

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 809

HE 004 473

**AUTHOR** Kennelly, Jean Rupp  
**TITLE** Collective Bargaining in Higher Education in the United States: Conceptual Models and a Survey of Incidence Among Faculty and Supportive Professional Personnel.

**INSTITUTION** Washington Univ., Seattle. Coll. of Education.  
**PUB DATE** 72  
**NOTE** 9p.

**EDRS PRICE** MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
**DESCRIPTORS** \*Collective Bargaining; \*Collective Negotiation; \*College Faculty; Colleges; \*Employer Employee Relationship; \*Higher Education; Models; Research; Research Projects; School Personnel; School Surveys; Teacher Militancy; Universities

**ABSTRACT**

This study (1) ascertains the incidence of collective bargaining activity involving faculty and supportive professional personnel, (2) determines the nature of the issues being negotiated, (3) extrapolates models of bargaining, and (4) analyzes and interprets relationships suggested by incidence, issues and models. Following an introductory discussion which touches upon the underlying concepts of terminological confusion, the inseparability of academic governance and collective bargaining, and individual-group imputations in bargaining, three models of bargaining--the collegial model, the managerial model, and the union model--are developed conceptually from the relevant literature. The empirical portion of the study consists of a national survey of American institutions of higher education. Survey data were gathered through a questionnaire mailed to 244 randomly selected institutions. Results indicated 29% of the respondent institutions reported collective bargaining activity in three stages. Fifteen percent reported developmental stage activity, 4% reported negotiations in progress, and 10% reported collective bargaining through the contract stage. (Author/MJM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
THE OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

University of Washington

Abstract

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES:  
CONCEPTUAL MODELS AND A SURVEY OF INCIDENCE AMONG FACULTY  
AND SUPPORTIVE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

by

Jean Rupp Kennelly

Chairman of Supervisory Committee: Professor Donald T. Williams, Jr.  
College of Education

Evidence that collective bargaining exists on the American campus appears in a variety of forms, among them regulatory legislation and ongoing news reporting. Both the scholarly and the popular press afford increasing attention to collective bargaining in higher education. Yet the body of objective inquiry into this subject remains scant. This inquiry seeks to gather and systematize information about collective bargaining among faculty and supportive professional personnel in higher education.

The Problem: The study addresses itself to these concerns: (1) ascertaining the incidence of collective bargaining activity involving faculty and supportive professional personnel, (2) determining the nature of the issues being negotiated, (3) extrapolating models of bargaining, and (4) analyzing and interpreting relationships suggested by incidence, issues, and models.

Design of the Study: An overall blending of conceptual and empirical techniques characterizes the inquiry. Following an introductory discussion which touches upon the underlying concepts of terminological confusion, the inseparability of academic governance and collective bargaining, and individual-group imputations in bargaining, three models of bargaining--the

ED 078809

AE004473

collegial model, the managerial model, and the union model--are developed conceptually from the relevant literature.

The empirical portion of the study consists of a national survey of American institutions of higher education. Survey data were gathered through a questionnaire mailed to two potential respondents at each of the sample institutions, the president or other chief officer and the chairman of a representative faculty organization. The sample consisted of 244 institutions selected randomly from those 2,551 American colleges and universities listed in the U.S. Office of Education's Education Directory. The institutional response rate was 78.27 percent with questionnaires returned by 273 respondents from 191 institutions.

Findings: Twenty-nine percent of the respondent institutions reported collective bargaining activity in three stages. Fifteen percent reported developmental-stage activity; 4 percent reported negotiations in progress, and 10 percent reported collective bargaining through the contract stage.

Economic issues such as fringe benefits, salaries, leaves, and tenure are reported as most often the subject matter of collective bargaining negotiations. Procedural issues such as due process, contact hours, and class size follow with few policy issues reported negotiated. All economic and procedural issues reported negotiated are reported twice as often by community college faculty as by faculties in all other institutional types. Although the incidence of policy issue negotiations, for example faculty code, curriculum, or degree offerings, is low in all types of institutions, more negotiation in this governance area is reported by university respondents than by any other group.

The greatest incidence of bargaining, that apparent in the community college, resembles but does not correspond in every respect to the union model. Public college bargaining corresponds somewhat to the manage-

rial model. Both private colleges and universities report bargaining which resembles the collegial model.

Parallels drawn between models of bargaining and bargaining organizations point out correspondences between the American Association of University Professors and the collegial model, between the National Education Association and the managerial model, and between the American Federation of Teachers and the union model.

A concluding schematic drawing calls attention to the fluid character of academic governance and its relationship to collective bargaining as structured in the conceptual models suggested.

**COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES: CONCEPTUAL MODELS AND A SURVEY OF INCIDENCE AND EXTENT AMONG FACULTY AND SUPPORTIVE PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL**  
 by Jean R. Kennelly, Higher Education, University of Washington, 1972  
**SUMMARY REPORT**

The sample consisted of 244 institutions selected randomly from those 2,551 American colleges and universities listed in the U.S. Office of Education's Education Directory, 1970. The institutional response rate was 78.27 percent with questionnaires returned by 273 respondents from 191 institutions.

Survey data were gathered through a questionnaire mailed to two potential respondents at each of the sample institutions, the president or other chief officer and the chairman of a representative faculty organization.

The first three tables which follow present survey data relative to incidence and extent of faculty collective bargaining, trends in faculty bargaining, and collective bargaining as a locus of decision-making in academic governance. The fourth table presents a summary of bargaining characteristics in terms of three conceptual models of collective bargaining in higher education: the collegial view, the managerial view, and the union view. The final two pages of the report present an overall summary of findings.

**Table 1--Distribution of Responses, Comparison of all Responses with Institutional Composite Responses, Incidence and Extent of Faculty Collective Bargaining**

| Incidence and Extent of Bargaining | Respondent Group or Institutional Composite | N = 273                | N = 191            |
|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------|
|                                    |   | Percent, All Responses | Percent, Composite |
| No evidence                        | All   | 40%                    | 31%                |
|                                    | University                                  | 36                     | 32                 |
|                                    | Public College                              | 29                     | 24                 |
|                                    | Private College                             | 62                     | 45                 |
|                                    | Community College                           | 27                     | 22                 |
| Talking stage                      | All   | 37%                    | 39%                |
|                                    | University                                  | 56                     | 44                 |
|                                    | Public College                              | 58                     | 52                 |
|                                    | Private College                             | 33                     | 46                 |
|                                    | Community College                           | 27                     | 26                 |
| Developmental stage                | All   | 13%                    | 15%                |
|                                    | University                                  | 15                     | 20                 |
|                                    | Public College                              | 11                     | 14                 |
|                                    | Private College                             | 8                      | 8                  |
|                                    | Community College                           | 17                     | 19                 |
| Negotiations stage                 | All   | 7%                     | 4%                 |
|                                    | University                                  | 0                      | 0                  |
|                                    | Public College                              | 0                      | 0                  |
|                                    | Private College                             | 0                      | 0                  |
|                                    | Community College                           | 17                     | 10                 |
| Contract stage                     | All   | 1%                     | 10%                |
|                                    | University                                  | 3                      | 4                  |
|                                    | Public College                              | 11                     | 10                 |
|                                    | Private College                             | 2                      | 2                  |
|                                    | Community College                           | 21                     | 21                 |

| Trend Perceived                   | Source of Responses         | Number | Percent |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|---------|
| No increase                       | All responding institutions | 1      | 0%      |
|                                   | Universities                | 0      | 0       |
|                                   | Public Colleges             | 0      | 0       |
|                                   | Private Colleges            | 1      | 1       |
|                                   | Community Colleges          | 0      | 0       |
| Clear increase                    | All responding institutions | 169    | 62%     |
|                                   | Universities                | 25     | 64      |
|                                   | Public Colleges             | 22     | 58      |
|                                   | Private Colleges            | 47     | 52      |
|                                   | Community Colleges          | 75     | 71      |
| Increase in<br>Limited areas      | All responding institutions | 58     | 21%     |
|                                   | Universities                | 8      | 21      |
|                                   | Public Colleges             | 7      | 18      |
|                                   | Private Colleges            | 28     | 31      |
|                                   | Community Colleges          | 15     | 14      |
| Developmental<br>Stage nationally | All responding institutions | 177    | 65%     |
|                                   | Universities                | 31     | 79      |
|                                   | Public Colleges             | 21     | 55      |
|                                   | Private Colleges            | 61     | 68      |
|                                   | Community Colleges          | 64     | 60      |
| Here to stay<br>Increase imminent | All responding institutions | 86     | 31%     |
|                                   | Universities                | 9      | 23      |
|                                   | Public Colleges             | 9      | 24      |
|                                   | Private Colleges            | 15     | 17      |
|                                   | Community Colleges          | 53     | 50      |
| No basis for<br>Predicting        | All responding institutions | 23     | 8%      |
|                                   | Universities                | 2      | 5       |
|                                   | Public Colleges             | 5      | 13      |
|                                   | Private Colleges            | 11     | 12      |
|                                   | Community Colleges          | 5      | 5       |

Table 2--Distribution of Responses, Perceptions of Trends in Faculty Collective Bargaining

N = 273

Note: The average respondent perceived 1.9 trends, a total of 514 for 273 respondents.



