future research.

It was known at the outset of this study that two of the colleges where faculty unrest existed had new presidents, and the writer was cognizant of the implications to these situations of Gouldner's work concerning the famous gypsum plant. Since the scope of the study was relatively narrow, no attempt was made to determine how many of the colleges had new presidents. A study of broader scope should take such a phenomenon into consideration.

Again, the Blau and Carnegie studies made distinctions of quality vis-a-vis the institutions which came under their scrutiny. Therefore a study of much larger scope should also consider the factor of quality.

One of the statements in the attitudinal index of the instrument alludes to the impact collective bargaining might have on donations to the college. What the writer had in mind here is that there may be affluent people who would not like it if a faculty "joined a union" and would therefore not make the donations they would have otherwise made. One of

the major sources of financial sustenance of institutions of this type is the governing board. Members of boards of trustees are frequently affluent businessmen (people likely to have anti-labor biases) who are appointed at least partially in the hope that they will make substantial contributions or have friends or contacts who will make substantial contributions. Herein lies another area of consideration for future research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Begin, James P., Settle, Theodore, and Alexander, Paula. Academics on Strike. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Management and Labor Relations, 1975.
- Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1973.
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Carr, Robert K. and Van Eyck, Daniel K. Collective Bargaining Comes To The Campus. Washington: American Council on Education, 1973.
- Corwin, Ronald G. Militant Professionalism. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Demerath, Nicholas J., Stephens, Richard W., and Taylor, Robb R. Power, Presidents, and Professors. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.
- Etzioni, Amitai. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Garbarino, Joseph W. Faculty Bargaining. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Gross, Edward and Brambsch, Paul V. University Goals and Academic Power. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Hall, Richard H. Organizations: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Hodgkinson, Harold J. and Meeth, Richard L. Power and Authority. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.
- Hughes, Clarence R., Underbrink, Robert L., and Gordon, Charles O., (eds.). Collective Negotiations In Higher Education. Carlinville, Illinois: Blackburn College Press, 1973.
- Keeton, Morris. Shared Authority on Campus. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.

- Ladd, Everett Carl, Jr. Professors, Unions and American Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973.
- McGrath, Earl J., (ed.). Selected Issues in College Administration. New York: Teachers College Press (Columbia University), 1967.
- Millett, John David. The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- _____. Decision-Making and Administration in Higher Education. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1968.
- Peterson, William D. A Study of Incidents Having an Impact on the Effectiveness of New and Experienced Presidents of Selected Colleges and Universities in the Midwest. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972.
- Smith, G. Kerry, (ed.). Agony and Promise: Current Issues in Higher Education, 1969. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Tice, Terrence N., (ed.). Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining on Campus. Ann Arbor: The Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972.

Articles and Periodicals

- American Association of University Professors, Committee on College and University Government. "Report of a Survey Subcommittee of Committee T," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, LVII (March, 1971).
- Anonymous. "Faculty Organizing: Special Report," White Collar Report, Number 989 (March 26, 1976).
- Anonymous. "Summary of State Collective Bargaining Statutes Affecting Teachers," Compact, V (February, 1971).
- Anonymous. "Unionism: A New Instrument for Faculty Governance," I.S.R. Journal, I (3) (Summer, 1969).
- Anonymous. "Unionization of Faculty Expected to Pick Up Speed Because of Tight Money and Ph.D.s," College Management, VI (September, 1971).
- Boyd, William B. "Collective Bargaining in Academe: Causes and Consequences," Liberal Education, LVII (October, 1971).
- Brogan, H.O. "Faculty Power: Pretense and Reality in Academic Government," Journal of Higher Education, XL (January, 1969).

- Brown, Martha A. "Collective Bargaining on the Campus: Professors, Associations and Unions," Labor Law Journal, XXI (March, 1970).
- Brown, Ralph S., Jr. "Collective Bargaining for the Faculty," Liberal Education, LVI (March, 1970).
- _____. "Collective Bargaining in Higher Education," Michigan Law Review, LXVII (5) (March, 1969).
- Brown, Ronald C. "Professors and Unions: The Faculty Senate: An Effective Alternate to Collective Bargaining in Higher Education?" William and Mary Law Review, XII (Winter, 1970).
- Clark, B.R. "Faculty Authority," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, XLVII (December, 1961).
- Coleman, Daniel R. "The Evolution of Collective Bargaining as it Relates to Higher Education in America," The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, XXIII (May, 1972).
- Cullen, John H. "Faculty Participation in College Administration," School and Society, XCV (February, 1967).
- Davis, B.H. "Faculty and Institutional Policy," Educational Record, XLVII (Spring, 1966).
- _____. "Unions and Higher Education: Another View," Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors, LIV (September, 1968).
- Day, James F. and Fisher, William H. "The Professor and Collective Negotiations," School and Society, XCV (April, 1967).
- Finkin, Matthew W. "Collective Bargaining and University Governance," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, LVII (June, 1971).
- _____. Division of Higher Education. "Collective Bargaining on the College Campus," Today's Education, LX (December, 1971).
- Garbarino, Joseph W. "Faculty Unionism: From Theory to Practice," Industrial Relations, X (February, 1971).
- Gillis, John W. "Academic Collective Bargaining: Comment and an Annotated Bibliography," Liberal Education, LVI (December, 1970).
- Haehn, James O. "A Survey of Faculty and Administrator Attitudes on Collective Bargaining," A Report to the Academic Senate, California State Colleges, Chico State College (May, 1970).
- Hickman, W.L. "Dictatorship of the Majority," School and Society, XCIII (October, 1965).

