DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 801 JC 710 175

AUTHOR	Moore, John W.
TITLE	Pennsylvania Community College Faculty: Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	May 71
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Collective Bargaining, *Collective Negotiation, Faculty Organizations, *Junior Colleges, *Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Background, Teacher Militancy, Teacher Strikes
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This study discusses faculty attitudes toward collective bargaining, including collective negotiations, sanctions, and withholding of faculty services. The purpose was to determine whether faculty members' perceptions of their capacities for power and mobility were related to their expression of relatively favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward collective negotiations. Attention was given to possible relationships between selected biographical career variables and faculty attitudes toward negotiations. The data were collected from faculty in 10 of 12 junior colleges in Pennsylvania. (CA)

PENNSYLVANIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY: ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

By

John W. Moore

Center for the Study of
Higher Education

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania 16801

May 1971

FOREWARD

The most rapidly growing segment of higher education in America today is that of community colleges. This growth is a result of a variety of forces. Society has increasing needs for paraprofessionals in numerous fields, with community colleges providing this type of skilled manpower. Increasingly involved in "functional education," community colleges are also assuming responsibility for technical instruction as well as general education. Career programs are rapidly replacing traditional vocational programs in community colleges by producing a mix of technical and academic instruction.

Other reasons for the rapid growth of community colleges are their commitment to be comprehensive in their curriculums; to serve students with wide ranges of interests, ages and abilities; to maintain flexibility with respect to the needs of the community; and to work toward excellence in teaching.

"The great equalizers," as they have often been called, community colleges also offer the opportunity

for further education and job training for the disadvantaged. According to a report of the Committee for Economic Development, "Because of their accessibility, they are a gateway through which the disadvantaged may move to civic influence and leadership, high level technical positions and university preparation for the advanced professions."[1]

This monograph focuses on an important aspect of the community college--its faculty. Explored are the questions of whether these faculty members are inclined toward collective negotiations, and whether their career patterns influence their attitudes toward progressive-traditional educational issues.

Collective negotiations is becoming increasingly important in relation to higher education. At present, over a dozen states have Public Employee Bargaining Laws,[2] with Hawaii, Pennsylvania and New Jersey passing them within the last few years. Because of these laws, there is now a rapid rush among many organizations for the power to serve as bargaining representatives for faculty in higher education establishments, particularly

those in community colleges. The attitudes of faculty members toward these activities and toward the various sanctions that could be applied within the collective negotiations framework--such as strikes--is important to our knowledge of how a community college functions.

The question of educational philosophy is also extremely vital. Community colleges have been founded on the open, liberal lines stated above where according to many, a student orientation (progressive attitude), should take precedence over a subject orientation (traditional attitude). Whether faculty not only verbally agree with this philosophy, but actually put it into practice in the classroom is an important issue. There have been some indications that the varied backgrounds from which community college faculty are drawn have an effect on whether or not a faculty member truly adheres to the progressive community college philosophy. The study presented here not only delves into this question, but also into whether or not certain other biographical aspects become involved in this process as well.

Graced perhaps with more public and political favor than any other segment of higher education today, community colleges represent a vast and important stride in our system of education. More knowledge is needed about their operations, their faculty and their students. It is only in this way that we will be truly able to assess their impact in the future. We are pleased to present this monograph by John W. Moore and Robert A. Patterson, which is derived from their studies offered in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the D.Ed. degree at The Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Robert Sweitzer, Professor of Higher Education, directed the research.

G. Lester Anderson
April 1971

---

[1]Education for the Urban Disadvantaged from Preschool to Employment: A Statement on National Policy by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development (New York: Committee for Economic Development, March, 1971), p. 41.

[2]Labor Law Journal (December 1968) 786-788.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations

PENNSYLVANIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

John W. Moore

PREFACE

This paper is a summary of the major findings and conclusions of an investigation of the attitudes of community college faculty in Pennsylvania toward the utilization of collective negotiations.[1] The study was conducted in the fall of 1969 at a time when faculty unionism was becoming more visible in colleges and universities, particularly in two-year colleges. Full-time teaching faculty from 10 of the 12 community colleges in Pennsylvania participated in the study by responding to a mailed questionnaire.

The first section of this paper provides an overview of the nature of the study with particular emphasis on the research procedures followed. Major findings of the study are presented in the next two sections, while the last section discusses the primary conclusion

---

[1]A generic term for various forms of group action employed by faculty to obtain their goals. The term is used frequently in the field of education to describe the process more commonly known as collective bargaining. Collective negotiations is used as a singluar subject when regarded as a process and as a plural subject when used to refer to a series or parts of negotiation.

derived from the study.[1]

An expression of appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert E. Sweitzer of The Pennsylvania State University for his suggestions, criticism and guidance throughout the project. I also wish to acknowledge and thank the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Penn State for providing the financial resources for the study. Thanks are also due to the many community college faculty members who participated in the study.

---

[1] For a comprehensive review of this study see John W. Moore, "The Attitudes of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Toward Collective Negotiations in Relation to Their Sense of Power and Sense of Mobility" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970).

PENNSYLVANIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

ATTITUDES TOWARD COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATIONS

John W. Moore

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

> Professors refuse to join unions or engage in collective bargaining because of a feeling prevalent among them that their salaries are not of the nature of wages, and that there would be species of moral obliquity implied in overtly so dealing with the matter.[1]

In 1918, Thorstein Veblen made this observation about the attitudes of college and university faculty toward unions and collective bargaining. For the most part, it accurately describes the traditional attitude of professors toward these forms of collective action. To a certain extent, Veblen's commentary is still true

---

[1]Thorstein Veblen, *Higher Learning in America* (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918), p. 162.

today. However, there have been indications that faculty employed in higher education -- particularly in two-year colleges -- are becoming more receptive to unionism and collective negotiations.

