The general purpose of this study was to investigate the question: Is unionization disruptive of intra-institutional relationships on community college campuses? The introduction of faculty unions into the college community is often perceived, even by proponents, as a process which engenders hostility and disruption. Social conflict theory is the framework within which this study examines this question of unions and their alleged disruption of institutional relationships.

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) is the data gathering instrument used to derive and organize the empirical aspects of the problem. The data collected with the PTO were computed using a two-way analysis of variance, F statistic, to test the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in morale between union and non-union faculty.
2. There is no significant difference in morale between campuses.

3. There is no significant interaction effect between campuses and membership.

The calculations of the two-way analysis of variance test showed no significant differences or interaction effect for overall PTO morale score, or for five of the PTO factors. However, the five following factors were computed to have significant differences or interaction effects: "Rapport with Administrators," "Satisfaction with Teaching," "Rapport among Teachers," "Teacher Salary," and "School Facilities and Services."

The conclusions of this study are that faculty unions have become interest groups within the college organization. The unequal distribution of power and authority gives rise to faculty unions. Conflict between faculty unions and college administrators is normal, and is beneficial to the resolution of differences. Finally, collegial relationships between administrators and faculty are difficult because collegiality is a relationship that exists between group members that share ideas, goals and values.
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AN ASSESSMENT OF DIFFERENCES IN MORALE BETWEEN AND AMONG SELECTED UNION AND NON-UNION COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Like all universities, mine has long since fallen apart in spirit. It is not a concentrated community. It is not any kind of community, except in enormous facade. Now its very facade will come down in the adversary relationships. . .(of unionism).

The above statement was written by Milton Mayer (1973:7) in an article titled "The Union and the University: Organizing the Ruins." The introduction of faculty unions into the academic community has often been perceived by many members of the institution as a disruption of intra-institutional relationships.

Fred E. Crossland (1976:41) has pointed out that, "Critics of faculty unionization often rhapsodize about 'collegiality' and predict its demise with the advent of collective bargaining."

Collegiality has historically been interpreted as a relationship wherein the various groups of the academic community participate in the governance of the institution. But as Crossland (1976:42) has so eloquently pointed out:

The faculty, once considered the heart of the institution and its collegial governor, (have) become 'employees'. And the administrators, once perceived as the faculty's housekeepers, (have) become 'employers'. 
This study will consider certain aspects of the myth/reality of collegial relationships on unionized campuses.

Faculty will be surveyed to assess their perceptions of certain relationships within the academic community. In brief, do members of faculty unions have higher morale than non-members? If it can be demonstrated that one group, union or non-union, have higher morale, then some of the suppositions made concerning the effects of unionization on college faculty can be empirically based.

Statement of the Problem

George Simmel has postulated that, "conflict sets boundaries between groups within a social system by strengthening group consciousness and awareness of separateness, thus establishing the identity of the group within the system" (Coser, 1956:34). In order to empirically test this and other propositions of social conflict theory (see p. 4), this study will address the following questions:

1. Is unionization disruptive of intra-institutional relationships?

2. What impact does unionization have on intra-institutional relationships as measured by level of morale?

3. Is there a significant difference in morale between union and non-union faculty members?
Objectives of the Study

1. To analyze the difference in intra-group (faculty/faculty) conflict/harmony between union and non-union faculty.
2. To analyze the difference between union and non-union faculty in inter-group (faculty/administration) conflict/harmony.
3. To analyze the difference between union and non-union faculty members' opinions concerning their working conditions.

Theoretical Formulations

The theoretical framework of this study is "social conflict" theory. Building upon the works of George Simmel (1955), Lewis Coser (1956), Ralf Dahrendorf (1959) and others, Ronald Corwin (1970) has applied the major tenets of social conflict theory to education. "Conflict theory," in Corwin's (1970:22) words, "". . .focuses on the structural interdependencies of society and as a formal theory it concentrates particularly on the structural subdivisions." Therefore, in this study the subdivisions upon which attention will be focused will be faculty groups within the educational institution. However, unlike theories such as functionalism (Merton, 1957), conflict theory addresses and considers the tensions that arise because of status and economic differences between the subdivisions within society.
Dahrendorf's (1958) position is that specific structures give rise to conflict and it is the task of sociological theory to prove that such is the case. According to Corwin (1970), theories can be classified according to the implicit social organization they suggest or employ. The model of complex organizations proposed by Dahrendorf (1959:162) is based on the following premises:

1. Every society is at every point subject to processes of change; social change is ubiquitous.
2. Every society displays at every point dissensus and conflict; social conflict is ubiquitous.
3. Every element in a society renders a contribution to its disintegration and change.
4. Every society is based on the coercion of some of its members by others.

Corwin expands on Dahrendorf's social conflict model by adding the following elements to the theory; rationality, personal sentiments, power, and cultural values. It is Corwin's (1970:25) position that, "...a conflict model must assign priority to power. Tension is likely when power is distributed differently among segments of the organization and when there are disparities between the system of power and prestige."

Dahrendorf has proposed that subgroups within an organization are inclined to oppose the source of power whenever it is exercised in a free society. The functioning of an organization, according to the premises of social conflict theory, often depends on the degree of
conflict among subgroups. In keeping with the above discussion, Corwin (1970:26-27) has proposed the following premises as the basis of a conflict model of complex organizations:

I. Conflict is an intergroup activity which has sources beyond the subjective attitudes of individual members.

II. Cultural relativism is a central concept to conflict theory because from their own point of view both sides are 'right'.

III. Organizations exist as a balance of power and are the result of historic power struggles.

IV. Conflict between groups requires cooperation within groups.

V. Groups must be visible to wage conflict.

VI. Conflict influences goals, which are forged out of the conflict process.

As can be surmised from the above premises, social conflict theorists do not consider conflict, as Corwin (1970:31) explains, "...necessarily detrimental to either the organization or the overall morale of its members: in fact, conflict provides one way of upholding valued principles and for that reason can be both useful and personally satisfying."

In short, the positive aspects of conflict may result in intra-group cooperation, and hence, may be beneficial to the maintenance of values, goals and group identity. As implied by Corwin above, group morale may be higher in organizations where differences are openly declared and sub-group identity and goals are clearly
perceived. High or low morale may then be an indicator of inter-group and intra-group conflict/harmony.

This study will therefore attempt to analyze certain aspects of inter-group and intra-group relationships of community college faculty by measuring group morale. In order to investigate such relationships the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO), a standardized questionnaire, will be utilized to gather data on faculty morale at two selected Oregon community colleges. The PTO was selected as a survey instrument because its sub-scores are a measurement of inter-group and intra-group relationships.

**Hypotheses**

The data gathered with the PTO will be treated statistically to test the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in morale between union and non-union faculty.
2. There is no significant difference in morale between campuses.
3. There is no significant interaction effect between campuses and membership.

These general hypotheses are treated by statistically testing the ten factors of morale and total morale score derived from the PTO. In other words, each factor of the PTO is treated as a sub-hypothesis; i.e., there is no significant difference in Rapport with Administrators
(Factor 1) between union and non-union faculty. A two-way ANOVA is computed for each factor with Campus and Membership as the independent variables and PTO mean scores as the dependent variables.
 CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In recent years faculty unions have become established on many college and university campuses. "By the beginning of 1976 bargaining agents had been chosen to represent the faculties of 294 institutions with over 410 campuses" (Ladd and Lipset, 1976:11). In a 1969 Carnegie Commission Higher Education survey of college and university faculty, 59 percent of those interviewed stated that they would vote for collective bargaining if an election were held on their campus (Carr and Van Eyck, 1973:39). Although collective bargaining does not necessarily require an external bargaining agent, this study shall focus on faculty unions which have affiliated with state/national organizations.

In their book, Collective Bargaining Comes to Campus, Carr and Van Eyck (1973:20) explain that beginning in the 1950's public employees in some metropolitan areas received the right to organize collectively. In 1966-67 several community college locals negotiated collective bargaining agreements. Henry Ford Community College in Dearborn, Michigan and the Chicago City Colleges entered into formal collective bargaining agreements in 1967 with their boards. By 1972 about 15 four-year institutions had collective bargaining agreements with their faculty (Carr and Van Eyck, 1973:18). The fact that
collective bargaining has become an established means of faculty-administration-board relations at many institutions is fairly easy to document (Carr and Van Eyck, 1973; Ladd and Lipset, 1973; Garbarino, 1975). What is much more difficult to explain is the reason faculty members have turned to collective bargaining. On this matter Carr and Van Eyck (1973:20) have reported that:

Three considerations have usually been basic to the decision of any group of employees, including college faculty, to engage in collective bargaining. The law must establish the right of the group to require their employer to bargain with them; there must be a substantial measure of dissatisfaction with existing conditions of employment; and someone must be making a positive effort to 'organize the work force'. . . .

Therefore, to better understand the development of faculty unions, these three "considerations," legal, employment conditions, and the organizers will be appraised individually.

