

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. 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 material submitted.**

**The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations 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 through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7921159

HUMPHREY, KENNETH LEE  
DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON: ATTITUDE TOWARD  
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND PERCEPTION OF  
FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP AT  
SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY, PH.D., 1979

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON: ATTITUDE TOWARD  
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND PERCEPTION OF  
FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP AT  
SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Kenneth L. Humphrey

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1979

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON: ATTITUDE TOWARD  
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND PERCEPTION OF  
FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP AT  
SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Kenneth L. Humphrey

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1979

## ABSTRACT

DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON: ATTITUDE TOWARD  
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND PERCEPTION OF  
FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP AT  
SELECTED MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

By

Kenneth L. Humphrey

The purpose of this study was to determine department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship as related to size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a department chairperson, and number of years employed at that particular college.

In an effort to determine attitudes and perceptions, questionnaires were sent to fifty-eight department chairpersons from selected Michigan public community colleges.

In relationship to the demographic data, there was no difference in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining. Although there were some slight differences in perceptions of faculty-administration

relationship, most of the department chairpersons perceived the relationship as being influenced by collective bargaining.

More specifically, attitudes toward collective bargaining were generally favorable: (1) they advocated collective bargaining for faculty, and (2) they felt that it was beneficial and that it should be encouraged. On the other hand, collective bargaining was perceived as (1) reducing collegiality, (2) formalizing relationships, and (3) increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

Recommendations for further research were made in hopes that strategies would be developed to help improve faculty-administration relationship, alter unwarranted attitudes toward collective bargaining, and to disspell false assumptions about collective bargaining. Since each institution is a separate entity in itself, the strategies should be developed for that particular institution and not all institutions in higher education.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of many persons for the completion of this study. First, much credit is due to my family: To my wife, Gloria, for her patience, love, support, and understanding throughout the study; to my children, Kendrea and Shonda, who allowed their father many moments of solitude without disturbance; to my mother and father, sister, and relatives for their encouragement and moral support when I needed it most.

The author was most fortunate to have a doctoral committee who was patient, gracious in assistance, and a source of constant encouragement. These persons, Drs. Hickey, Johnson, Featherstone, Kruger, and Ivey, gave me the guidance and assistance I needed to complete the work attempted.

The help of these individuals was vital and without it, this study could not have been completed. To each, the author extends his sincere thanks and appreciation. Naturally, the author assumes full responsibility for any errors that exist, opinions expressed, and conclusions drawn in the study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
Background of the Problem . . . . .	1
Purpose of Study . . . . .	7
Objectives . . . . .	8
Need and Importance of Study . . . . .	10
Limitations of Study . . . . .	12
Delimitations of Study . . . . .	13
Definition of Terms . . . . .	14
Overview . . . . .	16
II. THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	20
Introduction. . . . .	20
Faculty-Administration Relationships. . . . .	21
The Role of the Faculty Chairperson . . . . .	25
Related Study . . . . .	29
Summary . . . . .	35
III. METHOD OF STUDY . . . . .	39
Introduction. . . . .	39
Population and Sample. . . . .	39
Questionnaire . . . . .	41
Hypotheses . . . . .	43
Data Collection. . . . .	43
Data Analysis . . . . .	44
Summary . . . . .	45
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	46
Introduction. . . . .	46
General Characteristics of the Sample . . . . .	47
Attitudes toward Collective Bargaining . . . . .	51
Perceptions of Faculty-Administration Relationship . . . . .	64
Summary . . . . .	77

## Chapter

V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . .	79
Summary . . . . .	79
Methodology . . . . .	80
Findings . . . . .	82
Discussion . . . . .	83
Conclusions . . . . .	86
Future Research. . . . .	87

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX

A. COMPUTER SEARCH DESCRIPTORS . . . . .	89
B. MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: FACULTY AFFILIATION - NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS . . . . .	90
C. MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES COLLEGE SIZE: 1975 HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT . . . . .	91
D. QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	92
E. COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER . . . . .	95
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	97

## LIST OF TABLES

### Table

3.1	SAMPLE PER COLLEGE SIZE . . . . .	40
4.1	ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY SIZE OF COLLEGE . . . . .	48
4.2	ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT. . . . .	48
4.3	ANALYSIS OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS BY AGE. .	49
4.4	ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED AS A DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON. . . . .	50
4.5	ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED AT THE COLLEGE . . . . .	50
4.6	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS RELATED TO ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING. . . . .	52
4.7	CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6 . . . . .	55
4.8	CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6 . . . . .	56
4.9	CROSSTABULATION OF AGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6 . . . . .	56
4.10	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSONS BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6 . . . . .	57
4.11	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS EMPLOYED AT COLLEGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6 . . . . .	58
4.12	CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19 . . . . .	59

# Table

4.13	CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19 . . . . .	60
4.14	CROSSTABULATION OF AGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19 . . . . .	61
4.15	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19 . . . . .	61
4.16	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS EMPLOYED AT COLLEGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19 . . . . .	63
4.17	FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUES- TIONNAIRE ITEMS RELATED TO PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP . . .	66
4.18	CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE AND QUES- TIONNAIRE ITEM 9 . . . . .	67
4.19	CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9 . . . . .	68
4.20	CROSSTABULATION OF AGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9 . . . . .	68
4.21	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9 . . . . .	69
4.22	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AT COLLEGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9 . . . . .	70
4.23	CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11 . . . . .	70
4.24	CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11 . . . . .	71
4.25	CROSSTABULATION OF AGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11. . . . .	72
4.26	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11 . . . . .	72
4.27	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AT COLLEGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11 . . . . .	73
4.28	CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18 . . . . .	74

# Table

4.29	CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18 . . . . .	74
4.30	CROSSTABULATION OF AGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18 . . . . .	75
4.31	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18 . . . . .	76
4.32	CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AT COLLEGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18 . . . . .	76

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

#### Background of the Problem

Since the 1960s, some college faculty members have chosen to express many of their professional and financial concerns through the collective bargaining process. The principal factor in the faculty unionization movement, in the state of Michigan, was the passage of the Hutchinson Act (Public ERA of 1965) which granted public employees, including teachers, collective bargaining rights protected by law. The reasons for faculty members organizing, for purposes of collective bargaining, are varied. For example, the decision to organize may have been based upon low wages or a lack of a voice in determining matters affecting them on the job.

Presently, the primary attractiveness of unionization appears to be among public community colleges. For example, in the state of Michigan, approximately 83 percent of the public community colleges are involved in collective negotiations, whereas in comparison, approximately 47 percent of the state's public four-year institutions are engaged in the same process.<sup>1</sup>

As collective bargaining becomes the primary means for determining working conditions, wages, and so forth, there is the likelihood that the process of collective bargaining may strain the relationship between faculty and administration. In fact, D. H. Wollett, a proponent of collective bargaining, purports that:

Collective bargaining amounts to a turning away from collegiality and self-governance and a moving toward an adversarial system which recognizes that the central fact of life in the academy is that there are those who are managed, that there are employers and employees, that conflicts arise from these relationships, and that in a collective bargaining system they are resolved by a process predicated upon the proposition that people whose interests conflict are, at least in respect of those conflicts, adversaries.<sup>2</sup>

Wollett's assessment of collective bargaining contains three interrelated issues germane to this study: (1) collegiality, (2) conflict, and (3) adversarialism.

Since collegiality involves faculty participation in the area of governance, peer evaluation, consultation, and authority sharing,<sup>3</sup> the lack of collegiality has had a profound impact on public community colleges. For example, A. R. Weber and others contend that among those junior colleges that have developed from local systems of secondary education the absence of academic traditions has inhibited efforts to formulate procedures for establishing effective faculty representation.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, G. D. Welch asserts that faculty at community colleges have found the traditional collegiality model of governance unacceptable and have voluntarily agreed to enter

collective bargaining as a means of defining their role in more specific terms.<sup>5</sup> The essence of the preceding comments tend to suggest that faculty discontent with the collegial model of governance, as operationalized at their institution, may have influenced their decision to unionize.

Another aspect of collective bargaining is the assumption that collective bargaining is a conflict-creating mechanism which will serve only to polarize or politicize a campus.<sup>6</sup> This assumption is based upon the notion that both the faculty union and the administration must protect their respective interest(s). Conflict between the parties, however, may also occur in advance of the faculty decision to unionize. For example, S. M. Epler points out that conflict at junior colleges may be the result of the process of transition from secondary education to higher education status in that teachers seek the same prerogatives as their colleagues in established institutions of higher learning; moreover, the authoritarian, "dictatorial" tradition of secondary education clashes with the "democratic" concept of higher education.<sup>7</sup>

However, the presence of collective bargaining is likely to increase the amount of conflict between the parties if the faculty union is fashioned after the labor union model. To paraphrase, the Academic Collective

Bargaining Information Service's description of the labor union model of collective bargaining, as presented in their "Orientation Package," suggests that the model is based upon an adversary relationship, decision by compromise, exclusive agent, and the potential use of sanctions by either the union or management to force the opposition into granting concession; moreover, the model is founded upon the belief that conflict of interest between the union and management is fundamental and permanent.<sup>8</sup> In this context, H. E. Mazzola claims that conflict is linked to the philosophical differences that exist between the union and management,<sup>9</sup> whereas, in an education context, A. R. Weber and Associates take the position that "the issues most likely to generate conflict . . . are those arising from the employee status of professors."<sup>10</sup> If so, this condition may have indirect influence on the attitude that faculty and administrators have toward one another, thereby influencing the faculty-administration relationship.

One purported problem associated with collective bargaining in higher education is that some administrators have an unfavorable attitude toward collective bargaining:

Unfortunately, too many administrators look upon collective bargaining as an adversary relationship. . . . If administrators recognize that the process is one of compromise, the resultant agreement will

be a charter representing a new relationship. Paradoxically, this new relationship is in the spirit of the very origins of higher education universities.<sup>11</sup>

In view of such an attitude and the potential merits associated with the collegial environment, one could ask, what role should the administration take to advance the concept of collegiality? The answer may very well be tied to the department chairperson. As the chairperson is more or less wedged between faculty and administration, the chairperson is in a position to exert influence on both sides. However, the issue of the role of the department chairperson needs to be resolved first.

Much of the debate on the role of the department chairperson is concentrated on whether the chairperson is an extension of faculty or an agent of the administration. One argument takes the position that:

. . . it is the task of the department chairman to represent clearly and forcefully the needs of his department and the development of his discipline. . . . in this function the department chairman is definitely a faculty member.<sup>12</sup>

A counter argument is that if the chairperson uses independent judgment on matters of hiring, promoting, discharging, or adjudicating grievances, he/she is a part of management.<sup>13</sup> However, according to R. E. Kennedy, this level of administration rarely has the authority to act independently; instead, they made recommendations to the dean.<sup>14</sup> A somewhat middle of the road approach is that some researchers define the role as both

administration and spokesperson.<sup>15</sup> But, in the final analysis, according to J. Lombardi, "collective bargaining agreements are defining the status of the chairmen . . . by the simple process of defining the members of the employee bargaining unit."<sup>16</sup> Irrespective of how the role of the department chairperson is defined, the chairperson still may be in a position to influence the relationship between faculty and administration.