Recent developments in California, New York, and New Jersey are examples of the emerging interest of college and university faculty in unionism and collective negotiations. As early as 1967, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) organized union locals on 14 of the 18 state college campuses in California. Faculty at approximately one-third of these campuses endorsed the principle of collective bargaining, and in a system-wide referendum, slightly less than one-half of 6,000 voting faculty favored collective bargaining.[1]

In a recent election at the City University of New York, the United Federation of College Teachers (UFT), an affiliate of the AFT, won bargaining rights for over 6,000 non-tenured faculty, but failed to achieve the

---

[1] *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 14, 1967.

the same for tenured faculty in a close runoff election. More recently, a bargaining agent, the Senate Professional Association, was elected to represent over 15,000 faculty within the State University of New York system. Additionally, the faculties of six state colleges in New Jersey elected the Association of New Jersey State College Faculty -- an affiliate of the National Education Association -- to serve as their bargaining representative, and it received an 80 percent plurality in defeating the AFT and the American Association of University Professors for exclusive bargaining rights.[1] In response to these developments Lieberman stated:

> The New Jersey election results, especially if taken in conjunction with recent developments in higher education in California and New York, suggest that faculty support of academic senates as a practical alternative to collective bargaining may soon be a thing of the past.[2]

There also have been indications that graduate assistants employed by major universities throughout

---

[1]Stanley Elam and Michael Moskow, eds., *Employment Relations in Higher Education* (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1969).

[2]Myron Lieberman, "Faculty Senates: Institutionalized Irresponsibility," *Phi Delta Kappan* (September, 1969), 16-20.

the country are potential members of professional unions. In the 1964 "revolution" at the University of California at Berkeley, graduate assistants participated in a four-day strike and demanded increased professional status, better compensation and improved employment conditions. An additional outcome was the formation of an AFT local with a membership of approximately 600 graduate assistants.[1] In 1969, the Teaching Assistants Association of the University of Wisconsin was certified as the exclusive collective bargaining representative for over 1800 teaching assistants employed there.[2]

The most significant movement toward collective negotiations in higher education has occurred at the two-year college level. The AFT has organized over 60 local unions at two-year colleges, approximately 40 of which are located in California, Illinois and New York.

---

[1]Robert Dubin and Frederic Beisse, "The Assistant: Academic Subaltern," *Administrative Science Quarterly* (March, 1967), 521.

[2]National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, *Circular Letter No. 16* (Washington, D. C., June 14, 1969).

It has also obtained exclusive bargaining rights and has negotiated agreements at a number of two-year colleges. In addition, the United Federation of Teachers has organized locals and represents the faculties of the community colleges of the City University of New York.[1]

The National Education Association has also recognized the interest being shown in collective negotiations by two-year college faculty. In 1967, it organized the National Faculty Association for Community and Junior Colleges (NFA) in order to actively pursue collective negotiations. NFA officials now claim a membership of over 4,000 two-year college faculty.[2]

In light of these developments, there has been considerable speculation about the intensity of the movement toward faculty unionism and the probable future of collective negotiations in higher education. In a recent survey conducted by the American Council

---

[1]American Federation of Teachers (unpublished paper, February 14, 1969).

[2]*Pennsylvania Professor*, II, 1 (1969).

on Education, over 80 percent of the college and university presidents questioned indicated that collective negotiations will become a widely used means of determining faculty salaries and conditions of employment during the next decade.[1] Similar conclusions were drawn by a task force of the American Association for Higher Education, which studied 34 institutions of higher learning. The task force reported that the faculties employed by junior colleges and former teachers colleges will be particularly receptive to union activity.[2]

In Pennsylvania, the pattern leading to collective negotiations has evolved as it has in many other states. The emergence of teacher militancy[3] has taken place at

---

[1]*The Chronicle of Higher Education* (July 1, 1968), p. 5.

[2]*Faculty Participation in Academic Governance*, Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1967), p. 61.

[3]"Militancy" is a term generally associated with the emergence of collective negotiations in public education. Militant faculty are those who possess favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations and faculty unions.

the public school level mainly in large industrial urban areas. Teacher organizations, primarily the Pennsylvania State Education Association (PSEA) and the Pennsylvania State Federation of Teachers (PSFT), are leading local teacher groups toward increased militancy, and they successfully lobbied in the state legislature for a comprehensive public employee negotiations bill, which was passed in July 1970. At the time this study was initiated, the PSFT and the Pennsylvania Association for Higher Education, an affiliate of PSEA, were developing programs aimed at organizing community college faculty with collective negotiations as the ultimate goal.

Because there have been indications that collective negotiations will most likely occur in the near future in Pennsylvania's community colleges, it was considered desirable to collect and analyze empirical data concerning the attitudes of community college faculty toward these actions. An essential question considered was whether faculty members' perceptions of their capacities for power and mobility were related to their expression of relatively favorable or unfavorable

attitudes. Additionally, attention was directed to possible relationships between selected biographical career variables and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations.

