

1978

A study of the congruence between faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at selected four-year institutions that have negotiated collective bargaining contracts and those that have voted "no agent"

Kenneth E. Marks
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Marks, Kenneth E., "A study of the congruence between faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at selected four-year institutions that have negotiated collective bargaining contracts and those that have voted "no agent" " (1978). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 6572.

<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/6572>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

7903999

MARKS, KENNETH E.

A STUDY OF THE CONGRUENCE BETWEEN FACULTY AND
ADMINISTRATOR PERCEPTIONS OF GOVERNANCE
CHANGES AT SELECTED FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS
THAT HAVE NEGOTIATED COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
CONTRACTS AND THOSE THAT HAVE VOTED "NO
AGENT."

IDMA STATE UNIVERSITY, PH.D., 1978

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

A study of the congruence between faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at selected four-year institutions that have negotiated collective bargaining contracts and those that have voted "no agent"

by

Kenneth E. Marks

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa
1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	9
Purpose of Study	10
Key Terms and Definitions	12
Delimitations	15
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
Governance	18
The Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining Upon Academic Governance	26
General studies	26
Specific studies	28
Summary	41
RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES	44
Selection of the Sample of Institutions	44
Selection of the Faculty Sample	46
The Data Collection Instrument	46
Collection of Data	47
Data Analysis	48
FINDINGS	49
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	106
Discussion	106
Faculty status	107b
Selection of administrators	110
Financial planning and policy	112
Academic operation	118
Academic planning and policy	121
Professional duties	122

	Page
Organization of faculty agencies	124
Conclusions	128
Recommendations for Further Study	130
SUMMARY	131
REFERENCES	138
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	159
APPENDIX A	160
APPENDIX B	161
APPENDIX C	165
APPENDIX D	178
APPENDIX E	185
APPENDIX F	235
APPENDIX G	239

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Percentage distribution of responses by decision-making category.	51
Table 2. Analysis of faculty perceptions of changes in governance by bargaining agent--table of means, standard deviations and F statistics	57
Table 3. Analysis of administrator perceptions of changes in governance by bargaining agent--table of means, standard deviations and F statistics.	60
Table 4. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized institutions--AAUP bargaining agent.	62
Table 5. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized institutions--AFT bargaining agent	65
Table 6. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized institutions--NEA bargaining agent	68
Table 7. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent"	76
Table 8. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent"	80
Table 9. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions.	84
Table 10. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at institutions that voted "no-agent"	87
Table 11. Comparison of faculty perceptions of changes in governance at different categories of unionized institutions.	91
Table 12. Comparison of administrator perceptions of changes in governance at different categories of unionized institutions.	95

	Page
Table 13. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized liberal arts colleges.	99
Table 14. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized comprehensive universities and colleges.	102
Table 15. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 1.	186
Table 16. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 2.	189
Table 17. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 3.	192
Table 18. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 4.	195
Table 19. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 5.	198
Table 20. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 6.	201
Table 21. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 7.	204
Table 22. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 8.	207
Table 23. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 9.	210
Table 24. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 10	213

	Page
Table 25. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 11.	216
Table 26. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 12.	219
Table 27. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 13.	222
Table 28. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 14.	225
Table 29. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 15.	228
Table 30. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 16.	231
Table 31. Institutional characteristics	234

INTRODUCTION

Faculty collective bargaining is a new phenomenon in the world of higher education. Unlike many educational theories and systems which trace their history over decades and centuries, collective bargaining in postsecondary education began its active existence about fifteen years ago. Negotiations involving two-year schools are generally recognized as beginning at Milwaukee Technical Institute in 1963; the first acknowledged bargaining among four-year institutions occurred at the United States Merchant Marine Academy in 1966. These two institutions were both publicly supported; private academic institutions were not legally able to engage in collective bargaining due to prohibitions in the National Labor Relations Act. These restrictions were removed in 1970.

The forces that precipitated the move to faculty collective bargaining represented an array of pressures that had been building for years. Higher education has stood as the example of measured organizational development. The antecedents of modern higher education and collective bargaining are found in the records of the medieval masters and doctors' guilds. As these guilds grew in stature and power they became the communities of scholars. Over the centuries these "communities" solidified their place in the life of the university.

Eighteenth and early nineteenth century American colleges and universities were run by small, closely-knit groups of faculty. Faculty backgrounds and experiences were generally homogeneous; they had all experienced the same educational process and were prepared to teach a

restricted body of knowledge. Administrative needs, which were quite limited, were usually handled by one faculty member.

The late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth century witnessed an ever-increasing change of pace. New disciplines and fields of study came into existence and were added to the curricula. Programs of study diversified and faculty emerged from an expanding range of backgrounds. Faculty and administrative activities were increasingly distinguished from one another.

The midpoint of the twentieth century saw higher education standing on the threshold of even greater change. Increasing enrollment and exploding expectations from society accelerated the growth of postsecondary education. The G.I. Bill opened higher education to thousands of students who would never have considered additional education as a possible way to improve their life. The Russian "sputnik" brought postsecondary education onto the national and international scene as another factor to influence international relations.

The culmination came in the last half of the 1960s and the early 1970s. Society was in turmoil as new groups demanded a voice in the decision-making processes. Higher education was not exempt from these demands. Special interest groups, in growing numbers, argued for a role in determining the direction of postsecondary education. Arguments were heard for increased accountability on the part of academicians.

One method of extending accountability appeared to be to modify the traditional academic governance structure. Faculty saw their status being altered and their participation in governance activities being

modified. Corson (71, p. 10) lists four ways in which governance changed.

The individual institution is now part of a system, it is no longer a free standing, autonomous institution.

Decisions within the individual institution are subject to review and even to prescription, by governmental agencies to a degree unforeseen (and unacceptable). . . .

Collegiality in the making of the most fundamental decisions of the individual institutions has been diminished, altered and, in some instances, abandoned. The leadership of the individual institution has been delimited in scope and diminished in power and prestige.

Wollett (263, p. 8) notes that individuals in large statewide systems of higher education have become further and further removed from decision-making and governance processes. Individuals in authority have become impersonal and anonymous as verdicts are handed down affecting the life of the organization. Although not peculiar to the multiversity, it appears to be more common in the small institutions. In fact, the tendencies toward strong faculty government seem more likely to occur in the larger schools than in the smaller. Faculty governance, in the latter, tends to become a funnel for decisions made elsewhere (Baldrige, 25, p. 65).

Some faculty, sensing a change in their position in society, sought a way to preserve and possibly enhance, their standing. Collective bargaining became the new means for them to respond to societal pressures. Although the benefits of organizing for collective action had been demonstrated for years by labor unions, these examples were largely overlooked by the professoriate. Only as public school teachers and various minority groups successfully used collective bargaining to

achieve their goals in the late 1960s did faculty begin to consider its utility.

Legal constraints which effectively prohibited public employee bargaining had to be eliminated before faculty could emulate other groups. Historically, there had been three arguments used to prevent public sector bargaining. The common law doctrine of sovereignty, the illegal delegation of legislative and executive power, and the belief that government employment was a privilege not a right were used to inhibit unionization in governmental bodies.

Although the modification of these positions began about 1950, real change was dependent upon legislation. The first state to legislatively authorize public sector collective bargaining was Wisconsin in 1959. The New York law, known as the Taylor Law, enacted in 1967 had the greatest impact on faculty bargaining as it permitted the State University of New York (S.U.N.Y.) and the City University of New York (C.U.N.Y.) systems to organize. Executive orders 10988 (issued January 19, 1962) and 11491 (issued October 29, 1969) promulgated by Presidents Kennedy and Nixon, respectively, provided federal employees with the right to organize. Currently, forty-three states have developed some type of legal basis for public sector bargaining. The faculty in some of these states is still denied the right to bargain due to their exclusion from specifically identified groups of public employees.

The National Labor Relations Act governed private sector bargaining but for years private educational institutions were exempted from the Act by the Columbia decision (97 NLRB No. 72, 29 LRRM 1098, 1951). The

National Labor Relations Board finally reversed its stance in 1970 with the Cornell decision (183 NLRB No. 41, 74 LRRM 1269, 1970). Jurisdiction was assumed by the Board. Subsequent standards were set exempting private educational institutions with a gross income of less than one million dollars.

Although legalized faculty bargaining is a recent phenomenon, faculty organizations have had a long existence in higher education. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), founded in 1915, has been the largest faculty organization and generally acknowledged as the defender of faculty rights and privileges. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT), established in 1916, only began to expand its activities in higher education within the past decade. The National Education Association (NEA) organized in the midnineteenth century and long associated with public school teachers expanded its relationship with higher education in the 1960s. As the full potential of the field of higher education as a source of new members was recognized these three groups expanded their respective organizational activities. The competition among them has often been fierce.

Each of these organizations has been faced by stereotypical rolls as bargaining agents. The AFT has carried its ancestry of the AFL-CIO and industrial unionism. There has been a tendency for the AFT to be selected by community colleges where substantial numbers of the faculty are already members of the trade unions. The NEA has been known as the public school teachers' union. The faculty of the emerging universities and former teachers colleges have tended to support the NEA. Many of

the faculty at these institutions began their teaching careers in public school systems. The AAUP has enjoyed an advantage with the faculty from more established and elite institutions. Position statements on governance from each of these groups are found in Appendix B.

Observers of faculty collective bargaining have commented upon the varying rates at which faculty unionization has spread through the different types of institutions. Community and junior colleges have been the most extensively organized. This may be due, at least partially, to the newness of most of these units, the absence of a system for decision-making, and the public school ties. Kemerer (145, p. 92) argues that because two-year institutions experienced the fastest growth during the past decade, they are likely to be the most affected by no-growth conditions. Former teachers colleges or emerging state universities have been identified as the group next most susceptible to faculty unionization. Individuals at these institutions developed their professional identity and role in one context and have been forced to adapt to an altered set of circumstances (126, p. 51). A transition of this type and the resultant adjustments are seldom easy; unionization is often viewed as a mechanism for coping with this change.

Another institutional category, the less prestigious liberal arts colleges, should also be included here. Kemerer describes them as:

seriously threatened by rising costs and declining enrollments. Although most of these faculty members consider themselves relatively privileged, they are more likely to fear the loss of past gains as harassed administrators in their schools try to cope with both a no-growth era and the uncompetitive position . . . vis-a-vis low tuition state institutions. . . . (145, p. 92)

Faculty at research universities or elite liberal arts colleges where a tradition of strong faculty participation in decision-making exists have been the least amenable to collective bargaining.

National faculty groups were ready to act when public sector bargaining was legitimized. Individual faculty and administrators had to educate themselves about unionization and collective bargaining. Four basic premises supply the foundations for unions (221, p. 253). First, there is conflict between employees and administrators; second, an organization is accepted by the employees as their exclusive representative; third, protection extends to individuals and small groups; and fourth, the employee organization must win its exclusive status within a legal framework.

Faculty bargaining is often viewed as a monolithic structure but several approaches have been identified. Begin (34, pp. 4, 5, 6, 7) has identified three types of unionism among organized faculties.

1. Defensive unionism. The distinguishing features of this type are the prior existence of a fairly well established tradition of faculty participation in governance. . . . In the late 1960's a combination of pressures appeared that seemed to threaten the position of the faculties. . . . They were interested in converting what had been a relatively informal system of delegated authority . . . , into one with firm commitments that would have the weight of binding contracts if these could be negotiated.
2. Constitutional unionism. . . . has appeared in some institutions with little of the traditional governance arrangements. . . . This may have been because they were new institutions or were institutions so drastically changed from their original form or function. . . .

. . . , the union is accepted from the start as the basic arm of faculty in the "constitutional convention" stage of developing the system of governance. The

governance system is the product of bargaining and is contractually based. . . .

3. Reform unionism. . . . any type of unionism that produces changes in established practices of institutional operation. . . .

There appears to be no place in this triumvirate for union activity that does not deal with extremes of governance conditions.

Scholars studying academic collective bargaining have not only differentiated between types of unionism, they have also distinguished between bargaining philosophies. The ease with which a particular philosophy may be followed is controlled by both the brand of unionism and, most important, by the legislation facilitating bargaining. Mortimer (195, pp. 5, 6) has identified three philosophies.

The first type is the limited bargaining philosophy . . . , the collective bargaining contract is basically limited to employment issues. . . . There tends to be little or no contractual reference to governance matters. . . .

The second . . . is called structural bargaining, . . . The scope of issues treated in the contract is broader . . . , the issue may be treated in the contract but in structural terms only. There would be no reference to controlling policies or the criteria to be used in decision making.

The third . . . is called comprehensive bargaining . . . , the scope of issues treated in the contract is broad, and they are handled in both procedural and policy terms. These contracts may incorporate . . . a variety of other institutional documents . . . , and thereby make them binding.

Faculty collective bargaining is a multichanneled process. It may be impossible to answer whether the particular approach to bargaining a faculty selects is the one best suited to the organizational environment. One possible way to find an answer is to question faculty regarding

changes in institutional climate or conditions. There is little doubt it is easier to determine the extent of change in the economic aspects of an organization than it is in the noneconomic. The subjective basis for the evaluation of many of the nonmonetary issues makes it difficult to reach agreement on what has happened. The consequence has been that most studies of academic collective bargaining have avoided the noneconomic topics.

Problem Statement

Colleges and universities have traditionally governed themselves in an informal manner. As long as institutions and their faculty remained small, the individual faculty member could remain the focal point of the organization's actions. Rules and regulations could remain largely unwritten and still be applied successfully. This mode of operation came to be accepted and preferred by most academicians and administrations as the proper way to manage higher education.

The growth and unrest which characterized higher education in the 1960s dramatized the need to change governance structures and procedures. Students and minority groups demanded a voice and input in deciding how education's fiscal resources should be spent, state and federal governmental units required increased accountability, and faculty wanted greater support and fewer controls over their actions. Faculty collective bargaining was viewed as a method of coping with competing demands. The heart of the unionization process is a codification of the rules governing the work place. The process of formalizing and standardizing

policies and procedures can be an unsettling experience to an organization that had functioned informally. A common assumption associated with change of this nature is that various activities will be severely restricted. This seems to be the case with the collective bargaining process in higher education although it has never been demonstrated.

Faculty and administrators assume their roles will be significantly changed and restricted under the new conditions. There has been no study of whether or not this does occur. The purpose of this study is to determine faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in the way governance issues are handled. Faculty and administrators were asked to state their perceptions of the level of faculty participation at two points in time. The first of these was the perception of faculty participation in governance at the time of the bargaining representation election. The other was the perception of governance as it is conducted today. If faculty perceived changes in governance that are favorable to them, they should be increasingly supportive of collective bargaining.

Purpose of Study

The literature of collective bargaining in higher education has grown at a phenomenal rate since 1970. Accounts describing the unionization of the faculty at various institutions are available. Studies analyzing the consequences of collective bargaining on various activities have been conducted. Nowhere has the rank-and-file faculty been asked for their perceptions of the impact of collective bargaining.

This study is specifically designed to determine the congruence

between faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at selected four-year institutions that have negotiated collective bargaining contracts and those that have voted "no-agent". The following hypotheses are to be tested.

1. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at institutions having different bargaining agents.
2. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at institutions having different bargaining agents.
3. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators and faculty at institutions having different bargaining agents.
4. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".
5. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".
6. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".
7. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at the different categories of unionized institutions.

8. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at the different categories of unionized institutions.
9. There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at the different categories of unionized institutions.

The influence of various demographic factors will be analyzed as well as the effect of whether an institution is public or private.

Key Terms and Definitions

The following definitions of key terms are provided so there can be a common understanding of the language used throughout the project.

1. Collective bargaining: ". . . a continuing institutional relationship between an employer entity (governmental or private) and a labor organization (union or association) representing exclusively a defined group of employees of said employer (appropriate bargaining unit) concerned with the negotiation, administration, interpretation and enforcement of written agreements covering joint understandings as to wages or salaries, rates of pay, hours of work and other conditions of employment" (75, p. 42).

2. Governance: ". . . the structures and the processes of decision making" (57, p. vii). ". . . the processes by which decisions are made, who participates in these processes, the structure that relates those individuals, the effort that is made to see to it that decisions once made are carried out, and the processes used to evaluate the

results that are achieved" (71, p. 9).

3. Authority: ". . . we mean effective influence. Effective influence may or may not be synonymous with legal authority, because there may be a de-facto shift of decision-making power away from the party with the de jure authority. . . . Thus, effective influence can be described as the relative ability to specify the alternatives considered in resolving a given issue and to control the determination of the alternative that is ultimately selected" (1, pp. 14, 15).

4. Administrative dominance: ". . . a situation in which the administration makes decisions essentially on a unilateral basis with the faculty exercising little or no influence. The faculty is merely informed of decisions after they are made or consulted before a course of action is selected, but the administration gives the faculty viewpoint only pro-forma consideration" (1, p. 15).

5. Administrative primacy: ". . . authority resides primarily with the administration, but the faculty is actively consulted and its views are given careful consideration in reaching a decision. Faculty opinions may be presented in a formal manner, using such techniques as resolutions or petitions forwarded to the administration. Faculty influence may also be exercised by informal methods such as statements by leading faculty members, passive resistance to administrative decisions, and other manifestations of discontent. In any given decision, however, administrative views are given greater weight if there is a division of opinion" (1, p. 15).

6. Shared authority: ". . . both faculty and administration

exercise effective influence in decision-making. The concept of shared authority may be implemented through various institutional procedures. For example, the formulation of educational policies may be carried out by an academic senate comprised of faculty members and officials of the administration. A joint grievance committee may be established to handle disputes involving issues of personnel administration. Collective bargaining also constitutes a form of shared authority" (1, p. 15).

7. Faculty primacy: ". . . decision-making authority rests primarily in the hands of the faculty, although provisions are made for prior consultation with the administration and for the airing of administration views. In most public institutions, acceptance of the principle of faculty primacy would involve tacit or explicit delegation to the faculty of those powers legally vested in the administration or board of trustees" (1, p. 16).

8. Faculty dominance: ". . . unilateral decision-making authority is vested in the faculty" (1, p. 16).

9. Research universities: "These universities were on the list of the 100 leading institutions in terms of federal financial support in at least two out of the above three years [1968-69, 1969-70, 1970-71] and awarded at least 50 Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if a medical school was on the same campus) in 1969-70, or they were among the leading 50 institutions in terms of the total number of Ph.D.'s (plus M.D.'s if on the same campus) awarded during the years from 1960-61 to 1969-70" (56, p. 2).

10. Doctoral-granting universities: "These institutions awarded

at least 10 Ph.D.'s in 1969-70 with the exception of a few new doctoral-granting institutions that may be expected to increase the number of Ph.D.'s awarded within a few years" (56, p. 2).

11. Comprehensive universities and colleges: ". . . includes state colleges and some private colleges that offered a liberal arts program and at least one professional or occupational program such as teacher training or nursing. Many of the institutions in this group are former teachers colleges that have recently broadened their programs to include a liberal arts curriculum. Private institutions with fewer than 1,500 students and public institutions with fewer than 1,000 students in 1970 are not included even though they may offer a selection of programs, because they were not regarded as comprehensive with such small enrollments" (56, p. 2).

12. Liberal Arts colleges: "These colleges scored 5 or above on Astin's selectivity index or they were included among the 200 leading baccalaureate-granting institutions in terms of numbers of their graduates receiving Ph.D.'s at 40 leading doctoral-granting institutions from 1920 to 1966" (56, p. 3).

Delimitations

1. The geographic dispersion of institutions prohibited the use of any data gathering technique except the mailed questions.

2. A representative sample of colleges was selected in order to secure a cross section of the institutions needed. The faculty at an institution had to have voted for unionization or for the "no-agent"

option. The unionized institutions were further restricted by having to have negotiated at least one contract. Institutions were categorized by whether they were liberal arts colleges or comprehensive universities or colleges as defined by the Carnegie Commission. A further separation was made into public and private schools.

3. Only four-year colleges and universities were selected. No two-year community or junior colleges were chosen.

4. A random sample of fifty teaching faculty was drawn from each institution. The sample was drawn using the most recent copy of the institution's catalog, available in the Iowa State University Library.

5. A fixed sample of administrative personnel was drawn for each institution. The size of the sample varied from two to seven based upon the number of administrators. Positions used were president, vice-president for academic affairs, provost, vice-president for financial affairs, dean of students and various academic deans.

6. Only single campus institutions with one exception were selected for study. To permit a balanced analysis, a unit from the Vermont State College system was included in the survey.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Although faculty collective bargaining activity in higher education is relatively new; initially, there was a surge of writing describing collective bargaining and its adaptability to higher education. As faculties decided to organize and negotiations began articles attempting to explain why a particular faculty made its choice became commonplace. Explanations and rationalizations were also produced to provide an understanding of the decisions being made by labor boards and the courts. Even though most of the writing on academic collective bargaining was opinion based, substantive research into the causes and consequences of collective bargaining was being undertaken at some institutions across the country. Studies under the direction of Kenneth Mortimer at Pennsylvania State University and J. Victor Baldrige at Stanford University were initiated to provide basic data about collective bargaining. Most of the research done by scholars from these schools was descriptive in nature and restricted to one or a few incidents.

Prior to the review of literature appropriate indexes and abstracts were searched for relevant publications. Dissertation Abstracts and the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) [Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE) and Resources in Education (RIE)] data bases were searched by computer. These automated searches were supplemented and updated by manual searches. Education Index and Social Science Citation Index were also examined manually. All sources were reviewed from 1970 to the present. For the purposes of this research no studies

of collective bargaining activities involving community or junior colleges were reviewed.

The literature reviewed for this study is arranged in two groups. One contains writings about the governance of higher education; the other, the effects of collective bargaining on academic governance.

Governance

The characteristic diversity of many aspects of American higher education also permeates their governance systems. The forces supporting governance uniformity in other countries have either not been present or not been able to influence the development of the American systems. The presence of substantial variation, however, does not mean the absence of basic governance principles. The Carnegie Commission in a 1973 study (57, p. 5) commented upon five general features of academic governance. 1. There has been the absence of strong control by the federal government as state and local bodies have exercised most of the direction. 2. The existence of both public and private sectors in higher education. 3. Lay boards have been responsible for providing the governance of each institution, public or private. 4. The board has delegated significant amounts of authority to the institution's president. 5. The department has been the critical administrative unit for over a century.

The great diversity in higher education has prodded scholars to bring order and reason to the chaos that has often typified academic government. The result has been a continual search for theories or

philosophies of governance that could be applied to higher education. Three of the most common theoretical systems used to provide an explanation for what occurs are collegial, bureaucratic, and political structures.

The collegial approach to academic governance traces its antecedents to the concept of the community of scholars. The idea of a "community" had its origin in the Middle Ages with the fledgling universities and the companies of scholars. The autonomy and independence from sacred and secular control enjoyed by the communities have been held as the goal for contemporary scholars. For the collegial theory to work several conditions must be satisfied. They are:

(a) there is a readily identifiable commonality of purpose among participants . . . ; (b) there is at least the appearance of participation satisfying to most; and (c) there is loyalty to the process which tends to cause participants to be loyal to the decisions reached. . . . (205, p. 50)

The largest obstacle to attaining these conditions today is the size of most institutions. The commonality of interests and goals claimed for faculty and administrators in the past is apparently only a memory today. The dichotomy of views may increase as administrators are drawn from sources other than the ranks of the faculty. Faculty participation has grown more tenuous as the problems confronting higher education have become more complex. Extended study is required to become conversant with the options that are available and their relative merits. Often the faculty have neither the interest nor the time to devote to the necessary preparation. As academicians view decisions being made for them by other members of the institution there is less incentive

to be loyal to the decision-making process.

The collegial approach to governance while it varies among colleges and universities can be found at all levels within an institution. The typical medium for collegial participation is the committee. The contributions of these bodies range from weakly worded statements reflecting the consensus of faculty opinion to formal definitive reports (176, p. 16). Where collegial control exists the faculty generally oversees the preparation and admission of new members to the profession; the selection, promotion, and retention of colleagues; and the selection of departmental chairpersons and deans (181, pp. 36, 37). The small faculties of a century ago made collegial governance a reality. Mazzola indicates that collegiality in today's complex educational organization is more often a dream of the past.

The apparent lack of success of the collegial theory necessitated the application of an alternative system. Max Weber's bureaucratic model of government was extended to higher education. The increasing size of postsecondary education created conditions suitable for Weber's system. Baldrige (25, pp. 3, 4) mentions six prominent bureaucratic elements present in colleges and universities: 1) education institutions are complex organizations chartered by the state making them corporate entities with public obligations; 2) there is a formal hierarchy with rules specifying the relations between organizational levels; 3) formal channels of communication exist; 4) definite authority relationships exist between officials at different layers in the institution; 5) the institution's work is governed by a formal set of rules and

regulations; 6) bureaucratic characteristics are most evident in the portions of the organizations that deal with people. The increasing standardization of procedures and rules in response to federal and state regulation have provided additional impetus to bureaucratization.

There are limits, however, to the applicability of bureaucratic theory. Four points are made by Baldrige (25, pp. 4, 5) in explaining the inadequacies.

First, the bureaucratic model tells us much about "authority", that is legitimate, formalized power, but not much about the other types of power based on nonlegitimate threats, the force of mass movements, expertise, and appeals to emotion and sentiment. . . .

Second, the bureaucratic paradigm explains much about the formal structure but very little about the processes that give dynamism to the structure. . . .

Third, the bureaucratic paradigm deals with the formal structure at any one point in time, but does not explain how the organization changes over time. Finally, the bureaucratic model does not deal extensively with the crucial task of policy-formulation. The paradigm explains how policies may be carried out in the most efficient fashion after they are set, but it says little about the process by which the policy is established in the first place. . . .

These and other shortcomings in the bureaucratic system reinforced the search for additional models of academic governance.

The most recent governance theory proposed for higher education is the political model. The premise is advanced that complex organizations can be studied as miniature political systems and the crucial process to be examined is the policy formation procedures (29, p. 25). The reason to concentrate on policy formation is based on the belief that major policies commit an organization to certain goals and may dictate the means used to achieve them. Baldrige, who is the principal

proponent of the political model, has outlined six assumptions supporting his system (25, pp. 9, 10). 1. Conflict in a dynamic organization is natural and to be expected. 2. A college or university is made up of many interest groups each trying to affect policy formation so their goals and values will be given effect. 3. Small groups of politically active elites control most decisions, but different elite groups control different decisions. 4. While elites may control the decisions there is constant pressure to democratize the process. 5. Formal authority in a bureaucratic sense is severely limited and most decisions are the result of bargaining among power groups. 6. External forces exert substantial influence on decisions insuring internal forces to not make decisions in isolation.

None of these three systems is entirely satisfactory in providing a theoretical foundation for academic governance. Some combination of the systems appears to be a better approximation of reality. Whether other governance models will be proposed in the future is impossible to forecast. Two variations of the governance themes need to be included in this review. One is the union model of academic governance and the other is the shared authority paradigm.

The union model simply transfers the essential principles of collective bargaining to academe. This model presumes faculty and administrators do not share the same goals or standards. The former believe they are being sacrificed to the goal of increased efficiency while the latter are convinced the stability of the institution is being destroyed to provide security and improved working conditions for the faculty.

Conflict between the groups may become intense and strained relations may exist for an extended period (53, p. 42).

The shared authority paradigm and the collective bargaining process have been equated with one another. There is an essential difference, however, because the collective bargaining relationship is predicated upon an adversarial stance. This is not true of the other model. A significant amount of mutual trust and respect must exist among the parties involved and the structures and functions of governance must be considered legitimate (198, p. 15). This model provides the faculty with primary responsibility for decision-making over topics such as tenure, dismissal, curriculum, grades, and both the content and method of instruction. Final authority, however, still rests with the governing board (139, pp. 40, 41). Faculty participation must occur early enough in the decision-making process to result in effective influence in order for shared authority to exist. The definitive statement on shared authority was produced in 1966 by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (See Appendix C.)

Many commentators believe shared authority may be the most desirable governance relationship for all parties in higher education. Achieving this arrangement continues to be a long and arduous task.

Three factors have been identified as being very influential in determining the governance processes in effect. First, the environment, which includes legal control, sources of financial support and relationships with other societal groups, helps determine the conduct of

decision-making. Second, the goals or the purposes of the institution are also influential. Third, the size and complexity of the school may affect governance arrangements (31, pp. 27, 28). The diversity of conditions present in higher education guarantees variety in decision-making systems.

Riley and Baldrige (221, p. 194) state "there is no simple formula" for determining who should participate in college or university governance. They list four categories of individuals who can claim a right to participate in governing activities. They are (1) individuals who are affected by campus activities, (2) individuals who are most competent to do the campus work, (3) individuals whose cooperation is necessary to the effectiveness of the campus, and (4) individuals who have given their resources to the institution should be involved in regulating the campus.

McConnell and Mortimer (171, p. 7) indicate faculty participation in governance has come through specific delegation in some instances and tacit approval in others on the part of governing boards. Active faculty participation has been a fact-of-life at many institutions for years; at others it has been a myth maintained to the satisfaction of all parties.

The environment of higher education has resulted in governance procedures that are unique when compared to other systems. The president or chief executive officer is appointed for an indefinite term and in addition, a board of trustees, regents or governors, made up of individuals outside of academe are relied upon very heavily. External

nongovernmental groups have a significant influence on affairs in post-secondary education (148, pp. 108, 109). The result is a governance system for the faculty that culminates in a "faculty senate" which stands as the symbol of the faculty's hereditary tie to the "community of scholars".

Faculty senates and academic departments have often assumed the role of protectors of the collegial model of governance. Many times the senate is used to reinforce the claim that the faculty are the university.

The political nature of man means many

academic senates function more like legislative than forensic or collegial bodies. The detailed and routine work is done through senate committees and through the informal political communication networks which are part of senate operation.

. . . , the votes that a senate takes may be important; but it is questionable, given political maneuvering before the meeting, that the debate is meaningful or changes the outcome on an important issue. . . . (171, p. 41)

The presence of central administrators may confuse the nature of some faculty senates and their participation may unduly influence the deliberations of other senates. Equally as damaging is the domination of a faculty oligarchy that typically has close ties to the administration. Unless a topic achieves a high degree of notoriety most faculty will let the oligarchy control the decision-making.

The growing size of faculties and the proliferation of departments have caused even the oligarchic control of the senate to lose ground. Critical issues are now confronted by the faculty as departmental units or by the administration at the highest levels. In those instances

where a senate deliberates Kemerer and Baldrige (146, pp. 139, 140) indicate there is a belief the body responds to administrative rather than faculty leadership.

The Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining Upon Academic Governance

The literature examining collective bargaining and its effect upon academic governance has been separated into two categories for the purposes of this review. One views the impact in broad terms while the other relies on studies of specific incidents to analyze the impact of faculty bargaining.

General studies

The advent of faculty unionization upon the campus scene has prompted a debate on whether academic collective bargaining and the faculty senate can coexist or are they mutually exclusive. Begin (37), Brick (46), Garbarino and Aussieker (96), McConnell and Mortimer (171), and Riley and Baldrige (221), have written about the incompatibility of the two systems. All of these scholars support the belief that collective bargaining will prove inimical to the faculty senate and that a diminution of senate power will occur. However, Begin (35, pp. 2, 3) in 1974, found no instances in which a faculty senate had disappeared at an institution that had experienced faculty bargaining. Duryea et al. (80, p. 208) believe it is inevitable that unions will assume the power presently held by senates. In their opinion, this transfer of power will occur when the union sees its traditional areas of concern

under fire.

