

Faculty Collective Bargaining: The Voice of Experience

Allen Ponak and Mark Thompson

Volume 39, Number 3, 1984

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/050051ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/050051ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Article abstract

This paper examines the opinions of faculty members who work under collective bargaining regimes. It reports the results of a survey distributed at six Canadian universities where collective bargaining is in place and the faculty in a position to judge its impact.

Publisher(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (print)

1703-8138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Ponak, A. & Thompson, M. (1984). Faculty Collective Bargaining: The Voice of Experience. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 39(3), 449–465.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/050051ar>

Faculty Collective Bargaining

The Voice of Experience

**Allen Ponak
and
Mark Thompson**

This paper examines the opinions of faculty members who work under collective bargaining regimes. It reports the results of a survey distributed at six Canadian universities where collective bargaining is in place and the faculty in a position to judge its impact.

Collective bargaining is now a *fait accompli* at most Canadian universities. Faculty at over 40 universities currently are certified under provincial labour relations acts and nine other universities operate under *ad hoc* procedural arrangements (usually referred to as «special plans») negotiated by the faculty association and university administration [2]. There are only a very few universities in which collective bargaining of some form¹ (if only over wages and benefits) is not carried out [19].

Despite its importance, faculty collective bargaining is only ten years old and has been the subject of little research in this country. The adoption of collective bargaining occurred in an atmosphere of controversy and litigation at most universities with both advocates and opponents viewing it

• PONAK, Allen, Professor, Faculty of Management, University of Calgary.
THOMPSON, Mark, Professor, Faculty of Commerce, University of British Columbia.

•• This research was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Ottawa. The authors would like to thank Sharon Angel and Victoria Nzekwu for their research assistance.

¹ For purposes of this study, collective bargaining means that faculty representatives negotiate terms and conditions of employment with representatives of the university administration with the option, in case of an impasse, of a strike or binding arbitration. Other forms of faculty-university relations, for example, situations where faculty representatives present and discuss a wage brief with senior administration, but the administration renders the final decision, are not considered collective bargaining.

as a major departure from previous practices of university governance. Now that collective bargaining is well established, there is a need for information on its impact. For instance, have the strong feelings that accompanied its adoption dissipated, or has bargaining produced sharp cleavages based on rank, or department, or age? Has it led to a union «elite» out of touch with the majority of faculty members? Which aspects, if any, of collective bargaining are seen as beneficial and which are viewed as the major costs? How do faculty view strikes now that several contracts have been negotiated? These and other questions have yet to be seriously canvassed in Canada. This paper examines the opinions of faculty members who work under collective bargaining regimes. It reports the results of a survey distributed at six Canadian universities where collective bargaining is in place and the faculty in a position to judge its impact.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Previous published studies on faculty attitudes to collective bargaining have all been conducted in the United States. Despite considerable variation in the nature of the samples, type of instrument, and sophistication of methodology used, these studies suggest some common patterns in the way faculty members view collective bargaining and identify a number of variables which influence these views.

Five studies specifically asked faculty whether they favoured or opposed collective bargaining in universities; in four of these studies a majority favoured collective bargaining [4, 9, 12, 18,], in only one study was a majority of faculty opposed [3]. One study re-examined the attitudes of faculty two years after certification. Among those initially opposed, the degree of opposition had diminished, while faculty who had originally favoured bargaining were virtually unchanged, despite a relatively frustrating experience with the process [13]. A similar issue was raised in papers which looked at the compatibility of professionalism and collective bargaining. In two studies faculty saw no contradiction between the two concepts [4, 18], in another study faculty viewed them as incompatible [7], and views in a third survey were almost equally divided [3]. Results on the question of educational quality were mixed. Faculty in one study believed collective bargaining would reduce quality [3], while another group disagreed that bargaining would «reduce the pursuit of excellence» [4]. In terms of the benefits of bargaining, a majority of faculty saw bargaining as offering protection against unfair treatment [18, 4], enhancing job security [4], and providing superior economic benefits[4].

Faculty support for collective bargaining seldom extends to any enthusiasm for striking. While many faculty are not prepared to say that they will *never* strike under *any* circumstances [3, 4, 11], they express, at the same time, strong preference for the arbitration of interest disputes [4, 7]. It should be noted that few faculty in American public universities have the legal right to strike, a consideration that may have influenced their replies to questions on the point.

