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ABSTRACT

DECISION-MAKING AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: A COMPARISON OF FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AT UNIONIZED AND NON-UNIONIZED PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The purpose of this research was to analyze faculty perceptions of their input into decision-making and their level of organizational commitment, and to analyze any differences based upon whether or not the faculty participated in collective bargaining. In addition, the study investigated these perceptions with respect to certain demographics including age, gender, rank, tenure, discipline, and years of employment at the current institution. The population for this study included the full-time faculty at 10 private colleges and universities in the United States. The sample participants in this study were 850 full-time, randomly selected faculty members. Questionnaires were mailed and a 42% usable return rate was achieved.

The method of analysis was by survey. The instrument used to analyze the data was comprised of four sections: demographic information; the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday, Steers and Porter (1979); a 28-item section developed by the author to measure satisfaction with decision-making; and an open-ended question designed to elicit qualitative data. For statistical purposes, the One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), t test, and Pearson Correlation were used.

There were seven hypotheses in this study. The results revealed that there were no significant differences in faculty perceptions toward input into decision-making and level of organizational commitment at unionized and non-unionized institutions. There was, however, a moderately high correlation between organizational commitment and input into decision-making at both unionized and non-unionized institutions.
Copyright © 2001 by Mary J. Meehan
All Rights Reserved
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge many individuals who provided guidance, support and encouragement throughout this project. The idea for this research arose from the campus of Seton Hall University where I participated in many collegial discussions about faculty collective bargaining. Without the faculty’s willingness to share their views with me, I might never have had the fortitude to take on this work.

My dissertation committee, under the direction of Dr. Joseph Stetar, has supplied me with ideas, encouragement and feedback—all within an environment of collegiality. In addition to Dr. Stetar, I am grateful to Dr. John Collins, Dr. Mary Ruzicka, and Dr. Lucinda San Giovanni for the cappuccinos, SPSS support, and the reminder that I was first, and always will remain, a student of sociology.

I am also grateful to the faculty at Seton Hall University who participated in the pilot study of the survey instrument. Their comments and constructive criticisms were extremely helpful to me.

The faculty who participated in this study deserve special mention for their generosity and willingness to help a struggling graduate student. Without them, there would be no research.

It was Monsignor Robert Sheeran, president of Seton Hall University, who brought me to the University, and it has been his friendship, support and laughter that have kept me at this work. I am also grateful to my colleagues at Seton Hall for showing interest, and for extending their friendship at every phase of this doctoral degree.
In a very special way, I would like to thank Father Paul Holmes, associate provost at the University. Paul’s friendship, scholarship and editorial expertise gave me the confidence to reach the end of my long journey to a doctorate.

And finally, I would like to thank the Seton Hall community. This past year has been our most painful, but we came through the tragedy of 19 January 2000 mindful that we are people of hope.

Hazard Zet Forward!

4 January 2001

Feast of St. Elizabeth Ann Seton
DEDICATION

I lovingly dedicate this work to my parents,
Eugene and Mary Lee Meehan.

They would have been proud to finally have a “doctor” in the family.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................................................ iii

DEDICATION ....................................................................................... v

LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................. viii

LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................... ix

I  INTRODUCTION ............................................................................ 1

  Statement of the Problem ............................................................. 3
  The Research Question ............................................................... 5
  Subsidiary Questions .................................................................... 5
  Definition of Terms ...................................................................... 6
  Assumptions ................................................................................ 8
  Limitations ................................................................................ 9
  Significance of the Research ...................................................... 10
  Organization of the Research ..................................................... 13

II  REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .................................................. 14

  History of Collective Bargaining in Private Colleges and Universities 16
  Organizational Culture and Change ........................................... 23
  Organizational Commitment ....................................................... 35
  Governance and Decision-Making ............................................. 39
  Summary .................................................................................... 47

III  METHODOLOGY .......................................................................... 49

  Design ......................................................................................... 49
  Data Collection ........................................................................... 54
  Method of Analysis .................................................................... 55

IV  RESULTS AND FINDINGS .......................................................... 56

  Response rate ............................................................................. 56
  Frequency Data .......................................................................... 57
  Background Information ............................................................ 58
IV RESULTS AND FINDINGS (cont’d)

Research Question 1 .................................................. 66
Research Question 2 .................................................. 71
Research Question 3 .................................................. 74
Research Question 4 .................................................. 78
Research Question 5 .................................................. 81
Research Question 6 .................................................. 82
Research Question 7 .................................................. 83
Qualitative Data ......................................................... 84
Summary of Findings .................................................. 85

V CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ............................. 87

Introduction ............................................................ 87
Conclusions ............................................................ 88
Subsidiary Question 1 .................................................. 88
Subsidiary Question 2 .................................................. 89
Subsidiary Question 3 .................................................. 90
Subsidiary Question 4 .................................................. 92
Subsidiary Questions 5 and 6 ......................................... 93
Subsidiary Question 7 .................................................. 94
Summary of Conclusions ................................................. 95
Recommendations for Further Research ............................ 97

REFERENCES .................................................................. 100

APPENDIXES

A  Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval Letter .................. 117
B  Cover Letter to Participants ............................................. 119
C  Survey Instrument ..................................................... 121
D  Qualitative Comments .................................................. 126
LIST OF TABLES

1  Response Rates for Participating Institutions ......................................... 58
2  Frequency for Age of Respondents ......................................................... 59
3  Frequency for Gender of Respondents ..................................................... 60
4  Frequency for Tenure Status of Respondents .......................................... 61
5  Frequency for Respondents Denied Tenure or Promotion .......................... 61
6  Frequency for Rank of Respondents ....................................................... 62
7  Frequency for Academic Discipline of Respondents .................................. 63
8  Frequency for Terminal Degree Status of Respondents ............................. 64
9  Frequency for Years at Current Institution of Respondents ....................... 65
10 Frequency for Administrative Position of Respondents ................................ 66
11 T-test for Independent Sample: Union and Non-union Scores for
   Decision-making ....................................................................................... 70
12 One-way ANOVA: Decision Input at Non-unionized Institutions ............... 72
13 One-way ANOVA: Decision Input at Unionized Institutions ..................... 73
14 T-test for Independent Sample: Union and Non-union Scores
   for Organizational Commitment ................................................................ 77
15 One-way ANOVA: Organizational Commitment at Non-Unionized Institutions 79
16 One-way ANOVA: Organizational Commitment at Unionized Institutions .... 80
17 Correlation Between Organizational Commitment and Decision-Making among Unionized Respondents ...................................................... 81
18 Correlation Between Organizational Commitment and Decision-Making among Non-unionized Respondents ............................................. 82
19 One-way ANOVA: Academic Discipline for Combined Groups
   and Decision-making and Organizational Commitment .......................... 84
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are many critics who bemoan the state of leadership in American colleges and universities (Gerber, 1997) and who believe that the current leadership is not prepared for the future (Callan & Finney, 1993); others argue that the problems facing higher education must be addressed if colleges and universities are to fulfill the expectations of the American people. Within this same context, critics contend that academic standards have been lowered and grade inflation is rampant even on the most prestigious campuses (Basinger, 1997; Gose, 1997). Technology has emerged as not only a resource glutton, but as a source of conflict on many campuses as technology competes, and often wins the battle for resources (Trachtenberg, 1996). These and other challenges have emerged side by side with public demand for accountability, and decreasing support for financial aid and other sources of funding (U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

In addition to these challenges, higher education has experienced periods of growth and retrenchment since World War II (Dooris & Lozier, 1990; Keller, 1983). During these years of record expansion, colleges and universities have assumed that students and finances would be readily available for the foreseeable future and planned accordingly.
Ultimately, the faculty must meet these complex challenges. Given the state of affairs on colleges and university campuses, one question that emerges is whether faculty collective bargaining presents a mechanism for faculty to expand and strengthen their role in decision-making as one of the means of addressing these complex issues. There have been studies which have examined the effect of unionization on academic compensation and working conditions (Williams, 1987), but there is little research regarding the impact of faculty unionization on the professor as professional. As an example, almost twenty years ago, Baldridge, Kemerer, Adams, Najita, Naples, Schlesinger, and Thompson (1981) studied the impact of collective bargaining on governance and decision-making, and reported that respondents believed that faculty unions have been least effective on campuses in strengthening faculty governance, and in enhancing professional standing. Other studies have clearly demonstrated that collective bargaining can be an effective mechanism not only for improving compensation and influence in economic matters (Schuster, 1977), but also for improving faculty morale, as well (Rusnak, 1984).

By 1980, union contracts expanded beyond compensation to include such areas as staff reduction provisions and non-appointment (Gilmore, 1981). Faculty often turned to collective bargaining when they perceived that their role in decision-making was limited and ineffective. Williams and Zirkel (1989) noted that "after compensation issues, the level of participation in institutional decision-making was a major determinant in the degree of expressed support for collective bargaining" (p. 76). As further evidence, Brown (1975) discovered
that the extent to which faculties were allowed to participate in decision-making had a significant effect on the faculty’s attitudes toward collective bargaining. Brown found an inverse level of participation in institutional decision-making was a major determinant in the degree of relationship between participation level and pro-collective bargaining attitude. Wilson (1979) found that members of both the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) perceived that collective bargaining significantly increased faculty influence on campus governance beyond compensation issues.

If institutions that have faculty collective bargaining units also have faculty with higher levels of satisfaction with their input into decision-making, this would be important information for both faculty and administrators who must face increasingly complex issues while simultaneously undergoing a decrease in academic resources.

Statement of the Problem

In reviewing the environment over the past 20 years, two conclusions are apparent: collective bargaining has had but modest expansion in private colleges and universities; and changes in the balance of power and influence between administrations and faculty may have occurred. While the 1980 Yeshiva decision may have sounded the death-knell for collective bargaining at private institutions, it does not explain the limited growth in the public sector. As of 1997, less than five percent of faculty at private colleges, and only 50% of
faculty at public institutions, were unionized. Academic unions represent 250,716 professors with 509 bargaining agents at 1,097 two- and four-year colleges in the United States. There are 10,423 unionized faculty members in private four-year colleges, with 60 bargaining agents on 78 campuses. In 1996, twelve elections took place resulting in nine new contracts. All of these elections took place in public institutions (Hurd, Foerster, & Gotbaum, 1997).

Within the past several years, there have been what may be the stirrings of interest in faculty collective bargaining units at several private colleges. The faculty at Manhattan College, for instance, sought and received NLRB approval in late 1999 to conduct an election in January 2000. While the faculty at Manhattan subsequently voted against collective bargaining, the option to unionize is now available to this faculty should they wish to conduct an election in the future. Several other private colleges and universities are also in the process of seeking unionization. A group of faculty at Seton Hall University in New Jersey has initiated legal proceedings to overturn a prior Yeshiva decision prohibiting unionization at the university. The faculty at the University of Great Falls, Montana, has a similar petition before the NLRB, as does Sacred Heart University in Connecticut (Leatherman, 2000).

Although there are data regarding the number of institutions that have collective bargaining units, very little research has been conducted concerning the models of faculty influence in decision-making processes. If collective bargaining is selected by academics as a means of obtaining more influence, increasing job satisfaction and, ultimately, a greater commitment to the
institution, then it follows that academics, administrators, organized labor, and students of faculty governance would benefit from access to data and conclusions about the significance of unionized and non-unionized faculty perceptions regarding their satisfaction with their role in decision-making, and their level of perceived organizational commitment.

The Research Question

The primary purpose of this study is to determine if there are differences in faculty perceptions of the work environment in private colleges and universities with, and those without, faculty collective bargaining units.

Subsidiary Questions

What are the differences, if any, between faculty employed by private colleges or universities with collective bargaining units, and those employed by private colleges or universities without collective bargaining units, regarding degree of satisfaction with their role in decision-making?

What are the differences, if any, in the characteristics (age, gender, tenure status, rank, discipline, and years of employment at current institution) of faculty employed by private colleges or universities with collective bargaining units, and those employed by private colleges or universities without collective bargaining units and the degree of satisfaction with role in decision-making?

What are the differences, if any, between faculty employed by a private college or university with a collective bargaining unit and those employed by a
private college or university without a collective bargaining unit regarding organizational commitment?

What are the differences, if any, in the characteristics (age, gender, tenure status, rank, discipline, and years of employment at current institution) of faculty employed by private colleges and universities with a collective bargaining unit, and those without a collective bargaining unit regarding organizational commitment?

Among faculty employed by a private college or university with a collective bargaining unit, what is the relationship between the variable of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

Among faculty employed by a private college or university without a collective bargaining unit, what is the relationship between the variable of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

What are the differences, if any, in the characteristic of academic discipline of faculty employed by a private college and university and the degree of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

**Definition of Terms**

Bargaining agent: “An external organization that is selected by a given constituency to represent its interests with management. The agent is the representative of all members of the unit. Decisions in respect to bargaining demands and the acceptance of bargained-out decisions are controlled by the principle of majority rule” (Wollett, 1973, p. 24). The three major bargaining
units in the United States are the AAUP, the National Education Association and the AFT (Hurd, Foerster, & Gotbaum, 1997).

**Collective Bargaining:** "A system of representative government in which members of a body politic participate, through a designated organizational representative, in decision-making which affects their working environment—salaries, terms and conditions of employment, and other matters related to their interests as an occupational group" (Wollett, 1973, p. 24).

**Faculty Senate:** "An academic, or faculty, senate is an internal organization financed with institutional funds. The senate is typically a representative form of government whereby the elected senators constitute a deliberative body empowered to act directly or through committees or officers" (Wollett, 1973, p. 38).

**Governance:** "The processes and structures through which individuals and groups participate in and influence decision processes in higher education. Traditionally, particular attention is given to defining and differentiating the appropriate roles of various campus constituencies and major decision structures and processes" (Schuster, Smith, Corak, & Yamada, 1994, pp. 14-17).

**National Labor Relations Act (NLRA):** This act applies to private colleges and universities with a gross annual income of one million dollars or more. The Act limits the mandatory subjects of bargaining to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment and the conditions of employment (Wollett, 1973).

**Participation in decision-making:** The consultation and involvement of interested parties in the making of decisions that subsequently affect them
(Schuster et al., 1994).