- Hoor, Marten. "Academic Authority: The Power and the Glory," Educational Record, XLV (Summer, 1964).
- Hunter, John R. "An Analysis of Observations Regarding Issues of Negotiations in Community Junior Colleges," Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII (1970).
- Kerr, J. David. "Professors, Unite!" Harper's (October, 1971).
- Lane, Tracy N. "An Investigation of Some Non-Economic Factors in Collective Bargaining Associated with the Satisfaction of the Negotiators," Dissertation Abstracts, XXXII (1971).
- Levine, M.J. "Higher Education and Collective Action: Will Professors Unionize?" Journal of Higher Education, XXXVIII (May, 1967).
- Livingston, J.C. "Collective Bargaining and Professionalism in Higher Education," Educational Record, XLVIII (Winter, 1967).
- Moskow, Michael H. "The Scope of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education," Wisconsin Law Review, No. 1 (1971).
- Rehmus, Charles M. "Collective Bargaining and the Market for Academic Personnel," Quarterly Review of Economics and Business, VIII (Autumn, 1968).
- TenBoer, Martin H. "A Study of the Extent and Impact of Organized Labor in Colleges and Universities," The Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, XXII (December, 1970).
- _____. "Report of Committee T on Place and Functions of Faculties in University Government and Administration," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, VI (May, 1970).
- _____. "The Role of the Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters: A Report of Committee T," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, LVII (June, 1971).
- Van de Water, John R. "Union-Management Relations in Public and Private Education," Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, XVII (1).
- Wollett, Donald H. "The Status and Trends of Collective Negotiation for Faculty in Higher Education," Wisconsin Law Review (1971).

Government Publications and Special Reports

- Anonymous. "Jurisdictional Standards Applicable to Private Colleges and Universities, Notice of Issuance of Rule." Washington, D.C.: National Labor Relations Board, D4649, November 30, 1970. (mimeographed)

- Begin, James P. Faculty Bargaining - A Conceptual Discussion. U.S. Office of Education Research Project No. T-B082, Washington, D.C., 1973.
- Dykes, Archie R. Faculty Participation in Academic Decision Making: Report of a Study. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
- Mortimer, Kenneth P. and Lozier, Gregory G. Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance. Center for the Study of Higher Education Report No. 17, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1972.
- Seidman, Joel, Edge, Al, and Lane, Kelley. Faculty Attitudes and Choice of a Collective Bargaining Agency in Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Industrial Relations Center, 1974.
- Stevens, Carl M. The Professors and Collective Action: Which Kind? Minneapolis: Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, 1971.
- Thomson, A.W.J. An Introduction to Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. Ithaca, New York: New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, 1974.

APPENDIX A

COLLEGE FACULTIES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

COLLEGE FACULTIES INCLUDED IN SURVEY

Adrian College Adrian, Michigan	United Methodist
Albion College Albion, Michigan	United Methodist
Alma College Alma, Michigan	Independent
Aquinas College Grand Rapids, Michigan	Roman Catholic
Calvin College Grand Rapids, Michigan	Christian Reformed Church
Hillsdale College Hillsdale, Michigan	Independent
Hope College Holland, Michigan	Independent
Kalamazoo College Kalamazoo, Michigan	Baptist
Marygrove College Detroit, Michigan	Independent
Mercy College of Detroit Detroit, Michigan	Roman Catholic
Nazareth College Kalamazoo, Michigan	Independent
Spring Arbor College Spring Arbor, Michigan	Free Methodist

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE WITH RESPONDENTS

November 23, 1973

Dear Professor:

I am presently on leave of absence from one of Michigan's well-known private liberal arts colleges to finish my doctoral dissertation.

The enclosed questionnaire is a very necessary part of my research. The subject, collective bargaining in private liberal arts colleges, has in some ways grown out of numerous conversations with colleagues and administrators regarding the underlying causes and possible consequences of collective bargaining in higher education and more particularly the small private liberal arts college.

My review of the literature reveals that there is very little research in this area, especially as it relates to the small college. There is an abundance of opinion which has been published, much of which is pessimistic and occasionally alarmist. My research is one attempt to meet the necessity for valid information.

Since collective bargaining is, by statute, a consequence of faculty initiative, faculty opinions on the issue are naturally a critical element where a fact-finding undertaking of this nature is concerned. Your response would make possible a contribution which would be a helpful aid in planning for future reforms in collegial governance if they are deemed necessary. At any rate, we seek to gather information which will dissipate the fears which many have regarding the prospects of collective bargaining.

I am greatly in need of your cooperation in completing the questionnaire and returning it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope provided. If you supply me with your name and address, I would be more than willing to share the findings of this research with you. While I do require the name of your college, I want to assure you that should it be necessary to refer to any particular college in the dissertation, care will be taken not to reflect upon that institution in a negative way.

It should not take more than 10 minutes of your time to fill in the requested information. I would very much appreciate it if you would mail the completed questionnaire to me as soon as possible, but not later than December 21st. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Kenneth S. Parr

January 25, 1974

Dear Professor:

In late November I sent you a questionnaire designed to inquire into your attitudes relating to the issue of collective bargaining in higher education. If you are one of the more than 300 who returned the questionnaire, I wish to express my sincere thanks. However, as is usually the case in research of this type, a second mailing is necessary. The enclosed materials are for those of you who, for one reason or another, did not respond to the first questionnaire.

While my concern for your response is obviously self-serving, the findings should answer many questions concerning all in the private sector of higher education. While you need not sign your name to the questionnaire, if you wish to receive the results of this study I should be happy to send them to you if you will supply me with your name and mailing address. The first questionnaire may have reached you at an inconvenient time when you were in the midst of end-of-term activities and/or the holiday rush. I trust that this second mailing will arrive at a more opportune time, for if I am going to be able to complete my study I must have a sizeable return.

Thank you for your assistance. I shall look forward to hearing from you soon. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your reply.

Sincerely,

Kenneth S. Parr

encl.

APPENDIX C

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

The questions below, for the most part, can be answered by circling the appropriate number on the right hand margin. They embody ideas which are believed to be related in some way to faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining. Our purpose here is to determine whether or not there is, in fact, a relationship.