Substantial research has been conducted on the relationship between faculty attitudes and potential explanatory factors. Demographic variables have received a great deal of attention. In general, age, rank, salary, and tenure status (all temporally related) have been found to be inversely related to bargaining attitudes [3, 4, 7, 11, 18]. Similarly, satisfaction with salary and its distribution also is important [3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16]. Several studies, however, have reported no relationship between one or more of the above variables and bargaining attitudes [1, 5, 6, 15]. Only one study has reported contrary findings: a survey of an education faculty in a private university found rank and tenure to be positively associated with support for union affiliation [12]. Two other demographic variables which might have been expected to influence faculty views, gender and marital status, have consistently shown no relationship to bargaining attitudes [1, 3, 4, 5, 6].

Discipline or department seems to be an important predictor of attitudes toward bargaining. Several surveys have found that faculty in technical disciplines, e.g., natural sciences and engineering, show less enthusiasm for bargaining than their colleagues in the humanities and social sciences [7, 17, 18]. No study reports the reverse relationship, i.e., support for bargaining stronger in technical departments, though several studies have reported no association [1, 3, 5]. These inconsistent findings suggest that individual or local factors may outweigh discipline at some universities.

Political views are generally good predictors of bargaining attitudes. Faculty who support liberal or left of center political parties also favour collective bargaining. In the U.S., faculty who vote for the Democratic Party are more favourably disposed to collective bargaining [3, 11, 13]. Job or career satisfaction also is an important determinant. Studies show that satisfaction is inversely related to support for collective bargaining: i.e. dissatisfied faculty are more likely to favour the adoption of collective bargaining. However, participation in decisions, which might be seen as a component of job satisfaction does not appear to be a significant factor [1]. Finally, two studies that addressed the relationship of research activities and bargaining attitudes reached different conclusions. One found a negative relationship [10], the other, no relationship [14].

Are the U.S. research conclusions applicable to Canada? Apart from any cultural differences between the two countries or variation in industrial relations patterns, there are distinctions in the context of university collective bargaining. In Canada, the «special plan» form of bargaining represents an intermediate stage between certification and consultation. No such mechanism exists in the United States. Further, the adoption of collective bargaining at many American universities was accompanied by controversy over selection of a bargaining agent. Several different national organizations and occasional local or state bodies actively competed for faculty allegiance. During certification campaigns, prospective voters were presented with conflicting views about the desirability of bargaining and the ability of different groups to represent their interests effectively. By contrast, existing faculty associations became bargaining agents at all universities in English Canada and at most campuses in Québec. U.S. research has shown that unions have an emotive impact among university faculty, so that attitudes toward collective bargaining are linked with views of unions and the labour movement. The adoption of collective bargaining by existing faculty associations in Canadian universities may diminish some of the more negative connotations of unionization.

Perhaps the most important distinction between the research reported here and the American data concerns actual experience with collective bargaining. Almost all U.S. data were collected either at campuses without any experience with collective bargaining or unionization [1, 17] or at campuses in the midst of or which had recently undergone union campaigns [7, 18]. Faculty members were asked to express their opinion about a institution about which most had little first-hand knowledge. In contrast, faculty experience with collective bargaining is much more extensive and of longer duration in Canada. Our research was conducted at universities where faculty bargaining had been in place from four to eight years. Attitudes based on assessments of the actual realities of collective bargaining may well differ from those based on perceptions of hypothetical costs and benefits.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Data reported in this study are based on the responses of more than 1 400 faculty members at six universities in British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba, Ontario, and New Brunswick. Each of the universities offers a full range of undergraduate and graduate programs in the humanities and social and physical sciences, and four offer comprehensive programs in the various professional discipline. The smallest university had a full time student population of 6,500, the largest 20,000. Faculty size (full time equivalents) ranged from 500 to 1 950 faculty members.

An equal number of certified and special plan universities were included in the sample. On the three special plan campuses, faculty bargain over a relatively narrow range of mainly compensation related subjects. Faculty at the certified universities negotiate a much wider array of topics. Collective agreements at all six institutions usually last one year, although two-year agreements have been signed at one of the certified universities. Bargaining was adopted on four campuses between 1974 and 1976 and on the other two in the 1978-1979 academic year.

The data were gathered between November 1982 and March 1983 via mail questionnaires sent to all faculty members at the smaller universities and a random sample of faculty at the larger universities. Response rates at the individual sites varied from 32% to 48%, with a combined response rate of 38%. A comparison of the respondents to the overall faculty population at each of the universities showed no important differences in terms of age, salary, rank, gender, and proportion with tenure. For the combined sample, the mean age of the respondents was 45 years, salary averaged \$42,500, 36 percent were full professors, 34 percent associates, and 19 percent assistant professors, 77 percent of respondents had tenure, and 84 percent were male.