Academic senates and faculty collective bargaining structures have existed long enough for some comparisons to be made between them. Insights (132, pp. 56, 57) indicates that they are:

First, although senates may have some basis for their existence in the documents of the institution, their scope of operations is dependent upon board or administrative approval. In some cases, changes in senate structures and operations are mandated by the board. . . . In contrast, no such unilateral change could be made in the structure of a faculty bargaining agent or in the terms of a negotiated contract without prior approval of the agent and its governing body.

Second, academic senates normally are dependent on institutional appropriations for their operating funds. . . . A faculty association or union relies on a dues structure for its financial support. A local association will often receive additional funds and support services from its national affiliate to help the costs of election campaigns and the negotiation process. . . .

Third, many senates are based on individual campuses and do not reflect the statewide or multicampus nature of much of higher education. Where statewide senates are in existence, they have yet to develop substantial lobbying or political power with state legislatures. Some associations, particularly the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, claim they have such lobbying power and are active in attempting to influence the political decision-making process as it applies to the interests of education.

Fourth, the membership of senates usually includes faculty, administrators, and, more recently, students. . . . Faculty associations are more clearly dominated by faculty members--some even exclude administrators from their membership. In cases where the negotiation process has started, there is a legally binding separation between administrators (management) and the faculty (employees), imposed by the definition of who is in the "faculty" bargaining unit. . . .

Fifth, senates are likely to be less concerned about adequate grievance and appeal mechanisms. They often do not provide an avenue of appeal from their own decision. . . . Associations negotiating contracts will almost always specify an avenue of appeal from decisions made by either the faculty or the administration. (132, pp. 56, 57)

In instances where power and influence accrues to the union the faculty can no longer negotiate individual arrangements with the institution; an agreement is reached for the professoriate as a whole. Second, informal personnel policies and practices become precisely phrased clauses in the contract. Third, no matter how restrictive the bargaining law may be in regard to topics that may be negotiated, the list of permissible subjects will grow.

Once a bargaining agent has the weight of statutory certification behind it, a familiar process comes into play. First, the matter of salaries is linked to the matter of workload; workload is related directly to class size; class size to range of offering; and range of offerings to curricular policy. Dispute over class size may also lead to bargaining over admissions policies. . . . (48, pp. 1074, 1076)

Increased explicitness and uniformity in rules and regulations, and the centralization of control appear to be the consequences of faculty negotiations. Often an increase in faculty control of administrative activities is forecast as the outcome of collective bargaining, however, the opposite appears to be true. The concentration of power and decision-making in the upper levels of the management hierarchy or with the governing board is facilitated by the bargaining process (146, p. 9; 43, pp. 265, 267).

Specific studies

Ladd and Lipset (151) utilized data from surveys in 1969 and 1972 to provide the earliest sampling of faculty opinion regarding unionization. Most of their study was a demographic analysis of union sympathizers and opponents. Data indicate that supporters of collective bargaining are likely to be younger, untenured, in the lower professional

ranks and from the least prestigious institutions when compared with faculty opposed to collective action (151, p. 16). Advocates also hold more liberal political views.

The effects of unionism were examined in some detail by Ladd and Lipset. The first issue reviewed was salary parity. Collective bargaining has been used to install equal pay concepts while removing the merit pay or "star" system. Where it hasn't been eliminated an attempt has been made to place the system under faculty or peer review (151, p. 16). Reappointment and tenure processes have also felt the impact of collective negotiations. The emphasis upon a formalization of the rules and procedures to be followed in granting or denying promotion or tenure has been widespread. There has also been a trend for unions to demand that peer judgments be allowed to stand without further review by administrators.

Beyond the issues of jobs and salaries there are a number of non-economic topics encompassed in the governance process that may be influenced by bargaining. In the Ladd and Lipset survey substantial space was devoted to the question of representation. Historically, faculty oligarchies have controlled governance activities, however, unionization, normally, ousts this ruling group and installs a different minority. Ladd and Lipset found that although unions may initially allow any faculty member a voice in the deliberations of the bargaining unit this attitude soon changes. Eventually, only dues paying members may participate in the deliberations of the group and the ratification of contracts. A basic question left unanswered by Ladd and Lipset's study

was whether the lot of the average faculty member had improved.

As part of the study the continued existence of traditional faculty governance mechanisms was reviewed. National faculty associations contend collective bargaining and faculty senates are not incompatible (151, p. 83). Experience indicates academic senates are weakened the longer unionization is present. When legally binding contracts assign the bargaining unit specific roles in various governance activities the effect upon senate contributions is dramatic.

Nowhere in the study did Ladd and Lipset question faculty about specific governance activities and whether they have changed. Reasons for this were the newness of faculty unionization and not many four-year institutions were operating under negotiated contracts. The survey was not designed to determine faculty evaluations of current governance conditions.

The Stanford Project on Academic Governance, another nationwide survey, examined the impact of collective bargaining on governance. This project, begun in 1971, consisted of two phases. The first in 1971 was a study of general issues in academic governance at 240 institutions. The second begun in 1974 examined collective bargaining at a total of 511 institutions. The general faculty was surveyed in the initial phase but in the second phase, only the president of the institution and the faculty leader of the bargaining unit were questioned. Case studies were conducted at seven institutions which were at varying stages in the development of faculty collective bargaining.

The results of the study were set forth in twenty-seven findings.

Some of these are particularly relevant to this research.

1. Several critical factors can influence the effect of faculty collective bargaining on campus governance, including the geographic extent and personnel composition of the bargaining unit, the scope of bargaining, union security agreements, and strike sanctions.
2. One of the most important factors shaping collective bargaining is the "scope of bargaining" that is allowed.
3. Interestingly, the national affiliation of the union is one of the least important factors influencing governance.
4. Unions have made impressive progress in affecting personnel policies in the short time they have been representing faculty.
5. Faculty unions may help to raise standards in institutions where professional practices, peer judgments, and faculty rights have had little foothold.
6. The positive effects on personnel matters may be offset by a number of negative consequences.
7. Senates are unlikely to convert to unions successfully.
8. Senates and unions have different responsibilities, with unions addressing economic issues and working conditions, and senates dealing with curriculum, degree requirement, and admissions.
9. Senates will not collapse with the arrival of collective bargaining, but as union influence continues to expand into areas of traditional senate responsibility, the current pattern of union and senate influence may not remain stable.
10. Presidents on unionized campuses feel they have lost power to unionized faculty, and foresee a steady erosion of administrative capacity by faculty unions.
11. Despite the presidents' feeling of vulnerability, evidence indicates that there is actually a shift toward greater administrative power.
12. A majority of both campus presidents and union chairpersons foresee outside arbitrators and courts playing a greater role in campus decision making.

13. Collective bargaining will realign many of the major blocks in the traditional academic setting.
14. Greater procedural protection for faculty promotions and tenure, less arbitrariness about administrative decisions, more job security and protection for non-teaching professionals, and greater economic security in general--all are more likely with unions than without.
15. Other major benefits of unionization are governance-related--faculties will use unions to establish stronger faculty participation in decision making in institutions that have never had a strong tradition of faculty governance and preserve their role in governance where it is being challenged.
16. Although the advantages are real, on the negative side faculty unionization will add one more strong interest group to campus politics, further complicating the decision-making process and constituting a potential veto to beneficial organizational change.
17. Most disturbingly, unionization challenges one of the more cherished principles of the academic profession--merit judgments based on peer evaluation. (146, pp. 3-12)

Kemerer and Baldrige cite several factors that influence the shape of bargaining. Some of these are: (1) There is the issue of which institutions will be in the bargaining unit? Single campus institutions are not confronted with this problem. The eventual bargaining agent for a statewide system can be influenced by this decision. (2) Who will be in the bargaining unit? Where are deans and department heads to be placed? What about nonteaching professionals? Deans are rarely put in a unit; however, department heads often are made part of the unit. Nonteaching professionals are commonly added to the unit. Their presence can drastically affect the orientation of the bargaining since they may outnumber the faculty. (3) Which bargaining organization will represent the faculty? The authors believe that despite the rhetoric the

three major associations are very similar in goals and tactics. (4) The existence of union security provisions. The strength, in terms of membership and money, of the union will be influenced by the presence of "closed", or "union" shop; maintenance of membership rules; agency shop, or fair share agreement (146, pp. 87, 88). (5) What issues can be bargained. Usually there is a list of mandatory as well as permissible subjects that may be bargained. This list may be specifically itemized or broadly categorized; either way, it will expand and grow as time passes. Five reasons are given for the continued enlargement of faculty contracts:

1. language specificity, 2. grievance pressures, 3. shifts from traditional governance operations to the union, 4. contract interpretation, and 5. hard bargaining at the table. (146, p. 97)

Finally, sanctions may be used as a last resort to influence bargaining. Faculty at private institutions have the right to strike under the NLRA. Employees of public institutions are usually confined to mediation, fact-finding and arbitration procedures to solve the stalemates that occur.

In the opinion of Kemerer and Baldrige the consequences of collective bargaining for faculty senates are a moot point because most campus senates seldom address substantive issues. Critical issues for the faculty are either handled at the departmental level or by the administration, but not by the senate (146, p. 139). These interpretations generally apply to the lower ranking, less prestigious institutions because they rarely have a tradition of faculty governance. This category of colleges and universities has been the most heavily unionized.

Occasionally the argument is raised that a senate could become the bargaining agent representing the faculty. Opponents of this view state company unions have been declared illegal by the courts and this, in reality, is what a senate is. Although the legal question has not been settled, the consensus among academic collective bargaining observers supports this assessment.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in late 1970 conducted a study of the levels of faculty participation in governance activities (6). A questionnaire was mailed jointly to the chief administrative officer and the AAUP local chapter president at all 1056 AAUP member institutions. Completed instruments were received from 970 institutions.

Thirty-one areas of decision-making were listed and five forms of faculty participation (determination, joint action, consultation, discussion, and none) were presented in the questionnaire. For the purposes of the study, the levels of participation were defined by the AAUP as follows.

DETERMINATION . . . the faculty of an academic unit or its duly authorized representatives have final legislative or operational authority with respect to the policy or action and, any other technically required approvals or concurrences are only pro forma. . . .

JOINT ACTION . . . formal agreement by both the faculty and other components of the institution is required for affirmative action or policy determination. Negative action can be accomplished by a veto by any component. . . .

CONSULTATION . . . there is a formal procedure or established practice which provides a means for the faculty (as a whole or through authorized representatives) to present its judgment in the form of a recommendation, vote, or

other expression sufficiently explicit to record the position, or positions taken by the faculty. This explicit expression of faculty judgment must take place in time to affect the decision made. . . .

DISCUSSION . . . there is only an informal expression of opinion from the faculty or from individual faculty members; or . . . formally expressed opinion only from administratively selected committees.

NONE . . . there is no faculty participation. (6, p. 122)

Respondents indicated the percentage of each form of participation used in a particular decision-making area. The results revealed that faculty participation for all issues listed was considered by both faculty and administrators to be slightly below the consultation level (6, p. 72).

The thirty-one decision-making areas were grouped into eight categories. While the total average response was near the consultation level there were wide variances in the level of faculty participation. Decisions relating to faculty status were placed in the consultation mode. Operational decisions ranged from faculty-administration joint action to faculty determination. Issues involving the academic performance of students were judged to be at the level of faculty determination. Faculty involvement in academic planning and policy ranged from a high of faculty-administration joint action to a low of faculty discussion. Decision-making concerning the selection of administrators and department chairmen was assessed at the discussion level. Faculty participation in financial planning and policy decisions was lower yet, varying between no involvement and discussion or faculty-administration joint action. Faculty-administrative joint action was

the perceived level of decision-making for the organization of faculty agencies except for one area, the authority of faculty in government. In this instance, faculty-administration consultation was the rule. Student affairs decisions began at the joint action level and dropped to the consultation range.

The Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service (ACBIS) in 1977 sponsored a follow-up study utilizing data collected by the AAUP study in 1970 (3). This was the first effort at a longitudinal study of governance and the effects of collective bargaining. All institutions included in the 1977 study were in the 1970 survey. Participants in the ACBIS survey were placed in one of two groups, one containing 137 institutions that had held bargaining elections and the other a control group of 276 schools that had not held a bargaining election. The original questionnaire with minor modifications was mailed to the chief administrative officer and either the bargaining agent representative for a campus or the AAUP chapter officer or chairperson of the faculty senate. Joint responses were encouraged but not mandatory. Total response to the instrument after several reminders was 46%.

Analysis of the results indicated a general improvement in the level of faculty participation in decision-making which occurred regardless of the presence of collective bargaining (3, p. 11). Respondents were assigned to one of three groups, collective bargaining, no-agent, and control, to facilitate a more precise analysis of changes. The survey questions were analyzed according to personnel, academic and administrative issues. The personnel category evidenced a general increase



in faculty participation although the activity was still classified as consultation. The collective bargaining and no-agent groups revealed sharper increases in faculty participation than the control unit. Responses in the academic category revealed no increase for any of the three groups, due in part to the joint-action level for this category in 1970. Faculty participation in administrative category activities moved from discussion to consultation. Adler indicated this was not as dramatic a change as might appear because there were no large percentage changes. Apparently participation has improved everywhere but nowhere has the change been significant (3, pp. 14, 16).

Hall studied the impact of collective bargaining on the governance at a single four-year state college. More specifically, the problem proposed was an inquiry into the changes in the governance processes as demonstrated in the collective bargaining contract, and the changes resulting from the collective bargaining process that were not covered in the contract itself (110, p. 4).

Fifteen issues were selected to determine governance change.

These were:

(1) faculty appointments, (2) faculty evaluation, (3) fringe benefits, (4) grievance procedure, (5) merit increments, (6) overload, (7) personnel file, (8) promotion, (9) retrenchment of faculty, (10) salaries, (11) scheduling, (12) selection of central administrators, (13) selection of department chairmen, (14) tenure, and (15) workload. (110, p. 18)

Document study, participant observation, interviews, and questionnaires were used to obtain data. Most important, the instrument was sent to all full-time teaching faculty members.

Hall also reported that the governance processes prior to collective bargaining were dominated and controlled by the administration (110, p. 40). Although the faculty power base was improved after signing the first contract, management retained the final decision-making authority.

Faculty dissatisfaction, with internal governance processes, as a possible basis for collective bargaining was investigated by Opdahl (212). Two institutions, one in New Jersey and one in Pennsylvania, were studied. The former was operating under a contract while the latter was not. Respondents from both state colleges indicated the desire for increased faculty power was the motivating force for collective bargaining. Present governance arrangements were judged to be administration dominated or inadequate to withstand the centralization of power at the state level (212, pp. 78, 79).

Forty-two institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania that had experienced faculty collective bargaining or organizational activities were studied by Gershenfeld and Mortimer (101). Data were collected regarding the development and consequences of collective bargaining at each school through a series of interviews with key administrators and leaders in the faculty associations.

Their responses indicated the most important consequence of collective bargaining in the governance area has been expanded formal faculty influence over decision-making processes (101, p. 42). There was agreement that administrator attitude toward the collective bargaining process had a substantial effect upon the transition to a contract. Administrative roles had been altered in three ways by unionization:

First, administration has become more difficult, more complex, and more time-consuming. Second, administration is highly centralized under collective bargaining--as reflected in the modest management roles of deans and department chairpersons on most campuses. Finally, collective bargaining has had some impact on the professional status of administrators and on their relationships with the faculty. (101, p. 52)

Several observations were made by Gershenfeld and Mortimer regarding the impact of bargaining on personnel policies. (1) The faculty input had increased and administrators were no longer making unilateral decisions. (2) Except for merit, there had been little substantive change in personnel policies. (3) Forces other than collective bargaining, e.g., budget problems and the job market, influence personnel issues (101, p. 81).

Several conclusions about faculty roles in governance as a consequence of collective bargaining were drawn by the authors. Faculty involvement in governance had increased in almost all cases. Faculty senates had generally been weakened although they usually continued to exist. Administrators supported the preservation of some nonunion channels for faculty participation in decision-making. On noncontract questions, the faculty had only an advisory role (101, p. 204).

The major findings relating to governance obtained from the data were:

GOVERNANCE.

16. Administrators have lost a degree of flexibility as a result of collective bargaining, but many administrators particularly among the state colleges, emphasize the loss of flexibility may also be attributed to state controls and financial pressures. Collective bargaining often leads to a clearer delineation of administrative roles and professional status through limitations on their associations with academic departments.

17. Campus administration is more centralized under faculty bargaining, particularly in institutions where department chairpersons are included in the faculty bargaining unit.
18. Faculty participation in governance has increased at most unionized institutions. The nature of this participation varies somewhat with a general tendency for some faculty governance activities to shift from the traditional mechanisms to faculty union organization.
. . . (101, p. 325)

Collective negotiations at the State University of New York at Cortland was the subject of a study by Hedgepeth (115). Although the analysis was limited to data gathered at one campus of a state university system, it provided valuable information regarding collective bargaining's impact on the faculty.

One of the areas studied included governance structures and procedures. There was agreement the relationships between various groups had become more precisely defined. Concern was voiced that a consequence of bargaining was an increasingly impersonal and rigid set of personal relationships (115, pp. 10, 11)

Two specific alterations in governance activities had occurred as a result of collective bargaining. First, the nonteaching professionals became voting members in the decision-making processes. There was no consensus on the impact this had had or would be likely to have on the institution. Second, the union assumed some of the duties formerly performed by the faculty senate. Examples of this were the union's absorbing the grievance process and the demise of the Faculty Rights Committee. Most respondents thought it was only a matter of time before the union achieved de facto control of governance regardless of

whether it had de jure control (115, p. 15).

Collective bargaining has left its imprint on many areas and activities in higher education. Kenneth Mortimer, perhaps the leading scholar of academic bargaining, has forecast additional changes that are already underway or likely to occur. They are:

the roles and duties of certain administrators are likely to change under collective bargaining. In cases where department chairpersons are in the bargaining unit some institutions have already increased the authority and scope of activities performed in the dean's office. . . .

. . . , in many public and private institutions collective bargaining takes place directly between representatives of the faculty and the board of trustees. In some multi-campus public institutions the campus administration has little if any role in negotiating the contract. This direct access of faculty to boards has the potential of undermining the position and authority of campus administration. . . .

. . . , separate jurisdictions and collective bargaining will require more codification of governance than has been customary. . . . Institutions simply will not be allowed to be casual about the way they retain, promote and pay academic personnel. Faculty rights will be matched more closely by statements of faculty responsibilities. . . .
(194, pp. 19, 20)

Summary

The literature reviewed in this chapter identifies the existence of three governance structures, collegial, bureaucratic, and political. Each of these philosophies has had its period of popularity and continues to be supported in varying degree. Most operating governance systems probably would combine all three approaches. Collegial governance contributes the idea of a community of scholars seeking similar goals. Bureaucratic governance provides a means for coping with

increasing size and complexity. The political model of governance emphasizes the clashing and competing interests of the individuals making up higher education. The shared authority paradigm may best represent a merging of the three systems. Based on mutual trust and respect it is the ideal to be achieved. Regardless of how well-defined these governance structures are collective bargaining presents a number of problems.

A broad question raised in the literature is the longevity of academic senates upon the arrival of faculty bargaining. The two institutions can exist and the demise of the senate is not inevitable. When faculty unions have to exercise their power and prerogatives a decline in senate power is unavoidable.

Most of the studies conducted to date have concentrated on single institutions and nearly all the studies have been concentrated in a few states, e.g., New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. Also the investigations were conducted so quickly after the decision to organize or the contract was negotiated that its impact could not be assessed. The research has been conducted almost exclusively at public institutions. The individuals interviewed or polled have usually been the top administrative figures and the key faculty leaders. The rank-and-file faculty around whom collective bargaining is build have normally been ignored. Except for the work by Kemerer and Baldrige, and Adler there have been no studies recording the changes in governance activities or perceptions of these changes.

The findings of these studies indicate an improvement in faculty

involvement in governance activities. The new levels attained still do not qualify for the shared authority approach. An inexorable growth in the power of the union occurs regardless of the institution involved. Administrator and faculty roles have changed as a consequence.

RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The problem researched was to determine whether faculty and administrators at institutions that have negotiated contracts and those that have voted for "no-agent" perceive changes in governance at their institutions. The data collected from the questionnaire will permit an analysis of the degree of governance change that occurs under the two environments. Further examination of the data may reveal differences in perceptions among faculty and administrators categorized by bargaining agent and by institutional type (liberal arts college or comprehensive college).

This chapter reviews the methodology used in the study. The principal sections are: 1) Selection of the Sample Institutions, 2) Selection of the Faculty Sample, 3) The Data Collection Instrument, 4) Collection of the Data, and 5) Data Analysis.

Selection of the Sample of Institutions

Due to specific conditions having to be met, the sample could not be randomly drawn. The first task was to determine the institutions that had voted affirmatively for a bargaining agent and those that had voted negatively selecting the "no-agent" option. The Chronicle of Higher Education periodically publishes a list titled "Collective Bargaining on the Campuses". The list published on May 31, 1977, was used in this study. The identified institutions were subdivided by whether they had chosen a bargaining agent or opted for "no-agent". The goal was to create

a matrix by selecting two institutions, one private and one public, for each cell. One side of the matrix was assigned to type of institution (Liberal Arts Colleges or Comprehensive Universities and Colleges) and the other to bargaining agent (AFT, AAUP, NEA, "no-agent").

The institutions were placed in three categories using the Carnegie Commission's classification of colleges and universities (56). These categories were doctoral granting institutions, comprehensive universities and colleges, and liberal arts colleges. The doctoral granting institution category was eliminated because multicampus or statewide systems dominated the entries. The problems in using this category were further complicated by the small number of institutions available for each cell.

Additional data about each institution were obtained from a number of sources. Student enrollment figures for the academic years beginning with 1970-71 and type of control, public or private, information were obtained from National Center for Educational Statistics publications (242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248). Number of full-time faculty by rank and average compensation by rank data were assembled from annual articles by the American Association of University Professors (7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13). Appropriation information when it was available was taken from the Grapevine (63).

A regularly appearing publication of the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service (133) was used to verify the bargaining agent for each institution. This report also provides information about the institutions that have contracts in force or are negotiating new

contracts. Each of the institutions selected for this study had to have negotiated a contract.

A list of institutions was assembled; eight for each type of institution and four for each bargaining agent category. A list of the institutions used in this study may be found in Appendix A.

Selection of the Faculty Sample

Fifty randomly selected faculty names and selected administrative personnel were sampled. Faculty lists were obtained from the most recent copy of the college's catalog available in the Iowa State University Library. The fifty randomly selected names included both full- and part-time faculty. The administrators selected were from predetermined positions if they existed on a given campus. The President, Vice-President for Academic Affairs or Provost, Vice-President for Financial Affairs or Treasurer, Dean of Students, Graduate Dean, and academic deans were selected. No attempt was made to balance the sample by sex or faculty rank.

The Data Collection Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study was adapted from work done by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). The twenty-five issues used in the questionnaire were drawn from one constructed and used by the AAUP in 1970 (6). This questionnaire consisted of thirty-four items requiring respondents to select from among five forms of faculty participation in decision-making. The questions eliminated from the AAUP

instrument dealt with student affairs and faculty-board communication. The queries used in the current study were grouped into the following broad areas, faculty status, academic operation, academic planning and policy, selection of administrators and department chairmen, financial planning and policy, professional duties, and organization of faculty agencies (6, pp. 123, 124).

Part II of the questionnaire was arranged in two columns, one to each side of the list of issues. Column A asked each respondent to evaluate the decision-making process for each issue at the time of the bargaining representation election. Column B asked for the same evaluation for each issue today. Five levels of decision-making were available for each column. These categories were adopted from the five zones of authority or effective influence proposed by the American Association for Higher Education (1). A brief definition of each of these categories is provided in the instrument. (See Appendix D.)

Collection of Data

Eight hundred eighty-six questionnaires were sent out March 28, 1978. A sample of the accompanying cover letter can be found in Appendix D. A second mailing was made on May 1, 1978, to all institutions that had returned less than 50% of the original mailing.

Data Analysis

Questionnaires received prior to June 1, 1978, were used in this study. These were reviewed for completeness and the data were prepared for computer analysis. Programs from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) were run in a multiprocessing environment on an IBM 360/65-AS/5 coupled system at the Iowa State University Computation Center.

One-way analysis of variance and Scheffé tests were used to determine the existence and significance of differences in faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at institutions having different bargaining agents. The t-test for the difference between two sample means was utilized for the comparison of the perceptions of changes in governance of various groups. All tests were run using the .05 level of significance.

FINDINGS

The responses of 307 faculty and 52 administrators comprise the data analyzed for this study. The 359 completed questionnaires represent a return of 40.5% of the 886 instruments distributed. This response rate compares with a 46% return for the questionnaire used in the study recently completed by Adler (3) for the Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service. The population of Adler's study was limited to the chief executive officer of the institutions and the president of the local bargaining agent or AAUP chapter. The 46% return rate was reached only after repeated mailings and personal appeals. Two mailings were used to gain the 40.5% response for the present study.

The returned questionnaires form a balanced response when several factors are examined. Using the Carnegie Commission Classification of Institutions of Higher Education eight Liberal Arts Colleges and eight Comprehensive Universities and Colleges were selected for the sample. The Liberal Arts Colleges provided 48.2% and the Comprehensive Universities and Colleges 51.8% of the instruments returned.

Six public and ten private institutions made up the sample. Faculty at public colleges and universities accounted for 43.5% of the returns. Their colleagues at the private institutions provided the balance of the responses, 56.5%.

Three collective bargaining organizations and the "no-agent" option were represented in the sample used in this study. The returned questionnaires were distributed 22.0% from faculty at institutions with

the AAUP as bargaining agent, 26.5% from faculty with the AFT as their agent, and 24.0% from faculty with the NEA as their agent, and 27.6% from faculty at campuses where the no-agent option had been chosen.

The questionnaire was sent to 800 faculty and 86 administrators. Faculty accounted for 85.5% of the returns while administrators contributed 14.5%. The 307 instruments returned by faculty are 38.4% of the total sent out; the 52 from administrators are 60.6% of the total distributed.

Returned questionnaires were distributed by academic rank in the following manner, instructor, 5.0%; assistant professor, 21.2%; associate professor, 38.4%; professor, 29.8%; and not applicable, 5.6%. This last category was comprised of administrators who did not hold academic rank.

Tenured individuals provided 68.8% of the replies, nontenured persons, 20.3%, and the not applicable category, 10.9%. Again, administrators functioning in positions not protected by tenure created the last group.

Table 1, Distribution of Responses, provides the percentage of the responses assigned to a particular category of decision-making. Column A responses represent decision-making at the time of the collective bargaining representation election. Column B represents the view of decision-making at the present time. The percentage in each cell is a percentage of the 359 completed questionnaires.

Each column has had a "no response" category added to account for the individuals who did not reply to an issue. There were a few

Table 1. Percentage distribution of responses by decision-making category

Types of issues	No response	Adminis- trative dominance	Adminis- trative primacy	Shared authority	Faculty primacy	Faculty dominance
			<u>Column A</u>			
1. Faculty appointments	8.1	19.8	32.9	26.7	12.0	0.6
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	8.1	32.9	28.4	22.3	7.5	0.8
3. Faculty promotion	8.4	24.2	35.9	23.1	7.5	0.8
4. Faculty tenure awards	10.0	27.6	32.0	22.6	7.2	0.6
5. Selection of the presi- dent	12.3	29.8	32.6	23.4	0.8	1.1
6. Selection of academic deans	10.3	39.0	35.4	13.9	1.1	0.3
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	10.6	25.3	30.6	18.4	9.2	5.8
8. Faculty salary scales	9.5	50.4	26.5	12.8	0.8	0.0
9. Individual faculty salaries	9.2	46.8	29.5	12.3	2.2	0.0
10. Physical facilities building programs	8.6	53.2	29.0	0.6	0.3	0.3
11. Short-range institutional planning	9.2	29.2	40.9	18.9	1.4	0.3
12. Long-range institutional planning	8.6	38.7	35.9	15.9	0.8	0.0

13.	Budget formulation	8.1	48.5	34.0	9.5	0.0	0.0
14.	Curriculum offerings	8.6	4.5	15.0	32.0	30.9	8.9
15.	Degree requirements	8.4	5.8	13.9	35.1	25.9	10.9
16.	Academic performance of students	8.9	2.5	11.1	20.6	29.5	27.3
17.	Types of degrees offered	8.9	10.3	23.4	39.8	13.6	3.9
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	8.9	10.0	27.9	39.3	11.4	2.5
19.	Student admission requirements	8.6	22.3	30.9	26.2	10.0	1.9
20.	Average faculty teaching load	8.6	25.6	34.0	26.5	3.9	1.4
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	8.4	6.7	20.1	29.5	23.4	12.0
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	9.5	3.6	12.5	21.2	21.7	31.5
23.	Membership of departmental committees	9.2	2.5	9.7	21.4	21.7	35.4
24.	Establishment of institution-wide committees	9.2	13.4	26.7	36.8	11.4	2.5
25.	Membership of institution-wide committees	9.2	10.3	23.4	38.7	12.3	6.1

Table 1 (Continued)

Types of Issues	No response	Administrative dominance	Administrative primacy	Shared authority	Faculty primacy	Faculty dominance
			<u>Column B</u>			
1. Faculty appointments	3.3	10.3	30.1	38.2	16.4	1.7
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	3.6	15.0	33.4	32.9	14.5	0.6
3. Faculty promotion	3.6	13.9	33.1	34.3	13.6	1.4
4. Faculty tenure awards	5.3	15.0	32.6	33.1	12.8	1.1
5. Selection of the president	7.5	17.3	40.1	33.1	1.1	0.8
6. Selection of academic deans	5.0	25.9	43.2	23.7	1.9	0.3
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	4.7	12.8	21.7	26.7	19.5	14.5
8. Faculty salary scales	3.9	18.4	24.2	46.2	6.1	1.1
9. Individual faculty salaries	4.2	18.4	28.7	39.0	8.4	1.4
10. Physical facilities building programs	3.6	40.9	44.0	10.3	0.8	0.3
11. Short-range institutional planning	3.9	14.5	45.7	32.0	3.6	0.3
12. Long-range institutional planning	4.2	22.6	43.5	27.9	1.9	0.0

13.	Budget formulation	3.3	37.9	40.1	17.8	0.8	0.0
14.	Curriculum offerings	3.6	2.5	10.0	33.7	39.6	10.6
15.	Degree requirements	3.6	2.2	11.1	38.2	32.0	12.8
16.	Academic performance of students	4.2	1.4	5.8	23.7	33.1	31.8
17.	Types of degrees offered	4.2	7.0	20.6	49.6	13.6	5.0
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	4.2	8.1	22.0	47.4	14.8	3.6
19.	Student admission requirements	3.9	17.8	33.7	31.5	10.9	2.2
20.	Average faculty teaching load	3.6	14.5	21.7	48.2	8.6	3.3
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	3.6	3.6	13.9	34.8	29.0	15.0
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	4.7	1.9	8.1	21.2	22.6	41.5
23.	Membership of departmental committees	4.5	2.2	5.8	19.2	22.3	46.0
24.	Establishment of institution-wide committees	4.2	8.1	20.6	44.0	16.4	6.7
25.	Membership of institution-wide committees	4.2	5.8	15.9	44.8	18.9	10.3

individuals who did not complete Column A because they arrived after the election had occurred. Issue 5 had the largest percentage of no responses. Some individuals indicated they were not answering this item because their institution had not experienced selecting a new president since they were employed. There were other instances involving several issues where respondent did not provide a reply because neither the faculty nor administration controlled the decision-making process.