Research Variables

Attitudes of faculty toward collective negotiations were designated the dependent variable. According to Guilford, an attitude is a personal disposition common to individuals, but possessed in different degrees, which impels them to react to objects, situations, or propositions in ways that can be called favorable or unfavorable.[1]

"Collective negotiations" is a generic term for various forms of collective or group action used by faculty as a means of attaining their objectives. The term includes the concepts of collective bargaining and professional negotiation. Collective negotiation is, for the most part, the same concept as collective bargaining, the industrial term. Yoder's definition of the later concept is helpful in understanding the

---

[1]J. P. Guilford, *Psychometric Methods in Psychology and Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954), p. 456.

nature of collective negotiations.

> Collective bargaining describes the process in which conditions of employment are determined by agreement between representatives of an organized group of employees, on one hand, and one or more employers, on the other. It is called "collective" because employees form an association that they authorize to act as their agent in reaching an agreement and because employers also act as a group rather than as individuals. It is described as "bargaining" in part because the method of reaching an agreement involves proposals and counter proposals, offers and counter offers.[1]

The two principal independent variables were faculty perceptions of their sense of power, and of sense of mobility. In this instance, "sense of power" refers to the degree to which a faculty member feels he can influence the course of events in the college system that hold significance for him, such as college policies, practices and other professional employment

---

[1]Dale Yoder, *Personnel Management and Industrial Relations* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 165.

issues.[1] Sense of power is conceived as a continuum upon which faculty can be ordered from those at one extreme who feel almost powerless in their efforts to influence institutional direction, to faculty at the other extreme who feel they have extensive influence. As a psychological concept, sense of power is distinguished from power itself, which refers to the actual ability to apply sanctions or to control. In this instance, it is the faculty member's perception of power--not his actual power--that is the focus of the study.

In relating sense of power to faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations, it was suspected that they were inversely correlated. For example, faculty members with feelings of lack of power were expected to have relatively more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than those with a high sense of power. It seemed reasonable to expect that faculty who

---

[1]This concept of sense of power was originally developed by Gerald H. Moeller, "The Relationship Between Bureaucracy in School System Organization and Teachers' Sense of Power" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1962). The theoretical basis underlying the concept was derived from the work of Seeman. See Melvin Seeman, "On the Meaning of Alienation," *American Sociological Review*, 24 (1959) 849-852.

felt powerless as individuals would be attracted to collective action as a means of increasing their personal and collective influence. On the other hand, faculty having a relatively high sense of power would probably be less likely to have a need for collective action.

This expectation is compatible with Corwin's[1] theory that the emergence of teacher militancy is related to the increasing "professionalization" of educators. In this sense, "professionalization" represents the drive by educators to gain increased control or power over the conditions in which they perform their professional duties. Collective negotiations is viewed as the tactic used by educators to achieve these ends.

"Sense of mobility" is a measure of the degree to which a faculty member feels that he is capable of changing employers in a relatively unrestrictive manner. It is conceived as a two-dimensional construct that

---

[1]Ronald F. Corwin, *A Sociology of Education*, (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965), p. 162.

that is comprised of the faculty member's perceptions of the extent of his professional employment opportunities, and his perceptions of various personal constraints that tend to limit his ability to change employers. Both dimensions of sense of mobility are designed as continuums upon which faculty can be ranked from high to low.

An important purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between sense of mobility and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. Results derived from other research studies related to the issue are conflicting and inconclusive. For example, Andreasen's[1] research suggests that membership in a teacher's union is inversely correlated with mobility. In a study in which he compared union and non-union members, Andreasen concluded that union members tended to be relatively immobile and generally felt "trapped" in their current positions. Immobility

---

[1]Hoakon L. Andreasen, "Teacher Unionism: Personal Data Affecting Membership," *Phi Delta Kappan* (November, 1968), 117.

tended to reduce their individual bargaining power and consequently their own recourse was to align themselves at the local level with the organization that appeared to be the most aggressive in pursuing a program leading to improved employment conditions. Research conducted by Tannenbaum[1] and Spinrad[2] in the private sector also suggests that union activism is related to employee immobility. Tannenbaum concluded that active union members tended to have a greater "stake in their jobs" as a result of personal investments and community identification.

Contrary to these conclusions, Lane's[3] findings in a study of faculty unionism at a large California state college suggested that faculty mobility and unionism are directly correlated. He found that faculty members belonging to a union were more willing to leave the

---

[1]Arnold Tannenbaum and Robert L. Kahn, *Participation in Union Locals* (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1958), p. 115.

[2]W. Spinrad, "Correlates of Trade Union Participation: A Summary of Literature," *American Sociological Review*, 25 (1960), 237.

[3]Robert E. Lane, "Faculty Unionism in a California State College - A Comparative Analysis of Union Members and Non-members " (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967).

college and were less loyal to it than non-union faculty. Lane also concluded, as did Corwin[1], that unionism or militancy was the result of increasing "professionalism" in the sense that faculty members had a greater identification with and loyalty to the professional peer group than to the institution.

Data Collection and Analysis

A total of 951 full-time faculty employed in 10 of Pennsylvania's 12 community colleges were identified as the population for the study. Questionnaires were mailed to this group and 612 faculty (64.3 percent) returned them completed. Of this number, 547 (57.5 percent) were usable for the purpose of data analysis.

The research questionnaire consisted of five parts: 1) Kerlinger Education scale;[2] 2) Sense of Mobility scale; 3) Collective Negotiations scale; 4) Sense of Power scale; and 5) Biographical and career information.

---

[1]Corwin, *op. cit.*.