The questionnaire also gathered information on department, number of years employed at current university, administrative responsibilities, participation in the faculty association, research output, voting behavior, job satisfaction, socio-economic attitudes, and father's occupation. The key dependent variable for this paper, attitudes toward collective bargaining, was based on responses to an eighteen item questionnaire adapted for this study from earlier (U.S.) research [13]. Respondents indicated the extent of their agreement or disagreement with statements which dealt with different aspects of faculty collective bargaining.

RESULTS

Bargaining attitudes

Responses to the eighteen statements about collective bargaining are presented in Table 1. The first two columns report average scores and standard deviations. A 4-point scale was used to score each item: strongly agree = 1; agree with reservations = 2; disagree with reservations = 3; and strongly disagree = 4. The third column indicates the proportion of respondents who agreed (strongly or with reservations) with the statement. Some items were worded in favour of collective bargaining (eg. Item 15) and some against collective bargaining (eg. Item 9).

TABLE 1
FACULTY ATTITUDES TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

	<i>Mean¹</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>	<i>Proportion Agreeing</i>
1. Collective bargaining increases the amount of dissent within the faculty.	2.8	.91	34%
2. Collective bargaining improves academic opportunities for women.	2.2	.87	68%
3. Collective bargaining forces student groups to cooperate with university administration against faculty demands and interests.	3.3	.74	12%
4. Collective bargaining results in over-emphasis on rules and regulations.	2.2	.99	64%
5. Collective bargaining reduces collegiality between administrators and faculty	2.2	.97	62%
6. Collective bargaining is likely to bring higher salaries and improved benefits.	1.8	.77	86%
7. Collective bargaining will substitute seniority for merit and will lower the standards for tenure appointments.	2.6	1.0	45%
8. Collective bargaining for faculty is meaningless without willingness on the part of the faculty to strike should negotiations reach an impasse.	2.7	1.0	41%
9. Collective bargaining by faculty has no place in a university.	3.2	1.0	21%
10. Collectively bargained grievance procedures serve to protect the faculty against arbitrary action by administrative officials.	1.7	.76	89%
11. Non-tenured faculty need assurance of fair treatment at the point where the tenure decision is made, and only collective bargaining can ensure this.	2.5	.98	49%
12. Faculty have little real power to influence university policies through the traditional self-government institutions such as faculty senates or councils.	2.5	.97	52%
13. Because it is non-professional conduct, faculty should not engage in actions such as strikes or picketing.	2.4	1.1	52%
14. Collective bargaining by faculty members requires a greater expenditure of time and effort than the potential gain justifies.	2.9	.89	27%
15. Collective bargaining by faculty will improve the quality of education at this university.	2.7	.92	44%
16. Because it is not apt to produce results, faculty should not engage in actions such as strikes or picketing.	2.6	1.0	43%
17. If the university and faculty association fail to reach agreement during contract negotiations, the dispute should be submitted to binding arbitration.	1.6	.71	91%
18. The faculty association should cooperate with other campus unions in their bargaining activities.	2.5	1.0	52%

¹ Mean scores reflect raw (or actual) responses to the item on a four point scale: 1- strongly agree; 2- agree with reservations; 3- disagree with reservations; 4- strongly disagree.

A review of Table 1 demonstrates general support for collective bargaining by faculty subject to it for several years. Faculty strongly rejected suggestions that collective bargaining «has no place in a university» (Item 9), and that collective bargaining «requires a greater expenditure of time and effort than the potential gain justifies» (Item 14). An overwhelming proportion of faculty (88%) also disagreed that collective bargaining forces students and administrators to combine forces against faculty (Item 3), and a substantial majority (66%) disagreed that bargaining increases internal dissent (Item 1). Indeed, there was a strong belief that collective bargaining would provide benefits in terms of improved salaries (Item 6) and protection against arbitrary administrative action (Item 10), and a reasonably strong belief that bargaining improves academic opportunities for women (Item 3).

Relatively large standard deviations indicate that collective bargaining is still controversial. Furthermore, respondents recognized that collective bargaining was not without its costs. A substantial majority agreed that collective bargaining results in the overemphasis of rules and regulations (Item 4) and reduces collegiality (Item 5). As well, there were very mixed feelings about whether bargaining would lower standards (Item 7), provide fairer tenure decisions (Item 11), or improve the quality of education (Item 15). The response to Item 11, for instance, may indicate confidence in equity of traditional mechanisms for making tenure decisions among the majority of tenured faculty (77 percent of the sample is tenured), but less confidence among the non-tenured.