An examination of Table 1 reveals a movement from administrative control toward increased faculty participation in the decision-making process on all issues. The most dramatic shift in percentages occurs on Issue 8, Faculty salary scales and Issue 9, Individual faculty salaries. In Column A of Issue 8, 50.4% of the respondents selected administrative dominance, 26.5% to administrative primacy, and 12.8% to shared authority. In Column B administrative dominance was selected by 18.4% of the responses, administrative primacy by 24.2%, and shared authority by 46.2%. The impetus for this change is not indicated. Column A of Issue 9 had responses distributed as follows, 46.8% administrative dominance; 29.5%, administrative primacy; and 12.3% shared authority. The shift in Column B for Issue 9 parallels that of Issue 8, 18.4%, administrative dominance; 28.7%, administrative primacy; and 39.0%, shared authority.

Issue 1, Faculty appointments; Issue 2, Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause; Issue 3, Faculty promotion; and Issue 4, Faculty tenure awards all indicate substantial shifts in the percentage distribution of responses. There is a move away from administrative control toward shared authority and faculty primacy.

The motivations for these changes are open to conjecture.

Issue 13, Budget formulation indicates that while there may have been some changes in participation, the administration still retains fiscal control. Column A of this issue reflects 48.5%, administrative dominance; 34.0%, administrative primacy; and 9.5%, shared authority, while Column B reports 37.9%, administrative dominance; 40.1% administrative primacy; and 17.8%, shared authority. Although there may be the initial stages of change, the data indicate the administration is still responsible for the budget.

The twenty-five governance issues from the questionnaire are considered individually for each of the nine hypotheses. Similar issues are grouped for the purposes of discussing each hypothesis.

Hypothesis I: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at institutions having different bargaining agents.

A one-way analysis of variance and Scheffé test was used to assess the significance of the dependent variables representing the twenty-five governance issues in the questionnaire. The dependent variables, DIFF 1 through DIFF 25, were obtained by subtracting the mean perception of decision-making at the time of the collective bargaining representation election from the perception of decision-making at the time the questionnaire was completed. Table 2 presents for each issue the means and standard deviations of each bargaining agent and the F statistic. An examination of Table 2 reveals there are no significant differences in the perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at institutions

Table 2. Analysis of faculty perceptions of changes in governance by bargaining agent--table of means, standard deviations and F statistics

Type of issue	AAUP		AFT		NEA		F statistic
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	
1. Faculty appointments	.2941	1.3501	.5625	1.1675	.5890	1.0519	.2695
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	.5735	1.3194	.7375	1.2091	.6301	1.0476	.6955
3. Faculty promotion	.4853	1.2518	.6375	1.1278	.6575	1.0700	.6243
4. Faculty tenure awards	.6029	1.3060	.5375	1.1794	.6712	.8984	.7685
5. Selection of the president	.5000	1.0148	.3000	.9057	.3836	.8271	.4173
6. Selection of academic deans	.4412	.9365	.3250	.9908	.4932	.9298	.5358
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	.9559	1.6790	.9250	1.4650	1.0274	1.3014	.9101
8. Faculty salary scales	1.1471	.9814	1.1125	1.1023	1.2877	1.0734	.5636
9. Individual faculty salaries	1.1324	1.1833	.9125	1.1273	1.2192	1.1211	.2317
10. Physical facilities building programs	.3382	.6374	.2875	.6787	.2329	.5657	.6118
11. Short-range institutional planning	.5588	.7203	.5125	.8567	.4247	.8806	.6164

12.	Long-range institu- tional planning	.5441	.8364	.5000	.9413	.3836	.7751	.5124
13.	Budget formulation	.3088	.6749	.3000	.9057	.2877	.7724	.9875
14.	Curriculum offerings	.2500	1.0978	.5500	1.1896	.5205	1.0015	.2046
15.	Degree requirements	.2206	1.2198	.4625	.9539	.4932	.9298	.2343
16.	Academic performance of students	.2647	1.2047	.5375	1.1467	.4521	1.1309	.3532
17.	Types of degrees offered	.2206	.9596	.3875	.9479	.3973	.7948	.4288
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	.3235	1.0987	.4750	1.1135	.3425	.9009	.6217
19.	Student admission requirements	.2059	1.1003	.3375	.8560	.2603	.6461	.6580
20.	Average faculty teaching load	.7647	1.1605	.8250	1.1559	.6849	.8800	.7226
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	.2941	1.0798	.5750	1.3759	.5205	1.0423	.3248
22.	Establishment of de- partmental committees	.3824	1.1333	.6500	1.3789	.4521	.9286	.3474
23.	Membership of depart- mental committees	.3971	1.2595	.6000	1.3743	.3836	.8918	.4569
24.	Establishment of insti- tution-wide committees	.4706	.9692	.6000	1.0626	.5205	.8678	.7154
25.	Membership of institu- tion-wide committees	.4706	1.0576	.6000	1.2386	.5068	.8680	.7470

having different bargaining agents, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected at the .05 level.

Hypothesis II: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at institutions having different bargaining agents.

A one-way analysis of variance and Scheffé test was used to assess the significance of the dependent variables representing the twenty-five governance issues from the questionnaire. The dependent variables, DIFF 1 through DIFF 25, were obtained by subtracting the mean perception of decision-making at the time of the collective bargaining representation election from the perception of decision-making at the time the questionnaire was completed. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of each bargaining agent and the F statistic for each issue. An examination of Table 3 reveals there are no significant differences in the perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at institutions having different bargaining agents, again not rejecting the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis III: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators and faculty at institutions having different bargaining agents.

Results of the data analyzed for this hypothesis are found in Tables 4, 5, and 6. Each of the tables represents one of the bargaining agents, the AAUP, AFT, and NEA. T-tests were run on the mean differences between faculty and administrator responses for each of the twenty-five

Table 3. Analysis of administrator perceptions of changes in governance by bargaining agent--
table of means, standard deviations and F statistics

Type of issue	AAUP		AFT		NEA		F statistic
	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation	
1. Faculty appointments	1.0909	1.2210	.8000	1.0823	1.0000	.8165	.7654
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	1.0000	1.0954	.8667	1.3020	.8462	.6887	.9313
3. Faculty promotion	1.0000	1.1832	.8000	1.2071	1.0000	.9129	.8615
4. Faculty tenure awards	1.0909	1.1362	.8667	1.4573	.8462	1.0682	.8708
5. Selection of the president	.7273	.7862	.4667	.6399	.3846	.6504	.4589
6. Selection of academic deans	.7273	1.1909	.4667	.6399	.6923	.9473	.7278
7. Selection of depart- mental chairpersons	1.2727	1.2721	1.0000	1.0000	1.4615	1.3301	.5938
8. Faculty salary scales	1.6364	1.1201	1.3333	1.3973	1.2308	1.0919	.7092
9. Individual faculty salaries	1.5455	1.1282	.9333	.9611	1.2308	1.2352	.3856
10. Physical facilities building programs	.3636	.9244	.4000	.5071	.6923	.8549	.4968
11. Short-range institu- tional planning	.7273	1.1037	.5333	.5164	1.0000	1.0000	.3849

12.	Long-range institutional planning	.6364	.9244	.4000	.5071	.9231	.8623	.2104
13.	Budget formulation	.8182	.7508	.4000	.5071	.8462	.8006	.1722
14.	Curriculum offerings	1.1818	1.4709	.7333	.7988	.6154	1.4456	.5138
15.	Degree requirements	1.0909	1.5136	.8000	1.1464	.6923	1.2506	.7432
16.	Academic performance of students	1.2727	2.0045	.2667	.5936	.6154	1.6093	.2304
17.	Types of degrees offered	1.1818	1.6624	.5333	1.1872	.3077	.8549	.2260
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	.9091	1.6404	.5333	.6399	.6923	.8549	.6802
19.	Student admission requirements	.9091	1.3003	.2667	.7988	.5385	.9674	.2927
20.	Average faculty teaching load	1.3636	1.4334	1.0667	1.0998	.7692	1.2352	.5125
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	1.5455	1.4397	.6000	1.1212	.5385	1.1983	.1018
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	1.1818	1.6011	.7333	1.0328	.6154	1.6093	.5950
23.	Membership of departmental committees	1.2727	1.6787	.8000	.9411	.7692	1.5892	.6243
24.	Establishing of institution-wide committees	1.1818	1.1677	1.2000	1.0823	.6923	1.0316	.4108
25.	Membership of institution-wide committees	.9091	1.0445	1.0667	1.0328	.7692	1.0919	.7592

Table 4. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized institutions--AAUP bargaining agent

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	68	.2941	1.350	-1.84	0.070
	Administrators	11	1.0909	1.221		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	68	.5735	1.319	-1.02	0.313
	Administrators	11	1.0000	1.095		
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	68	.4853	1.252	-1.27	0.206
	Administrators	11	1.0000	1.183		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	68	.6029	1.306	-1.17	0.246
	Administrators	11	1.0909	1.136		
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	68	.5000	1.015	-0.71	0.481
	Administrators	11	.7273	0.786		
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	68	.4412	0.937	-0.90	0.369
	Administrators	11	.7273	1.191		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	68	.9559	1.679	-0.60	0.552
	Administrators	11	1.2727	1.272		
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	68	1.1471	0.981	-1.50	0.136
	Administrators	11	1.6364	1.120		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	68	1.1324	1.183	-1.08	0.283
	Administrators	11	1.5455	1.128		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	68	.3382	0.637	-0.11	0.909
	Administrators	11	.3636	0.924		

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	68	.5588	0.720	-0.49	0.634
	Administrators	11	.7273	1.104		
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	68	.5441	0.836	-0.33	0.739
	Administrators	11	.6364	0.924		
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	68	.3088	0.675	-2.39	0.025*
	Administrators	11	.8182	0.751		
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	68	.2500	1.098	-2.49	0.015*
	Administrators	11	1.1818	1.471		
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	68	.2206	1.220	-2.12	0.037*
	Administrators	11	1.0909	1.514		
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	68	.2647	1.205	-1.62	0.133 ^a
	Administrators	11	1.2727	2.005		
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	68	.2206	0.960	-1.87	0.089 ^a
	Administrators	11	1.1818	1.662		
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	68	.3235	1.099	-1.52	0.132
	Administrators	11	.9091	1.640		
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	68	.2059	1.100	-1.92	0.059
	Administrators	11	.9091	1.300		
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	68	.7647	1.161	-1.54	0.129
	Administrators	11	1.3636	1.433		
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	68	.2941	1.080	-3.40	0.001**
	Administrators	11	1.5455	1.440		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 4 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	68	.3824	1.133	-2.04	0.045*
	Administrators	11	1.1818	1.601		
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	68	.3971	1.259	-2.04	0.045*
	Administrators	11	1.2727	1.679		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	68	.4706	0.969	-2.19	0.031*
	Administrators	11	1.1818	1.168		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	68	.4706	1.058	-1.28	0.205
	Administrators	11	.9091	1.044		

Table 5. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized institutions--AFL bargaining agent

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	80	.5625	1.168	-0.73	0.467
	Administrators	15	.8000	1.082		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	80	.7375	1.209	-0.38	0.708
	Administrators	15	.8667	1.302		
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	80	.6375	1.128	-0.51	0.614
	Administrators	15	.8000	1.207		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	80	.5375	1.179	-0.95	0.342
	Administrators	15	.8667	1.457		
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	80	.3000	0.906	-0.68	0.498
	Administrators	15	.4667	0.640		
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	80	.3250	0.991	-0.53	0.596
	Administrators	15	.4667	0.640		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	80	.9250	1.465	-0.19	0.850
	Administrators	15	1.0000	1.000		
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	80	1.1125	1.102	-0.68	0.497
	Administrators	15	1.3333	1.397		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	80	.9125	1.127	-0.07	0.947
	Administrators	15	.9333	0.961		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	80	.2875	0.679	-0.61	0.544
	Administrators	15	.4000	0.507		

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	80	.5125	0.857	-0.13	0.900 ^a
	Administrators	15	.5333	0.516		
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	80	.5000	0.941	0.60	0.555 ^a
	Administrators	15	.4000	0.507		
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	80	.3000	0.906	-0.60	0.550 ^a
	Administrators	15	.4000	0.507		
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	80	.5500	1.190	-0.57	0.569
	Administrators	15	.7333	0.799		
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	80	.4625	0.954	-1.22	0.227
	Administrators	15	.8000	1.146		
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	80	.5375	1.147	1.36	0.184 ^a
	Administrators	15	.2667	0.594		
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	80	.3875	0.948	-0.52	0.601
	Administrators	15	.5333	1.187		
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	80	.4750	1.113	-0.28	0.780 ^a
	Administrators	15	.5333	0.640		
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	80	.3375	0.856	0.30	0.767
	Administrators	15	.2667	0.799		
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	80	.8250	1.156	-0.75	0.456
	Administrators	15	1.0667	1.100		
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	80	.5750	1.376	-0.07	0.947
	Administrators	15	.6000	1.121		
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	80	.6500	1.379	-0.22	0.825
	Administrators	15	.7333	1.033		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

Table 5 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	80	.6000	1.374	-0.54	0.591
	Administrators	15	.8000	0.941		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	80	.6000	1.063	-2.00	0.048*
	Administrators	15	1.2000	1.082		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	80	.6000	1.239	-1.37	0.174
	Administrators	15	1.0667	1.033		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 6. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized institutions--NEA bargaining agent

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	73	.5890	1.052	-1.34	0.185
	Administrators	13	1.0000	0.816		
2. Faculty reappointments nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	73	.6301	1.048	-0.71	0.477
	Administrators	13	.8462	0.689		
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	73	.6575	1.070	-1.08	0.281
	Administrators	13	1.0000	0.913		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	73	.6712	0.898	-0.63	0.531
	Administrators	13	.8462	1.068		
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	73	.3836	0.827	-0.01	0.997
	Administrators	13	.3846	0.650		
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	73	.4932	0.930	-0.71	0.480
	Administrators	13	.6923	0.947		
7. Selection of depart- mental chairpersons	Faculty	73	1.0274	1.301	-1.10	0.272
	Administrators	13	1.4615	1.330		
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	73	1.2877	1.073	0.18	0.861
	Administrators	13	1.2308	1.092		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	73	1.2192	1.121	-0.03	0.973
	Administrators	13	1.2308	1.235		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	73	.2329	0.566	-1.87	0.083 ^a
	Administrators	13	.6923	0.855		

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	73	.4247	0.881	-2.13	0.036*
	Administrators	13	1.0000	1.000		
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	73	.3836	0.775	-2.27	0.026*
	Administrators	13	.9231	0.862		
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	73	.2877	0.772	-2.39	0.019*
	Administrators	13	.8462	0.801		
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	73	.5205	1.002	-0.29	0.770
	Administrators	13	.6154	1.446		
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	73	.4932	0.930	-0.67	0.502
	Administrators	13	.6923	1.251		
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	73	.4521	1.131	-0.45	0.655
	Administrators	13	.6154	1.609		
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	73	.3973	0.795	0.37	0.712
	Administrators	13	.3077	0.855		
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	73	.3425	0.901	-1.30	0.197
	Administrators	13	.6923	0.855		
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	73	.2603	0.646	-1.00	0.335 ^a
	Administrators	13	.5385	0.967		
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	73	.6849	0.880	-0.30	0.766
	Administrators	13	.7692	1.235		
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	73	.5205	1.042	-0.06	0.956
	Administrators	13	.5385	1.198		
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	73	.4521	0.929	-0.36	0.728 ^a
	Administrators	13	.6154	1.609		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variations therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 6 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	73	.3836	0.892	-0.85	0.410
	Administrators	13	.7692	1.589		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	73	.5205	0.868	-0.64	0.525
	Administrators	13	.6923	1.032		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	73	.5068	0.868	-0.96	0.337
	Administrators	13	.7692	1.092		

governance issues. The T formula for pooled variance was used for most of the issues reported in Tables 4, 5, and 6. When the t-test indicated unequal sample variances the T formula for separate variances was used.

Table 4, presents the results of t-tests on the mean differences between faculty and administrator perceptions at institutions having the AAUP as the bargaining agent. No significant statistical difference is reported between faculty and administrator perceptions for the issues concerned with faculty status. These are Issue 1, Faculty appointments; Issue 2, Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause; Issue 3, Faculty promotion; and Issue 4, Faculty tenure awards. The null hypothesis is not rejected for these issues. The means of both groups indicate a similar perception of change in the decision-making processes for these issues toward greater faculty involvement.

No significant statistical difference is noted between faculty and administrator perceptions for Issue 5, Selection of the president, Issue 6, Selection of academic deans; and Issue 7, Selection of departmental chairperson. The null hypothesis is not rejected for these issues. The means of both groups for these issues also indicate a similar perception of change toward increased faculty participation.

A significant statistical difference between faculty and administrator perceptions was found in one of the issues (Issue 13) concerning financial planning and policy matters. No significant statistical difference was recorded for Issue 8, Faculty salary scales; Issue 9, Individual faculty salaries; Issue 10, Physical facilities building programs; Issue 11, Short-range institutional planning; and Issue 12, Long-range

institutional planning. The null hypothesis is not rejected for these issues. The means of both groups evidenced an increased faculty role in decision-making.

There was a significant statistical difference between faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance for Issue 13, Budget formulation. A t-value of -2.29 ($p < .025$) is produced. Although both groups perceived an increase in faculty involvement in the decision-making process, administrators see a much greater shift from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance. The null hypothesis is rejected for Issue 13.

Two of the three issues that can be grouped under the heading academic operations reveal significant statistical differences between faculty and administrator perceptions. Issue 14, Curriculum offerings has a t-value of 2.49 ($p < .015$). Issue 15, Degree requirements produced a t-value of -2.12 ($p < .037$). Administrators perceive greater movement from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance on both issues. The null hypothesis is rejected for Issues 14 and 15.

Issue 16, Academic performance of students does not produce a significant statistical difference when faculty and administrator perceptions are compared. The null hypothesis is not rejected for this issue. The means of both groups indicate a perception of increased faculty participation in decision-making.

Academic planning and policy matters are covered by Issues 17, 18, and 19. Issue 17, Type of degree offered; Issue 18, Establishment of new academic programs; and Issue 19, Student admission requirements

present no significant statistical differences between faculty and administrator perceptions. The null hypothesis is not rejected for these issues. Faculty and administrator means, also, indicate an increase in faculty involvement.

Issue 20, Average faculty teaching load shows no significant statistical difference between faculty and administrators, therefore the null hypothesis is not rejected.

A highly significant statistical difference between faculty and administration perceptions is found in Issue 21, Faculty teaching assignments. A t-value of -3.40 ($p < .001$) is recorded. Administrators perceive a greater shift along the decision-making continuum from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance thus rejecting the null hypothesis.

Significant statistical differences between faculty and administrator perceptions are also recorded for Issues 22, 23, and 24. Issue 22, Establishment of departmental committees has a t-value of -2.04 ($p < .045$). Issue 23, Membership of departmental committees presents a t-value of -2.04 ($p < .045$). Issue 24, Establishment of institution-wide committees has a t-value of -2.19 ($p < .031$). Each of these issues has the administrators perceiving greater movement from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Membership of institution-wide committees, Issue 25, presents no significant statistical difference between faculty and administrator perceptions. The null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 5, gives the results of t-tests on the mean differences

between faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at institutions having the AFT as the bargaining agent. An examination of this Table indicates that only for Issue 24, Establishment of institution-wide committees is there a significant statistical difference between faculty and administrators. A t-value of -2.00 ($p < .048$) is reported for this issue. Administrators perceive a greater change from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance on this issue. The null hypothesis is rejected for Issue 24 and not rejected for the other issues.

Table 6, presents the results of t-tests on the mean differences between faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at institutions having the NEA as the bargaining agent. Only three of the twenty-five issues have significant statistical differences. These are Issue 11, Short-range institutional planning; Issue 12, Long-range institutional planning; and Issue 13, Budget formulation. A t-value of -2.13 ($p < .026$) was calculated for Issue 11. Issue 12 has a t-value of -2.27 ($p < .026$) and Issue 13, a t-value of -2.39 ($p < .019$). The faculty do not perceive as great a shift on the decision-making scale toward faculty dominance as the administrators. The null hypothesis is rejected for Issues 11, 12, and 13 but not for the rest of the issues.

Hypothesis IV: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".

The results of the data analysis for this hypothesis are found in Table 7. Faculty responses were identified and t-tests run on the mean differences between the unionized and no-agent replies for the twenty-five governance issues. The T formula for separate variances was used for most of the issues. A footnote in the Table identifies the issues where the T formula for pooled variances was used.

Only Issue 13, Budget formulation, did not produce a significant statistical difference between faculty perceptions of changes in governance at unionized and "no-agent" institutions.

The rest of the governance issues reported highly significant statistical differences between faculty perceptions at unionized and no-agent institutions. Without exception, faculty at unionized institutions perceived a greater shift in decision-making along the scale from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance. Six issues merit special mention. Issue 3, Faculty promotion; Issue 4, Faculty tenure awards; Issue 14, Curriculum offerings; Issue 17, Types of degrees offered; Issue 18, Establishment of new academic programs; and Issue 19, Student admission requirements were perceived by faculty at no-agent institutions as having shifted on the decision-making scale from faculty dominance toward administrator dominance. The null hypothesis is rejected for all issues except Issue 13.

Hypothesis V: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".

Table 7. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent"

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Separate t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Unionized	221	.4887	1.193	3.52	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.1163	0.640		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Unionized	221	.6516	1.191	5.40	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.0233	0.782		
3. Faculty promotion	Unionized	221	.5973	1.146	6.57	0.001**
	No-agent	86	-.0814	0.636		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Unionized	221	.6018	1.134	5.76	0.001**
	No-agent	86	-.0814	0.843		
5. Selection of the president	Unionized	221	.3891	0.916	3.97	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.0698	0.480		
6. Selection of academic deans	Unionized	221	.4163	0.953	3.41	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.0698	0.732		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Unionized	221	.9683	1.478	5.22	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.2093	0.984		
8. Faculty salary scales	Unionized	221	1.1810	1.055	10.96	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.0930	0.644		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Unionized	221	1.0814	1.145	10.30	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.0581	0.581		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Unionized	221	.2851	0.629	3.43	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.0581	0.494		

11. Short-range institutional planning	Unionized	221	.4977	0.824	3.54	0.001 ^{**} ,a
	No-agent	86	.1395	0.722		
12. Long-range institutional planning	Unionized	221	.4751	0.856	3.70	0.001 ^{**} ,a
	No-agent	86	.0814	0.785		
13. Budget formulation	Unionized	221	.2986	0.793	1.25	0.212 ^a
	No-agent	86	.1744	0.754		
14. Curriculum offerings	Unionized	221	.4480	1.105	4.10	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	-.0233	0.811		
15. Degree requirements	Unionized	221	.3982	1.038	3.46	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	.0349	0.727		
16. Academic performance of students	Unionized	221	.4253	1.160	3.22	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	.0581	0.772		
17. Types of degrees offered	Unionized	221	.3394	0.903	4.26	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	-.0581	0.657		
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Unionized	221	.3846	1.041	4.38	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	-.0581	0.675		
19. Student admission requirements	Unionized	221	.2715	0.878	3.28	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	-.0116	0.584		
20. Average faculty teaching load	Unionized	221	.7602	1.071	8.48	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	.0116	0.473		
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Unionized	221	.4706	1.185	3.97	0.001 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	.0000	0.812		
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Unionized	221	.5023	1.170	2.97	0.003 ^{**}
	No-agent	86	.1512	0.819		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated equal variances therefore the T formula for pooled variances was used.

^{**}Significant at the .01 level.

Table 7 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Separate t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Unionized	221	.4661	1.197	3.01	0.003**
	No-agent	86	.0930	0.876		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Unionized	221	.5339	0.970	4.63	0.001**
	No-agent	86	.0465	0.766		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Unionized	221	.5294	1.068	3.06	0.002**
	No-agent	86	.1744	0.843		

Table 8, gives the results of the data analyzed for this hypothesis. Administrator responses were identified and t-tests run on the mean differences between the unionized and no-agent replies for the governance issues. The T formula for separate variances was used for most of the issues. Exceptions where the T formula for pooled variances was used are identified by footnote.

Significant statistical differences are presented for Issues 5, 7, and 18. Issue 5, Selection of the president has a t-value of 2.12 ($p < .039$). Selection of departmental chairperson, Issue 7, records a t-value of 2.64 ($p < .011$). A t-value of 2.47 ($p < .017$) is calculated for Issue 18, Establishment of new academic programs. Highly significant statistical differences are produced for the remainder of the issues. The null hypothesis is rejected for these twenty-two issues.

Issue 6, Selection of academic deans; Issue 10, Physical facilities building programs; and Issue 12, Long-range institutional planning report no significant statistical difference between administrator perceptions at unionized and no-agent institutions. The null hypothesis is not rejected for these issues.

Administrators from unionized institutions perceived a greater shift in the decision-making scale from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance than their no-agent counterparts. There were ten issues where the administrators at no-agent institutions perceived a shift along the decision-making scale from faculty dominance toward administrative dominance. The issues where this occurred are: Issue 1, Faculty appointments; Issue 15, Degree requirements; Issue 16, Academic

Table 8. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent"

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Separate t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Unionized	39	.9487	1.025	4.90	0.001**
	No-agent	13	-.1538	0.555		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Unionized	39	.8974	1.046	4.44	0.001**
	No-agent	13	.0000	0.408		
3. Faculty promotion	Unionized	39	.9231	1.085	4.45	0.001**
	No-agent	13	.0000	0.408		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Unionized	39	.9231	1.222	3.54	0.001**
	No-agent	13	.0769	0.494		
5. Selection of the president	Unionized	39	.5128	0.683	2.12	0.039*,a
	No-agent	13	.0769	0.494		
6. Selection of academic deans	Unionized	39	.6154	0.907	1.10	0.276 ^a
	No-agent	13	.3077	0.751		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Unionized	39	1.2308	1.180	2.64	0.011*,a
	No-agent	13	.3077	0.751		
8. Faculty salary scales	Unionized	39	1.3846	1.206	5.61	0.001**
	No-agent	13	.1538	0.376		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Unionized	39	1.2051	1.105	5.12	0.001**
	No-agent	13	.1538	0.376		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Unionized	39	.4872	0.756	1.49	0.144
	No-agent	13	.2308	0.439		

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Unionized	39	.7436	0.880	2.75	0.009**
		No-agent	13	.2308	0.439		
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Unionized	39	.6410	0.778	1.31	0.197 ^a
		No-agent	13	.3077	0.855		
13.	Budget formulation	Unionized	39	.6667	0.701	4.33	0.001**
		No-agent	13	.0769	0.277		
14.	Curriculum offerings	Unionized	39	.8205	1.233	3.61	0.001**
		No-agent	13	.0000	.048		
15.	Degree requirements	Unionized	39	.8462	1.268	4.25	0.001**
		No-agent	13	-.0769	0.277		
16.	Academic performance of students	Unionized	39	.6667	1.475	2.91	0.005**
		No-agent	13	-.1538	0.555		
17.	Types of degrees offered	Unionized	39	.6410	1.267	3.12	0.003**
		No-agent	13	-.1538	0.555		
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Unionized	39	.6923	1.055	2.47	0.017 ^{*,a}
		No-agent	13	-.0769	0.641		
19.	Student admission requirements	Unionized	39	.5385	1.022	3.08	0.004**
		No-agent	13	-.1538	0.555		
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Unionized	39	1.0513	1.234	4.25	0.001**
		No-agent	13	-.0769	0.641		
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Unionized	39	.8462	1.288	2.97	0.005**
		No-agent	13	.0000	0.707		
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Unionized	39	.8205	1.393	3.60	0.001**
		No-agent	13	-.1538	0.555		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated equal variances therefore the T formula for pooled variances was used.

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 8 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases		Standard deviation	Variance	
					Separate t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Unionized	39	.9231	1.384	3.99	0.001**
	No-agent	13	-.1538	0.555		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Unionized	39	1.0256	1.088	3.17	0.003**,a
	No-agent	13	.0000	0.707		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Unionized	39	.9231	1.036	3.27	0.002**,a
	No-agent	13	-.0769	0.641		

performance of students; Issue 17, Types of degrees offered; Issue 18, Establishment of new academic programs; Issue 19, Student admission requirements; Issue 20, Average faculty teaching load; Issue 22, Establishment of departmental committees; Issue 23, Membership of departmental committees; and Issue 25, Membership of institution-wide committees.

Hypothesis VI: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".

The results of the data analyzed for this hypothesis are found in Tables 9 and 10. Table 9, presents the comparison for unionized institutions while Table 10 presents the same only for no-agent institutions. T-tests were run on the mean differences between faculty and administrator responses to the governance issues. The T formula for pooled variances was used for most of the issues in the two tables. Where it was necessary to use the T formula for separate variances, the instances are identified by footnote.