Organizational culture: “A set of cognitions that are shared by all or many members of a social unit and that are acquired through social learning and socialization processes; they include values, common understandings and patterns of beliefs and expectations” (Kabanoff, 1993, p. 10).

Organizational commitment: can be characterized by “three related factors: (1) a strong belief in, and acceptance of, the organization’s goals and values; (2) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization; and (3) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization” (Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian, 1974, p. 604). Organizational commitment is hypothesized to be more stable over time than is job satisfaction since job satisfaction is more affected by day-to-day events (Zahra, 1984).

NLRB v. Yeshiva University: In 1980, the United States Supreme Court ruled in a 5-4 decision that the faculty at New York’s Yeshiva University were managerial based on their role in decision-making at the university. Based on this decision, many private colleges and universities in the United States petitioned to have their unions decertified. This decision is considered by many to be the “death knell” for unionization movements in private colleges and universities (Douglas, 1990).

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made to conduct this study:

1. The principle of shared academic governance between faculty and
administrators is accepted at the institutions studied.

2. The colleges and universities studied have similar missions as
determined through a content analysis of web-site materials.

3. The colleges and universities studied share a view that
organizational commitment as defined for purposes of this study is
a positive condition contributing to an effective work environment.

Limitations

The following limitations are relevant to this study:

1. The research was limited to private institutions that are protected
under the NLRA. The effect of state labor laws was not addressed
in this research.

2. The study was limited to measuring only faculty perceptions of
decision-making and organizational commitment at their respective
institutions. Additionally, administrators and key institutional
leaders were not interviewed. The richness and depth of an
interview process might have amplified, and even contradicted,
some of the findings in this study.

3. There is no intent to infer causality from the relationships found
between and among the variables. Faculty collective bargaining is
a complex phenomenon with multiple causal factors. The approach
in this research has been to identify possible relationships of a
specific environmental factor as perceived by individual faculty
members.

4. The lack of similar studies limits comparison of this study with previous research.

**Significance of the Research**

The effects of faculty collective bargaining on the social climate of the academy have been cited as a concern by writers such as Schaefer (1987) and Birnbaum and Inman (1984). These writers posit that collective bargaining by faculty is not in keeping with the collegial and traditional atmosphere of the academy; however, there is little evidence in the literature to support the view that actual incompatibility between the university and the union is inevitable (Wilson, 1992).

Faculty believe that their voice is important when decisions are made, but that their authority is declining (Williams, Gore, Broches, & Lostoski, 1987). The current environment of increased accountability and competition, coupled with concurrent decreases in resources, suggest that research is needed to determine whether or not collective bargaining may provide a mechanism for increased satisfaction with decision-making and a stronger commitment to the institution.

A central tenet of decision-making is that, as a process and product, it should be based on a vision shared by leaders and members of the institution (Chan, 1988). A corollary is that members throughout the organization should not only share the vision, but also have opportunities for establishing goals and
objectives as well as developing specific strategies to achieve them (Simerly, 1991). Broad-based consensus is imperative because “participation promotes legitimacy and eventually cooperation” (Adler & Lane, 1988, p. 31).

McCormack (1995) reported that “there appears to be an innate philosophical difference within the structure of higher education as to the effectiveness and potential of the participatory governance process in the management of institutions” (p. 6). Additionally, while administrators are expected to promote decision-making opportunities (AAUP, 1973), they also have the legal authority to bar faculty from governing activities (Miles, 1987). These are philosophical differences that require additional exploration—exploration that is based on data, rather than preconceived and often long-held beliefs that are based on tradition.

There are generally thought to be three conditions which are necessary for establishing a climate conducive to faculty collective bargaining (Carr & Van Eyck, 1973). Labor law must protect the right of the faculty to organize and it must require that institutions enter into bargaining with the duly elected representatives of the bargaining unit. Also, faculty must be measurably dissatisfied with their current situation. According to Kemerer and Baldridge (1975), faculty discontent is typically focused on two issues—adverse compensation and a sense that they have insufficient input into decision-making. The final condition is that there must be a group of faculty who proactively promote the formation of a union.

It is an obvious but often-overlooked fact that one of the reasons faculty
choose to engage in collective bargaining is precisely because they already perceive a lack of involvement in the institution. Collective bargaining, therefore, is not necessarily the cause of conflict and lack of collegiality, but often the result of these conditions. A critical question is whether, after a mature union is in place, the satisfaction with decision-making and the level of commitment is different from those institutions where faculty do not engage in bargaining.

Moore and Amey (1993) declared that the evidence concerning the efficacy of faculty collective bargaining is inconclusive. They suggest that the real impact of unions might well be in the areas of governance, rather than in truly increasing compensation and benefits. In addition, Moore and Amey were skeptical about the long-term ability of unions to deliver on their promise to address complex issues facing colleges and universities.

While it is not certain that faculty collective bargaining is an effective mechanism for enhancing faculty's input into decision-making, it is clear from the literature that colleges and universities must be prepared to respond quickly and effectively to the rapidly increasing demands of both external and internal constituencies. Some argue that faculty collective bargaining creates divided loyalties and in such environments the institution loses the struggle for the faculty's commitment. However, absent research on these two dimensions, it is evident that research focusing on possible differences between unionized and non-unionized faculty could provide additional points for an informed discussion on the merits of faculty collective bargaining.
Organization of the Research

This research is organized in five chapters. Chapter I provides the background information, including the definition of terms, the research question and subsidiary questions, assumptions and limitations of the study, and the significance of the research.

Chapter I summarizes the major related work including a history of faculty collective bargaining, a summary of the work on organizational culture and change, as well as relevant research in the areas of organizational commitment, and governance and decision-making in higher education.

Chapter III describes the design, development, and piloting of the instrument, the methods of analysis, and data collection.

Chapter IV details the outcomes of the methodology chapter: response rate, demographic information, qualitative data, and statistical analysis including ANOVA, t-tests, and correlations. The qualitative data are summarized and appended to this research.

Chapter V summarizes all of the chapters highlighting the purpose of the research, the statement of the research questions and subsidiary questions, and discussion of the findings, as well as the recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature identified no research that specifically addressed the subject studied by this dissertation: faculty perceptions of organizational commitment and decision-making at private colleges with, and those without, faculty collective bargaining units. The literature is replete with information on faculty input into decision-making, as well as much information on the history of faculty collective bargaining units. Parallel studies examine organizational commitment in the corporate and health care environments, but little has been written regarding faculty and their perceptions of their own organizational commitment (Fjortoft, 1993; Harshbarger, 1988).

A significant portion of the literature on faculty collective bargaining may be characterized as historical perspectives or anecdotes, and while it contains helpful expositions of the conditions that precede and follow collective bargaining, there is minimal analysis. According to Jung and Liu (1982), the literature in the field of faculty collective bargaining is more focused on the causes of bargaining than with the consequences. The literature on faculty collective bargaining treats such issues as the contents and scope of bargaining contracts (Rhoades, 1998); extent of faculty unionization (Garbarino, 1975; Hurd et al., 1997); faculty satisfaction with unions (Gomez-Mejia & Balkin,
1984; Neumann & Finlay-Neumann, 1990); administrators’ attitudes toward faculty unions (Odewahn & Spritzer, 1976); and factors associated with the decision to unionize (Williams & Zirbel, 1989). Hemmasi and Graf (1993) state that “most investigations of employee unionization, both in the university and in other settings, are criticized for lacking explicit theoretical frameworks” (p. 14). In addition to a lack of theoretical framework, there appears to be cyclical interest in a number of issues such as decision-making and compensation, but there is little sustained interest on any given issue. There is a dearth, therefore, of both theoretical and longitudinal data.

The review of the literature is presented in four general areas relevant to this study. First, the author provided a history of faculty collective bargaining in the United States. Second, the author reviewed the literature relating to organizational culture and climate, and the impact of culture and climate on the decisions made by faculty either to pursue or to oppose collective bargaining. Third, the author has provided a summary of the relevant literature on organizational commitment in order to determine if, in conjunction with the faculty’s role in decision-making, it is possible to suggest differences on these dimensions between unionized and non-unionized faculty. And, fourth, the author reviewed pertinent literature on faculty decision-making itself. Higher education’s unique governance structure, based on the principles of shared governance and collegiality, often leads to conflict in practice. Forces that inhibit cooperation between faculty and administrators are identified, as such conflicts are often associated with a given faculty’s decision to form collective
bargaining units.

History of Collective Bargaining in Private Colleges and Universities

The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) first appeared in higher education in 1951, when it was asked to certify the Council of Industrial Organizations (CIO) as the bargaining agent for clerical workers at Columbia University libraries (Rhodes & Smith, 1977). The NLRB declined to assert its jurisdictional power in a non-profit educational institution. It was not until the landmark cases in 1970 at Syracuse University and Cornell University that the NLRB asserted its jurisdiction in an educational institution. The NLRB intervened in these cases because it determined that both of these private institutions had a significant impact on interstate commerce, and it was therefore in the national interest to have application of national labor policy. At the time of the ruling, the decision only included non-professional workers, but just two years later, the NLRB ruled that full-time faculty are not managers and could be eligible for private sector bargaining (Rhodes & Smith, 1977).

In the early 1970s a combination of forces caused the rate of growth in higher education to begin declining. Contributing factors included an economic recession, the end of the military draft, budget cuts for state and federal governments, and a drop-off in the number of high school graduates (Cope, 1987; Keller, 1983). These conditions contributed to a climate conducive to collective bargaining.

As the body of blue-collar workers began to shrink in the United States,
there was a corresponding increase in collective bargaining by professionals beginning in the late 1960s. By 1976, 17.4% of all union members were professionals (Chamot, 1976). Chamot (1976) suggested that the rapid rise can be attributed to a number of reasons, perhaps none more provocative than the notion that the nature of modern professional work is routine and non-challenging. Chamot defined a professional as one who is compensated for services rendered, and as one who is a member of a special group to which admission is gained only after advanced or specialized study.

In writing about the movement on campuses to form collective bargaining units, Chamot (1976) stated that in places faculties unionized, the primary concerns were “job security and the somewhat related, but much broader subject of university governance” (p. 122). Chamot continued to posit that colleges were moving away from the system of collegiality as they hired full time administrators with the goal of increasing productivity. In Chamot’s view, unionization was a method for faculty to improve its bargaining position with a too-powerful administration. Further supporting this concept, Allen and Keaveny (1981) suggested that if faculty perceived their salaries to be inadequate, regardless of whether the salary was commensurate with similarly ranked academicians at other schools, the motivation to join a union was strong.

The first collective bargaining contract for the faculty at a post-secondary institution was signed in 1963 at a two-year school—Milwaukee Technical Institute. The first strike was at Henry Ford Community College in Michigan in 1966, the same year that the faculty at the Merchant Marine Academy became
the first to unionize at a four-year college. During 1968 and 1969, the faculty at City University in New York, Central Michigan University and Southeastern Massachusetts University attracted attention as the first instances of collective bargaining units at major four-year institutions (Mortimer, 1982).

Mortimer (1982) stressed that the period of the 1970s was characterized by several key trends. Faculty collective bargaining was primarily a phenomenon in the public sector. According to the National Center for the Study of Faculty Collective Bargaining and the Professions, there were less than 400 campuses with faculty unions in 1975, and 86% of these were public institutions. (These data are for two- and four-year institutions.) During the 1970s, the growth in faculty unions closely paralleled the development of legislation in a number of key states in the East and Midwest (Mortimer, 1982).

Collective bargaining efforts at private colleges and universities were seriously dominated by the 1980 decision of the United States Supreme Court in NLRB v. Yeshiva University. In 1974, the Yeshiva University Faculty Association filed a petition with the NLRB requesting certification as a bargaining agent for the faculty of 10 of the then 13 schools within Yeshiva University. The NLRB ruled in favor of the faculty and directed an election. The administration of the University refused to bargain and the union sought enforcement in the legal system. The Court of Appeals of the Second Circuit Court reversed the NLRB ruling and defined the employees as managerial. The faculty union then proceeded to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court held that the faculty at Yeshiva University were
managers and, therefore, not covered by the NLRA. In a 5-to-4 ruling, Justice Powell emphasized that employees are ineligible to bargain under the NLRA if they also have supervisory or managerial responsibilities. Powell ruled that the faculty at Yeshiva University exercise authority that, in any other context, unquestionably would be managerial. He cited the faculty’s “absolute” authority in academic affairs. Powell wrote that “the faculty determines, within each school, the product to be produced, the terms upon which it will be offered, and the customers who will be served” (NLRB v. Yeshiva University, 1980). Powell also pointed to the faculty’s role in hiring, tenure, sabbaticals, promotion and termination. Concluding that faculty members may act in their own interest, rather than the interest of their employers, Powell claimed that faculty independence only increases the danger of divided loyalty which the managerial exclusion is designed to prevent. In Powell’s opinion, Yeshiva University’s extraordinary reliance on the faculty’s judgment in formulating academic policy made the danger of divided loyalty acute.

Prior to the Yeshiva decision, the NLRB and other courts had declared only a handful of professions beyond the protection of the NLRA. For example, head nurses, academic chairs, and engineers had previously been excluded from NLRA protection. In NLRB v. Yeshiva, the Supreme Court excluded from NLRA protection a very large group of professionals.

Following the 1980 Yeshiva decision, union organization in private colleges and universities declined significantly. As of 1997, the National Center for the Study of Faculty Collective Bargaining and the Professions reported that
less then 5% of four-year private colleges and universities had faculty collective bargaining units (Hurd et al., 1997); however, there has been a recent interest on several private campuses including Manhattan College, Sacred Heart University and Seton Hall University. The NLRB recently ruled that the faculty at Manhattan College were not managerial and, therefore, were protected under the NLRA. (While the faculty at Manhattan were permitted under the law to form a collective bargaining unit, the faculty did not have a majority of the votes necessary to form a unit. The courts have yet to decide the matter at Sacred Heart University and Seton Hall University, although there are petitions before the NLRB.)

Thirteen days after the Yeshiva decision, the administration of the University of New Haven announced that the university was terminating bargaining relationships with its faculty union. At the time, the university and the union were negotiating their third contract. Within one year of the Yeshiva decision, there were 35 cases in which private colleges and universities took the position that their faculty are managerial and consequently excluded from bargaining (Hurd et al., 1997).