The Legal-Ideological Environment

There seems to be general agreement among those who have written on the topic that President Kennedy's executive order 10988, which provided federal employees the right to organize and bargain collectively, marked the initial movement toward wide scale collective bargaining by public employees (Ladd and Lipset, 1973:4). It is worth noting that as recently as the 1960's higher education faculty had not seriously considered unionization. Faculty attitudes on the topic seem to confirm Thorsen Veblen's (1918:162) comment that
professors would not join unions because of a belief that their salaries are not of the nature of wages. Also, that they considered it morally wrong to become involved in such matters.

Traditionally, higher education faculty have associated unions with manual labor and therefore incompatible with their image of their professional status. Consequently, academics have generally been adverse to being associated with the labor union movement.

An ideological change seems to have occurred during the 1960's which was expressed in legislation being passed which granted public employees the right to organize and bargain. It is important to note that during this period the state affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers were engaged in extensive lobbying efforts in many states for passage of collective bargaining legislation.

In short, during the 1960's ideological, legal and economic conditions evolved to the point that collective bargaining became an acceptable practice to many faculty. The Carnegie Commission study found that by 1969, 59.8 percent of all higher education faculty endorsed the principle of collective bargaining (Ladd, 1973:11). Nonetheless, endorsing the principles of faculty collective bargaining and joining a faculty union are two different matters. This brings up the next topic, that of dissatisfaction with conditions of employment.
Higher education, like the rest of American society, has been experiencing forceful social, political and economic pressures to change during the past 20 years. And as Garbarino (1975:24) and others have stated, the institutions of education have changed considerably during the post-World War II period. Much of this change was generated by increasing student enrollment. However, by the late 60's and early 70's, the growth period seemed to have reached a peak. The student growth rate had begun to level off about 1970, while at the same time operating funds had become more limited, and inflation had eroded salary increases. In the Carnegie Commission's 1969 study only 46.6 percent of the faculty in higher education rated their own salary as "excellent" or "good" (Carr and Van Eyck, 1973:53).

Because of these factors, there evolved on many campuses support for an active representation of the interests of faculty members. Garbarino (1975:10) maintains that faculty, especially the young and untenured, have primarily been attracted to unions as a means to obtain economic security.

Another by-product of the post-World War II growth rate was an accompanying "bureaucratization" of the academic institution. With the increase in personnel (students, faculty, and support staff),
the traditional collegial governance system proved too slow and
cumbersome to serve the multitude of demands from the various sec-
tors of the expanding institution. Understandably, administrative
staff assumed greater control of the institution's governance system.
Crossland (1976:41) succinctly describes this phenomenon:

If authority of the faculty remained intact and unquestioned
in the institutional charter, its actual power was atrophying.
Faculty meetings were still convened, but were often little
more than ceremonial occasions to ratify administrative
decrees.

As long as management was small and visible, and in some way
answerable to the faculty, professors were content to do their teach-
ing and research and leave management of the institution to the
administrators. In the past 25 years, however, the faculty have wit-
tnessed their small administrative staffs rapidly expanding into self-
perpetuating bureaucracies. During this same period, faculty have
experienced the loss of effective control of what they have tradition-
ally considered their areas of interest.

Crossland (1975:42) explains that the faculty's most important
losses were those of allowing, "...the administration's capture of
financial affairs, and its close identification with, and influence upon,
the institution's board of trustees." In many institutions boards
became nearly totally dependent on their administrators for informa-
tion upon which they made their decisions. In addition, the structure
of the organization was such that any faculty input into the decisional
process was channeled through the administration. Institutional environments, operating as such have often provoked professors to turn to faculty unions in an effort to retain, or regain, inclusion in the decision making process.

**The Organizers**

"Faculty, like workers in industry," Carr and Van Eyck (1973:115) maintain, "seem to be dependent on a positive effort to organize them by an outside agency. . . ." Hence, another contributing factor to the growth of faculty unions has been the national teacher/professor organizations. There are three major national organizations that are currently involved in representing faculty members in labor negotiations and which, for all practical purposes and those of this study, can be considered faculty unions. The American Association of University Professors, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers represent the majority of unionized faculty in the U.S.

Unions may be new to college and university faculty but professors have long been organized into "professional" associations. The oldest of the post-secondary faculty associations is the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). Formed in 1915 the AAUP has long fought for academic freedom and tenure policies
which in turn have helped to establish academic "due process"
procedures.

In addition, the AAUP has through its committees and reports
attempted to advance faculty salaries by advocating minimal national
standards. Throughout much of its history the AAUP has, in fact,
provided for members many of the services that trade unions have
supplied for their members. Nonetheless, from its inception until
1972, the AAUP resisted the idea that it become involved in trade
union activities, i.e., collective bargaining and strikes (Ladd and
Lipset, 1976:256). However, by the early 1970's the demands,
especially by the younger and untenured faculty, were such that the
membership voted to, "...pursue collective bargaining, as a major
additional way of realizing the Association's goals in higher education"
(Garbarino, 1975:86).

The change in policy did not set well with all members, as
expressed by the outgoing president, Sanford Kadish, in 1972 (Ladd
and Lipset, 1976:246):

In dividing the university into worker-professor and
manager-administrators and governing boards... (collective bargaining) imperils the premise of shared
authority, encourages the polarization in interests and
exaggerates the adversary concerns over interest held in
common.

Not only are some of the leaders of the AAUP discontent with the
change in policy; between 1971 and 1974 membership dropped 15,000.
Garbarino (1975:88) claims that the principal argument against involvement in collective bargaining is that in the process of functioning as a "union" the AAUP would lose its professional standing which would change the nature of the organization.

A major reason that the AAUP has undergone its recent re-evaluation of its position concerning collective bargaining has been due to the successes of the National Education Association (NEA) in increasing membership in higher education. Historically, the NEA has considered itself a "professional" teachers' association. Primary and secondary school teachers and administrators have traditionally constituted the bulk of the membership for the NEA. Nevertheless, as early as 1870 a higher education department was formed, only to be dropped in 1920 because of the AAUP efforts at that level. In 1943 the higher education department was reestablished and has been functioning since (Ladd and Lipset, 1976:247).

Throughout most of its history the NEA was dominated by school superintendents and principals. Improving the salaries and working conditions of teachers has consistently been the foremost task of the NEA, but only recently has that included collective bargaining. The utilization of collective bargaining as a means of dealing with school boards has spawned an exodus of administrators from the organization. As Garbarino (1975:97) has explained;
As the organization becomes increasingly committed to collective bargaining, some of these organizational relationships are changing. For example, the American Association of Higher Education, a membership organization of faculty and some administrators in higher education, dropped its affiliation with the NEA in 1968, at least in part over the collective bargaining issue.

However, higher education membership has steadily increased in the 1970's to the point that the NEA now has approximately 54,000 higher education members in 354 locals, 149 of which are bargaining agents (Ladd, 1976:11). Initially, NEA's higher education organizing efforts were directed at teachers' colleges and community colleges. At its 1972 convention, however, NEA voted to give top priority to organizing higher education (Ladd and Lipset, 1976:248). Consequently, during the 1970's, the NEA, for all practical purposes, began to function as a faculty union.

The changes in policy toward collective bargaining by the NEA and AAUP were brought about to a great extent by the recent successes of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT). The AFT was founded in 1916 as an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor. During the depression the AFT had a limited number of higher education faculty members, most of whom belonged for social and political reasons. As Ladd and Lipset (1976:249) have reported, "The college teachers' locals, which numbered about 2,000 members, were particularly affected by the politicization of that era and
were caught up in bitter factional strife between pro-Communist and liberal-Socialist factions."

Higher education faculty membership did not increase significantly, however, until the 1960's. In 1963 the United Federation of College Teachers, Local 1460, was organized in New York City (Ladd and Lipset, 1976:249). The AFT organized a college and university department in 1967, which by 1974 had grown to 240 locals with 30,000 to 35,000 higher education members (Garbarino, 1975:93). The majority of the AFT higher education membership is in New York state where an AFT/NEA merger constitutes about 36,000 members.

The AFT ability to attract members from higher education is probably limited by the organization being, "...more militant, more indignant, more ideological, more issue-oriented, more committed to support for groups on the fringes of the professoriate..." (Garbarino, 1975:94). It is these very same qualities, however, that have attracted the majority of its members, which have a common characteristic of being predominantly from public four-year colleges and urban community colleges in industrial states.

In summary, the "organizers," AFT, NEA, and AAUP, vary considerably in their approaches in representing faculty interest. Nonetheless, all three organizations are increasing their commitment to collective bargaining, which will probably have a tendency to diminish their differences in the future.
Intra-Institutional Relationships

Kemerer and Baldridge (1975:52) distinguish between "institutional" and "environmental" causes of unionization. What has been described above as "legal-ideological" and "the organizers" would constitute environmental causes according to their typology. "Employment conditions," on the other hand, would be defined as being an institutional cause. Their analysis of institutional causes is somewhat more sociological than the explanation of employment conditions outlined above. In the words of Kemerer and Baldridge (1975:52):

The causes of faculty unionization that originate in the world beyond the campus explain the general tendency toward unionization, but they do not explain why any specific individual joins a union.