Significant statistical differences on four issues (1, 15, 23 and 25) and highly significant statistical differences on two other issues are reported in Table 9. A t-value of -2.26 ($p < .024$) is calculated for Issue 1, Faculty appointments, Issue 15, Degree requirements has a t-value of -2.40 ($p < .017$). Membership of departmental committees, Issue 23 records a t-value of -2.15 ($p < .033$) and a t-value of -2.13 ($p < .034$) for Issue 25, Membership of institution-wide committees. Issues 13 and 24 provide the highly significant differences. Issue

Table 9. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	221	.4887	1.193	-2.26	0.024*
	Administrators	39	.9487	1.025		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	221	.6516	1.191	-1.21	0.228
	Administrators	39	.8974	1.046		
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	221	.5973	1.146	-1.65	0.100
	Administrators	39	.9231	1.085		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	221	.6018	1.134	-1.61	0.108
	Administrators	39	.9231	1.222		
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	221	.3891	0.916	-0.98	0.328 ^a
	Administrators	39	.5128	0.683		
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	221	.4163	0.953	-1.21	0.227
	Administrators	39	.6154	0.907		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	221	.9683	1.478	-1.05	0.294
	Administrators	39	1.2308	1.180		
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	221	1.1810	1.055	-1.09	0.278
	Administrators	39	1.3846	1.206		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	221	1.0814	1.145	-0.63	0.533
	Administrators	39	1.2051	1.105		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	221	.2851	0.629	-1.79	0.074
	Administrators	39	.4872	0.756		

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	221	.4977	0.824	-1.70	0.090
	Administrators	39	.7436	0.880		
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	221	.4751	0.856	-1.13	0.259
	Administrators	39	.6410	0.778		
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	221	.2986	0.793	-2.72	0.007**
	Administrators	39	.6667	0.701		
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	221	.4480	1.105	-1.91	0.058
	Administrators	39	.8250	1.233		
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	221	.3982	1.038	-2.40	0.017*
	Administrators	39	.8462	1.268		
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	221	.4253	1.160	-0.97	0.337 ^a
	Administrators	39	.6667	1.475		
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	221	.3394	0.903	-1.42	0.161 ^a
	Administrators	39	.6410	1.267		
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	221	.3846	1.041	-1.70	0.091
	Administrators	39	.6923	1.055		
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	221	.2715	0.878	-1.71	0.089
	Administrators	39	.5385	1.022		
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	221	.7602	1.071	-1.53	0.128
	Administrators	39	1.0513	1.234		
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	221	.4706	1.185	-1.80	0.073
	Administrators	39	.8462	1.288		
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	221	.5023	1.170	-1.52	0.130
	Administrators	39	.8205	1.393		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 9 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	221	.4661	1.197	-2.15	0.033*
	Administrators	39	.9231	1.384		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	221	.5339	0.970	-2.86	0.005**
	Administrators	39	1.0256	1.088		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	221	.5294	1.068	-2.13	0.034*
	Administrators	39	.9231	1.036		

Table 10. Comparison of perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at institutions that voted "no-agent"

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	86	.1163	0.640	1.44	0.153
	Administrators	13	-.1538	0.555		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	86	.0233	0.782	0.16	0.870 ^a
	Administrators	13	.0000	0.408		
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	86	-.0814	0.636	-0.45	0.656
	Administrators	13	.0000	0.408		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	86	-.0814	0.843	-0.96	0.345 ^a
	Administrators	13	.0769	0.494		
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	86	.0698	0.480	-0.05	0.960
	Administrators	13	.0769	0.494		
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	86	.0698	0.732	-1.09	0.279
	Administrators	13	.3077	0.751		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	86	.2093	0.984	-0.35	0.731
	Administrators	13	.3077	0.751		
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	86	.0930	0.644	-0.49	0.631 ^a
	Administrators	13	.1538	0.376		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	86	.0581	0.581	-0.57	0.567
	Administrators	13	.1538	0.376		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	86	.0581	0.494	-1.19	0.237
	Administrators	13	.2308	0.439		

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	86	.1395	0.722	-0.44	0.659
		Administrators	13	.2308	0.439		
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	86	.0814	0.785	-0.96	0.341
		Administrators	13	.3077	0.855		
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	86	.1744	0.754	0.87	0.388 ^a
		Administrators	13	.0769	0.277		
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	86	-.0233	0.811	-0.16	0.872 ^a
		Administrators	13	.0000	0.408		
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	86	.0349	0.727	1.02	0.314 ^a
		Administrators	13	-.0769	0.277		
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	86	.0581	0.772	0.95	0.344
		Administrators	13	-.1538	0.555		
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	86	-.0581	0.657	0.50	0.619
		Administrators	13	-.1538	0.555		
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	86	-.0581	0.675	0.09	0.925
		Administrators	13	-.0769	0.641		
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	86	-.0116	0.584	0.82	0.412
		Administrators	13	-.1538	0.555		
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	86	.0116	0.473	0.60	0.550
		Administrators	13	-.0769	0.641		
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	86	.0000	0.812	0.00	1.000
		Administrators	13	.0000	0.707		
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	86	.1512	0.819	1.30	0.198
		Administrators	13	-.1538	0.555		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

Table 10 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	86	.0930	0.876	0.98	0.328
	Administrators	13	-.1538	0.555		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	86	.0465	0.766	0.21	0.837
	Administrators	13	.0000	0.707		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	86	.1744	0.843	1.03	0.306
	Administrators	13	-.0769	0.641		

13, Budget formulation has a t-value of -2.72 ($p < .007$). A t-value of -2.86 ($p < .005$) is reported for Issue 24, Establishment of institution-wide committees. The null hypothesis is rejected for these six issues. The null hypothesis is not rejected for the remainder of the issues.

Table 10, presents no significant statistical differences between faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at non-agent institutions on any of the governance issues. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected for any of the issues.

Hypothesis VII: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at the different categories of unionized institutions.

Table 11, gives the results of the data analyzed for this hypothesis. Faculty responses from unionized institutions were identified and t-tests run on the mean differences between the liberal arts colleges and the comprehensive universities and colleges' replies for the governance issues. The T formula for pooled variances was used for most of the issues. Instances when the T formula for separate variances was used are identified in the Table.

Highly significant statistical differences are produced for four issues. These are Issues 2, 4, 5, and 7. A t-value of -3.00 ($p < .003$) is reported for Issue 2, Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause. Issue 4, Faculty tenure awards has a t-value of -3.76 ($p < .001$). Selection of the president, Issue 5 records a t-value of -3.39 ($p < .001$) while Issue 7, Selection of departmental chairperson has a t-value of -3.91 ($p < .001$). The null hypothesis is rejected for these

Table 11. Comparison of faculty perceptions of changes in governance at different categories of unionized institutions

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Liberal Arts	106	.3113	1.166	-2.14	0.034 [*]
	Comprehensive	115	.6522	1.200		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Liberal Arts	106	.4057	1.153	-3.00	0.003 ^{**}
	Comprehensive	115	.8783	1.186		
3. Faculty promotion	Liberal Arts	106	.4434	1.180	-1.93	0.055
	Comprehensive	115	.7391	1.101		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Liberal Arts	106	.3113	1.124	-3.76	0.001 ^{**}
	Comprehensive	115	.8696	1.080		
5. Selection of the president	Liberal Arts	106	.1792	0.714	-3.39	0.001 ^{**} ,a
	Comprehensive	115	.5826	1.034		
6. Selection of academic deans	Liberal Arts	106	.4057	0.924	-0.16	0.874
	Comprehensive	115	.4261	0.983		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Liberal Arts	106	.5755	1.294	-3.91	0.001 ^{**}
	Comprehensive	115	1.3304	1.549		
8. Faculty salary scales	Liberal Arts	106	1.3209	1.019	1.90	0.058
	Comprehensive	115	1.0522	1.075		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Liberal Arts	106	1.2170	1.171	1.70	0.091
	Comprehensive	115	.9565	1.111		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Liberal Arts	106	.2547	0.536	-0.70	0.488 ^a
	Comprehensive	115	.3130	0.705		

11. Short-range institutional planning	Liberal Arts	106	.5094	0.771	0.20	0.840
	Comprehensive	115	.4870	0.872		
12. Long-range institutional planning	Liberal Arts	106	.3868	0.711	-1.50	0.136 ^a
	Comprehensive	115	.5565	0.966		
13. Budget formulation	Liberal Arts	106	.2264	0.666	-1.32	0.189 ^a
	Comprehensive	115	.3652	0.892		
14. Curriculum offerings	Liberal Arts	106	.3208	1.074	-1.65	0.100
	Comprehensive	115	.5652	1.125		
15. Degree requirements	Liberal Arts	106	.2547	0.996	-1.99	0.048 [*]
	Comprehensive	115	.5304	1.062		
16. Academic performance of students	Liberal Arts	106	.3113	1.036	-1.42	0.158 ^a
	Comprehensive	115	.5304	1.259		
17. Types of degrees offered	Liberal Arts	106	.2358	0.857	-1.64	0.102
	Comprehensive	115	.4348	0.938		
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Liberal Arts	106	.2736	1.100	-1.53	0.128
	Comprehensive	115	.4870	0.977		
19. Student admission requirements	Liberal Arts	106	.1604	0.896	-1.82	0.071
	Comprehensive	115	.3739	0.853		
20. Average faculty teaching load	Liberal Arts	106	.5943	1.031	-2.23	0.027 [*]
	Comprehensive	115	.9130	1.089		
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Liberal Arts	106	.2925	1.042	-2.18	0.030 ^{*,a}
	Comprehensive	115	.6348	1.286		
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Liberal Arts	106	.4245	1.014	-0.96	0.339 ^a
	Comprehensive	115	.5739	1.298		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Table 11 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Liberal Arts	106	.3585	0.997	-1.30	0.195 ^a
	Comprehensive	115	.5652	1.352		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Liberal Arts	106	.4340	0.884	-1.47	0.142
	Comprehensive	115	.6261	1.038		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Liberal Arts	106	.3962	1.011	-1.79	0.075
	Comprehensive	115	.6522	1.109		

issues.

Four other Issues, 1, 15, 20, and 21, report significant statistical differences between faculty perceptions at liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges. Issue 1, Faculty appointments produced a t-value of -2.14 ($p < .034$). A t-value of -1.99 ($p < .048$) was calculated for Issue 15, Degree requirements. Average faculty teaching load, Issue 20 has a t-value of -2.33 ($p < .027$) and Issue 21, Faculty teaching assignments presents a t-value of -2.18 ($p < .030$). The null hypothesis is rejected for these four issues also.

The eight issues that reported either a significant or highly significant difference all had the faculty at the comprehensive universities and colleges perceiving a greater shift on the decision-making continuum from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance.

Hypothesis VIII: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at the different categories of unionized institutions.

Results of the data analyzed for this hypothesis are given in Table 12. Administrator responses from unionized institutions were identified and t-tests run on the mean differences between the liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges' replies on the governance issues. The T formula for pooled variances was used on all but one issue where the T formula for separate variances was applied.

Significant statistical differences were calculated for two issues. Issue 8, Faculty salary scales has a t-value of 2.72 ($p < .010$) and Issue 24, Establishment of institution-wide committees produced a t-value

Table 12. Comparison of administrator perceptions of changes in governance at different categories of unionized institutions

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Liberal Arts	15	1.1333	0.990	0.89	0.381
	Comprehensive	24	.8333	1.049		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Liberal Arts	15	.9333	0.884	0.17	0.868
	Comprehensive	24	.8750	1.154		
3. Faculty promotion	Liberal Arts	15	1.0667	1.033	0.65	0.521
	Comprehensive	24	.8333	1.129		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Liberal Arts	15	.9333	1.335	0.04	0.968
	Comprehensive	24	.9167	1.176		
5. Selection of the president	Liberal Arts	15	.6000	0.737	0.62	0.536
	Comprehensive	24	.4583	0.658		
6. Selection of academic deans	Liberal Arts	15	.7333	1.163	0.57	0.573 ^a
	Comprehensive	24	.5417	0.721		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Liberal Arts	15	1.1333	0.834	-0.40	0.689
	Comprehensive	24	1.2917	1.367		
8. Faculty salary scales	Liberal Arts	15	2.0000	1.309	2.72	0.010 [*]
	Comprehensive	24	1.0000	0.978		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Liberal Arts	15	1.6000	1.121	1.82	0.077
	Comprehensive	24	.9583	1.042		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Liberal Arts	15	.6000	0.737	0.73	0.469
	Comprehensive	24	.4167	0.776		

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Liberal Arts	15	1.0000	0.845	1.46	0.153
		Comprehensive	24	.5833	0.881		
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Liberal Arts	15	.8000	0.862	1.01	0.319
		Comprehensive	24	.5417	0.721		
13.	Budget formulation	Liberal Arts	15	.7333	0.704	0.46	0.645
		Comprehensive	24	.6250	0.711		
14.	Curriculum offerings	Liberal Arts	15	1.0667	1.486	0.99	0.331
		Comprehensive	24	.6667	1.049		
15.	Degree requirements	Liberal Arts	15	1.2000	1.474	1.40	0.171
		Comprehensive	24	.6250	1.096		
16.	Academic performance of students	Liberal Arts	15	1.0667	1.668	1.35	0.184
		Comprehensive	24	.4167	1.316		
17.	Types of degrees offered	Liberal Arts	15	.8000	1.474	0.61	0.543
		Comprehensive	24	.5417	1.141		
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Liberal Arts	15	.8000	1.207	0.50	0.621
		Comprehensive	24	.6250	0.970		
19.	Student admission requirements	Liberal Arts	15	.7333	1.163	0.94	0.353
		Comprehensive	24	.4167	0.929		
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Liberal Arts	15	1.4000	1.454	1.41	0.166
		Comprehensive	24	.8333	1.049		
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Liberal Arts	15	1.0000	1.464	0.58	0.562
		Comprehensive	24	.7500	1.189		
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Liberal Arts	15	.9333	1.438	0.40	0.695
		Comprehensive	24	.7500	1.391		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 12 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Prob-ability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Liberal Arts	15	1.2667	1.387	1.23	0.225
	Comprehensive	24	.7083	1.367		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Liberal Arts	15	1.4667	1.187	2.09	0.044*
	Comprehensive	24	.7500	0.944		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Liberal Arts	15	1.2667	0.961	1.68	0.102
	Comprehensive	24	.7083	1.042		

of 2.09 ($p < .044$). Administrators at liberal arts colleges perceive greater movement along the continuum from administrative dominance toward faculty dominance than their counterparts. The null hypothesis is rejected for these two issues.

Hypothesis IX: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at the different categories of unionized institutions.

Tables 13 and 14, provide the results of the data analyzed for this hypothesis. Faculty and administrator perceptions for unionized liberal arts colleges are presented in Table 13; a similar comparison for unionized comprehensive universities and colleges occurs in Table 14. T-tests were run on the mean differences between faculty and administrator responses to the governance issues. The T formula for pooled variances was used for most of the issues in the tables. Where it was necessary to use the T formula for separate variances the instances are indicated by footnote.

Significant statistical differences are presented for ten issues in Table 13. Issue 1, Faculty appointments has a t-value of -2.60 ($p < .011$). Selection of the president, Issue 6 shows a t-value of -2.13 ($p < .035$). A t-value of -2.33 ($p < .022$) is given for Issue 8, Faculty salary scales while Issue 10, Physical facilities building programs has a t-value of -2.28 ($p < .024$) and Issue 12, Long-range institutional planning shows a t-value of -2.05 ($p < .043$). Issue 14, Curriculum offerings has a t-value of -2.39 ($p < .018$) and Issue 15, Degree requirements presents a t-value of -2.41 ($p < .028$). Student admission

Table 13. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized liberal arts colleges

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	106	.3113	1.166	-2.60	0.011*
	Administrators	15	1.1333	0.990		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	106	.4057	1.153	-1.70	0.092
	Administrators	15	.9333	0.884		
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	106	.4434	1.180	-1.94	0.055
	Administrators	15	1.0667	1.033		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	106	.3113	1.124	-1.96	0.052
	Administrators	15	.9333	1.335		
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	105	.1792	0.714	-2.13	0.35*
	Administrators	15	.6000	0.737		
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	106	.4057	0.924	-1.24	0.216
	Administrators	15	.7333	1.163		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	106	.5755	1.294	-1.62	0.198
	Administrators	15	1.1333	0.834		
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	106	1.3208	1.019	-2.33	0.022*
	Administrators	15	2.0000	1.309		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	106	1.2170	1.171	-1.19	0.236
	Administrators	15	1.6000	1.121		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	106	.2547	0.536	-2.22	0.028*
	Administrators	15	.6000	0.737		

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	106	.5094	0.771	-2.28	0.024*
	Administrators	15	1.0000	0.845		
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	106	.3868	0.711	-2.05	0.043*
	Administrators	15	.8000	0.862		
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	106	.2264	0.666	-2.74	0.007**
	Administrators	15	.7333	0.704		
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	106	.3208	1.074	-2.39	0.018*
	Administrators	15	1.0667	1.486		
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	106	.2547	0.996	-2.41	0.028*, ^a
	Administrators	15	1.2000	1.474		
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	106	.3113	1.036	-1.71	0.107 ^a
	Administrators	15	1.0667	1.668		
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	106	.2358	0.857	-1.45	0.168 ^a
	Administrators	15	.8000	1.474		
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	106	.2736	1.100	-1.71	0.089
	Administrators	15	.8000	1.207		
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	106	.1604	0.896	-2.23	0.028*
	Administrators	15	.7333	1.163		
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	106	.5943	1.031	-2.68	0.008**
	Administrators	15	1.4000	1.454		
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	106	.2925	1.042	-2.33	0.021*
	Administrators	15	1.0000	1.464		
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	106	.4245	1.014	-1.32	0.204 ^a
	Administrators	15	.9333	1.438		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .01 level.

Table 13 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	106	.3585	0.997	-3.13	0.002**
	Administrators	15	1.2667	1.387		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	106	.4340	0.884	-4.05	0.001**
	Administrators	15	1.4667	1.187		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	106	.3962	1.011	-3.14	0.002**
	Administrators	15	1.2667	0.961		

Table 14. Comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance at unionized comprehensive universities and colleges

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	115	.6522	1.200	-0.69	0.494
	Administrators	24	.8333	1.049		
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	115	.8783	1.186	0.01	0.990
	Administrators	24	.8750	1.154		
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	115	.7391	1.101	-0.38	0.705
	Administrators	24	.8333	1.129		
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	115	.8696	1.080	-0.19	0.849
	Administrators	24	.9167	1.176		
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	115	.5826	1.034	0.75	0.456 ^a
	Administrators	24	.4583	0.658		
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	115	.4261	0.983	-0.55	0.586
	Administrators	24	.5417	0.721		
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	115	1.3304	1.549	0.11	0.910
	Administrators	24	1.2917	1.367		
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	115	1.0522	1.075	0.22	0.827
	Administrators	24	1.0000	0.978		
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	115	.9565	1.111	-0.01	0.994
	Administrators	24	.9583	1.042		
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	115	.3130	0.705	-0.64	0.521
	Administrators	24	.4167	0.776		

11.	Short-range institu- tional planning	Faculty	115	.4870	0.872	-0.49	0.624
		Administrators	24	.5833	0.881		
12.	Long-range institu- tional planning	Faculty	115	.5565	0.966	0.07	0.943
		Administrators	24	.5417	0.721		
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	115	.3652	0.892	-1.34	0.183
		Administrators	24	.6250	0.711		
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	115	.5652	1.125	-0.41	0.685
		Administrators	24	.6667	1.049		
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	115	.5304	1.062	-0.39	0.694
		Administrators	24	.6250	1.096		
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	115	.5304	1.259	0.40	0.690
		Administrators	24	.4167	1.316		
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	115	.4348	0.938	-0.49	0.626
		Administrators	24	.5417	1.141		
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	115	.4870	0.977	-0.63	0.529
		Administrators	24	.6250	0.970		
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	115	.3739	0.853	-0.22	0.826
		Administrators	24	.4167	0.929		
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	115	.9130	1.089	0.33	0.743
		Administrators	24	.8333	1.049		
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	115	.6348	1.286	-0.40	0.687
		Administrators	24	.7500	1.189		
22.	Establishment of de- partmental committees	Faculty	115	.5739	1.298	-0.60	0.551
		Administrators	24	.7500	1.391		

^aThe F test which was performed indicated unequal sample variances therefore the T formula for separate variances was used.

Table 14 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	
					Pooled t-value	Probability
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	115	.5652	1.352	-0.47	0.638
	Administrators	24	.7083	1.367		
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	115	.6261	1.038	-0.54	0.590
	Administrators	24	.7500	0.944		
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	115	.6522	1.109	-0.23	0.820
	Administrators	24	.7083	1.042		

requirements, Issue 19 has a t-value of -2.23 ($p < .028$) while Issue 21, Faculty teaching assignments records a t-value of -2.33 ($p < .021$).

The null hypothesis is rejected for these issues.

Highly significant statistical differences are calculated for five issues. Issue 13, Budget formulation has a t-value of -2.74 ($p < .007$), Issue 20, Average faculty teaching load a t-value of -2.68 ($p < .008$), and Issue 23, Membership of departmental committees a t-value of -3.13 ($p < .002$). Establishment of institution-wide committees, Issue 24 presents a t-value of -4.05 ($p < .001$) and Issue 25, Membership of institution-wide committees shows a t-value of -3.14 ($p < .002$). The null hypothesis is also rejected for these five issues.

No significant statistical differences are reported between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized comprehensive universities and colleges in Table 14. The null hypothesis is not rejected for any of the twenty-five governance issues.

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion

In discussing the findings from Chapter 4, twenty-five issues have been grouped into seven broad groups. Results of the data analyses have then been assessed across the nine hypotheses. These results are then examined in terms of the responses for each institution. General conclusions have been drawn with specific conclusions for the individual sample institutions added where appropriate. Finally, recommendations for further study have been made.

The AAUP in its 1971 study of faculty participation in governance grouped its questions into nine categories (6, pp. 123, 124). This grouping has been followed; seven divisions and the issues to be used in this discussion have been identified. They are:

- I. Faculty Status
 1. Faculty appointments
 2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause
 3. Faculty promotion
 4. Faculty tenure awards
- II. Selection of Administrators
 5. Selection of the president
 6. Selection of academic deans
 7. Selection of departmental chairperson
- III. Financial Planning and Policy
 8. Faculty salary scales

9. Individual faculty salaries
 10. Physical facilities building programs
 11. Short-range institutional planning
 12. Long-range institutional planning
 13. Budget formulation
- IV. Academic Operation
14. Curriculum offerings
 15. Degree requirements
 16. Academic performance of students
- V. Academic Planning and Policy
17. Types of degrees offered
 18. Establishment of new academic programs
 19. Student admission requirements
- VI. Professional Duties
20. Average faculty teaching load
 21. Faculty teaching assignments
- VII. Organization of Faculty Agencies
22. Establishment of departmental committees
 23. Membership of departmental committees
 24. Establishment of institution-wide committees
 25. Membership of institution-wide committees

Reference may be made to the tables found in the preceding chapter and those in Appendix E. Table 31 may be examined for institutional characteristics for the institutions studied.

Faculty status

The issues referenced by this class, when inadequate, often provide the impetus to move a faculty toward unionization. Differences of opinion between faculty and administrators regarding the balance of control in this area are common to higher education. Significant differences found on these issues based on the research are reported in Table 7. The presence of highly significant differences between faculty at unionized and no-agent institutions might have been anticipated if governance documents from the institution could have been examined. If the unions are affecting governance conditions in any manner, faculty status is one of the first areas in which change will occur. An interesting perception difference occurs in Faculty promotion (Issue 3) and Faculty tenure awards (Issue 4) reported in Table 7 for the no-agent faculty. A comparison of means of the two issues indicate no-agent faculty perceive a retrogression toward administrative dominance in the decision-making process. If such changes occur, is it based on administration retribution or is it due to submission on the part of the faculty?

The results show highly significant differences between the perceptions of unionized and no-agent administrators. The mean responses of administrators at no-agent institutions for the issue of faculty appointment was not anticipated. The data provide an indication that decision-making has moved toward administrative dominance. This may tend to confirm that administrative control is reasserted, and even expanded, on many issues after a no-agent vote has passed.

Significant differences in perceptions between faculty and

administrators regarding faculty appointments were found at unionized institutions. The mean responses of administrators indicate a perceived shift in decision-making toward faculty dominance from the time of the representation election to the time the questionnaire was completed. It appears that regardless of the amount of actual change, administrators may perceive substantial alterations in their ability to make decisions after a contract is in force. While there were no significant differences in perceptions between faculty and administrators at no-agent institutions Table 10 does indicate administrators perceive a movement toward administrative dominance of faculty appointments. Faculty also perceive a similar shift toward administrative dominance on Faculty promotion (Issue 3) and Faculty tenure awards (Issue 4).

Significant or highly significant differences were found on three of the four issues in the faculty status group between faculty at unionized liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities. The means indicate faculty at the comprehensive universities perceived a greater tendency toward faculty dominance in the decision-making process, however, no significant differences were recorded between administrators in the two categories of schools.

A significant difference was noted between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized liberal arts colleges. Administrators perceived a much greater movement toward faculty dominance, possibly because administrators have traditionally dominated the operation of many liberal arts colleges. Any change, therefore, in the policies and procedures is likely to be viewed as a move toward faculty dominance. No

significant differences were reported between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized comprehensive universities and colleges.

An examination of faculty and administrator mean responses on an institutional basis reveals there is a perceived shift toward faculty dominance. There were some exceptions, however as Institution 4, a no-agent, public, comprehensive university reports both faculty and administrators perceiving a shift toward administrative dominance. Institution 6, a no-agent, private, liberal arts, indicates the faculty perceived a change toward faculty dominance on Issue 1, Faculty appointments and a move toward administrative dominance on Issues 3, Faculty promotion and 4, Faculty tenure awards. The faculty at Institution 9, a public, liberal arts college with the AAUP as an agent, reveal the largest shift toward administrative dominance.

Whether a faculty member or an administrator is located at a unionized or no-agent institution does affect their perceptions of changes in governance. The perceived shift toward faculty dominance at unionized institutions may be anticipated although the data from Institution 9 would tend to contradict this. Both groups at no-agent institutions perceived a move toward administrative dominance. Although the experience of a bargaining representation election should act as a deterrent to the unilateral exercise of administrative authority the data reported by this study do not support this theory.

Selection of administrators

No significant differences were found for the issues in this classification until faculty were compared at unionized and no-agent institutions. Highly significant differences were reported on all three of the issues related to the selection of administrators in Table 7. The literature of higher education indicates the selection of the president has been traditionally controlled by the governing board with varying amounts of input from other groups. If faculty participation is to increase the contract would be the place for a faculty role to be codified. The means of both groups, unionized and no-agent, indicated little movement even though it is in the direction of faculty dominance.

The selection of academic deans while usually open to greater faculty participation has traditionally been controlled by the administration. Faculty at unionized institutions report a perceived shift toward faculty dominance in the selection of academic deans. Given the reality of many campuses this may mean faculty input is more readily accepted now than in the past.

The means of the two groups on the selection of departmental chairpersons revealed the greatest difference. Unionized faculty perceived a shift toward faculty dominance on this issue. This perception may be due to the existence of contract clauses making the chairperson a member of the bargaining unit and arranging for the chairperson's selection from the membership of a department. Faculty at no-agent institutions may be confronted with chairpersons who are still appointed by the administration with little or no faculty input.

Significant differences were noted in perceptions of administrators at unionized and no-agent institutions on the selection of the president and departmental chairperson. Administrators at unionized campuses perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance in these areas. In some instances the presidential selection process may guarantee faculty a place on the selection committee where there had previously been none, however, they may still be excluded from participation in the selection process at the no-agent school.

Significant differences between faculty perceptions at unionized liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges were indicated for Selection of the president (Issue 5) and Selection of departmental chairpersons (Issue 7). Faculty at the comprehensive universities perceived a large movement toward faculty dominance. The autocratic administrative control often found at liberal arts colleges may be the cause of these differences. A significant difference in perceptions was reported between faculty and administrators at unionized liberal arts colleges on these issues. Administrators perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance. If administrative control had been dominant in the past then almost any restructuring would be viewed with dismay.

Mean faculty and administrator responses for Institution 4 indicated a tendency toward administrative dominance. If this perception accurately reflects reality, the administration is, no doubt, asserting more control and implementing what it considers to be its prerogatives. The mean faculty responses for Institution 6 also indicated a move toward

administrative dominance on Selection of the president (Issue 5) and Selection of academic deans (Issue 6). The same shift toward administrative dominance was found in the mean faculty responses to the issues in this set from Institution 9.

The results for the three issues concerned with the selection of administrators support the assertion that faculty participation in governance is increasing. Contracts that specify the participants in the selection process and the standard procedures for providing input confirm to faculty their role is increasing. At the same time these occurrences reinforce administrator beliefs that their authority is being undermined.

Financial planning and policy

The allocation of limited resources and the roles various campus groups should have in the distribution of these resources are often issues in the unionization campaign. The literature indicates that faculty have traditionally been excluded in fiscal matters or involved only peripherally. The major decisions are often made by the central administration of the institution, its governing board, or in the case of a public institution, the state legislature. In the eyes of faculty, this has placed them in the role of hapless victims at the mercy of the administration.

Highly significant differences are presented for Faculty salary scales (Issue 8) and Individual faculty salaries (Issue 9) in Table 7 which records the changes of perceptions between faculty at unionized and no-agent institutions. The differences should be anticipated because

many contracts specify in detail the pay matrices, salary schedules, compensation formulas and seniority rules influencing salaries. Non-union institutions often present a significant contrast with no salary schedules or any definitive statement regarding the distribution of salary monies available. The no-agent institutions' faculty mean reflects a perception of slight change toward faculty dominance. Table 8, which compares administrators at unionized and no-agent institutions also recorded highly significant differences on these issues. Administrators at the unionized institutions perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance.

A significant difference was shown between administrators at unionized liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges on Faculty salary scales (Issue 8). Administrators at liberal arts colleges perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance. This may be in response to the failure of many liberal arts colleges to have any printed salary information available to their faculty. Within the unionized liberal arts colleges there was a significant difference in perceptions between faculty and administrators on the above issue. The administrators, in this comparison, also, perceived a movement toward faculty dominance. Although the administrators at these campuses may feel the changes have been dramatic when compared to previous salary procedures, faculty may sense only minute changes in policy.

As in previous instances, Institution 4 faculty mean responses indicated a move toward administrative dominance while the administrators' responses reflected no change in decision-making. The same type of

faculty perception was recorded for Institution 6. The faculty at these two schools, both of which voted for no-agent, appear to be losing whatever voice they may have had in salary matters.

The faculty at Institution 9, a public, liberal arts college with the AAUP for an agent, reversed its pattern of perceptions on these two issues when compared to previous responses as they perceived a shift toward faculty dominance. The existence of a contract with tightly written salary clauses may provide the basis for their perception although it is difficult to understand why the same perceptions would not have occurred for the faculty status issues.

The results on the salary issues were not unusual. Many negotiated contracts contain detailed, lengthy statements covering the distribution of salary dollars causing both sides at the bargaining table to perceive changes. Even though the perception will usually be in favor of an increased faculty role, the appropriateness of their role is open to debate.

The first significant differences between faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance on the subset of planning issues, 11 and 12, occurred in the responses from the NEA bargaining agent group. These two issues and Budget formulation (Issue 13) were the only instances in which there were significant differences between faculty and administrator perceptions categorized by bargaining agent. The administrators perceived greater movement toward faculty dominance on both planning issues.

Highly significant differences were again noted between faculty at

unionized and no-agent institutions on Short-range institutional planning (Issue 11) and Long-range institutional planning (Issue 12). Unionized faculty perceived a larger shift toward faculty dominance on these two issues. This perception may be an expected one because planning on many campuses has traditionally taken place at administrative levels above the faculty. Planning has tended to be a closely guarded responsibility and in many cases, the faculty often learn of plans only after they have been initiated. Any contractual change in this process, such as providing for more faculty participation would be perceived as movement in the faculty's favor. There was a highly significant difference between administrators' perceptions of Short-range institutional planning (Issue 11) at unionized and no-agent schools. Administrators of unionized institutions perceived greater movement toward faculty dominance. The highly significant difference for short-range planning and not for long-range planning raises an interesting question. Do faculty and administrators define these activities the same way?

Table 13, which compares faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at unionized liberal arts colleges notes significant differences on Issues 11 and 12. On both issues, administrators perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance. No similar significant differences were reported for unionized comprehensive universities and colleges. This may be due, in part, to a lower level of faculty involvement in these issues at the liberal arts colleges.

Individually, Institution 4 data reflects faculty perceiving a shift toward administrative dominance while administrators perceived

just the opposite. The same contrast in perceptions was also recorded for Institution 6. These were the first issues for Institution 15 to report faculty perceptions of a move toward administrative dominance. Administrator perceptions on these issues were in the opposite direction.