[2]The Kerlinger Education scale was not used by the author as part of this study. Instead, it was used as part of a cooperative research project conducted by Robert A. Patterson. A discussion of the Patterson study follows this paper.

The Collective Negotiations scale (CN) was a 30-item Likert-type scale used to measure faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations.[1] Coefficient alpha, a measure of the internal consistency of the CN scale, was computed to be .96. The Sense of Power scale (SP) was a 15-item Likert scale and its reliability was .94.[2] The Sense of Mobility scale consisted of two 15-item Likert-type subscales designed to measure the two dimensions of sense of mobility--perceptions of professional opportunities (PO scale), and perceptions of personal constraints on mobility (PS scale). The PO and PC scales each had reliability coefficients of .90.

Data collected from the returned questionnaires were scored and analyzed. Pearson product-moment and point-biserial correlation coefficients were computed as measures of the relationships between the various

---

[1]The CN scale was a modification of a scale originated by Patrick W. Carlton, "Attitudes of Certified Instructional Personnel in North Carolina Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiation and Sanctions," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966).

[2]The SP scale was a modification of a scale developed by Moeller, *op. cit.*.

research variables and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. The statistical significance of the correlation coefficients was tested at the .05 and .01 levels using two-tailed z test procedures.[1]

It should be remembered that questionnaires were mailed to all full-time faculty and since only 64.3 percent returned them completed, generalizations from the results are somewhat limited. However, a follow-up study of a random sample of the non-respondents was conducted, and the results indicated that the non-respondents did not differ significantly from the respondent group in terms of their scores on the research scales. The results of the study are interpretable only as descriptions of the statistical relationship between selected measurements of the research variables. The results are not measures of casual relationships between these variables.

---

[1]Paul Blommers and E. F. Lindquist, *Elementary Statistical Methods* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), p. 464.

General Attitudes Toward Collective Negotiations

Collective negotiation fundamentally is comprised of two complementary aspects: the negotiations process, and coercive tactics such as sanctions and the withholding of services, which are applied as a means of equalizing the bargaining power of both parties. Sanctions generally range from widespread campaigns publicizing alleged inferior educational practices or unfair employment practices to more militant forms of group action such as withholding services or striking.

This conceptualization of collective negotiations was the basis upon which the items in the Collective Negotiations (CN) scale were categorized for the purpose of interpretation. The items were placed in the following categories on the basis of their content: 1) items pertaining to attitudes toward collective action; 2) items pertaining to attitudes toward the implementation of sanctions; and 3) items pertaining to attitudes toward the withholding of faculty services.[1]

---

[1]Face validity was the criterion used to assign each of the selected items to one of the three categories. Practical considerations dictated that this approach be used rather than a more sophisticated factor analysis procedure.

These categories were thought to be a continuum representing increasing levels of intensity of militant attitudes. The first category (collective action) represented less intense attitudes than the second category (sanctions). The third category (withholding services) was the most extreme form of militancy.

The nature of the responses of the subjects to the items (Table 1) indicates that community college faculty in Pennsylvania are favorably disposed to collective action (negotiations). For example, approximately 88 percent agreed that faculty should be able to organize and bargain collectively, and a comparable proportion agreed that collective negotiations is an effective way for faculty to participate in determining the conditions of their employment. The vast majority agreed that collective negotiations is an effective way to limit the unilateral authority of the governing board without infringing on the authority of the board or placing undesirable restrictions on the board. A sizable majority also agreed that collective negotiations would provide them with greater on-the-job dignity and independence as well as increased political

TABLE 1

Faculty Responses to Item-Concepts of the CN Scale Categorized As Measures of Attitudes Toward Collective Action

Item-Concept	Percentage	
	Agree	Disagree
1. Faculty should be able to organize and bargain collectively.	88	12
2. Collective negotiations is an effective way for faculty to participate in determining the conditions of their employment.	89	11
3. Collective negotiations is an effective way to limit the unilateral authority of the governing board.	82	18
4. Collective negotiations is an infringement on the authority of the governing board.	11	89
5. Collectively negotiated written agreements place undesirable restrictions on the college administration.	26	74
6. Collective negotiations is primarily a coercive technique that will have detrimental effects on higher education.	17	83
7. Collective negotiations can provide faculty with greater on-the-job dignity and independence in the performance of their functions.	80	20
8. Collective negotiations is beneath the dignity of college faculty.	21	79
9. Good faculty members can always get the salary they need without resorting to collective negotiations.	27	73
10. Collective negotiations is a good way to unite the profession into a powerful political body.	60	40

power without having detrimental effects on higher education. Only a small minority, 27 percent, felt that good faculty members could always get the salary they needed without resorting to collective negotiations.

Faculty responses to the items dealing with sanctions (Table 2) indicated that community college faculty possess favorable orientations toward the use of various forms of sanctions. A large majority agreed that the faculty had a right to impose sanctions under certain circumstances, and they perceived sanctions as a legitimate and acceptable means of improving the conditions of their professional employment. Only 26 percent felt that sanctions and other coercive measures were unprofessional.