## GOVERNANCE AREAS

## DECISION-MAKING MODES

|                             | Collective bargaining |    | Faculty and administration shared |     | Faculty primary role |     | Administration primary role |     | Faculty, administration, student shared |     |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----|-----------------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----|---|-----|
|                             | N                     | %  | N                                 | %   | N                    | %   | N                           | %   | N                                       | %   |
| <b>Economic</b>             |                       |    |                                   |     |                      |     |                             |     |   |     |
| Tenure                      | 13                    | 5% | 132                               | 48% | 45                   | 17% | 49                          | 18% | 10                                      | 4%  |
| Salary                      | 40                    | 15 | 96                                | 35  | 7                    | 3   | 117                         | 43  | 7                                       | 3   |
| Fringe benefits             | 38                    | 14 | 104                               | 38  | 5                    | 2   | 96                          | 35  | 4                                       | 1   |
| Leaves                      | 25                    | 9  | 107                               | 39  | 23                   | 8   | 99                          | 36  | 2                                       | 1   |
| Promotion                   | 7                     | 3  | 130                               | 48  | 35                   | 13  | 65                          | 24  | 7                                       | 3   |
| Sub-category Mean           |                       | 9% |                                   | 42% |                      | 8%  |                             | 31% |   | 2%  |
| <b>Policy</b>               |                       |    |                                   |     |                      |     |                             |     |   |     |
| Faculty code                | 6                     | 2% | 120                               | 44% | 89                   | 33% | 20                          | 7%  | 3                                       | 1%  |
| Admissions policy           | 2                     | 1  | 111                               | 41  | 23                   | 8   | 101                         | 37  | 19                                      | 7   |
| Research policy             | 4                     | 1  | 116                               | 43  | 29                   | 11  | 75                          | 27  | 7                                       | 3   |
| Community service policy    | 1                     | 0  | 125                               | 46  | 6                    | 2   | 68                          | 25  | 26                                      | 10  |
| Student conduct             | 0                     | 0  | 48                                | 18  | 8                    | 3   | 36                          | 13  | 164                                     | 60  |
| Curriculum determination    | 2                     | 1  | 118                               | 43  | 78                   | 29  | 12                          | 4   | 65                                      | 24  |
| Degree offerings            | 1                     | 0  | 132                               | 48  | 46                   | 17  | 50                          | 18  | 20                                      | 7   |
| Sub-category Mean           |                       | 1% |                                   | 40% |                      | 15% |                             | 19% |   | 16% |
| <b>Procedural</b>           |                       |    |                                   |     |                      |     |                             |     |   |     |
| Selection of faculty        | 2                     | 1% | 137                               | 50% | 41                   | 15% | 58                          | 21% | 26                                      | 10% |
| Selection of administration | 2                     | 1  | 69                                | 25  | 3                    | 1   | 141                         | 52  | 39                                      | 14  |
| Due process                 | 29                    | 11 | 112                               | 41  | 41                   | 15  | 31                          | 11  | 30                                      | 11  |
| Contact hours (number of)   | 24                    | 9  | 119                               | 44  | 16                   | 6   | 94                          | 34  | 1                                       | 0   |
| Office space                | 11                    | 4  | 87                                | 32  | 7                    | 3   | 151                         | 55  | 0                                       | 0   |
| Secretarial assistance      | 12                    | 4  | 75                                | 27  | 4                    | 1   | 178                         | 65  | 0                                       | 0   |
| Class size                  | 14                    | 5  | 132                               | 48  | 32                   | 12  | 77                          | 28  | 5                                       | 2   |
| Budget allocation           | 2                     | 1  | 83                                | 30  | 1                    | 0   | 168                         | 62  | 10                                      | 4   |
| Personnel allocation        | 3                     | 1  | 82                                | 30  | 5                    | 2   | 171                         | 63  | 4                                       | 1   |
| Sub-category Mean           |                       | 4% |                                   | 37% |                      | 6%  |                             | 44% |   | 5%  |
| Mean Category Response      |                       | 5% |                                   | 38% |                      | 10% |                             | 31% |   | 8%  |