The differences found in these issues were not unexpected. As mentioned previously, planning activities at many institutions have been considered outside the faculty purview. Participation in planning was limited to the central administration. At the smaller institutions any shift from the traditional planning processes might be viewed as a substantial step toward faculty domination. This may explain, at least partially, the varying perceptions at the three institutions discussed in the preceding paragraph.

Only two significant differences were found involving physical facilities building programs (Issue 10). One of these was the comparison of faculty at unionized and no-agent institutions which produced a highly significant difference where unionized faculty perceived a shift toward faculty dominance. The other was a significant difference between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized liberal arts colleges where administrators, in this comparison, perceived a greater movement toward faculty dominance.

Institution 4 continues to record a faculty perception of a tendency toward administrative dominance while administrators at the school indicated an opposite perception. Similar perceptions are reported at Institutions 6 and 15.

Budget formulation (Issue 13) would appear to be the most critical

issue in the entire group. Tables 4 and 6 indicate the first significant differences, between faculty and administrators, for this issue. Table 4 reports for institutions with the AAUP as bargaining agent the comparison of faculty and administrator perceptions. Administrators perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance of budget formulation. Table 6 presents the same comparison as Table 4 except with the NEA as bargaining agent. Here, too, administrators perceived a move toward faculty dominance.

No significant difference was reported in faculty perceptions at unionized and no-agent institutions for Budget formulation (Issue 13). A highly significant difference, however, was reported between administrators at unionized and no-agent institutions on this issue as administrators at unionized campuses perceived a shift toward faculty dominance.

A highly significant difference was noted between the perceptions of faculty and administrators at unionized institutions on budget formulation with administrators perceiving a greater shift toward faculty dominance. Another highly significant difference was reported between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized liberal arts colleges. The administrators, in this instance, too, perceived a tendency toward faculty dominance.

Institution 4 data indicated faculty perceived a move toward administrative dominance while the administrators reported no change in perceptions. Similar perceptions were held by faculty and administrators at Institution 6. It should be noted that Institution 9 faculty returned to their earlier perceptions of a move toward administrative

dominance. The faculty at Institution 15, a public, comprehensive university, with the NEA as bargaining agent perceived a move toward administrative dominance and the administrators a move toward faculty dominance.

Budget formulation has usually been an administrative function with little if any contribution from the faculty. Contracts that allow for regular faculty input into the budget process may be assessed by administrators as examples of increasing faculty domination in decision-making activities. Faculty viewing the same changes from their end of the spectrum may regard them as bringing little change. There is little question administrators want to retain as much control as possible.

Academic operation

The issues encompassed in this category are regularly considered by many academicians to be under the auspices of the faculty. Whether reality on a campus coincides with these perceptions is another matter. As institutions are faced with increased financial concerns and declining enrollments, administrators may tend to expand their control of academic operations. Expanded curriculum offerings and the faculty to support new programs require additional fiscal support. Are existing programs to be discontinued before new curriculum offerings are added? Which programs will be cost effective and which will attract the most students? Who will control these decisions, the faculty or the administrators? Will degree requirements be based on the need to attract students or to maintain academic quality? The same question applies to

academic performance of students.

Significant differences on all three issues in this area occurred between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized institutions where the AAUP is the bargaining agent. Administrator responses indicate they perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance.

Highly significant differences were noted in the perception of faculty at unionized and no-agent campuses of the three issues. Faculty at unionized schools perceived a larger movement toward faculty dominance while at no-agent institutions they perceived a move toward administrative dominance on Curriculum offerings (Issue 14).

Highly significant differences were also found between administrators at unionized and no-agent campuses for these issues. Administrators at unionized institutions perceived a greater tendency toward faculty dominance while at no-agent schools they perceived a move toward administrative dominance on Degree requirements (Issue 15) and Academic performance of students (Issue 16). Whether these perceptions reflect substantive changes is another question, and one that cannot be answered by this study.

A significant difference in perceptions between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions was indicated for Degree requirements (Issue 15) as administrators perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance. While no significant differences in perceptions of faculty and administrators at no-agent schools were recorded, some note should be made of the means calculated for these issues. The faculty mean for Curriculum offerings (Issue 14) indicates a move toward

administrative dominance. Administrator means for Degree requirements (Issue 15) and Academic performance of students (Issue 16) indicate a similar perception.

Significant differences in perceptions were exhibited between faculty and administrators at unionized liberal arts colleges.

On the Issues of Curriculum offerings and Degree requirement administrators perceived a larger shift toward faculty dominance on these issues.

Most of the differences reported for the issues in this group are expected. Faculty have traditionally controlled the decision-making on these issues and present contract language often confirms this. In this environment administrators may perceive themselves as losing control or influence over another area. Intriguing questions are raised by these analyses that reveal the perception of a move toward administrative dominance. Unfortunately, data are not available to pursue the questions of how much of a shift has actually occurred and what the motivating forces were.

Again, Institution 4 could be used as a site for a case study of these issues because mean responses on faculty and administrator perceptions both indicated a shift toward administrative dominance. Mean faculty responses to Curriculum offerings (Issue 14) for Institution 6, also, indicated a perceived move toward administrative dominance. At Institution 9 a move toward administrative dominance on all three issues was detected in analyzing the mean faculty responses.

Academic planning and policy

Many of the preliminary comments made in the preceding section are equally applicable to academic planning. Each of the issues may influence the financial stability of an institution. These are areas where administrators have generally expected the faculty to provide the impetus for change. A question arises as to whether the fiscal stability of the institution can be protected by faculty decision-making on these issues. The alternative for faculty, of course, is to have the administration retain total control of deciding how and when changes will be made.

Highly significant differences in perceptions were reported between faculty at unionized and no-agent institutions on all three issues. Faculty at unionized schools perceived a shift toward faculty dominance on each issue, while a move toward administrative dominance was perceived by faculty at no-agent campuses. Highly significant differences in perceptions were recorded between administrators at unionized and no-agent institutions on Types of degrees offered (Issue 17) and Student admission requirements (Issue 19). A significant difference was noted for Establishment of new academic programs (Issue 18). The administrators at the no-agent locations perceived a shift toward administrative dominance while the opposite perception was presented by administrators on unionized campuses.

Although no significant differences were recorded between faculty and administrators at no-agent institutions on these issues, their mean responses should be noted. Both faculty and administrators perceived

a shift toward administrative dominance. Whether or not these perceptions coincide with reality is a subject for further study. If perceptions and reality do agree then the reasons for this change should be explored. One may postulate whether the consequence of a no-agent victory causes administrators to assert their control or is it in response to fiscal problems?

Significant differences between faculty and administrators' perceptions at unionized liberal arts colleges were shown for Types of degrees offered (Issue 17) and Student admission requirements (Issue 19). In both issues administrators perceived a shift toward faculty dominance.

Faculty and administrators at Institution 4 both perceived a move toward administrative dominance on the three issues. The faculty at Institutions 6 and 9 also perceived a tendency toward administrative dominance, while faculty at Institution 13 perceived no change, the administrators perceived a shift toward administrative dominance.

While differences recorded between faculty and administrator perceptions could have been anticipated, the shift toward administrative dominance by both faculty and administrators at no-agent institutions needs further study.

Professional duties

Average Faculty teaching load and Faculty teaching assignments are the two Issues in this class. Teaching responsibilities are often determined by departmental faculty meeting as a whole and adjustments are made from term to term based on the needs of individual and departmental faculty. Many factors may impinge upon the equitable distribution

of assignments or teaching load.

As enrollments decline, administrative control of these issues can facilitate the reduction of faculty positions by assigning each faculty member more hours of classroom contact and reducing the number of faculty. This administrative control also permits increasing enrollments to be absorbed.

A highly significant difference between perceptions of faculty and administrators at unionized institutions with the AAUP as bargaining agent was noted for Faculty teaching assignments (Issue 21). Administrators perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance.

Highly significant differences between faculty perceptions at unionized and no-agent institutions were indicated in Table 7. Faculty at unionized campuses perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance. Highly significant differences in perceptions were also recorded between administrators at unionized and no-agent schools. Administrators at unionized sites perceived a tendency toward faculty dominance. Their counterparts at no-agent schools, however, perceived a move toward administrative dominance.

No significant differences in perceptions were noted between faculty and administrators at no-agent institutions but on Average faculty teaching load (Issue 20), administrators perceived a shift toward administrative dominance.

Significant differences in the perceptions of faculty at unionized liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges were reported for Average faculty teaching load (Issue 20) and Faculty

teaching assignments (Issue 12). Faculty at the latter institutions perceived a greater tendency toward faculty dominance on both issues.

A highly significant difference in perceptions was recorded between faculty and administrators at unionized liberal arts colleges for Average faculty teaching load (Issue 20). Administrators perceived a larger shift toward faculty dominance. A significant difference was shown between faculty and administrators' perceptions of Faculty teaching assignments (Issue 21) at unionized liberal arts colleges. Administrators again perceived a greater change toward faculty dominance.

Once again faculty and administrators, both, perceived a shift toward administrative dominance on Average faculty teaching load (Issue 20) and Faculty teaching assignments (Issue 21) at Institution 4. Faculty perceived a move toward administrative dominance at Institutions 6 and 9 on these issues.

Administrator perceptions of a shift toward faculty dominance may be anticipated as a result of codifying many previously unwritten practices. As activities are stated in a contract and responsibilities and obligations assigned to the parties, differences in perceptions may occur. This is evident where unwritten rules and procedures have permitted both sides to claim control over a particular activity.

Organization of faculty agencies

Committees, and other bodies of a similar nature, have been used by faculty to insure their participation in and control of decision-making processes on many campuses. The procedures available for establishing these bodies and the methods used for appointing the membership

influence the success of these groups. If the faculty monitor the establishment and selection process they will be more amenable to the findings and decisions. When the administration controls directly or indirectly the establishment and selection of a committee its decisions may become suspect in the eyes of the faculty. Faculty views are further influenced by their position on the campus. An administrator may believe the faculty are participating when they have one or two faculty representatives on a committee, while the faculty member may feel excluded unless his or her department or college is represented.

Significant differences were noted between the perceptions of faculty and administrators at unionized institutions with the AAUP as a bargaining agent for Establishment of departmental committees (Issue 22), Membership of departmental committees (Issue 23) and Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24). The administrators perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance on all of these issues. A significant difference was also reflected in the perceptions of faculty and administrators at unionized campuses having the AFT as the bargaining agent for Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24). The administrators in this instance perceived a larger change toward faculty dominance. No significant differences were indicated between faculty and administrators at the institutions where the NEA is the bargaining agent.

Highly significant differences were shown for all four issues in the perceptions of faculty and administrators at unionized and no-agent institutions. Both groups at the unionized locations perceived a

greater tendency toward faculty dominance. On Establishment of departmental committees (Issue 22), Membership of departmental committees (Issue 23) and Establishing of institution-wide committees (Issue 24) administrators at no-agent institutions perceived a shift toward administrative dominance.

A perceived move toward faculty dominance on the part of faculty and administrators may be the result of placing the procedures for establishing committees in a contract. If these clauses also specify the membership then it is understandable for administrators to believe their control is eroding. What is difficult to accept is the perception by the administration of a shift toward administrative dominance at no-agent institutions. If their perceptions and reality agree, is this shift part of an assertion of administrative authority or an act of retribution?

Significant differences in perceptions were noted between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions on Membership of departmental committees (Issue 23) and Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24). A highly significant difference between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized institutions was recorded on Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24). Administrators perceived a larger shift toward faculty dominance on all three issues. Although there were no significant differences between faculty and administrator perceptions at no-agent institutions the administrators perceived a shift toward administrative dominance.

A significant difference in the perceptions of administrators at

unionized liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges was recorded for Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24). Administrators at the unionized liberal arts colleges perceived a greater shift toward faculty dominance. This may be due to the administrative domination of activities that have occurred at some small liberal arts colleges.

Highly significant differences were noted between the perceptions of faculty and administrators at unionized liberal arts colleges on Membership of departmental committees (Issue 23), Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24) and Membership of institution-wide committees (Issue 25). Administrators perceived a larger move toward faculty dominance on these three issues. This finding may reinforce the comments in the preceding paragraph that as procedures for establishing committees and selecting members become part of the contract administrators may suspect that their control is declining.

Faculty and administrators at Institution 4 perceived a shift toward administrative dominance on all four issues. Faculty at Institution 6 perceived a shift toward administrative dominance on Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24) and Membership of institution-wide committees (Issue 25) while faculty at Institution 9 recorded this type of shift only on Membership of institution-wide committees (Issue 25).

The questionnaire used in this study provided respondents with the opportunity to make additional comments on changes in governance since the collective bargaining representation election. A number of the

respondents did add comments that amplified or clarified their answers. A selection of these comments is found in Appendix F.

Conclusions

There are differences in the perceptions of changes in governance between the faculty and the administrators at unionized institutions and their colleagues at no-agent campuses. The experience of negotiating a contract and, then, living by its provisions influences the views of both faculty and administrators.

There also exist differences in perceptions of governance change between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions. Faculty perceive an improvement in their participation in the decision-making process although it may not be as substantial as they would prefer. Administrators will perceive a diminution in their power and authority at the time a contract takes effect although it may not be altered as much as they had anticipated.

Some differences in perceptions occur between faculty and administrators at unionized liberal arts colleges and their counterparts at unionized comprehensive universities and colleges. Respondents at the unionized liberal arts colleges perceive a larger shift toward faculty dominance. This may be due, in part, to the presence of a more autocratic governance scheme at many of the smaller liberal arts colleges. Comprehensive universities and colleges which encompass emerging universities and former teacher's colleges may have experienced extensive governance changes before unionization.

Faculty and administrators at no-agent institutions perceive a move toward administrative dominance. If perceptions and reality agree then the bases are being built again for future problems. In the aftermath of a representation election which has selected the no-agent option it would seem appropriate for changes in governance to occur very slowly. If perceptions and reality coincide do they indicate a desire for retribution on the part of the administration or is it only a tendency to assert what are considered administrative prerogatives. The other alternative is a resignation on the part of the faculty who had supported collective bargaining.

It would appear that Institutions 4, 6, and 9 might be headed for governance problems based on the faculty perceptions. The uniform view of a shift toward administrative dominance on almost all issues at these campuses contrasts with the faculty perceptions at other institutions.

Many of these differences in faculty and administrator perceptions probably do not need to exist. They are predicated on a biased or inaccurate view of the way in which governance works on a particular campus. A serious review of the way in which an institution has been governed may cause a revision of perceptions. Mutually agreed upon institutional goals and objectives may also bring faculty and administrator perceptions closer together.

Recommendations for Further Study

Governance at institutions that have voted no-agent should be examined to determine if actual changes coincide with perceived changes. If there is no change then why does the perception exist. Several of the institutions used in this study would be excellent candidates for study.

The governance history of unionized liberal arts colleges and unionized comprehensive universities and colleges should be studied to determine which type of institution has experienced the greatest change in governance. A study of this nature may be difficult to conduct because of the diversity in governance. The only practical approach may be individual case studies.

This study should be replicated in about two years to ascertain the extent of changes in governance at these institutions over a longer period of time. One of the deficiencies in academic collective bargaining research is the absence of longitudinal studies.

The impact of collective bargaining on each of the twenty-five governance issues could be studied on a case study basis or longitudinally. The absence of research on these topics means the opportunities are almost endless.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine the congruence between faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at selected four-year institutions that have negotiated collective bargaining contracts and those that have voted "no-agent".

Studies that had been conducted in the past were either nationwide in their scope (145, 146) or limited to the presidents of institutions and the campus representatives of bargaining agents (3). These studies were further limited because they did not examine the impact of collective bargaining upon campus changes.

To study the congruence between faculty and administrator perceptions a group of sixteen institutions was selected. Eight were liberal arts colleges and eight were comprehensive universities and colleges as classified by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Within these categories each of the major faculty organizations, the AAUP, AFT, and NEA, as well as the no-agent campuses were equally represented. An attempt was made to represent publicly and privately controlled institutions equally within each category but this could not be achieved.

For the purposes of this study, a questionnaire was designed to ascertain faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process on twenty-five governance issues. Respondents were asked to compare their perception of decision-making processes at the time of the representation election and the present status of the decision-making process.

Fifty faculty were randomly selected from each of the sixteen institutions as well as specifically identified administrators. An initial mailing of 886 questionnaires was made. A second mailing was made to the faculty and administrators at fourteen of the institutions. Completed questionnaires from 359 respondents, 40.5% of the sample, were analyzed for the study.

One-way analysis of variance and Scheffé tests were used to determine the existence and significance of differences in faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at institutions having different bargaining agents. The t-test was used to compare the perceptions of changes in governance of various groups. All tests were run at the .05 level of significance.

Each of the twenty-five governance issues was examined for each of the following hypotheses.

Hypothesis I: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at institutions having different bargaining agents.

No significant differences in perceptions between faculty were noted for any of the twenty-five governance issues, therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected for all issues.

Hypothesis II: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at institutions having different bargaining agents.

No significant differences in perceptions between administrators

were shown for any of the twenty-five governance issues, therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected for all issues.

Hypothesis III: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators and faculty at institutions having different bargaining agents.

Significant differences were reported between faculty and administrator perceptions at institutions with the AAUP as bargaining agent for the following issues: Issue 13, Budget formulation; Issue 14, Curriculum offerings; Issue 22, Establishment of departmental committees; Issue 23, Membership of departmental committees; and Issue 24, Establishment of institution-wide committees. The null hypothesis was rejected for these issues.

Only one issue: Establishment of institution-wide committees (Issue 24) revealed a significant difference between faculty and administrator perceptions at institutions with the AFT as bargaining agent. The null hypothesis was rejected for this issue.

Significant differences between faculty and administrator perceptions at institutions with the NEA as bargaining agent were noted on three different issues. The null hypothesis was rejected for Issue 11, Short-range institutional planning; Issue 12, Long-range institutional planning; and Issue 13, Budget formulation.

Apparently, there is agreement between faculty and administrators regarding changes in governance at institutions that have the AFT as bargaining agent. There are the beginnings of differences in perceptions between faculty and administrators at institutions with the NEA

as bargaining agent. The largest differences occur at institutions with the AAUP as bargaining agent.

Hypothesis IV: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".

Highly significant differences in the perceptions of faculty at unionized and no-agent institutions were found on twenty-four of the issues. The null hypothesis was not rejected on Issue 13, Budget formulation, the only issue to not produce a significant difference.

Hypothesis V: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".

No significant differences were found for Issue 6, Selection of academic deans; Issue 10, Physical facilities building programs; and Issue 12, Long-range institutional planning. The null hypothesis was not rejected for these issues. Significant or highly significant differences were recorded on the rest of the issues.

Hypothesis VI: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions and those that voted "no-agent".

Significant differences between the perceptions of faculty and administrators at unionized institutions were presented for Issue 1, Faculty appointments; Issue 14, Degree requirements; Issue 23, Membership of departmental committees; and Issue 25, Membership of institution-wide

committees. Highly significant differences were noted for Issue 13, Budget formulation and Issue 24, Establishment of institution-wide committees. The null hypothesis was rejected for these six issues.

No significant differences were presented between faculty and administrator perceptions of the changes in governance at no-agent institutions for the twenty-five issues.

Hypothesis VII: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty at the different categories of unionized institutions.

The categories of institutions used to test this hypothesis were liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges.

Significant or highly significant differences were calculated for eight issues: Issue 1, Faculty appointments; Issue 2, Faculty reappointments; Issue 4, Faculty tenure awards; Issue 5, Selection of the president; Issue 7, Selection of departmental chairpersons; Issue 15, Degree requirements; Issue 20, Average faculty teaching load; and Issue 21, Faculty teaching assignments. The null hypotheses was rejected for these issues.

Hypothesis VIII: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between administrators at the different categories of unionized institutions.

The categories of institutions used to test this hypothesis were liberal arts colleges and comprehensive universities and colleges.

Issue 8, Faculty salary scales, and Issue 24, Establishment of

institution-wide committees produced significant differences in perceptions between administrators, thereby rejecting the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis IX: There will be congruent perceptions of changes in governance between faculty and administrators at the different categories of unionized institutions.

Significant differences between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized liberal arts colleges were reported on fourteen issues: Faculty appointments, Selection of the president, Faculty salary scales, Physical facilities building programs, Long-range institutional planning, Curriculum offerings, Degree requirements, Student admission requirements, Faculty teaching assignments, Budget formulation, Average faculty teaching load, Membership of departmental committees, Establishment of institution-wide committees, and Membership of institution-wide committees. The null hypothesis was rejected for these issues.

No significant differences were recorded between faculty and administrator perceptions at unionized comprehensive universities and colleges so the null hypothesis was not rejected for any of the issues.

Differences do occur between faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance. The differences occurring between faculty and administrators at unionized institutions could be anticipated. Unless the two groups work together to soften their differences a widening gap may develop. This would certainly work against the best interests of the individual institutions and higher education, in general.

Other perceptions of change were not anticipated. The views recorded by both faculty and administrators at no-agent institutions of a shift toward administrative dominance hold the promise for more problems in the future. Faculty and administration interests must be balanced somehow so the institution can achieve its goals. If an equilibrium is not achieved then higher education will become less effective in the years ahead.

REFERENCES

1. AAHE-NEA Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, *Campus Governance Programs. Faculty participation in academic governance*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education/National Education Association, 1967.
2. Adams, W. The state of higher education: Myths and realities. *AAUP Bulletin* 60 (June 1974): 119-125.
3. Adler, Dan L. *Governance and collective bargaining in four-year institutions, 1970-1977*. Monograph 3. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1978.
4. American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. *AAUP Bulletin* 52 (December 1966): 375-379.
5. American Association of University Professors. *Report of the Survey Sub-committee of Committee T*. *AAUP Bulletin* 55 (Summer 1969): 180-185.
6. American Association of University Professors. *Report of the Survey Sub-committee of Committee T*. *AAUP Bulletin* 57 (Spring 1971): 68-124.
7. American Association of University Professors. *Committee Z. At the brink: Report on the economic status of the profession, 1970-71*. *AAUP Bulletin* 57 (June 1971): 223-285.
8. American Association of University Professors. *Committee Z. Coping with adversity: Report on the economic status of the profession, 1971-72*. *AAUP Bulletin* 58 (June 1972): 178-243.
9. American Association of University Professors. *Statement on collective bargaining*. *AAUP Bulletin* 58 (December 1972): 423-424.
10. American Association of University Professors. *Committee Z. Surviving the seventies: Report on the economic status of the profession, 1972-73*. *AAUP Bulletin* 59 (June 1973): 188-258.
11. American Association of University Professors. *Committee Z. Hard times: Report on the economic status of the profession, 1973-74*. *AAUP Bulletin* 60 (June 1974): 171-243.

12. American Association of University Professors. Committee Z. Two steps backwards: Report on the economic status of the profession, 1974-75. AAUP Bulletin 61 (August 1975): 118-199.
13. American Association of University Professors. Committee Z. Nearly keeping up: Report on the economic status of the profession, 1975-76. AAUP Bulletin 62 (August 1976): 195-285.
14. American Association of University Professors. AAUP policy documents and reports. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 136 646, 1977.
15. American Association of University Professors. Committee Z. No progress this year: Report on the economic status of the profession, 1976-77. AAUP Bulletin 63 (August 1977): 146-228.
16. Anderson, G. Lester. Does governance make a difference? Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 076 139, 1971.
17. Andes, J. Developing trends in content of collective bargaining contracts in higher education. Special Report 6. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, no date.
18. Angell, G. W. Improving collective negotiations on the campus. Educational Record 53 (Spring 1972): 169-176.
19. Angell, G. W. Grievance procedures under collective bargaining: Boon or burden? Phi Delta Kappan 53 (April 1972): 501-505.
20. Armstrong, James Owen. Faculty perceptions of shared authority and collective bargaining at the public institutions of higher education in Virginia. Ph.D. dissertation, the College of William and Mary in Virginia, 1975.
21. Atwood, L. Erwin, and Starck, Kenneth. Faculty attitudes toward university role and governance: A factor analytic approach. Journal of Experimental Education 39 (Winter 1970): 1-9.
22. Aussieker, Bill, and Barbarino, J. W. Measuring faculty unionism: Quantity and quality. Industrial Relations 12 (May 1973): 117-124.
23. Bailey, S. K. Public money and the integrity of the higher academy. Educational Record 50 (Spring 1969): 149-154.
24. Bailey, S. K. Education and the state. Education Record 55 (Winter 1974): 5-12.
25. Baldrige, J. Victor. Academic governance: Research on institutional politics and decision making. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1971.

26. Baldrige, J. Victor. Models of university governance: Bureaucratic, collegial, and political. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 060 825, 1971.
27. Baldrige, J. Victor. Power and conflict in the university: Research in the sociology of complex organizations. New York: John Wiley, 1971.
28. Baldrige, J. Victor. Impact of institutional size and complexity on faculty autonomy. *Journal of Higher Education* 44 (October 1973): 532-547.
29. Baldrige, J. Victor, and others. Alternative models of governance in higher education. Research and Development Memorandum No. 129. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 109 937, 1974.
30. Baldrige, J. Victor, and others. An overview of the Stanford Project on Academic Governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 098 876, 1974.
31. Baldrige, J. Victor, and others. Diversity in academic governance patterns. Research and Development Memorandum No. 130. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC document Reproduction Service, ED 100 256, 1975.
32. Baldrige, J. Victor, and Kemerer, Frank R. Academic senates and faculty collective bargaining. *Journal of Higher Education* 47 (July/August 1976): 391-411.
33. Barnett, Peter. Authority and purpose in college governance. *College and University* 47 (Spring 1972): 159-167.
34. Begin, James P., ed. Academics at the bargaining table: Early experience. Proceedings of a conference held at the University Extension Division, Rutgers University. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 082 701, 1972.
35. Begin, James P. Faculty governance and collective bargaining: An early appraisal. Special Report 5. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1974.
36. Begin, James P. Faculty bargaining in 1973: A loss of momentum? *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 25 (April 1974): 74-81.
37. Begin, James P. Faculty governance and collective bargaining: An early appraisal. *Journal of Higher Education* 45 (November 1974): 582-593.

38. Benewitz, Maurice C., ed. Proceedings, First Annual Conference, April, 1973. National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 086 096, 1973.
39. Birnbaum, Robert. Unionization and faculty compensation. Educational Record 55 (Winter 1974): 29-33.
40. Blackburn, Robert, and Bylsma, Donald. Changes in faculty governance and faculty welfare: Some empirical consequences of collective negotiations. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 058 882, 1971.
41. Bloustein, Edward J. Collective bargaining in the halls of academe. Liberal Education 50 (May 1973): 187-193.
42. Boyd, William B. Collective bargaining in academe: Causes and consequences. Liberal Education 57 (October 1971): 306-318.
43. Boyd, William B. The impact of collective bargaining on university governance. Liberal Education 58 (May 1972): 265-271.
44. Boyd, William B. The impact of collective bargaining on university governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 092 052, 1973.
45. Brewster, Kingman, Jr. The politics of academia. School and Society 98 (April 1970): 211-214.
46. Brick, Michael, ed. Collective negotiations in higher education. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 084 993, 1973.
47. Brophy, Jacqueline. Collective bargaining on campus. Today's Education 61 (April 1972): 54-55.
48. Brown, R. S., Jr. Collective bargaining in higher education. Michigan Law Review 67 (March 1969): 1067-1082.
49. Brown, Roberta D. College goals and congruence: The degree of congruence or disagreement in value systems among faculty, students, and administrators. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 127 897, 1976.
50. Bucklew, N. S. Administering a faculty agreement. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 22 (May 1971): 46-51.
51. Budig, Gene A. and Rives, Stanley G. Academic quicksand: Some trends and issues in higher education. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972.

52. Bundy, McGeorge. Faculty power. *Atlantic* 222 (September 1968): 41-47.
53. Byrnes, Joseph F. The existence of both academic and union models of governance at Rider College. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 26 (July/August 1975): 41-45.
54. Byrnes, Joseph F. Representing the faculty in a unionized college: The tasks and roles of a chief negotiator. *Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector* 6 (1977): 19-27.
55. Carlisle, Howard M. University administration and the change process. *Phi Kappa Phi Journal* 55 (Fall 1975): 26-29.
56. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A classification of institutions of higher education. Berkeley, California: The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973.
57. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of higher education: Six priority problems. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
58. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The states and higher education. A proud past and a vital future. Supplement. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 129 129, 1976.
59. Carr, Robert K. Academic bargaining: Power changes for everyone? *New Directions for Higher Education* 2 (Spring 1974): 61-78.
60. Carr, R. K., and Van Eyck, D. K. Collective bargaining on campus. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973.
61. Caws, Peter J. Design for a university. *Daedalus* 99 (Winter 1970): 84-107.
62. Chamberlain, Philip C. Collective bargaining and legal influences in higher education. *Viewpoints* 52 (September 1976): 51-63.
63. Chambers, M. M. Grapevine. 123-222 (January 1969-January 1977).
64. Clark, Burton R. Belief and loyalty in college organization. *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (June 1971): 499-515.
65. Coleman, Daniel R. The evolution of collective bargaining as it relates to higher education in America. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 23 (March 1972): 40-60.
66. Coleman, Daniel R. The evolution of collective bargaining as it relates to higher education in America. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 23 (May 1972): 1-20.