Generally speaking, it is hoped that this study will illuminate some of the "institutional causes" of faculty unionization.

However, a closer study of Kemerer and Baldridge's work reveals that they focused their analysis on purely "descriptive" factors. For example, they listed as "institutional causes":

(1) type of institution; (2) formal control; (3) funding source;
(4) selectivity scale; (5) institutional age; (6) affluence (student income); (7) amount of external influences; and (8) highest degree offered (Kemerer and Baldridge, 1975:54). Their research clearly
indicates that these "institutional causes" are influential factors for assessing faculty members' propensity to unionize.

Like most of the researchers that have preceded them, Kemerer and Baldridge have only outlined additional descriptive and external causes of faculty unionism. Whereas, it is the position of this study that research is needed on the impact of faculty unions on intra-institutional relationships.

The majority of the researchers writing on faculty unions have, like Kemerer and Baldrigde, simply presented descriptive characteristics of institutional environments and faculty members' political-social-economic status and/or preferences (Carr and Van Eyck, 1973; Garbarino, 1975; Ladd and Lipset, 1975). The major purpose of most of these researchers has been that of explaining why professors join faculty unions.

**Inter-group Relationships and Morale**

Little attention, however, has been directed to the question of what effect a faculty union has on relationships within the institution. Within the academic institution there exist various sets of relationships (administrator-faculty, faculty-faculty, faculty-student), which involve inter-group interactions that are vital to the orderly functioning of the organization. It is this area of inter-group interactions to which this study is directed.
Therefore, a measure is needed to assess some quality of inter-group interactions to address the question of what effect faculty unions have on total institutional relationships. The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) described in the following chapter (p. 25), is an instrument that has been designed to assess faculty morale by measuring "rapport" among various groups within, and associated with, the academic institution.

The designers of the PTO, R.R. Bentley and A.M. Rempel (1967:1) have declared that:

(Morale) may best be conceived of as a continuous variable. The level of morale is then determined by the extent to which an individual's needs are satisfied, and the extent to which the individual perceives satisfaction as stemming from the total job situation.

Faculty who have high morale are those who express a positive attitude about their working conditions and relations. Furthermore, Bentley and Rempel (1967:2) explain that, "What is important in morale is what the person believes and feels, rather than the conditions that may exist as perceived by others."

Consequently, Bentley and Rempel designed the PTO to obtain data that would reflect what a faculty member believes and feels. The instrument is devised so that a faculty member can, "...make qualitative judgments and express his feelings about the persons and things in his environment that may be related to his morale" (Bentley and Rempel, 1967:2).
Research Studies on Faculty Morale

There have been approximately 50 research studies which have utilized the PTO as a data gathering instrument. To follow is a brief review of some of the more relevant (with respect to this study) research studies that have employed the PTO.

Of special interest is a research study by Collins and Nelson (1968) on differences in morale between union and non-union teachers. Using the PTO they found that, "...non-union teachers had significantly (p = 0.05) higher morale for the Teacher Salary factor, Teacher Status factor, and Total Morale" (1968:3). In addition, their research revealed that older, higher salaried, tenured, most-experienced teachers had lower morale than younger, lower salaried, non-tenured, lesser-experienced teachers. Both NEA and AFT faculty were surveyed; however, the authors did not report any differences in morale between the two unions.

Gubser (1968) tested for a correlation between authoritarianism and morale in a school district in Oregon using the California F-scale and the PTO. He found that there was no relationship between the two.

Bentley and Rempel (1970) used the PTO to test for differences in morale between teachers in Oregon and Indiana. They established, as might be expected, a high correlation between the level of morale
and salary level. Also, teachers with Bachelor degrees had significantly lower morale scores than did teachers with Masters. The mean score responses of female teachers were higher on nearly every factor. The teacher's age group was also of significance for each factor and for total score. Similar to findings of other studies, morale increases with age, except for teachers in the 25-34 age bracket.

In 30 randomly selected schools in New York, Gilbert (1972) found that teachers in larger schools had PTO factor scores for teachers from smaller schools. For example, Teacher Rapport with Principal, and Rapport among Teachers were significantly higher in smaller schools. However, total morale score did not indicate a relationship between size of school, teacher experience or level of instruction.

John K. Best (1973) used the PTO and the Alutto-Belasco Decisional Participation Scale to test for a correlation between morale and decisional participation. His study demonstrated that, "Significant differences (existed) among the decisional conditions in overall morale and the single dimension of rapport with principal." The study also indicated that a teacher's position in "organizational outcomes" is related to their perception of their level of involvement of decision making.
Cleveland (1973) found, in his study of four New York school
districts, a relationship between Jackson's "formal" and "psychologi-
cal" group membership categories and level of morale. Employing
Jackson's membership typology the study indicated that teachers
designated as "psychological" group members had higher morale.
Teachers classified as "psychological" group members also had
significantly higher PTO factor scores on ten items.

Summary

As described above, many research studies on the faculty
union movement have focused on the question of why faculty members
join unions. In attempting to explain the rise of faculty unions most
researchers have concentrated on three general causal conditions.
These conditions have been outlined by Carr and Van Eyck (1973)
as being the "legal-ideological," "employment conditions," and "the
organizers."

Legal-ideological conditions hinge on state legislatures passing
permissive legislation which grants public employees the right to
bargain. The second factor that researchers have noted, is
employment conditions. Of major importance in this area are
salaries, fringe benefits and decision making participation. The AFT,
NEA, and AAUP, "the organizers," have been the necessary third
condition, in that they have provided the organizational structure for the faculty union movement.

Utilizing the PTO, researchers have found that on some factors non-union teachers had higher morale than union members (Collins and Nelson, 1968). Bentley and Rempel's (1970) study indicated a correlation between morale and economic status. Also, research has demonstrated a relationship between the size of a school and teacher morale (Gilbert, 1972). John K. Best (1973) found that involvement in decision making affected morale. Finally, Cleveland (1973) showed that a relationship existed between group membership categories and morale.
CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

This chapter is a discussion of the research procedures and statistical computations used in this study. Sampling procedures and the research instrument are discussed and the statistical methods are outlined.

Sampling Procedures

1. A random sample of faculty members from two selected Oregon community colleges was surveyed employing the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO), and

2. The PTO was used to test for differences in morale between union and non-union faculty members, and between the two campuses.

Description of the Instrument

The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire was developed in the early 1960's by R.R. Bentley and A.M. Rempel at Purdue University. It has since been used in over 50 research studies to assess teacher morale. According to the authors (1967:1):

(The PTO) yields a total score indicating general level of teacher morale, but it also provides meaningful subscores which break down morale into some of its dimensions. The
ten categories included are; 1) Teacher Rapport with administrators; 2) Satisfaction with Teaching; 3) Rapport among Teachers; 4) Teacher Salary; 5) Teacher Load; 6) Curriculum Issues; 7) Teacher Status; 8) Community Support; 9) School Facilities & Services; 10) Community Pressure.

The PTO is an instrument designed to assess teacher morale.

**Population and Sample**

1. The population shall consist of all faculty members, who are in bargaining units approved by the Oregon Employees Relation Board, at two selected Oregon community colleges.

2. The sample will be randomly drawn from faculty members in the above population (Table 1).

| Table 1. Number of Faculty Sampled by Campus and Membership. |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Campus I         | Campus II         |
| Union n = 23     | Union n = 23      |
| Non-union n = 23 | Non-union n = 23 |
| Total per campus | Total per campus  |
| n = 46           | n = 46            |
| Total sample     | Total sample      |
| n = 92           | n = 92            |

**Independent and Dependent Variables**

1. The independent variable will be membership or non-membership in a faculty union, and campus.
2. The dependent variable will be the mean score responses of the faculty on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Test Statistic

1. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistic will be used to test for significant differences between faculty member mean score responses to the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

2. The assumptions for the ANOVA statistic are that the dependent variables, mean score responses of the PTO, are normally distributed. The variance within and between the mean scores are common and equal. The sample, faculty members, is randomly drawn (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/1</td>
<td>MS campus/MS error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/1</td>
<td>MS member/MS error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C/1</td>
<td>MS inter/MS error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D/88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above two-way analysis of variance table displays an ANOVA layout for testing whether or not there is: (1) a significant difference between campuses; (2) a significant difference between
union and non-union faculty (membership); or, (3) a significant interaction effect.

An interaction effect is a test for the situation in which two groups are treated as if they were homogeneous. For example, in this study the union faculty on both campuses are statistically treated as one group. The test for an interaction effect will indicate if differences exist between the two unions. The mean scores for each union group have to be analyzed to identify the extent of their differences. An analysis of interaction effect is conducted in the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter has been divided into two sections. The first part is a discussion of the "Characteristics of the Sample." There is a breakdown of the sample by age, sex, and degree held. The second section of the chapter is concerned with an analysis of the mean score responses to the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. The statistical computations of each PTO factor are discussed.