Respondents in this survey strongly confirmed previous findings about attitudes of faculty members towards arbitration (Item 17), with over 90 percent agreeing that interest disputes should be submitted to binding arbitration. Yet this overwhelming preference for arbitration may not be as clearcut as it seems. Over forty percent of respondents believed that «collective bargaining is meaningless without willingness of faculty to strike» (Item 8). A similar proportion of faculty was not prepared to reject strike action simply on the grounds that «it is non-professional» (Item 13) or because «it is not apt to produce results» (Item 16). These responses to questions about strikes and arbitration are consistent with American research. While there is a vast preference for arbitration, there also appears to be a belief that strikes may be more effective for achieving a particular objective and therefore many faculty are not prepared to reject its use out of hand.

Predicting bargaining attitudes

To facilitate the analysis of bargaining attitude predictors, three scales were formed from among the eighteen items.² The first scale, comprising Items 1, 4, 5, 7, and 14, incorporates perceptions about possible drawbacks of collective bargaining (i.e. increases dissent, lowers standards, etc.) It is labelled CB Drawbacks (Chronbach's alpha = .83). The second scale contained Items 2, 6, 10, 11 and 15 and groups together statements about perceived advantages of bargaining (fair tenure decisions, higher salary and benefits, etc.) This scale is called CB Advantages (Chronbach's alpha = .78) The third scale, composed of Items 8, 13, 16 and 18, is called Militancy (Chronbach's alpha = .68) and includes opinions about strikes and cooperation between faculty and support staff unions. All three scales were formed by summing the scores on the individual items comprising the scale, a procedure which entailed reversing item scores in some cases.

For consistency purposes, the three scales were all scored in the same direction: a high scale score on CB Drawbacks indicates the respondent *disagrees* that bargaining has drawbacks; a high score on CB Advantages indicates agreement that bargaining has advantages; and the higher the score on Militancy the more favourable the respondent toward strike action and cooperation with support unions. Reconfirming earlier observations, the mean score on the CB Advantages scale (3.0) was significantly higher ($p < .001$) than the mean score on the CB Drawbacks scale (2.5).

Multiple regression (ordinary least squares) was used to investigate the relationship of potential explanatory variables to the three bargaining attitude scales. Seventeen variables³ drawn from earlier research were selected for the analysis. One group of variables may be termed *demographic* and in-

² The three scales were devised by the researchers based on *a priori* judgement.

³ While many of the independent variables are self-explanatory, others need some elaboration. «Discipline» was based on department: professional faculty member (coded 1) included individuals in architecture, business, dentistry, engineering, law, or medicine. «Association attendance» measured a faculty member's attendance of faculty association meetings: 1 (low) indicated no attendance; 5 (high) indicated attendance at more than 75% of meetings. «Publications» represents the number of professional writings (books, articles, monographs) the respondent reported publishing in the previous two years. «Salary» is individuals basic university gross salary. «Administrator» was coded from 0 to 4: 0 indicating no administrative positions were held; 4 indicating four common university positions were held (eg. department chairman, university senate). «Dissatisfaction» was measured on a scale (Chronbach's alpha = .70) based on responses to three questions dealing with satisfaction with career, current university, and working conditions. The higher the score the more dissatisfied the respondent. «Conservative» was measured on a scale (Chronbach's alpha = .58) based on responses to three questions which asked respondents to characterize themselves as conservatives, liberals, or radicals with respect to social and economic policy and to indicate whether Canada's NATO involvement should increase or decrease. The higher the score, the more conservative the respondent.

clude: age, gender, salary, length of service at present university (years current university), rank, and tenure status. Based on previous studies, it was hypothesized that age, salary, length of service, and rank would be negatively related to views on bargaining, tenured faculty would hold more negative attitudes than non-tenured faculty, and that gender would have no affect. A second set of variables are *psychological*: political views (as measured by voting for the NDP in the last provincial election); self-expressed conservatism; and dissatisfaction with career, current university, and working conditions. It was expected that persons with left-wing political views would favour bargaining and that conservatives would be opposed. Faculty with high dissatisfaction should support bargaining as a means of improving their lot. *Socio-economic background* also was included. It was hypothesized that respondents from blue collar backgrounds would be more supportive of collective bargaining.