In Michigan, cases of disputes over membership to the faculty bargaining unit at public institutions are generally settled by the Michigan Employment Relations Commission (MERC), while cases at private institutions are settled by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). For example, at Gogebic Community College (Case No. R74 D-183), MERC ruled against the exclusion of department chairpersons to the bargaining unit. The Commission's decision was based upon the opinion that chairpersons at this College were communication links between faculty and the administration and that the real power of authority rested with the deans.<sup>17</sup> At Western Michigan University (Case No. R74 C-113), MERC ruled in favor of exclusion of department chairpersons; the Commission concluded that the department chairpersons' responsibilities and functions were aligned with those of management.<sup>18</sup> Finally, to cite an NLRB decision in Michigan, the Board, in its review of a case at the University of Detroit (193 NLRB No. 95, Case No. 7-RC-10492), issued a

decision to include department chairpersons in the faculty bargaining unit. In this ruling, the Board was of the opinion that the chairpersons "lack the power to recommend the appointment, promotion, tenure or discharge of faculty members."<sup>19</sup>

The complexity of the issues related to collective bargaining may effect the relationship between faculty and administration. However, the department chairperson's attitude toward collective bargaining may also be a contributing factor. As the chairperson generally assumes the task of enforcing the terms of the agreement, it is likely that the chairperson has a definite attitude toward collective bargaining and perceptions of the faculty-administration relationship. For example, the department chairperson who perceives faculty-administration relationship as adversarial may also have a negative attitude toward collective bargaining. The problem, therefore, is that little is known about department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining or their perceptions of the influence of collective bargaining on faculty-administration relationship.

#### Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to produce descriptive research on department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationships, as related to specific variables. These variables include:

1. Size of college as based upon headcount enrollment
  - A. Small - less than 4,500
  - B. Medium - 4,500 to 8,000
  - C. Large - more than 8,000
2. Division of employment
  - A. Arts and Sciences
  - B. Business
  - C. Vocational/Technical
3. Age
4. Number of years in office as a department chairperson
5. Number of years employed at that particular college

### Objectives

This study is intended to accomplish the following:

1. To determine the chairperson's attitude toward collective bargaining as related to specific variables
2. To determine the chairperson's perception of faculty-administration relationship as related to specific variables

In determining the above objectives, the chairperson's responses should shed light on whether their perceptions of the faculty-administration relationship are analogous

to their attitudes toward collective bargaining. The importance of such findings may contribute toward helping department chairpersons to analyze their attitudes toward collective bargaining. This may contribute toward improving the faculty-administration relationship and facilitate the task of attaining institutional goals.

To support this research, attitudes toward collective bargaining will be investigated on the basis of (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) neutral, (4) disagree, (5) strongly disagree. The same categories will be used to investigate the faculty-administration relationship on the basis of being (1) collegial, (2) formalized, and (3) adversarial.

The choice of studying department chairpersons specifically rather than all administrators was a pragmatic one. As the chairperson is literally lodged between departmental faculty and the upper extension of the administration, the chairperson has the vantage point from which to articulate the merits of a collegial relationship to both sides. Therefore, if the chairperson is to assume a leadership role in advancing the faculty-administration relationship, knowledge of the chairperson's attitude toward collective bargaining becomes essential.

### Need and Importance of Study

The need for this study developed out of two commentaries on collective bargaining. In the first, H. I. Goodman gave this account on the future of faculty unionism:

There is no evidence to warrant the assumption that once a faculty union has been obtained, any serious effort will be made to displace it. . . . college administrators must anticipate the spread and permanence of faculty unionism.<sup>20</sup>

In the second, J. Lombardi takes the position that:

. . . if resistance rather than accommodation becomes the covert or overt policy the stresses will increase. Ultimately, accommodations will have to be made; participatory democracy and collective bargaining are not going to disappear. . . .<sup>21</sup>

The common thread permeating both comments is the foretelling of the likely presence of faculty collective bargaining in higher education. Consequently, this would seem to indicate that administrators should learn to live with collective bargaining. In other words, where collective bargaining is present, administrators should undertake the task of eradicating adversarialism and advance the concept of collegiality because faculty and administrators are generally dependent upon one another in their efforts to attain quality teaching. Collegiality, as used here, implies that both the administration and faculty view their relationship as partners cooperating to improve the quality of teaching. However, as

adversaries they may demonstrate minimal cooperation, or they may attempt to accomplish the same goal through independent action.

By contrast, the concept of collegiality generally implies that faculty and administrators are allies in the pursuit of quality teaching; however, the concept of adversarialism implies that they are opponents. One reason may be that the administration may perceive the faculty as invading their domain. Consequently, within this context, it would seem that collegiality is likely to be more conducive to improving the quality of teaching, especially if the concept of collegiality is viewed as a relationship predicated upon mutual trust and respect. This should not be construed as to imply that collegiality improves the quality of teaching. What is implied is that in an educational environment, if faculty and administrators have trust and respect for one another the task of attaining quality teaching should be facilitated.

As most institutions are entities within themselves, the true challenge lies with the ability of each institution to change unfounded assumptions about collective bargaining. This task will necessitate the need for research on attitudes toward collective bargaining and the faculty-administration relationship. Hopefully, this study will contribute toward helping to establish the need for developing strategies to alter attitudes toward collective bargaining that tend to be

contrary to the notion of mutual trust and respect. It is within this context that the need and importance of this study were developed.

#### Limitations of Study

The limitations associated with this study fall into three categories. The first concerns the selection and limitation of variables. These variables include: (1) size of college, (2) division of employment, (3) age, (4) number of years in office as a department chairperson, and (5) number of years employed at that particular college. Obviously, other variables could have been selected to describe the sample used in this study. The second limitation is the type of institutions from which the population will be taken. The selection of community colleges, with a unionized faculty group, places a limitation on the generalizations about attitudes toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationships. Consequently, the generalizations are limited to reflect the attitudes and perceptions of department chairpersons at two-year colleges with faculty collective bargaining. This study is limited to public community colleges in Michigan whose faculty association is affiliated with the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers. At present, there are twenty-one<sup>22</sup> such units in the state. The third limitation of this study is the choice of the population

sample. This study is confined to department chairpersons in Arts and Sciences, Business, and the Vocational-Technical areas at selected Michigan community colleges.

#### Delimitations of Study

The major delimitation of this study is related to the restriction placed upon the selection of the sample. The sample is composed of department chairpersons at community colleges in which the faculty is unionized. Because of the author's interest in investigating attitudes and perceptions of the department chairpersons at unionized colleges, the department chairpersons at nonunionized colleges were excluded from the sample. Consequently, the generalizations on attitudes and perceptions are limited to the department chairpersons selected for this study.

The above limitation also increases the likelihood of a sampling bias. For example, by omitting department chairpersons at nonunionized colleges, the likelihood of a sampling bias is increased in that department chairpersons at nonunionized colleges may have different attitudes and perceptions than their counterparts at unionized colleges. Consequently, the findings in this study may not reflect the attitudes and perceptions of department chairpersons at nonunionized colleges.

### Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined in the context in which they are used in this study. The definitions are based upon past research or common usage in the field of education and in the area of collective bargaining.

Administration.--Refers to those who administer board policy or supervise people or programs.<sup>23</sup>

Agreement.--Refers to a contract or mutual understanding between a union (faculty association) and company (Board of Trustees) or their representatives setting forth the terms and condition of employment.<sup>24</sup>

Attitude.--Refers to a mental position with regard to a fact or state.<sup>25</sup>

Board of Trustees.--Refers to appointed or elected college officials who have the power to make plans for, to promote, or acquire, construct, own, develop, maintain, and operate a community college.<sup>26</sup>

Collective Bargaining.--Refers to the process whereby representatives of labor (faculty association) and company (Board of Trustees) or their representatives set forth the terms and condition of employment.<sup>27</sup>

Department Chairperson--Refers to a member of the administration who may also serve as departmental faculty spokesperson (author's definition).

Management.--Refers to those who are accountable and responsible for the administration and direction of an enterprise (the college) and the functions of leadership.<sup>28</sup>

Parties.--Refers to those who sign the terms of the contract and speak for those they represent, both on the company (the college) and union (faculty association) sides.<sup>29</sup>

Public Community College.--Refers to a two-year institution meeting the requirements established by amendments to Act. No. 331 of the Public Acts of 1966 of Michigan.<sup>30</sup>

Relationship.--Refers to a state of affairs existing between those having relations or dealings.<sup>31</sup>

For the purpose of this study, the following represent extreme kinds of relationships:

Adversary.--Refers to institutional governance in which faculty and administration compete for authority.<sup>32</sup> The competition for authority is over personnel-related matters (promotion, tenure), academic matters (curriculum), and administrative matters such as the allocation of departmental resources as they relate to wages and conditions of employment.

Collegiality.--Refers to the traditional approach to campus governance whereby faculty and administration exercise joint responsibility.<sup>33</sup> The joint responsibility would be over personnel-related matters (promotion, tenure), academic matters (curriculum), and administrative matters such as the allocation of departmental resources as they relate to wages and conditions of employment.

#### Overview

A frame of reference for the study is developed in Chapter I. Included are background, purpose, objectives, need and importance of study, limitations, and definitions.

In Chapter II a selected review of pertinent literature is presented.

In Chapter III the design of the study is presented, including hypotheses, description of population and sample, development of implementation, and data analysis.

Analysis of the data is examined in Chapter IV.

Finally, in Chapter V, a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations are presented.

## CHAPTER I--NOTES

<sup>1</sup>Howard B. Means and Philip W. Semas, eds., A Chronicle of Higher Education Handbook: Faculty Collective Bargaining, 2d ed. (Washington, D.C.: Editorial Project for Education, 1976), pp. 84-91.

<sup>2</sup>Donald H. Wollett, "Historical Development of Faculty Collective Bargaining and Current Extent," Proceedings, First Annual Conference, April 1973, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, ed. Maurice C. Benewitz (New York: Baruch College, City University of New York, 1973), p. 32.

<sup>3</sup>Lawrence DeLucia, "Collegiality and Collective Bargaining: Oil and Water," Proceedings, Second Annual Conference, April 1974, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, ed. Thomas M. Mannix (New York: Baruch College, City University of New York, 1974), p. 58.

<sup>4</sup>Arnold R. Weber and others, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program (Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1967), p. 33.

<sup>5</sup>Gerald D. Welch, "Collective Bargaining and the Management Negotiating Team," The Journal of the College and University Personnel and Association 25 (January 1974): 49.

<sup>6</sup>Israel Kugler, "Creation of a Distinction between Management and Faculty," Proceedings, First Annual Conference, April 1973, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, ed. Maurice C. Benewitz (New York: Baruch College, City University of New York, 1973), p. 32.

<sup>7</sup>Stephen M. Epler, Faculty-Administration Relationship--Why the Conflict (Los Angeles: Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1966), p. 9.

<sup>8</sup>"Orientation Package," Academic Bargaining Model (Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service), p. 2.

<sup>9</sup>Herbert E. Mazzola, "Collective Negotiations and University Faculties," Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 23 (August 1972):36.

<sup>10</sup>Weber, p. 64.

<sup>11</sup>Israel Kugler, "A New Relationship," The Effects of Faculty Collective Bargaining on Higher Education, ed. Raymond G. Hewitt (Wellesley, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1973), p. 94.

<sup>12</sup>Calvin B. T. Lee, "Relationship of the Department Chairman to the Academic," The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role, ed. James Brann and A. Emmet (Detroit: Balamp Publishing, 1972), p. 56.

<sup>13</sup>Wollett, p. 30.

<sup>14</sup>Ralph E. Kennedy, "NLRB and Faculty Bargaining Units: The Charting of an Uncharted Area," Proceedings, Second Annual Conference, April 1974, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, ed. Thomas M. Mannix (New York: Baruch College, City University of New York, April 1974), p. 42.

<sup>15</sup>Dwight F. Decker, The Role of the Faculty Bargaining Unit at Rhode Island Junior College (Practicum: Nova University, April 1975), pp. 1-4.

<sup>16</sup>John Lombardi, The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges (Los Angeles: Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1974), p. 14.

<sup>17</sup>Michigan Employment Relations Commission, Decisions Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Order, vol. XB (Big Rapids: Opinion Press, 1975), p. 554.

<sup>18</sup>Michigan Employment Relations Commission, Decisions Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Order, vol. XA (Big Rapids: Opinion Press, 1975), pp. 118-19.