The reaction to collective bargaining by faculty at private colleges and universities seems to fit into several categories (Rabban, 1987). Many faculty consider autonomy from bureaucratic control, participation in organizational decision-making, and rewards based on individual merit inherent in the very definition of the term professional. Many professionals believe that collective bargaining inevitably destroys the very nature of professional work. In this view,
collective bargaining may be appropriate for industrial or clerical workers, but it is inconsistent with professional status.

Others, however, view collective bargaining as a legally enforceable method to preserve or obtain the same prerogatives of professional status that their colleagues perceive unions to threaten. Many proponents of collective bargaining encourage the development of collective bargaining methods appropriate to the distinctive backgrounds, roles, abilities and interests of professionals.

Faculty compensation has been, and remains, one of the major bargaining issues in union contracts. In the early 1970s, there was a debate among advocates and opponents as to the effect of bargaining on compensation packages. Birnbaum (1976) suggested that the relationship between unionization and compensation might not be as strong as initially reported because the increases at public institutions had stabilized. Johnstone (1981) discovered that the percentage of increase in the 1970s for unionized versus non-unionized campuses demonstrated a definite increase of more than 1% in each of the years reported for those with collective bargaining contracts. Brown and Stone (1977) found no significant differences in compensation when regional data were included. Mortimer (1982) observed that faculty at private institutions where there are unions were compensated better than their colleagues at public institutions during this period. During the 1970s, there was a decided increase in support for faculty unionization, even for the more controversial issues such as engaging in strikes. Graf, Hemmasi, Newgren, and Nielsen (1994), for example, stated that in a 1977 survey, the Carnegie Commission had reported that 61% of
professors surveyed perceived faculty strikes as a legitimate means of action, a figure that represented a 14% increase over a 1969 survey.

In summarizing faculty collective bargaining in the 1980s, Matteoli (1987) stated that the NLRB’s post-Yesiva decisions substantiated that the Board was inconsistent in its rulings; however, he also contended that the Board’s decisions have departed from the criteria used by the Supreme Court, and that the rulings tended to see if faculty played a “dominant” rather than “significant” role in managerial decisions. Matteoli also recognized that despite this more pro-union interpretation of the Supreme Court, only five percent of all private colleges had faculty collective bargaining units at the end of the 1980s.

By 1990, 65 bargaining units were in place in the private sector (similar to the number in 1979), in contrast to the public sector which grew from 270 to 384 during this same time period (Douglas & Or, 1990).

While the faculty views of collective bargaining have changed in some instances as evidenced by the decision to decertify unions (Hurd et al., 1997), and the limited growth of collective bargaining, the administrative perspective has remained constant through the years. Examining the administrative perspective, it may be safe to presume that administrators remain convinced that shared governance and collective bargaining are not compatible. In almost every case in which faculty have petitioned for a collective bargaining agent, the administration has initiated legal action to block the union (Hurd et al., 1997). An exception is Goddard College. In 2000, the Board of Trustees and administration supported the faculty’s decision to unionize because of the
college's tradition of decision-making based on democratic principles. As one observer of collective bargaining noted, "bargaining tends to foster adversarial relationships, while shared governance rests on trusting relationships; bargaining tends to assume a basic conflict of interest between employer and employee, while shared governance assumes a convergence of interests in the good of the university" (C. A. Clark, 1981, p. 468).

Organizational Culture and Change

The growing body of scholarship on organizational culture in the private sector has recently expanded to include limited but systematic study of organizational culture and change in higher education (Austin, 1992; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; B. R. Clark, 1987a, 1987b; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1988). There are perhaps as many models of academic culture as there are colleges and universities. As there are persistent calls for the implementation of change in colleges and universities throughout the country, it is increasingly important to understand the processes by which shared meaning is created through leadership and decision-making in these institutions. As Bila & Miller (1997) state:

"Although attempts at reforming higher education through faculty-driven mechanisms have become somewhat popular, little has been done to form an understanding of the cultures which embody the academic enterprise" (p. 4).

If colleges and universities are to respond to the demands for increased accountability, flexibility, along with decreasing resources, it is important to understand the potential for change present within institutions of higher
education. Kabanoff, Waldersee and Cohen (1995) conducted an empirical study using content analysis of organizational documents to determine how organizational culture is related to the manner in which organizations discuss and portray change. The researchers' aim was to utilize a typology of organizational structures to explain differences in organizational cultures. The researchers proposed a typology with four structures: collegiate, elite, leadership and meritocratic. The study examined 88 organizations from both the private and the not-for-profit sector including colleges and universities.

The results of the Kabanoff et al. (1995) study indicated that both elite and leadership organizations viewed change negatively. Meritocratic organizations viewed change negatively, but focused on employees as full participants in the change process. In the meritocratic organizations, change was associated with needs. The colleges and universities in the study were classified primarily as collegial structures in the typology. In this study, only the collegial organizations consistently focused on change as a positive process. The authors further stated that whereas the meritocratic organizations focused on needs, the collegial organizations couched change in terms of means. Kabanoff et al. illustrated this focus through the use of examples such as the reference to "reviews," "stages," "strategies," and "discussions." Pleasure words (satisfaction, confidence, pleased) decreased in collegial structures as change words increased (p. 196).

While the collegial culture spoke and wrote of change enthusiastically, change appeared to have a negative association with the core aspects of the
collegial culture, i.e., satisfaction, community, confidence. Kabanoff et al. (1995) summarized the collegial structure by stating that “only in this structure is change viewed in a positive way and only in this structure is there an emphasis on employee participation” (p. 1099). Collegial structures do not focus on organizational goals, but rather on the benefits change brings to stakeholders. The important contradiction, however, is that this support of change is coupled with indications of a declining sense of collective satisfaction and collective solidarity.

In their conclusion, Kabanoff et al. (1995) suggest that change agents must tailor their change messages to the given values context and organizational culture. The researchers believe that “culture fit” is eminently more important than “strategic fit” (p. 1101). Where there is no cultural compatibility, there can be no long-term effective strategy for change implementation.

O'Reilly, Chapman and Caldwell (1991) uncovered factors relating to innovation, supportiveness and cohesion that were positively correlated with high levels of organizational commitment. They found consonance in fit between the individual and organizational values thus leading to greater job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Mintzberg (1979) reasoned that a strong ideology resulted in members’ identification with the organization and subjugation of their personal interests as compared to those of the organization.

Schein (1990) identified three levels of culture: observable artifacts, values and basic assumptions. Schein defined basic assumptions as deeply embedded and often unconscious understandings that people have about how
organizations operate. Values are expressed beliefs about the nature of such roles, and artifacts are those manipulations by which people are most likely to be able to see the essence of culture. Artifacts take many forms, including language, stories, myths, rituals and ceremonies.

While building on Schein's approach, Hatch (1993) offered a cultural dynamics model for understanding organizational culture that incorporates symbolic-interpretive perspectives of how meaning defines culture as a process. In her cultural dynamics model, culture is understood as continuous cycles of action and meaning-making in combination with cycles of image and identity formation. This paradigmatic shift provides a cultural framework for understanding how individuals both maintain and change their contexts of choice as they interpret particular areas of significance. Hatch (1993) noted that "it is through culture that a person constructs the sense of individual and organizational identity and creates images that are taken for the self and the organization" (p. 681).

The need for dramatic change has become the norm in institutional life (Cascio, 1993; Ginzberg & Vojta, 1985) and, consequently, organizational culture has taken on new complexities. According to Kanter (1983), with change comes opportunities for individual and organizational development, adaptation and forms of entrepreneurship. Change also brings with it organizational and individual levels of uncertainty, turnover, power struggles and cynicism (Buono & Bowditch, 1989).

During times of change, the cultural environment created within the
academy is likely to grow in importance. As Schudson (1989) argued, "at certain moments when society is in flux, more people are searching for sculptural leadership and a demand for meaning may become as important as the character of the supply of available significance" (p. 174). In light of this reality, it is important to examine the organizational culture and its impact on both the need for, and support of change in the academy.

In their view of organizational culture, Ouchi and Wilkins (1985) suggested that "the contemporary study of organizational culture is perhaps best understood as only the latest struggle between explicit and rational views of the organization on the one hand and implicit, nonrational views on the other" (p. 462). They concluded that studies of planned change efforts do not support the belief that organizational culture can be easily manipulated as a rational tool of management. Similar to Kabanoff et al. (1995), Ouchi and Wilkins concluded that it is important to work within the existing values and culture rather than attempt to manipulate the culture of an organization.

Schein (1985) cautioned against oversimplified, prescriptive culture management strategies but, in the end, he suggested that "we recognize that the unique and essential function of leadership is the manipulation of culture" (p. 317). Tierney (1988) counseled researchers and practitioners to avoid using organizational culture as a new management approach to cure organizational ills.

In light of Tierney's and Schein's arguments, the question to be asked is whether or not there is any relevance of organizational culture to the process of change. When understood as a powerful internal dynamic that influences both
continuity and change, organizational culture can provide a conceptual bridge between the academy and its structure, between individuals and the larger community. The complexity of cultural analysis required by this model compels leaders and would-be change agents to look beyond articulated values, rational plans, and developmental scenarios in order to understand the change process. Reed and Hughes (1992) urged leaders and managers to expand their capacities to understand and incorporate alternative realities rather than focusing on consensus. As building consensus is often considered the bedrock of change in the academy, this position provides a suggestion for a rather different focus in viewing how change might take place in the academy.

Change does not then "occur because of heroic individuals, or because of rationally determined processes and goals. Instead, change takes place by the continuous interaction of structure and individual" (Tierney, 1991, p. 11). What becomes culturally and organizationally significant is the nature of this relationship and how people in the academy create and recreate meaning.

Bergquist (1992) discussed organizational culture and change in The Four Cultures of the Academy. As a model for understanding the academic environment, Bergquist proposed the creative integration of what he determined to be four distinct cultures in the academy: collegial, negotiating, managerial and developmental. Since Bergquist stated that "collegiate institutions seem to be particularly resistant to change" (p. xi), he proposed that "an appreciation of academic culture is essential to any effective use of . . . analyses of strategies for change in collegiate settings" (p. 7).
Bergquist (1992) explained that the collegial culture is one in which relationships are long term, informal and non-hierarchical. Faculty members tend to identify through the specialization with the sense of scholarly identity as more dominant than a local or community identity. Academic freedom, individualism, charismatic leadership and a focus on creating a learning environment are all hallmarks of this culture. In the collegial environment, Bergquist concluded that change takes place “primarily through—and power resides in—the quasi-political, committee-based, faculty controlled governmental processes” (p. 46).

The managerial culture for Bergquist (1992) is “repressive and uninspired—a culture found primarily in Catholic colleges and community colleges that are financially strapped” (p. 65). Due to economic constraints and a mission that typically has as its goal both access and service to the poor, Bergquist believed that such institutions are often unable to create environments in which risks can readily be taken, nor can they adequately support faculty research. The emphasis is on competence and the goal of delivering an effective education. It follows that a “successful faculty member in this culture is a competent one, not one who advocates for change and the resources necessary to complement innovation” (p. 77).

The collegial and managerial cultures overlap for Bergquist (1992) in a shared faculty emphasis on primary affiliation with discipline and the rise to power through informal networks. Bergquist suggested that, “in response to a need for structure and coherence, faculty advocate for a model that includes planning and development with retention of democracy and avoidance of the
political infighting prevalent in the collegial culture” (p. 93). Behind this developmental culture lies the notion that one can take the best from the collegial culture (namely, its values) and the best from the managerial culture (namely, its procedures) and blend them together to create a healing and positive influence; in this way, “somehow the collegial and managerial can be made one” (p. 101).

For Bergquist (1992), the developmental culture brings these two often conflicting sets of needs into harmony. According to Bergquist, those in the developmental culture hold the belief that teaching and learning are more the mission of higher education than is research or scholarly pursuits. In the developmental culture, there is an emphasis on problem-solving and theme-oriented approach to curriculum development. Bergquist stated that “developmentalists also attempt to avoid the paternalistic power that is so common in the collegial culture” (p. 119). Developmentalists believe that evaluation of performance should always be tied to developmental efforts.

Bergquist (1992) suggested that his fourth culture, the negotiating culture, emerged in response to “the inability of the managerial culture to meet the personal and financial needs of the faculty and staff” (p. 129). In the negotiating culture, faculty members believe that change takes place through confrontation and the effective use of withholding of prized resources.

Equity and egalitarianism are the dominant values in the negotiating culture. As with the managerial culture, almost anything — including educational programs and priorities — is negotiable. In contrast, the
developmental culture views such compromises as offensive and inappropriate. In the negotiating culture, the power of formal managerial leadership is reduced since the collective bargaining units hold such a great deal of power.

In describing the process of change, Bergquist (1992) identified three domains of change: structure, process and attitude; as well as four diffusion strategies: rational planning, social interaction, resolution of human problems, and the political approach. Bergquist stated that we can begin in any of the three domains of change or with any of the four diffusion strategies. The important thing is to start and to recognize that we must draw on all of these strategies if we are to meet distinctive challenges (and exploit the potential) of each of the four cultures. (p. 208)

In Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership, Bolman and Deal (1997) presented four frames that they believe should be present in all organizations: structural, human resources, political, and symbolic.

Rather than framing these four perspectives as cultures, Bolman and Deal (1997) preferred the term “frame.” Defined as “vantage points,” “images of an organization” and “tools for actions,” frames are used to gather information, make judgments, and determine how to get things done (p. 11).

According to Bolman and Deal (1997), the structural frame emphasizes “the importance of formal roles and relationships” (p. 16), while the human resource frame “enables people to get the job done while feeling good about what they are doing” (p. 14). Organizations are viewed as arenas in which different interest groups compete for power and resources in the political frame,
whereas, the symbolic frame views organizations as cultures that are propelled more "by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes and myths than by rules, politics and managerial authority" (p. 16).

In discussing organizational change, Bolman and Deal (1997) suggested that it is important for organizations to develop all four frames for effective change to take place. For Bolman and Deal, change alters powerful relationships, stresses the connection between skills and structure, and, "most important, it intrudes upon deeply rooted symbolic agreements and ritual behavior" (p. 375).