Characteristics of the Sample

As shown in Table 3, there is a distinct sexual factor in terms of membership. The unions have higher male and lower female membership when compared to the non-union faculty groups, than is reflected in the faculty at large.

Table 3. Breakdown of Sex by Membership and Campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Campus I</th>
<th>Campus II</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>union non-union</td>
<td>union non-union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.70 0.61</td>
<td>0.70 0.57</td>
<td>0.64 (n = 59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.30 0.39</td>
<td>0.30 0.43</td>
<td>0.36 (n = 33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the level of education is assessed, the union members are no more likely than the non-union faculty to have Masters degrees.
However, there is a difference between Campus I and Campus II in terms of the latter having a higher union membership of faculty with BA degrees or less (Table 4). The percentage of BA and MA degrees held by non-union faculty is very close to that of the overall faculty (see totals for Table 4). Whereas, BA and MA percentages of union faculty differ considerably from the degree percentages of the total faculty.

When sex is compared to degree held, a difference between the two campuses is evident (Table 5). Campus II has a much greater percentage of union members, male and female, with BA degrees than Campus I.

Table 6 is a breakdown of faculty by age groups. The most significant information shown is that of the average age of the faculty members. Campus II has a slightly higher average age for faculty which is interesting considering that it is the younger institution. The largest age group is between 30 and 39 (35 percent), with Campus I having the greatest number of faculty in this category. However, over half of the faculty are over 40 (54 percent), with Campus I having the greater number of faculty in this group (31).

**Analysis of PTO Factors**

As stated in the introduction of the study, one of the major objectives of this study was to analyze differences between union and
Table 4. Comparison of Degree Held by Membership and Campus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Campus I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Campus II</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA or less</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.25 (n = 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA or more</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.75 (n = 69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Comparison of Sex to Degree by Campus and Membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Age Breakdown by Campus and Membership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (yrs)</th>
<th>Campus I</th>
<th></th>
<th>Campus II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td>union</td>
<td>non-union</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.11 (n = 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.35 (n = 35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25 (n = 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.24 (n = 22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05 (n = 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{x})</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>48.30</td>
<td>42.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
non-uniform faculty members in terms of intra-institutional relationships. The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) was utilized to measure these relationships as factors of morale. Morale, as explained by Bentley and Rempel (1967:2) is multi-dimensional in that it is affected by many factors. The PTO measures morale by assessing ten separate factors, which when combined, give an overall morale score. Table 7 lists the ten factors and the number of questions for each factor in the PTO.

Table 7. Morale Factors from the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of questions</th>
<th>No. of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfaction with Teaching 20</td>
<td>7. Teacher Status 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teacher Salary 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher Load 11</td>
<td>9. School Facilities &amp; Services 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Community Pressure 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the general hypotheses (p. 6), a two-way analysis of variance F statistic (ANOVA) was computed for each of the ten factors of morale. With total morale score as the dependent variable add group membership and campus as the independent variables, no significant difference was found in overall morale.
scores between union and non-union faculty members of the two campuses surveyed. However, when a two-way ANOVA was computed for each of the specific factors of morale, significant differences existed at the 0.05 level of significance for five factors which are described below.

Factors Indicating a Significant Difference or Interaction Effect

The figures to follow, graphically illustrate the distribution of mean scores for each group. The left-hand column is a mean score in which the lower number indicates the higher morale score, and vice versa. Union and non-union faculty are divided on the left and right sides of the scale respectively. Campus identification is by number, i.e., Campus I and Campus II. References to "high" or "low" mean scores are to be interpreted in a relative sense. The mean score of a specific group is "high" or "low" relative to the mean scores of the other groups.

In Figure 1, for example, Campus I union faculty's mean score is 2.54. Campus II union faculty's mean score is 2.04. This shows that union faculty at Campus II have a "high" mean score, relative to the "low" mean score of union faculty at Campus I.
Intersecting lines indicate that an "interaction effect" has occurred. For an interaction effect to be significant a specific variance must exist in mean scores of the groups being compared. As demonstrated in Figure 1 an interaction effect occurred, and was significant because of the variance in mean score of Campus I from the other groups.

Figure 1 illustrates that no statistically significant difference exists between campuses or between union and non-union groups. The interaction effect, however, shows that Campus I union faculty has low rapport with their administrators.

A significant interaction effect also occurred with Factor 2, Satisfaction with Teaching. As Figure 2 shows, the mean score of non-union faculty from Campus II indicates the least relative satisfaction with teaching. Similar to the previous factor, there is no significant difference between the measured classifications--campuses and membership. A significant interaction effect exists because the mean score of non-union faculty at Campus II indicates a significant variance from the other three groups.

A significant difference was computed for Figures 3, 4, and 5. This means that the variance of the mean scores for the measured categories, campuses and membership, differed significantly. In terms of Rapport among Teachers, Figure 3, there was a significant difference of mean scores between union and non-union groups.
Figure 1. Rapport with Administrators.

Figure 2. Satisfaction with Teaching.
Figure 3. Rapport among Teachers.

Figure 4. Satisfaction with Salary.
Figure 4, Satisfaction with Salary, illustrates a significant difference exists between campuses. A significant difference between campuses was also computed for School Facilities and Services, Figure 5.

A significant difference between union and non-union faculty members was found with Factor 3, Rapport among Teachers (Figure 3). Union faculty members from both campuses scored significantly higher on this PTO factor than the non-union members. This would suggest that greater rapport existed among union faculty members.

In terms of Satisfaction with Salary, Factor 4, a significant difference was computed by the two-way ANOVA between the campuses. Union faculty members from Campus I mean scores on this factor (Figure 4) indicated that they were the least satisfied with their salaries.

In addition, a significant difference was found on Factor 9, School Facilities and Services (Figure 5). Campus I faculty, union and non-union, mean scores indicated that they were less satisfied with campus facilities and services than were union and non-union members from Campus II.

No significant difference was computed for the five factors: Teacher Load; Curriculum Issues; Teacher Status; Community Support; and Community Pressure (see Figures 6 through 10).

In summary, no significant difference was found in overall morale (see Figure 11), or for five of the morale sub-factors.
Figure 5. School Facilities and Services.

Figure 6. Teacher Load.

Figure 7. Curriculum.
Figure 8. Community Support.

Figure 9. Teacher Status.

Figure 10. Community Pressure.
Figure 11. Overall Morale.

However, significant differences were found to exist for the factors, Rapport with Administrators; Satisfaction with Teaching; Rapport among Teachers; Satisfaction with Salary; and School Facilities and Services.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

The following discussion attempts to analyze the empirical findings of this study within the framework of social conflict theory. Some definitions which are fundamental to the tenets of conflict theory, however, must first be agreed upon.

Social scientists have devoted a considerable amount of time and thought to defining the sociological concept "group." Conflict theorists have been especially concerned with the definition of this concept. An explanation of the characteristics and delimitations of a group is crucial to the propositions of social conflict theory, before proceeding to interpretation of the data within the theoretical framework of social conflict theory.

Discussion of Concepts

The definition of group used in this study is from Ralf Dahrendorf's book, *Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society*. He makes a distinction between two types of groups—"interest groups," and "quasi-groups." Dahrendorf (1959:180) defines "quasi-groups" as aggregates of people who have some common characteristics, e.g. non-union faculty, but have no recognizable social structure or organization. "Interest groups," on the other hand, "have a structure,
a form of organization, a program or goal, and a personnel or members" (Dahrendorf, 1959:180).

Using these definitions, this study will classify the faculty union as an interest group. While the term quasi-group does not strictly apply to non-union faculty on a specific campus, it is the best available descriptor. Non-union faculty are part of the overall campus "organization," and "personnel." Nonetheless, being an employee of college X, along with classified staff, administrators and some students, is "secondary" to being a member of an association limited to faculty members. The faculty association, unionized or not, is the group to which "primary" identification is established.

With the faculty union becoming the legal association representing faculty interest, non-union faculty become an aggregate with quasi-group status. As non-members of the faculty union, they are the field from which union members are recruited. Non-union faculty compose a quasi-group because they are not members of the interest group which could provide them primary structural and organizational identity.

In the empirical analysis of this study, statistical tests were computed to measure significant differences in morale between union and non-union faculty. Non-union faculty were therefore treated statistically as if they had "group" status. The above definitions of "interest groups" and "quasi-groups" is presented so that the reader
will understand that while they are treated statistically as having
group identification, operationally non-union faculty are defined as a
quasi-group.

Dahrendorf (1959:168), at a more inclusive level of abstraction,
employs Max Weber's concept, "imperatively coordinated associa-
tions," to identify what in sociological literature is usually termed the
social organization. His reasoning for using this phrase is to,
"...imply the coordination of organized aggregates of roles by
domination and subjection." In other words, he is proclaiming that
social organizations are characterized by relationships that are
"imperatively coordinated," or regulated by authority.