<sup>19</sup>1971 CCH NLRB Decisions (New York: Commerce Clearinghouse, Inc., 1972), pp. 30, 407.

<sup>20</sup>Harold I. Goodman, "The Impact of Unions and Collective Bargaining on American Higher Education," Reshaping American Higher Education, ed. Louis C. Vaccaro (Irving, Texas: Dallas University, 1975), p. 67.

<sup>21</sup>Lombardi, pp. 18-19.

<sup>22</sup>Means and Semas, pp. 84-90.

<sup>23</sup>Barbara J. Hansen and Richard D. Petrizzo, Faculty and Administrative Attitude toward and Expectations Concerning Collective Bargaining at College of DuPage, as Compared with Empirical Findings (Practicum: Nova University, December 1976), p. 8.

<sup>24</sup>Harold S. Roberts, Roberts' Dictionary of Industrial Relations, rev. ed. (Washington, D.C.: BNA Incorporated, 1971), p. 15.

<sup>25</sup>Hansen and Petrizzo, p. 18.

<sup>26</sup>1966 Mich. P.A. 311, Sect. 389.121.

<sup>27</sup>Roberts, p. 74.

<sup>28</sup>Hansen and Petrizzo, p. 8.

<sup>29</sup>Roberts, p. 304.

<sup>30</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 393.

<sup>31</sup>Webster's Third New International Dictionary, unabridged (Springfield, Mass.: C & C Merriam Co., Publisher, 1971), p. 1916.

<sup>32</sup>Means and Semas, p. 1.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 2.

## CHAPTER II

### THE REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Introduction

The search of the literature for this study indicates that little research has been undertaken on the department chairperson's attitude toward collective bargaining and perception of faculty-administration relationship. Much of the research tends to investigate attitudes and relationship as independent variables. Since most of the research tends to be fragmented, this chapter will present attitudes and relationships in the broad sense. Also in this section some discussion will focus on the department chairperson.

Two studies were found that are relevant to this study: (1) "Faculty-Administration Relationship--Why the Conflict?" by E. M. Epler and (2) "Faculty and Administrative Attitudes toward and Expectations Concerning Recognized Collective Bargaining at College of DuPage as Compared with Empirical Findings" by B. J. Hansen and R. D. Petrizzo. Both studies will be reviewed in this chapter.

### Faculty-Administration Relationships

In a general sense, faculty-administration relationship may be characterized as being adversarial, collegial, or a modification of either extreme. Moreover, it is purported the collective bargaining tends to influence the relationship between faculty and administration. As a case in point, W. F. Sturner, in reviewing the early days of collective bargaining at Oakland University, made the following observation: "It became impossible to avoid the 'adversary relationship,' given the nature of the legal process, the outcomes of binding relationship, the venting of feelings, and the inevitable scramble to protect one's 'natural prerogatives' while whittling away at the unnatural, vested interest of the other side."<sup>1</sup>

In a slightly different context, B. R. Bronsard discusses the degree of adversarialism as being influenced by the trust and respect that the parties have for one another.<sup>2</sup> More specifically, he asserts that: "An atmosphere of strong mutual trust and respect leads to a contract allowing for much collegial flexibility; and atmosphere of weak mutual trust and respect leads to a detailed contract allowing for little collegial flexibility."<sup>3</sup>

While some commentators equate adversarialism with collective bargaining, K. Mortimer and G. Lozier

expressed the following concern about adversarialism in higher education: ". . . it is difficult to foresee how colleges and universities can effectively separate relationships which operate in collective bargaining from those operative in other areas of academic decision-making."<sup>4</sup> However, in the context of shared authority, Mortimer and Lozier stated the following about faculty-administration relationships: "As one moves from joint participation to collective negotiations the tenor of relationships between the faculty and administration changes from one of mutual influence and persuasion to reliance on codified, formal authority relations embodied in a legally binding agreement."<sup>5</sup> While lacking supportive evidence, the above point of view does suggest that collective bargaining may contribute to leading faculty and the administration into a formalized relationship. The relationship becomes formalized when the bargaining on wages and working conditions results in a written agreement in which the administration must observe. A failure to abide by the agreement can result in a grievance.

Another aspect of faculty-administration relationships evolves around the department chairperson's attitude toward collective bargaining. In a contractual agreement context, G. Welch had this to say about attitude: "If he [chairperson] has negative attitudes toward

the agreement and is sloppy in enforcing the provisions, it will have a detrimental effect on faculty morale and will result in poor administration of the division."<sup>6</sup>

As this may be the case, J. Orze contends that once an agreement is ratified the faculty and administration are contractually committed to specific responsibilities which demand cooperative effort for their effective implementation.<sup>7</sup>

In order to avert the adversarialism that is generally tied to the decision-making process in "campus governance," two New England colleges and the Massachusetts State Board of Trustees attempted to do so through contract negotiations. According to D. E. Walters, the parties had to first set forth key conditions accepted as working principles. To paraphrase, the conditions were as follows:

1. That campus governance be independent of the union exclusive dominion or control
2. That all faculty, including department chairpersons, be entitled to participate in the negotiated system of campus governance
3. That the negotiated system of governance be recognized for its integrity by the administration

4. That the form of governance be tri-partite  
(faculty, students and administrators) in the  
contractual process of decision-making
5. That a dominant role be assigned to faculty  
over matters of special faculty interest<sup>8</sup>

The supportive rationale for taking this approach was that "if . . . faculty, students, and administrators alike are to emerge from the experience of unionization and collective bargaining as colleagues and not as adversaries, then campus governance must become a matter of collective bargaining; for properly negotiated it becomes a potent force for integration on campus."<sup>9</sup> Although the above assumption is lacking in evidence, there is still the need for the kind of relationship that will help to establish mutual trust and respect in faculty-administration relationships because in reality, faculty and the administration are dependent upon one another in the pursuit of quality teaching and operating the institution.

Walters' discussion of relationship was in the context that parties are in a position to determine the kind of relationship they want. The choice, according to Walters, depends on the set of assumptions that the parties bring to the bargaining table.<sup>10</sup> For example, in the case of the two New England colleges, it appears that the parties chose between two assumptions:

Assumption 1: By broadening the scope of negotiations at the bargaining table to include faculty governance, the control over campus decision-making will shift from the faculty (or the faculty senate) to the union. This will create an adversary form of government . . . and destroy collegiality as a viable system of relationships. . . .

Assumption 2: The highest standards of faculty professionalism and the system of collegiality . . . will be preserved intact only if unions and campus representatives can find creative ways to include faculty governance in collective bargaining without allowing the system of decision-making to become the exclusive property of either the union or the institution.<sup>11</sup>

On the basis of these assumptions, and the terms of the agreement between the parties, it seems apparent that they chose the latter assumption.

#### The Role of the Faculty Chairperson

While not directly related to this study, the role of the department chairperson did appear often enough to merit some discussion. As indicated in the preceding chapter, collective bargaining has tended to raise a question about the role of the department chairperson--is the chairperson a spokesperson for faculty or an agent of the administration? C. Lee explains part of the problem as follows:

In his own eyes (the chairperson) is still primarily a teacher who has to assume certain administrative tasks and responsibilities. He is, therefore, quite often in conflict as to whether his role is one of spokesman for faculty, or whether it is one of administrator who must make decisions for . . . his department (and) the college.<sup>12</sup>

In addition, J. Lombardi adds that the chairperson ". . . occupies a role that forces him to face two ways--the dean . . . from whom he receives whatever authority he is permitted to exercise . . . and his departmental colleagues with whom he shares responsibility for carrying out many of his duties."<sup>13</sup>

Further evidence indicating the lack of clarity can be seen in a study by D. F. Decker. Department chairpersons at Rhode Island Junior College are members of the faculty association. The contractual agreement between the Rhode Island Junior College Association and the Rhode Island Board of Regents outlines the duties of the department chairperson. Moreover, according to Decker, the role of the chairpersons at this college, as at most community colleges, is threefold: administrator, spokesperson for his/her department, and teacher.<sup>14</sup>

In analyzing the role, Decker concluded that the duties (see 2 and 7 below) associated with the role were generally in accord with the concepts of faculty as a spokesperson and agent of the administration, simultaneously. The duties are as follows:

"Spokesperson Role

"The department chairperson shall:

2. cooperate with the department members in planning programs,
7. generally promote the welfare of the department and the college by every appropriate means,

"Administrative Role

"The department chairperson shall:

1. have responsibility for the program of the department under the dean,
3. evaluate the instructional, administrative processes of the department and make recommendations to the dean,
4. evaluate periodically the department members and report the evaluation as required,
5. recommend appointment, reappointments, promotions and dismissals of department members,
6. insure that adequate supervision, advice and training are provided to new department members and others who might profit therefrom,
8. and carry out such other duties as are set forth elsewhere by the College."<sup>15</sup>

In associating duties 2 and 7 with the spokesperson role, Decker contends that ". . . in such a role, he (the chairperson) tries to obtain from the administration approval for the programs which his department desires, the necessary budgets, and also promote the vested interests of each faculty member of his department."<sup>16</sup> The remaining duties "places him (the chairperson) in a very different role--the concept of chairman as the first level of the administration--representing the broader interests of the college. . . ."<sup>17</sup> Finally, in analyzing their own role, chairpersons were unanimous in identifying with most of the duties as part of their role(s). The only exceptions were duties 6 and 8.<sup>18</sup> In essence, it seems apparent the department chairpersons in Decker's study tend to fit the description of the chairperson referred to by Lee.

Another aspect of the problem in defining the role of the department chairperson is that the duties

performed by them may differ between departments. For example, according to J. Lombardi, the duties performed in the liberal arts departments are likely to differ from those performed in the vocational/technical departments. The duties related to purchasing, replacement, repair, and inventorying of equipment would be of little importance to chairpersons of history, political science, and English; but they would be of greater importance to chairpersons of auto maintenance, paramedical, and engineering.<sup>19</sup>

For the sake of brevity, the specific duties performed by department chairpersons will not be reported. Most of the lists of duties are too lengthy for the purpose of this study. Reference, however, will be made to the categories of duties and the number of duties identified through research efforts. In J. Lombardi's analysis of some of the research effort to identify duties performed by department, at community colleges, he reported the following findings:

1. At the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Area Community College, J. Brann and T. A. Emmet (1972) identified 69 duties which were classified as general, instructional, student personnel, and administrative service.
2. In a sample of 173 colleges, J. Anothony (1971) identified 51 duties which were classified as general administration, curriculum and instruction, teacher improvement, student relations, and community relations.
3. In a study by A. B. Smith (1972), 46 duties were grouped into the categories of production activities, maintenance service, boundary: production supportive activities, boundary: institutional supportive activities, adaptive activities, and managerial activities.<sup>20</sup>

The preceding investigations seem to indicate that part of the problem in defining the chairperson's role may be related to the problem of determining the duties they perform. In order to resolve the latter problem, it may be necessary to establish common categories of duties acceptable to the researcher in this area. This would provide them with a common base for grouping the duties. The next step would be to isolate those duties common to most department chairpersons. This would allow the researchers to proceed with the task of determining if there is a relationship between the chairperson's role and the duties performed or to isolate other factors that may have some influence on the role of the department chairperson.

#### Related Study

During the mid 1960s, S. M. Epler investigated several factors thought to provoke conflict in faculty-administration relationships. The following factors were used to explain relationships at the junior college level of higher education:

1. Stereotyping
2. Changing status of the junior college
3. Loss of identity
4. Faculty conservatism
5. "Universal" versus "Particular" orientation
6. Poor administration
7. Lack of data
8. Goals and objectives
9. Communication
10. Role expectation<sup>21</sup>

Next, he developed hypotheses for each factor and attempted to synthesize them by presenting two concepts--"the dynamic of conflict" (J. Coleman, 1957) and "the nature of difference" (W. Schmidt and R. Tannenbaum, 1960).