Bolman and Deal (1997) presented four salient issues as reactions to change: "(1) change causes people to feel incompetent, needy and powerless; (2) change creates confusion and unpredictability throughout an organization; (3) change generates conflict; and (4) change creates loss" (p. 397).

Working within the four frames, Bolman and Deal (1997) identified a strategy for change related to each frame. In the human resource frame, Bolman and Deal recommended training and support for employees and, in the structural frame, the realignment of formal roles and relationships. In the political frame, the key strategy is the establishment of arenas, whereas the symbolic frame calls for the provision of transition rituals.

Birnbaum's (1988, 1991) representation of academic life included five cultures, all described under the umbrella of organizational behavior: collegial, bureaucratic, anarchical, political, and cybernetic. The cybernetic organization is one in which numerous subcultures interact and provide little or no clear dominant subgroup, thus supporting the need for a more detailed examination of
faculty cultures.

Whether the term "culture," "structure," or "frame" is used, the common element in the works of Bergquist (1992), Bolman and Deal (1997), and Kabanoff et al. (1995), is a cultural description of organizational life. While Bergquist limits his discussion to the academy, — and Kabanoff et al., and Bolman and Deal draw illustrations from a wide range of private and public organizations — all of these works contribute to an understanding of the social construction of identity, meaning and values as they relate to change implementation.

While Bergquist (1992) described his four cultures in a historical, or evolutionary context, Bolman and Deal (1997) stress the importance of an integration of the cultures, and note that one frame or culture can and should be dominant given specific times, situations, and environments; Kabanoff et al. (1995), on the other hand, define an organization as statically classified in terms of one structure.

Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978) warned that the search for an "all encompassing" model for an organizational culture was too simplistic because "no one model can delineate the intricacies . . . in complex organizations such as universities and colleges" (p. 28).

The literature demonstrates that, in actual practice, characteristics of all of these models are present on most campuses. Baldridge et al. (1978) reported, "Many writers have consciously rejected the bureaucratic image of the university" but "only a few small liberal arts colleges exist as actual examples of
democratic institutions...” (p. 31). Instead, successful and effective academic leadership has not been linked to a specific pattern (Birnbaum, 1991).

Colleges and universities are exceptionally complex institutions. Understanding phenomena like power, control, symbol and meaning involves economic, social, historical, psychological and technical considerations. Many current theories tend to be monist or pluralist—either reducing alternative conceptions to a central driving one or oscillating between different and often incomparable perspectives without a conception of how the pieces fit together.

Deetz (1993) suggested that a general, integrated theory of organizational culture should do the following: provide a unified way of understanding the complex processes of organizational life; direct the evaluation of existing institutional forms; and provide guidance for the evaluation of members and designers of organizational culture. It would appear that a considerable body of literature has developed regarding various theories on collegiate culture and the processes of decision-making within these cultures, but there is little empirical evidence that the type of systematic analysis proposed by Deetz has taken place. While Kabanoff et al. (1995) did conduct an empirical study, most of the theory reviewed by this author consisted of existing theories (Baldridge et al., 1978; Bergquist, 1992; Birnbaum, 1988, 1991; and Bolman & Deal, 1977).

Colleges and universities are characterized by both fragmentation and integration resulting in extremely complex mosaics. Dill (1982) argued the importance of meaning in the organizational culture when he wrote:

The difference that makes a difference, then, about academic institutions
is that they are value-rational organizations whose members are
committed to, and find meaning in, specified ideologies. These ideologies
are manifest in a symbolic life or culture at the level of the enterprise, the
profession, and the discipline. (p. 310)

The climate conducive to faculty movement toward collective bargaining
has been explained by macro factors (Kerr, 1972) such as changes in enrollment,
introduction of technology, decreases in support for higher education,
legislation, and a depressed academic job market. Micro predictors include
campus specific issues regarding tenure, job security, and grievance procedure,
as well as demographic characteristics of individuals (Gress, 1976). Duryea and
Fish (1973) studied status of the institution and the geographic location as
predictors. Researchers have also looked at change in mission, changes in
student academic preferences, and changes in institutional leadership. It is
suggested that salary compression may be a major factor, as well as freedom
from any fear of managerial retaliation given tenure and longevity (Rhoades,
1998).

Organizational Commitment

Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) offered a definition of organizational
commitment that has three components: (a) a strong belief in, and acceptance of,
organizational goals and values, (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on
behalf of the organization, and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the
organization.
While there are many studies addressing organizational commitment in the business sector, there are far fewer resources addressing organizational commitment in higher education. The research suggests that modern faculty identify with their discipline, and less frequently demonstrate allegiance to their institution (Fjortoft, 1993). The lack of attention to organizational commitment in higher education has become the focus of significant concern (Ormsby & Watts, 1989). In commenting on the lack of such research and the clear need for meaningful work in this area, Harshbarger (1988) stated that “Higher education has much to gain from the enhancement of institutional commitment on the part of faculty members” (p. 6).

Perhaps the first use of the terms “locals” and “cosmopolitans” to designate faculty commitment was the work of Gouldner (1957). Gouldner designated the term “locals” for faculty who were primarily identified with their own work in the organization. Those faculty who identified primarily with a national network of colleagues within their discipline were designated as “cosmopolitans.” Gouldner held that cosmopolitans tend to have low degrees of loyalty to their employer and high commitment to their discipline. The reverse Gouldner held to be true for locals. Gouldner posited that both types of faculty are necessary to the institution, for he believed that the cosmopolitans brought the expertise, while the locals provided loyalty and commitment.

Dressel, Johnson, and Marcus (1970) found that faculty who identify primarily with the institution rather than with the discipline or department tend to be the driving force in fostering the institution’s social or public service role.
as well as the force instilling an emphasis on undergraduate teaching and curricular reform.

Fjortoft (1993) differentiated organizational commitment from career commitment in that organizational commitment links the employee to the goals and values of the organization, not the profession. Fjortoft further clarified that organizational commitment differs from job satisfaction in that organizational commitment is more global and encompasses attitudes toward the organization as a whole, and that these are attitudes that develop over time. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, can fluctuate over time and incorporates both extrinsic as well as intrinsic factors. While research has established the relationship between job satisfaction and performance (Angle & Perry, 1981; Meyer, Paunonen, Gellatly, Goffin, & Jackson, 1989; Porter et al., 1974), it is important to highlight the possibility that one may be highly committed both to the profession and to the organization, yet have low job satisfaction at a given moment in time. An individual may also have high job satisfaction and high commitment to the profession, but a lesser commitment to the organization.

Researchers have traditionally focused on the employees' attachment to the institution (Mowday et al., 1982). In several more recent studies, researchers have shifted the focus to the employees' perception of the institution's commitment to them (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986; Hutchison, 1997). This view is based on social exchange theory, or the notion that the individual employee's organizational commitment is based on the employee's perception of the institution's commitment to the employee. Etzioni
(1961), Becker (1960) and Kanter (1968) all set forth similar concepts positing that favors or positive treatment from the organization resulted in a type of reciprocity. In these theories, the employees’ perceptions of the institutional commitment to them is viewed as an antecedent to their commitment to the organization.

Salanik (1977) described organizational commitment as a result of the constraints on an individual’s ability to leave an organization, and the extent to which the individual has made a definite and committing choice. In this view, the emphasis is on behavior. The literature also describes commitment as attitudinal. Mowday et al. (1982) attempted to reconcile attitudinal and behavioral forms of commitment.

The organizational structure of a college or university, as compared to a corporation, is an inherent obstacle that ultimately limits the usefulness of a corporate or business model (Brock & Harvey, 1993). Despite differences between corporations and colleges and universities, there are basic principles common to both types of organizational structures. These include the need for strong leadership and vision that inspire organizational-wide commitment (Chan, 1988). Yet these same qualities were found to be less effective in the academy than in corporate settings (Bing & Dye, 1992; Mason, 1972) because the concept of shared governance in higher education is fundamentally different than organizational structures found in corporations.

Ormsby and Watts (1989) conducted a longitudinal study of the effect of unionization on organizational commitment and concluded that collective
bargaining has no impact on the level of faculty commitment. Ormsby and Watts concluded that union members have dual commitments to the union and to the organization, and that union membership had no effect on organizational commitment. This study was limited to one college, and the results may or may not pertain to all institutions. However, their findings do bolster the opinion of Reichers (1985) who believed that employees could have multiple commitments. The presence of a union is simply one more commitment, and is not necessarily in conflict with the mission and vision of the leaders of the institution.

**Governance and Decision-Making**

Governance in an academic environment, as described by Vaughn (1995), is the institutional decision-making process which is “influenced by rules, regulations, committees, formal and informal groups and leaders, organizational structures, and the history and culture of the institution” (p. 23). The governance concept is designed to provide shared involvement in the decision-making process in a climate of mutual trust where those affected by the decision—administrators, staff, faculty or students—are to be involved in the decision-making process.

Whether or not one is an advocate of shared governance, it is quite clear that the success of any organization is dependent on the quality and effectiveness of the governance process.

In 1966, a joint statement on institutional governance was developed by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of
Governing Boards. Their statement affirmed the traditional authority of faculty in decisions affecting curriculum, methods of instruction, research, faculty status, degree requirements, and some aspects of student life. Shared participation among trustees, administrators, faculty, students and alumni was encouraged in decisions regarding the selection of a president, general educational policies, budget, long-range planning and the appointment of academic officers (Leatherman, 1998).

In June, 1987, the AAUP issued a policy on faculty unionization entitled, "Statement on Academic Government for Institutions Engaged in Collective Bargaining." This document states in part:

Collective bargaining should not replace, but rather should assure, effective forms of shared governance. ... From a faculty perspective, collective bargaining can strengthen shared governance by specifying and assuring the faculty role in institutional decision making. ... From an administrative perspective, contractual clarification and arbitral review of shared governance can reduce the conflicts occasioned by ill-defined or contested allocation of responsibility and thereby enhance consensus and cooperation in academic governance. ... When legislatures, judicial authorities, boards, administration, or faculty act on the mistaken assumption that collective bargaining is incompatible with collegial governance, they do a grave disservice to the very institutions they seek to serve. (AAUP, 1997, pp. 25-26)

This statement represents a reversal in position. According to Polishook
(1989), this was the first time that the AAUP acknowledged that a bargaining unit is a faculty organization. The AAUP is also stating that collective bargaining is not a substitute for faculty governance, but rather a supplement to the already existing mechanisms for faculty governance.

Prior to 1987, the AAUP had maintained the position that faculty collective bargaining was incompatible with the culture of higher education. In writing about the AAUP's position prior to 1987, Baratz (1978) stated that the AAUP had concluded that collective bargaining meant negotiations between two conflicting parties with opposite positions that, if pursued to the end, could result in drastic sanctions. Baratz stated that “the AAUP considered the academic decision-making process too complex and subtle to be able to be reduced to two conflicting and competing parties” (p. 198).

Governance and decision-making have been both broadly and thoroughly studied in higher education. The review of the literature includes the landmark studies and statements written from the mid-1960s through the 1970s. The most cited studies of this period address the issues of shared governance and authority (Baldridge et al., 1978; Millett, 1978; Mortimer & McConnell, 1978). Birnbaum (1991) noted that after a fifteen-year hiatus, faculty governance issues are again receiving attention in higher education literature. From the late 1970s through the 1980s, however, governance issues were not entirely ignored; rather, the faculty role in governance was discussed as involvement in planning and budgeting (e.g., Chan, 1988), or in collective bargaining (Kemerer & Baldridge, 1981).
The work of Anderson (1983) is a study of faculty involvement in institutional decision-making. It is a longitudinal study which sampled 93 colleges in 1981. Anderson reported a drop by twenty percentage points in the number of faculty members who believed that their institutions operated with a shared governance approach to decision-making. Anderson concluded that faculty were less involved in 1981 with decisions than they had been ten years earlier.

Reaching a consensus in the decision-making process in higher education may be difficult because goals within the institution are often conflicted: faculty are hired to teach, but are more often rewarded for their research; loyalty is often more to the discipline than the institution; and outcomes are largely intangible and not readily measurable (Brock & Harvey, 1993).

A central tenet of decision-making is that it should be based on a vision shared among the members of the organization (Chan, 1988). A corollary is that members throughout the organization should not only share the vision, but also have ample opportunity for "establishing goals and objectives as well as developing specific strategies to achieve them" (Simerly, 1991, p. 4). Broad-based consensus building is imperative because "participation promotes legitimacy and eventually cooperation" (Adler & Lane, 1988, p. 31). Me Cormack (1995) reported, "There appears to be an innate philosophical difference within the structure of higher education as to the effectiveness and potential of the participatory governance process in the management of institutions" (p. 6). Moreover, while administrators are expected to promote
decision-making opportunities (AAUP, 1973), these same administrators have the legal authority to bar faculty from governing activities (Miles, 1987).

McCormack (1995) reported that "there is little definitive research on the true impact of faculty participation in governance activities" (p. 6). There was, however, ample evidence in the literature that faculty have voiced frustration and concern about their role in campus governance (Birnbaum, 1991; Williams et al., 1987). McCormack documented the following issues: faculty distrust of administrators; a lack of reward for participation; ambivalence toward faculty senates; inability of the AAUP to enforce standards of governance; and a lack of fundamental right to participate in policy-making processes.

Gillen (1990) found that faculty generally perceive an improvement in faculty participation in governance after the establishment of faculty unions; however, Zirkel (1986) posited that "the gains in decision-making by faculty are usually matched by greater centralization of decision-making at the executive level" (p. 11).

At the beginning of the movement of faculty collective bargaining, there was significant debate regarding the role of faculty senates in a bargaining climate. Some might argue that where there were strong senates, there was little to no interest in bargaining (Mortimer, 1982). Orze (1977) explained what he posited were significant implications for faculty senates in a unionized environment. Since the union is usually contractually stipulated as the exclusive representative of the faculty, the faculty senate is, therefore, legally under the purview of the union. Orze contended that in a union environment there are
several possibilities regarding the relationship between the union and the senate: (1) they may be able to work cooperatively since the leadership is often the same group of faculty; (2) the union and senate leadership may also find themselves competing for power; or (3) the senate may find itself totally co-opted by the union leadership (pp. 510-513). Garbarino (1976) suggested the same three options as the possible relationships between a senate and a union. Garbarino stressed that the union will win in any competition because the union is the body that the administration is bound to recognize, regardless of the stance the senate may take on a given issue.