The importance of his definition is explained in the following
quote in which Dahrendorf (1959:17) states:

Within the frame of reference of (the conflict) model, (1) the
distribution of authority, in associations is the ultimate
"cause" of the formation of conflict groups, and (2), being
dichotomous, it is, in any given association, the cause of
the formation of two, and only two, conflict groups.

In brief, Dahrendorf is proposing that the authority structure of a
social organization gives rise to the formation of interest groups,
which in turn engage in social conflict.

Therefore, when the unionized college is classified as an
imperatively coordinated association, the administration and the
faculty union become the two conflicting interest groups. Non-union
faculty members constitute a quasi-group from which each interest, or conflict group, solicits support.

Consequently, non-union faculty, in their quasi-group status, become an important body of people because of their attitudes and beliefs which differ from union faculty members. Non-union faculty responses are valuable information for developing a better understanding of conflict group formation.

Summary

In summary, the sociological term "group" was defined as either (1) an interest group with structure, goals, organization and personnel, or (2) a quasi-group which means an aggregate of people without the delimitations of an interest group.

The concept "imperatively coordinated associations" was applied to define the overall college's social organization. As an imperatively coordinated association, the authority structure of the college causes the formation of interest groups which engage in social conflict. The organization of a recognized faculty union then places faculty members who choose not to join into a quasi-group which does not engage in social conflict as a structured and organized collective.
Interpretation of Data within
Theoretical Framework

Conflict: An Inter-group Activity

Theory. Premise I states that conflict is an intergroup activity which has sources beyond the subjective attitudes of individual members (Corwin, 1970:26).

In their situation as opposing interest groups within an imperatively coordinated association, the faculty union and the administration are engaged in inter-group conflict. Individual subjective attitudes are not the source of conflict, rather, as proposed by conflict theory, the differential distribution of authority within the college gives rise to conflict relations.

In keeping with the above proposal, it would be expected that in imperatively coordinated associations--college organizations--the union faculty would express less rapport with their administrators than non-union faculty. Social Conflict theory, according to Coser (1956:34) proposes that, "...conflict sets boundaries between groups within a social system by strengthening group consciousness and awareness of separateness...." Non-union faculty, not being a member of the faculty union, yet possessing quasi-group status in the overall college aggregate, would therefore be expected to express less
"group consciousness" with union faculty and less social conflict with their administrators.

Findings. In general, the empirical findings of this study are in keeping with the above propositions. Non-union faculty did have high mean score responses on Factor 1, "Rapport with Administration" (see p. 35). Not being union members, non-union faculty probably identify as members of the expanded college community, which includes the administration. This all-embracing "group consciousness" of administrators and non-union faculty causes them to perceive unionization as breaking up their college community.

The PTO responses to "Rapport with Administrators," of union faculty members are not consistent on the two campuses. Campus I union faculty responses are consistent with the tenets of conflict theory. Their low rapport, i.e., high mean score, with their administrators can be interpreted as indicating high group consciousness and awareness of separateness from the administration (see Figure 1).

The score of Campus II union members on this factor indicated even greater rapport with their administrators than the non-union faculty. A tempting interpretation of this unexpected finding would be to suggest that differences in administrative personalities on the two campuses account for the divergent results. Dahrendorf (1959:192),
however, has written that:

[We] must . . . reject the general correlation asserted by Schumpter, Marshall, and Ginsberg between conflict group membership and social personality; again, this is no more than a generalization derived from a single observation.

and;

The authority role of the individual and such patterns of behavior as can be inferred from it are an independent variable the connection of which with other aspects of social behavior is theoretically indeterminate and can be established only by empirical observations.

In short, it would not be in keeping with the tenets of conflict theory to pursue an explanation based on the analysis of individual personalities.

Social conflict theorists have proposed explanations which may account for the high rapport with their administrators recorded by Campus II union faculty. Lewis Coser (1956:152) has explained that, "One safeguard against conflict disrupting the consensual basis of the relationship, however, is contained in the social structure itself: it is provided by the institutionalization and tolerance of conflict."

Following Coser's line of thought, the high rapport with administration scores of Campus II union faculty might be accounted for by the college's process for conflict resolution. The object of conflict is to obtain results. It could be that the union faculty on Campus II feel that they have been successful in accomplishing their goals through the conflict process.
Coser (1956:137) goes on to declare that, "...conflict, rather than being disruptive and dissociating, may indeed be the means of balancing and hence maintaining a society as a going concern." Seen in this perspective, the differences in Campus I and Campus II union faculty, on this factor, might be accounted for by their different processes of conflict resolution, and/or their ability to make the process work.

In summary, the argument presented has been that conflict occurs within an imperatively coordinated association, i.e., college organization, and between interest groups--faculty and administrators.

Furthermore, individualistic-psychological interpretation of conflict relations is limited and cannot fully account for this socio-logical phenomenon.

**Conflict Theory and Cultural Relativism**

**Theory.** Premise II states that cultural relativism is a central concept to conflict theory because from their own point of view both sides are "right" (Corwin, 1970:26). As the anthropologist Nash (1974:9) has so clearly stated:

Cultures and human beings are what they are because of enculturative factors which perpetuate, recondition, and occasionally renew the way of life of a people. And as a corollary of enculturation, people tend to feel that their judgments and perceptions are to be preferred to all others.

People are enculturated, or socialized, in all societies to perceive
their social group's world view---Weltanschauung---as "right." This is the meaning of cultural relativism, and it is applicable to small groups as well as larger social-cultural systems.

Social conflict theory, Coser (1956:38) explains, proposes that, "Conflict with other groups contributes to the establishment and reaffirmation of the identity of the group and maintains its boundaries against the surrounding social world." In other words, each interest group develops its own world view which is "reaffirmed" and "maintained" through conflict.

Findings. In this study faculty union members would be expected to have high intra-group rapport because of their clear group identity and boundaries. Non-union faculty, by reason of their quasi-group status, would not be expected to have high rapport with other non-union faculty. Members of faculty unions surveyed for this study had high intra-group "Rapport among Teachers" scores (see Figure 3). Such high intra-group rapport would seem to indicate, in the language of conflict theory, that their world view is reaffirmed and maintained through inter-group conflict. In addition, the union faculty probably perceive their non-union colleagues as heretics, because as Coser (1956:103) declares, the greater the conflict with another group, the greater the intolerance of deviation within the group.
Organizational Power

Theory. Premise III declares that organizations exist as a balance of power and are the result of historic power struggles (Corwin, 1970:26). Conflicts, as argued above, are the product of the differential distribution of power and authority in imperatively coordinated associations. Power, especially legitimized power--authority--is the crucial factor for explaining social interaction between groups. Dahrendorf (1959:166), in keeping with Max Weber, claims that, "...power is merely a factual relation, authority is a legitimate relation and subjection."

Colleges have a history of development and change, and the forces of social conflict have obviously been instrumental in this process. Arthur Cohen (1975:19) has described the existing academic environment as a community where:

A conflict has existed for a long time, but its consequences were not serious when the colleges were small. ... Large size, red tape, and growth of large central staffs lead to the central office versus campus syndrome and the tendency of each administrator to build his own empire.

Faculty unions are interest groups which have evolved to contest the differential distribution of power within the institution.

Findings. The PTO responses of the union faculty at Campus I on Factor 1, "Rapport with Administration," may indicate that they perceive the power and authority to be unequally distributed in the
institutions. Their mean scores on "Satisfaction with Salary, " and "Facilities and Services," can also be interpreted to indicate dissatisfaction with the authority structure of the college.

The high rapport score Campus II union faculty recorded on the same factor would seem to indicate that they were satisfied with the balance of power and authority on their campus. Coser (1956:137) has stated that, "(Conflict) makes possible a reassessment of relative power and thus serves as a balancing mechanism which helps to maintain and consolidate societies." The high level of rapport with the administration expressed by Campus II union faculty might be an instance where a mutually satisfactory balance presently exists.

**Inter-group Conflict and Intra-group Cooperation**

**Theory.** Premise IV states that conflict between groups requires cooperation within groups (Corwin, 1970:26).

Intra-group communication and cooperation is enhanced by inter-group conflict. "Conflict with another group," Coser (1956:95) explains, "leads to the mobilization of energies of group members and hence to increased cohesion of the group."

**Findings.** The empirical findings of this study appear to strongly support the above premise and Coser's proposition. Faculty union members on both campuses recorded high scores on Factor 3, "Rapport among Teachers." Inter-group conflict between the
administration and faculty union apparently strengthens harmony within the union.

Non-union members, on both campuses, had low scores on Factor 3 (see Figure 3). The tenets of conflict theory would predict that the quasi-group status of non-union faculty would not be conducive to the development of cohesion—rapport. Not being a member of the union, they lack the structural, organizational and directional forces which bind a group together.

**Group Visibility**

**Theory.** Premise V states that groups must be visible to wage conflict (Corwin, 1970:27).

In effect, this premise is stating that conflict cannot occur between quasi-groups. As stated previously, an interest group must have goals, direction and organization—hence visibility. In addition, Dahrendorf (1949:187) points out that there exist important "technical conditions" for an interest group to form. He has stated that "Without a charter, certain norms, a personnel, and certain material requisites, interest groups cannot be formed, even if it is justified to assume that quasi-groups exist."