Subsequently, he identified two kinds of conflicts--natural conflict and aggravated conflict. In the first type, Epler stated that some conflict exists in the natural state of things:

The faculty does have a perspective different than administration; the faculty does have different goals, values, and experiences than administrators; people do depend on stereotypes to structure their environment. Thus, some conflict is natural and will persist in some form or another.<sup>22</sup>

In the second type, Epler attributes the occurrence of aggravated conflict as the result of "poor administrative practices, lack of data, ambiguous goals, and faculty communication. . . ."<sup>23</sup> While Epler foretells the likelihood of continued conflict between faculty and administration, he also asserted that "insight into the etiology of conflict will help to prevent aggravated conflict and to modulate natural conflict."<sup>24</sup>

The Epler study tended to offer some insight into the conflict aspect of relationship. However, it is important to note that his inquiry was not done in the context of collective bargaining. His investigation of relationships was in the context of the transition of junior colleges from public school systems to becoming

separate entities. Nevertheless, his discussion of "natural conflict" and "aggravated conflict" is quite germane to this study.

As pointed out earlier, some commentators claim that collective bargaining separates the parties into opposing sides. As this may be the case, it is also likely that the relationship between faculty and administration may be influenced by Epler's definitions of natural conflict and aggravated conflict, especially if collective bargaining is perceived as an endless struggle for power. It is in this sense that natural conflict between the parties is likely to exist.

On the other hand, aggravated conflict is more likely to occur sometime after ratification of the agreement. At the same time, however, conflict may occur at any point during the course of negotiations. As a case in point, the writer has observed the rise of aggravated conflict and its detrimental effect on faculty-administration relationships within a specific context. It seems that during the many months of negotiations several incidents occurred that led to allegations and counter charges. As these incidents were unfolding, faculty morale began to show signs of decline. The faculty entered into contract maintenance. In general, contract maintenance implies that the faculty have chosen to limit the scope of their activities. For

example, if the agreement stipulates that faculty members must attend assigned committee meetings, they will fulfill this obligation. However, they may choose to not participate in any discussions at the meetings. The informal relationship between the parties tended to become fragile. Hopefully, after ratification of the agreement, the relationship will enter a period of relative "mutual trust" and "mutual respect." If so, the reoccurrence of aggravated conflict will more likely manifest itself at the department level because after ratification, the chairperson generally assumes the task of enforcing the terms of the agreement. The department chairperson is enforcing the terms of the agreement when he/she follows the procedures in the agreement stipulating how faculty evaluations will be conducted, or the procedures for making teaching assignments, or making sure that his/her departmental faculty put in a forty-hour work week, if this is written into the agreement.

At the College of DuPage, B. J. Hansen and R. D. Petrizzo compared faculty and administrator's attitudes toward and expectations concerning collective bargaining. They collected data by using a thirty-six-item questionnaire in which twelve items pertained to attitudes and the remaining twenty-four items pertained to expectations.

Their data on attitudes indicated that faculty and administrators differed in their attitudes toward

collective bargaining. In calculating mean scores for each of the twelve attitudinal items, the faculty mean score (32.01) indicated a slight tendency of agreement toward the value of collective bargaining; whereas, the administrators' mean score (36.59) indicated an extreme disagreement.<sup>25</sup> The range of mean scores was from twelve (indicating strong agreement) to sixty (indicating strong disagreement).<sup>26</sup> Although the data indicated disagreement between faculty and administrators, neither population registered a mean score indicating a preference for or against collective bargaining.<sup>27</sup>

The second part of their study led them to investigate how faculty and administrators perceived expectations concerning collective bargaining. Of the several subheadings used to facilitate their discussion, the subheading "Climate" is relevant to this study. This part of the study concentrated on the "consequences of collective bargaining as related to intra-institutional relationship."<sup>28</sup> In other words, they were interested in learning more about the influence of collective bargaining on relationship, collegiality, and faculty dissent. Their data indicated that faculty and administrators:

1. agreed that collective bargaining increases adversary relationships;
2. agreed that collective bargaining formalizes the relationship between faculty and administrators;
3. agreed that collective bargaining reduces collegiality; and

4. differed in their perception of whether faculty unionism increases faculty dissent--the survey response indicated that faculty held a neutral position, while the administration registered a mild agreement.<sup>29</sup>

Another aspect of the Hansen and Petrizzo study is that it provided the College of DuPage faculty and administration with an opportunity to analyze their attitudes toward and expectations concerning collective bargaining. At the time of their study, formalized bargaining did not exist at the College of DuPage. Therefore, their study may have aided the parties in assessing the ramifications of collective bargaining. Secondly, their study may have assisted the parties in their effort to decide upon whether or not to enter formalized bargaining. As the College of DuPage is a public college in the state of Illinois, the college's governing board was not required to negotiate with the faculty; formalized bargaining cannot occur unless the governing board voluntarily agrees to collective bargaining.<sup>30</sup> The state of Illinois has no laws granting teachers collective bargaining rights.

Inasmuch as an investigation of expectations may be of lesser importance to institutions with formalized bargaining, the disclosure of attitudes may help to improve faculty-administration relationship, in general. This may be true, especially at those institutions where collegiality has given way to an adversarial relationship,

for it is a common assumption "that the adversary relationship which seems to accompany collective bargaining is inimical to collegiality."<sup>31</sup> Therefore, until such time that conclusive evidence can indicate that adversarialism is not detrimental to the task of attaining institutional goals, colleges should continue to pursue the kind of relationship that is based upon trust and respect.

### Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present and discuss the depth of the literature search taken for this investigation.

As can be seen from the literature, research on the influence of the department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining on faculty-administration relationships is sketchy, at most. The few studies where administrators are included as part of the sample population tended to compare the attitudes of faculty and administration. Much of the literature on faculty-administration relationship is very fragmented. There was virtually no literature where attitudes, faculty-administration relationship, and department chairperson overlapped. (See Appendix A for the computer search descriptors used for this study.)

## CHAPTER II--NOTES

<sup>1</sup>William F. Sturner, "Struggling with the Unknown: The First Year of Collective Bargaining," Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 27 (Jan/Feb 1976):35.

<sup>2</sup>Donald R. Bronsard, "A Development, Comparison, and Contrast of Selected Faculty-Administration Consensus Regarding Collective Bargaining Contracts in Connecticut's Subsystems of Public Higher Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1975), p. 68.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 68-69.

<sup>4</sup>Kenneth P. Mortimer and Gregory G. Lozier, Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance (Pennsylvania State University: Center for the Study of Higher Education, June 1972), pp. 17-18.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 7-8.

<sup>6</sup>Welch, p. 31.

<sup>7</sup>Joseph J. Orze, "After It's Ratified That Contract Has to Work," College Management 9 (February 1974):15.

<sup>8</sup>Donald E. Walters, Collective Bargaining in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, March 1973), pp. 5-6.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., pp. 2, 3.

<sup>12</sup>Lee, pp. 54-55.

<sup>13</sup>Lombardi, p. 13.

<sup>14</sup>Decker (dissertation abstract), p. 1.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 9.

<sup>19</sup>John Lombardi, The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairperson in Community Colleges (Los Angeles: Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1974), p. 6.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., pp. 2-3.

<sup>21</sup>Epler, pp. 3-19.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Hansen and Petrizzo, p. 21.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., pp. 26-27.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Means and Semas, p. 80.

<sup>31</sup>An Excerpt from Faculty Collective Bargaining  
in Post-secondary Institutions: The Impact on the Campus  
and on the State (Wellesley, Mass.: New England Board  
of Higher Education, May 1972), pp. 8-9.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD OF STUDY

#### Introduction

This chapter contains a description and rationale for the sample in the study. Included is a brief review of the adopted questionnaire along with an explanation of the survey method.

#### Population and Sample

The population for this study is composed of department chairpersons from selected Michigan public community colleges whose faculty association is an affiliate of the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers. (See Appendix B.)

The sample in the study consisted of all department chairpersons from selected colleges. To facilitate selection, the colleges in Appendix B were divided into three categories. These categories included:

1. Small Size Colleges - less than 4,500
2. Medium Size Colleges - 4,500 to 8,000
3. Large Size Colleges - more than 8,000

The preceding categories were established on the basis of the Michigan 1975 Headcount Enrollment as based upon full-time equated students. (See Appendix C.)

Before establishing the sample, it was necessary to distinguish between colleges with and without department chairpersons. Therefore, each college in Appendix C was contacted. Moreover, permission to conduct a questionnaire survey and the names of department chairpersons was requested. Subsequently, eight colleges granted permission and furnished the names of chairpersons. The remaining thirteen colleges chose not to participate, or they had no department chairpersons, or the chairperson position was too newly established. Therefore, as shown in Table 3.1, the sample was made up of fifty-eight department chairpersons. In relationship to the

TABLE 3.1  
SAMPLE PER COLLEGE SIZE

College Size	Total Colleges Contacted	Total Colleges with Department Chairpersons	Total Colleges Granting Permission	Total Sample Respondents
Small	11	3	3	21
Medium	5	4	3	19
Large	5	2	2	18
Total	21	9	8	58

sampling procedure described in this section, the author acknowledges the likelihood that the findings in this study may have been influenced by a sampling bias.

Two considerations were important in the selection of the population. First of all, in the context of faculty-administration relationship, it was assumed that collective bargaining was the greatest administrative impact upon department chairpersons because they are literally wedged between faculty and upper echelon administrators. Also, they are usually charged with the task of enforcing the terms of the agreement. In view of the first consideration, it was also assumed that this level of administration would provide genuinely insightful information on attitudes toward collective bargaining and perception of the faculty-administration relationship.

#### Questionnaire

The questionnaire items used in this study were selected from a questionnaire used by Hansen and Petrizzo in their investigation of attitudes toward and expectations of collective bargaining at the College of DuPage. Inasmuch as their instrument was adopted from Kemerer and Baldrige, Unions on Campus, Jossey-Bass, 1975; and Ladd-Lipset Survey, as reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 23, 1975, p. 11, validity and reliability of their instrument was established.

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to solicit specific demographical information. The second part contains fourteen statements designed to measure attitudes toward collective bargaining and perceptions of the faculty-administration relationship. (See Appendix D.) The following items illustrate the kind of statements used:

1. Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university.
2. Collective bargaining will formalize relationships between faculty and administration.
3. Individual salary bargaining for merit increases is bad for college faculty as a group.

The scale by which the respondent indicated the extent to which each state characterizes attitude and perception was defined by five categories:

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

In order to investigate associations between collective bargaining and perceptions of the faculty-administration relationship, the five categories were recoded by combining Strongly agree and Agree, Disagree and Strongly

disagree, and Neutral retained its relative position between the two extreme categories: (1. Agree, 2. Neutral, 3. Disagree).

### Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be tested to meet the objectives of this study:

#### Objective 1:

To determine department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining, as related to specific variables.

H<sub>0</sub>:

There is no difference in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining as related to size of college, division of employment, age, years as a department chairperson, and years employed at the college.

#### Objective 2:

To determine department chairpersons' perceptions of faculty-administration relationship, as related to specific variables.

H<sub>0</sub>:

There is no difference in department chairpersons' perceptions of relationship between faculty and administration as related to size of college, division of employment, age, years as a chairperson, and years employed at the college.

### Data Collection

The administration of the questionnaire was conducted through direct mailing to department chairpersons.

Accompanying each questionnaire will be an addressed stamped envelope and transmittal letter. (See Appendix E.) As the questionnaires were not coded, a completion/returned postcard accompanied each questionnaire for follow-up purposes. Finally, a follow-up letter (see Appendix E) will be sent to department chairpersons who fail to complete and return the questionnaire.

### Data Analysis

In order to identify appropriate statistical tests, the Office of Research Consultation, at Michigan State University, was contacted for advisement. As a consequence of consultation, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was chosen as the method for data analysis.