Two variables measured *research orientation*: number of publications in the two years prior to the survey and self-expressed preference for research versus teaching. Research-oriented faculty should be less supportive of collective bargaining. *Discipline* was expected to influence bargaining attitudes with faculty in professional departments (eg. law, business, medicine) hypothesized to hold more negative attitudes than their colleagues in non-professional disciplines. The three *certified universities* were distinguished from the three special plan institutions. The scope negotiations is wider on certified campuses and the act of certification normally connotes a substantial commitment to bargaining. Faculty on certified campuses, therefore, should exhibit more favourable attitudes to bargaining. Finally, *faculty associations activists* (meeting attendance, member of association committees or executive) and persons active in *university governance* were identified. Individuals who take part in association affairs should support bargaining, its primary activity, while faculty who participate in academic governance should prefer mechanisms other than bargaining for reaching decisions.

The results of the multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 2. Four variables, association attendance, voted NDP, year current university, and dissatisfaction are significantly related to each of the three attitude scales. Six variables, on the other hand, were unable to explain any significant variation in bargaining attitudes; discipline, father's occupation, faculty association executive, rank, administrator, and gender. Most significant relationships are in the predicted directions, and all three regression equations are significant beyond the .001 level.

TABLE 2
FACTORS RELATED TO BARGAINING ATTITUDES:
MULTIPLE REGRESSION RESULTS¹

<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>CB Drawbacks</i>	<i>CB Advantages</i>	<i>Militancy</i>
Discipline (Pro = 1, other = 0)	-.03	-.01	-.06
Certified (Certified = 1, other = 0)	-.01	.08**	.04
Father's occupation (blue collar = 1, other = 0)	.03	.02	.04
Assistant Professor (Asst Prof. = 1, other = 0)	.01	.01	-.05
Faculty Assoc. Executive (Exec. = 1, other = 0)	.01	.05	.06
Association Attendance Publications	.26***	.20***	.15***
Research Orientation (Research = 1, Teaching = 0)	-.06*	-.02	-.02
Salary	-.07*	-.07*	-.01
Voted NDP (NDP = 1; other = 0)	-.06	-.13**	-.14**
Age	.22***	.20**	.19***
Years Current University	.03	.12**	.09*
Tenure (Tenure = 1; other = 0)	-.09*	-.14***	-.18***
Administrator	-.01	.09*	.01
Gender (Female = 1; Male = 0)	-.04	-.03	.01
Dissatisfaction	-.02	.01	.00
Conservative	.05	.07*	.16***
R Square	-.09*	-.10***	-.14***
F	.21	.19	.20
	16.75***	14.93***	16.17***

*** p < .001; ** p < .01; *p < .05

¹ Ordinary least square procedures were used. Regression coefficients are presented as standardized beta weights. Missing data reduced the sample size for the regression runs from 1404 to 1114.

The best predictors of perceptions of *collective bargaining drawbacks* were faculty association attendance and NDP voting. Faculty who regularly participate in faculty association meetings and who vote for the NDP are less likely to agree that collective bargaining has substantial negative cost. More conservative faculty members and faculty members with longer service at their current university, on the other hand, tend to view bargaining as having greater drawbacks. Research orientation also exercised an impact in the predicted direction. Faculty members who published more often and individuals who described themselves as more oriented toward research (as opposed to teaching) were more concerned about the drawbacks of bargaining than their less research oriented colleagues.

Perceptions of *collective bargaining advantages* were also strongly related to association attendance and NDP voting, again in the expected direction. There was a positive relationship between certification and beliefs about the benefits of bargaining. Faculty members at the certified university, where negotiations proceeded on a wide array of issues, believed more strongly in the advantages produced by collective bargaining than did their colleagues on campuses with more limited special plan systems. Dissatisfied faculty members, as well, held more positive attitudes towards the perceived benefits of collective bargaining.

As predicted, there were negative relationships between research orientation, conservativeness, and salary and perceptions of bargaining advantages. More highly paid faculty believe they reap fewer benefits under collective bargaining, more research oriented faculty are less likely to see benefits flowing from collective bargaining, and more conservative faculty again appear to view collective bargaining with significant misgiving.

The result with respect to the effects of tenure, age, and years current university are less straightforward. Contrary to the hypotheses, tenure and age were positively associated with CB Advantages. Furthermore, a faculty member's length of service was inversely related to bargaining advantages, despite the fact that length of service is highly correlated with age ($r = .71$) and tenure ($r = .61$). A possible explanation for these findings lies in the research of Kazlow and Giacquinta [12]. They found rank and tenure positively related to union support and explained their finding in terms of the desire of more senior faculty institutionalize their position against the encroachment of newer, more research oriented faculty. While speculative,

it is possible that the results in our study also reflect a certain insecurity on the part of older faculty.⁴

There were several strong predictors of *militancy*. In particular, highly dissatisfied faculty were much more likely to support the use of strikes and to favour cooperation with campus support staff unions. Faculty members who voted for the NDP and who attended association meetings also were much more prepared to consider the use of militant tactics. A positive, but not as powerful, relationship to militancy was shown by age.