**Findings.** Non-union faculty, for example, obviously meeting the *sine qua non* of a quasi-group, cannot legally organize collectively to represent their interest. Technically, or legally, their interests
that are within the scope of the existing collective bargaining statutes are represented by the faculty union. These technical-legal conditions, of course, limit non-union faculty's visibility, and inhibit the possibility of their becoming an interest group.

Conflict and Goals

Theory. Premise VI states that conflict influences goals, which are forged out of the conflict process (Corwin, 1970:27). Dahrendorf (1959:161) declared that "Every society is at every point subject to the processes of change; social change is ubiquitous." Social change, in other words, is the historical product of conflict which is ever present. The degree of social conflict may vary, interest groups may change, goals or directions may alter, but conflict is an on-going phenomenon.

Findings. By assessing several factors simultaneously, patterns of conflict are discernible. For instance, Factor 1, "Rapport with Administration," Factor 2, "Satisfaction with Salary," and Factor 9, "Satisfaction with Facilities and Services," could be interpreted as evidence that the union faculty and administration at Campus I differ considerably on goals.

The high degree of dissatisfaction expressed by Campus I union faculty suggests that the conflict process is not functioning to resolve tensions. Coser (1956:128) claims that, "A rigid system... by not
permitting conflict, will impede needed adjustments and so maximize the dangers of catastrophic breakdown." The dissatisfaction of Campus I union faculty may be a consequence of one interest group (faculty or administration) not accepting the legitimacy of the other's authority.

Dahrendorf's (1959:176) observations on this situation are most enlightening. He says that:

In every association, the interest of the ruling group are the values that constitute the ideology of legitimacy of its rule, whereas the interest of the subjected group constitute a threat to this ideology and the social relations it covers.

Obviously, if either interest group questions the legitimacy of the other's authority to rule or represent, there can be little resolution of goals.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, GENERALIZATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was conceived as an investigation of the effect that faculty unions have on intra-institutional relationships in the college community. The primary question addressed by this study is: Is unionization disruptive of intra-institutional relationships? This question is considered by assessing the relationships between union and non-union faculty and between faculty and administrators. Social conflict theory is the framework within which this study examines this question of unions and their alleged disruption of institutional relationships.

The data gathering instrument used to collect and organize the empirical materials of this study was the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. This is a questionnaire that was developed by Bentley and Rempel (1967), and has been used in over 50 research studies to assess teachers’ morale. The data collected were tested using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), F statistic, to test the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in morale between union and non-union faculty.

2. There is no significant difference in morale between campuses.

3. There is no significant interaction effect between campuses and membership.
The two-way ANOVA test showed that there was no significant difference or interaction effect for overall morale score, or for five of the PTO factors; "Teacher Load," "Curriculum," "Community Support," "Teacher Status," "Community Pressure." Five of the factors, however, were deemed to have a significant difference or interaction effect; "Rapport with Administrators," "Satisfaction with Teaching," "Rapport among Teachers," "Teacher Salary," and "School Facilities and Services."

Union faculty from Campus I mean score on "Rapport with Administration," was much lower than that of the other three groups surveyed. On the other hand, union faculty from both campuses had a significantly higher "Rapport with Teacher," mean score than that of the non-union faculty. On the factor, "Satisfaction with Teaching," non-union faculty from Campus II had the lowest mean score, i.e., relative to the other groups. However, Campus II non-union faculty's mean score on "Satisfaction with Salary," was high as was that of the union members from Campus II and the non-union faculty from Campus I. Union faculty from Campus I had a low mean score on this factor, relative to the other three groups. The other PTO factor on which a significant difference was indicated was "School Facilities and Services," on which union and non-union faculty from Campus I had the lowest mean score.
The PTO findings were analyzed within the framework of social conflict theory. In general the following arguments were presented.

1. Conflict within the community college is an inter-group activity between opposing interest groups, e.g., faculty and administrators.

2. Conflict is primarily a product of the differential distribution of power within an organization. Also, unionized faculty have high intra-group rapport because social conflict reaffirms and maintains group identity.

3. Faculty unions, are interest groups that have evolved to contest the differential distribution of power within the institution.

4. Conflict with their administrators requires faculty union members to cooperate within their group.

5. Conflict only occurs between visible groups, e.g., administration and faculty union, that have goals, organization and structure.

6. The conflict process is instrumental to the development of the goals of the various interest groups within the college community.

The conclusions of this study suggest that the answer to the initial question, "Is unionization disruptive of intra-institutional relationships," is yes. However, social conflict theorists maintain
that conflict is always present, i.e., the normal consequences of inter-group relationships between interest groups within an organization (Dahrendorf, 1959).

According to many critics of faculty unions the tradition of "collegiality" will be destroyed by the introduction of unionization. If "rapport" is interpreted as connotative of "collegiality," then the findings of this study indicate that collegial relations are greatest among union faculty members. This study argues that collegiality is a relationship that can only exist among group members who share interests, goals and values. Unionization is disruptive for relationships between groups that do not share interests, values and goals, (faculty and administration) but helps it to unify relationships among organized faculty members.

Limitations of Theoretical Framework

Integration vs. Conflict Theory

Post World War II conflict theory is largely a reaction to functionalism, the dominant theory in the social sciences of this period. Talcot Parsons (1951), a principal functional theorist, has described social organizations as "integrated" systems that are maintained by authority and norms. According to Dahrendorf (1959:161), functionalism, especially the Parsonian view, has presented a model
of society that is consensual, integrated and static. To counter the functionalist model, Dahrendorf proposed a dialectical conflict model.

Dahrendorf (1959:160) has criticized Parsonian functionalism as a "utopian" theory of society. In turn, he proposes an inverse set of assumptions for analyzing social processes. Peter Weingart (1969) has argued, however, that on closer examination, Dahrendorf's theory of social organization is very similar to that proposed by Parsons. Both theorists, for example, describe social reality as institutionalized patterns, i.e., "social systems," and "imperatively coordinated associations." Dahrendorf, like Parsons, views social organizations as structures of legitimate normative patterns. Even though he describes these normative patterns as "coercive," his portrayal resembles Parson's view of legitimate status roles (1959:162).

Dahrendorf (1959:165) differs from Parsons in asserting that the "differential distribution of authority," results in social conflict. To claim such an origin for social conflict, however, is not the same as describing a causal sequence of the conflict process. In criticizing Dahrendorf's position, J.H. Turner (1975:437) has pointed out that:

Thus, a theory of conflict must analyze conflict processes over time by focusing on the conditions leading to the withdrawal of legitimacy, the escalation of relative deprivation, the initial increase in conflict intensity, the organization of conflict groups, and the subsequent increase (or decrease) in conflict intensity.

In failing to provide a typology of conflict processes, Dahrendorf's
model of social conflict is subject to the same critique that he has made of Parsonian functionalism. Furthermore, the lack of a typology of conflict severely limits the theory as an explanation of social order; i.e., How is an imperatively coordinated association organized?

**Social Conflict for Social Integration**

The other theorist, upon which many of the propositions of this study are based, is Lewis Coser. Throughout his career Coser has criticized Parsons' functionalism for ignoring social conflict. On the other hand, Coser has accused Dahrendorf of neglecting the positive aspects of social conflict. Coser (1956:137), following the tradition of Georg Simmel, has proposed that social conflict is essential in maintaining a viable social system.

In his book, *The Functions of Social Conflict*, and in other writings, Coser has presented numerous propositions, addressing the causes, intensity, duration and functions of social conflict. However, his constant emphasis on the positive functions of conflict, result in nearly a Parsonian view of society. The majority of Coser's propositions are focused on the integrative functions of social conflict. Turner (1975:440), in critiquing Coser's propositions, argues:

Thus, by choosing to focus primarily on the positive functions or outcomes of conflict for social integration, the net effect of the propositions as they now stand is to convey an overly
integrated view of the social world, even in the face of open conflict among groups.

Coser's propositions, in the final analysis, suggest an integrated social world not all that different from Parson's integrated social system.

Limits of Theory

The theoretical framework of this study is based on the propositions of Dahrendorf and Coser. The limitations of their propositions thereby apply to this study.

Dahrendorf has said that the functionalist model is "one-sided" because it only applies to the integration aspects of society. Also, he points out that it assumes a relatively "static" society (1959:161). He proposes, in contrast, a dialectical conflict model which assumes a society undergoing varying degrees of constant change.

Weingart (1969), and Turner (1975) have argued that Dahrendorf's conflict model is not necessarily the antithesis of functionalism. In classifying social organizations as imperatively coordinated associations, in which authority can be a legitimate power, Dahrendorf nearly parallels Parsons' legitimatized "social systems."

The major shortcoming of Dahrendorf's propositions, though, is his failure to provide a historical typology of the conflict process. By not having a historical typology, this study was limited in being able to assess potentially influential variables. Historical conditions on
individual campuses obviously were important in the formation of current faculty attitudes. The synchronic approach utilized in this study did not consider the historical variable(s).