An analysis of the items pertaining to the withholding of faculty services (Table 3) indicated that community college faculty are more divided in their attitudes toward this kind of group behavior than they are toward other forms of collective action. Although 61 percent of the respondents agreed that faculty should be able to withhold services, 56 percent felt that collective negotiations should omit the threat of withholding

TABLE 2

Faculty Responses to Item-Concepts of the CN Scale Categorized As Measures of Attitudes Toward Sanctions

Item-Concept	Percentages Agree	Disagree
1. Faculty have a right to impose sanctions on governing boards under certain situations.	79	21
2. Sanctions are an acceptable means of improving educational opportunities and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.	72	28
3. Faculty organizations at local, state, and national levels should publicize unfair practices by governing boards through various mass media.	67	33
4. Certain forms of censure are legitimate techniques for use by faculty.	78	22
5. Sanctions and other forms of coercive measures are unprofessional.	26	84

TABLE 3

Faculty Responses to Item-Concepts of the CN Scale Categorized As Measures of Attitudes Toward Withholding of Faculty Services

Item-Concept	Percentages Agree	Disagree
1. Faculty should be able to withhold services.	61	39
2. Collective negotiations should omit the threat of withholding services.	56	44
3. Strikes are an undesirable aspect of collective negotiations.	64	36
4. Faculty should not strike in order to enforce their demands.	55	45
5. Withholding of services is a violation of professional ethics and trust.	44	56

services. The majority of faculty members generally perceived the strike weapon as undesirable.

In summary, these findings seem to indicate that community college faculty in Pennsylvania have favorable attitudes toward the use of collective negotiations as a means of pursuing faculty interests. When specifically asked if they would join a faculty organization engaged in collective negotiations, 68 percent said they would join such an organization, while only 11 percent said they would not. Twenty-one percent stated that they were undecided. This suggests that of those faculty who were willing to respond to the questionnaire, the vast majority were willing to organize.

Faculty seem to view the implementation of sanctions as a legitimate course of collective action. This acceptance of the legitimacy of sanctions by faculty is a condition that may be conducive to their increased application in conflict situations. There seems to be less consensus however, concerning the desirability of withholding faculty services. The exercise of group

pressure apparently is viewed as legitimate, but there is hesitance in taking stronger action against the administration or board. Thus, the climate in Pennsylvania's community colleges appears conducive for unionization or the exercise of power of faculty groups and for using collective action for agreed upon purposes.

Power, Mobility and Collective Negotiations

To examine the relationship between faculty sense of power and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations, sense of power was inversely correlated with faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. The correlation coefficient $r = -.42$ was found to be statistically significant at the .01 level. Faculty with a relatively low sense of power -- those who felt "powerless" or unable to influence the course of events within the college system -- had more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than those with a high sense of power.

This finding seems compatible with the theory that the emergence of teacher militancy is related to the "professionalization" of teachers.[1] In this sense "professionalization" represents the faculty's drive to gain increased control over the conditions in which they perform their professional duties. Inherent in the

---

[1]Ronald G. Corwin, *A Sociology of Education* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965), p. 262.

professional role are expectations for considerable control over the conditions of employment and for participation in institutional governance. In situations where these expectations are not fulfilled, faculty are likely to be frustrated by feelings of powerlessness. Collective action then may be perceived by faculty as a desirable recourse. On the other hand, when faculty as individuals feel capable of influencing institutional conditions, they seem less attracted to collective actior In its simplest form, the emergence of unionism in higher education may be understood in terms of a faculty struggle for collective power and the professionalization of their role.

The two dimensions of sense of mobility were positively correlated with faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. The Professional Opportunity Subscale (PO) was significantly correlated ($r = .14$) with faculty attitudes at the .01 level. Faculty members who perceived their "professional opportunities" to move to other jobs as being relatively extensive showed more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than faculty

members who viewed their alternative job opportunities as relatively limited. The Personal Constraints (PC) Subscale was significantly correlated (r = .10) at the .05 level, showing that the most favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations were possessed by faculty who perceived relatively few "personal constraints" on their ability to change colleges.

These findings seem to indicate that faculty members possessing favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations perceived themselves as being relatively "mobile." This appears contrary to a widely held "myth" or "logical belief" that faculty with relatively more militant attitudes are necessarily those persons who feel unable to compete successfully in the academic marketplace. Nor do these findings support the theory that the faculty member who is inclined toward collective action is the individual who is "trapped" in his present job or more geographically restricted.[1]

---

[1]Haakon L. Andreasen, "Teacher Unionism: Personal Dat Affecting Membership," *Phi Delta Kappan,* L (November, 1968), 177.

The fact that a direct relationship exists between sense of mobility and favorable attitudes toward collectivism also seems to support the theory that faculty unionism may be symptomatic of increasing professionalism among two-year college faculty. Faculty unionism and other kinds of collective action actually may be forms of professional identification resulting in greater loyalty to one's professional peer group than to one's institution.

Findings derived from other research studies seem to substantiate the idea that an inverse relationship exists between professionalism and institutional loyalty. Gouldner[1] and Scott,[2] who studied the relationship between these variables in a liberal arts college and a welfare agency respectively, concluded that a professional orientation is inversely related to organizational loyalty. In Gouldner's terms, professionals tend to be "cosmopolitans," not "locals." In a comparative study of union and non-union faculty in a California state college,

---

[1]Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2 (1957-1958), 281-306.

[2]W. Richard Scott, "A Case Study of Professional Workers in a Bureaucratic Seeting" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1961).

Lane[1] also found union members significantly less loyal to the college and more willing to leave their employer than non-union faculty.

In speculating further about the relationship between sense of mobility and collectivism, it may be that the controversial nature of collective negotiations is an important dimension. The less mobile faculty member may view the possible consequences of collective action as excessively threatening to his employment security, and prefer not to jeopardize it by promoting collective negotiations. On the other hand, the more mobile faculty member may feel that in the event his employment is jeopardized through his attitudes and activities in the area of collective negotiations, he will be able to find employment elsewhere.