The SPSS system was used to establish simple frequency distributions and crosstabulations for investigating sets of relationship among the variables selected for this study. More specifically, the crosstabulation analysis was selected for the purpose of investigating the relationship between questionnaire items 6, 9, 11, 18, and 19 (see Appendix D) and the following variables: (1) size of college, (2) division of employment, (3) age, (4) number of years in office as a department chairperson, and (5) number of years employed at that particular college. Kendall's Tau ( $Tau_b$  and  $Tau_c$ ) was used for tests

of significance. The statistical significance will be tested and analyzed at an alpha level of .05.

### Summary

In this chapter, department chairpersons from selected community colleges in Michigan were selected as the sample. An established questionnaire designed to investigate attitudes toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship was chosen for this study. Data collection and administration of the questionnaire was established via direct mailing, codification, and a follow-up letter. The hypotheses will be analyzed at an alpha level of .05, using the SPSS.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to product descriptive research on department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining, and perceptions of the faculty-administration relationship, as related to specific variables.

The accumulated data of the questionnaire were tabulated and the results summarized in a series of tables which are presented in terms of percentages: (1) Simple frequency distributions were used to summarize the demographic data, and (2) Crosstabulations, with Kendall's  $\tau_b$  and  $\tau_c$  as tests of significance, at the .05 level, were used to analyze associations among the variables selected for this study.

Of the fifty-eight department chairpersons selected for the sample, fifty-one department chairpersons completed and returned the questionnaire. The sample consisted of thirty-three chairpersons in Arts and Sciences, seven in Business, and eighteen in the Vocational/Technical area.

The major headings for the data analysis which follow are: (1) General Characteristics of the Sample, (2) Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining, (3) Perceptions of Faculty-Administration Relationship, and (4) An Overall Summary.

#### General Characteristics of the Sample

In an attempt to obtain an analysis of attitudes toward collective bargaining, and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship, several variables were considered. These included size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a chairperson, and number of years employed at that particular college. The demographic data of the sample are summarized in Tables 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5.

While Table 4.1 shows that fifty-one department chairpersons responded to the questionnaire, the proportion of chairpersons who completed and returned the questionnaire was the same for all three categories, denoting size of college.

Table 4.2 indicates that approximately 62 percent of the sample were employed in the Division of Arts and Sciences. By contrast, the small percentage in the Division of Business and the Vocational/Technical area was due to fewer department chairpersons in the total sample: there were seven chairpersons in Business, eighteen in the Vocational/Technical area; therefore, the response rate

TABLE 4.1  
ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY SIZE OF COLLEGE

Size of College	Department Chairperson	
	N	%
Small	17	33.3
Medium	17	33.3
Large	17	33.3
Totals	51	99.9*

\* Error due to rounding off of numbers.

TABLE 4.2  
ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT

Division of Employment	Department Chairperson	
	N	%
Arts and Sciences	31	62.0
Business	7	14.0
Vocational/Technical	12	24.0
Totals	50*	100.0

\* Total numbers may differ due to missing data.

was 100 percent and 67 percent, respectively. In Arts and Sciences the response rate was 94 percent.

While approximately 82 percent of the sample were between the age of thirty and sixty, most of the department chairpersons were in the forty to forty-nine age range. (See Table 4.3.)

TABLE 4.3  
ANALYSIS OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS BY AGE

Age	Department Chairperson	
	N	%
20 - 29	1	2.0
30 - 39	8	16.0
40 - 49	24	48.0
50 - 59	14	28.0
Greater than 60	3	6.0
Totals	50*	100.0

\*Error due to missing data

As shown in Table 4.4, there was very little difference in the distribution of department chairpersons on the basis of number of years employed as a chairperson. Despite considerable clustering in three of the four categories, about 39 percent of the sample had served as a department chairperson from between one to five years.

TABLE 4.4  
ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED AS A  
DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON

Years as a Chairperson	Department Chairperson	
	N	%
1 - 5	20	39.2
5 - 10	14	27.4
10 - 20	16	31.4
Greater than 20	1	2.0
Totals	51	100.0

TABLE 4.5  
ANALYSIS OF NUMBER OF YEARS EMPLOYED AT THE COLLEGE

Years Employed at College	Department Chairperson	
	N	%
1 - 5	6	12.0
5 - 10	10	20.0
10 - 20	31	62.0
Greater than 20	3	6.0
Totals	50*	100.0

\* Error due to missing data.

Table 4.5 disclosed that 62 percent of the sample had been at their present place of employment from ten to twenty years.

To summarize, there was an equal number of department chairpersons (17) from the small, medium, and large colleges who completed and returned the questionnaire. Moreover, approximately 62 percent were from the Division of Arts and Sciences. In addition, they were generally between the age of forty and forty-nine and had been in office from one to twenty years. In general, however, most of the chairpersons had held their current position from one to five years (39 percent) and from ten to twenty years (31 percent). Finally, 62 percent of the sample had been at their present place of employment from ten to twenty years.

#### Attitudes toward Collective Bargaining

The purpose of this section is to present an analysis of data to investigate department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining.

Of the fifty-one department chairpersons responding to the questionnaire, the data in Table 4.6 show that they were, generally, consistent in their response to the attitudinal items. In fact, except for 17, the overall frequency distribution of responses was quite distinct. They generally agreed or disagreed in their response to the items shown in Table 4.6.

TABLE 4.6

## FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS RELATED TO ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Questionnaire Items	Response Category				
	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neutral	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree
6. Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university.	2	2	3	17	27
7. Because it is nonprofessional conduct, faculty should not engage in militant actions such as strikes or picketing.	6	7	9	16	13
8. Because it is not apt to produce results, faculty should not engage in militant actions such as strikes or picketing.	2	7	9	20	13
10. If faculties bargain collectively, then students should have that right as well.	3	3	10	23	12
12. Unions have made impressive progress affecting personnel policies in the short time they have been representing faculty.	11	24	10	6	-0-
13. Faculty senates and unions should have different responsibilities with unions addressing economic issues and working conditions and senates dealing with curriculum, degree requirements, and admission.	16	21	7	5	2

TABLE 4.6 (continued)

Questionnaire Items	Response Category				
	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neutral	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree
14. Individual salary bargaining for merit increases is bad for college faculty as a group.	14	20	10	6	1
15. The only basis for salary differentiation among faculty in the same position should be age or seniority.	3	7	7	22	11
16. Nontenured faculty need the assurance of fair treatment at the point where the tenure decision is made, and only an employee organization can provide this.	5	15	6	18	5
17. Faculties have little real power to influence college policies since the traditional "self-government" institutions, such as faculty senate or councils, are typically ineffective.	2	13	10	20	6
19. The recent growth of faculty collective bargaining is beneficial and should be encouraged.	10	21	13	4	3
Totals	74	140	94	157	93

Note: Indicators of central tendency; mean = 3.08; mode = 3.36; median = 3.18.

Also, Table 4.6 illustrates that a relatively high frequency of neutral responses were given for items 10, 12, 14, 17, and 19. As a consequence, the three measures of central tendency were concentrated near the midpoint of the response set. The mean score was 3.08, the mode was 3.36, and the median was 3.18.

With respect to attitudes toward collective bargaining, the following hypothesis was postulated:

H<sub>0</sub>:

There is no difference in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining as related to size of college, division of employment, age, years as a department chairperson, and years employed at the college.

In order to determine attitudes, the variables in the above hypothesis were crosstabulated with items 6 and 19 of the questionnaire:

Item 6. Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university.

Item 19. The recent growth of faculty collective bargaining is beneficial and should be encouraged.

The other items (7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17) were primarily related to a particular issue associated with collective bargaining. (See Appendix D.)

Kendall Tau, a nonparametric statistic, was selected to test the previously stated null hypothesis

at the .05 level of significance. As the data given in Tables 4.7 - 4.11 indicate, there were no differences in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining.

As a case in point, the data given in Table 4.7 indicate that 86.3 percent of the chairpersons, according to size of college, viewed faculty collective bargaining as having a place in higher education.

TABLE 4.7  
CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6

Size of College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	1	2.0	2	3.9	14	27.5
Medium	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	33.3
Large	3	5.9	1	2.0	13	25.5
Totals	4	7.9	3	5.9	44	86.3

n = 51; Kendall Tau<sub>b</sub> = .07404; Significance = .2862; Not Significant at .05 level.

Likewise, the data presented in Table 4.8 suggest that collectively there were no differences in attitudes as related to division of employment. Approximately 88.0 percent of the chairpersons indicated that faculty collective bargaining has a place in higher education.

TABLE 4.8  
CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6

Division of Employment	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arts & Sciences	0	0.0	2	4.0	29	58.0
Business	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	14.0
Vocational/Tech	4	8.0	0	0.0	8	16.0
Totals	4	8.0	2	4.0	44	88.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  =  $-.28515$ ; Significance =  $.0176$ ; Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.9  
CROSSTABULATION OF AGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6

Age	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
30 - 39	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	18.0
40 - 49	0	0.0	1	2.0	23	46.0
50 - 59	4	8.0	1	2.0	12	24.0
Totals	4	8.0	2	4.0	44	88.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  =  $-.35021$ ; Significance =  $.0045$ ; Significant at .05 level.

However, the department chairpersons in the Vocational/Technical area tended to differ in their response to questionnaire item 6 more than their counterparts in the other two divisions.

Similarly, with respect to age and number of years as a department chairperson, the crosstabulations, shown in Tables 4.9 and 4.10, suggest that 88.0 percent of the department chairpersons advocated collective bargaining for faculty. Moreover, Table 4.9 indicates that the greatest difference in response to questionnaire item 6 was among department chairpersons between the age of fifty and fifty-nine.

In Table 4.10, the data given indicate that the greatest difference in response to questionnaire item 6 was department chairpersons who had been in office from ten to twenty years.

TABLE 4.10  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSONS BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6

Years as Chairperson	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	0	0.0	1	2.0	19	38.0
5 - 10	1	2.0	0	0.0	13	26.0
10 - 20	2	4.0	2	4.0	12	24.0
Totals	3	6.0	3	6.0	44	88.0

n = 51; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  =  $-.23403$ ; Significance =  $.0391$ ; Significant at .05 level.

As indicated in Table 4.11, the crosstabulation of years employed at the college was descriptive of department chairpersons who had been at their present place of employment from five to twenty years. The data also show that 85.4 percent of the department chairpersons viewed faculty collective bargaining as having a place in higher education.

TABLE 4.11  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS EMPLOYED AT COLLEGE BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 6

Years Employed at College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5 - 10	1	2.4	0	0.0	9	22.0
10 - 20	3	7.3	2	4.9	26	63.4
Totals	4	9.7	2	4.9	35	85.4

n = 41; Kendall  $\tau_{bc} = -.04045$ ; Significance = .3372; Not Significant at .05 level.

While the crosstabulations, as shown in Tables 4.12 through 4.16 indicate that a majority of department chairpersons agreed that faculty collective bargaining was beneficial and should be encouraged, there were also a noticeable number of neutral response indicating uncertainty. The proportion of neutral response ranged from 21.9 percent to 25.5 percent. In spite of the indication

of uncertainty, approximately 62 percent of the department chairpersons agree that faculty collective bargaining was beneficial and should be encouraged.

The data given in Table 4.12, denoting size of college, indicate that department chairpersons at the large colleges tended to differ in their response to questionnaire item 19 more than their counterparts at the small and medium-size colleges. At the large colleges, they were widely divided in their response, 9.8 percent agreed, 13.7 percent were neutral, and 9.8 percent disagreed. At the other colleges, the differences were less pronounced.

TABLE 4.12  
CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19

Size of College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	13	25.5	2	3.9	2	3.9
Medium	13	25.5	4	7.9	0	0.0
Large	5	9.8	7	13.7	5	9.8
Totals	31	60.8	13	25.5	7	13.7

$n = 51$ ; Kendall  $\tau_{pb} = .35663$ ; Significance = .0027; Significant at .05 level.