Strong negative relationships to militancy were exercised by years at current university, conservativeness, and salary. Faculty with lengthy service at their present university were much less likely to support the use of strikes or favour cooperation with campus staff. Similarly, more conservative faculty and more highly paid faculty were also much less likely to hold favourable views of militant tactics.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The responses of a large group of faculty from six institutions clearly demonstrates that faculty members who have experienced collective bargaining support it, although not uncritically. The main advantages are perceived to lie in the protection collective bargaining can provide against arbitrary administrative action and in its ability to extract higher salaries. The main disadvantages are seen in a reduction of collegiality and an over-emphasis of rules and regulations. But it is evident from the pattern of responses to individual questions (and statistical comparison) that faculty members view collective bargaining as yielding a net positive benefit. Consistent with American research, it was also found that arbitration overwhelmingly is the preferred method of interest dispute resolution among Canadian faculty.

Like their counterparts in the U.S., enthusiasm for collective bargaining is affected by political beliefs, faculty association activism, job satisfaction, salary, and length of service. Association activity is obviously tied to

4 To determine to what extent multi-collinearity may have effected these findings, several versions of the regression equation were specified. In some equations age, years current university, or tenure were dropped and in other equations combinations of these and other variables were eliminated. In no case did the *direction* of the impact of age, tenure, or years current university change. However, the *magnitude* and at times the significance level of these variables was altered in some regression specifications. The changes were most noticeable with respect to age and virtually nil with respect to years current university.

support for bargaining. Political views originate outside the university, and are unlikely to be affected by events in a faculty member's working life. But the other variables, such as job satisfaction and salaries clearly are job related. While improved working conditions might diminish support for bargaining, continued financial constraints should restrict salaries and worsen working conditions, thus producing stronger support for bargaining and militant tactics. The virtual hiring freezes that have accompanied budget cuts have reduced turnover, which should increase average length of service. But the expected perquisites of longer service may also disappear, perhaps altering the relationship between bargaining support and seniority.

Equally interesting are the many individual and job-related distinctions which do not affect bargaining attitudes. Discipline, rank and tenure, socio-economic background and reasearch orientation are not strong predictors of bargaining attitudes. Nor does administrative service or service on a faculty association executive affect views of bargaining. Previous research found that all of these variables significantly affected attitudes toward bargaining and unionism before the fact. The lack of impact in this sample probably indicates that experience with bargaining has moderated attitudes formed by past academic experience or status in the university. Far from dividing faculty, as opponents once feared, the practice of bargaining appears to have lessened divisions on traditional lines. Indeed, even faculty association activists appear to agree with their colleagues, neither more militant nor more convinced of the virtues of collective bargaining.

As well, the distinction between the certified and special plan universities was not great. Faculty in both situations agreed about the bargaining's drawbacks and about militant tactics, but differed as to the advantages of bargaining. These findings suggest that faculty in special plan universities recognize the costs of bargaining but place lower value on the potential benefits, perhaps reflecting the somewhat narrower scope of negotiations on the special plan campuses.

This research presents at least three issues which can be fruitfully explored in future. First, the results obtained in this study should be compared to data obtained on campuses with no collective bargaining. One would strongly anticipate that faculty at certified and special plan universities (where collective bargaining had been formally chosen by a majority) would hold more pro-collective bargaining attitudes than faculty on non-bargaining campuses, but it is less clear whether the correlates of these attitudes would prove to be the same. Comparing the underlying attitudinal predictors between bargaining and non-bargaining institutions might offer considerable insight into why faculty members opt for bargaining in the first place.

A second potentially valuable area for research involves the CB Drawbacks and CB Advantages scales. Faculty attitudes might be analysed within a two-by-two matrix, comparing the characteristics of those who score high on both scales to those who score high on the CB Advantages scale but low on the CB Drawbacks dimension. It is noteworthy that salary level and certification displayed strong relationship to attitudes toward bargaining advantages but had no impact on attitudes toward bargaining drawbacks.

Third, the opposite effects exercised by age and length of service warrants careful investigation using sub-group analysis or analysis of interaction effects in multiple regression. [10]. Virtually all previous studies show these two variables exercising a similar (and usually negative) impact on support for collective bargaining. Accounting for the contrary findings obtained in this study should further contribute to our understanding of faculty bargaining.