Another plausible explanation for this finding may be that the advantages or benefits derived from changing colleges may not be sufficient to offset the

---

[1]Robert E. Lane, "Faculty Unionism In a California State College - A Comparative Analysis of Union Members and Non-Members" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967).

personal and economic risks, since compensation and benefits to faculty members may not vary substantially from institution to institution. Therefore, the professionally career-oriented faculty member may perceive collective negotiations as the most productive approach to providing for the welfare of local community college faculty.

Other Relationships

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, a secondary purpose was to investigate the relationship between selected biographical and career variables, and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. For the purpose of analysis and interpretation, the biographical and career information variables were grouped into four categories: 1) demographic variables; 2) professional employment variables; 3) information variables related to organizational membership; and 4) variables based on career and employment experience. Correlation coefficients for the biographical career variables that were significantly correlated with faculty attitude are included in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Correlation Coefficients for Relationship Between Biographical-Career Variables Significantly Correlated With CN Scale Scores

Variable	Correlation Coefficient r	Significance Level
Age	-.227	.01
Satisfaction with Community College Teaching	-.210	.01
Political Preference	-.190	.01
Religious Preference	-.176	.01
Past Union Membership	-.156	.01
High School Teaching Experience	-.124	.01
Tenure Status	.120	.01
Business/Industry Employment Experience	.108	.05
Academic Field	.104	.05
Teaching Curriculum	-.102	.05
Degree	.100	.05
Current Union Membership	-.100	.05
Sex	-.099	.05
Rank	-.091	.05
Father's Union Membership	-.088	.05

In the relationship between the demographic variables and faculty attitudes, younger faculty members had significantly more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than did older faculty. This was also true for male faculty members versus female faculty members, and non-Protestants versus Protestants. Faculty members with a liberal political orientation had significantly more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than those with a conservative political orientation, and faculty whose fathers were members of a labor union were also significantly more favorable toward collective negotiations than those whose fathers were not members of unions. The following demographic variables were *not* found to be significantly correlated with faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations: marital status, number of children, parent's birthplace, parent's level of education, father's occupation, and type of childhood community.

The analysis of the relationship between selected professional employment variables and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations showed that faculty

members who reported they were relatively dissatisfied with community college teaching had more favorable attitudes toward negotiations, as did those who possessed graduate degrees. Non-tenured faculty also favored collective negotiations along with those of relatively lower professorial rank. Faculty teaching in non-science fields were also found to be more favorable toward collective negotiations as were those teaching in college transfer programs rather than faculty members teaching in vocational-technical programs. Salary level and the length of employment were not significantly correlated with attitudes toward collective negotiations.

Findings related to membership in professional or employee organizations indicated that faculty who were former members or current members in an employee union possessed more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than faculty without such union affiliation. Past or current membership in academic organizations such as the National Education Association, the American Association of University Professors or the American Association for Higher Education was not significantly correlated with militant attitudes.

Investigation of the relationship between career and employment experiences and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations showed that faculty members who had previously taught at the high school level and those without employment experience in business and industry had more favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations than faculty who had never taught at that level or those just with business experience. Teaching experience in higher education was not significantly related to the attitude of faculty members toward collective negotiations.

In these analyses, distinctions must be made between the *statistical* and *practical* significance of the findings. For example, the fact that a rather large number (547) of subjects were included would have enhanced the probability of statistically significant differences. From a practical standpoint, correlation coefficients as low as the ones presented here indicate that the biographical-career variables have extremely limited practical value as "predictors" of faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. Despite these limitations,

the findings are useful in providing insights into the personal characteristics of faculty who may be likely to be receptive to unionism and collective negotiations.

In summary, faculty who expressed the most favorable attitudes toward collective negotiations are male, relatively young, non-Protestant, and liberal in political orientation. They have advanced graduate degrees, but are of relatively low professorial rank and without tenure. Generally they have academic backgrounds in the non-science fields and teach predominantly in the college transfer curriculum. They often have had high school teaching experience and previously may have belonged to a labor union.

Discussion

What then will be the future of collective negotiations in Pennsylvania's community colleges? Although the actual behavior of many faculty members may very well differ from responses on an inventory designed to measure attitudes toward collective negotiations, a knowledge of opinions or attitudes concerning collective negotiations can provide some basis for predicting future behavior.

An analysis of the study findings suggests that a majority of Pennsylvania's community college faculty are favorably disposed to faculty organization and collective negotiations. This is indicated by the fact that more than two-thirds of the respondents reported that they would affiliate with a faculty organization engaged in collective negotiations. On the other hand, only a small minority, 11 percent, reported they would not join such an organization, while 21 percent were undecided.

Study findings also suggest that although faculty perceive collective negotiations as a legitimate

technique for the pursuance of group goals, there still is some division within faculty ranks concerning the desirability of various coercive tactics. Some forms of sanctions generally are viewed as ethical actions to be used by faculty in the face of an impasse. However, there is considerable disagreement concerning the appropriateness of work stoppages as a collective tactic. For example, slightly more than half, 55 percent, reported that faculty should not strike in order to enforce their demands. It might be concluded that although community college faculty members in Pennsylvania may support the legitimacy of the collective negotiations process, there still may be a reluctance to use the more militant tactics associated with "blue collar" workers.