1. Name of college _____
2. Sex----- Female--- 1
Male--- 2
3. Age----- 25-30--- 1
31-40--- 2
41-50--- 3
Over 50--- 4
4. Major teaching or service area:

Education-----	1
Arts & Humanities (includes Religion, Philosophy, English, Speech, and Theatre)-----	2
Foreign and Classical Language-----	3
Natural Science (includes Geology, Math, and Engineering)-----	4
Physical Education-----	5
Social Science (includes Home Economics and Business Adm.)-----	6
Nursing-----	7
Library and Library Science-----	8
5. Are you tenured?----- Yes--- 1
No--- 2
Doesn't apply (visiting, etc.)--- 3
6. Years completed at present college----- 5 or less--- 1
6-10--- 2
11-15--- 3
Over 15--- 4
7. Have you ever served (including presently) on
a faculty committee commonly regarded by your
colleagues as prestigious?----- Yes--- 1
No--- 2
8. To what extent is religion an influence in the
campus life of your college?----- Not at all--- 1
Very little--- 2
A great deal--- 3

9. How often do you attend church?----- Never--- 1
A few times a year--- 2
Once or twice a month--- 3
Every week--- 4
10. Could you have been appointed to your present position if you had not indicated agreement with some general theological position?----- Yes--- 1
No--- 2
11. Does your college have a religious service or chapel which students are required or strongly encouraged to attend?----- Yes--- 1
No--- 2
12. How would you characterize yourself politically?----- Conservative--- 1
Moderate--- 2
Liberal--- 3
13. Has your college changed presidents in the past three or four years?----- Yes--- 1
No--- 2
14. How would you characterize the performance of the administration at your college?----- Poor--- 1
Satisfactory--- 2
Very good--- 3
15. In view of the financial strain most colleges are experiencing, what is your attitude toward the salary situation at your college?
The college is doing its best--- 1
The college is doing well but it could do better--- 2
The college could do much better--- 3
16. Have you ever declined a definite offer to teach at a higher salaried institution in order to remain in your present position?----- Yes--- 1
No--- 2
17. When you heard that faculties at Central Michigan and other universities in Michigan had begun to bargain collectively, what was your reaction?
I never thought about it one way or the other--- 1
There are no implications for my college--- 2
It is probably a matter of time before my college has it--- 3
18. Sizeable segments of the faculties at two well-known private liberal arts colleges in Michigan have initiated proceedings with the National Labor Relations Board to institute collective bargaining. Please state your reaction to this.

19. Would bargaining improve salaries at your college?----- Probably Not--- 1
 Probably Some--- 2
 Probably a Great Deal--- 3
20. Do you feel the administration at your college has a proper attitude toward academic freedom?----- Yes--- 1
 No--- 2
21. The distribution of power (the ability to influence institutional policy) at my college should be more equitable between administration and faculty than is presently the case.----- Agree--- 1
 Disagree--- 2
22. The distribution of power should be more equitable between tenured and untenured faculty than is presently the case.----- Agree--- 1
 Disagree--- 2
23. Our faculty should have greater control over the matters of faculty promotions and tenure than is presently the case.----- Agree--- 1
 Disagree--- 2
24. Our faculty should have greater control over administrative appointments such as presidents, deans, and department heads than is presently the case.----- Agree--- 1
 Disagree--- 2
25. Our faculty should have greater control over the total institutional budget than is presently the case.----- Agree--- 1
 Disagree--- 2
26. Would you mind stating how you voted in the last presidential election?----- Republican--- 1
 Democratic--- 2
 Other--- 3
27. Please rank (by putting numbers in the spaces) which of the following issues would most likely cause your faculty to organize for collective bargaining. (#1 = most likely; #6 = least likely. The numbers should not be used more than once.)

An unequitable distribution of power between faculty and administration-----	_____
Success of collective bargaining at other private colleges in Michigan-----	_____
A low faculty sense of job security-----	_____
Discontent with salaries-----	_____
Violations of academic freedom-----	_____
Poor communication with the faculty by the administration-----	_____

Please circle your response to each of the statements below.
 (Note: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree.)

	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
28. Collective bargaining is desirable because it would enable our faculty to exercise a greater influence over faculty promotions and tenure.	1	2	3	4
29. Collective bargaining is desirable because it would enable our faculty to exercise more power over the college budget and the establishment of institutional priorities.	1	2	3	4
30. Collective bargaining is desirable because it would enable our faculty to exercise more power over administrative appointments such as presidents, deans, and department heads.	1	2	3	4
31. Collective bargaining is undesirable because it would cause a serious decrease in financial donations to the college.	1	2	3	4
32. Collective bargaining is undesirable because it would cause a damaging and permanent split between faculty and administration.	1	2	3	4
33. Collective bargaining is undesirable because it would cause faculty salary demands which exceed budgetary limitations.	1	2	3	4
34. I would vote to approve collective bargaining for our faculty if an election were held today.	1	2	3	4
35. I believe collective bargaining would be a good thing for my college.	1	2	3	4
36. My attitude toward collective bargaining during the last two or three years has-----				
grown more favorable---				1
remained the same---				2
grown less favorable---				3

APPENDIX D

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

TABLE 1 -- Analysis of variance of collective bargaining attitudes of 330 Michigan private liberal arts college professors on the basis of ten variables

Variable	Between Mean Square	F Statistics	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
Church Attendance	24.179	18.125	3	.0005
Political Orientation	17.937	20.132	2	.0005
Sex	.243	.473	1	.492
Age	13.642	9.548	3	.0005
Tenure Status	12.178	12.873	2	.0005
Longevity	16.899	12.087	3	.0005
Teaching Discipline	7.20	2.064	7	.047
Attitude Toward Salary	47.412	63.587	2	.0005
Attitude Toward Fac./Admin. Power Alignment	17.275	38.382	1	.0005
Evaluation of Administrative Performance	42.609	55.997	2	.0005

TABLE 2 -- The attitudes of 308 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by 1972 presidential vote

Collective Bargaining Index		Nixon (Republican)	McGovern (Democratic)	Total
Strongly Favor	N	8	34	42
	%	8.8	15.7	13.6
Favor	N	14	46	60
	%	15.4	21.2	19.5
Neutral	N	18	65	83
	%	19.8	30.0	26.9
Oppose	N	24	48	72
	%	26.4	22.1	23.4
Strongly Oppose	N	27	24	51
	%	29.7	11.1	16.6
Total	N ^a	91	217	308 ^b
	%	29.5	70.5	100.0