On the basis of division of employment, the data given in Table 4.13 indicate that the most apparent

difference in response to questionnaire item 19 was among department chairpersons in the Vocational/Technical area. They were clearly divided in their response in that 6 percent agreed that collective bargaining was beneficial and that it should be encouraged, whereas 8 percent disagreed and 10 percent were neutral. In Arts and Sciences, and in Business, the differences in response to item 19 were relatively small, as compared to the differences observed in the Vocational/Technical area.

TABLE 4.13  
CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19

Division of Employment	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arts & Sciences	23	46.0	5	10.0	3	6.0
Business	5	10.0	2	4.0	0	0.0
Vocational/Tech	3	6.0	5	10.0	4	8.0
Totals	31	62.0	12	24.0	7	14.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  = .34918; Significance = .0040; Significant at .05 level.

Tables 4.14 and 4.15 indicate that there were significant differences among department chairpersons in the categories denoting age and number of years as a

TABLE 4.14  
CROSSTABULATION OF AGE BY QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19

Age	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
30 - 39	7	14.0	2	4.0	0	0.0
40 - 49	18	36.0	5	10.0	1	2.0
50 - 59	6	12.0	5	10.0	6	12.0
Totals	31	62.0	12	24.0	7	14.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{b}$  = .47614; Significance = .0020; Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.15  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19

Years as Chairperson	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	15	30.0	5	10.0	0	0.0
5 - 10	9	18.0	2	4.0	3	6.0
10 - 20	7	14.0	6	12.0	3	6.0
Totals	31	62.0	13	26.0	6	12.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{b}$  = .26168; Significance = .0220; Significant at .05 level.

chairperson. The data given in Table 4.14 indicate that most of the differences occurred among department chairpersons in the fifty to fifty-nine age category; 12 percent were in agreement, 10 percent were neutral, and 12 percent disagreed that collective bargaining was beneficial and that it should be encouraged. In Table 4.15 department chairpersons with ten to twenty years, as a chairperson, also differed in their response to questionnaire item 19 (14 percent agreed, 12 percent neutral, 6 percent disagreed).

Irrespective of the number of years employed at the college, the data given in Table 4.16 indicate that most (61 percent) of the department chairpersons thought that collective bargaining was beneficial and that it should be encouraged.

In this section, the null hypothesis was presented for the purpose of investigating department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining. The crosstabulation data indicated that the department chairpersons (1) sanctioned collective bargaining for faculty and (2) viewed faculty collective bargaining as being beneficial and should be encouraged. Moreover, the data indicated that collectively there were no differences in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining as related to (1) size of college,

(2) division of employment, (3) age, (4) years as a department chairperson, and (5) years employed at that particular college.

TABLE 4.16  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS EMPLOYED AT COLLEGE BY  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 19

Years Employed at College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5 - 10	8	19.5	1	2.4	1	2.4
10 - 20	17	41.5	8	19.5	6	14.6
Totals	25	61.0	9	21.9	7	17.0

n = 41; Kendall Tau<sub>c</sub> = .18084; Significance = .0926; Not Significant at .05 level.

Although the data, in general, indicated that collectively there were no differences in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining, some differences were observed among specific groups of department chairpersons. For example, department chairpersons in the Vocational/Technical area, those between the age of fifty and fifty-nine, and those with ten to twenty years in office, differed more in their response to questionnaire item 6 and 19 than their counterparts. In the main, however, most of the department chairpersons

advocated collective bargaining for faculty and thought that it was beneficial and that it should be encouraged.

Perceptions of Faculty-Administration  
Relationship

The purpose of this section is to present an analysis of data to investigate department chairpersons' perceptions of faculty-administration relationship. The same statistical method employed in the preceding section was used to test the following hypothesis:

H<sub>0</sub>:

There is no difference in department chairpersons' perceptions of relationship between faculty and administration as related to size of college, division of employment, age, years as a chairperson, and years employed at the college.

The variables in the aforementioned null hypothesis were crosstabulated with items 9, 11, and 18 of the questionnaire:

- Item 9. Collective bargaining will reduce collegiality between administrators and faculty.
- Item 11. Collective bargaining will formalize relationships between faculty and administration.
- Item 18. Collective bargaining will increase the sense of an adversary relationship between faculty and administrators.

With respect to frequency distribution of responses to the above questionnaire items, the data

given in Table 4.17 indicate that, in general, the department chairpersons perceived collective bargaining as (1) reducing collegiality, (2) formalizing relationships, and (3) increasing the sense of adversarialism. In addition, the responses given in Table 4.17 show a fairly pronounced tendency of agreement among the chairpersons in their overall response to the three items. For example, the indicators of central tendency are below the midpoint for the response set. More specifically, the mean score was 2.47, the mode was 2.00, and the median was 2.73.

Based upon the crosstabulations shown in Tables 4.18 - 4.32, the data indicate that the department chairpersons differed in their perceptions of faculty-administration relationship. In general, the differences were not significant. There were, however, three instances in which the differences were significant; and they were reflected in the crosstabulations between (1) size of college and item 18 (see Table 4.28) and (2) years as a chairperson and item 18 (see Table 4.31).

On the basis of size college, the data given in Table 4.18 indicate that approximately 53 percent of the department chairpersons perceived collective bargaining as reducing collegiality between faculty and administrators.

TABLE 4.17

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS RELATED TO PERCEPTIONS OF FACULTY-  
ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP

Questionnaire Items	Response Category				
	(1) Strongly Agree	(2) Agree	(3) Neutral	(4) Disagree	(5) Strongly Disagree
9. Collective bargaining will reduce collegiality between administrators and faculty.	6	21	7	14	3
11. Collective bargaining will formalize relationships between faculty and administration.	6	32	5	6	1
18. Collective bargaining will increase the sense of an adversary relationship between faculty and administrators.	9	24	6	11	1

Note: Predictors of Central Tendency: mean = 2.47, Mode = 2.00, Median = 2.73.

TABLE 4.18  
CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9

Size of College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	8	15.7	4	7.8	5	9.8
Medium	8	15.7	2	3.9	7	13.7
Large	11	21.5	1	2.0	5	9.8
Totals	27	52.9	7	13.7	17	33.3

n = 51; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  =  $-.08621$ ; Significance =  $.2732$ ; Not Significant at .05 level.

As shown in Table 4.19, approximately 77 percent of the department chairpersons, regardless of division of employment, agreed that collective bargaining reduced collegiality between faculty and administrators.

Similarly, the data given in Table 4.20 indicate that for all age categories most of the department chairpersons perceived collective bargaining as reducing collegiality.

Table 4.21 indicates that regardless of age, most (52 percent) of the department chairpersons agreed that collective bargaining reduced collegiality between faculty and administrators; however, 34 percent disagreed.

TABLE 4.19

CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9

Division of Employment	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arts & Sciences	25	51.1	3	6.2	2	4.1
Business	6	12.2	0	0.0	1	2.0
Vocational/Tech	7	14.3	1	2.0	4	8.2
Totals	38	77.6	4	8.2	7	14.3

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  = .22219; Significance = .0501; Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.20

## CROSSTABULATION OF AGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9

Age	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
30 - 39	4	8.0	2	4.0	3	6.0
40 - 49	11	22.0	3	6.0	10	20.0
50 - 59	12	24.0	1	2.0	4	8.0
Totals	27	54.0	6	12.0	17	34.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  = .16811; Significance = .0992; Not Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.21  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9

Years as Chairperson	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	9	18.0	4	8.0	7	14.0
5 - 10	9	18.0	1	2.0	4	8.0
10 - 20	8	16.0	2	4.0	6	12.0
Totals	26	52.0	7	14.0	17	34.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  =  $-.02684$ ; Significance =  $.4177$ ; Not Significant at  $.05$  level.

On the basis of number of years employed at the college, Table 4.22 also indicates that most (54 percent) of the department chairpersons agreed that collective bargaining reduced collegiality between faculty and administrators.

Moreover, Table 4.23 indicates that 76 percent of the department chairpersons, from different size colleges, perceived collective bargaining as formalizing the relationships between faculty and administration.

As shown in Table 4.24, approximately 78 percent of the department chairpersons from the three divisions denoting place of employment indicated that collective bargaining formalizes the relationships between faculty and administration.

TABLE 4.22  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AT COLLEGE AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 9

Years at College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5 - 10	6	14.6	2	4.9	2	4.9
10 - 20	16	39.0	4	9.8	11	26.8
Totals	22	53.6	6	14.7	13	31.7

n = 41; Kendall  $\tau_{bc}$  = .09518; Significance = .2385; Not Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.23  
CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11

Size of College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	10	20.0	3	6.0	3	6.0
Medium	14	28.0	2	4.0	1	2.0
Large	14	28.0	0	0.0	3	6.0
Totals	38	76.0	5	10.0	7	14.0

n = 51; Kendall  $\tau_{bd}$  = -.1511; Significance = .1259; Not Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.24  
CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11

Division of Employment	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arts & Sciences	25	51.1	3	6.2	2	4.1
Business	6	12.2	0	0.0	1	2.0
Vocational/Tech	7	14.3	1	2.0	4	8.2
Totals	38	77.6	4	8.2	7	14.3

n = 50; Kendall Tau<sub>b</sub> = .22219; Significance = .0501; Not Significant at .05 level.

Similarly, the data given in Table 4.25 indicate that regardless of age, most (77.6 percent) of the department chairpersons perceived collective bargaining as formalizing the relationship between faculty and administration.

On the basis of number of years as a chairperson, the data given in Table 4.26 also indicate that most (75.4 percent) of the department chairpersons thought that collective bargaining formalizes the relationships between faculty and administration.

Table 4.27 indicates that most (75.6 percent) of the department chairpersons who had been at the college from five to ten years and from ten to twenty years

TABLE 4.25  
CROSSTABULATION OF AGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11

Age	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
30 - 39	7	14.3	1	2.0	1	2.0
40 - 49	19	38.8	1	2.0	3	6.0
50 - 59	12	24.5	2	4.0	3	6.0
Totals	38	77.6	4	8.0	7	14.0

n = 49; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  = .08294; Significance = .2678; Not Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.26  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11

Years as Chairperson	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	15	30.6	3	6.1	2	4.1
5 - 10	11	22.4	1	2.0	1	2.0
10 - 20	11	22.4	1	2.0	4	8.2
Totals	37	75.4	5	10.1	7	14.3

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  = .06836; Significance = .3030; Not Significant at .05 level.

agreed that collective bargaining formalizes the relationships between faculty and administration.

TABLE 4.27  
CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AT COLLEGE AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 11

Years at College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5 - 10	8	19.5	1	2.4	1	2.4
10 - 20	23	56.1	2	4.9	6	14.6
Totals	31	75.6	3	7.3	7	17.0

n = 41; Kendall  $\tau_c = .05235$ ; Significance = .3281; Not Significant at .05 level.

As the data given in Table 4.28 indicate, department chairpersons at the large colleges tended to differ in their response to questionnaire item 18 more so than department chairpersons at the small and medium size colleges.

Table 4.29 indicates that 66 percent of the department chairpersons, in the three divisions of employment, perceived collective bargaining as increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

TABLE 4.28  
CROSSTABULATION OF SIZE OF COLLEGE AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18

Size of College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small	9	17.6	3	5.9	5	9.8
Medium	10	19.6	2	3.9	5	9.8
Large	14	27.5	1	2.0	2	3.9
Totals	33	64.7	6	11.8	12	23.5

n = 51; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  =  $-.21714$ ; Significance =  $.0457$ ; Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.29  
CROSSTABULATION OF DIVISION OF EMPLOYMENT AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18

Division of Employment	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arts & Sciences	20	40.0	4	8.0	7	14.0
Business	7	14.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Vocational/Tech	6	12.0	1	2.0	5	10.0
Totals	33	66.0	5	10.0	12	24.0

n = 50; Kendall  $\tau_{pb}$  =  $.04950$ ; Significance =  $.3547$ ; Not Significant at .05 level.