An appraisal of the characteristics of faculty members who participated in the study provided insight into their apparent receptiveness to collective negotiations. Since the community colleges in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are basically in a developmental phase -- the earliest college being founded in 1964 --

their staffing patterns may have attracted faculty with reasonably strong inclinations toward collective action. For example, a majority of faculty have been recruited from elementary and secondary schools where teacher negotiations have emerged rapidly during the 1960s. Colleges and universities have also been the source of many young liberally oriented faculty members who have participated in or been affected by the many social reform movements of the rebellious 1960s. These faculty members may represent a "new breed" of professionals who possibly will reject the traditional norms of the profession. Faculty unionism in higher education may prove to be the rebellion of young, liberal, and professionally oriented faculty against the traditional, more academically autonomous but politically passive role of the older faculty members. Unionism may be the "new breed's" reaction against the fundamental evaluation and reward system in higher education.

Faculty who expressed attitudes favorable to collective negotiations also perceived themselves as relatively

mobile. In Gouldner's terms, they can be classified as "cosmopolitans" rather than "locals" primarily because they identify more with community college faculty in general, as opposed to their local colleagues or college. In this respect, the trend toward collective organization, a form of peer group identification, may exemplify a growing sense of professionalism among community college faculty.

The emergence of faculty unionism essentially may be understood as an expansion of the professional role -- a drive toward increased "faculty power." A major finding of this study indicated that faculty who are most receptive to collective negotiations exhibit a "low sense of power," and feel relatively incapable of influencing the course of events within their college. These individuals likely view collective action as an effective way to cope with these feelings.

The significance of the relationship between

---

[1]Alvin W. Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2 (1957-1958), 281-306.

"sense of power" and collective action is enhanced further by the results of Niland's research.[1] He found that the major source of conflict between faculty and administration in California junior colleges was the monopolization of the policy-making function by administrators. This was viewed as a violation of the self-image of the junior college faculty member as an expert who has a right, like his counterpart in four-year colleges, to be consulted when any decision is made affecting his working conditions.

In general, faculty employed by four-year colleges and universities have enjoyed considerable autonomy in the performance of their professional duties and have played a role in institutional governance. It probably is safe to conclude that their influence, individually and collectively, has been substantially greater than their faculty colleagues employed in two-year colleges.

---

[1]William P. Niland, *Faculty-Administration Conflict In California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and a Proposal for Resolution* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1964).

Richard C. Richardson, President of Northampton Community College, spoke to this point.

> Faculty participation in policy determination is a matter of relatively recent concern to junior college educators. In fact, two-year college administrators have for the most part refused to share board delegated powers with the teaching faculty.[1]

There are two important conditions that have limited the participation of two-year college faculty in college policy determination and decision making. First, the traditional role of the two-year college faculty member has been solely that of a teacher. In this regard, he has performed his duties in ways more similar to the high school teacher than the university professor. Second, most two-year colleges have developed as extensions of the public school system and have assumed an organizational structure similar to these institutions. Two-year colleges are usually organized in a pyramid structure, based on principles of a hierarchy of authority, the division of labor, and a definite

---

[1]Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Policy Formulation in the Two-Year College: Rennaissance of Revolution?" *Junior College Journal* (March, 1967), 41-44.

employer-employee relationship. Authority is highly centralized in the hands of the governing boards and chief administrators, with limited authority delegated to the faculty.[1]

It now appears that two-year college faculty will no longer be satisfied with an administrative structure that results in faculty having an inadequate voice in institutional matters. In these situations, collective action may become the technique used to increase faculty power and expand their influence in decisions related to their employment.

In essence, the emergence of faculty unionism represents a struggle for increased faculty power. Two-year college faculty seem no longer satisfied with a secondary role in institutional governance. In situations where faculty influence is thwarted by oppressive administrative style and bureaucratic structure collective action may become the technique used to increase faculty power. In this sense, collective negotiations is a means of substituting bilateral decision making

---

[1]Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 154.

for unilateral administrative action.

The results of this study suggest that community college faculty in Pennsylvania perceive collective negotiations as an effective means of neutralizing the unilateral exercise of power by college governing boards. As has been the case in other states, faculty here will not be satisfied with a token role in institutional governance. As they search for increased participation in decision making, faculty will look to unionism and other forms of collective action as a means of accomplishing that end. In conclusion, the following commentary made after the faculty strike at the Chicago City College in 1967 may accurately describe current and future circumstances in Pennsylvania's community colleges:

1. The faculty's demand for major voice in determining working conditions can no longer be denied.

2. The faculty are prepared to join a union and to strike if no other alternative is available to insure improvements in their working conditions and quality education for their students.

3. The administration and board of control must be prepared to bargain and communicate directly with elected faculty representatives.[1]

[1]Norman Swenson and Leon Novar, "Chicago City College Teachers Strike," *Junior College Journal* (March, 1967), 19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., Richardson, Richard C., Jr. *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Blommers, Paul and Lindquist, E. F. *Elementary Statistical Methods*. Boston, Mass: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Brown, David G. *The Market for College Teachers*. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Brown, David G. *The Mobile Professors*. Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1967.

Caplow, Theodore and McGee, Reece J. *The Academic Market-Place*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1965.

Corwin, Ronald G. *Sociology of Education*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

Elam, Stanley, and Moskow, Michael, ed. *Employment Relations in Higher Education*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1969.

Lieberman, Myron and Moskow, Michael. *Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Lieberman, Myron. "Representational Systems in Higher Education." *Employment Relations in Higher Education*. Edited by Stanley Elam and Michael Moskow. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1969.

Tannenbaum, Arnold and Kahn, Robert L. *Participation in Union Locals.* Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1958.