The theoretical propositions of Lewis Coser are a reaction to the functionalists and Dahrendorf. However, in overstressing the "integration" aspects of his propositions Coser adopts a near functionalist perspective.

It is the impreciseness of many of Coser's propositions that is of greater importance for this study. Some propositions are in fact redundant. Coser's neglect to specify clearly the social units--groups, individuals, organizations, societies--to which individual propositions apply, is of especial importance herein. By not employing more precisely defined social units, this study was limited in being able to identify the effects of specific independent variables--sex, age, level of education, etc.

In summary, the theoretical limitations of the propositions of Coser and Dahrendorf are also limits within which this study was formulated. Consequently, historical conditions and more precisely defined social units were not explored as important controlling variables.

The above notwithstanding, the intention of this study was not to test social conflict theory. This study used conflict theory as a classifying devise in order to be more precise in the examination of
the central question. Hence, based on the evidence gathered in this study, no claims can or were intended to be made about social conflict theory per se.

**Generalizations and Implications**

"Is unionization disruptive of intra-institutional relationships?"

This is the primary question with which this study has been concerned. This question is treated empirically, herein, by a statistical analysis of differences in morale between union and non-union faculty. In addition, the theoretical propositions of social conflict theory have been used as a framework in which to discuss the question.

The conclusions arrived at in this study suggest that unionization is probably disruptive of intra-institutional relationships. However, social conflict theorists argue that conflict is always present (Dahrendorf, 1959; Coser, 1956). It existed before unionization and it will continue to exist after a faculty organizes. What is viewed by some members of the academic community as disruptive, if changed, is the relative power positions of the groups involved.

Crossland (1976:42), who was quoted in the introduction of this study as describing college faculty as "employees," has posed the question:

Will faculty collective bargaining really redistribute power in the academy, significantly alter the governance of the
colleges...and usher in a renaissance of faculty leadership?

He answers his own question by declaring that, "It is still too early for a definite answer, but it probably will not" (emphasis added). Crossland, like many established academics is basing his position on his own subjective impressions. In his article, there is not a single reference to an empirically based research study. This study has attempted to address the above question with explanations based on research rather than "subjective impressions."

In terms of future research on the question of conflict and intra-institutional relationships, a promising approach has been proposed by R. Likert and J.G. Likert (1976) in their recent book, *New Ways of Managing Conflict*. They have developed a series of questionnaires that directly address the issue of intra-institutional relationships. The Likerts' questionnaires appear to be capable of producing data, which in turn could provide empirically based explanations of intra-institutional conflict.

To return to the initial question, "Is unionization disruptive of intra-institutional relationships?" The research on the topic most often answers in the affirmative. Nonetheless, as stated above, conflict is natural, or as Dahrendorf (1959:162) claims, "ubiquitous." Furthermore, the suppression or attempt to avoid conflict results in a breakdown of intra-group communication.
Quite often the term "collegiality" is invoked with the implied claim that it represents an ideal, non-competitive form of faculty-administration relationship. Or, as Crossland (1976:41) states, "Critics of faculty unionization often rhapsodize about 'collegiality' and predict its demise with the advent of collective bargaining."

Along these same lines, Baril and Hoffman (1975:3) declared that, "Theoretically, collegiality assumes that all participants in the academic community share the same interest, goals, and values."

If collegiality does exist in this idealized form, it is probably only at "elite" universities, and among top administrators and a few senior faculty members.

Cohen (1975:130) has underscored this latter operational definition of collegiality by declaring that, "... the traditional hierarchial model of educational organizations... holds that purposive change must be integrated at the top of the organization..."

This study has, albeit indirectly, considered certain aspects of collegial relations on college campuses. The two PTO factors, "Rapport with Administrators," and "Rapport among Teachers," can be used to provide data pertaining to collegial relations.

As was depicted in Figure 1 (p. 35), the factor, "Rapport with Administrators," yielded mixed results. Statistical tests did not indicate a uniform difference between campuses or membership groups. Campus I union faculty stood apart from the other three
groups with a mean score which indicated low rapport with their administrators. If rapport is interpreted as an indicator of "collegiality," then relative to the other three groups, Campus I union faculty probably do not have a strong collegial relationship with their administrators.

The second PTO factor which provides an indication of collegiality is "Rapport among Teachers." As portrayed in Figure 3 (p. 36), mean scores for union and non-union groups were significantly different when computed. The relative position of mean scores shows that union faculty have higher rapport with fellow faculty members, than is the case for non-union faculty. Again, if "rapport" is interpreted as evidence of "collegiality," then the collegiality among union faculty is greater than that among non-union faculty.

In other words, the findings of this study suggest that collegial relationships are the strongest between faculty members who belong to the union. Such a finding would be in keeping with the theoretical framework which states that inter-group conflict strengthens group identity and boundaries (Coser, 1956:38).

To extend this argument to decision making, a review of the literature on collegiality reveals that some researchers are concerned about the "rank and file" faculty gaining a voice in decision making. Some skeptics of unionization are rather explicit in pointing out that the tradition of collegiality and democratic decision making
are incompatible. Ladd and Lipset (1976:245) describe the situation as being one in which:

The egalitarian norms of unionism would appear to clash much more sharply with the standards and expectations that have prevailed (among professional doctors, lawyers, and scholars).

Declarations such as this suggest that the primary, albeit only implied, concern of established faculty and administrators is that of power and authority. As Dahrendorf (1975:176) so clearly outlines:

In every association, the interest of the ruling group are the values that constitute the ideology of the legitimacy of its rule, whereas the interest of the subjected group constitutes a threat to this ideology and the social relations it covers.

Faculty unions, therefore, are interest groups that come into existence in response to the prevailing "authority" structure and its self-perpetuating "ideology." Existing authority structures, the board, administration, and at some institutions senior faculty, perceive faculty unions as disruptive because they pose a threat to their legitimacy.

In the final analysis, the concept of collegiality is employed as an ideological justification of the traditional authority structure. If faculty and administrators shared "interest," "goals," and "values," they would then be colleagues. However, as Crossland (1976:41) points out:

As institutions and faculties grew, the governance of colleges and universities became increasingly the
responsibility of 'professional' administrators, many of whom had never earned advanced degrees and never taught a class.

If, as Baril and Hoffman (1975:3) argue, colleagues are those people with whom you share interest, goals and values, then only other faculty members qualify. Collegiality, in other words, is characteristic of intra-group relationships. Inter-group relationships, i.e., faculty union and administration contact, are characterized by conflict which in turn contributes to the establishment and reaffirmation of interest identity (Coser, 1956:38). Therefore, a related research topic that would probably yield valuable information on intra-institutional relationships would be that of comparing faculty morale with faculty interest in being involved in institutional decision making. Employing Alutto and Belasco's (1974) Decisional Participation Scale, a comparison could be made between faculty desire to participate in decision making and their morale. Such an analysis might indicate if involvement in decision making is an important factor in faculty morale. In view of the abundance of articles written on the topic of faculty participation in institutional governance, there is a dire need for quantitative research in this area.

The primary argument that has been developed in this chapter is that "collegiality" and participation in decision making, or governance, are integrally linked. Furthermore, faculty unions have
evolved as a means of achieving participation in governance, and have effectuated collegial relations among union members.

Control of one's working environment, i.e., participation in governance, has long been a major concern of social conflict theorists. Karl Marx (Nord, 1974:562), often acknowledged as the original conflict theorist, declared that:

When man loses control over the outcomes of his own activities, he fails to exercise that unique attribute (consciousness of action), and hence is alienated; he is not 'whole man.'

Furthermore, Marx observed that "control" was not an individual attainment, but arises out of group actions (Nord, 1974:562).

Marx's position correlates closely to the conclusions of this study. Faculty unions have evolved from "group actions," which have been provoked by the unequal distribution of power within the educational institution. Union activity increases consciousness of shared interest, goals and values, which in turn enhances collegial relations among members.

This study advocates that future research should be directed toward: (1) a more precise identification of conflict issues within the educational institution, e.g., Likert and Likert, *New Ways of Managing Conflict*; and (2) identifying specific areas of faculty needs for participation in governance, e.g., Alutto and Belasco, "Determinants of Attitudinal Militancy among Nurses and Teachers."
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PLEASE NOTE:

Pages 75-83, "The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire", copyright 1964 by the Purdue Research Foundation not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at Oregon State University Library.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.
THE PURDUE TEACHER OPINIONAIRE

Prepared by Ralph R. Bentley and Averno M. Rempel

This instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about your work as a teacher and various school problems in your particular school situation. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark the statements frankly.

A separate answer sheet is furnished for your responses. Fill in the information requested on the answer sheet. You will notice that there is no place for your name. Please do not record your name. All responses will be strictly confidential and results will be reported by groups only. DO NOT OMIT ANY ITEMS.