Tau C = .23

P = .0006

^aNumber upon which percentages are based

^bNo response to question = 22

TABLE 3 -- The attitudes of 327 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by perceived collective bargaining effects on salary

Collective Bargaining Index		No Effect On Salaries	Some Improvement On Salaries	Much Improvement On Salaries	Total
Strongly Favor	N	2	30	13	45
	%	1.5	17.3	56.5	13.8
Favor	N	11	50	5	66
	%	8.4	28.9	21.7	20.2
Neutral	N	33	52	3	88
	%	25.2	30.1	13.0	26.9
Oppose	N	46	29	2	77
	%	35.1	16.8	8.7	23.5
Strongly Oppose	N	39	12	0	51
	%	29.8	6.9	0	15.6
Total		N ^a			
		%			
		131	173	23	327 ^b
		40.1	52.9	7.0	100.0

Tau C = .46

P== .0000

^aNumber upon which percentages are based.

^bNo response to question = 3

TABLE 4 -- The attitudes of 323 Michigan private liberal arts college professors toward collective bargaining by attitudes toward faculty control of budget

Collective Bargaining Index		Faculty Should Have More Control	Status Quo Should Be Maintained	Total
Strongly Favor	N	40	5	45
	%	22.6	3.4	13.9
Favor	N	50	13	63
	%	28.2	8.9	19.5
Neutral	N	48	40	88
	%	27.1	27.4	27.2
Oppose	N	28	48	76
	%	15.8	32.9	23.5
Strongly Oppose	N	11	40	51
	%	6.2	27.4	15.8
Total	N	177	146	323 ^b
	%	54.8	45.2	100.0

Tau C = .52

P = .0000

^aNumber upon which percentages are based.

^bNo response to question = 7

APPENDIX E

**INFORMATION AND NEWS ITEMS PERTAINING
TO THE EVENTS SUBSEQUENT TO THIS
SURVEY AT ADRIAN AND ALBION COLLEGES**

The Detroit Free Press
June 15, 1975

Adrian College Feels Winds of Change

By Rone Tempest
Free Press Staff Writer

ADRIAN - For most of its 116-year history in this Lenawee County town, Adrian College has thrived on a diet of quiet conservatism.

While other colleges fretted with the dialectics of revolt and reform, tiny Adrian College, affiliated with the United Methodist Church, remained a bastion of fundamental Christian values and temperance.

The closest thing the school had to a student demonstration was a 1968 memorial procession for Martin Luther King. The procession was approved by the administration and school president John H. Dawson marched with the students.

Until two years ago, the men's and women's dormitories were maintained, with obvious discretion, on opposite sides of the 200-acre campus. Applicants for faculty positions were asked to declare whether they drank or smoked.

Students were required to attend a certain number of chapel sessions or morally uplifting lectures in order to graduate. Alcoholic beverages were strictly forbidden.

But things have changed for Adrian College. Like many American colleges it faces declining enrollment and a financial deficit.

The past few months have been unsettling. The college trustees voted to permit liquor in student dorms. The faculty called for President Dawson's resignation.

Top administrators have been fired and people in the agricultural Lenawee county seat are wondering what kind of place Adrian College is becoming and whether it will survive the next few years.

Under the leadership of President Dawson, 60, a Methodist minister from Pittsburgh who arrived at the school in 1955, Adrian went on an extensive building program.

Between 1957 and 1968, large new academic buildings of Indiana limestone sprouted all over the campus, many built with more than \$16 million donated to the school during those years by Tecumseh industrialist Ray W. Herrick. One huge building, Dawson Auditorium, was named for the college president.

Adrian College Feels Winds of Change (cont'd)

During the 1970-71 academic year enrollment at Adrian College peaked at 1,542 students. Optimistic administrators talked of having 2,000 students.

But in the past four years enrollment has fallen 40 percent, to a full-time student population of 916 for the last academic year.

Meanwhile, operating costs for the college have shot up. Adrian is expected to face a deficit of between \$700,000 and \$900,000 at the end of the fiscal year.

Dawson says that the school must have at least 1,300 students at the school to pay its operating costs. Yet the \$3,600 annual costs for tuition, room and board makes attendance at Adrian prohibitive for many families.

In short, the college has suffered the same problems of declining enrollment and increased costs which are faced by many of the nation's small, private institutions. Like others, its future is threatened.

Toledo's Mary Manse College, to cite one example, recently announced that it was closing at the end of the summer because of similar financial troubles.

Largely because of its financial problems, Adrian has gone through several months of uncharacteristic turmoil. The faculty called for President Dawson's resignation. Dawson reacted by firing four top administrators. Leaders of student government issued a letter condemning the firings and comparing the school to a penal colony.

The emboilments have produced an atmosphere at Adrian, once noted for its tranquility, of suspicion and bitterness.

"There is a feeling on the campus of an almost new McCarthyism," says Dr. William Simmons, an ordained Methodist minister who as dean of students was one of the four fired. "There is a feeling that if you don't give the party line your job is in danger."

"I and the rest of the faculty are kind of gun-shy now after the firings," reports Spanish professor Dr. Beverly Allen, a veteran of 3 years at the school. "We are cautious because we don't want any further bloodbaths here."

Last week faculty members met with representatives of the American Association of University Professors to discuss unionization.

The problems at Adrian began to surface in December, when the school's board of trustees voted 13-10 to allow alcoholic beverages in student dormitories. It was a move aimed primarily at attracting more students to

Adrian College Feels Winds of Change (cont'd)

the school but it was interpreted by many as a repudiation of Dr. Dawson's conservative policies.

Dawson's position has always been that it is not necessary to liberalize college rules to attract more students.

"I feel that there is a reservoir of conservative students which can be tapped," he said in an interview last week. "We have just been recruiting the wrong kinds of students. We need to be recruiting more students who are going to like Adrian College."