Veblen, Thorstein. *Higher Learning in America.* New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1918, p. 162.

Periodicals

Andreasen, Haaken L. "Teacher Unionism: Personal Data Affecting Membership." *Phi Delta Kappan,* L (November, 1968), 177.

Batchelder, Richard D. "Unionism Under Attack - N.E.A. versus A.F.T." *Times Education Supplement* (February 11, 1966), 396-397.

Dubin, Robert and Beisse, Frederic. "The Assistant: Academic Subaltern." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 2 (March, 1967), 521.

Elam, Stanley. "Collective Bargaining and Strikes." *Phi Delta Kappan,* 64 (October, 1962), 1-11.

Elam, Stanley. "Union or Guild." *Nation* (June 29, 1964), 651-653.

Fisher, W. H. "Professors and Collective Bargaining." *School and Society,* 95 (April 1, 1967), 226-229.

Gouldner, Alvin. "Cosmopolitans and Locals." *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 2 (1957-1958), 281-306.

Levine, Marvin J. "Higher Edu ation and Collective Action." *Journal of Higher Education,* 38 (May, 1967), 263-268.

Lovejoy, Arthur C. "Professional Association or Trade Union." *A.A.U.P. Bulletin,* 24 (Autumn, 1968), 209-411.

Marmion, Harry A. "Unions and Higher Education." *Educational Record*, 49 (Winter, 1968), 41-48.

McIntosh, Carl W. "The Unionization of College and University Teachers." *Journal of Higher Education*, 36 (October, 1965), 348-373.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Policy Formulation in the Two-Year College: Renaissance or Revolution?" *Junior College Journal*, 37 (March, 1967), 41-44.

Swenson, Norman and Novar, Leon. "Chicago City College Teachers Strike." *Junior College Journal*, 37 (March, 1967), 19-22.

Unpublished Materials

Carlton, Richard W. "Attitudes of Certified Instructional Personnel in North Carolina Toward Questions Concerning Collective Negotiations and Sanctions." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1966.

Lane, Robert F. "Faculty Unionism in a California State College: A Comparative Analysis of Union Members and Non-Members." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, 1967.

Moeller, Gerald H. "The Relationship Between Bureaucracy in School System Organizations and Teachers' Sense of Power." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1962.

Moore, John W. "The Attitudes of Pennsylvania Community College Faculty Toward Collective Negotiations in Relation to Their Sense of Power and Sense of Mobility." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970.

Niland, William P. "Faculty-Administration Conflict in California Public Junior Colleges: An Analysis and a Proposal or Resolution." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1964.

Scott, W. Richard, "A Case Study of Professional Workers In a Bureaucratic Setting." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1961.

Notes on the Author

JOHN W. MOORE received his Doctor of Education degree from The Pennsylvania State University in 1970. He served on the staff of that university from 1966 to 1970, initially as a member of the Student Personnel Staff and subsequently as Assistant to the Dean of the College of Education. In the Fall of 1970, he moved to the University of Vermont as Assistant Dean of Students and Assistant Professor of Education. Dr. Moore will assume full-time teaching and research responsibilities in the Department of Educational Administration beginning during the summer of 1971. His primary academic interest is organizational theory and behavior, with a special emphasis on collective negotiations in educational institutions.

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

The Center for the Study of Higher Education was established in January 1969 to study higher education as an area of scholarly inquiry and research. Its studies are designed not only to be relevant to the university and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but also to colleges and universities throughout the nation. The immediate focus of the center's research falls into three broad areas--governance, graduate and professional education, and human service occupation programs in two-year colleges.

Research reports, monographs and position papers prepared by staff members of the center can be obtained on a limited basis. Inquiries should be addressed to the Center for the Study of Higher Education, 110 Willard Building, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Monographs

Institutional Self-Study at The Pennsylvania State University, Kenneth P. Mortimer and David W. Leslie (eds.), December 1970.

Numbered Reports

Centers and Institutes at The Pennsylvania State University: A Case Study, Mary M. Norman, March 1971, Report No. 9.

New Careers in Human Service: A Challenge to the Two-Year College (A Preliminary Report), Martha A. Burns, March 1971, Report No. 8

The Academy and General Education, Stanley O. Ikenberry, December 1970, Report No. 7

A Profile of Proliferating Institutes: A Study of Selected Characteristics of Institutes and Centers in 51 Land Grant Universities, Stanley O. Ikenberry, November 1970, Report No. 6

Roles and Structures for Participation in Higher Education Governance: A Rationale, Stanley O. Ikenberry, August 1970, Report No. 5

The Changing College Curriculum--Issues and Implications, G. Lester Anderson, and Instructional Systems in Higher Education--Specifications for Individualization, Stanley O. Ikenberry, January 1970, Report No. 2.

The "Special Admission" Student and the College, W. Frank Hull IV, November 1969, Report No. 1

Occasional Reports

Academic Senates: Some Models with Background Material, G. Lester Anderson, Kenneth P. Mortimer, W. Frank Hull IV and David W. Leslie, March 1970.

Some Considerations Involved in Changing the Male/Female Ratio at University Park, Harold G. Richard, June 1970.

Bibliographies

Selected Bibliography on the Concept of Leadership, Robert R. Smedley June 1970, Number 4

The Black Student in Higher Education: A Bibliography, W. Frank Hull IV, November 1969, Number 3.

Student Unrest on the American Campus: A Bibliography, David W. Leslie, November 1969, Number 2.