Garbarino (1975) reported that, despite the potential conflicts between senates and unions, senates nonetheless survived in a climate of collective bargaining. Senates tended to remain focused on academic matters, whereas collective bargaining units took on the role of negotiating benefits and work conditions.

Writing in 1974, Schuster stated that the professional literature has not yet paid much attention to whether and how faculty unionism has begun to alter the academy in fundamental ways including, for instance, changes in decision-making processes for academic matters and shifts in the relative influence of various participants in those processes. (pp. 8-9)

Over twenty-five years have passed, and the research, other than that examining differences in salary and benefits between unionized and non-unionized institutions, remains scant.
Gemmill (1978) stated that the participation in governance cannot be carried out in the same way by a faculty union because "there are three characteristics of unionism which get in the way: conflict of interest, exclusive representation; and binding arbitration" (p. 11). While some may argue that this is a healthy conflict, nonetheless the conflict between an administration that supports merit and the desire to recruit new faculty, does rub up against the need for the faculty to have a "one for all" mentality that argues against merit, and protects longevity.

Research done by Deming (1982) supports the assertion that organizations with sincere processes for employee participation in decision-making and goal-setting have higher overall performance and greater satisfaction on the part of all involved with the organization. Many other more contemporary writers in the field of organizational performance echo these assumptions with great regularity. Drummond and Reitsch (1995) studied the differences between faculty and administrators in their perceptions of shared governance and concluded that "the more influence a faculty member has in the decision-making process, the more confidence he or she has in the shared governance" (p. 57). Drummond and Reitsch conclude that it is "plausible that improved faculty attitudes about the organization lead to better outcomes in terms of productivity and interpersonal relations" (p. 58).

Miller (1996) wrote that the institutional benefits of involving faculty in the governance process include greater personal investment by faculty in the work they do and are
expected to do, greater organizational commitment, ... stronger
dedication to the workplace, and even better teaching, research, and
service being performed. (pp. 6-7)

Unionized faculty at four-year and two-year public and private
institutions generally agreed that faculty bargaining increased the quality and
quantity of information and improved the decision-making process (Pollack,
1982). Similar research concluded that collective bargaining increased the
faculty’s role in decision-making (Harper, 1979). Studies examining the content
of union contracts did not demonstrate that the contract provisions had expanded
the control of faculty in decision-making areas (Williams & Zirkel, 1989).
Pollack’s and Harper’s studies explored faculty perception, however, and
Williams and Zirkel’s research documented contractual obligations. It may be
that satisfaction improves with the advent of union contracts, even if the actual
contracts do not expand the scope of faculty control.

In studying faculty attitudes regarding decision-making in unionized
environments, Doyle (1988) stated that
governance is impacted by an assortment of variables including
personality, existing and previous relationships, leadership styles, system
structures and procedures, and legislative actions. By design, collective
bargaining increases the emphasis on these variables and attempts to
formalize the relationships and procedures. The issues of governance may
be too complex to effectively evaluate the extent of the impact that
collective bargaining has had. (pp. 110-111)
Summary

As this review has demonstrated, the literature is replete with speculation regarding the potential negative impact of faculty unionization on the institution, but there are also accounts of increases in compensation and benefits post-unionization, with little or no evidence that unionization had a deleterious effect on the institution. Writing over 25 years ago, Metzger (1975) described the growth of unionization as a "slide toward ordinarieness" and a process which would require faculty to "relinquish certain professional characteristics" (p. 33). Metzger's predictions are not supported by the literature. However, it is clear that, other than in the cases of compensation and other measurable and quantifiable factors such as reduced credit loads, the literature is primarily anecdotal and qualitative in nature.

The culture of the academy has been influenced by centuries of tradition. Both faculty and administrators agree that the culture of the academy sets colleges and universities apart from other professions. Harshbarger (1988) suggested that, given this cultural milieu, it would "seem unlikely that the sources of faculty commitment to the institution would mirror those of employees in other walks of life" (p. 40). However, Harshbarger did conclude that, despite cultural differences and the sources of commitment, faculty levels of organizational commitment are consistent with other professions, albeit slightly lower than in some professions.

Faculty participation in governance has been one of the distinguishing hallmarks of higher education. It is interesting to note that one of the sacred
realities of higher education — participatory governance — became the trumpet song of corporations in the past 25 years. Writers such as Deming (1982) concluded that only in environments where there is strong and meaningful input into the decision-making process can there be organizations that are capable of responding to swiftly changing external pressures and challenges.

Even though it is primarily anecdotal and considered opinion, as opposed to empirical, the literature nonetheless supports the need to study whether or not faculty collective bargaining has an influence on faculty organizational commitment and input into decision-making.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to analyze whether there are differences in the perceptions of unionized and non-unionized faculty at private colleges and universities in satisfaction with decision-making and level of organizational commitment. This chapter addresses the basic design of the study, the research instrument, the data collection and the method of analysis.

Design

The research design for this investigation is a descriptive survey. A comparative design determines if there are differences in the reported level of degree of satisfaction with the faculty’s role in decision-making and organizational commitment in colleges and universities with faculty collective bargaining, and institutions that do not have faculty collective bargaining. The characteristics of the faculty were measured as extraneous variables to determine any relationship. These characteristics include age, gender, rank, tenure status, and years of employment at current institution.

The subjects for this study met the following criteria: (a) full-time faculty members, (b) employed as a faculty member in a private college or university, and (c) employed by the college or university for at least one year. Excluded
from the study were adjunct faculty and part-time faculty.

The institutions selected for this study are all classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as "Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I," as of January 1, 2000 (McCormick, 2000). (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching modified its categories after this study.) This category was chosen since it contained the largest number of institutions with collective bargaining units. There are currently nine private colleges in this category with a total of 12 bargaining units. These institutions are the following: Regis University in Colorado, Monmouth University in New Jersey, Rider University in New Jersey, Long Island University (Brooklyn and C. W. Post), New York Institute of Technology (Central Islip, Manhattan, and Old Westbury), Niagara University in New York, University of Scranton in Pennsylvania, Dowling College in New York, and Emerson College in Massachusetts. Dowling College, Emerson College, Monmouth University and Rider University were excluded from this study because of (1) their specialized academic mission; (2) the lack of a comparable institution in the non-unionized group; or (3) their proximity and familiarity to the author, thus posing some potential bias.

In selecting non-unionized institutions, every attempt was made to find schools with the following comparable characteristics: relative size, geographical region, and sponsorship. The following five schools were chosen: Loyola Marymount in California, Ithaca College in New York, Rochester Institute of Technology in New York, Marist College in New York, and
Villanova University in Pennsylvania.

Initially, the study was to include structured interviews conducted on-site with selected administrators and faculty leaders, as well as a survey of all full-time faculty; however, only one of the unionized colleges agreed to participate in such interviews. Two colleges with unionized faculty did not respond to written requests, one indicated that they would not endorse the study, and an official from the remaining institution indicated that he was not interested in participating at this time, but would be willing to reconsider at a later date. In light of these responses, the study was limited to an anonymous survey of faculty. A random sample of full-time faculty at each institution resulted in a mailing of surveys to 850 faculty members. While data were tracked by institution, the results are reported in the aggregate to protect the confidentiality of the participants and their institutions.

A questionnaire was developed by the author to gather data for this study. After a review of related literature, questions were designed to determine the perceptions of faculty toward the process of decision-making. Degree of satisfaction with the faculty role in decision-making was measured using the criteria typically used by the NLRB in determining a given faculty’s extent of participation in decision-making. In order to determine whether or not a given faculty at an institution is managerial or non-managerial, certain criteria are accepted as indicators of faculty involvement in decision-making. (These criteria came about as a result of the 1980 NLRB v. Yeshiva Decision.) These criteria include the faculty’s role in decision-making regarding admission criteria,
grading policy, recruitment and selection of faculty, promotion of faculty, program development, curriculum design and academic budgets. The survey was designed to measure only the faulty member’s level of satisfaction with his or her role in decision-making. The survey did not measure the actual level of involvement in decision-making. In some instances, it would be possible for a faculty member to have no involvement in decision-making, yet a respondent could indicate a high level of satisfaction; and, conversely, there could be a significant level of involvement, and a respondent could indicate dissatisfaction.

Perception of organizational commitment was measured using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) developed by Mowday et al. (1979). This instrument has been used widely in the research literature. Morris and Sherman (1981) indicated that this is the only instrument measuring organizational commitment to have substantial documentation relating it to behavioral outcomes in organizations, and it also has a substantial available body of reliability and validity information. Mowday et al. (1982) provided extensive norm, reliability and validity findings for the OCQ on a sample that was administered to 2,563 employees working in a variety of public and private settings. Data were reported as follows:

Means and standard deviations — The mean level of commitment ranged from 4.0 to 6.1 across all samples. Mean scores are slightly above the midpoint on the 7-point Likert scale. The standard deviations which ranged from 0.64 to 1.30 indicate an acceptable distribution of responses within samples.

Internal consistency reliability — The coefficient alpha ranged from .82
to .93, with a median of .90. Item analysis indicated that each item had a positive correlation with the total score of the OCQ with a range from .36 to .72, and a median correlation of .64.

Test-retest reliability — Acceptable levels of $r = .53$ to $r = .75$ over periods ranging from two months to four months.

The first use of this instrument with university faculty was reported by Harshbarger (1988) who concluded that this instrument was appropriate for measuring faculty organizational commitment. Harshbarger made only minor revisions to the instrument by substituting the word “university” for “organization,” and the word “faculty” for “employee.” In addition, Harshbarger included demographic information, as well as items relating to rank, tenure and discipline. Similar language was included in the instrument used in the present research.

For purposes of this study, demographic variables were added including age, gender, tenure status, rank, academic discipline, years at the current institution, and union membership. In addition, items regarding the possession of the terminal degree were also included. These demographic additions are similar to those added by Harshbarger (1988) while studying faculty organizational commitment at a four-year university. In addition, an open-ended question was added to the instrument.

A field test was conducted since the section on decision-making was developed by the author and had not previously been used with any known group of faculty. The instrument was given to 30 faculty at a four-year institution
which was not selected for this research. The survey was sent with a cover letter explaining the purposes of the research, and with a return envelope. Twenty-six faculty members (87%) responded.

This field test generated both an acceptable return rate, as well as qualitative responses resulting in a number of modifications and improvements.

Data Collection

After receiving approval from Seton Hall University's Institutional Review Board (Appendix A), a cover letter (Appendix B), the survey instrument (Appendix C), and a self-addressed stamped envelope were sent to a random sample of 850 full-time faculty members at the selected institutions on September 10, 2000. The total number of full-time faculty reported by these institutions was 2,987, as of June 2000. The cover letter requested that the survey be returned by October 1, 2000. There were 387 responses, or, a return rate of 46%. Of this number, 30 were not included in the research because the faculty member was retired, was employed on a part-time status, or, did not complete the questionnaire as instructed. There were, consequently, 357 usable responses: 169 from faculty who are members of collective bargaining units, and 188 who do not participate in collective bargaining at their institutions, thus resulting in a 42% response rate of usable surveys. As of October 1, 2000, all 387 questionnaires had been received. Responses received after this date were not included in the study.

Data were analyzed through the use of SPSS version 10.0 for Windows, a
computer software package.

**Method of Analysis**

The survey instrument (see Appendix C) consisted of four parts: Demographic information (10 items), the Decision-Making section (28 items), the Organizational Commitment section (15 items), and a section labeled "Remarks." A seven-point Likert scale was used for both the Decision-Making and Organizational Commitment sections of the instrument. For the Organizational Commitment test, the scoring was based on Mowday et al. (1982) guidelines. Several of the items in this section were inversely scored, with a maximum score possible of 105. The Decision-Making section was scored from a low of 1 (Very unsatisfied) to a high of 7 (Very satisfied) on each of 28 items. The highest possible score on this section was 196.

The comparison of the two groups was tested by using the t-test for independent samples, Pearson Correlation, and One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

The results and findings using this methodology are detailed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to determine if there are differences between unionized and non-unionized faculty in relation to their perceptions of input into decision-making and levels of organizational commitment.

Response rate

The survey was mailed on September 10, 2000, to 850 randomly selected full-time faculty from five institutions with collective bargaining units (Long Island University, Niagara University, New York Institute of Technology, Regis University, and University of Scranton), and to the five institutions without faculty collective bargaining units (Ithaca College, Loyola Marymount University, Marist College, Rochester Institute of Technology and Villanova University). The total number of full-time faculty as reported by these ten institutions as of June 2000 was 2,987. No follow-up procedures were needed as the initial request yielded a more than adequate response rate (46%), or 387 responses, by the requested return date of October 1, 2000.

Upon completion of the survey collection, it was found that 30 surveys could not be included in this study due to the following reasons:

1. Three of the respondents indicated that they were part-time faculty
members.

2. Four of the respondents indicated that they had recently retired.

3. Twenty respondents failed to complete entire sections of the instrument.

4. Three respondents indicated that while they maintained faculty status, they had recently become full-time administrators at their respective institutions.

Therefore, for purposes of this study, 42% was the survey response rate based upon the receipt of 357 usable surveys from a pool of 850 qualified participants.

**Frequency Data**

Demographic data were obtained to provide the following information: age, gender, tenure status, rank, discipline, years of employment at current institution, and union membership. The study classified respondents into union versus non-union. There were 169 usable responses from faculty who are members of collective bargaining units, and 188 usable responses from faculty not members of collective bargaining units. Table 1 summarizes the colleges and universities surveyed, along with their respective response rates. All other data do not reference individual institutions in order to protect the anonymity and confidentiality of those institutions surveyed in this research.
### Table 1
#### Response Rates for Participating Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number mailed</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Union</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIU</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYIT</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-union</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marist</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIT</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Rea and Parker (1997), a total response rate of 42% (357 of 850), provides a 95% (+or − 3%) level of confidence that the 357 respondents statistically represent the entire population of 850.

### Background Information

Respondents were asked to provide the following background information: age, gender, tenure status, whether tenure or promotion has ever
been denied, faculty rank, academic discipline, highest degree earned, years of employment at current institution, administrative status, and union membership.