67. Corbally, John E., Jr. Boards of trustees in the governance of higher education. *Theory into Practice* 9 (October 1970): 239-243.
68. Corson, John J. Governance: Interacting roles of faculty, students and administrators. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 050 673, 1971.
69. Corson, John J. The modernization of the university: The impact of function on governance. *The Journal of Higher Education* 42 (June 1971): 430-441.
70. Corson, John J. Institutional governance within a system. *Educational Record* 54 (Spring 1973): 107-114.
71. Corson, John J. Changing patterns of governance in higher education. Report series 1975-76, No. 2. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 131 817, 1976.
72. Cote, William E. MSU faculty rejects unions. *Change* 5 (February 1973): 28-30.
73. Crossland, Fred E. Will the academy survive unionization? *Change* 8 (February 1976): 38-42.
74. Cuninggim, Meerimon. The governance of higher education: Selected problems. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 902 054, 1973.
75. Davey, Harold W. Contemporary collective bargaining. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
76. Dubeck, L. W. Collective bargaining: A view from the faculty. Occasional Paper 7. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975.
77. Dudra, M., ed. Collective negotiations in education: Progress and prospects. Loretto, Pennsylvania: Graduate Program in Industrial Relations, Saint Francis College, 1974.
78. Duryea, E. D. Reform in university government. *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (May 1971): 339-352.
79. Duryea, E. D., and Fisk, R. S. Impact of unionism on governance. In *The Expanded Campus*, pp. 105-115. Edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye.
80. Duryea, E. D.; Fisk, R. S.; and Associates. Faculty unions and collective bargaining. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

81. Dykes, Archie R. Faculty participation in academic decision making. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
82. Ecker, George Paul, and Baldrige, J. Victor. Academic politics, morale and involvement: Preliminary findings of the Stanford Project on Academic Governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 071 625, 1973.
83. Edwards, Scott. An academic chairman looks at governance. Change 4 (September 1972): 24-29.
84. Ehrle, Elwood B., and Earley, Jane F. The effects of collective bargaining on department chairpersons and deans. Educational Record 57 (Summer 1977): 149-154.
85. Elam, S., and Moscow, M. H., ed. Employment relations in higher education. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1969.
86. Enarson, H. L. Tinkering with university government. Educational Record 54 (Winter 1972): 47-50.
87. Epstein, Leon D. State authority and state universities. Daedalus 99 (Summer 1970): 700-712.
88. Falcone, Michael A. Collective bargaining: Its effect on campus governance. Special Report 16. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975.
89. Fenlon, P. E. State-wide coordination and college and university facilities. AAUP Bulletin 53 (Winter 1967): 408-411.
90. Finkin, Matthew W. Collective bargaining and university governance. Wisconsin Law Review 1971 (1971): 125-149.
91. Finkin, Matthew W. Collective bargaining and university government. AAUP Bulletin 57 (June 1971): 149-162.
92. Furniss, W. T. Governance and gumption. Educational Record 57 (Fall 1976): 262-268.
93. Frymier, Jack R. Freedom and order in the university. Theory into Practice 9 (October 1970): 254-260.
94. Garbarino, J. W. Precarious professors. Industrial Relations 10 (February 1971): 1-20.
95. Garbarino, Joseph W. Creeping unionism and the faculty labor market. In Higher education and the labor market, pp. 309-332. Edited by Margaret S. Gordon. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

96. ~~Garbarino, Joseph W., and Aussieker, Bill. Faculty bargaining: Change and conflict. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.~~
97. ~~Garbarino, Joseph W.; Feller, David E.; and Finkin, Matthew W. Faculty bargaining in public higher education: A report and two essays. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.~~
98. Gee, E. Gordon. Organizing the halls of ivy: Developing a framework for viable alternatives in higher education employment. Utah Law Review 1973 (1972): 233-269.
99. Geiger, L. G. Academic codes and governance. Intellect 101 (January 1973): 225-230.
100. Gemmell, J. Collective bargaining: A view from the presidency. Occasional Paper 6. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1975.
101. Gershenfeld, Walter J., and Mortimer, Kenneth P. Faculty collective bargaining activity in Pennsylvania. The first five years. (1970-1975). Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 125 490, 1976.
102. Glenny, L. A. The anonymous leaders of higher education. Journal of Higher Education 43 (January 1972): 9-22.
103. Graff, Orin B. Value referents in the governance of higher education. Theory into Practice 9 (October 1970): 211-225.
104. Gress, James R. Predicting faculty attitude toward collective bargaining. Research in Higher Education 4 (May 1976): 247-256.
105. Gross, Edward, and Grambsch, Paul V. University goals and academic power. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1968.
106. Groty, C. Keith. Better academic personnel administration need not wait for collective bargaining. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 25 (April 1974): 90-91.
107. Gubasta, Joseph L. Illusions and realities of managing for planned change. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 135 304, 1977.
108. Gunne, M. G. Distributions of authority and patterns of governance at six Pennsylvania institutions: A comparative study. Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1974.

109. Gunn, Manual G., and Mortimer, Kenneth P. Distributions of authority and patterns of governance. Report No. 25. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 116 757, 1975.
110. Hall, Herbert Eugene. Analysis of the impact of collective bargaining on the governance processes of a selected four-year state college. Ed.D. dissertation, West Virginia University, 1973.
111. Hanley, Dexter L. Issues and models for collective bargaining in higher education. Liberal Educator 57 (March 1971): 5-14.
112. Hartman, James B. Collective bargaining in the university. Interchange 6 (1975): 32-43.
113. Haslam, C. L. The locus of decision making in colleges and universities: The broad perspective. Journal of College and University Laws 1 (Spring 1974): 241-263.
114. Hedgepeth, Royster C. Consequences of collective bargaining in higher education: An exploratory analysis. Journal of Higher Education 45 (December 1974): 691-705.
115. Hedgepeth, Royster C. An exploratory analysis of the consequences of collective bargaining in higher education: The role of the faculty. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 090 865, 1974.
116. Henderson, A. D. Control in higher education: Trends and issues. Journal of Higher Education 40 (January 1969): 1-11.
117. Hepler, John C. Timetable for a takeover. Journal of Higher Education 42 (February 1971): 103-115.
118. Herman, E. Edward, and Skinner, Gordon S. Faculty representation: The vote at Cincinnati. Monthly Labor Review 99 (March 1976): 44-48.
119. Hern, J. J., and Thompson, H. L. Who governs in academia? Journal of General Education 22 (July 1970): 123-137.
120. Hodgkinson, Harold L. Ideal governance structure would be larger and smaller simultaneously. College and University Business 48 (April 1970): 65-68.
121. Hodgkinson, Harold L. Presidents and campus governance: A research profile. Educational Record 51 (Spring 1970): 159-166.
122. Hodgkinson, Harold L. Campus governance--the amazing thing is that it works at all. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 051 439, 1971.

123. Hodgkinson, Harold L. *The campus senate: Experiment in democracy.* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1974.
124. Howe, Ray A. *The bloody business of bargaining.* *College and University Business* 48 (March 1970): 63-67.
125. Hughes, Clarence. *Collective bargaining and the private colleges.* *Intellect* 101 (October 1972): 41-42.
126. Hughes, Clarence R.; Underbrink, Robert L.; and Gordon, Charles O. *Collective negotiations in higher education: A reader.* Carlinville, Illinois: Blackburn College Press, 1973.
127. Ianni, L. *The critical state of collective bargaining in higher education.* *Intellect* 102 (February 1974): 294-296.
128. Ikenberry, Stanley. *Restructuring the governance of higher education.* *AAUP Bulletin* 56 (December 1970): 371-374.
129. Ikenberry, Stanley O. *Roles and Structures for participation in higher education governance: A rationale.* Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 045 023, 1970.
130. Ikenberry, Stanley. *Restructuring college and university organization and governance: An introduction.* *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (June 1971): 421-429.
131. Ikenberry, Stanley. *The organizational dilemma.* *Journal of Higher Education* 43 (January 1972): 23-34.
132. *Insights into higher education: Selected writings of CHSE, 1969-73. Volume I: Governance.* Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 091 978, 1974.
133. *Institutions and campuses with faculty collective bargaining agents. Special Report 12 Update.* Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, February 1977.
134. Jenks, R. Stephen. *An internal change agent's role in restructuring university governance.* *Journal of Higher Education* 44 (May 1973): 370-379.
135. Jennings, F. G. *Some notes on governance.* *Teachers College Record* 72 (May 1971): 481-484.
136. Johnson, Mark Deveraux. *State-institutional governance relationships under faculty collective bargaining in the Pennsylvania State College and University system, 1971-1976.* Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1976.

137. Kahn, Kenneth F. Conducting a "no-union" election campaign on campus. *Journal of College and University Law* 1 (Summer 1974): 291-304.
138. Kammerer, G. M. The state university as a political system. *Journal of Politics* 31 (May 1969): 289-310.
139. Katz, Ellis. Faculty stakes in collective bargaining: Expectations and realities. In encountering the unionized university, pp. 27-46. Edited by Jack H. Schuster. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
140. Kauffman, Joseph F. Who turned off faculty power? *College and University Business* 52 (March 1972): 43-45.
141. Keck, Donald. College governance and collective bargaining. *Today's Education* 61 (December 1972): 51-52.
142. Keene, C. Mansel. Administration of systemwide faculty and staff affairs. *Public Administration Review* 30 (March/April 1970): 113-117.
143. Keeton, Morris. The disenfranchised on campus. *Journal of Higher Education* 41 (June 1970): 421-429.
144. Keeton, Morris. Shared authority on campus: A report on the campus governance program of the American Association for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1971.
145. Kemerer, Frank Robert. The impact of faculty collective bargaining on college and university governance. Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.
146. Kemerer, F. R., and Baldrige, J. V. Unions on campus. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
147. Kemerer, Frank R., and Baldrige, J. Victor. The impact of faculty unions on governance. *Change* 7 (December/January 1975-76): 50-51.
148. Kerr, Clark. Governance and functions. *Daedalus* 99 (Winter 1970): 108-121.
149. Kerr, J. D. Faculty bargaining in higher education: New twists to the university. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 22 (May 1971): 37-45.

150. Kruytbosch, C. E., and Messinger, S. L., eds. The state of the university: Authority and change. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1970.
151. Ladd, E. C., and Lipset, S. M. Professors, unions, and American higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1973.
152. Ladd, Everett C., Jr., and Lipset, Seymour M. Unionizing the professoriate. Change 5 (Summer 1973): 38-44.
153. Leslie, David W. Variability in faculty perceptions of legitimacy of governance at three Pennsylvania institutions: A comparative study. Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.
154. Leslie, David W. Variability in faculty perception of the legitimacy of decision making at nine Pennsylvania institutions. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 086 049, 1973.
155. Leslie, David W., and Satryb, R. P. Collective bargaining and the management of conflict: Proposed research directions. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 25 (April 1974): 12-22.
156. Leslie, David W. Legitimizing university governance: Theory and practice. Higher Education 4 (May 1975): 233-246.
157. Lindeman, Lynn W. The five most cited reasons for faculty unionization. Intellect 102 (November 1973): 85-88.
158. Lindeman, Lynn W. University goals and collective bargaining. Norman, Oklahoma: The Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of Oklahoma, 1974.

159. Lindeman, Lynn W. Institutional goals and faculty attitudes toward collective negotiations. Research in Higher Education 3 (November 1975): 205-215.
160. Lipset, Seymour Martin. Faculty unions and collegiality. Change 7 (March 1975): 39-41.
161. Lisensky, Robert P. The management dilemma: Shared authority. The management challenge: Now and tomorrow. Putting it all together: The management team. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 113 992, 1971.

162. Lorenz, Fred J. Collective bargaining in higher education. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 23 (December 1971): 32-53.
163. Lozier, G. Gregory. A "classic" vote for no representation: Michigan State University. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, no date.
164. Lozier, G. Gregory. Changing attitudes toward the use of strikes in higher education. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 25 (April 1974): 41-48.
165. Lozier, G. Gregory, and Mortimer, Kenneth P. A collective bargaining election: Issues and faculty voting behavior. *Research in Higher Education* 4 (April 1976): 193-208.
166. Lussier, Virginia Lee. Albion College votes "no agent": A case study. Special Report 7. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, no date.
167. Lussier, Virginia Lee. National faculty associations in collective bargaining: A comparative discussion. Special Report 8. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1974.
168. Lussier, V. L. Faculty bargaining associations: National objectives versus campus contracts. *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (September/October 1975): 507-518.
169. McConnell, T. R. Faculty interests in value change and power conflicts. *AAUP Bulletin* 55 (Spring 1969): 342-352.
170. McConnell, T. R. The redistribution of power in higher education: Changing patterns of internal governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 048 842, 1971.
171. McConnell, T. R., and Mortimer, Kenneth P. The faculty in university governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 050 703, 1971.
172. McHugh, William F. Collective negotiations in public higher education. *College and University Business* 47 (December 1969): 41-44, 61-62.
173. McHugh, William F. Collective bargaining with professionals in higher education: Problems in unit determination. *Wisconsin Law Review* 1971 (1971): 55-90.

174. McHugh, William F. Faculty unionism and tenure. *Journal of College and University Law* 1 (Fall 1973): 46-73.
175. Mannix, Thomas M., ed. Collective bargaining in higher education. Proceedings, Second Annual Conference, April 1974. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 104 210, 1974.
176. Mannix, Thomas M., ed. Collective bargaining in higher education. Proceedings, Third Annual Conference, April 1975. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 125 393, 1975.
177. Mannix, Thomas M., ed. Collective bargaining in higher education. Proceedings, Fourth Annual Conference, April 1976. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 136 659, 1976.
178. Maxon, Henry L. Faculty unionism and university governance. In *Encountering the unionized university*, pp. 1-26. Edited by Jack H. Schuster. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
179. Mayer, Milton. The union and the university--organizing the ruins. *The Center Magazine* 6 (May/June 1973): 4-7.
180. Maynard, Arthur P. May tenure rights of faculty be bargained away" *Journal of College and University Law* 2 (Spring 1975): 256-268.
181. Mazzola, Herbert E. Collective negotiations and university faculties. *Journal of College and University Personnel Association* 23 (August 1972): 34-47.
182. Menard, A. P., and Di Giovanni, N., Jr. Preparation of faculty representation cases--a checklist of issues for private colleges and universities. Special Report 26. Washington, D.C.: Academic Collective Bargaining Information Service, 1976.
183. Meyerson, Martin. Impetus to the faculty in university governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 052 734, 1971.
184. Meyerson, Martin. In the dark: Authority and the governance of universities. *AAUP Bulletin* 57 (June 1971): 163-65.
185. Millett, John D. State administration of higher education. *Public Administration Review* 30 (March/April 1970): 101-106.
186. Millett, John D. Governance and leadership in higher education. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 098 909, 1974.

187. Millett, John D. *New structures of campus power*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
188. Mintz, Bernard. *The CUNY experience*. *Wisconsin Law Review* 1971 (1971): 112-124.
189. Mintz, Bernard, and Golden, Allan. *In defense of academic judgment; settling faculty collective bargaining agreement grievances through arbitration*. *Buffalo Law Review* 22 (Winter 1973): 523-544.
190. Mix, Marjorie C. *The "other professionals" in university governance*. *Educational Record* 53 (February 1972): 331-336.
191. Moore, Michael A. *An experiment in governance: The Ohio faculty senate*. *The Journal of Higher Education* 46 (July/August 1975): 365-379.
192. Mortimer, Kenneth P. *The dilemmas in new campus governance structures*. *The Journal of Higher Education* 42 (June 1971): 467-482.
193. Mortimer, Kenneth P. *The structure and operation of faculty governance: Who rules and how?* Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 052 735, 1971.
194. Mortimer, Kenneth P. *Forms of campus governance: Joint participation, separate jurisdictions and collective bargaining*. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 076 085, 1973.
195. Mortimer, Kenneth P. *Research data on tenure and governance under collective bargaining*. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 100 200, 1974.
196. Mortimer, Kenneth P. *"No Representative" victories in faculty collective bargaining elections*. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 26 (January/February 1975): 34-37.
197. Mortimer, Kenneth P. *A survey of experience in academic collective bargaining*. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 108 560, 1975.
198. Mortimer, Kenneth P.; Ikenberry, Stanley O.; and Anderson, G. Lester. *Governance and emerging values in higher education*. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 055 547, 1971.
199. Mortimer, Kenneth P., and Lozier, G. Gregory. *Collective bargaining: Implications for governance*. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 067 059, 1972.

200. Mortimer, Kenneth P., and Lozier, G. Gregory. Faculty workload and collective bargaining. *New Directions for Institutional Research* 1 (Summer 1974): 49-64.
201. Mortimer, Kenneth P., and Johnson, M. D. Faculty collective bargaining in public higher education. *Educational Record* 57 (Winter 1976): 34-44.
202. Mortimer, Kenneth P.; Gunne, Manuel G.; and Leslie, David W. Perceived legitimacy of decision making and academic governance patterns in higher education: A comparative analysis. *Research in Higher Education* 4 (May 1976): 273-290.
203. Mortimer, Kenneth P., and McConnell, T. R. Sharing authority effectively: Participation, interaction, and discretion. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
204. Moskow, Michael H. The scope of collective bargaining in higher education. *Wisconsin Law Review* 1971 (1971): 33-54.
205. Naples, Caesar J. Collective bargaining: Opportunities for "management". In *Encountering the unionized university*, pp. 47-60. Edited by Jack H. Schuster. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
206. National Education Association. Division of Higher Education. Collective bargaining on the college campus. *Today's Education* 60 (December 1971): 44-45.
207. Neff, Charles B. Planning and governance. *Journal of Higher Education* 42 (February 1971): 116-132.
208. Odewahn, Charles A. Faculty unionism: It is inevitable? *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 25 (April 1974): 92-98.
209. Oliker, Mary Pat, and Kaufman, Norma. The faculty unionization challenge. *Journal of Higher Education* 46 (September/October 1975): 519-531.
210. Olsen, James K. Governance by confrontation: Adversarialism at the university. *Intellect* 102 (March 1974): 361-364.
211. O'Neil, Robert M. The eclipse of faculty autonomy. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 052 736, 1971.
212. Opdahl, R. W. Perceptions and preferences of faculty in "emerging" state colleges with regard to arrangements for their participation in decision-making. Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

213. Pendleton, E. C., and Najita, J. M. Unionization of Hawaii faculty: A study in frustration. Honolulu: Industrial Relations Center, University of Hawaii, 1974.
214. Perkins, J. A. Organization and functions of the university. *The Journal of Higher Education* 43 (December 1972): 679-691.
215. Pfnister, Allan O. The role of faculty in university governance. *The Journal of Higher Education* 41 (June 1970): 430-449.
216. Ping, Charles J. A roundtable: How to live with faculty power. *College and University Business* 53 (December 1972): 33-44.
217. Ping, Charles J. On learning to live with collective bargaining. *The Journal of Higher Education* 44 (February 1973): 102-113.
218. Ping, Charles J. Unionization and institutional planning. *Educational Record* 54 (Spring 1973): 100-106.
219. Polishhook, Shelia Stern. Collective bargaining and the City University of New York. *The Journal of Higher Education* 41 (May 1970): 377-386.
220. Richardson, Richard D., Jr. Governance theory: A comparison of approaches. *The Journal of Higher Education* 45 (May 1974): 344-354.
221. Riley, Gary L., and Baldrige, J. V. Governing academic organizations: New problems, new perspectives. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977.
222. Rosenzweig, R. M. Who wants to govern the university? *Educational Record* 51 (Summer 1970): 267-272.
223. Sandin, Robert T. Power and purpose in collegiate government. The role of faculty in academic planning. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 076 155, 1969.
224. Sands, C. Dallas. The role of collective bargaining in higher education. *Wisconsin Law Review* 1971 (1971): 150-176.
225. Satryb, Ronald P. Evolution of the S.U.N.Y. grievance procedures from the first contract to the second. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 26 (July/August 1975): 47-52.
226. Sawicki, Robert L. The unionization of professors at the University of Delaware. *Liberal Education* 60 (December 1974): 449-460.

227. Schein, Edgar H. The reluctant professor: Implications for university management. *Notre Dame Journal of Education* 4 (Spring 1973): 36-48.
228. Schramm, Carl J. Union organizing at private colleges and universities: A prognosis revisited. *Labor Law Journal* 26 (November 1975): 724-731.
229. Schramm, Carl J. Why the slowdown in faculty bargaining? *Monthly Labor Review* 99 (March 1976): 43.
230. Schuh, J. H. Decision-making process in liberal arts colleges of large universities. *College and University* 50 (Winter 1975): 177-182.
231. Schuster, Jack H. The search for new models in faculty bargaining. In *Encountering the unionized university*, pp. 79-98. Edited by Jack H. Schuster. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
232. Seidman, Joel; Kelley, Lane; and Edge, Alfred. Faculty bargaining comes to Hawaii. *Industrial Relations* 13 (February 1974): 5-22.
233. Selden, William K. Coordination and governance of higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1971.
234. Sharpe, Daniel R. Collective bargaining by university and college faculties under the National Labor Relations Act. *Ohio State Law Journal* 36 (1975): 71-96.
235. Smith, B., and Reitz, R. Authority, shared and increased. *Liberal Education* 56 (December 1970): 501-510.
236. Steinbach, S. E. Collective bargaining on private campuses. *Current Issues in Higher Education* 27 (1972): 116-129.
237. Stevens, Carl M. The professors and collective action: Which kind? Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 055 558, 1971.
238. Sturner, William F. University governance through the bicameral legislature. *The Journal of Higher Education* 42 (March 1971): 219-228.
239. Sumberg, A. D. Collective bargaining. In *The troubled campus*, pp. 139-145. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

240. Taylor, D. Reginald. Enigmas of upper level universities: University governance and faculty tenure. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 124 058, 1975.
241. Tice, Terrence, ed. Campus employment relations. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Continuing Legal Education, the University of Michigan, 1975.
242. Torrence, William D., and Vitton, John J. Faculty work stoppages in post-secondary education. Journal of College Negotiations in the Public Sector 6 (1977): 11-18.
243. Troutman, James G. Faculty perceptions of college governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 127 900, 1976.
244. Tyler, Gus. The faculty join the proletariat. Change 3 (Winter 1971-1972): 40-45.
245. United States. Office of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Education directory, 1970-71. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1971.
246. United States. Office of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Education Directory, 1971-72. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972.
247. United States. Office of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Education Directory, 1972-73. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1973.
248. United States. Office of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Education Directory, 1973-74. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1974.
249. United States. Office of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Education Directory, 1974-75. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1975.
250. United States. Office of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Education Directory, 1975-76. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1976.

251. United States. Office of Education. National Center for Educational Statistics. Education Directory, 1976-77. Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1977.
252. Unionization. College Management 5 (July 1970): 14-15.
253. Walker, D. E. Collegiality and collective bargaining: An alternative perspective. Educational Record 57 (Spring 1976): 119-124.
254. Wallis, W. Allen. Unity in the university. Daedalus 104 (Winter 1975): 68-77.
255. Walters, D. E. Comment: Campus governance must become a matter of collective bargaining. College Management 8 (May 1973): 6-7.
256. Walters, Donald E. Collective bargaining in higher education. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 092 059, 1973.
257. Weaver, Thomas L. A profile of faculty and administrator perceptions of a college's governance characteristics. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 136 870, 1977.
258. Weinberg, W. M. Structural realities of collective bargaining in public higher education. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 25 (April 1974): 4-11.
259. Whitmer, J. M., Jr.; Wolins, LeRoy; and Hart, Lynn. Profiles of faculty collective bargaining at the University of Northern Iowa, Iowa State University and the State University of Iowa. Iowa State Journal of Research 52 (August 1977): 67-97.
260. Williams, Bernard Jay. Faculty bargaining: Exclusive representation and the faculty senate. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association 24 (September 1972): 45-56.
261. Wingfield, Clyde J. Campus conflict and institutional maintenance: An agenda for public administration. Public Administration Review 30 (March/April 1970): 96-101.
262. Wise, W. M. New configurations in governance. In The troubled campus, pp. 131-136. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.
263. Wollett, Donald H. The status and trends of collective negotiations for faculty in higher education. Wisconsin Law Review 1971 (1971): 2-32.

264. Zoffer, H. J. The murky future of university administration. *College and University Journal* 12 (May 1973): 30-33.
265. Zoffer, H. J. A college administrator looks at collective bargaining. *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association* 26 (July/August 1975): 33-40.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Each member of my committee, Ray Bryan, Larry Ebbers, Arthur Gowan, George Kizer, and Clifford Smith, deserves a special note of thanks for the guidance and counsel provided during my program of studies and the completion of the dissertation.

An expression of appreciation is extended to Tony Netusil and Rex Thomas who assisted me in understanding the intricacies of statistical analysis.

My gratitude is also extended to Mr. Warren B. Kuhn, Dean of Library Services, and Mr. John C. McNee, Assistant Director for Public Services for their encouragement and patience as I attempted to balance the demands of work and study. The many individuals who worked with me in the Reference Department have been tolerant beyond expectation.

Finally, to my wife, Karen, and children, Denise, Daniel and Desmond, who have been without a husband and father too long, my gratitude for their perseverance.

APPENDIX A

Institutions Selected for the Study

Ashland College	Lincoln University
Bloomfield College	Loretto Heights College
University of Dubuque	Monmouth College
Eastern Oregon State College	Plymouth State College
Franklin Pierce College	Quinnipiac College
Hamline University	Rhode Island College
Jacksonville University	Saginaw Valley State College
Johnson State College	Wagner College

APPENDIX B

Position Statements on Academic Governance by
National Faculty Organizations

American Association of University Professors.

The Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities adopted in 1966 still is accepted as the organization's position on governance. This statement is found in Appendix C.

American Federation of Labor.

Policy statements of the Federation take the form of resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the membership. Convention resolutions passed during the period 1973-1977 concerned with governance topics are included in this Appendix. These were received from Mr. Robert Nielsen, Higher Education Director, American Federation of Labor.

TENURE QUOTAS

WHEREAS, many colleges and universities are considering or have already implemented quota systems, sometimes retroactively, under the guise of ensuring "healthy ratios" between tenured and non-tenured members of their staffs, and

WHEREAS, such quota systems often have the effect of excluding the young, women, and minorities from a career in their chosen professions, be it

RESOLVED, that the American Federation of Teachers strongly opposes the imposition of tenure quotas, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the American Federation of Teachers urges all of its college and university locals to fight against implementation of systems of tenure quotas, and to incorporate language into collective bargaining agreements prohibiting tenure quotas.

ACADEMIC RANK QUOTAS

WHEREAS, movement through the traditional academic ranks has been a normal expectation of any individual entering service in a college or university, and

WHEREAS, there are those who call for "national studies" in order to impose artificial ratios on the academic ranks, and

WHEREAS, academic rank ratios deprive many individuals of recognition of their professional attainments

BE IT RESOLVED, that the American Federation of Teachers oppose arbitrary ratios among the ranks in the colleges and universities, and be it further

RESOLVED, that college and university locals are encouraged to fight any attempt to introduce such quantitative elements into their institutions, and to incorporate language into collective bargaining agreements prohibiting academic rank quotas.

DUE PROCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

WHEREAS, probationary members of the instructional staffs of colleges and universities are generally not accorded written reasons for the denial of reappointment and tenure, and

WHEREAS, all members of the instructional staffs of colleges and universities are generally not accorded written reasons for the denial of promotion, and

WHEREAS, the denial of reasons sanctions personnel decisions that are arbitrary, discriminatory, capricious, grievously injurious to the careers of professionals, and detrimental to their students and institutions, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that the Convention of AFT calls upon all institutions to divulge the reasons for all personnel actions to the individuals directly affected by them and requesting them, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the AFT pledges its support to all instructional staff members seeking redress of grievances through academic due process and legal procedures, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the AFT calls upon all locals to incorporate these principles in collective bargaining proposals for negotiations and agreements.

National Education Association.

Although no specific policy statement has been produced regarding academic governance a resolution dealing with collective bargaining and grievance procedures has been adopted by the Representative Assembly. This resolution is not restricted to higher education.

E.6. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

The National Education Association believes that local affiliates and governing boards must negotiate written master contracts. Such contracts shall result from negotiation in good faith between associations and governing boards through representatives of their choosing, to establish, maintain, protect, and improve terms and conditions for professional service and other matters of concern, including a provision for agency shop.

Grievance procedures shall be provided in the master contract with definite steps to appeal the application or interpretation of the contract. Binding arbitration shall be a part of the grievance procedure.

The Association also recommends that state affiliates seek statutory penalties for governing boards that do not bargain in good faith or do not comply with negotiated contracts.

The Association believes in the necessity of federal collective bargaining for teachers, but it will also pursue collective bargaining legislation in each state to protect the rights of teachers.¹

¹NEA Handbook 1976-77, pp. 219, 220.

APPENDIX C

American Association of University ProfessorsAmerican Council on EducationAssociation of Governing Boards of Universities and CollegesStatement onGovernment of Colleges and UniversitiesI. Introduction

This Statement is a call to mutual understanding regarding the government of colleges and universities. Understanding, based on community of interest, and producing joint effort, is essential for at least three reasons. First, the academic institution, public or private, often had become less autonomous; buildings, research, and student tuition are supported by funds over which the college or university exercises a diminishing control. Legislative and executive governmental authority, at all levels, plays a part in the making of important decisions in academic policy. If these voices and forces are to be successfully heard and integrated, the academic institution must be in a position to meet them with its own generally unified view. Second, regard for the welfare of the institution remains important despite the mobility and interchange of scholars. Third, a college or university in which all the components are aware of their interdependence, of the usefulness of communication among themselves, and of the force of joint action will enjoy increased capacity to solve educational problems.

II. The Academic Institution: Joint Effort

A. Preliminary Considerations

The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.

Joint effort in an academic institution will take a variety of forms appropriate to the kinds of situations encountered. In some instances, an initial exploration or recommendation will be made by the president with consideration by the faculty at a later stage; in other instances, a first and essentially definitive recommendation will be made by the faculty, subject to the endorsement of the president and the governing board. In still others, a substantive contribution can be made when student leaders are responsibly involved in the process. Although the variety of such approaches may be wide, at least two general conclusions regarding joint effort seem clearly warranted: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand, as developed hereinafter.

B. Determination of General Educational Policy

The general educational policy, i.e., the objectives of an institution and the nature, range, and pace of its efforts, is shaped by the

institutional charter or by law, by tradition and historical development, by the present needs of the community of the institution, and by the professional aspirations and standards of those directly involved in its work. Every board will wish to go beyond its formal trustee obligation to conserve the accomplishment of the past and to engage seriously with the future; every faculty will seek to conduct an operation worthy of scholarly standards of learning; every administrative officer will strive to meet his charge and to attain the goals of the institution. The interests of all are coordinate and related, and unilateral effort can lead to confusion or conflict. Essential to a solution is a reasonably explicit statement on general educational policy. Operating responsibility and authority, and procedures for continuing review, should be clearly defined in official regulations.

When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction.

Special considerations may require particular accommodations: (1) a publicly supported institution may be regulated by statutory provisions, and (2) a church-controlled institution may be limited by its charter or bylaws. When such external requirements influence course content and manner of instruction or research, they impair the educational effectiveness of the institution.

Such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis to be given to the various elements of the educational and research program should involve participation

of governing board, administration and faculty prior to final decision.

C. Internal Operations of the Institution

The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community.

Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university. The channels of communication should be established and maintained by joint endeavor. Distinction should be observed between the institutional system of communication and the system of responsibility for the making of decisions.

A second area calling for joint effort in internal operations is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.

A third area is budgeting. The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation of authority will

determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to ~~serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the~~ chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. His dual role requires that he be able to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. He should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

The selection of academic deans and other chief academic officers should be the responsibility of the president with the advice of and in consultation with the appropriate faculty.

Determinations of faculty status, normally based on the recommendations of the faculty groups involved, are discussed in Part V of this Statement; but it should here be noted that the building of a strong faculty requires careful joint effort in such actions as staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. Joint action should also govern dismissals; the applicable principles and procedures in these matters are well-established.

D. External Relations of the Institution

Anyone--a member of the governing board, the president or other member of the administration, a member of the faculty, or a member of the

student body or the alumni--affects the institution when he speaks of it in public. An individual who speaks unofficially should so indicate. An official spokesman for the institution, the board, the administration, the faculty, or the student body should be guided by established policy.

It should be noted that only the board speaks legally for the whole institution, although it may delegate responsibility to an agent.

The right of a board member, an administrative officer, a faculty member, or a student to speak on general educational questions or about the administration and operations of his own institution is a part of his right as a citizen and should not be abridged by the institution. There exist, of course, legal bounds relating to defamation of character, and there are questions of propriety.

III. The Academic Institution: The Governing Board

The governing board has a special obligation to assure that the history of the college or university shall serve as a prelude and inspiration to the future. The board helps relate the institution to its chief community: e.g., the community college to serve the educational needs of a defined population area or group, the church-controlled college to be cognizant of the announced position of its denomination, and the comprehensive university to discharge the many duties and to accept the appropriate new challenges which are its concern at the several levels of higher education.