As shown in Table 4.30, most (66 percent) of the department chairpersons, regardless of age, perceived collective bargaining as increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

TABLE 4.30  
CROSSTABULATION OF AGE AND QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18

Age	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
30 - 39	6	12.0	1	2.0	2	4.0
40 - 49	13	26.0	3	6.0	8	16.0
50 - 59	14	28.0	1	2.0	2	4.0
Totals	33	66.0	5	10.0	12	24.0

n = 50; Kendall Tau<sub>b</sub> =  $-.16124$ ; Significance =  $.1102$ ; Not Significant at .05 level.

While 64 percent of the department chairpersons in Table 4.31 agreed that collective bargaining increases the sense of adversarialism, the department chairpersons with ten to twenty years in office differed significantly in their response to questionnaire item 18.

On the basis of years employed at the college, approximately 68 percent of the department chairpersons (Table 4.32) perceived collective bargaining as increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

TABLE 4.31

CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AS CHAIRPERSON AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18

Years as Chairperson	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 - 5	10	20.0	4	8.0	6	12.0
5 - 10	8	16.0	1	2.0	5	10.0
10 - 20	14	28.0	1	2.0	1	2.0
Totals	32	64.0	6	12.0	12	24.0

n = 50; Kendall Tau<sub>b</sub> = -.27370; Significance = .0176; Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 4.32

CROSSTABULATION OF YEARS AT COLLEGE AND  
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEM 18

Years at College	Response Category					
	Agree		Neutral		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
5 - 10	7	17.1	1	2.4	2	4.9
10 - 20	21	51.2	3	7.3	7	17.1
Totals	28	68.3	4	9.7	9	22.0

n = 41; Kendall Tau<sub>c</sub> = .01904; Significance = .4410; Not Significant at .05 level.

In summary, the crosstabulations in this section indicated that on the basis of size of college, division of employment, age, years as a chairperson, and years at that particular college, there were some differences in perceptions of faculty-administration relationship, but not significantly. In general, the data indicated that a majority of department chairpersons perceived collective bargaining as (1) reducing collegiality, (2) formalizing relationships, and (3) increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

#### Summary

In this chapter, an analysis of data was presented in order to investigate (1) attitudes toward collective bargaining and (2) perceptions of faculty-administration relationship, as related to size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a chairperson, and number of years employed at the college.

With respect to demographic information, the fifty-one department chairpersons who completed and returned the questionnaire was proportionally the same (seventeen chairpersons or 33.3 percent) for all three categories (small, medium, large) denoting size of college. Secondly, most of the respondents (62 percent) were employed in the Division of Arts and Sciences. Thirdly, approximately 76 percent of the department chairpersons were between the age of forty and fifty-nine,

and 48 percent in the forty to forty-nine age range. Finally, most of the chairpersons had been at their present place of employment from ten to twenty years; however, on the basis of number of years as a chairperson the range was from one to twenty years, with 39 percent and 31 percent of them holding office from one to five years and from ten to twenty years, respectively.

With respect to attitudes, there were no differences in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining. The majority of chairpersons advocated (1) faculty collective bargaining for faculty in higher education and (2) indicated that collective bargaining was beneficial and should be encouraged. There were, however, significant differences in the response to questionnaire item 6 and 19, among department chairpersons in the Vocational/Technical area, between the age of fifty and fifty-nine, and between department chairpersons with ten to twenty years in office.

With respect to perceptions, there were some differences in department chairpersons' perceptions of faculty-administration relationship, but not significantly. The majority of chairpersons perceived collective bargaining as (1) reducing collegiality, (2) formalizing relationships, and (3) increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

This study was designed to investigate department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship as related to size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a department chairperson, and years employed at that particular college.

Since the department chairperson, generally, assumes the task of enforcing the terms of the agreement, it is likely that the chairperson has a specific attitude toward collective bargaining and perceptions of the influence of collective bargaining on faculty-administration relationship. As a case in point, it is conceivable that the department chairperson who has an unfavorable attitude may also perceive the relationship as adversarial, or the chairperson with a favorable attitude may perceive the relationship as nonadversarial. In any event, both examples imply that we know very little about department chairpersons' attitudes toward

collective bargaining or their perceptions of the influence of collective bargaining on faculty-administration relationships.

### Methodology

The sample for this study consisted of department chairpersons from selected Michigan public community colleges. The colleges were selected on the basis of the faculty association's affiliation with the National Education Association, or the American Federation of Teachers.

In selecting the sample, it was first necessary to distinguish between institutions with department chairpersons and those without. This was accomplished by contacting the president at each of the twenty-nine public community colleges. They were asked if their present administrative structure included the office of department chairperson; if so, they were asked to name each chairperson in Arts and Sciences, Business, and the Vocational/Technical area. Subsequently, fifty-eight department chairpersons from twenty-one community colleges were identified.

A copy of an adopted questionnaire, a cover letter, and stamped return envelop were mailed to the fifty-eight department chairpersons. Approximately 88 percent, or fifty-one department chairpersons,

completed and returned the questionnaire. A follow-up letter was sent to those who had not responded at the end of four weeks.

The scale by which the respondents indicated the extent to which each questionnaire item characterized his/her attitude and perceptions was defined as (1) Strongly agree, (2) Agree, (3) Neutral, (4) Disagree, and (5) Strongly Disagree. However, for analysis of data, the response set was recoded by consolidating the agreement responses (Strongly agree and Agree) and those indicating disagreement (Disagree and Strongly Disagree). Consequently, the recoded response set was (1) Agree, (2) Neutral, and (3) Disagree. The response set was recoded for the purpose of reporting the data.

With assistance from the Office of Research Consultation at Michigan State University, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was employed as the procedure for carrying out various forms of analysis.

Crosstabulation analysis and Kendall Tau tests were used to establish associations between selected attitudinal items (6, 19), items pertaining to perceptions (9, 11, 18), with selected variables (size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a chairperson, and years at the college). Statistical significance was reported at the .05 level of confidence.

### Findings

H<sub>0</sub>:

There is no difference in department chairpersons' attitudes toward collective bargaining as related to size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a department chairperson, and years employed at the college.

On the basis of our findings, it appears that there is some support for the assertion that there is no difference in attitudes toward collective bargaining. Specifically, the data indicate that regardless of size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a department chairperson, or years employed at the college, most of the department chairpersons:

1. advocated collective bargaining for faculty and
2. asserted that collective bargaining was beneficial and should be encouraged.

H<sub>0</sub>:

There is no difference in department chairpersons' perceptions of relationship between faculty and administration as related to size of college, division of employment, age, number of years as a department chairperson, and years employed at the college.

On the basis of the findings, it appears that there is limited support for the assertion that there is no difference in perceptions of faculty-administration relationship. Specifically, the data indicate that

while there were some differences, most of the department chairpersons, generally, perceived collective bargaining as:

1. reducing collegiality between faculty and administration,
2. formalizing the relationship between faculty and administration, and
3. increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

#### Discussion

In general, it was anticipated that the findings of this study would indicate that department chairpersons would have unfavorable attitudes toward collective bargaining. In addition, they would also perceive collective bargaining as affecting the relationship between the faculty and administration. In the main, the findings indicated that the attitudes were generally favorable on collective bargaining. Moreover, the findings also indicated that collective bargaining was perceived as affecting the relationship between the faculty and administration.

While the findings indicate that collective bargaining reduces collegiality, it should be pointed out that at some institutions the concept of collegiality may not have existed before the faculty chose to unionize.

Moreover, if collegiality is perceived as a process of bilateral decision making, and the faculty chooses to enter into collective bargaining, this would tend to suggest that collective bargaining is perceived as a more desirable means of seeking a partnership in the decision-making process. Moreover, in comparison, the concept of collegiality does not provide assurance of participation in the decision-making process. However, under collective bargaining the assurance of participation is mandated by law.

As indicated in Chapter I, the relationship between faculty and the administration becomes formalized when the parties are compelled to adhere to the terms specified in the agreement. Otherwise, to deviate may constitute a violation of the agreement. This can place a hardship on the department chairperson. For example, while a faculty member may be willing to accept a temporary teaching assignment, the chairperson may not be able to assign the teaching assignment to that person. In this case, the hardship is that the department chairperson does not have the flexibility to make an arbitrary teaching assignment that developed out of an emergency not covered in the agreement.

While the findings indicate that collective bargaining was perceived as being beneficial, it is unclear to the writer as to why the sample responded as they did

to the question of beneficiality. Since it is unlikely that all of the department chairpersons had the same reasons for responding as they did, this would seem to indicate a need for further research in this area.

Although the population and sample placed limitations upon the generalizability of the findings, the five demographic characteristics--(1) size of college, (2) division of employment, (3) age, (4) number of years as a department chairperson, and (5) years employed at the college--seem to have had some influence in establishing attitudes and perceptions. This may have been attributed to the homogeneity of the sample. Most of the department chairpersons were between the age of forty and forty-nine. Secondly, they had been at their current place of employment from ten to twenty years. Thirdly, most of the department chairpersons had been in office from five to ten years. As a consequence of these similarities, the writer suspects that attitudes and perceptions may have been influenced by the chairperson's exposure to and experience in dealing with a unionized faculty. It should be pointed out, however, that the demographic characteristics made no distinction as to whether the department chairpersons were unionized or nonunionized. This difference in union status may have contributed to helping to form attitudes and perceptions. This suggests an area for further research.

### Conclusions

The implications which can be drawn from this study, although modest in scope, are none the less important. This study concludes that collective bargaining for faculty is advocated by department chairpersons. They also view collective bargaining as beneficial and feel that it should be encouraged. Moreover, they perceive collective bargaining as reducing collegiality, formalizing relationships, and increasing the sense of adversarialism between faculty and administration.

In view of these attitudes and perceptions, it would be most interesting to discover what factors are of importance in helping the department chairperson to formulate his/her attitudes and perceptions. For example, what is the relationship between the department chairperson's dual function as representative of the administration and departmental spokesperson for faculty and his/her attitude toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship? In addition, what relationship is there between enforcing the terms of the agreement and the department chairperson's attitude toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship? After these questions have been answered, it would be of equal importance to ascertain whether attitudes can be predicted on the basis of perceptions of faculty-administration relationship.

Since it is unlikely that collective bargaining for faculty in higher education will suddenly disappear, it seems imperative that we learn more about attitudes and perceptions. Strategies must be developed to help alter unwarranted attitudes and assumptions about collective bargaining which may indirectly, or directly, affect the educative process. Finally, in order to avoid fulfilling negative self-fulfilling prophecies, steps should be taken to assure that supervisory personnel, such as department chairpersons, develop positive attitudes and perceptions which will help elevate the faculty-administration relationship.

#### Future Research

1. A study could be conducted to ascertain whether unionized department chairpersons and nonunionized department chairpersons differ in their attitudes toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship.
2. A study could be conducted to determine if exposure to and experience in dealing with a unionized faculty are factors which help to form attitudes toward collective and perceptions of faculty-administration relationships.
3. A study could be conducted to determine if the dual capacity of the department chairperson's

function as representative of the administration and departmental spokesperson for faculty is a factor that influences his/her attitude toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship.