Dawson, in fact, blames the enrollment decline on "recent trends at the college toward a more liberal posture." He points to the success of such schools as Oklahoma's Oral Roberts University, a fundamentalist school founded near Tulsa by radio evangelist and healer Oral Roberts, as an example that colleges with distinct conservative philosophies can prosper.

Without comparing Adrian College directly with Oral Roberts University, he says: "There needs to be a moving away from the more liberal approach and the more liberal profile with its social values back to a conservative position more relatively in keeping with Adrian College's heritage and tradition."

Concerned about the financial situation the Adrian faculty met in early May and voted to ask for Dawson's resignation, citing "eroding leadership and lack of confidence in Dawson's judgement and ability to listen" as reasons for the vote.

In the same faculty statement calling for the resignation, known on the campus as the "Brown Paper" because it was printed on brown construction paper, the faculty praised Dawson for his leadership in building up the school in his 20 years as president.

Dawson did not react publicly until the college's board of trustees, in a closed session May 16, rejected faculty requests for his dismissal and gave him a vote of confidence. Dawson interprets the trustees' vote as a mandate in support of his policies.

On May 20 he sent a confidential memorandum to three top administrators--the vice-president for academic affairs, the dean of students and the dean of women--requesting their resignations by that afternoon. The dean of admissions was fired two weeks later.

In an interview, Dawson said these administrators had been identified with the trend toward "liberalization." He replaced them with close friends on the staff, including the director of athletics and the basketball coach, and expressed his intention to return Adrian back to its "traditional conservative values."

Adrian College Feels Winds of Change (cont'd)

On May 23, Adrian student leaders Mark Knapp of Osseo, student body president, and Mark Courtrade of Dearborn Heights, issued an open letter condemning the firings.

"We are turning from a college with liberal possibilities, with the hope of adapting to changing times," the students wrote, "to an institution in the penal sense with little or no consideration given to the needs and desires of faculty and students."

"President Dawson is losing touch," said Courtrade. "He is finding it a little bit harder to relate to the younger students and younger faculty. He claims that this is a religious school and yet when they have chapel every Wednesday only 10 people show up."

Dawson says he has received substantial support from the college's alumnae and trustees.

Many of the trustees consider Dawson synonymous with the college itself, crediting him with building it from a school with only 300 students to an accredited small college.

"When John came to Adrian it was not an accredited college," says Adrian businessman and trustee Charles Hickman. "He has caused the school to be accredited. He has managed to raise funds to rebuild practically every building on the campus and build new buildings to the point where it went from a very minor college with 300 students into a school with as many as 1,500 students.

"That is not the case now but that is not the case with many small colleges. I think he has shown excellent leadership."

Michigan Christian Advocate
(Official Publication of Michigan United Methodists)
June 5, 1975

Is There a Balm in Adrian?
By Keith I. Pohl

Needless to say the problems of Adrian College were sufficiently severe that it needs no added calamities at this moment in time. (See articles on firing and student reaction on page 7 of this issue.) Denominational colleges are struggling to keep alive in the face of shrinking enrollments and soaring costs. Adrian College is in a critical condition. Now with internal warring the situation might prove fatal.

The irony of the potential tragedy is that all of the parties concerned are able persons of goodwill; yet the inability and/or unwillingness to communicate threatens to undo them all as well as the college.

The college's Board of Trustees is composed of people of honor and integrity, persons with proven good sense and business acumen. Yet, they have rarely listened to more than a single voice. They have chosen to stand removed from the concerns of the faculty, the students, and the second level of the administration. They have been entrusted with a governing responsibility which cannot be passed to any president or executive committee.

President John H. Dawson is one of the few persons of our time that will be assured a prominent place in the history of Michigan United Methodism. He is a skilled and industrious college executive. It is no exaggeration of fact to say that John Dawson built Adrian College. Indeed, the school would not be misnamed if it were called "Dawson-Herrick College." However, John Dawson is neither in temperament nor experience a proponent of democratic leadership. He has proven for 20 years to be the sole captain of the ship; consensus is foreign to his philosophy and style. A hard hand can build a college, but can it sustain a college in an age when faculty refuse to swear, "It is not ours to question why, it is ours to do or die!" or when students refuse to be seen but not heard?

In the last few years as Adrian College grew in brick and mortar, it also grew in the quality of its academic excellence. The Adrian faculty is as capable as any in the small colleges of Michigan. However, they blundered in calling for the resignation of President Dawson. A request for an inquiry into their complaints would have been appropriate; but a petition for resignation simply pushed people into corners where egos had to be defended and save-face had to be maintained. The faculty can be criticized for not following proper procedures, for poorly handling the media exposure of their concern, and for an unclear writing of their complaints. Nevertheless, they deserve to be heard. To say that their "complaints contained nothing of substance" is sheer folly and an open affront to the integrity of 53 outstanding educators.

Is There a Balm in Adrian? (cont'd)

Surely, enough mistakes have been made. Trustees, president, faculty, all can share in fumbles of the past. The critical item before those who care for the future of Adrian College is not wasting time and energy in finding fault, but rather finding a way to reconcile the differences and mediate the tensions.

One does not need to be a prophet with great foretelling powers to see that if the situation continues to be a struggle of egos, a battle of powers with the friends and supporters of one side against the friends and supporters of the other, all will lose. Adrian College might become another case of one more missing college--a beautiful campus with modern facilities, debt free, with everything but students and teachers. It might then become the "Dawson-Herrick Community College of Lenawee County."

A strong president fighting with a strong faculty while the trustees passively sit "speaking no evil, seeing no evil, hearing no evil" is not the course for people of such high stature. Each is above such petty behavior. All are aware that they share a common no-win consequence and a mutually destructive future.

Is there a balm in Adrian? Is there some way out? Is there someone who can reconcile the tempers and mediate the grievances? What person or group of persons can build a link of communication?

Soon both of Michigan's annual conferences will be in session. Is there any way that the collective wisdom of the most able in our church might help? Do the conferences have any guiding interests in the affairs of its institutions? Will they even inquire? Could the national Board of Higher Education and Ministry bring advice to a situation sorely crying for some cool thinking and cautious action?