REFERENCES

- 1 BIGONESS, William, «Correlates of Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining», *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 6, no 2, 1978, pp. 228-233.
- 2 Canadian Association of University Teachers, *Bulletin*, Vol. 31, no 1, February, 1984.
- 3 DRISCOLL, James, «Analyzing Attitudes Towards Unions: Two Case Studies in Higher Education», *Proceedings of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, Vol. 30, 1977, pp. 366-377.
- 4 FEUILLE, Peter and James BLANDIN, «Faculty Job Satisfaction and Bargaining Sentiments: A Case Study», *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 17, no 4, 1974, pp. 678-692.
- 5 GREES, James, «Predicting Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining», *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 4, 1976, pp. 247-256.
- 6 HAMMER, Tove Helland and Michael BERMAN, «The Role of Non-Economic Factors in Faculty Union Voting», *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 66, no 4, pp. 415-421.
- 7 HERMAN, E. Edward and Gordon SKINNER, «A Survey of Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining» *Proceedings of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, Vol. 28, 1975, pp. 266-277.

- 8 HILL, Malcolm, «Variations in Job Satisfaction Among Higher Education Faculty in Unionized and Non-Unionized Institutions in Pennsylvania», *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, Vol. 11, no 2, 1982, pp. 165-179.
- 9 HILLS, Frederick and Thomas BERGMANN, «Professional Employees: Unionization Attitudes and Reward Preferences» *Personnel Administrator*, July 1982, pp. 50-55.
- 10 JANZ, Tom and Larry PINFIELD, «Interactions that Moderate the Discrimination of Stayers from Leavers for a Remote Resource Industry», *Working Paper*, no 32-82, Faculty of Management, University of Calgary, 1982.
- 11 KAMENS, David and Giam SARUP, «Reward Systems, Faculty Alienation, and Militancy: Academic Dilemmas in the Middle Age of the Academic Profession», *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 8, 1978, pp. 227-240.
- 12 KAZLOW, Carole and Joseph GIACQUINTA, «Tenure, Support of Collective Bargaining and Unionism in Higher Education: Some Challenging Findings», *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 6, 1977, pp. 45-63.
- 13 KELLEY, Lane and Alfred EDGE, «An Assessment of Attitudinal Change Toward Collective Bargaining of the University of Hawaii Faculty: 1972-1973», *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, Vol. 5, no 4, 1976, pp. 249-359.
- 14 LADD, Everett Carll, Jr. and Seymour Martin LIPSETT, *Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education*, Washington, D.C., American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1973.
- 15 MUCZYCK, Jan, Richard HISE, and Martin GANNON, «Faculty Attitudes and the Election of a Bargaining Agent in the Pennsylvania State College Systems», *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, Vol. 4, no 2, 1975, pp. 175-189.
- 16 NEUMANN, Yoram, «Determinants of Faculty Attitudes Toward Collective Bargaining in University Graduate Departments: An Organizational Climate Approach», *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 10, no 2, 1979, pp. 123-138.
- 17 NIXON II, Howard, «Faculty Support of Traditional Labor Tactics on Campus», *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 48 (Summer), 1975, pp. 276-286.
- 18 SEIDMAN, Joel, Alfred EDGE, and Lane KELLEY, «Attitudes of Hawaiian Higher Education Faculty Toward Unionism and Collective Bargaining», *Journal of Collective Negotiations*, Vol. 3, no 2, 1974, pp. 91-119.
- 19 THOMPSON, Mark, «The Development of Collective Bargaining in Canadian Universities», *Proceedings of the Industrial Relations Research Association*, Vol. 28, 1975, pp. 257-265.

La négociation collective dans les universités: le fruit de l'expérience

La négociation collective est maintenant un fait accompli dans la plupart des universités canadiennes. Les professeurs de plus de quarante universités sont accrédités en vertu des lois des relations du travail provinciales et, dans neuf autres universités, on vit sous un régime d'ententes spéciales (ce qu'on appelle ordinairement «plans spéciaux») négociées par les associations d'enseignants et l'administration des universités. Il n'y a que très peu d'universités où une convention collective sous une forme quelconque (même s'il ne s'agit que des traitements et des avantages sociaux) ne soit pas en vigueur.

Le présent article analyse les opinions des professeurs travaillant sous les régimes de conventions collectives. Il rend compte des résultats d'une enquête qui a été effectuée dans six universités canadiennes où il existe des conventions collectives et où le personnel professoral est en mesure d'en apprécier les effets.

Plus de 1 400 professeurs ont participé à cette enquête en Colombie-Britannique, en Alberta, au Manitoba, en Ontario et au Nouveau-Brunswick. L'importance du corps professoral variait entre 500 et 1 950 professeurs, l'échantillon comprenait un nombre égal d'universités où les professeurs sont accrédités et d'universités sous un régime spécial. Les négociations ont débuté sur quatre campus entre 1974 et 1976 et, sur deux autres, au cours de l'année scolaire 1978-1979.