DIRECTIONS FOR RECORDING RESPONSES ON ANSWER SHEET

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you agree, probably agree, probably disagree, or disagree with each statement. Mark your answers on the separate answer sheet in the following manner:

If you agree with the statement, blacken the space.

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably agree with the statement, blacken the space.

If you are somewhat uncertain, but probably disagree with the statement, blacken the space.

If you disagree with the statement, blacken the space.

All marks should be heavy and completely fill the answer space. If you change a response, erase the first mark completely. Make no stray marks on the answer sheet. Please do not mark this booklet.

* This questionnaire has been modified and reprinted with permission of Purdue Research Foundation, copyright 1967.

Copyright 1964, Purdue Research Foundation.
Due to the variety of titles employed for community college administrators the terms supervisor, administrator and administration are used in this questionnaire as a general designation for the management personnel of the college to whom you are responsible, i.e., your dean, division director, cluster coordinator, etc.

1. Details, "red tape," and required reports absorb too much of my time. A PA PD D

2. The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our administration. A PA PD D

3. Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at our college. A PA PD D

4. The faculty feels that their suggestions pertaining to salaries are adequately transmitted by the administration to the board of education. A PA PD D

5. Our administrators show favoritism in their relations with the faculty in our school. A PA PD D

6. Faculty in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of record-keeping and clerical work. A PA PD D

7. My supervisor makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty. A PA PD D

8. Community demands upon the faculty's time are unreasonable. A PA PD D

9. I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are determined. A PA PD D

10. My work load is greater than that of most of the other faculty in our college. A PA PD D

11. The extra-curricular load of the faculty in our college is unreasonable. A PA PD D

12. Our administrator's leadership in the college challenges and stimulates our professional growth. A PA PD D

13. My faculty position gives me the social status in the community that I desire. A PA PD D

14. The number of hours a faculty member must work is unreasonable. A PA PD D

15. College teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like. A PA PD D

16. My college provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment. A PA PD D

17. Our college has a well-balanced curriculum. A PA PD D

18. There is a great deal of griping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among our faculty. A PA PD D

19. College teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction. A PA PD D

20. The curriculum of our college makes reasonable provision for student individual differences. A PA PD D

21. The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient. A PA PD D
22. Generally, faculty in our college do not take advantage of one another... A PA PD D
23. The faculty in our college cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives. A PA PD D
24. College teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society. A PA PD D
25. The curriculum of our college is in need of major revisions. A PA PD D
26. I love to teach. A PA PD D
27. If I could plan my career again, I would choose college teaching... A PA PD D
28. Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues. A PA PD D
29. I would recommend college teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability. A PA PD D
30. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching. A PA PD D
31. The college schedule places my classes at a disadvantage. A PA PD D
32. Within the limits of financial resources, the college tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc. A PA PD D
33. My supervisor makes my work easier and more pleasant. A PA PD D
34. Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden. A PA PD D
35. Our community makes its faculty feel as though they are a real part of the community. A PA PD D
36. Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice. A PA PD D
37. College teaching affords me the security I want in an occupation. A PA PD D
38. My supervisor understands and recognizes good teaching procedures. A PA PD D
39. Faculty members clearly understand the policies governing salary increases. A PA PD D
40. My classes are used as a "dumping ground" for problem students. A PA PD D
41. The lines and methods of communication between faculty and the administration in our college are well developed and maintained. A PA PD D
42. My teaching load in this college is unreasonable. A PA PD D
43. My supervisor shows a real interest in my department. A PA PD D
44. Our administration promotes a sense of belonging among the faculty in our college. A PA PD D
45. My heavy teaching load unduly restricts my nonprofessional activities. A PA PD D
46. I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding. A PA PD D
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I feel that I am an important part of this college.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>The competency of the faculty in our college compares favorably with that of faculty in other colleges with which I am familiar.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>My college provides the faculty with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I feel successful and competent in my present position.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Our faculty is congenial to work with.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>My colleagues are well prepared for their jobs.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Our college faculty has a tendency to form into cliques.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>The faculty in our college work well together.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I am at a disadvantage professionally because other faculty are better prepared to teach than I am.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Our college provides adequate clerical services for the faculty.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>As far as I know, the other faculty think I am a good teacher.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Library facilities and resources are adequate for the subject area which I teach.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>The &quot;stress and strain&quot; resulting from college teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>My supervisor is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>I do not hesitate to discuss any college problem with my supervisor.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>College teaching gives me the prestige I desire.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>My college teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>The salary schedule in our college adequately recognizes teacher competency.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>In my judgment, this community is a good place to raise a family.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>This community respects the faculty and treats them like professional persons.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>My supervisor acts as though he is interested in me and my problems.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>My supervisor supervises rather than &quot;snoo pervises&quot; the faculty in our college.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
71. It is difficult for faculty to gain acceptance by the people in this community.

72. Faculty meetings called by our administration waste the time and energy of the staff.

73. My supervisor has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.

74. I feel that my work is judged fairly by my supervisor.

75. Salaries paid in this college compare favorably with salaries in other colleges with which I am familiar.

76. Most of the actions of students irritate me.

77. The cooperativeness of faculty in our school helps make my work more enjoyable.

78. My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.

79. The purposes and objectives of the college cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.

80. The faculty in our college have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students.

81. This community expects its faculty to meet unreasonable personal standards.

82. My students appreciate the help I give them with their work.

83. To me there is no more challenging work than college teaching.

84. Other faculty in our college are appreciative of my work.

85. As a faculty member in this community, my nonprofessional activities outside of college are unduly restricted.

86. As a faculty member, I think I am as competent as most other faculty.

87. The faculty with whom I work have high professional ethics.

88. Our college curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens.

89. I really enjoy working with my students.

90. The faculty in our college show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments.

91. Faculty in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes.

92. My supervisor tries to make me feel comfortable when he visits my classes.
93. My supervisor makes effective use of the individual faculty's capacity and talent.                        A PA PD D

94. The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the college.               A PA PD

95. Faculty feel free to go to the administration about problems of personal and group welfare.               A PA PD D

96. This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff.               A PA PD D

97. This community is willing to support a good program of education.                                A PA PD D

98. Our community expects the faculty to participate in too many social activities.                      A PA PD D

99. Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a college instructor.                           A PA PD D

100. I am well satisfied with my present teaching position.                                                A PA PD D
DECISIONAL PARTICIPATION

Please indicate your current level of participation in decision making, and the level at which you would like to participate in each of the following situations.

1. When a new faculty member is hired in your department would you be involved in making such a decision? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

2. Would you want to be involved in such a decision? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

3. When a new administrator is hired in your division would you be involved in the process? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

4. Would you want to be involved in such a decision? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

5. When your department's budget is developed are you involved in the process? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

6. Would you want to be involved in the process? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

7. Would you be involved in the development of a new instructional method for your classes? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

8. Would you want to be involved? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

9. Would you be involved in the decision making of adding new buildings or facilities? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

10. Would you want to be involved? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

11. Would you be involved in curriculum development decisions for your division? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

12. Would you want to be involved? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

13. Are you involved in the decision making process for determining faculty salaries and benefits? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

14. Do you want to be involved in such matters? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

15. Are you involved in the process which determines faculty workload and assignments? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

16. Do you want to be involved in this process? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

17. Have you been involved in the process for selecting department chairpersons? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

18. Do you want to be involved in this process? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

19. Are you involved in the college's long range planning decisions? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

20. Would you want to be involved in such decisions? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
1. Sex: Male 1[]
   Female 2[]

2. College: ____________________________

3. Campus: ____________________________

4. Age:  
   20 or under 1[]
   21 - 25 2[]
   26 - 30 3[]
   31 - 35 4[]
   36 - 40 5[]
   41 - 45 6[]
   46 - 50 7[]
   51 - 55 8[]
   56 - 60 9[]
   60 and over 10[]

5. Level of education:
   Bachelors or less 1[]
   M.A. 2[]
   Ph.D 3[]

6. Counting this year, how many years have you taught in educational institutions?
   1 - 5 years 1[]
   6 - 10 " 2[]
   11 - 15 " 3[]
   16 - 20 " 4[]
   21 - 25 " 5[]
   26 - or more 6[]

7. Salary; 9 months, before taxes and deductions:
   $ 8,999 or below 1[]
   9,000 - 10,999 2[]
   11,000 - 12,999 3[]
   13,000 - 14,999 4[]
   15,000 - 16,999 5[]
   17,000 - 18,999 6[]
   19,000 - 20,999 7[]
   21,000 or more 8[]
8. Are you a member of any of the following organizations? (Mark all that apply.)

   American Association of University Professors 1[
   American Federation of Teachers 2[
   National Education Association 3[
   A State, County, or City Employees' Association 4[
   An association limited to teachers at your college 5[
   None of the above 6[

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the following statements.

9. Collective bargaining provides the best means of achieving faculty needs and objectives. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
10. Faculty unions serve a needed and beneficial purpose on college campuses. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
11. A strike is sometimes a necessary means of collective behavior by college faculty. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]