Most obviously this is not the time for the reign of the Sampson mentality. A spirit of revenge and a thrust for hasty decisions will bring no less than evil upon all houses. This is the time for the best from all who love Adrian College and care about its continuing ministry in the name of Christian higher education.

Michigan Christian Advocate
(Official Publication of Michigan United Methodists)
September 25, 1975

**Adrian College Faculty Cast Strong
Vote for Joining Union**

By over a two-to-one margin the faculty at Adrian College voted to be represented by the College Association of Professors, an affiliate of the Michigan Education Association. The balloting was supervised by the National Labor Relations Board on September 12 and brought to an end individualized negotiations with the college administration.

The Adrian faculty is the first among the private colleges in Michigan to form a union to negotiate on its behalf. This action is also believed to be a first among the small colleges related to the United Methodist Church across the country.

The Adrian professors cast 59 votes in the election: 40 for the MEA affiliate, one for the American Association of University Professors, and 18 votes for no union representation.

(The following is uncopyrighted material, but permission has been granted to include this report, in its entirety, in this appendix.)

Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service
Washington, D.C.

SPECIAL REPORT #7

ALBION COLLEGE VOTES "NO AGENT" - A CASE STUDY

By
Dr. Virginia Lee Lussier
University of Delaware

NOTE: Interviews on which this report is based were given by the President, Executive Vice President, Dean of the Faculty, Associate Dean, three representatives from the American Association of University Professors, three representatives from the Albion Society of Professors, four faculty members who publicly expressed a no-agent position, two faculty members who took no stated position, and one student. The statements made and views expressed in this paper are solely the responsibility of the author.

INTRODUCTION:

The vast majority of four-year institutions which have chosen collective bargaining agents to represent faculty are in public colleges and universities. As of March 1974, only 29 faculties at private four-year institutions were represented by agents. Eight of these 29 faculties were unionized during 1973. Rejection of collective bargaining by four-year institutions has been the more frequent pattern. Eighteen of the 21 four-year institutions which have voted against collective bargaining have been private colleges and universities. One such "no representation" election occurred at Albion College.

Founded in 1835, Albion College is a small, private, coeducational Methodist Church-related college about 80 miles south of Lansing, Michigan. Located in a quiet manufacturing town of about 12,500, it has a prestigious academic reputation throughout Michigan and the Great Lakes area. Many of the 110 faculty, who teach a student enrollment of over 1,750, were attracted to Albion because it offered an opportunity to teach at a small college in a harmonious setting. However, serious problems appeared on campus during the early 1970's. The culmination of these problems resulted in a collective bargaining election held on October 15, 1973.

PRE-ELECTION EVENTS:

Reasons for faculties' unionization vary from institution to institution. At Albion College a combination of growing financial difficulties, faculty cutbacks and the faculty's perception of their lack of input into the decision-making process led to the collective bargaining vote.

In the 1960's, at many institutions of higher learning, it appeared that there would always be an abundance of students and a shortage of faculty. A decision was made by the Board of Trustees at Albion to allow the college to grow to an enrollment of 2,000. The administration began hiring faculty and constructing buildings to accommodate a student body of that number. By 1970, the National growth pattern had reversed itself. Student population was declining and job-hunting faculty were numerous. A national financial crunch ensued, which Albion did not escape.

The 1971 Carnegie Commission Report, titled The New Depression in Higher Education, reviewed the financial situation at several institutions, including Albion. This report alerted the Albion faculty to the financial collision course of their institution.

The President's State of the College address in Fall 1972 further elaborated on this problem. Deficits were escalating at a rapidly increasing rate. By the 1971-72 academic year the operating deficit reached an accumulated total of \$305,136 and in that year alone it was almost \$200,000. Immediate action was needed to balance the budget and forestall the closing of the institution.

One course of action designed to achieve a balanced budget was retrenchment of faculty positions. The student-faculty ratio in 1971-72 was 12:1. The board of trustees made it clear that it should be raised to 15:1. It was determined that the faculty cutbacks were to be made in departments (such as Music and Modern Language) that had few majors and low course enrollments in relation to the number of faculty employed. Some cuts were accomplished through attrition, but the situation also required some terminal contracts, one of which went to a tenured professor.

Financial problems also dictated other economies. Funds were not available for pay raises. Only a 3-1/2 percent cost-of-living increase was given in the 1973-74 contract. Tuition-free classes for faculty spouses and funded sabbaticals were discontinued. In addition, sabbatical leave was only given if another faculty member was available to teach students.

The faculty's perception of their own lack of input in the decision-making process was another factor which resulted in the collective bargaining vote. There were several sources for this feeling, one being the presidential selection process at Albion in 1970. Candidates suggested by the Faculty-Student Search Committee were either not acceptable to the Search Committee or not approved by the Board of Trustees. Finally, during the summer of 1970, the Board chose one of its own members for this position.

A continuing turnover of Deans and interim Deans of the Faculty weakened the long-term academic leadership of that office. Faculty members no longer felt they had a representative voicing their concerns in college administration. Paralleling this development, the growing financial crisis led to the appointment of an individual with a broad background in university financial management as Executive Vice President. The vacuum in the Dean's Office and the need to make difficult financial decisions involving faculty and program cutbacks, led faculty to perceive a shift in academic decision-making from the faculty-oriented Dean's office to the financial offices.

The Albion faculty decision-making apparatus provides for a series of standing committees set within a framework of an Albion College Association, a body which includes all members of the faculty. Some committees, such as those which involve recommendations regarding tenure, sabbatical leaves, college or academic budget, report directly to the administration. On all other matters, any action by the committees must come to the faculty for final approval. Only tenured faculty may serve on the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Budget Advisory Committee, and the Faculty Steering Committee, although non-tenured members may sit on at least ten other major committees and ad hoc task forces. Many of these latter groups have been created recently.