Les données furent recueillies par la poste entre novembre 1982 et mars 1983. Le taux des réponses varie selon les endroits de 32 à 48 pour cent. Le taux combiné des réponses s'établissait à 38 pour cent. La comparaison des répondants par rapport à l'ensemble du corps professoral de chaque université n'indique aucune différence marquée en ce qui concerne l'âge, le traitement, le rang, le sexe et le pourcentage des professeurs titulaires. Pour l'échantillon combiné, l'âge moyen des répondants était de 45 ans et la moyenne des traitements s'établissait à 42 500.00\$ par année. 36 pour cent étaient professeurs à plein temps, 34 pour cent professeurs-adjoints et 19 pour cent, assistants-professeurs. 77 pour cent étaient titulaires et 84 pour cent étaient de sexe masculin.

Les réponses au questionnaire ont démontré clairement que les professeurs, qui ont fait l'expérience de la négociation collective, y sont favorables, bien qu'ils expriment certaines critiques. Les principaux avantages perçus ont trait à la protection que procure la négociation collective contre les décisions administratives arbitraires et la possibilité qu'elle offre de faire hausser les salaires. Les principaux inconvénients résideraient dans un recul de la collégialité et une surabondance de règles et de prescriptions. Mais il ressort du genre de réponses données aux questions individuelles (ainsi que d'une comparaison statistique) que les professeurs considèrent la négociation collective comme un net avantage. On s'est également rendu compte que l'arbitrage est de beaucoup la méthode préférée de solution des conflits d'intérêts. Tout

comme pour leurs confrères des États-Unis, l'enthousiasme pour la négociation collective est tempéré par les convictions politiques, le militantisme des associations, la satisfaction au travail, le traitement et l'ancienneté. Naturellement, l'activité de l'association vise à appuyer la négociation. Les courants de pensée politique prennent naissance à l'extérieur de l'université et il n'est guère probable que ces événements influencent la vie de travail du professeur. Mais les autres variables, tels que la satisfaction au travail et les salaires se rattachent nettement à la fonction. De même que des conditions de travail meilleures peuvent entraîner une désaffection pour la négociation, des contraintes financières sans fin, susceptibles d'abaisser les salaires et rendre plus mauvaises les conditions de travail, peuvent avoir l'effet contraire, donc entraîner un appui plus marqué des professeurs pour la négociation et accroître le militantisme syndical. Le gel des engagements qui a accompagné les coupures budgétaires a réduit le roulement du personnel, ce qui devrait augmenter la durée de service. Mais les avantages découlant du service plus prolongé peuvent aussi disparaître, ce qui peut modifier le rapport entre l'appui à la négociation et l'ancienneté.

Les nombreuses différences individuelles et professionnelles qui n'ont pas d'influence sur les comportements en matière de négociation sont également intéressantes. La discipline, le rang, la permanence, le passé socio-économique et l'orientation de la recherche ne sont pas des indices marquants des comportements en ce qui a trait à la négociation. Servir en qualité d'administrateur ou faire partie du comité de direction d'une association n'influent pas non plus sur les opinions, sur les jugements que l'on porte sur la négociation. Des recherches antérieures ont démontré que toutes ces variables ont un effet sur les opinions concernant la négociation avant qu'elle n'ait lieu. Le manque d'effet que l'on remarque dans le présent échantillon indique que l'expérience de la négociation a modéré les comportements découlant des pratiques scolaires précédentes et du statut à l'université. Loin de diviser les professeurs, comme ses adversaires le craignaient, l'exercice de la négociation collective semble avoir atténué les divisions qui existaient traditionnellement. En réalité, même les plus actifs au sein de l'association sont d'accord avec leurs collègues n'étant ni plus combattifs ni plus convaincus des vertus de la négociation collective.

De même, la différence entre les universités où les professeurs sont accrédités et celles sous un régime spécial n'est pas grande. Dans les deux cas, les professeurs sont d'accord sur «les inconvénients de la négociation et au sujet des tactiques militantes» mais ils diffèrent d'avis quant à ses bienfaits. Ces constatations laissent penser que les professeurs des universités sous régime spécial reconnaissent ce que coûte la négociation, mais n'accordent qu'une faveur moindre à ses avantages potentiels, ce qui reflète peut-être le fait que le champ des négociations est moins vaste sur les campus où il n'y a pas d'accréditation.