The age of respondents ranged from a low of one respondent between the age of 25-29, to a high of three respondents between the ages of 75-79. Over 50% of the respondents were between age 45 and 59. There were no significant differences noted between the two groups on this element. Table 2 presents the associated frequency statistics.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Union Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Non-union Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second demographic element was gender. There were 65 women (38.5%) and 104 men (61.5%) in the unionized faculty group; 57 women (30.3%), and 131 men (69.7%) in the non-unionized faculty group; and a total of 122 women (34.2%) and 235 men (65.8%). While these numbers are consistent with national trends for gender composition, it is noteworthy that the non-union sample had 8.2% fewer women than the union faculty group. Table 3 portrays the gender composition of the respondents.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency for Gender of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure status was the third element reported by respondents. Table 4 portrays the differences between the unionized and non-unionized groups. The most noteworthy difference is that 80.3% of the non-unionized faculty group was tenured as compared with 66.3% of the union sample.
Table 4

Frequency for Tenure Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unionized</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-unionized</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not tenured</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related to the tenure status was the question regarding denial of promotion or tenure. Of the unionized faculty, 19.5% reported a denial of tenure or promotion as compared with 9.6% of the non-unionized faculty. Table 5 portrays the frequency and percent for both groups, as well as totals for both groups combined.

Table 5

Frequency for Respondents Denied Tenure or Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unionized</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-unionized</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were no significant differences between the two groups in the response to current faculty rank. In both groups, the largest number of respondents reported that they were full professors.

Table 6

Frequency for Rank of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Non-union</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to choose from among six basic clusters of discipline, with “other” as a seventh choice. There were some variations in the percent of faculty reporting membership in various disciplines. The largest difference was between unionized and non-unionized faculty reporting membership in “biological, agricultural and health sciences” and “arts and letters.” Table 7 highlights differences and similarities between the two groups.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Discipline</th>
<th>Union Frequency</th>
<th>Union Percent</th>
<th>Non-union Frequency</th>
<th>Non-union Percent</th>
<th>Total Frequency</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences and math</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological, agricultural and health sciences</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied sciences and engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences and education</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and letters</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>357</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents indicated that 91.9% had completed a terminal degree. Table 8 portrays these data. There are no significant differences between the union and non-union groups.
Table 8

Frequency for Terminal Degree Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Union</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-union</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The years of employment at the current institution revealed no major differences between the two groups as illustrated in Table 9. Both groups showed the largest percent of respondents having served in the 5-9 year range, although the numbers were fairly evenly distributed with smaller numbers at the 0-4 and over-35 years of employment ranges.
Table 9

Frequency for Years at Current Institution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Union</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-union</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | 169         | 100.0  | 188        | 100.0  | 357         | 100.0  |

Respondents were asked to indicate if they served in an administrative capacity. The responses for both groups were fairly consistent as evidenced in Table 10. While administrative position was not a variable analyzed in the research questions, it was included in the identifying information in the event that there was a significant difference between the two groups. A significant difference might signify an intervening variable that could affect the scores on either organizational commitment or decision-making.
Table 10

Frequency for Administrative Position of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Union</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-union</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The background information provides a rich description of the faculty. These data demonstrate a fair degree of consistency between the two groups, with the most noteworthy differences in the areas of gender, tenure status, tenure and promotion denial, and membership in discipline.

Research Question 1

The purpose of this study was to determine if there are differences in faculty perceptions of the work environment in private colleges and universities with, and those without, faculty collective bargaining units.

The first question to be addressed in this study is as follows: What are the differences, if any, between faculty employed by private colleges or universities with collective bargaining units, and those employed by private colleges or universities without collective bargaining units regarding degree of satisfaction with their role in decision-making?
The section of the instrument measuring satisfaction with decision-making consisted of 28 items and used a 7-point Likert scale. The items were developed from the criteria used by the Supreme Court in 1980 while deciding if the faculty at Yeshiva University were managers because of their role in university decision-making. The range of scores for the union group was 1.10 to 7.00, and for the non-union group was 2.10 to 7.00. Figure 1 depicts the frequency scores for the union group, Figure 2 for the non-union group, and Figure 3 for the combined groups.
Figure 1. Distribution of decision-making scores for unionized respondents

Figure 2. Distribution of decision-making scores for non-unionized respondents

Figure 3. Distribution of decision-making scores for combined groups
Comparison of the two groups on the score of decision-making was tested by t-tests for independent samples. Table 11 demonstrates that there was no significant difference between the means for the two groups, despite a slightly larger mean score for the non-union group.
Table 11

T-test for independent sample: union and non-union scores for decision-making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union membership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.2354</td>
<td>1.0601</td>
<td>8.154E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.4019</td>
<td>1.0908</td>
<td>7.955E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision input</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-test for Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision input</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>-1.459</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>-1.461</td>
<td>352.836</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>-.1665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-test for Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision input</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>.1141</td>
<td>Lower: -.3909, Upper: 5.792E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>.1139</td>
<td>Lower: -.3905, Upper: 5.758E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 2

The second research question is as follows: What are the differences, if any, in the characteristics (age, gender, tenure status, rank, and years of employment) of faculty employed by private colleges or universities with collective bargaining units and those employed by private colleges or universities without collective bargaining units and the degree of satisfaction with role in decision-making?

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used for data analysis. The dependent variable was the test score in decision-making. The independent variables were age, gender, tenure status, rank, and years of employment. Tables 12 and 13 portray the ANOVA results for the non-unionized and unionized populations, respectively, for each of the independent variables. In all but the instance of academic discipline, there were no significant differences.
Table 12

One-Way ANOVA: Decision Input at Non-Unionized Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>Within Groups</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>12,854</td>
<td>209,645</td>
<td>222,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>.376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>221,369</td>
<td>222,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>222,312</td>
<td>222,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>219,778</td>
<td>222,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>.907</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>22,292</td>
<td>200,207</td>
<td>222,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>3.715</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.359</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years at Current Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>7,342</td>
<td>215,157</td>
<td>222,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>.918</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

One-Way ANOVA: Decision input at unionized institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>10.696</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>178.089</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.785</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.076</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>1.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>184.709</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.785</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>1.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>187.295</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.785</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>5.959</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.490</td>
<td>1.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>182.825</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.785</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.422</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>181.363</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.785</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years at Current Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>13.850</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.979</td>
<td>1.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>174.934</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>188.785</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3

The third research question was as follows: What are the differences, if any, between faculty employed by a private college or university with a collective bargaining unit and those employed by a private college or university without a collective bargaining unit regarding organizational commitment?

The section of the instrument measuring organizational commitment consisted of 15 items and used a 7-point Likert scale. The range of scores for the unionized group was 1.13 to 7.00, and for the non-unionized group was 1.46 to 6.93. The mean for the unionized group was 4.8784 and for the non-unionized group was 4.9927. Figure 4 depicts the frequency scores for the union group, Figure 5 for the non-union group and Figure 6 for the combined groups.
Figure 4. Distribution of organizational commitment scores for unionized respondents

Figure 5. Distribution of organizational commitment scores for non-unionized respondents

Figure 6. Distribution of organizational commitment scores for combined groups
Comparison of the two groups on the score of organizational commitment was tested by t-tests for independent samples. Table 14 demonstrates that there was no significant difference between the two means for the two groups.
### Table 14

**T-Test for Independent Sample: Union and Non-Union Scores for Organizational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union membership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>4.8784</td>
<td>1.2756</td>
<td>9.812E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.9927</td>
<td>1.2209</td>
<td>8.905E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equal variances not assumed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.864</td>
<td>3355</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>-.1143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.862</td>
<td>347.138</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>-.1143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1322</td>
<td>-.3742 - .1457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1325</td>
<td>-.3749 - .1464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 4

The fourth research question is as follows: What are the differences, if any, in the characteristics (age, gender, tenure status, rank, discipline, and years of employment at current institution) of faculty employed by private colleges and universities with a collective bargaining unit and those without a collective bargaining unit regarding organizational commitment?

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used for data analysis. The independent variable was the test score on organizational commitment. The dependent variables were age, gender, years of employment at current institution, rank, tenure status and academic discipline. Tables 15 and 16 portray the ANOVA results for the unionized and non-unionized groups for each of the independent variables. There were no significant differences in the scores on organizational commitment.
### Table 15

**One-Way ANOVA: Organizational Commitment at Non-Unionized Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.840</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>260.360</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278.760</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.464E-02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.464E-02</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>278.715</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278.760</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.287E-02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.287E-02</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>278.687</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278.760</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>276.692</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278.760</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.427</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>269.333</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278.760</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years at Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>9.357</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>269.403</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278.760</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

One-Way ANOVA: Organizational Commitment at Unionized Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>16.438</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>256.922</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273.360</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>272.247</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273.360</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>272.692</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273.360</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.402</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>1.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>265.958</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273.360</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.894</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>266.466</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273.360</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years at Current</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution**</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.592</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>268.767</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>273.360</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 5

The fifth research question was as follows: Among faculty employed by a private college or university with a collective bargaining unit, what is the relationship between the variable of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

Pearson Correlation was used to determine if there was a relationship between the scores on Decision-Making and Organizational Commitment for the unionized group. Table 17 demonstrates that there is a moderately positive correlation between the two scores at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) level of significance.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Decision Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pearson Correlation</strong></td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 6

The sixth research question was as follows: Among faculty employed by a private college or university without a collective bargaining unit, what is the relationship between the variable of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

The Pearson Correlation test was used to determine whether there was a relationship between the scores on Decision-making and Organizational Commitment for the non-unionized group. Table 18 demonstrates that there is a moderately positive correlation between the two scores at the 0.01 level of significance.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational Commitment</th>
<th>Decision Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                       |                           |               |
| Decision Input        |                           |               |
| Pearson Correlation   |                           |               |
|                       | .562                      | 1.000         |
| Sig. (2-tailed)       |                           | .000          |
| N                     | 188                       | 188           |
Research Question 7

The seventh, and final, research question was as follows: What are the differences, if any, in the characteristic of academic discipline of faculty employed by both unionized and non-unionized private colleges and universities and the degree of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine if there were differences in the scores for the combined groups of unionized and non-unionized respondents. The dependent variables were the test scores in decision-making and organizational commitment, and the independent variable was the academic discipline of the respondents. As Table 19 demonstrates, there was no difference between the two groups on the variable of organizational commitment. There were significant differences among academic disciplines regarding the scores on decision-making. (This variation can be attributed to the difference among the non-unionized respondents as demonstrated in the second research question.) Post-hoc tests (LSD, Bonferroni and Scheffé) all indicated that the physical sciences and mathematics scored moderately higher than the other disciplines; however, these results need to be evaluated in the context of the unequal group size among disciplines.
Table 19

**One-Way ANOVA: Academic Discipline for Combined Groups and Decision-Making and Organizational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>22,350</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.725</td>
<td>3.331</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>391,400</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>413,750</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>550,609</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>553,282</td>
<td>356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qualitative Data**

The survey instrument provided a section for "Remarks." There was a total of 76 responses in this category, or 21% of the respondents. Thirty-four, or 18% of the non-unionized group; and 42, or 25% of the unionized respondents, included comments in this section. The responses are included in Appendix D.

The comments range from suggestions regarding ways to improve the survey instrument, to well wishes from sympathetic respondents. Some respondents indicated that their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their college or university had more to do with job-related factors, such as supportive colleagues and flexible schedules, than with input into decision-making. Indeed, some respondents indicated that they had no interest in making administrative
decisions.

Approximately one-third of the responses could be characterized as complaints about either the state of the specific college or university administration, or complaints about the state of higher education. An additional third of the respondents reported satisfaction with their lack of current involvement in decision-making and/or their overall satisfaction with their current situation. Eight respondents had either a criticism or suggestion concerning ways to improve the survey instrument. The remainder of the remarks were general comments about the state of affairs in their specific institutions.

Summary of Findings

This chapter presented the data from a survey of faculty perceptions regarding input into decision-making and level of organizational commitment at ten colleges and universities. The study addressed seven research questions that have been identified in the literature, but for which there has been little empirical analysis.

Items from the survey were grouped in relation to the two key independent variables: level of organizational commitment and input into decision-making. Data summarizing faculty demographics were presented in percentages form for each dependent variable: age, gender, tenure status, rank, academic discipline, years at current institution, administrative position, and denial of promotion and tenure. Data for individual institutions were reported in
the aggregate to ensure confidentiality and anonymity; however, response rates for each institution were cited to demonstrate appropriate response rates from each institution.

The seven research questions were analyzed using SPSS for Windows, version 10.0. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), t-tests for independent sample, and Pearson Correlation were used to analyze the data.

Findings and conclusions based upon the analysis of the data are discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences between unionized and non-unionized faculty at private colleges and universities on the dimensions of satisfaction with decision-making and level of organizational commitment. Given the significant challenges facing higher education, it is important for faculty, administrators and board members to determine if certain forms of faculty representation have a positive, negative, or no relation to the faculty’s perceptions regarding decision-making and organizational commitment. If the faculty is to suggest, initiate, and support strategies that will strengthen the country’s colleges and universities, then it is important to know if collective bargaining is a mechanism that impacts these variables. Prior to this research, there were no studies that examined both level of organizational commitment and satisfaction with decision-making in unionized and non-unionized private institutions.

At the time of this study, there were nine private, unionized colleges and universities that had been classified as “Master’s (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I” by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement for Teaching (McCormick, 2000). From this group of nine, five were selected for this study.
Consideration was given to size, location, mission, and academic programs in selecting five non-unionized colleges and universities from the same classification. Of the 850 full-time faculty who were mailed surveys, 387, or 46% returned the instruments. A total of 357, or 42%, were used for this study as 30 were eliminated for reasons cited in Chapter 3. From this total, 169 responses were from unionized faculty, and 188 from non-unionized faculty.

Conclusions

**Subsidiary Question 1.**

What are the differences, if any, between faculty employed by private colleges and universities with collective bargaining units, and those employed by private colleges and universities without collective bargaining units, regarding degree of satisfaction with their role in decision-making?

A series of 28 items addressed the respondents’ level of satisfaction with decision-making. These items are the same criteria used by the NLRB in determining whether a given faculty is managerial based upon its role in deciding these issues. A t-test for independent samples was used to determine if there were differences between the two groups. There were no significant differences between the two groups.