Many faculty members appeared to view the functioning of this system with reservations or disapproval. Individuals who sat on these committees, especially those committees specified above, were viewed by some as having an important influence on policy outcomes. Non-tenured faculty felt not only unrepresented, but some felt that the membership of the committees perpetuated itself, thereby entrenching the interests of the older and more conservative members. Others, some of whom sit on these committees, had been frustrated by the advisory nature of their recommendations. Policy recommendations, they felt, had not been followed. Changes in committee decisions by administrators not charged with academic responsibility, and implementation of some policies without faculty preparation or consideration, had made administrative actions appear arbitrary and capricious. Increasing alienation was evident in the one and one-half years before the drive for a collective bargaining election began.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGENTS:

Members of the campus AAUP chapter became interested in the phenomenon of collective bargaining in the fall of 1972. Discovering this, the Michigan Association of Higher Education (an NEA affiliate) arranged several meetings with them on that subject. A split within the AAUP group occurred during the winter of 1972-73. One segment wanted to begin the circulation of authorization cards since they saw collective bargaining as the only alternative. The other wanted to examine more thoroughly the phenomenon of collective bargaining. The former group became the Albion Society of Professors (ASP). In reaction to the ASP's circulation of cards, the AAUP, following a vote of its local membership, determined that it, too, would seek to represent the Albion faculty. Thirty percent of the cards of both groups were signed within a month. Members of the ASP signed AAUP cards and maintained membership in AAUP, and at least one maintained an elected office in AAUP. In March 1973, the ASP filed a petition with the National Labor Relations Board. The following month, a hearing concerning

the constituency of the faculty bargaining unit was held and an agreement was made between the ASP and AAUP groups and the university administration. In some institutions there has been a great diversity of opinion among all groups as to who should be included or excluded. The only source of difficulty in the Albion case was whether part-time faculty should be included. In return for some other inclusions, the administration was successful in having part-time faculty excluded. The final composition of the unit included all tenured and non-tenured regular full-time personnel with faculty rank whether under contract or on leave; professional librarians holding faculty rank; coaches; developing skill center personnel with faculty rank; counseling center personnel with faculty rank; and department chairmen.

At this same hearing, the date for the election was set for October 15, 1973.

The Albion Society of Professors, with a core group of 10 to 15 members, affiliated with the Michigan Association for Higher Education (MAHE) since that group was immediately willing to provide the costs of organizing and running an election campaign. MAHE, the state association of the National Education Association, provided about \$300 for postage, paper and printing costs, rental of meeting facilities and part-time clerical help. In addition, three or four individuals were provided as speakers, as well as field personnel from Lansing and Battle Creek. The total financial commitment from the state association was under \$1,000.00.

As mentioned above, a split existed within the local AAUP chapter as to whether collective bargaining should be pursued. The nucleus of those who wished to do so formed a Steering Committee composed of six individuals. Once the decision was made to participate in the election, the local requested and received help from the national AAUP. The national organization covered the complete campaign costs of their affiliate and provided speakers both from Michigan and the national office in Washington. As with the ASP, the total financial commitment from outside sources was less than \$1,000.00.

There were two primary issues in the campaign: job security and academic governance. The former was the principal concern of the ASP and the latter of the AAUP. The cutting of faculty positions in departments that had especially low student enrollment for the number of faculty members on the staff greatly threatened the non-tenured faculty. Some ASP officers thought many of the dismissals were being used as an excuse to get rid of people who were not liked. In addition, the reduction of departments, in the ASP view, was strictly on the basis of financial exigency, rather than professional or educational merit. They argued that the administration was no longer concerned whether students should have the option to take a course, only whether the financial resources were available for its existence. Increasing economic pressures from the college employees who were already unionized (secretaries and plant maintenance employees), they feared, would force the administration to make

budget cuts which would further reduce academic programs, reduce the number of faculty, keep faculty salaries modest, and increase faculty workload.

As a result of the ASP stance, many younger, non-tenured professors from departments facing cutbacks joined this group. The ASP campaign strategy was to rely on the dissemination of newsletters and other material, and on meetings to clarify the issues as they saw them.

The issue which was central to the AAUP's campaign was campus governance. This group felt that the traditional system of institutional governance--where responsibility for decision-making is shared by trustees, administrators, faculty and students--was being eroded. They argued that many functions such as curriculum development, methods of instruction, and, of prime importance, the hiring and dismissal of faculty, which are primarily the responsibility of faculty, had been at times usurped by the administration. Committees at times had not acted on important matters, or had yielded to the subtle influence and pressure of the administration. The Albion College Board of Trustees, the AAUP felt, had too often legislated in areas of faculty concern without faculty consultation or proper regard for faculty interests. And, most importantly, the office of the Dean of the Faculty had become weak in power and responsibility.

The basic strategy of the AAUP campaign was to disseminate as much information as possible, while presenting the issues and the AAUP's suggested alternatives in a calm and rational manner.

Although there was no unified opposition by faculty members against the unionization effort, several faculty members publicly stated their opposition to collective bargaining. Some argued that an adversarial relationship would be created between faculty and administration; that trustees and donors would cease to support the college financially because the money would be used for purposes which they could no longer control; and that faculty life would become regimented under a bargaining agent. For others, collective bargaining evoked an emotional response--a feeling that it was a solution for workers, but not for professionals.

Albion is a small campus, and all 110 faculty members eligible to vote in the election were sensitized to the issues involved in the campaign. Three general discussion sessions sponsored by the unions were held for faculty members in which the ASP, AAUP, and various individuals opposing collective bargaining presented their views. Each of the contending unions held meetings with outside speakers. Much literature was distributed by all contending parties (except the administration) and a file on collective bargaining was maintained in the library. Polls were also taken to determine how faculty members would vote. In light of these efforts and of the general discussion of collective bargaining on campus, it was virtually impossible for a faculty member not to be aware of the issues. This was reflected in the number of faculty who went to the polls. Only four of the 110 faculty failed to vote, two of whom were not on campus at the time.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSE:

On advice of counsel, the President made only one major statement, which was delivered immediately prior to the first election. In his address, he said that, if necessary, he was willing to live with collective bargaining. But he outlined the negative effects he felt it would have on the Albion campus.