4. A study could be conducted to determine if the department chairperson's responsibility of enforcing the terms of the agreement influences his/her attitude toward collective bargaining and perceptions of faculty-administration relationship.
5. A study could be conducted to determine if the department chairperson's attitude toward collective bargaining can be predicted on the basis of his/her perception of faculty-administration relationship.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMPUTER SEARCH DESCRIPTORS

(Educational Resources Information Center: ERIC)

## APPENDIX A

### COMPUTER SEARCH DESCRIPTORS (Educational Resources Information Center: ERIC)

1	2	3	4	5
Faculty	Collective Bargaining	Administrative Personnel	Attitudes	Higher Education
College Faculty	Employer Employee Relationship	Supervisors	Interpersonal Relationship	Post Secondary Education
Instructional Staff	Industrial Relations	Administration	Human Relations	Colleges
Faculty Advisors	Unions	Instructor Coordinators	Administrator Attitudes	Junior Colleges
College Teachers	Teacher Associations	Educational Administration	Employer Attitudes	Community Colleges
	Teacher Administrator Relationship		Negative Attitudes	
	Teacher Attitudes		Organizational Climate	
			Teacher Administrator Relationship	
			Employer Employee Relationship	

#### Strategy

1 + 2 + 5  
and  
3 + 4 + 5

Covering the period from 1970 to June 1977.

APPENDIX B

MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: FACULTY AFFILIATION -  
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND AMERICAN  
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

APPENDIX B

MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES: FACULTY AFFILIATION\* -  
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION AND AMERICAN  
FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

<u>National Education Association Affiliated:</u>	<u>American Federation of Teachers Affiliated:</u>
1. Alpena	1. Henry Ford
2. Bay DeNoc	2. Highland Park
3. Glen Oaks	3. Lake Michigan
4. Gogebic	4. Wayne County
5. Jackson	
6. Kalamazoo	
7. Kirtland	
8. Lansing	
9. Mid-Michigan	
10. Monroe	
11. Montcalm	
12. Muskegon	
13. Oakland	
14. Schoolcraft	
15. Southwestern Michigan	
16. St. Clair County	
17. Washtenaw	

\* Source: A Chronicle of Higher Education Handbook:  
Faculty Collective Bargaining, 2d ed. (Wash-  
ington, D.C.: Editorial Project for Education,  
1976).

APPENDIX C

MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES COLLEGE SIZE:  
1975 HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT

## APPENDIX C

### MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES COLLEGE SIZE: 1975 HEADCOUNT ENROLLMENT\*

<u>Small Size</u> <u>(Less than 4,500)</u>	<u>Medium Size</u> <u>(4,500 - 8,000)</u>	<u>Large Size</u> <u>(More than 8,000)</u>
1. Alpena (1,846)	Jackson (7,607)	Henry Ford (14,709)
2. Bay De Noc (1,459)	Kalamazoo (6,073)	Lansing (15,436)
3. Glen Oaks (1,154)	Muskegon (6,034)	Oakland (18,873)
4. Gogebic (1,232)	St. Clair County (4,181)	Schoolcraft (8,056)
5. Highland Park (3,530)	Washtenaw (6,730)	Wayne County (15,453)
6. Kirtland (1,579)		
7. Lake Michigan (3,865)		
8. Mid-Michigan (2,200)		
9. Monroe (2,119)		
10. Montcalm (918)		
11. Southwestern Michigan (1,525)		

\* Source: 1976-77 Directory of Michigan Institutions of Higher Education (Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1977).

## APPENDIX D

### QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

Demographical Information Items

1. Size of college:     1    2    3

Please place a check mark to the left of the appropriate category.

2. Division of Employment

\_\_\_\_ Arts and Sciences

\_\_\_\_ Business

\_\_\_\_ Vocational/Technical

3. Age

\_\_\_\_ 20-29

\_\_\_\_ 30-39

\_\_\_\_ 40-49

\_\_\_\_ 50-59

\_\_\_\_ Greater than 60

4. Number of years as a department chairperson

\_\_\_\_ 1-5

\_\_\_\_ 5-10

\_\_\_\_ 10-20

\_\_\_\_ Greater than 20

5. Number of years employed at this particular college

\_\_\_\_ 1-5

\_\_\_\_ 5-10

\_\_\_\_ 10-20

\_\_\_\_ Greater than 20

## COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND RELATIONSHIP ITEMS

Please indicate your response to each item using the following key to select the appropriate answer:

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Collective bargaining by faculty members has no place in a college or university.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Because it is nonprofessional conduct, faculty should not engage in militant actions such as strikes or picketing.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Because it is not apt to produce results, faculty should not engage in militant actions such as strikes or picketing.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Collective bargaining will reduce collegiality between administrators and faculty.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. If faculties bargain collectively, then students should have the right as well.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. Collective bargaining will formalize relationships between faculty and administration.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Unions have made impressive progress affecting personnel policies in the short time they have been representing faculty.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Faculty senates and unions should have different responsibilities, with unions addressing economic issues and working conditions and senates dealing with curriculum, degree requirements and admissions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Individual salary bargaining for merit increases is bad for college faculty as a group.   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. The only basis for salary differentiation among faculty in the same position should be age or seniority.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 16. Nontenured faculty need the assurance of fair treatment at the point where the tenure decision is made, and only an employee organization can provide this.                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Faculties have little real power to influence college policies since the traditional "self-government" institutions, such as faculty senate or councils, are typically ineffective. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Collective bargaining will increase the sense of an adversary relationship between faculty and administrators.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. The recent growth of faculty collective bargaining is beneficial and should be encouraged.  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

APPENDIX E

COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER



Serving the Heart  
of Michigan

*Lansing Community College*  
*Lansing Community College*  
419 N. CAPITOL AVENUE, BOX 40010  
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48901

## APPENDIX E

### COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

May, 1978

Dear Colleague:

Attached you will find a questionnaire which is being used in a study of attitudes toward collective bargaining and perception of faculty-administration relationship. This study is being supervised by the Department of Higher Education Administration, Michigan State University. As a colleague involved in education in the community college, I am soliciting your cooperation.

I assure you that all information given will be treated in confidence. To assure confidentiality, the questionnaires have not been coded. However, for the purpose of organizing and controlling, I am enclosing a postcard to indicate that you have returned the questionnaire.

Your cooperation is deeply appreciated. Kindly complete the questionnaire and return it in the stamped self-addressed envelope which has been enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Humphrey  
Administrative Assistant  
Division of Arts and Sciences

Enclosures



Serving the Heart  
of Michigan

*Lansing Community College*  
*Lansing Community College*

419 N. CAPITOL AVENUE, BOX 40010  
LANSING, MICHIGAN 48901

June, 1978

Dear Colleague:

Recently I mailed you a confidential questionnaire in which you were asked to complete and return. I have not yet received your response to this questionnaire. Therefore, I am enclosing another questionnaire for you to complete and return.

If you have already mailed the first questionnaire, please disregard this second questionnaire. If you have not completed the questionnaire, please take a few moments to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Kenneth L. Humphrey  
Administrative Assistant  
Division of Arts and Sciences

Enclosures

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- Benewitz, Maurice C., ed. Proceedings, First Annual Conference, April 1973, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. New York: Baruch College City University of New York, 1973.
- Brann, James, and Emmet A., eds. The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role. Detroit: Balamp Publishing, 1972.
- Bronsard, Donald R. "A Development, Comparison, and Contrast of Selected Faculty-Administration Consensus Regarding Collective Bargaining Contracts in Connecticut's Four Subsystems of Public Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1975.
- 1971 CCH NLRB Decisions. New York: Commerce Clearing House, Inc., 1972.
- Decker, Dwight F. The Role of the Faculty Bargaining Unit at Rhode Island Junior College. Practicum, Nova University, April 1975.
- Epler, Stephen M. Faculty-Administration Relationship--Why the Conflict. Los Angeles: Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, December 1966.
- An Excerpt from Faculty Collective Bargaining in Post-secondary Institutions: The Impact on the Campus and on the State. Wellesley, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, May 1972.
- Hansen, Barbara J., and Petrizzo, Richard D. Faculty and Administrative Attitude toward and Expectations Concerning Collective Bargaining at College of DuPage as Compared with Empirical Findings. Practicum, Nova University, December 1976.

Hewitt, Raymond G., ed. The Effects of Faculty Collective on Higher Education: Proceedings of a Conference Held in Boston, Massachusetts. Wellesley, Mass.: New England Board of Higher Education, 1973.

Lombardi, John. The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges. Los Angeles: Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, March 1974.

Mannix, Thomas M., ed. Proceedings, Second Annual Conference, April 1974, National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. New York: Baruch College, City University of New York, 1974.

Means, Howard B., and Semas, Philip W., eds. A Chronicle of Higher Education Handbook: Faculty Collective Bargaining. 2d ed. Washington, D.C.: Editorial Project for Education, 1976.

Menard, Arthur P., and DiGiovanni, Nicholas. Preparation of Faculty Representation Cases--A Checklist of Issues for Private Colleges and Universities. Special Report No. 26. Washington, D.C.: Bargaining Information Service, April 1976.

Michigan Employment Relations Commission. Decisions Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Order. Vol. XA. Big Rapids: Opinion Press, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. Decisions Findings of Fact Conclusions of Law and Order. Vol. XB. Big Rapids: Opinion Press, 1975.

Michigan Legislative Council. Michigan Compiled Law 1970. Vol. III. Ann Arbor: Lithocrafter, Inc.

1966 Michigan P.A. 311, Sect. 389.121.

Miskel, Cecil. "Teacher and Administrator Attitudes toward Collective Negotiation Issues." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting--58th, New Orleans, February 1973.

Mortimer, Kenneth P., and Lozier, Gregory G. Collective Bargaining Implications for Governance. Pennsylvania State University: Center for the Study of Higher Education, June 1972.

- Roberts, Harold S. Roberts' Dictionary of Industrial Relations. Revised ed. Washington, D.C.: BNA Inc., 1971.
- Vaccaro, Louis C., ed. Reshaping American Higher Education. Irving, Texas: Dallas University, 1975.
- Walters, Donald E. Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, March 1973.
- Weber, Arnold R., and others. Faculty Participation in Academic Governance. Report of the AAHE Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, Campus Governance Program. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1967.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Unabridged. Springfield: C & C Merriam Co., Publisher, 1971.

#### Periodicals

- Begin, James P. "The Emergence of Faculty Bargaining in New Jersey." Community and Junior College Journal 44 (Dec/Jan 19 ):18-19.
- Blomerley, Peter. "Junior College Departments and Academic Governance." Junior College Journal 41 (February 1971):38-40.
- Boyd, William W. "The Faculty Problem . . . Handle with Care." AGB Reports 18 (Sep/Oct 1976):37-42.
- Darnton, Donald C. "A Case for the Faculty-Administrator." Educational Records 52 (Spring 1970):154-58.
- Koehnline, William A., and Blocker, Clyde E. "The Division Chairman in the Community College." Junior College Journal 40 (February 1970):9-12.
- Marcus, Leonard. "Union Organization Drives: Summary and Review." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 23 (August 1972):34-47.
- O'Grady, James P., Jr. "Role of the Departmental Chairman: Missouri and Illinois Two-Year Colleges." Junior College Journal 42 (February 1971):32-34.

- Orze, Joseph J. "After It's Ratified that Contract Has To Work." College Management 9 (February 1974): 15-17.
- Perkus, Gerald H., and Christopulos, Diana K. "Change of Life at Hartwick College." New Directions for Higher Education 15 (Autumn 1976):69-81.
- Ping, Charles J. "On Learning to Live with Collective Bargaining." Journal of Higher Education 44 (February 1973):102-13.
- Place, William S. "Perceptions of Influence Relationships and Faculty Satisfaction: A Study in Organizational Control." Perceptual and Motor Skills 38 (June 1974):953-54.
- Smith, A. B. "Department Chairmen: Neither Fish nor Fowl." Junior College Journal 42 (March 1972): 40-43.
- Sturner, William F. "Struggling with the Unknown: The First Year of Collective Bargaining." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 27 (Jan/Feb 1976):29-38.
- Welch, Gerald D. "Collective Bargaining and the Management Negotiating Team." Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 25 (January 1974):49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Role of the Department Chairman in Collective Bargaining." Community and Junior College Journal 44 (December 1973):30.