The fact that there were no significant differences between the faculty employed in unionized and non-unionized environments could be due to several factors. One factor might be that there really were no differences in the
environments as they impact satisfaction with decision-making. The literature demonstrates that where there were strong faculty senates and faculty guides prior to unionization, often these structures stay in place and the only significant difference made by the union is a decrease in workload, and an increase in salary (Rhoades, 1998). Clearly, a positive work environment can occur in any institution without regard to the type of organizational structure in place to represent faculty issues and perspectives.

There is an alternate view regarding participation in decision-making. Although participation in decision-making would appear to have a positive value for most employees in any setting, there are faculty who are not interested in taking on what they perceive to be “the work of the administration.” This opinion is evidenced in comments written on the survey instruments by several faculty members (See Appendix D). It is important to note that this study measured only satisfaction with input into decision-making, it did not attempt to measure the actual role faculty play in decision-making at their institutions.

**Subsidiary Question 2.**

What are the differences, if any, in the characteristics (age, gender, years of employment at current institution, rank, and tenure status) of faculty employed by private colleges or universities with collective bargaining units, and those employed by private colleges and universities without collective bargaining and the degree of satisfaction with role in decision-making?

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the data.
For the non-unionized group, there was a slight difference among disciplines and their reported level of satisfaction with decision-making.

This author could find no research indicating differences among these variables and actual satisfaction with the level of input into decision-making. The literature does address differences among these variables and attitudes toward unionization. For example, women were found to be less inclined to choose unionization than men, and also reported more satisfaction post-unionization (Gomez-Mejia and Balkin, 1984). There is also research that suggests that assistant and full professors are more inclined to unionization than associate professors. Academic disciplines within business schools appear to be less inclined to unionize, whereas liberal arts faculty are more positive about unionization. It is, however, important to emphasize that these studies point to possible differences in attitudes toward unionization, not about satisfaction with decision-making.

**Subsidiary Question 3.**

What are the differences, if any, between faculty employed by a private college or university with a collective bargaining unit and those employed by a private college or university without a collective bargaining unit regarding organizational commitment?

The section of the instrument measuring organizational commitment consisted of 15 items and used a seven-point Likert scale. There was no significant difference between unionized and non-unionized faculty and their
scores on organizational commitment.

Porter et al. (1974) demonstrated that individuals who are committed to an institution tend to perform at a higher level and also tend to stay with the institution, thus decreasing turnover and increasing institutional effectiveness. There is no doubt that high levels of organizational commitment are important to administrators, boards, and to faculty. There is research that suggests that faculty who are more committed to the institution than they are to their discipline are often those faculty more invested in governance and in service to students (Dressel et al., 1970). Given the need to also have faculty who are committed to their scholarly work and research, it would appear that colleges and universities might consider ways to strike a balance between what Gouldner (1957) called “locals” and “cosmopolitans.” It is in this mix that faculty can perhaps best fulfill the three areas of teaching, service, and research.

The average score for the unionized group was 4.87 and for the non-unionized group was 4.99 on the Organizational Commitment section of the instrument. In his study of faculty, Harshbarger (1988) reported a mean score of 4.44. Mowday et al. (1979) reported scores across all professions in a national survey as ranging between 4.0 and 6.1. While the scores reported in this study, as well as in Harshbarger’s work, fall within the lower range, they are nonetheless comparable to other professions. This is an important finding as the results are empirical evidence that faculty can maintain multiple loyalties: institution, discipline, and union. As administrators and faculty alike struggle with determining the advantages and disadvantages of a union, this study would
lend evidence to the theory that unions do not have a negative impact on organizational commitment. Any causal relationship between unionization and organizational commitment cannot be determined from this study; however, it can be safely concluded that there was no difference between unionized and non-unionized faculty in reported level of organizational commitment.

Subsidiary Question 4.

What are the differences, if any, in the characteristics (age, gender, years of experience at current institution, rank and tenure) of faculty employed by private colleges and universities with a collective bargaining unit, and those without a collective bargaining unit regarding organizational commitment?

Using One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), there were no significant differences among the characteristics of age, gender, years of experience at the current institution, rank and tenure and scores on the organizational commitment section of the survey.

Consistent with responses on the decision-making section of the survey instrument, there were also no differences among these characteristics for organizational commitment. Harshbarger (1988) found higher scores for assistant and full professors than he did for associate professors using the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Fjortoft (1993), using a different measure of organizational commitment, found no difference in organizational commitment based upon rank, but she did find differences in commitment at the departmental level, and concluded that all ranks were more committed at the departmental
level than at the institutional level. Neumann and Finlay-Neumann (1990) discovered that full professors were more committed to the institution than were faculty of other ranks. The results of this study, therefore, are not consistent with prior research on the question of whether there are differences among rank and level of organizational commitment.

**Subsidiary Questions 5 and 6.**

Among faculty employed by a private college or university with a collective bargaining unit, what is the relationship between the variable of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment? Among faculty employed by a private college or university without a collective bargaining unit, what is the relationship between the variable of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to determine whether there was a relationship between satisfaction with decision-making and organizational commitment among unionized and non-unionized faculty. There was a moderately positive relationship between the two variables. While the unionized group had a slightly more positive correlation, there was no significant difference between the union and non-unionized groups.

Drummond and Reitsch (1995) concluded that the perceived level of participation in shared governance directly affects faculty attitudes about the quality of the institutional environment. They suggested that an "institution where faculty have a positive attitude toward governance is one where the needs
of the constituents are served more effectively and efficiently than one where . . . negative views abound" (p. 55). Drummond and Reitsch also conclude that institutions with collective bargaining and those without report similar attitudes about shared governance. Faculty who feel positively about their input into the decision-making processes appear to also have high levels of organizational commitment.

These findings are, to some degree, the objectification of intuitive reasoning. Individuals who are satisfied with their input into decision-making would certainly seem to be individuals who would be more satisfied with and committed to, the institution that fosters an atmosphere of general satisfaction. Conversely, those who are not satisfied with their level of decision-making would logically appear to be those less loyal to the institution. There is no reason to suggest causality between these variables, but this would be an area for future exploration.

**Subsidiary Question 7.**

What are the differences, if any, in the characteristic of academic discipline of faculty employed by a private college and university with and without collective bargaining and the degree of participation in decision-making and organizational commitment?

One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze whether there was a difference in discipline when combining the two groups and examining both decision-making and organizational commitment. There was no
difference among disciplines on organizational commitment, but there was a significant difference among disciplines in the score for satisfaction with decision-making.

The difference among discipline on the score for satisfaction with decision-making can be attributed to the non-unionized group. There were no differences for the unionized group. These findings support the need for further research to determine if these results can be generalized to other settings, as well as to determine possible reasons for the differences between unionized and non-unionized groups on this one characteristic of discipline.

Summary of Conclusions

Those studying faculty unions in the 1970s had various opinions and predictions regarding what the future might hold for faculty collective bargaining. Wollett (1973) stated that "the development of collective bargaining in higher education will probably be uneven — neither a wave nor a ripple — but something in between, reflecting the diversity in institutions" (p. 22). Wollett went on to suggest that the myriad of problems facing individual institutions raised the question of whether or not collective bargaining could be both a viable and a sensible solution for institutions facing massive change.

Garbarino (1975) expressed certitude that collective bargaining "is a form of university governance, possibly the [italics added] form of governance over large areas of higher education" (p. 29). Garbarino suggested that faculty collective bargaining was a viable solution to a breakdown in traditional forms
of governance to successfully adapt to change. Garbarino continued by predicting that “the rate of expansion is likely to be slow, and periods of stagnation will occur, but persistent, long-term growth (of faculty collective bargaining) is the most likely prospect” (p.29).

While both of these predictions pre-dated the 1980 Yeshiva decision, the questions raised by both Wollett (1973) and Garbarino (1975) are as relevant today as they were three decades ago. The ability of faculty governance to provide a mechanism for the efficient and effective management of change from both the internal and external environments is an issue of major concern, but one where little attention is given in the literature. This study attempted to address whether or not faculty collective bargaining made a difference in faculty members’ level of satisfaction with decision-making. The results of this study clearly indicate that there was no difference between unionized and non-unionized faculty perceptions of their level of satisfaction. It is important to emphasize that this study did not measure actual levels of input into decision-making, only the level of satisfaction with the degree of input. It is quite possible that a given faculty could have no input whatsoever, and nonetheless report extremely high levels of satisfaction. Conversely, a given faculty member could have some degree of input into every decision made in an institution and report very low satisfaction with the degree of input. This is an extremely important point and cannot be over-emphasized.

The scores on the organizational commitment variable clearly indicate that faculty are capable of, and do indeed, maintain multiple commitments to
discipline, institution and union. If one is considering the advantages against the
disadvantages of faculty collective bargaining, it is significant to include a
discussion on the comparable levels of organizational commitment between
unionized and non-unionized faculty.

In examining the broader issues of faculty commitment and the importance
of faculty loyalty when facing external and internal challenges, these findings
lend optimism to any discussion in which the commitment of faculty is deemed a
critical success factor in the ability to design and implement change strategies.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Given the results of the study and the derived conclusions, a number of
recommendations for further research are proposed concerning the continued
study of faculty collective bargaining and its relationship to organizational
commitment and satisfaction with decision-making.

1. The economic situation was not addressed by this study, and is clearly
an issue among faculty. No salary data were collected for this study, but
available data on compensation indicate that the situation is worsening for many
faculty. A study of faculty compensation at unionized and non-unionized
institutions, along with scores on satisfaction with decision-making and
organizational commitment, could explore the implications of the economic
situation as it pertains to faculty organizational commitment and satisfaction
with decision-making.

2. The study focused on present perceptions of satisfaction with decision-
making and organizational commitment. It is recommended that the study be replicated in five years with the same institutions to examine possible faculty changes in perception over time. A question to explore would be whether faculty had held to their present perceptions, regardless of changes in economic status.

3. This study did not compare individual institutions due to agreements regarding anonymity and confidentiality. The current study, the literature, as well as the sponsorship of the institutions where faculty are currently seeking NLRB support for unionization, suggest that Catholic colleges and universities may be a subset of institutions worthy of attention. If Catholic colleges and universities are those in which faculty are most interested in unionization at this time, there is merit to determining the extent of interest in collective bargaining at such institutions, as well as the reasons why there is more interest in unionization than at other private colleges and universities.

4. Future areas of exploration might analyze more extensively the data contained in the current study. There are numerous questions for which these data can provide answers, including, but not limited to the following: What disciplines have higher versus lower levels of satisfaction with decision-making? What are the specific decision-making items with which faculty are most satisfied? What are those that have the least positive level of satisfaction?

5. Do public colleges and universities differ significantly from private colleges and universities in the levels of satisfaction with decision-making and organizational commitment?

6. Future studies of faculty organizational commitment might be enriched
through the use of focused, structured interviews so that exploration could occur to identify sources and potential conflicts affecting organizational commitment. (This methodology was considered for the current research, but the key administrators in most of the institutions surveyed did not offer support of this research method citing a number of reasons including concerns over the effect on faculty morale.)

7. This research was limited to a discussion of possible differences between unionized and non-unionized institutions on the variables of satisfaction with decision-making and organizational commitment. Given that there are other variables affecting organizational culture (e.g., level of job satisfaction), future research could explore such variables.
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Appendix B

Cover Letter to Participants
Mary J. Meehan  
Seton Hall University  
South Orange, NJ 07079  

Name:  
Address:  
City, State, Zip:  

Dear:  

I am a doctoral candidate at Seton Hall University currently pursuing a degree in Higher Education Administration. I am also the Vice President and Assistant to the President at the University. I am conducting research on a comparison of perceptions in the areas of governance and organizational commitment. The research will determine differences in perception between unionized and non-unionized faculty at private colleges and universities. The research will not identify differences between and among individual institutions, but rather in the aggregate.  

The enclosed questionnaire measures the ways that you as a faculty member perceive your institution. I am requesting that you take a few moments of your valuable time to respond to the questionnaire. (The questionnaire should take you fewer than ten minutes.) The completion and return of the questionnaire indicate that you understand the purpose of the research, and agree to participate in the study. Upon completion, please place it in the enclosed, stamped envelope and return it to me by (Date, 2000). For sample control and follow-up purposes, each questionnaire is coded; however, the master list will only contain names and the codes — it will be destroyed upon receipt of the questionnaires.  

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached through the Office of Grants and Research Services. The telephone number of the Office is (973) 275-2974.  

Thank you in advance for your assistance in completing this survey. Your participation is, of course, voluntary, and all information will be treated with the highest standards of confidentiality. If you would like more information about this research, or a copy of the results, please contact me at (973) 275-2830, or e-mail me at meehanm@shu.edu.  

Sincerely yours,  

Mary J. Meehan
Appendix C

Survey Instrument
PERCEPTIONS REGARDING
DECISION-MAKING AND
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

On the following pages are statements of perception regarding the role
of faculty in decision-making and the level of faculty organizational
commitment.

Read each statement and think about your own college or university;
place an "X" in the appropriate box for each item.

Please do not forward this questionnaire to colleagues for submission.
Also, please do not submit more than one response.

Your participation in this research is voluntary, and all responses will be
kept in the strictest confidence.

Your prompt reply is deeply appreciated. Thank you in advance for
participating in this study.