In general, the administration's strategy appeared to be one of silence. Some faculty felt the President should not have made even the statement he did, since it produced, in their opinion, some union votes. This group maintained that any statement which appeared to advocate a hard line or seemed unreasonable could only provoke further problems for the administration. There was no way, they felt, that the administration could benefit from confrontation. Other faculty felt that the administration did not really feel neutral on the subject of bargaining, since a majority vote for an agent would force it into negotiations on a variety of economic and educational issues. Therefore, in their opinion, it was in the best interests of the administration to make its real views known.

From the viewpoint of many faculty, perhaps the most important step that was taken was the hiring of a new Dean of Faculty to replace the Dean who resigned during the spring of 1973. Many faculty members had spoken to the new Dean during his interviews on campus. They made him aware of their views, and they were favorably impressed with his responses. The President made known publicly his staunch support for the Dean and his determination to rely on that office for academic decisions.

Other changes made by the administration during the fall of 1973 included reinstitution of sabbaticals for faculty and tuition remission for faculty spouses; introduction of a new evaluation procedure for all faculty; creation of a special task force to begin study on a grievance procedure; development of a new salary step system which awarded faculty a certain amount for "merit" and a certain amount for "equity adjustments"; and provision for a total of seven percent in the fund for salary increases (five percent across-the-board pay increase and two percent distributed among faculty for other considerations).

THE ELECTIONS:

The first election was a surprise to many since some polls taken had predicted a clear "no agent" victory. The results were: 52 "no agent" votes; 31 AAUP votes; 24 ASP votes; and six challenged votes. Three of the challenges were discarded by the NLRB. Hence, even if the AAUP or "no agent" adherents received all three of the remaining valid votes, neither would have had enough to be declared the winner. Since the no-agent option failed to have more than half the votes recorded, a runoff election was required between the two top contenders. ASP, therefore, was dropped from the runoff vote which was scheduled for November 14, 1973.

An unusual event then occurred. Faculty supporting no-agent and several AAUP leaders (it must be remembered that segments of this group were not fully committed to collective bargaining) attempted to formulate an agreement between the AAUP and the administration that would guarantee changes in college academic procedures without a runoff vote. This effort proceeded in two ways. First, a group of no-agent people circulated a petition, which 65 faculty members signed, supporting basic changes in academic policy making. Second, the AAUP chapter solicited proposals from faculty members to affect these procedural changes. This method, it appeared, would give both faculty and administration what they wanted: the administration would avoid a unionized campus and faculty would achieve fundamental changes in procedures, specifically a direct decision-making authority on academic questions. However, NLRB rules state that an employer may not make any kind of offer that might be construed as an attempt to influence votes, as long as there is an election pending. Even if the AAUP agreed not to complain to the NLRB about this violation, any individual faculty member who felt his or her rights were endangered could have legitimately filed a complaint. On advice from counsel, the administration refused to agree to any such bargain.

The results of the runoff election were 54 votes for no-agent and 44 for the AAUP. A change of six votes would have instituted faculty bargaining at Albion College.

The no-agent vote at Albion is attributed to a variety of factors. Many faculty who voted no-agent did so to give the new Dean an opportunity to prove himself. While the administration regards the changes in policy cited above as policies that would have been instituted under any conditions, many faculty members regard them as beneficial effects from the collective bargaining campaign. In addition to these important influences, some view the divisions within the ASP and AAUP and their lack of a solid front as contributing to a no-agent vote. This was especially true of the AAUP, which included many no-agent people within its ranks. In the month prior to the runoff election, there was almost no AAUP campaigning while the group tried to decide where it stood on the collective bargaining issue.

Others see the large union vote as registering faculty feeling that many campus policies and practices needed change.

CONCLUSIONS:

The advantages and disadvantages of collective bargaining are still discussed in a general way at Albion College, although there is little open discussion among the ASP and AAUP membership of a new collective bargaining campaign. This does not mean, however, that faculty members are completely satisfied with the administration's approach to problem solving. Many faculty members appear to be playing a watching and waiting game. There are two aspects in this posture. Of crucial importance is the role of the academic dean. If he represents the interests of the faculty, the faculty are likely to be satisfied. If, in the struggle to decide policy matters, the faculty perceive that academic decisions are being made without the advice of that office, dissension between faculty and

administration could reappear.

Second, decisions in several key academic issue areas bear watching. Faculty cutbacks still need to be made in Spring, 1974. Projected student enrollments for Fall, 1974 are down. If this drop materializes, further faculty cuts may be necessary. These new developments could cause new problems for the administration. Other areas of faculty concern include: decisions concerning faculty salary increases, tenure quotas, hiring practices and procedures, and faculty workloads. Faculty members want their voice heard in deciding policy in these areas. How the administration responds to these issues could well determine future faculty interest in collective bargaining.

There are certain aspects of the Albion election and events surrounding it which should receive special consideration from administrators at other institutions. The first aspect deals with governance. It appears advisable to have the locus of decision-making placed visibly in the hands of those with the authority and expertise to make decisions on certain types of policy. Faculty became disgruntled at Albion when the individuals appointed to represent their interests in the administration seemed to be rendered ineffective and when, in their opinion, committee recommendations on many issues were no longer heeded. At this point, faculty began to view the decision-making apparatus as authoritarian and arbitrary.

Secondly, it may not be advisable for an administration to assume an antagonistic posture during an election campaign. There is some evidence in the Albion case to suggest that any hostility by the administration would have promoted rather than impeded an agent vote. Although the administration maintains that it would have made the same changes in procedure and policy with or without a collective bargaining campaign, its efforts were viewed as positive and conciliatory by the faculty.

One additional reason for assuming a non-antagonistic stance is that an administration can find itself trying to negotiate a contract with this same group of faculty members. The less contention in the election proceedings, the better the chance for smooth negotiations.

Lastly, and in connection with the point above, the administration at Albion adhered closely to the procedures established both in the faculty handbook and those required by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), being careful to avoid any activity that could be construed as an unfair labor practice. Following legal procedures established by the NLRA may not produce a no-agent vote, but failure to follow them may help to produce an agent vote.