The governing board of an institution of higher education in the United States operates, with few exceptions, as the final institutional

authority. Private institutions are established by charters; public institutions are established by constitutional or statutory provisions. In private institutions the board is frequently self-perpetuating; in public colleges and universities the present membership of a board may be asked to suggest candidates for appointment. As a whole and individually when the governing board confronts the problem of succession, serious attention should be given to obtaining properly qualified persons. Where public law calls for election of governing board members, means should be found to insure the nomination of fully suited persons, and the electorate should be informed of the relevant criteria for board membership.

Since the membership of the board may embrace both individual and collective competence of recognized weight, its advice or help may be sought through established channels by other components of the academic community. The governing board of an institution of higher education, while maintaining a general overview, entrusts the conduct of administration to the administrative officers, the president and the deans, and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty. The board should undertake appropriate self-limitation.

One of the governing board's important tasks is to ensure the publication of codified statements that define the over-all policies and procedures of the institution under its jurisdiction.

The board plays a central role in relating the likely needs of the future to predictable resources; it has the responsibility for husbanding the endowment; it is responsible for obtaining needed capital and

operating funds; and in the broadest sense of the term it should pay attention to personnel policy. In order to fulfill these duties, the board should be aided by, and may insist upon, the development of long-range planning by the administration and faculty.

When ignorance or ill-will threatens the institution or any part of it, the governing board must be available for support. In grave crises it will be expected to serve as a champion. Although the action to be taken by it will usually be on behalf of the president, the faculty, or the student body, the board should make clear that the protection it offers to an individual or a group is, in fact, a fundamental defense of the vested interests of society in the educational institution.

IV. The Academic Institution: The President

The president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his capacity for institutional leadership. He shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system which links the components of the academic community. He represents his institution to its many publics. His leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty.

As the chief planning officer of an institution, the president has a special obligation to innovate and initiate. The degree to which a president can envision new horizons for his institution, and can persuade others to see them and to work toward them, will often constitute the chief measure of his administration.

The president must at times, with or without support, infuse new life into a department; relatedly, he may at times be required, working within the concept of tenure, to solve problems of obsolescence. The president will necessarily utilize the judgments of the faculty, but in the interest of academic standards he may also seek outside evaluations by scholars of acknowledged competence.

It is the duty of the president to see to it that the standards and procedures in operational use within the college or university conform to the policy established by the governing board and to the standards of sound academic practice. It is also incumbent on the president to insure that faculty views, including dissenting views, are presented to the board in those areas and on those issues where responsibilities are shared. Similarly the faculty should be informed of the views of the board and the administration on like issues.

The president is largely responsible for the maintenance of existing institutional resources and the creation of new resources; he has ultimate managerial responsibility for a large area of nonacademic activities, he is responsible for public understanding, and by the nature of his office is the chief spokesman of his institution. In these and other areas his work is to plan, to organize, to direct, and to represent. The presidential function should receive the general support of board and faculty.

V. The Academic Institution: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, manpower limitations, the time element and the policies of other groups, bodies and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of the colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise there is the more general competence of experienced

faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the chief academic officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chairman or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of his department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and of related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chairman or department head should not have tenure in his office; his tenure as a faculty member is a matter of separate right. He should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to re-election or to re-appointment by procedures which involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chairman has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty

participation should be designed, approved and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.

The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.

Among the means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use are: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees, (2) joint ad hoc committees, (3) standing liaison committees, (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies, and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.

On Student Status

When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness. The obstacles to such participation are large and should not be minimized: inexperience,

untested capacity, a transitory status which means that present action does not carry with it subsequent responsibility, and the inescapable fact that the other components of the institution are in a position of judgment over the students. It is important to recognize that student needs are strongly related to educational experience, both formal and informal. Students expect, and have a right to expect, that the educational process will be structured, that they will be stimulated by it to become independent adults, and that they will have effectively transmitted to them the cultural heritage of the larger society. If institutional support is to have its fullest possible meaning it should incorporate the strength, freshness of view and idealism of the student body.

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and (4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution.

APPENDIX D

PART II

DISTRIBUTION OF DECISION-MAKING

The American Association for Higher Education in its Faculty Participation in Academic Governance published in 1967, proposed a Distribution of Authority Model that could be used to determine the extent of faculty and administration involvement in academic governance. The model consists of five categories: Administrative Dominance, Administrative Primacy, Shared Authority, Faculty Primacy, and Faculty Dominance. Each of these categories is briefly described as follows:

- 1/ Administrative Dominance -- Decisions are made unilaterally by the administration;
- 2/ Administrative Primacy -- Decision-making authority rests primarily with the administration but the faculty is actively consulted;
- 3/ Shared Authority -- Faculty and administration both exercise effective influence in decision-making;
- 4/ Faculty Primacy -- Decision-making authority rests primarily with the faculty but the administration is actively consulted;
- 5/ Faculty Dominance -- Decisions are made unilaterally by the faculty.

Using these definitions, please circle the number that best represents your perception of the distribution of authority as it relates to the way each issue was decided at the time of the collective bargaining representation election (Column A) and is presently decided (Column B).

COLUMN A					COLUMN B					
At the time of the collective bargaining representation election on your campus, which of the categories best describes the decision-making process for each issue.					At the present time which of the categories best describes the decision-making process for each issue on your campus.					
Administrative Dominance	Administrative Primacy	Shared Authority	Faculty Primacy	Faculty Dominance	Types of Issues	Administrative Dominance	Administrative Primacy	Shared Authority	Faculty Primacy	Faculty Dominance
1	2	3	4	5	1/ Faculty appointments	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2/ Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3/ Faculty promotion	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4/ Faculty tenure awards	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5/ Selection of the president	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6/ Selection of academic deans	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7/ Selection of departmental chairpersons	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8/ Faculty salary scales	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9/ Individual faculty salaries	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10/ Physical facilities	1	2	3	4	5

At the time of the collective bargaining representation election on your campus, which of the categories best describes the decision-making process for each issue.

At the present time which of the categories best describes the decision-making process for each issue on your campus.

Administrative Dominance	Administrative Primacy	Shared Authority	Faculty Primacy	Faculty Dominance	Types of Issues	Administrative Dominance	Administrative Primacy	Shared Authority	Faculty Primacy	Faculty Dominance
1	2	3	4	5	1/ Faculty appointments	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	2/ Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	3/ Faculty promotion	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	4/ Faculty tenure awards	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	5/ Selection of the president	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	6/ Selection of academic deans	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	7/ Selection of departmental chairpersons	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	8/ Faculty salary scales	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	9/ Individual faculty salaries	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	10/ Physical facilities building programs	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	11/ Short-range institutional planning	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	12/ Long-range institutional planning	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	13/ Budget formulation	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	14/ Curriculum offerings	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	15/ Degree requirements	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	16/ Academic performance of students	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	17/ Types of degrees offered	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	18/ Establishment of new academic programs	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	19/ Student admission requirements	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	20/ Average faculty teaching load	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	21/ Faculty teaching assignments	1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5	22/ Establishment of	1	2	3	4	5

12/ Articles published in the past two years:

1/ 0 3/ 2 5/ 4
2/ 1 4/ 3 6/ 5 or more 181

13/ Books published in the past two years:

1/ 0 3/ 2 5/ 4
2/ 1 4/ 3 6/ 5 or more

14/ Have you served on a departmental committee in the past two years:

1/ Yes
2/ No

15/ Have you served on an institution-wide committee in the past two years:

1/ Yes
2/ No

If you were included in the bargaining unit at the time of the representation election, please answer the next three questions. If not, proceed to Question 19.

16/ Were you a member of a bargaining organization at the time of the representation election:

1/ Yes
2/ No

17/ Did you vote for collective bargaining:

1/ Yes
2/ No

18/ Are you now a member of a bargaining organization:

1/ Yes
2/ No

19/ Was there a faculty senate or similar body in existence at the time of the vote on collective bargaining:

1/ Yes
2/ No

If yes, does the faculty senate or similar body still exist:

1/ Yes
2/ No

20/ If you answered question 19 affirmatively, how would you categorize the change in senate influence or power:

1/ Decreased significantly 3/ No change 5/ Increased significantly
2/ Decreased slightly 4/ Increased slightly

21/ How would you categorize the change in influence or power of the Board of Trustees (Regents, Governors) since the vote on collective bargaining:

1/ Decreased significantly 3/ No change 5/ Increased significantly
2/ Decreased slightly 4/ Increased slightly

22/ How would you categorize the change in the influence or power of the chief executive officer (President, Chancellor) since the vote on collective bargaining:

1/ Decreased significantly 3/ No change 5/ Increased significantly
2/ Decreased slightly 4/ Increased slightly

CONFIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

182

PART I

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

DIRECTIONS: Please circle only one response for each question. Answer the questions on the front and back sides of the form, then complete the questions on the inside of the questionnaire.

1/ College or university position:

- 1/ Faculty
2/ Administrator

2/ Academic rank:

- 1/ Instructor 3/ Associate Professor 5/ Not applicable
2/ Assistant Professor 4/ Professor

3/ Employment status:

- 1/ Full-time
2/ Part-time

4/ Tenure status:

- 1/ Tenured 3/ Not applicable
2/ Nontenured

5/ Highest degree earned:

- 1/ Bachelor 3/ Ph.D., Ed.D., or equivalent
2/ Master 4/ Professional (e.g., J.D., M.D.)

6/ Discipline:

- 1/ Humanities 4/ Biological Science 7/ Other
2/ Social Science 5/ Engineering
3/ Physical Science 6/ Agriculture

7/ Salary:

- 1/ Below \$9,999 4/ \$20,000-\$24,999 7/ More than \$35,000
2/ \$10,000-\$14,999 5/ \$25,000-\$29,999
3/ \$15,000-\$19,999 6/ \$30,000-\$34,999

8/ Age:

- 1/ 21-30 years 3/ 41-50 years 5/ Over 60 years
2/ 31-40 years 4/ 51-60 years

9/ Number of years on staff at present institution:

- 1/ 1-3 years 3/ 7-9 years 5/ More than 12 years
2/ 4-6 years 4/ 10-12 years

10/ Number of colleges or universities where you have been a member of the staff:

- 1/ 1 3/ 3 5/ 5 or more
2/ 2 4/ 4

11/ Number of professional groups to which you belong:

- 1/ 0 3/ 2 5/ 4
2/ 1 4/ 3 6/ 5 or more

Iowa State University of Science and Technology Ames, Iowa 50011



Research Institute for Studies in Education
College of Education
The Quadrangle
Telephone 515-294-7009

Dear Colleague:

Governance and collective bargaining in higher education are two processes that have influenced one another during the past decade. You are being asked to participate in a study of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance that have occurred since your faculty chose the "no agent" option in the representation election. Your institution along with a number of other colleges and universities has been selected for this analysis.

Enclosed is a questionnaire asking for your perceptions of the changes in governance that have taken place at your institution since the bargaining election. The instrument is brief; it should take no more than twenty minutes to complete. A postage paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Please feel free to add any comments you would like in the space provided on the inside page.

The name of your institution has been placed in the upper right hand corner of the questionnaire, in order that responses may be analyzed by category of institution. The instrument has not been coded in any other way. All responses to this questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. No identification will be made of individuals or of specific institutions in reporting the results. If you would care to identify yourself I will be happy to send you a copy of the results.

Your responses will be extremely important in order to compare faculty and administrator perceptions at different institutions. I appreciate your participation and hope you will find the questionnaire interesting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Kenneth E. Marks".

Kenneth E. Marks

Enclosure



*Research Institute for Studies in Education
College of Education
The Quadrangle
Telephone 515-294-7009*

Dear Colleague:

Governance and collective bargaining in higher education are two processes that have influenced one another during the past decade. You are being asked to participate in a study of faculty and administrator perceptions of changes in governance that have occurred since your faculty voted to bargain collectively. Your institution along with a number of other colleges and universities has been selected for this analysis.

Enclosed is a questionnaire asking for your perceptions of the changes in governance that have taken place at your institution since the bargaining election. The instrument is brief; it should take no more than twenty minutes to complete. A postage paid return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Please feel free to add any comments you would like in the space provided on the inside page.

The name of your institution has been placed in the upper right hand corner of the questionnaire, in order that responses may be analyzed by bargaining agent and category of institution. The instrument has not been coded in any other way. All responses to this questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential. No identification will be made of individuals or of specific institution in reporting the results. If you would care to identify yourself I will be happy to send you a copy of the results.

Your responses will be extremely important in order to compare faculty and administrator perceptions at different institutions. I appreciate your participation and hope you will find the questionnaire interesting.

Sincerely,

Kenneth E. Marks

Enclosure

APPENDIX E

Table 15. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 1

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	17	1.8235	.8090	3.0000	.5000
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	2.6667	.5774
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal	Faculty	17	1.3529	.6063	2.7647	.8314
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	17	1.6471	.7859	3.0000	1.0000
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.3333
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	17	1.7647	.8314	3.2353	.7524
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	17	1.5294	.6243	2.7647	.4372
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	1.6667	1.5275
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	17	1.1765	.3930	2.0588	.8269
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.0000	1.0000
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	17	1.6471	.9315	3.8235	.9510
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.3333	.5774
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	17	1.5882	.8703	3.0588	.7475
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	17	1.2353	.8314	2.6471	1.0572
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	17	1.2353	.5623	2.0000	.7071
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	1.6667	.5774

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	17	1.6471	1.0572	2.7059	.9196
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.0000	.0001
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	17	1.5294	.8745	2.8824	.8575
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.0000	.0001
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	17	1.2353	.4372	2.0000	.5000
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	1.6667	.5774
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	17	3.1176	.9926	3.8235	.9510
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	17	2.9412	.8269	3.5882	.8703
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	17	3.5294	1.1789	4.0588	.7475
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	3.0000	1.0000
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	17	2.5294	.7998	3.1176	.8575
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	3.0000	1.0000
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	17	2.7059	.8489	3.3529	.6063
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	1.5275
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	17	1.7647	.6642	2.7059	.9196
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	17	2.1176	1.0537	3.5882	1.1213
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.6667	.5774
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	17	2.8235	1.0146	3.6417	.8618
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	3.6667	.5774
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	17	3.4118	1.2277	4.2941	.9196
	Administrators	3	2.0000	2.0000	4.0000	.0001
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	17	3.4118	1.1213	4.2353	.9034
	Administrators	3	2.0000	2.0000	4.3333	.5774

Table 15 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	17	2.7647	1.1472	3.7647	.9034
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.3333	.5774
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	17	3.0588	1.0290	3.9412	.8269
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.3333	.5774

Table 16. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 2

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	10	2.2000	1.1353	2.6000	.9661
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	2.3000	.5774
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	10	1.8000	.9189	2.5000	.5270
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	2.0000	.0001
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	10	1.6000	.8433	2.4000	.6992
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	2.3333	.5774
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	10	1.9000	.9944	2.5000	.5270
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	2.3333	.5774
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	10	1.3000	.8233	1.5000	.7071
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	2.0000	.0001
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	10	1.4000	.8433	1.7000	.4830
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.3333	.5774
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	10	1.8000	.9189	2.5000	.7071
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	2.0000	.0001
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	10	1.6000	.9661	2.8000	.9189
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	3.0000	.0001
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	10	1.5000	.8498	2.7000	.9487
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	3.0000	.0001
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	10	1.5000	1.0801	1.7000	.9487
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	1.3333	.5774

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	10	1.6000	.6992	2.2000	.4216
		Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	2.0000	1.0000
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	10	1.5000	.7071	2.0000	.6667
		Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	1.6667	.5774
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	10	1.5000	.8498	1.7000	.8233
		Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	1.6667	.5774
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	10	3.3000	1.4944	3.9000	.3162
		Administrators	3	1.6667	2.8868	4.0000	1.0000
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	10	3.2000	1.6865	3.9000	.8756
		Administrators	3	1.6667	2.8868	4.0000	1.0000
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	10	3.5000	1.7795	4.0000	.9428
		Administrators	3	1.6667	2.8868	4.6667	.5774
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	10	1.9000	1.2867	2.4000	1.1738
		Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	2.6667	1.5275
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	10	2.0000	1.0541	2.7000	.8233
		Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.6667	.5774
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	10	2.6000	1.5055	3.0000	1.0541
		Administrators	3	1.3333	2.3094	2.6667	.5774
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	10	2.1000	1.1005	3.1000	.3162
		Administrators	3	.0000	.0000	2.3333	2.0817
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	10	2.8000	1.3984	3.3000	.4830
		Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	2.6667	.5774
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	10	3.4000	1.5055	4.0000	.8165
		Administrators	3	.0000	.0000	2.0000	2.0000
23.	Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	10	3.4000	1.5055	3.9000	.9944
		Administrators	3	.0000	.0000	2.3333	2.0817

Table 16 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	10	2.3000	1.1595	3.0000	.9428
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	3.3333	1.5275
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	10	2.5000	1.0801	3.6000	.9661
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	2.6667	1.1547

Table 17. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 3

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	21	1.8571	.9636	2.5714	.9258
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	2.3333	.5774
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	21	1.2857	.4629	2.0952	.7003
	Administrators	3	.6667	.5774	1.3333	1.1547
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	21	1.4762	.5118	2.1429	.8536
	Administrators	3	.6667	.5774	2.0000	.0001
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	21	1.4286	.5071	2.0000	.5477
	Administrators	3	.6667	.5774	2.0000	.0001
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	21	1.6667	.7303	2.0000	.7746
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	1.3333	.5774
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	21	1.8095	.6796	2.3810	1.0235
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	2.3333	.5774
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	21	2.5238	1.2091	3.6667	.8563
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.3333	.5774
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	21	1.0476	.2182	3.2381	.6249
	Administrators	3	.6667	.5774	3.0000	1.0000
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	21	1.1429	.3586	3.0952	.7684
	Administrators	3	.6667	.5774	3.3333	.5774
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	21	1.3333	.4830	1.7143	.6437
	Administrators	3	.6667	.5774	1.3333	.5774

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	21	1.8095	.9284	2.6190	.6690
		Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	2.3333	.5774
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	21	1.6667	.5774	2.3810	.5896
		Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	2.0000	.0001
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	21	1.2857	.4629	1.7619	.8309
		Administrators	3	.6667	.5774	1.6667	.5774
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	21	3.7619	.7684	4.0476	.6690
		Administrators	3	2.6667	2.5166	3.6667	1.1547
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	21	3.9524	.8646	4.2381	.7003
		Administrators	3	2.6667	2.5166	3.6667	1.5275
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	21	4.2381	.8309	4.3810	.8047
		Administrators	3	3.0000	2.6458	4.0000	1.0000
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	21	3.5238	.8136	3.7619	.8309
		Administrators	3	1.6667	1.5275	2.3333	.5774
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	21	3.0952	.8309	3.3333	.8563
		Administrators	3	1.6667	1.5275	2.3333	.5774
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	21	2.8571	1.1526	3.0000	1.0954
		Administrators	3	1.6667	1.5275	2.6667	.5774
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	21	2.3810	.8047	3.2857	.7838
		Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	3.0000	.0001
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	21	3.2381	1.0911	3.7619	.7684
		Administrators	3	2.0000	2.0000	3.0000	1.0000
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	21	4.0476	.8646	4.4286	.5976
		Administrators	3	2.3333	2.0817	3.3333	.5774
23.	Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	21	4.2381	.8309	4.5238	.6796
		Administrators	3	2.0000	1.7321	3.3333	.5774

Table 17 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	21	2.6667	.8563	2.9524	.5896
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	2.3333	.5774
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	21	3.0000	1.2247	3.3333	.9661
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	2.6667	.5774

Table 18. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 4

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	24	2.1167	.7614	2.0000	.7802
	Administrators	6	3.0000	.0001	2.6667	.8165
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	24	1.9167	.7755	1.6250	.6469
	Administrators	6	2.6667	.5164	2.5000	.8367
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	24	2.0833	.7755	1.7500	.7372
	Administrators	6	2.6667	.5164	2.5000	.8367
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	24	2.0417	.6241	1.6250	.6469
	Administrators	6	2.6667	.5164	2.5000	.8367
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	24	2.4167	1.2129	2.3333	1.1672
	Administrators	6	2.8333	.4082	2.6667	.8165
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	24	1.8333	.8165	1.5833	.7173
	Administrators	6	2.3333	.8165	2.3333	.8165
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	24	1.8750	.9918	1.50000	.8341
	Administrators	6	2.0000	1.2649	2.0000	1.2649
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	24	1.7500	.9441	1.6250	.8754
	Administrators	6	2.3333	.8165	2.3333	.8165
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	24	1.7917	.7790	1.6250	.7697
	Administrators	6	2.3333	.8165	2.3333	.8165
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	24	1.9167	.7173	1.8333	.7020
	Administrators	6	2.0000	.6325	2.1667	.7528

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	24	2.1250	.6124	2.0833	.6539
		Administrators	6	2.1667	.7528	2.3333	.8165
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	24	2.1667	.6370	2.1250	.7974
		Administrators	6	2.3333	.8165	2.5000	.8367
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	24	1.6667	.7020	1.5417	.6580
		Administrators	6	2.6667	.8165	2.6667	.8165
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	24	3.0833	.9743	2.7917	.9315
		Administrators	6	3.3333	.8165	3.1667	1.1690
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	24	3.1250	.9470	3.0833	.9286
		Administrators	6	3.5000	.8367	3.3333	1.2111
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	24	3.5833	1.4116	3.4583	1.3825
		Administrators	6	4.0000	.8944	3.6667	1.5055
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	24	2.7083	.9546	2.5417	.9771
		Administrators	6	3.1667	.4082	2.8333	.9832
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	24	2.5833	.7173	2.2917	.7506
		Administrators	6	3.5000	.5477	3.1667	1.1690
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	24	2.5833	1.1389	2.3750	1.0555
		Administrators	6	2.6667	1.3663	2.3333	1.5055
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	24	2.3333	.8681	2.2083	.8330
		Administrators	6	3.0000	.6325	2.6667	1.0328
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	24	3.1250	.9470	2.7917	1.0206
		Administrators	6	3.0000	.6325	2.6667	1.0328
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	24	2.7917	1.1413	2.7500	1.1516
		Administrators	6	3.3333	1.0328	3.0000	1.4142
23.	Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	24	3.2083	1.2151	3.0417	1.3015
		Administrators	6	3.3333	1.0328	3.0000	1.4142

Table 18 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	24	2.1250	.8999	2.0417	.9079
	Administrators	6	3.0000	.0001	2.6667	.8165
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	24	2.1667	1.0072	2.0417	1.0417
	Administrators	6	3.0000	.0001	2.6667	.8165

Table 19. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 5

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	16	1.9375	.7719	2.2500	.7746
	Administrators	4	2.0000	.0001	3.2500	.9574
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	16	1.9375	1.1236	2.6250	.6191
	Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	2.7500	.5000
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	16	2.0000	.7303	2.8750	.8062
	Administrators	4	1.7500	.5000	3.0000	.8165
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	16	1.1875	1.0468	1.7500	1.5706
	Administrators	4	2.0000	.8165	3.2500	1.2583
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	16	1.0625	.4425	1.3750	.7188
	Administrators	4	1.5000	1.0000	2.0000	.8165
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	16	1.1875	.4031	1.7500	.5774
	Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	1.7500	.5000
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	16	1.6250	.7188	2.1250	.9574
	Administrators	4	1.5000	.5774	2.7500	.9574
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	16	1.1875	.5439	2.3750	.8062
	Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	2.5000	1.2910
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	16	1.2500	.5774	2.5625	1.1529
	Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	2.5000	1.2910
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	16	1.0625	.2500	1.1875	.4031
	Administrators	4	1.0000	.0001	1.7500	.5000

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	16	1.4375	.5123	2.2500	.7746
		Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	2.2500	.5000
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	16	1.2500	.4472	1.9375	.5737
		Administrators	4	1.5000	.5774	2.2500	.5000
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	16	1.2500	.4472	1.4375	.6292
		Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	1.7500	.9574
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	16	2.9375	1.2366	3.2500	1.1255
		Administrators	4	2.0000	.8165	3.5000	.5774
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	16	2.8750	1.0247	3.2500	1.0000
		Administrators	4	2.0000	.8165	3.7500	.9574
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	16	3.2500	1.5706	3.7500	1.4376
		Administrators	4	2.7500	.9574	3.5000	.5774
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	16	2.0625	1.1236	2.5625	1.0935
		Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	2.5000	1.0000
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	16	2.2500	1.0000	2.9375	.9287
		Administrators	4	1.7500	.5000	3.0000	.0001
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	16	1.1875	.4031	1.6875	.7042
		Administrators	4	1.0000	.0001	1.7500	.5000
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	16	1.6875	.7932	2.5000	.8944
		Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	3.2500	.9574
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	16	2.8750	1.1475	2.9375	.8539
		Administrators	4	1.7500	.9574	3.2500	.9574
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	16	3.0000	1.5492	3.5000	1.4142
		Administrators	4	2.5000	1.2910	3.7500	.5000
23.	Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	16	3.5000	1.3166	3.7500	1.3416
		Administrators	4	2.2500	.9574	4.0000	.8165

Table 19 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	16	2.1250	1.3601	2.5000	.8944
	Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	2.5000	.5774
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	16	2.8125	1.3769	2.8750	.5000
	Administrators	4	1.5000	1.0000	2.5000	.5774

Table 20. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 6

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	21	2.9524	1.3593	3.1429	1.1952
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	21	2.9048	1.3002	2.9048	1.1360
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	21	2.8571	1.2364	2.7619	1.0443
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	21	2.7143	1.2306	2.3810	1.1609
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	21	2.1429	1.2762	2.0952	1.3002
	Administrators	1	2.0000	.0000	2.0000	.0000
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	21	1.6667	1.3166	1.5238	1.0779
	Administrators	1	2.0000	.0000	2.0000	.0000
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	21	2.5238	1.4359	2.6190	1.4310
	Administrators	1	2.0000	.0000	2.0000	.0000
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	21	1.8571	1.0142	1.8095	.8729
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	21	2.2381	1.2209	2.1905	1.0779
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	21	1.6190	.7400	1.5238	.6796
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	21	2.1905	1.1233	1.9524	1.0713
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	21	2.0925	.9952	1.7619	.9952
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	21	1.8571	.7928	1.7619	.8309
	Administrators	1	2.0000	.0000	2.0000	.0000
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	21	3.5238	1.5690	3.4762	1.5040
	Administrators	1	4.0000	.0000	4.0000	.0000
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	21	3.5714	1.4343	3.5714	1.3990
	Administrators	1	4.0000	.0000	4.0000	.0000
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	21	3.9524	1.5645	4.0000	1.4491
	Administrators	1	4.0000	.0000	4.0000	.0000
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	21	3.0476	1.4655	2.7619	1.3749
	Administrators	1	4.0000	.0000	4.0000	.0000
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	21	2.8095	1.4359	2.5714	1.3990
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	21	2.2857	1.2306	2.0952	1.1792
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	21	2.3333	1.3166	2.2381	1.2611
	Administrators	1	2.0000	.0000	2.0000	.0000
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	21	3.5238	1.4359	3.4762	1.3645
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	21	4.1429	1.6213	4.3810	1.3220
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	21	4.0476	1.6875	4.2857	1.4880
	Administrators	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000

Table 20 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	21	2.4286	1.2873	2.1905	1.2498
	Administrator	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	21	2.3333	1.1547	2.2857	1.1019
	Administrator	1	3.0000	.0000	3.0000	.0000

Table 21. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 7

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	15	2.0667	.8837	2.3333	.9759
	Administrators	2	2.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	15	1.3333	.7237	1.5333	.9155
	Administrators	2	2.0000	1.4142	2.5000	.7071
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	15	1.2667	.5936	1.2667	.5936
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.0000	.0001
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	15	1.2000	.5606	1.3333	.6172
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	15	1.1333	.7432	1.2667	.8837
	Administrators	2	2.5000	.7071	3.0000	.0001
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	15	1.3333	.7237	1.5333	.7432
	Administrators	2	2.0000	1.4142	3.0000	.0001
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	15	1.4667	.7432	2.2000	1.0142
	Administrators	2	2.0000	1.4142	3.0000	.0001
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	15	1.1333	.5164	1.0667	.4577
	Administrators	2	1.0000	.0001	1.5000	.7071
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	15	1.1333	.5164	1.2000	.5606
	Administrators	2	1.0000	.0001	1.5000	.7071
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	15	1.3333	.7237	1.6000	.8281
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.0000	.0001

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	15	1.9333	.8837	2.2000	.9411
		Administrators	2	2.0000	1.4142	2.5000	.7071
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	15	1.4667	.7432	1.6000	.8281
		Administrators	2	2.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	15	1.1333	.5164	1.4000	.6325
		Administrators	2	1.0000	.0001	1.0000	.0001
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	15	3.4000	1.2984	3.4667	1.2459
		Administrators	2	3.5000	.7071	3.5000	.7071
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	15	3.1333	1.3020	3.1333	1.3020
		Administrators	2	4.0000	1.4142	4.0000	1.4142
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	15	3.6667	1.4475	3.6667	1.4475
		Administrators	2	4.0000	1.4142	4.0000	1.4142
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	15	2.8667	1.1255	2.8667	1.1255
		Administrators	2	2.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	15	2.6667	1.2344	2.8000	1.2071
		Administrators	2	3.0000	.0001	3.0000	.0001
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	15	2.2000	1.0142	2.2667	1.0328
		Administrators	2	2.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	15	1.4667	.7432	1.4667	.7432
		Administrators	2	3.0000	.0001	3.0000	.0001
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	15	2.4000	1.2984	2.5333	1.3020
		Administrators	2	3.0000	.0001	3.0000	.0001
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	15	2.8667	1.3558	3.0000	1.4142
		Administrators	2	4.0000	1.4142	4.0000	1.4142
23.	Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	15	2.8667	1.3558	3.0000	1.4142
		Administrators	2	4.0000	1.4142	4.0000	1.4142

Table 21 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	15	1.9333	.9612	2.2000	.9411
	Administrators	2	2.0000	1.4142	2.0000	1.4142
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	15	2.0000	1.1339	2.7333	1.2228
	Administrators	2	3.0000	.0001	3.0000	.0001

Table 22. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 8

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	22	1.9091	.8112	2.1364	.7743
	Administrators	3	2.3333	.5774	3.0000	1.0000
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	22	1.9091	.8112	2.1364	.7102
	Administrators	3	2.3333	.5774	2.3333	.5774
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	22	1.8182	.8528	2.0909	.7502
	Administrators	3	2.3333	.5774	2.6667	.5774
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	22	1.7273	.8827	1.9091	.7502
	Administrators	3	2.0000	1.0000	2.3333	.5774
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	22	2.0909	.7502	2.0909	.6838
	Administrators	3	1.6667	.5774	1.6667	.5774
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	22	1.5909	.7341	1.8182	.7950
	Administrators	3	1.6667	.5774	2.0000	1.0000
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	22	1.8182	1.1396	2.1818	1.0527
	Administrators	3	1.3333	1.1547	2.0000	2.0000
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	22	1.4091	.7964	2.4545	.9117
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.0000	3.6667	1.5275
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	22	1.7273	1.0320	2.3636	.9535
	Administrators	3	1.3333	.5774	2.0000	1.0000
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	22	1.3636	.5811	1.5000	.6726
	Administrators	3	1.0000	.0001	1.3333	.5774