Mary J. Meehan
Seton Hall University
**DECISION-MAKING**

Please rate your satisfaction with the faculty's role at your institution in each of the following areas (1-28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>Moderately unsatisfied</th>
<th>Slightly unsatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Slightly satisfied</th>
<th>Moderately satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In establishing tuition rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In determining room and board charges and other fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In undergraduate admissions decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In formulating undergraduate admissions policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In formulating graduate admissions policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In establishing the size of the undergraduate student body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In formulating financial aid policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In making financial aid decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. In establishing the college/university's scholarship budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In making scholarship decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In assigning teaching loads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In establishing the size of classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. In developing the academic schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. In the college/university's grading policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In hiring full-time faculty members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In hiring adjunct faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. In the tenure review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. In the promotion process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In determining faculty salary scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. In determining health and other benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. In the grievance process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. In the college/university's overall budget process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. In determining academic department budgets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In approving the college/university's calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. In selecting department chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. In selecting college/university administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In reviewing/approving the college/university mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. In reviewing/approving the college/university mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Agreement Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. In conducting academic program review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. In the implementation of new academic programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Commitment**

Please indicate the level of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements (29-43).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this college/university be successful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I tell my friends that this is a great college/university to work for.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I feel very little loyalty to this college/university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I would accept almost any type of academic assignment in order to keep working for this college/university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I find that my values and the college/university's values are very similar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this college/university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I could get just as well be working for a different college/university as long as the type of work was similar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. This college/university really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this college/university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I am extremely glad that I chose this college/university to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. There is not much to be gained by remaining with this college/university indefinitely.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Often I find it difficult to agree with this college/university's policies on important matters relating to its faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I really care about the fate of this college/university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. For me, this is the best of all colleges/universities for which to work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Deciding to work for this college/university was a definite mistake on my part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please turn the page...
**BACKGROUND DATA**

*Please answer the following questions (44-53).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. What is your age?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. What is your gender?</td>
<td>Female ☐ Male ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Are you tenured?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Have you ever been denied tenure or promotion at your current college/university?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. What is your faculty rank?</td>
<td>Full Professor ☐ Associate Professor ☐ Assistant Professor ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer or Instructor ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Which of the following categories best describes your academic discipline?</td>
<td>Physical sciences and mathematics ☐ Biological, agricultural and health sciences ☐ Applied sciences and engineering ☐ Social sciences and education ☐ Arts and letters ☐ Business ☐ Other ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Do you possess a terminal degree?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. How many years (to the nearest whole number) have you served on the faculty of your current institution?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Do you now hold an administrative post?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Are you a member of a faculty union?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REMARKS**

*Please feel free to add any comments.*

---
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Appendix D

Qualitative Comments
Comments from respondents who are not members of a faculty union:

1. Interesting research—we are essentially powerless, overworked as a labor force—faculty goals and ideals (intellectual) are fundamentally different than administrative (financial/business) goals—thus leading to apathetic faculty who are minimalistic in their approach to the job.

2. The College has great potential but some very poor administrators. This is too often stifling.

3. Question 42 emphasis on "the best" influences my strong reactions.

4. The administration is far less of a problem than the other faculty. It is the faculty who choose not to do research, and think of themselves as High Quality teachers (generally untrue), that serve on committees, and make policy that interferes with the rest of us doing our jobs.

5. As a measure of institutional satisfaction, the "institutional commitment" section is possibly misleading, I think. Some questions need to be asked about the market realities which draw faculty to an institution and given those, how they feel about the place. Without those questions, I don't think respondents will be answering from a consistent frame of reference.

6. The extent to which I commit myself to teaching, scholarship and service has to do with personal motives and a desire to move on rather than satisfaction with this college. Yet for many people this is an ideal institution—we just need higher pay and a lighter teaching load. My comments in Part II are idiosyncratic not typical, I would imagine.

7. My administrative post is 25% and is with a graduate program.

8. There are many decisions I am perfectly happy not to be a part of in running this institution. I have been a chair since 1977. I thought the decision-making part of this could be misconstrued.

9. The decision-making part was hard for me to answer because I do not think the faculty should have a role, on many of these areas (tuition, financial aid, as examples).

10. This year we are starting a new faculty body which hopefully will give the faculty more say in matters of primary faculty concern, if not, a union is probably next. Good luck on your project.

11. I have never been impressed with doctoral programs in Higher Education
Administration. Some of the worst administrators I have seen have come out of such programs. Administrators should have backgrounds in scholarly work if they are going to administer scholarly institutions.

12. An example of a major dissatisfaction is our University's having jumped on the bandwagon of distance learning. And, a committee selected the software. And it does not work and this is very frustrating. Our dean said we had to use it even though other colleges bailed out—the dean did not want it to appear that we were not making use of resources.

13. A smaller number of more pointed questions would be a better format for this survey. There are a great number of areas in any business or organization in which I do not wish to participate. I like a say in situations close to me. This was difficult for me to get across with these questions.

14. Unionization is not needed here. Faculty have much input into decisions.

15. A serious commitment to an institution without any critical dimension is near to idolatry. A critical perspective may come from caring about education more than institutional leaders do—as well as from having a professional life apart from the institution as a writer, scholar, researcher and writer.

16. The current president has made a concerted effort to involve faculty in strategic planning. There is a strong governance process for faculty with respect to academic affairs.

17. Some questions assume that faculty can move to better settings for their discipline. That is not always the case.

18. Be sure you calculate history as a discipline that can go either way—in the Humanities or Social Sciences. Question 30 is fuzzy and too imprecise to render any meaningful data because I inspire myself to be my professional best so I am always giving 100% in my teaching, research and scholarship. Frequently, however, this institution gets in the way.

19. Our institution will likely change from quarters to semesters—a decision made this year. I strongly value the students here but feel the values of the university are oppressive to both them and me. I feel I have tried to work for change on the university level, but feel successful only in the classroom.

20. I think you need to measure a responder's view toward faculty governance in general in order to properly evaluate responses. Some faculty are
ardent advocates of faculty involvement in all aspects of university life and others (like me) are more than happy to have competent administrators relieve me of administrative burdens so I can focus on my discipline.

21. Administrative salaries are very high. Faculty pay is partly determined by merit increases that are arbitrarily administered by chairs and deans who uniformly nit-pick to find fault in order not to give any significant merit pay. As an example, two students out of 74 wrote on student evaluations that my class was too hard. In my yearly review, I was told that I needed to work on my teaching skills and could not receive significant merit pay. The other 72 students gave me glowing reviews of the course.

22. University policy with regard to faculty has not been clarified in several areas. We are a primarily undergraduate institution but as of yet have not reconciled faculty scholarship and teaching with the stated mission.

23. I am a teacher. I teach undergraduates well, at this undergraduate department. I was hired as a teacher. I have always fulfilled my part of the reasons for my hiring. Currently teaching prowess is not valued as much as any publication. I feel betrayed by both administration and yes-men colleagues. It is immoral for a >75% tuition-driven institution to "pay faculty to do research" to the detriment of teaching students.

24. Long-time AAUP supporter—sometime associate dean—senate president for two years.

25. I really think salary decisions would be more equitable if we had a faculty union. It is not fair that people who are hired later come in at a higher salary than those who are tenured or at a higher rank.

26. Because I am relatively new to the University, there are some decisions I haven't been a part of yet that I expect to be included in the future. My answers to 10-28 might reflect that to some extent.

27. Ex corde ecclesiae and Dominus Jesus have prompted me to look seriously elsewhere, though I have grown to love my University.

28. Many of the questions were not relevant because as a faculty member I do not take part in those decisions. Therefore, my satisfaction-dissatisfaction does not apply.

29. Tenure and unions will ruin our college system. Merit and performance should be the only qualification for promotion and longevity.
30. Although I am not happy with the relationship between the administration and the faculty—I would not tend to move from this College because of (1) location, (2) colleagues, and (3) I am tenured and I don't believe I could get a tenured position at another college. Although the College as a whole does not treat the faculty well, in our subgroup, the dean does treat us well.

31. I wish there were a question or two about satisfaction with career/field choice. Public school teachers earn significantly more than we do. Also, I do not care for my field of study as much as I would like, but don't know how to switch at this point. There seems to be little advantage in this field.

32. Beam me up, Scotty, this College sucks!

33. Twenty-five years as faculty member—originally joined this institution as an administrator; moved back to faculty.

34. I think of satisfaction as an absolute; I am either satisfied or not. Beyond satisfied, I am pleased, delighted, ecstatic. So, I find the categories of "slightly" and "moderately" hard ones to relate to. But maybe that's just me.

Comments from respondents who are members of a faculty union:

1. Enough revealed already.

2. Deciding to enter the teaching profession and accepting an assignment from this institution rank as two of the most gratifying decisions I made. It ranks with marriage and parenting.

3. The current relationship of private funds/holdings to common concerns like education is the real issue and the underlying cause of my "very unsatisfied" responses.

4. Some of my willingness to leave relates to my age. (Most of it, but I always would have been willing to go to a more prestigious university if teaching circumstances had been equal or better.)

5. Many questions do not apply to me.


7. The faculty in my department are outstanding. They are the reason I
remain at this institution.

8. I am dismayed by the lack of organization at this College. The various departments such as registrar, admissions, etc. do not work with individual departments. Transfer paperwork could come three years after the student enters. Transcripts are not current. Administration is not management oriented.

9. This job meets so many of my personal needs now, after 45 years of experience, most in non-academic settings. I expect I am not typical.

10. Mobility in academia is problematic; if there were more opportunities for associate/full professors to move into other universities, I probably would have been gone by now. I am very comfortable with my departmental colleagues.

11. In part my answers reflect a good understanding of the nature of the University—its pluses and minuses—when I agreed to accept this position—i.e., I knew what I was getting into, so my expectations have been met. Our union is strong and provides a lot of influence, but it is still a Catholic top-down management style and faculty generally are not decision makers. Good luck with your dissertation!

12. My colleagues and students are great people to work with; my department is especially supportive and well-run. People in my field are a “dime a dozen”—very tight job market. My University is beginning to work toward more faculty involvement in governance, but there is much to be done in this area.

13. Our union is quite interested in a strong voice in governance. Unfortunately, many obstacles/areas I’m unhappy about my union does not support. It (the union) is opposed to merit pay or reduced loads for research. We have absolutely no say in academic budgets. Our union and administration are always at odds—so, I doubt we’ll make much progress on governance issues in the next ten years!

14. Neutral answers on questions 1-28 generally reflect lack of interest as well as lack of involvement in decision processes (other than 17 and 18 which reflect lack of knowledge on my part.) If this survey is done again in five years, there is expected to be more faculty involvement.

15. Faculty in my institution are simply not involved in many of the decision-making categories outlined in Part I of this survey. Faculty here do not participate in these things. In reading this survey I was somewhat surprised at the extent faculty at my University are apparently excluded
from many routine aspects of the decision-making process.

16. Deepest criticism of University’s exclusion of faculty form governance decisions: choosing of deans, Academic VP.

17. One year ago some of my answers would have been dramatically different, e.g. #’s 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, but in December of 1999 the Board of Trustees voted to “phase out” my department without input from the faculty in spite of hundreds of protest letters and a two-hour presentation by faculty and alumni. We felt devalued and devastated by their refusal to change their minds and still throw away a prestigious program with a 50 year history—just because “our enrollments are down.” So, I hope you will take this into consideration when you analyze my answers.

18. Regarding faculty governance—we have a University (not faculty) senate half of whose members are administrators and which is chaired by the Academic VP. Faculty participation in governance here is practically non-existent. Faculty were not even included on the search committees for the last three administrative appointments one of which was for the president of the University.

19. It was difficult to answer a number of these questions (especially under “Institutional Commitment”) because our University earlier this year decided to close the college I teach in. Of course we as faculty do not feel this was a very sound decision and feel we were not treated fairly. Good luck with your study!

20. My comments pertain to my college, not the university as a whole.

21. There are some administrative and budgetary functions that I think should be left to the administration. They also bear the responsibility for the consequences of their decisions.

22. The neutral answers were for those areas where faculty input is not sought and I don’t want to participate in those decisions.

23. Questions 29-43: Commitment is to students, not to this institution. Institution ends up “winning” as a result. Haven’t sought a terminal degree because of what is witnessed at this institution.

24. Questions such as you ask can never be answered in a vacuum—I find myself much happier here than at another university in large part because I have been given such flexibility in scheduling and therefore juggle family and career more easily. For instance, the university gave me a
semester's reassigned research time the spring my son was born, and I am able to teach early in the day so as to be home in the afternoon some days. Factors such is these lead to a much greater loyalty on my part.

25. There is a significant difference between the university's mission and beliefs and the way the administration treats faculty.

26. I have generally been unsympathetic with our union since its inception, although I have accepted the will of the majority and recognize the union has probably improved benefits for me. Since we have affiliated with a national union, I worry that it will work to compromise the religious identity of the school.

27. Gender issues are significant here. I was surprised to not see them addressed on this form.

28. I believe that without a faculty union the faculty as this institution would have little or no voice in matters of academic affairs, or working conditions and compensation. The administration has, in recent years, developed a distinctly corporate model of management which ignores the collegial model of old. The union gives us a voice that we would not otherwise have.

29. Please understand that many of the "areas" in the beginning of the decision-making part are not faculty decisions here! I would certainly welcome an opportunity to be part of the process but it is reserved exclusively for administrators.

30. A University that has great potential but does not care about students or faculty. It is all money. Accept students as long as they can breathe. Dorms and classrooms look like crap, but money keeps rolling in.

31. My general position is that my university is a wonderful place to work, in spite of the administration.

32. We are a very modest, mediocre university which is indifferent to the arts, and beyond the money they take in, indifferent to the students. I am, however, thrilled to have an academic appointment and appreciative of being tenured which was relatively easy to achieve here due to their overall mediocrity. That's why the responses to the questions seem paradoxical.

33. I want complete disclosure of the University's financial standings, preferably reviewed and made public by an unbiased third party accounting firm. It is impossible to make good decisions without a
The union protects senior faculty and treats junior faculty very badly.

Not an especially well-crafted questionnaire!

As you can see, my perceptions come from 35 years of teaching while I was an administrator for another 12 years.

I enjoy working here, but for personal reasons: location, convenience and colleagues. I feel there is much that could be done to raise the morale of faculty.

I don’t like this college, but I like the work. Although I’ve never been denied promotion or tenure, I had to fight for it each time because the initial decisions were “no” due to across-the-board policies not to grant any tenure that year, or, promotion another year. When I protested (threatened a grievance), they granted me what I had earned.

Despite the negativity of some of my answers, I feel extremely lucky to have a job in my field, to be able to develop my areas, to be encouraged (or at least to be left alone) to do my research. My wife also has a tenured faculty position on another campus, so things have really worked out better than we imagined when we graduated in the slump of ’81.

My faith in private universities has been nearly totally destroyed. The input from faculty is almost totally ignored. The academic mission is compromised so as to maximize surpluses and squirrel away university funds. Tenure turns out to be a double-edged “blessing.”

The University does little to make faculty feel more than hired workers.

Despite my commitment and that of others like me on the faculty, the University with which I am affiliated has declined as an academic institution over the past fifteen years.