N = 273

Table 3--Distribution of Responses, Collective Bargaining as a Locus of

Table 4--Summary of Conceptual Models of Collective Bargaining in American Higher Education

| Models of Bargaining                |   |  |                                  |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Characteristics                     | COLLEGIAL MODEL                           | MANAGERIAL MODEL   | UNION MODEL                      |
| ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE                 | shared authority                          | imposed authority  | negotiated authority             |
| Decision-making locus               | consensus within the community            | involvement according to hierarchical position (faculty advisory)  | balance of power                 |
| Final authority                     | community                                 | administration   | bargaining process               |
| Faculty role                        | scholars and institutional officers       | professional employees   | professional employees           |
| Administration role                 | facilitators and institutional officers   | managers   | employers and managers           |
| Faculty-administration relationship | community of interest; commonality        | community of interest; subordination (after bargaining, adversity) | conflict of interest; adversity  |
| COLLECTIVE BARGAINING               |   |  |                                  |
| Purpose                             | protection of academic freedom and tenure | protection of legitimate governance                                | protection of employee rights    |
| Terminology                         | collective bargaining                     | professional negotiations  | collective bargaining            |
| Degree of necessity                 | as last resort only                       | to be avoided if possible  | essential                        |
| Bargaining organizations            | AAUP, faculty senate                      | NEA (when bargaining becomes unavoidable)                          | AFT, NEA                         |
| ORIENTATIONS                        |   |  |                                  |
| Historical                          | medieval scholars' guilds                 | industrial scientific management                                   | the labor movement               |
| Structural                          | community                                 | bureaucracy  | bureaucracy                      |
| Goal                                | search for truth                          | efficiency, productivity   | accountability                   |
| Individual-group                    | the individual                            | the group  | the individual through the group |



## OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

### A. THE NATIONAL SURVEY

#### 1. Incidence and extent of collective bargaining involving faculty and supportive professional personnel

Twenty-nine percent of the respondent institutions report collective bargaining activity in three stages. Fifteen percent report developmental-stage activity, four percent report negotiations in progress, and ten percent report collective bargaining through the contract stage.

#### 2. Relative incidence and extent of bargaining in four identified types of higher education institutions; universities, public senior colleges, private senior colleges, and community colleges

The greatest incidence and extent of collective bargaining occurs in community colleges where nearly half of all higher education faculty bargaining takes place. Fifty percent of the community colleges report bargaining activity in developmental through contract stages, with ongoing activity divided in approximately equal portions among the three stages. Twenty-four percent of the universities report bargaining activity, chiefly in the developmental stage; and twenty-four percent of the public colleges also report bargaining activity, slightly more in the developmental than in the contract stage. The lowest incidence of bargaining occurs in private colleges where ~~eighteen~~ <sup>eighteen</sup> percent report collective bargaining in progress, chiefly in the ~~negotiations~~ <sup>negotiations</sup> stage.

#### 3. Overall incidence of negotiation of typical issues and relative incidence of issues negotiated in identified types of higher education institutions

Economic issues such as fringe benefits, salaries, leaves, and tenure are reported as most often the subject matter of collective bargaining negotiations. Procedural issues such as due process, contact hours, and class size follow with few policy issues reported negotiated. All economic and procedural issues reported negotiated are reported twice as often by community college faculty as by faculties in all other institutional types. Although the incidence of policy issue negotiations, for example faculty code, curriculum, or degree offerings, is low in all types of institutions, more negotiation in this governance area is reported by university respondents than by any other group.

### B. MODELS OF BARGAINING

#### 1. Discernible models of bargaining in American higher education

Three models, models which might be labeled the collegial view, the managerial view, and the union view are discernible.

#### 2. Incidence of apparent models of bargaining by types of colleges and universities

The greatest incidence of bargaining, that apparent in the community college, resembles but does not correspond in every respect with the union model. Within

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (continued)

any given institutional type--university, public college, private college, or community college--only one of the three models appears to correspond with bargaining activity reported. Public college bargaining corresponds somewhat to the managerial model, and both private colleges and universities report bargaining which resembles the collegial model.

### 3. Relative incidence of negotiation of typical issues by apparent models of bargaining

In bargaining with each institutional type--and by that model each resembles-- economic issues are most frequently negotiated. Specifically, in order of frequency, fringe benefits, salary, and due process are most frequently negotiated in community colleges. In public senior colleges, where negotiation is next most prevalent, salary and fringe benefits are negotiated with equal frequency, followed by leaves and due process. In universities, issues most often negotiated are salary, fringe benefits, leaves, and contact hours. And in private colleges where the least bargaining occurs, salary, due process, and secretarial assistance, in that order, are the issues most often reported negotiated. Withal, salary appears as the most consistently and most frequently negotiated issue.