11.	Short-range institu- tional planning	Faculty	22	1.8636	.7102	2.0455	.5755
		Administrators	3	1.3333	.5774	1.6667	.5774
12.	Long-range institu- tional planning	Faculty	22	1.7273	.7673	1.8182	.5885
		Administrators	3	1.3333	.5774	1.3333	.5774
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	22	1.5909	.7964	1.6364	.6580
		Administrators	3	1.3333	.5774	1.6667	.5774
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	22	2.6364	.9535	3.2273	.7516
		Administrators	3	2.6667	.5774	3.0000	1.0000
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	22	2.7273	.8270	3.0455	.5755
		Administrators	3	2.6667	.5774	3.0000	1.0000
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	22	3.2727	1.1205	3.5909	.8541
		Administrators	3	3.3333	1.1547	3.6667	1.5275
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	22	2.1818	.8528	2.2727	.8827
		Administrators	3	2.6667	1.5275	2.3333	1.1547
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	22	2.2273	1.0660	2.3182	.8937
		Administrators	3	2.6667	.5774	2.6667	.5774
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	22	2.2273	.8691	2.3636	.7895
		Administrators	3	2.6667	.5774	3.0000	1.0000
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	22	2.0909	.9715	2.3636	.9535
		Administrators	3	2.0000	1.0000	2.6667	1.5275
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	22	3.1364	1.2834	3.4545	1.0108
		Administrators	3	2.3333	.5774	3.0000	1.0000
22.	Establishment of de- partmental committees	Faculty	22	2.9091	1.1509	3.5000	1.0579
		Administrators	3	3.6667	.5774	3.6667	.5774
23.	Membership of depart- mental committees	Faculty	22	3.0909	1.1916	3.6818	.9455
		Administrators	3	4.0000	.0001	4.0000	.0001

Table 22 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	22	2.5455	1.2239	3.1818	1.2960
	Administrators	3	2.3333	.5774	4.0000	1.7321
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	22	2.8636	1.2069	3.4545	1.0568
	Administrators	3	2.6667	.5774	4.0000	1.7321

Table 23. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 9

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	19	2.2105	1.3157	1.5263	.7723
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	19	1.8947	1.3289	1.3158	.5824
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	19	1.8421	1.2140	1.2105	.4189
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	19	1.8421	1.2140	1.2632	.5620
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	19	1.6316	1.2115	1.5263	1.1239
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	19	1.3158	.8201	1.2632	.6534
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	19	1.7895	1.0842	1.4737	.6967
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	19	1.3684	.8951	2.3684	.9551
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	19	1.3684	.7609	2.2105	1.2283
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	19	1.4737	1.1723	1.6316	1.1648
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--

11.	Short-range institu- tional planning	Faculty Administrators	19 0	1.3684 --	.8307 --	1.7368 --	.9335 --
12.	Long-range institu- tional planning	Faculty Administrators	19 0	1.4737 --	.7723 --	1.5789 --	.7685 --
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty Administrators	19 0	1.2632 --	.5620 --	1.1579 --	.5015 --
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty Administrators	19 0	3.3684 --	1.7388 --	3.0526 --	1.5083 --
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty Administrators	19 0	3.3158 --	1.6684 --	2.7895 --	1.3157 --
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty Administrators	19 0	3.6842 --	1.5653 --	3.5263 --	1.4286 --
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty Administrators	19 0	3.3684 --	1.4225 --	3.1053 --	.9941 --
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty Administrators	19 0	2.7368 --	1.5218 --	2.4737 --	1.2635 --
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty Administrators	19 0	2.3158 --	1.4550 --	1.8947 --	1.3289 --
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty Administrators	19 0	2.2632 --	1.1471 --	2.5263 --	1.0203 --
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty Administrators	19 0	3.0526 --	1.6824 --	2.8421 --	1.3023 --
22.	Establishment of de- partmental committees	Faculty Administrators	19 0	3.4737 --	1.9542 --	3.4737 --	1.8369 --
23.	Membership of depart- mental committees	Faculty Administrators	19 0	3.5263 --	1.7438 --	3.5789 --	1.6095 --

Table 23 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	19	2.7368	1.4080	2.7895	1.3976
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	19	2.6842	1.4163	2.5789	1.3045
	Administrators	0	--	--	--	--

Table 24. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 10

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	18	1.6111	.9785	2.5556	1.1490
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	3.0000	.0001
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	18	1.6111	1.1448	2.3889	1.2433
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	18	2.1111	1.2738	3.0556	1.3492
	Administrators	2	4.0000	.0001	4.5000	.7071
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	18	2.3333	1.2367	3.0556	1.2590
	Administrators	2	4.0000	.0001	3.5000	.7071
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	18	2.0556	1.2590	2.4444	1.2472
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	2.5000	.7071
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	18	1.6667	.9701	2.5000	1.0981
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	2.5000	.7071
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	18	2.0000	1.3284	3.1111	1.4907
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	2.5000	.7071
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	18	1.5000	.9852	2.6667	1.0847
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	18	1.5000	.9852	2.8889	1.1827
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.0000	.0001
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	18	1.5556	.9835	2.0556	.9984
	Administrators	2	1.0000	.0001	1.5000	.7071

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	18	2.1111	1.1318	2.5000	1.0981
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	18	1.9444	1.1100	2.2778	1.0178
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.5000	.7071
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	18	1.5000	.8575	2.0556	.9984
	Administrators	2	1.5000	.7071	2.0000	.0001
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	18	2.6111	1.2433	3.1667	1.3394
	Administrators	2	3.0000	1.4142	2.5000	.7071
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	18	2.2778	1.2274	2.8889	1.3235
	Administrators	2	2.5000	2.1213	2.5000	.7071
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	18	2.8889	1.2783	3.6111	1.5570
	Administrators	2	3.5000	.7071	3.5000	.7071
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	18	2.2222	1.1144	2.7778	1.3528
	Administrators	2	3.0000	1.4142	2.5000	.7071
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	18	1.8333	1.0432	2.3333	1.2834
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	2.0000	.0001
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	18	1.7778	1.0033	2.1667	1.2005
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	2.0000	.0001
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	18	2.1667	1.2005	2.7222	1.2274
	Administrators	2	2.5000	2.1213	2.0000	1.4142
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	18	2.5556	1.3382	3.1667	1.3394
	Administrators	2	3.0000	1.4142	2.0000	.0001
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	18	3.0000	1.4951	3.5556	1.4642
	Administrators	2	3.5000	.7071	3.5000	.7071
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	18	3.2222	1.4371	3.7222	1.5645
	Administrators	2	3.5000	.7071	4.0000	.0001

Table 24 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	18	2.1667	1.0981	2.8333	1.2005
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	2.5000	.7071
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	18	2.3333	1.0847	3.0000	1.1882
	Administrators	2	2.0000	.0001	2.5000	.7071

Table 25. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 11

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	17	1.8824	.9926	2.4118	.8703
	Administrators	5	1.4000	.5477	2.4000	.5477
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	17	1.7059	.9852	2.4706	.9432
	Administrators	5	1.6000	.8944	2.6000	.5477
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	17	1.8235	1.0146	2.5882	.7952
	Administrators	5	1.4000	.5477	2.4000	.5477
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	17	1.6471	.8618	2.4706	.7174
	Administrators	5	1.4000	.5477	2.4000	.5477
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	17	1.4706	.7174	1.7647	.7524
	Administrators	5	1.8000	.8367	2.0000	.7071
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	17	1.2353	.6642	1.4118	.7952
	Administrators	5	1.4000	.5477	2.0000	.7071
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	17	1.4706	.9432	2.3529	.9963
	Administrators	5	1.2000	.4472	3.0000	.0001
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	17	1.2353	.4372	1.9412	.7475
	Administrators	5	1.2000	.4472	2.2000	1.0954
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	17	1.2353	.4372	1.8824	.6966
	Administrators	5	1.6000	.5477	2.4000	1.3416
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	17	1.1176	.6002	1.2941	.6860
	Administrators	5	1.0000	.0001	1.6000	.5477

11.	Short-range institu- tional planning	Faculty	17	1.5294	.7174	2.1765	.6359
		Administrators	5	1.6000	.8944	2.8000	.8367
12.	Long-range institu- tional planning	Faculty	17	1.4118	.7952	1.8824	.8575
		Administrators	5	1.2000	.4472	2.2000	.4472
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	17	1.2941	.5879	1.4118	.7123
		Administrators	5	1.2000	.4472	2.2000	.4472
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	17	2.7647	1.0914	3.2353	.7524
		Administrators	5	2.6000	.5477	3.0000	.7071
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	17	2.6471	.9963	3.0588	.7475
		Administrators	5	2.8000	.4472	3.2000	.4472
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	17	2.9412	1.0290	3.3529	.7859
		Administrators	5	3.4000	.8944	3.4000	.5477
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	17	2.5294	.9432	2.9412	.6587
		Administrators	5	2.4000	.5477	2.6000	.5477
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	17	2.2941	1.0467	2.7647	.9701
		Administrators	5	2.2000	.4472	3.2000	.4472
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	17	2.1176	1.1114	2.2353	1.0914
		Administrators	5	2.6000	1.1402	3.0000	.7071
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	17	1.9412	.8993	2.4118	.7952
		Administrators	5	1.6000	.8944	2.2000	1.0954
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	17	2.6471	1.1147	3.0588	1.0880
		Administrators	5	2.2000	.8367	2.8000	.4472
22.	Establishment of de- partmental committees	Faculty	17	3.5294	1.2805	3.7647	1.1472
		Administrators	5	4.2000	.8367	4.2000	1.0954
23.	Membership of depart- mental committees	Faculty	17	3.7059	1.3585	3.8824	1.1114
		Administrators	5	4.0000	.7071	4.0000	1.0000

Table 25 (Continued)

Type of issues	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	17	2.1765	1.2862	2.7647	1.1472
	Administrators	5	2.6000	.8944	3.2000	.4472
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	17	2.2941	1.2632	2.8824	1.1114
	Administrators	5	2.8000	.4472	3.2000	.4472

Table 26. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 12

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	26	2.4615	.9892	2.6923	.9282
	Administrators	4	2.0000	1.4142	2.0000	1.4142
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	26	2.3462	1.0175	2.5769	.9021
	Administrators	4	2.0000	1.4142	2.0000	1.4142
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	26	2.5385	.9892	2.6538	.9356
	Administrators	4	2.0000	1.4142	2.0000	1.4142
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	26	2.5000	1.0296	2.8077	.8010
	Administrators	4	2.0000	1.4142	2.0000	1.4142
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	26	2.3462	.8918	2.6154	.6373
	Administrators	4	2.2500	1.5000	2.5000	1.7321
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	26	2.0769	.9767	2.5385	.8593
	Administrators	4	1.7500	1.2583	2.2500	1.7078
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	26	2.1923	1.0961	2.7308	.9616
	Administrators	4	2.5000	1.9149	3.0000	2.0000
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	26	1.4231	.7027	1.9231	.8449
	Administrators	4	1.2500	.9574	1.5000	1.0000
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	26	1.4615	.7060	1.8077	.6939
	Administrators	4	1.5000	1.0000	1.7500	1.2583
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	26	1.7308	.8274	1.9231	.6884
	Administrators	4	1.2500	.9574	1.5000	1.0000

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	26	2.0769	.8449	2.6154	.6972
		Administrators	4	1.2500	.9574	1.5000	1.0000
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	26	1.9231	.8910	2.4231	.6433
		Administrators	4	1.5000	1.2910	2.2500	1.7078
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	26	1.6923	.7884	2.3077	.7884
		Administrators	4	1.5000	1.0000	1.7500	1.2583
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	26	3.2692	1.0023	3.4615	.7606
		Administrators	4	2.7500	1.8930	3.0000	2.0000
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	26	3.3846	1.2026	3.5385	.9892
		Administrators	4	2.7500	1.8930	2.7500	1.8930
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	26	3.5769	1.2058	3.8462	.8806
		Administrators	4	2.7500	1.8930	2.7500	1.8930
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	26	2.6154	1.0612	2.8077	.8953
		Administrators	4	2.0000	1.4142	2.0000	1.4142
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	26	2.5385	1.0670	2.7308	.9616
		Administrators	4	2.5000	1.7321	2.7500	1.8930
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	26	1.8846	.9089	2.1538	.8806
		Administrators	4	1.7500	1.2583	1.7500	1.2583
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	26	1.6923	1.1232	1.9231	1.0554
		Administrators	4	1.5000	1.0000	1.7500	1.2583
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	26	3.2308	1.2428	3.5000	1.0677
		Administrators	4	2.5000	1.9149	3.0000	2.1602
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	26	4.0385	1.3411	4.3077	1.0870
		Administrators	4	3.0000	2.1602	3.0000	2.1602
23.	Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	26	4.1923	1.3570	4.3846	1.0612
		Administrators	4	3.2500	2.2174	3.2500	2.2174

Table 26 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	26	3.1154	1.0325	3.3846	.8038
	Administrators	4	2.0000	1.4142	2.5000	1.7321
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	26	3.3462	1.1293	3.6538	.8918
	Administrators	4	2.5000	1.7321	2.7500	1.8930

Table 27. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 13

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	14	2.7143	1.1387	3.0714	1.2067
	Administrators	4	2.7500	1.2583	3.0000	.0001
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	14	2.1429	1.1673	3.0714	1.1411
	Administrators	4	2.7500	1.2583	3.2500	.5000
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	14	2.5714	1.0894	2.8571	1.0995
	Administrators	4	3.2500	.9574	3.5000	.5774
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	14	2.7143	1.0690	2.9286	1.1411
	Administrators	4	3.0000	.8165	3.2500	.5000
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	14	1.7143	.9945	1.7857	.8018
	Administrators	4	2.0000	.8165	2.5000	.5774
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	14	2.0714	.9972	1.5714	.6462
	Administrators	4	2.0000	.0001	2.2500	.5000
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	14	3.0000	1.3009	3.4286	1.4525
	Administrators	4	2.5000	.5774	3.2500	.5000
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	14	2.0000	1.1094	2.7857	.9750
	Administrators	4	2.2500	.5000	3.0000	.0001
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	14	2.1429	1.0995	2.6429	1.0818
	Administrators	4	2.7500	.9574	3.2500	.5000
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	14	1.5000	.7596	1.5000	.6504
	Administrators	4	2.0000	.8165	2.2500	.9574

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	14	2.0714	.9169	2.1429	1.0271
	Administrators	4	2.2500	.5000	2.5000	.5774
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	14	1.5000	.8549	1.6429	.8419
	Administrators	4	2.2500	.5000	2.5000	.5774
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	14	1.6429	.8419	1.8571	.9493
	Administrators	4	2.0000	.8165	2.5000	.5774
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	14	3.3571	1.1507	3.5000	1.1602
	Administrators	4	3.0000	1.1547	3.5000	1.2910
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	14	3.2143	1.1217	3.2857	1.2044
	Administrators	4	3.7500	1.2583	3.7500	1.2583
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	14	3.9286	1.2688	3.9286	1.2688
	Administrators	4	4.2500	1.5000	4.2500	1.5000
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	14	2.7143	1.3260	2.7143	1.4373
	Administrators	4	3.0000	.8165	2.7500	.5000
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	14	2.7857	1.0509	3.0714	1.2067
	Administrators	4	2.5000	.5774	2.7500	.5000
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	14	2.6429	1.1507	2.5714	1.1579
	Administrators	4	3.5000	1.0000	3.2500	.9574
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	14	2.0000	1.0377	2.8571	1.0995
	Administrators	4	2.2500	.5000	2.7500	.5000
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	14	3.5714	1.4525	3.6429	1.3927
	Administrators	4	2.0000	1.6330	1.7500	1.2583
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	14	4.0714	1.3848	4.1429	1.4064
	Administrators	4	3.0000	.8165	3.7500	.9574
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	14	4.2143	1.3688	4.2857	1.3828
	Administrators	4	3.5000	1.2910	4.2500	.9574

Table 27 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	14	2.7143	1.0690	2.8571	1.2315
	Administrators	4	2.7500	.5000	3.5000	.5774
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	14	2.8571	1.2924	3.1429	1.4601
	Administrators	4	3.0000	.8165	3.7500	.5000

Table 28. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 14

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	28	2.3571	1.5447	3.4286	.9201
	Administrators	4	2.5000	1.2910	3.5000	.5774
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	28	2.1429	1.4584	3.2143	.9947
	Administrators	4	2.5000	1.2910	3.7500	.5000
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	28	1.9286	1.3032	2.8929	.9165
	Administrators	4	2.5000	1.2910	3.7500	.5000
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	28	1.9643	1.3739	2.9286	.9400
	Administrators	4	2.2500	.9574	3.7500	.9574
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	28	1.7857	1.1007	2.4286	.6901
	Administrators	4	1.5000	.5774	2.2500	.5000
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	28	1.6786	1.0905	2.3571	.6785
	Administrators	4	1.7500	.9574	2.5000	.5774
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	28	2.1071	1.3968	3.9643	1.0709
	Administrators	4	2.7500	1.5000	4.0000	.0001
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	28	1.6071	1.0659	2.8929	.9560
	Administrators	4	1.7500	.5000	2.7500	.9574
9. Individual faculty scales	Faculty	28	1.6786	1.0560	2.7857	.8759
	Administrators	4	1.7500	.9574	3.0000	.8165
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	28	1.2500	.8872	1.8929	.6853
	Administrators	4	1.5000	1.0000	1.7500	.9574

11.	Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	28	1.5714	1.0690	2.3929	.7660
		Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	1.7500	.5000
12.	Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	28	1.3214	.9449	2.2143	.8759
		Administrators	4	1.5000	1.0000	2.0000	.8165
13.	Budget formulation	Faculty	28	1.5000	.9623	2.1071	.8317
		Administrators	4	1.2500	.5000	1.5000	.5774
14.	Curriculum offerings	Faculty	28	2.4286	1.6200	3.2857	.9372
		Administrators	4	3.2500	.9574	3.7500	.9574
15.	Degree requirements	Faculty	28	2.3214	1.5647	3.1429	.9705
		Administrators	4	2.2500	.9574	3.2500	.5000
16.	Academic performance of students	Faculty	28	2.6429	1.7683	3.6429	1.0616
		Administrators	4	3.7500	1.5000	3.7500	1.5000
17.	Types of degrees offered	Faculty	28	2.0714	1.2745	2.8214	.7228
		Administrators	4	2.2500	.9574	3.5000	1.0000
18.	Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	28	2.2143	1.3432	2.9643	.8381
		Administrators	4	2.7500	1.2583	3.2500	1.2583
19.	Student admission requirements	Faculty	28	1.8571	1.2084	2.4643	.9993
		Administrators	4	2.7500	1.2583	3.0000	.8165
20.	Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	28	1.5714	1.0690	2.8214	.8189
		Administrators	4	1.7500	.5000	2.7500	.9574
21.	Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	28	2.6071	1.7286	3.9286	1.1841
		Administrators	4	3.0000	1.4142	3.5000	1.2910
22.	Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	28	3.2500	1.9930	4.3214	1.2188
		Administrators	4	3.2500	1.5000	4.0000	1.4142
23.	Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	28	3.3571	2.0040	4.4286	1.1684
		Administrators	4	3.7500	.9574	4.2500	.9574

Table 28 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	28	2.0714	1.3313	3.0000	.9027
	Administrators	4	1.7500	.5000	3.0000	1.4142
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	28	2.2143	1.4996	3.2857	.9759
	Administrators	4	2.0000	.8165	3.2500	1.2583

Table 29. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 15

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	17	2.1176	1.4090	2.2353	.9034
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	1.6667	1.5275
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	17	1.8824	1.3173	2.0000	.9354
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	1.3333	1.1547
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	17	1.9412	1.2976	2.1765	1.0146
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.0000	1.7321
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	17	1.4118	1.1757	2.0000	1.1180
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.0000	1.7321
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	17	1.3529	1.3666	1.8824	.8575
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	1.6667	1.5275
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	17	1.4706	1.0676	1.8235	.7276
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	1.6667	1.5275
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	17	3.2941	2.0544	4.2353	1.3005
	Administrators	3	1.6667	2.8868	3.3333	2.8868
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	17	1.4706	1.0073	2.3529	.8618
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	1.3333	1.1547
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	17	1.4706	.9432	2.1765	.8090
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	1.6667	1.5275
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	17	1.4118	1.0037	1.2353	.5623
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	1.3333	1.5275

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	17	1.6471	1.0572	1.4118	.7123
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	1.0000	1.0000
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	17	1.4118	.9393	1.3519	.6063
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	1.0000	1.0000
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	17	1.4118	.9393	1.3529	.7019
	Administrators	3	.3333	.5774	1.0000	1.0000
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	17	2.4118	1.3257	3.2353	1.2005
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.3333	2.0817
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	17	2.4706	1.4194	3.1765	1.2367
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.3333	2.0817
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	17	3.3529	1.8689	3.9412	1.3906
	Administrators	3	1.3333	2.3094	3.0000	2.6458
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	17	1.7059	1.0467	2.1176	.9275
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	1.6667	1.5275
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	17	1.7059	1.0467	1.8824	.8575
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	1.3333	1.1547
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	17	1.7647	1.3933	2.1765	1.2367
	Administrators	3	.6667	1.1547	1.3333	1.1547
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	17	1.5882	1.0641	2.3529	.9963
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.0000	1.7321
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	17	2.8235	1.5506	3.3529	1.2217
	Administrators	3	1.3333	2.3094	2.3333	2.0817
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	17	3.1765	2.0073	3.8235	1.6672
	Administrators	3	1.6667	2.8868	3.3333	2.8868
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	17	3.3529	2.0598	3.9412	1.6760
	Administrators	3	1.6667	2.8868	3.3333	2.8868

Table 29 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	17	1.7647	1.0326	2.3529	1.2217
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	1.6667	1.5275
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	17	2.0588	1.1440	2.5294	1.1789
	Administrators	3	1.0000	1.7321	2.0000	1.7321

Table 30. Mean faculty and administrator perceptions of the decision-making process for governance issues by institution--Institution No. 16

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
1. Faculty appointments	Faculty	22	2.4091	1.3683	2.8182	1.4355
	Administrators	5	2.8000	1.0954	3.4000	.8944
2. Faculty reappointments, nonrenewal or dismissal for cause	Faculty	22	2.0000	1.1547	2.8636	1.3556
	Administrators	5	2.4000	.8944	2.8000	1.0954
3. Faculty promotion	Faculty	22	1.9545	1.1329	2.5909	1.2212
	Administrators	5	2.6000	.8944	2.8000	1.0954
4. Faculty tenure awards	Faculty	22	1.6818	1.1705	2.6364	1.2553
	Administrators	5	2.4000	1.1402	2.8000	1.0954
5. Selection of the president	Faculty	22	1.1364	.7743	1.7273	.9847
	Administrators	5	2.2000	.8367	2.4000	.5477
6. Selection of academic deans	Faculty	22	1.0000	.6901	1.5909	.9081
	Administrators	5	2.2000	.8367	2.4000	.5477
7. Selection of departmental chairpersons	Faculty	22	2.5909	1.8429	3.8182	1.7081
	Administrators	5	2.8000	.8367	3.8000	1.0954
8. Faculty salary scales	Faculty	22	1.2273	.8691	2.2273	1.0660
	Administrators	5	1.4000	.5477	2.4000	.8944
9. Individual faculty salaries	Faculty	22	1.1818	.9069	2.3182	1.2868
	Administrators	5	1.6000	.5477	2.4000	.8944
10. Physical facilities building programs	Faculty	22	1.0455	.6530	1.2727	.7025
	Administrators	5	1.6000	.5477	1.6000	.5477

11. Short-range institutional planning	Faculty	22	1.4545	.9625	1.7727	1.0204
	Administrators	5	2.2000	1.3038	2.2000	1.3038
12. Long-range institutional planning	Faculty	22	1.2727	.8827	1.5909	1.0075
	Administrators	5	2.2000	1.3038	2.2000	1.3038
13. Budget formulation	Faculty	22	1.1818	.8528	1.5455	.9625
	Administrators	5	2.0000	.7071	2.6000	.5477
14. Curriculum offerings	Faculty	22	2.9545	1.6177	3.1818	1.5004
	Administrators	5	3.8000	.4472	4.0000	.7071
15. Degree requirements	Faculty	22	3.0455	1.6755	3.3636	1.5900
	Administrators	5	4.0000	.7071	4.0000	.7071
16. Academic performance of students	Faculty	22	3.4091	1.8685	3.7273	1.7507
	Administrators	5	4.2000	.8367	4.2000	.8367
17. Types of degrees offered	Faculty	22	2.5000	1.4392	2.7273	1.3516
	Administrators	5	3.2000	.8367	3.2000	.8367
18. Establishment of new academic programs	Faculty	22	2.4091	1.4362	2.8182	1.4355
	Administrators	5	2.8000	.4472	2.8000	.4472
19. Student admission requirements	Faculty	22	1.9545	1.3266	2.0455	1.2902
	Administrators	5	2.8000	.4472	3.0000	.7071
20. Average faculty teaching load	Faculty	22	1.9545	1.3266	2.5000	1.1443
	Administrators	5	2.4000	.5477	3.0000	.7071
21. Faculty teaching assignments	Faculty	22	3.2727	1.7507	3.5000	1.6833
	Administrators	5	2.6000	.5477	3.4000	.5477
22. Establishment of departmental committees	Faculty	22	3.6364	1.9160	3.8636	1.7264
	Administrators	5	4.0000	.7071	4.2000	.4472
23. Membership of departmental committees	Faculty	22	3.6818	1.9368	4.0000	1.7457
	Administrators	5	4.2000	.4472	4.2000	.4472

Table 30 (Continued)

Type of issue	Groups	No. of cases	Perceptions at time of representation election		Perceptions today	
			Mean	Standard deviation	Mean	Standard deviation
24. Establishment of institution-wide committees	Faculty	22	2.5909	1.4690	2.9091	1.4771
	Administrators	5	2.8000	.8367	3.000	.7071
25. Membership of institution-wide committees	Faculty	22	2.6818	1.6442	3.0455	1.5577
	Administrators	5	2.6000	1.1402	2.6000	.8944

Table 31. Institutional characteristics

Institution	Type	Control	Bargaining agent
1	Comprehensive university and college	private	AAUP
2	Liberal arts college	private	AAUP
3	Liberal arts college	private	NEA
4	Comprehensive university and college	public	no-agent
5	Liberal arts college	private	AFT
6	Liberal arts college	private	no-agent
7	Comprehensive university and college	private	no-agent
8	Liberal arts college	public	AFT
9	Liberal arts college	public	AAUP
10	Liberal arts college	private	NEA
11	Comprehensive university and college	private	NEA
12	Liberal arts college	public	No-agent
13	Comprehensive university and college	private	AFT
14	Comprehensive university and college	public	AFT
15	Comprehensive university and college	public	NEA
16	Comprehensive university and college	private	AAUP

APPENDIX F

Respondents' Comments on Changes in Governance

"The faculty is consulted on more matters now than previously, however the administration exercises final control in almost all cases. Faculty recommendations, including unanimous votes for tenure, are often ignored. My status is (TDR) tenure-deferred-due-to ratio which is a 3-year contract, virtual tenure but not guaranteed."

"The collective bargaining agreement has insured that problems do receive attention and that solutions are found. Many times a win-win proposition."

"Governance has changed by and large for the better. Initial fear on the part of administration made process difficult in the beginning. Responsibilities, authority are much more clearly defined now. There is less 'secrecy' in the running of the institution. The faculty has clearly a stronger role--more influence in campus life--politics, policies."

"Collective bargaining has clearly altered the governance structure; decision making has been more spelled out; rights and responsibilities of faculty and administration are more pronounced; the master contract established procedure and due process. My perception: collective bargaining was positive for the institution; it gave stability to a precarious administering of the college."

"In my opinion, bargaining has stifled the administration in our small institution so they have lost flexibility in meeting the needs of students and institution."

"The primary change is the formulation of set procedures by which decision making occurs, e.g. who is consulted, times or dates for decisions, regions or areas of authority."

"In the aftermath of a faculty strike last September, the level of collegiality between faculty and administrators has markedly declined. Our president, who was appointed after the first contract in 1974, appears frustrated with his lack of unquestioned authority, he feels that his ability to effectively manage the college is thereby limited, and he has displayed an unwillingness to work cooperatively with the AAUP chapter (the bargaining agent). He now blames the faculty for most of the ills of the institution, and he seems to be dealing with collective bargaining in a way similar to a business president within the industrial model. This is clearly a faulty model for successfully dealing with a tenured faculty, and if this president's actions are at all typical of other college presidents today, then more professional training is necessary to help them learn to cope with CB and still foster collegiality."

"Collective bargaining (unionization) has destroyed the stability of this institution. Faculty now are out for themselves as individuals to an excessive degree. They place their own petty vested interests on a much higher scale of priority than their overall concerns for the good

of their students and the institution. The heightened state of confrontation now present detracts significantly from the academic function of this academic institution."

"A good deal of the lack of change (surprising to me now as I look at it) can be ascribed to faculty apathy--always present--and a mistaken impression that Federal law will take care of it all.

"If anything, the perception by a reactionary (stiffly conservative, at least) new administration of the faculty--union as the 'enemy' obstructs any meaningful dialogue. The strategy is now not to tolerate, as it once did, the tweedy types, but rather to stonewall everything and do only what outside consultants (high-priced ones) suggest, with never an acknowledgment that some of what those consultants are advising be done is exactly what the 'enemy' has been pleading for all along. We're more like Cassandra everyday."

"Since this is an impecunious institution unionization has not given the faculty as much leverage as might have been supposed. The main achievement has been in the improvement of 'administrative manners'. They are not as high handed as they use to be."

"We went from Louis XIV's court to a legalistic system which has not solved our basic problem--MONEY. Still, it is better than what we had before."

"This used to be, quite generally, a faculty-operated school. It is now virtually completely, an administratively-operated school."

"No basic changes--president still largely controls with the fiction of faculty involvement."

"Collective bargaining has changed salaries primarily. They have increased by greater increments since the contract. Tenure, promotion, etc. are 'recommended' by faculty committees, yet the President makes his own decisions. The contract mandates REASONS be written; these were not previously available. Our administration takes a 'business attitude to running the college which for the most part leaves the faculty out in the cold."

"We made the university governance system (by-laws) part of the union contract, thinking that the President would then have to abide by the by-laws. He still ignores them. He has had to bargain on salaries. And he has found it a little more difficult to dismiss faculty he doesn't like. Luckily he hasn't taken much interest in day to day academic activities."

"A tyrant of a president caused us to organize. He is still president. We have repeatedly voted no confidence in him and his people. He rules out of order motions in faculty meetings he doesn't like. In short, the situation has gone from bad to worse. But it would be even less tolerable without a contract."

"The gains are few, the cost in bickering is high, and the consequence of polarization lamentable."

APPENDIX G

IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Telephone (515) 294-4531

Date: February 21, 1978

To: Kenneth Marks

From: Mary Lou Arends, Secretary
University Human Subjects Review Committee

Re: Human subjects review of project entitled "A study of the congruence between faculty and administrator perceptions of governance changes at selected four-year institutions that have negotiated collective bargaining contracts and those that have voted "no agent"."

Your research project was reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Review Committee Chairman on February 21, 1978. Materials submitted by you for the review are enclosed. One copy has been retained for our files.

cc J Ahmann
file